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This study investigated the effects of personality characteristics on emergent leadership in small group settings. Two instruments were used to assess personality factors: The BASIS-A and the California Personality Inventory (CPI). A sociometric tool was developed to elicit leader ranking of female group members. The BASIS-A, was used to test for Taking Charge and Wanting Recognition lifestyles in women who emerged as leaders. The CPI was used to assess female emergent leaders for Dominance and Leadership Potential. The two instruments and a sociometric form were distributed to 115 female graduate counselor-in-training students the last week of their group counseling experience. This survey resulted in 55 respondents (N=55) from eleven discussion groups.

It was expected that women who had the highest averaged leader rank would demonstrate higher test scores in Dominance, Leadership Potential, Taking Charge, and Wanting Recognition than women who received a lower averaged leader rank. It was also thought that these four test factors would
be highly related. If so, a case would be made to use the BASIS-A as an emergent leader assessment tool because it is consistently based in one psychological theory.

No significant effect was found between the highest leader rank and three of the test measures: Dominance, Leadership Potential, and Taking Charge. Using four one-way ANOVAs, a significant effect was found between highest leader rank and Wanting Recognition. This demonstrated that individuals high in interpersonal caution, empathy, and with a need to succeed emerged as leaders. Possible explanations for this finding were discussed.

Significant relationships were found using the Pearson-r correlation statistic between three of the four test variables. From the CPI, the Dominance and Leadership Potential scales were highly correlated to the BASIS-A Taking Charge life-style. The BASIS-A Wanting Recognition life-style was not related to either Dominance or Leadership Potential. Unexpectedly, a significant relationship was found in this population between Wanting Recognition and Taking Charge.

Perhaps due to the limited inter-correlational analysis and small sample, these research results did not support using the BASIS-A as a sole emergent leader assessment. More research is needed before such a case can be made.
Copyright by
Virginia C. Gray
1996
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIST OF TABLES</th>
<th>iv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Terms</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of the Problem</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of the Study</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of the Study</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. METHODS AND PROCEDURES</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruments</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications and Recommendations</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDICES</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Distribution of Dependent Measures Among the 55 Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Analysis of CPI Variable Dominance (DO) by Leader Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Analysis of CPI Variable Leadership Potential Index (LPI) by Leader Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Analysis of BASIS-A Variable Taking Charge (TC) by Leader Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Analysis of BASIS-A Variable Wanting Recognition by Leader Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>ANOVA for Leader Ranking and CPI Variable DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>ANOVA for Leader Ranking and CPI Variable LPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>ANOVA for Leader Ranking and BASIS-A Variable TC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>ANOVA for Leader Ranking and BASIS-A Variable WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Correlations Among Test Variables DO, LPI, TC and WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Linear Trend Between Leader Rank and Wanting Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Quartic Trend Between Leader Rank and Dominance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Cubic Trend Between Leader Rank and Taking Charge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Research on gender-related leadership appears to have made only small advances over the years. Meanwhile, as women continue to join the workforce in increasing numbers and leadership positions open up, more and more women have the experience and expertise to acquire leadership posts. Because women now comprise 61% of the workforce (Crosby & Jaskar, 1993), new interest in society's view of women in leadership roles is emerging. Consequently, it seems important to re-address personality and leadership to include a feminine perspective (Astin & Leland, 1991; Helgesen, 1990; Kouzes & Posner, 1987).

Clinical research of female leadership emergence is limited and the research that exists often demonstrates inconsistencies (Hegstrom & Griffith, 1992). Inconsistencies have resulted because of the following factors: Lack of agreed measurement tools, task differences, social interaction variables, variations in length of group, task skill requirements (Eagly & Kauau, 1991), group size, group setting/environment, and gender division of membership (Hegstrom & Griffith, 1992).
Early studies measured personality traits using a variety of personality assessment instruments to find a link between personality and leadership emergence. According to Mann (1959), an integration of measurement tools to describe emergent leaders was never achieved. More recently, the California Personality Inventory (CPI) has been implemented and accepted as a tool of leadership measure across the research (Burns, 1978; Gough, 1984; Gough, 1990; Simonton, 1987; Stogdill, 1981). In describing personality attributes, the CPI addresses personality as one's interpersonal orientation. The CPI scales are represented to be gender neutral and reflect general factors of interpersonal orientation or ways of living (Gough, 1990).

Although the CPI has become widely accepted in leadership emergence literature, it did not develop out of a consistent psychological theory. The BASIS-A, a lifestyle oriented instrument, was developed out of Adlerian Psychology. Similar to the CPI, the BASIS-A themes describe personality as a method of achieving interpersonal success (Wheeler, Kern, & Curlette, 1993). Concentrating on potential similarities between the two instruments, this research compared subject results on two BASIS-A lifestyle themes with two leadership oriented scales from the CPI.

A rationale for using Adlerian lifestyle themes as a
standard and a theoretically consistent measure of personality style in the leadership literature is made in the text that follows.

This study falls under the gender research category because it addresses leadership life-styles of women. Gender research has been criticized by feminist psychologists stating that it is not rigorous enough to penetrate gender stereotypes (Halpren, 1992). Contributing factors include research methods that do not capture the similarities among genders (McGrath, Kelly, Rhodes, 1991) and gender trait measures that are outmoded (Davis & Gilbert, 1989). All of these factors continue to produce biased studies (Unger & Crawford, 1993) and lead to interpretations of women as different and deficient (Eagly, 1990).

Addressing patterns and gender similarities instead of differences would help to diminish gender stereotyping, according to McGrath, Kelly, and Rhodes (1991). This study will conform to gender-free research concerns by using CPI measures to capture a "core of common characteristics pertinent to leadership" (Gough, 1990, p. 367) and BASIS-A themes to describe an individual's "motivations to achieve interpersonal success" (Kern, Wheeler, & Curlette, 1993, p. 6) regardless of gender. These two measurement tools were
expected to reflect established patterns of leaders that could describe either gender.

Because both instruments are gender free measures, we expected that BASIS-A life-styles of emergent leaders would demonstrate a significant relationship with CPI leadership scales. It appeared highly probable that the BASIS-A would provide not only a gender-free method of assessing emerging leadership thinking and strategy, but provide a theoretically consistent measure as well.

Definition of Terms

Life-Style Theme: A concept to describe an individual's consistent pattern of movement through life. Life-style themes include sets of private logic and goals of behavior that represent a method of perceiving the world. Life-style themes are in essence motivation for behavior (Curlette, Wheeler, & Kern, 1993). For the purpose of this research, a life-style theme is defined as a scale on the BASIS-A instrument. The two scales of Interest are Taking Charge and Wanting Recognition.

Leadership: A set of basic beliefs and goals that enable a person to take charge, direct others, provide feedback, and take responsibility for group tasks or group direction. Leadership is a process by which one individual influences a group to collectively and willingly engage in specific objectives or goals (Clark & Clark, 1981; Hogan,
Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). For the purpose of this research, leadership is used interchangeably with emergent leader to describe the individuals with the highest leader ranking from a group member ranking exercise (APPENDIX D).

**Emergent Leader:** A group member who takes on a dominant role to direct the group's behaviors. This can be achieved through setting goals, initiating interaction, summarizing contributions, and assisting in the overall functioning of the group (Crockett, 1955; Hogan et al., 1994). For the purpose of this research, an emergent leader is defined as an individual who has the highest ranking as a preferred group leader from a group member ranking exercise (APPENDIX D).

**Statement of the Problem**

The problem to be investigated is to uncover lifestyle themes of women who emerge as leaders in small interpersonal groups. This study will examine interpersonal lifestyle themes of women who emerge as leaders, differentiate them from non-leader women, and compare Adlerian BASIS-A lifestyle theme measures with California Personality Inventory (CPI) measures of personality associated with emergent leadership.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purposes of the study are the following: (1). to determine if high scores on CPI dominance and leadership
index scales are representative of women who emerge as leaders in small groups, (2). to determine if taking charge and wanting recognition BASIS-A life-style themes are indicative of women who emerge as leaders, (3). to analyze similarities between BASIS-A life-style theme measures and California Personality Inventory measures of women who emerge as leaders, and (4). to provide a rationale for using Adlerian life-style themes as a personality measure for future gender-free leadership research.

Significance of the Study

Clinical research on leader emergence is limited and inconsistent. Contributing factors include gender differences and biases that are not well understood or controlled for. Also, women emergent leaders are not well represented in the literature. Additionally, emergent leader measurement tools typically are gender-biased, not based on a theoretical structure, and not consistently represented throughout the emergent leader literature. The BASIS-A instrument will be used to compensate for two of the identified weaknesses. This instrument is based on the theory of Adlerian Psychology and measures interpersonal movement as defined by early pioneers of Adlerian Psychology. Additionally, the BASIS-A is a gender-free instrument (Curlett, Wheeler, & Kern, 1993).
Literature Review

The following literature review provides exploration on the effects of personality, gender, social expectations, and group dynamics on emergent leadership in small group settings. One important note must preface this review. Traditionally, the Adlerian literature does not treat personality as static. Adler (1973) viewed life-style as the cognitive organization of personality representing a central plan for living. This plan includes a combination of movement toward a positive feeling and away from a negative feeling (Brown, 1976). Similarly Gough (1987) stated that the California Personality Inventory measures personality concepts of interpersonal life representing "characteristic challenges, cathexed goals, and problems to be avoided" (Gough, 1987, p. 10). Consequently, the terms life-style and personality are used interchangeably throughout this paper.

Personality and Emergent Leadership

While leadership research has made widespread use of personality measures, no single measure of the leadership personality has been established (Hogan, Curphy & Hogan, 1994; Mann, 1959). Investigating how to evaluate leadership potential in people has long been of interest and is growing in concern as companies seek people to effectively lead in today's economic and cultural changes.
Personality traits associated with leadership were collected and reviewed by Stogdill as early as 1948. In his literature review, Stogdill (1948) reported the factors of originality, popularity, sociability, judgment, aggressiveness, desire to excel, humor, cooperativeness, liveliness, and athletic ability to be highly correlated with successful leaders.

In a meta-analysis, Mann (1959) confirmed some of Stogdill's (1948) findings. Mann (1959) correlated leadership with seven personality categories: intelligence, adjustment, extroversion, dominance, masculinity, conservatism, and sensitivity. He found all factors, with the exception of conservatism and masculinity, had high positive correlations with leadership.

Similarly, Rawls and Rawls (1968) reported a grouping of scales from the California Personality Inventory (CPI) that positively correlated with leadership. Dominance, capacity for status sociability, social presence, self-acceptance, achievement via independence, and empathy were factors associated with leaders. Later re-confirming these findings, Gough (1984) found that these traits were highly related to favorable staff and peer evaluations.

Continuing an effort to find a predictable grouping of personality factors related to leadership, Gough (1969) conducted a factor analysis resulting in a five-variable
equation. Using criterion weights he developed the Leadership Index equation. This equation was a mathematical calculation that distinguished leaders from non-leaders. Hogan (1978) validated the Leadership Index, finding a moderately high correlation (.62) between leadership ratings and Leadership Index scores. The Leadership Index, now the Leadership Potential Index, includes the dominance, sociability, good impression, achievement via independence, and sense of well being CPI scales. Gough (1969) reported that gender differences on the Leadership Potential Index tend to favor females, yet not significantly.

Interpretation of research on personality and emergent leadership is difficult due to the lack of standard terminology (Hogan, Curphy & Hogan, 1994; Mann, 1959). Hogan, Curphy, and Hogan (1994) stated that most emergent leadership research has found personality characteristics that overlap the big-five model of personality. Increasing in its acceptance, the big-five taxonomy is a method by which personality can be evaluated using constructs of surgency, emotional stability, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and intellectance. Hogan et al. (1994) suggested that the big-five model provides standard terminology that is useful in the emergent leadership personality research because several researchers found
emergent leaders possessed one or more of these constructs (Borgotta, 1954; Carter, 1954; Gough, 1990; Stogdill, 1948).

Kenny and Zaccaro (1983) reported that between 48% and 82% of the variance of leadership emergence is from personality. Stogdill (1948) stated that personality characteristics were strong factors in leadership emergence, yet he also recognized other factors as well. According to Stogdill (1948) in addition to personality, leadership is influenced by group goals and the activities of followers. Other research demonstrates the effects of gender, socialization, gender preferences, and other group variables on the impact of group leader emergence (Mann, 1959; Stogdill, 1981).

Gender and Emergent Leadership

A plethora of research exists on the relationship between gender and leader emergence. Many researchers agree that gender differences and cultural biases play a role (Davis & Gilbert, 1989; Eagly & Karau, 1991; Fleischer & Jerome, 1986; Hegstom & Griffith, 1992; Stogdill, 1981). This phenomenon was first identified by Bales (1955) who discovered that two types of group leaders emerge in small groups: a task and social leader. He suggested that task and social leaders emerge in response to the primary needs of a group of individuals similar to how they emerge in families. Because in families, men
assume roles that are task intensive while women care for the family's emotional needs, the two leader types emerge from the socialization process. Bales (1955) referred to this as the sex-role differentiation theory.

Burke (1967) verified the existence of task and social-emotional leadership factors required for successful leadership. Research by Powell and Butterfield (1981) found that masculine leadership was significantly described as task oriented and feminine leadership was described as interpersonal. This led to gender stereotyping of task and social-emotional factors prompting researchers to test these factors as if masculinity and femininity existed as extreme points on a continuum (Eagly & Karau, 1991; Powell & Butterfield, 1989). Burke (1967) disagreed with this typing as he found that role differentiation by gender occurs only under restricted circumstances.

Supporting gender differences, Hatcher (1991) found significant effects for gender on personality scales of women in the work force. Women measured less inclined toward doing harm yet more autonomous, sentient, and understanding than men on the Personality Research Form-E. Eagly and Johnson (1990) began their research by supporting gender differences among leaders by providing three rationales for expecting women to be different than men in leadership qualities: biological differences, child
rearing practices, and societal pressure to behave in a gender-consistent manner. Yet, from their meta-analysis, they concluded that women tend to be just as task orientated and more democratic in leadership style than men.

Gender differences in personality tendencies may be of little use because many researchers have reported that the most successful leaders are people who are able to demonstrate both task and social-emotional orientation (Bales, 1955; Sorenson & Savage, 1989; Sorrentino & Field, 1986). Bem (1974) also proposed that androgyny, a propensity to display both masculine and feminine traits, is the most appropriate behavior for effective behavior in general. Steinberg and Shapiro (1982) confirmed that women and men leaders do not have significantly different scores on California Personality Inventory personality measures. Their research demonstrated that women leaders score higher than non-leader women on the masculinity factor and men leaders score higher on the femininity factor than non-leader men. Leaders, then, may be individuals who have successfully integrated both gender orientations.

Gender, Social Influence, and Leader Emergence

Early studies of gender and social influence on leadership began with Megargee (1969). Social expectations were found to be barriers to women in leadership. Using
the California Personality Inventory, dominance scale, Megargee (1969) paired combinations of high dominant and low dominant males and females. Results demonstrated that high and low dominant men emerged as leaders significantly more often than high dominant women. This research was replicated well into the 1980's with only slight increases of high dominant women emerging as leaders when paired with low dominant men (Davis & Gilbert, 1989; Fleischer & Chertkoff, 1986; Goktepe & Schneier, 1989). Davis and Gilbert (1989) found that 30% of low dominant males emerged when paired with high dominant females. Davis and Gilbert (1989) suggested that these results indicate a tendency for women to behave according to cultural expectations when paired with men.

Only as a result of outside influence did Fleischer and Chertkoff (1986) and Porter et al. (1985) see an increase in high dominance women taking the lead. Feedback to women about their dominance levels in comparison to others (Fleischer & Chertkoff, 1986) and a cognitive reminder about leadership roles (Porter et al., 1985) brought significant increases in dominant women emerging as leaders in mixed-gender pairings. Conclusions suggested that social rules for gender appropriate behavior appear to be at work in male-female pairings. Beyond personality
characteristics, leadership appears to be a malleable state (Hogan, 1978).

Bass (1981) reported that it is not women's gender but the status placed on women's gender that handicaps women's emergence as leaders. Other researchers agreed that status is a variable affecting leader emergence (Crockett, 1955; Driskell & Mullen, 1990; Meeker & Wetzela-O'Niell, 1977; Stein & Heller, 1979; Thune et al., 1980). Wood and Kanter (1986) tested this by giving false feedback about status, including competence, intellect, and moral aptitude to their subjects. Finding that status, not gender, predicted leader emergence, Wood and Kanter (1986) concluded that society's devaluation of women's gender creates a lowered, or false status. This finding strongly indicates that leader emergence cannot be based solely on being a woman or a man.

Continuing to search for emergent leadership factors, several researchers investigated the relationship between group member participation rate and emergent leadership in small group settings (Aries, 1976; Aries, 1982; Bass, 1949; Borgotta, 1954; Craig & Sherif, 1986; Megargee et al., 1966; Mullen et al., 1985; Stein & Heller, 1979). Bass (1949) was the first to demonstrate participation rate as a predictor to leader emergence. After participation rate was found to account for 63% of
emergent leadership variance (Stein & Heller, 1979) it was discovered that males in mixed-group task-oriented settings tend to give more task-oriented contributions (Borgotta, 1954; Eagly & Karau, 1991; Stein & Heller, 1979) and initiate and receive significantly more group interaction (Aries, 1976) than females. However, Eagly and Karau (1991) argued that the participation rate of males is inflated in the literature by virtue of the task-oriented, short-term nature of academic research. As several researchers demonstrated, the number of times males and females initiate interaction in a group changes as gender composition, task orientation (Aries, 1982; Craig & Sherif, 1986; Eagly & Karau, 1991), motivation, and knowledge of leadership capability changes (Carter, 1954; Mullen et al., 1985).

**Gender Preference for Leaders**

Research studies reported mixed results around gender preference in leaders (Eagly, Makhi jani, & Klonsky, 1992; Knight & Saal, 1984; Russell et al., 1988; Shore, 1992). One study reported that males are more highly rated than females, especially in male-dominated fields (Eagly, Makhi jani, & Klonsky, 1992). Yet, other research found that women preferred women leaders who had high levels of both task- and social-emotional orientation regardless of field (Russell et al. (1988). Of the preferred women
leaders, their social-emotional ability was rated higher than preferred male leader counterparts. Russel et al. (1988) said that this demonstrates society's inequity of expectations between male and female leaders. Higher expectations exist for female leaders.

Subtle biases against women as leaders appear to be at play. Kushell and Newton (1986) found subordinates preferred to be led by a democratic leader. And while Eagly and Johnson (1990) discovered that women were more likely to use a democratic leadership style than men, some research suggested preferences for male leaders. Pazy (1992) found previous experience being led by a female diminishing such biases, however, low expectations for future performance, due to a belief that women's success is based on luck (Eagly, Makhijani & Klonsky, 1992), appears to explain the disparity in ratings and rankings of female leader candidates in the workplace (L'Heureux-Barrett & Barnes-Farrell, 1991; Shore, 1992).

Eagly and Johnson (1990) acknowledged that women and men may lead differently, yet occupation and training (Gough, 1990; Hatcher, 1991) have been found to influence leadership discrepancies. Some research shows a trend that women "at the top" drop feminine leadership styles and adopt more male-oriented leadership styles in order to be accepted and to be perceived as competent. Baril et al.
(1989), Knight & Saal (1984), and Shore (1992) found that females with high levels of stereotypic masculine traits are favored over females with high levels of stereotypic feminine traits as leaders by both female and male subordinates.

Conversely, more research has suggested individuals with a combination of task and social-orientation emerge as leaders, regardless of gender (Baril et al., 1989; Day & Stogdill, 1972; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Gerber, 1988; Gough, 1990; Noble, 1987; Sorrentino & Field, 1986). Even so, women leaders with high levels of social-orientation may be on the rise in popularity and acceptability as indicated by an increasing number of studies reporting destructiveness from too much competition (Kounzes & Posner, 1987) and that women's leadership competence is comparable to men's (L'Heureux-Barrett & Barnes-Farrell, 1991; Wentworth & Anderson, 1984). In support, positive correlations have been reported for women exhibiting high levels of task orientation and social-emotional orientation with higher management positions in organizational settings (Russell et al, 1988).

Several studies demonstrate a trend that women who are viewed as high in social-orientation and task-expertise avoid taking the leadership role and are less likely to self identify as a leader (Crocker & McGraw, 1984; Goktepe
& Schneier, 1989; Hegstrom & Griffith, 1992; Owen, 1986; Stogdill, 1981). Helgesen (1990) and Owen (1986) explained that women may avoid the leader role in order to maintain their developmental preference of in-relation-to-others (Gilligan, 1982). Owen (1986) supported this with research results: Women leaders emphasized togetherness at the expense of being perceived as the leader.

Group Factors and Leader Emergence

Although personality, gender, and social influence play a large part in emergent leadership, group factors cannot be overlooked. Research has found that as group situations change, the personal attributes required for the leader role will change (Clifford & Cohn, 1964; Mann, 1959). The most predominantly researched group elements include task-type (Eagly & Karau, 1991; Mann, 1959; Meeker & Weitzel-O'Niell, 1977; Wentworth & Anderson, 1984), group duration (Eagly & Karau, 1991; Knight & Saal, 1984; Wood et al., 1985) group culture and composition (Aries, 1976, 1982; Craig & Sherif, 1986; Mabry, 1986; Porter et al., 1985), and group size (Medalia, 1954; Porter et al., 1985).

Group Task

To test for gender differences in leader emergence, early researchers attempted to keep tasks gender-neutral (Eagly & Karau, 1991). Yet, because of inconsistent
results throughout the literature, task was manipulated to explore associations with task type and leader emergence. Tasks were either goal completion or discussion with no expected outcome. Results showed that when task was socially-oriented or viewed as feminine in nature, women emerged as leaders. Men emerged as leaders most often when the group goal was task-completion or when the task was viewed as masculine in nature (Eagly & Karau, 1991; Wentworth & Anderson, 1984). Wentworth and Anderson (1984) concluded that gender of task inhibits or facilitates leadership emergence.

Carbonell (1984) manipulated task in high dominant women-high dominant men pairings. He showed a significant increase in high dominant women emerging as leaders only when the task was feminine. When tasks were neutral, Meeker and Weitzel-O’Neill (1977) stated that men and women would emerge with equal occurrence. However, this contradicts Eagly and Karau’s (1991) meta-analysis findings that men emerge more often than women on general leadership.

**Group Duration**

Length of time a group is together is another factor found to influence leader emergence. Wood et al. (1985) and Eagly and Karau (1991) found that males tend to emerge in short-term situations whereas women tend to emerge as
leaders of groups that meet over an extended period of time. Several group specialists have noted that as a group meets they transition through stages (Berg & Landreth, 1991; Tuckman & Jensen, 1977), and, over time, the social complexity of the group increases (Berg & Landreth, 1991). Eagly and Karau (1991) explained that initial group success depends on movement toward the group goal which requires a task-oriented and knowledgeable individual. But, as the group moves toward their goal, social leaders emerge to increase support and morale needed for long-term success (Bales, 1955; Eagly & Karau, 1991; Wentworth & Anderson, 1984).

Knight and Saal (1984) stated that in long-term relationships it is perceived expertise, not gender, that influences leadership choice. Wentworth and Anderson (1984) agreed that task expertise plays a role in leader emergence but more significantly for women than for men: Women expressed greater knowledge on feminine tasks than men. This coupled with the fact that women are perceived to be more socially competent (Stein & Heller, 1979) and social-orientation is considered a feminine task (Carbonell, 1984; Powell & Butterfield, 1981), both men and women tend to choose women leaders when negotiation and sharing of ideas is the predominant group task (Wentworth & Anderson, 1984; Wood et al., 1985).
Short group duration is reportedly typical of academic studies (Eagly & Karau, 1991). Eagly and Karau (1991) confirmed that expression of gender stereotyped behavior changes with the length of time a group is together. They reported that short-term behaviors are more gender stereotypical than long-term behaviors. Consequently, Eagly and Karau (1991) concluded that the academic culture of short-term studies may produce exaggerated reports of men emerging as leaders more often than women.

**Group Culture and Composition**

Group composition also affects behavior that influences leader emergence. Research findings demonstrate that males and females behave differently in same gender and mixed gender groups (Aries, 1976; Aries, 1982; Eagly & Karau, 1991; Mabry, 1985). In all-male groups, an increase in aggressive responses (Mabry, 1985) and a stable dominance order (Aries, 1976) was reported. All-female groups showed less disagreement (Mabry, 1985) and more flexibility in rank order (Aries, 1976).

Distribution of gender mix in groups has been found to influence leader emergence. When groups were of equal gender distribution, behaviors were less gender stereotypic (Carli, 1985). Aries (1976) found significant changes in male interaction styles from single gender to mixed gender groups in her early research, and yet demonstrated no
differences in later research (1982). In mixed gender groups, women showed an increase in verbal dominance while men increased non-verbal dominance (Ariess, 1976, 1982). Although this research is primarily based on short-term gatherings, it suggests that gender role expectations appear to be at work in mixed gender groups.

Manipulating the gender ratio of the group yields conflicting effects. Craig and Sherif (1986) demonstrated that men are more influential when they are only one in a group with three women. Oppositely, Eagly and Karau (1991) reported that men are less likely to take a leadership role when they are a token group member. However, Eagly and Karau (1991) noted that research trends have changed over time. More recently, they reported that with an unequal number of male and female group members, male emergent leadership has shown declines over the past 10 years.

Group Size

A final variable that influences leader emergence is the size of the group. As size of group increases the emergent leader shifts due to the changes in expectations of leadership behaviors (Medalia, 1954) and deviations from behavioral norms that occur (Porter et al., 1985). Stogdill (1978) reported several studies that indicate the chances for leadership diminishes as the group size increases. Stogdill (1978) explained that leadership
demands change due to an increase in the demand for structure and direction as group size increases. And, because structure is traditionally a masculine task (Powell & Butterfield, 1981; Carbonell, 1984), this validates Eagly and Karau's (1991) finding that men tend to emerge as leaders of large groups.

Summary of the Literature

The literature on emergent leadership demonstrates many factors effecting who emerges as leaders of groups. Variables associated with the group experience, such as task-orientation, duration, gender, social influence, culture, and size, have been shown to influence leader emergence. The research also demonstrated how these factors have influenced leadership evaluation and satisfaction. Yet due to the multitude of factors and their variations, the research provides few conclusive themes. The least conclusive is in the area of personality and gender.

Because we know that personality can account for up to 82% of the variance associated with leader emergence (Kenny & Zaccaro, 1983) and that a preference for women leaders may be forthcoming (Dounzes & Posner, 1987), this research will concentrate on personality factors associated with feminine leader emergence.
Another limitation found in the literature was the use of measurement tools having scales which were not represented by a consistent psychological theory but, instead, on groupings of generic personality factors. Consequently, this study will take an instrument based on Adlerian Psychology, the BASIS-A and compare it with one of the more widely used leader assessment instruments, the California Psychological Inventory.

And finally, most research on leader emergence in groups was done on short-term meetings with specific tasks to be completed. With a specific task and generally no more than 5 meetings, these studies invite biases for group leader emergence from the onset. This study will look at discussion groups that must organize themselves over a 14 week period.
CHAPTER II

METHOD AND PROCEDURES

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested for the purpose of examining the effects of leader ranking on specific instrument scale results as well as the relationship between Adlerian life-style themes and CPI scale results.

Hypothesis 1. There will be a significant difference between mean scores on the California Personality Inventory (CPI) Dominance scale by group leader ranking.

Hypothesis 2. There will be a significant difference between mean scores on the California Personality Inventory (CPI) Leadership Potential Index scale by group leader ranking.

Hypothesis 3. There will be a significant difference between mean scores on the Taking Charge (TC) life-style theme from the BASIS-A Inventory by group leader ranking.

Hypothesis 4. There will be a significant difference between mean scores on the Wanting Recognition (WR) life-style theme from the BASIS-A Inventory by group leader ranking.

Hypothesis 5. There will be a significant positive relationship between (a). Taking Charge and (b). Wanting Recognition life-style themes on the BASIS-A Inventory and
(a). Dominance and (b). Leadership Potential Index scores on the CPI instrument.

Subjects

The subjects of this study were 55 graduate level counselor-in-training students participating in group counseling classes at the University of North Texas. Groups were solicited from a university setting in order to maintain a consistent group context: Personal growth groups working on interpersonal and intrapersonal issues. These groups met weekly for one hour and 45 minutes for 14 weeks. The student groupings that were used in this study had no less than five and no more than ten group members with at least 50 percent female membership.

Participation in this study was voluntary. Subjects were told that their responses would be included in doctoral dissertation research, that their responses would be held in confidence, and that no name or identifying information would be included. They were also instructed that their decision to participate would not affect their class grade. Subjects were instructed that they were free to withdraw from this study at any time without penalty, prejudice, or loss of benefits to which they are otherwise entitled as a group member and university student. All participants were given the option of receiving the results of this study after completion.
Data Collection

Subjects were asked to volunteer to participate in this research. Group counseling classes were visited near the end of their group counseling experience. Classes were informed about what to expect if they volunteered: To fill out an informed consent form, to complete the BASIS-A and the CPI inventories, a group member ranking sheet, and a personal data sheet. Candidates were given the opportunity to ask the researcher questions at the initial meeting.

For groups of individuals who volunteered, pre-set packets were distributed to each volunteer. Three types of packets were distributed, one for women, one for men, and one for group facilitators. Pre-set packets for women contained, (1). an instruction sheet, (2). an informed consent form., (3). the CPI and BASIS-A assessment instruments, (4). a group member ranking sheet, and (5). a demographic sheet. Packets for male group members and group facilitators included, (1). an instruction sheet, (2). an informed consent form, (3). a group member ranking sheet, and (4). a demographic sheet.

Subjects were asked to fill out the information, seal their packet, and return it to their group counseling instructor the following week. The investigator collected the packets from instructors the following week.

Group members were instructed that approximately 1 hour 20 minutes would be needed to complete the two instruments and
that the researcher would be available by telephone should any questions arise. After group members returned the research documentation, the researcher collected the packets and organized them according to small group membership.

A master list of groups and respective subject names was created to code volunteer results. This was done to ensure confidentiality and reduce any researcher bias. With the logging of scored instrument results, subject names were replaced with numerics. This, along with group member rank and demographic data, was coded before any data analysis procedures were done.

Twenty one groups over a three semester timeframe were asked to participate in this research. Of these, 11 groups provided usable data. Two criteria were used to determine usable group data. First, at least 50 percent of the group had to be comprised of female membership, and second, 50 percent of the group membership had to participate in the study. Four groups did not fit the first criterion and 6 groups did not fit the second criterion.

From the 115 female group members who initially volunteered, 72 turned in completed packets, 2 turned in packets incomplete, and 41 volunteers did not return their research packets. This represents a 62.6% response rate. Within the 11 groups available, 55 participants' ranking and instrument results were used in this study (N=55). According
to Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1988), the size of sample population does not affect correlational outcomes. However, Kerlinger (1986) recommended using a minimum of 10 subjects per test variable. This research procedure used five test variables. Consequently, 55 female subjects satisfied the minimum of 50 needed for this study sample. Additionally, eight of the 22 group leaders (one group had a leader and co-leader) and 4 male group members participated in the sociometric leader ranking procedure.

Instruments

BASIS-A Instrument

The Basic Adlerian Scales for Interpersonal Success - Adult Form (BASIS-A) was developed by Wheeler, Kern, and Curlette (1993) to measure life-style themes. BASIS-A is a 65-item Likert scale self-report instrument that takes about 15 minutes to complete. The 65 items were derived from a factor analysis of 715 subjects from the southeastern United States, responding to 48 childhood items taken from Wheeler's (1980) questionnaire. The factor analysis resulted in five life-style themes: Belonging-Social Interest, Going Along, Taking Charge, Wanting Recognition, and Being Cautious.

Life-style themes describe an individual's "response style" (Kern, Wheeler, & Curlette, 1993, p. 15) which helps in understanding one's motivations in solving problems. The two life-style themes hypothesized to represent emergent leaders
are Taking Charge (TC) and Wanting Recognition (WR). Scores on these two life-style themes reflect a person having more or less of the dimension (Kern, Wheeler, & Curlette, 1993).

Taking Charge represents the leadership dimension. Leading groups, speaking up, and being strong-willed are characterized by a high score on Taking Charge. Low Taking Charge scores represent individuals who do not prefer taking the leadership role. High scores on the life-style theme, Wanting Recognition, represent a desire to gain approval from others. Indifferent to the opinions of others, people for whom approval from others is not important score low on Wanting Recognition. Wanting Recognition can also represent a "need to succeed" (p. 40) subscale determined by responses on specific assessment items (Kern, Wheeler, & Curlette, 1993).

Validity

Content, construct, and criterion-related validity has been established for the BASIS-A instrument. According to Kerlinger (1986), content validity demonstrates that the instrument measures what the researchers intend it to measure. Validity is, "the representativeness or sampling adequacy of the content" (p. 417). Curlette, Wheeler, & Kern (1993) established item representation in the initial item analysis of each content domain using expert Adlerian judges to determine theoretical accuracy.
Construct validity addresses variables or properties that affect the variance of performance between individuals. Constructs represent properties being measured and are typically associated with a theory (Kerlinger, 1986). Construct validity for the BASIS-A is supported by several methods. Two of these are expert Adlerian judges' ratings and inter-correlation of BASIS-A themes. Additionally, four themes, Taking Charge, Wanting Recognition, Being Cautious, and Going Along, when correlated with Social Interest, represent a rank order similar to Dreikurs' goals of misbehavior (Curlette, Kern, & Mullis, 1984).

Criterion-related validity is provided primarily by Pearson R correlations of each BASIS-A life-style theme with other psychological instruments. According to Kerlinger (1986), criterion-related validity is established by comparing test scores with already established criteria that measure the same or similar attribute. Criterion-related correlations for BASIS-A life-style themes and other instruments are extensive. Summaries indicate Pearson correlations range from .35 to .50 (Curlette, Wheeler, & Kern, 1993). Because a Pearson R measures the relationship between two factors, when the correlation factor is squared, it reveals the percentage that one variable can be said to be shared with another. According to Kerlinger (1986), the correlations derived from Curlette, Wheeler, and Kern (1993) are significant. Kerlinger (1986)
states that any correlation above .30, when derived from assessments of a large N, is statistically significant because 10% shared variance may point to an important relationship between variables.

For this study, the validity coefficients for Taking Charge (TC) and Wanting Recognition (WR) are discussed. High scores on Taking Charge life-style demonstrates correlations between .30 and .399 with Abasement (PRF), Extroversion (MBTI), Narcissistic (MCMI-II), Aggressive/Sadistic (MCMI-II), Antisocial (MCMI-II), Histrionic (MCMI-II), and Paranoid (MCMI-II). Correlations between .40 and .499 are found for Taking Charge and Aggression (PRF), while correlations of .50 and greater are shown between Taking Charge and Dominance (PRF) (Curlette, Wheeler, & Kern, 1993).

Wanting Recognition, high scores, have positive correlations ranging between .30 and .399 with Social Introversion (MMPI), History of Eating Disorder, Low risk of drug use, and Self-Defeating (MCMI-II) factors. Positive correlations from .40 to .499 exist between Wanting Recognition and Lack of Physical Health (CRIS) and Lack of Depression (BDI) (Curlette, Wheeler, & Kern, 1993).

Reliability

Predictability, dependability, and score stability describes the term reliability. An instrument is said to be reliable when results remain constant when the same subject is
measured again and again over time (Kerlinger, 1986). BASIS-A reliability is rated on internal consistency using the Spearman Brown coefficient alpha (Curlette, Wheeler, & Kern, 1993). Kerlinger (1986) stated that internal consistency tests the homogeneity of test items. With N=1083, coefficient alphas ranged from .82 to .87. Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs, (1988) noted that .70 to .90 can be interpreted as a high correlation.

Stability can be determined by test-retest methodology (Kerlinger, 1986). Test-retest reliability of the five BASIS-A lifestyle themes ranges from .66 to .87. According to Kerlinger (1986) these results are moderate. According to Curlette, Wheeler, and Kern, 1993, stability is weak perhaps due to the homogeneity of their sample, university students.

**California Personality Inventory**

The California Psychological Inventory (CPI) was developed by Harrison Gough to assess personality dimensions and interpersonal traits. Commonly used in counseling, academia, and business, the CPI is a 462-item true or false self-report instrument and takes about one hour to complete. A standard score scale with a mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10, the scales were derived from a normative sample of 6,000 adult females and 7,000 adult males (Gough, 1987).
The CPI assesses twenty "folk concept" (Gough, 1987, p. 1) scales that represent the underlying structure of the instrument. Dominance, Capacity for Status, Sociability, Social Presence, Self-Acceptance, Independence, Empathy, Responsibility, Socialization, Self-Control, Good Impression, Communality, Well Being, Tolerance, Achievement via Conformance, Achievement via Independence, Intellectual Efficiency, Psychological-mindedness, Flexibility, and Femininity/Masculinity comprise the twenty folk concept scales of the CPI.

For the purposes of this study, the researcher evaluated emergent leaders on the folk scale dominance as well as a cluster of scales associated with the Leadership Potential Index (LPI) scale. The LPI cluster of CPI scales includes the following weighted factors: dominance, sociability, good impression, achievement via independence, and sense of well being (Gough, 1969; Hogan, 1978).

A very high dominance score, a t-score above 70, indicates characteristics of competition, a need to control, domineering, and aggressively seeking power. A high score (55-70T) indicates a person who is reasonably dominant and who will take on leader roles when asked to do so. A low dominance score (30-55T) represents individuals who are not strongly dominant. This person may avoid leadership roles, is likely to be nonassertive, and may exhibit passive-aggressive
behaviors. A very low dominance score (below 30T) is likely to be passive, avoid pressure and tension, appear shy and may avoid responsibility (McAllister, 1988).

The LPI is a special index of the California Personality Inventory. This special index, "is designed to assess leadership potential, foresight, and decision-making ability" (McAllister, 1988, p. 22). A high LPI score (above 60T) indicates individuals who are dominant, self-confident, aggressive, rational, logical, clear thinking, demanding, ambitious, even egotistical. A low LPI score (below 40T) indicates a person who is not well suited for leadership. These individuals are cautious, careful, shy, unassuming, patient, peaceable, submissive, and cooperative. The mean LPI score is 50T with a standard deviation of plus or minus 5.50 for both females and males (McAllister, 1988).

Validity

Gough (1987) reported that the CPI scales are not homogeneous dimensions because life-styles are multi-themed. Consequently, internal validity among scales is relatively high as indicated by Gough's (1987) factor analysis. According to Kerlinger (1986), factor analysis is a multivariate method to discover or identify dimensions behind many measures. Four factors emerged from Gough's (1987) factor analysis. The twenty folk scales clustered into factor one, extraversion; factor two, control; factor three, flexibility;
and factor four, consensuality. These factors became a method
to slot individuals into four separate and distinctive life-
style: Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta.

Validity was further established with a panel of expert
judges who performed a consensual Q-sort on individuals who
had already taken the CPI. The sample included 793 persons.
Items were sought from Q-sorts correlated at or beyond the .01
probability level, yet most items were correlated at or beyond
the .05 significance level. Six positive correlation
coefficients ranging from .17 to .26 and six negatively
correlated factors ranging from -.15 to -.25 were found to
confirm the four life-style categories. Kerlinger (1986)
reported that with large N's, correlations at the .17 level
can demonstrate an important contribution as it accounts for
19% of the item variance.

Reliability

Reliability coefficients for the twenty folk concepts
were performed on English speaking college and high school
students and French speaking high school students. Using the
Spearman Brown formula, alpha coefficients for college males
ranged from .45 to .85 with a median coefficient of .72.
Alpha coefficients for college females ranged from .39 to .83
with a median of .73 (Gough, 1987). Correlations for English
speaking male high school students ranged from .43 to .76 with
a median of .68. For female English speaking high school
students, correlations ranged from .58 to .79 with a median of .71. French speaking male and female high school students reported difficulty reading the French version: Male correlations ranged from .50 to .83 with a median of .68, Female correlations ranged from .42 to .83 with a median of .70. According to Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1988), these correlations can be interpreted as ranging from low to high. Median alpha coefficients of .68 are considered having a moderate relationship whereas .70, .71, .72 and .73 are considered highly related.

**Sociometrics**

Jennings (1947) was one of the first researchers to measure the correlation between choice and status. She used a modified sociometric design to get interpersonal feelings of group participants about each other. Sociometrics are popular as they carry the effects of social choice, interaction, communication and influence of group composition. While popular, sociometrics are not used very often for research purposes because they are difficult to use. The methods of sociometric analyses are mathematically complex and difficult (Kerlinger, 1986).

Sociometrics and emergent leadership was explored by a couple of researchers. Shaw and Rothschild (1956) demonstrated a strong relationship between leader emergence and the person chosen most frequently as liked to be around.
They postulated that centrality (a graphic representation of sociometrics) was a factor for leader emergence. Other research has confirmed that centrality is a dominant factor in leader emergence (Abrahamson, 1969; Cohen, Bennis, & Wolkon, 1961).

According to Kerlinger (1982), a person is asked to choose one or more persons according to a set of criteria. That criteria is set in the form of a question. Consequently, a sociometric questionnaire will be administered to group members to determine a group leader.

Social choice of a group leader came from group members rank-order of each group member according to specified criteria (see APPENDIX D). The main purpose of this ranking is to create a scale for subjects so that individual information can be analyzed with interval data (Kerlinger, 1986). The group member ranking sheet will allow emergent leader rankings to be compared with BASIS-A and CPI results. An added advantage of using forced rankings is to partially eliminate socially pressured or socially desirable responses (Kerlinger, 1986).

Assumptions

It is assumed that individuals participating in the study are at or above the normal range of intelligence to read the assessment instruments and understand the researcher's instructions with little trouble. Additionally, it is assumed
that the participants are genuine in their desire to accurately self-assess and self-represent in order to gain accurate life-style theme and personality trait measures. It is also assumed that participants will with earnest sincerity complete a sociometric evaluation of their group and that collectively a group can perceive an emergent leader.

Limitations

The study is subject to limitations. Academic groups that volunteer to participate in this study may not be typical of other small discussion groups. Group composition, Master's level university students, may not be comparable to discussion groups researched thus far.

Reasons for volunteering may be a limiting factor. Students may volunteer based on interest of topic, not volunteer based on disinterest of topic, or they may feel influenced to participate by an instructor/professor, or other variables yet unknown.

Additionally, these groups are naturally occurring. Therefore, composition of several groups had both males and females. Because the investigator was interested in factors of emergent leadership with regard to women, subjects were asked to rank only female group members. Realizing that male group members may have emerged as the group leader, this research eliminated males from receiving a leader rank. Women with the highest leader rank from each group represented the
feminine leaders of this research. Because test scores from the highest ranked female group member from each group were the only scores computed, the reliability and generalizability of this study may be compromised. Using this methodology may inflate or deflate statistical results between leadership ranking and assessment variables (Kerlinger, 1982).

Likewise, the subjects studied in this research will be from one geographical area, the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex. This may reduce the generalizability of results to other geographical areas of the United States.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data Analysis

This chapter presents results of the study, including data analysis concerning each of the five hypotheses investigated. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the results and recommendations for further research.

The data on 55 subjects was analyzed to test the hypotheses of this study. The distribution of the four dependent variables, Dominance (DO), Leadership Potential Index (LPI), Taking Charge (TC), and Wanting Recognition (WR) among the 55 subjects are summarized in Table 1. This table displays the mean scores for each dependent variable across all leader ranks.

Table 1
Distribution of Dependent Measures Among the 55 Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Scales</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Min. Score</th>
<th>Max Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56.86</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>78.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52.02</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>68.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53.41</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>74.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPI</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52.81</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>42.77</td>
<td>62.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following four tables summarize the differences in subject scores on the four dependent measures by leader ranking. For this study, classification, leader rank, is the independent variable and assessment scores are the dependent variables (Hinkle, Wiersma & Jurs, 1988). The information in these four tables also represent the descriptive information which was evaluated in the ANOVA procedures.

Table 2
Analysis of CPI Variable Dominance (DO) by Leader Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57.83</td>
<td>11.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>59.27</td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53.27</td>
<td>10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56.54</td>
<td>9.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53.40</td>
<td>13.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Analysis of CPI Variable Leadership Potential Index (LPI) by Leader Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52.64</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51.45</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.80</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Analysis of BASIS-A Variable Taking Charge (TC) by Leader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51.50</td>
<td>10.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.45</td>
<td>8.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51.18</td>
<td>10.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51.45</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.10</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Analysis of BASIS-A Variable Wanting Recognition (WR) by Leader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>62.33</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52.91</td>
<td>7.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51.81</td>
<td>9.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47.64</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54.10</td>
<td>9.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The means for variable DO range from a low of 53.27 to a high of 57.83 and the standard deviations range from 8.16 to 13.53. The range of means and standard deviations for the LPI variable are more restrictive. The means range from a low of 50.80 to a high of 52.63 and the standard deviations range from 2.87 to 5.13. Dependent variable TC has means that range from a low of 51.18 to a high of 55.18 with standard deviations ranging from 6.80 to 10.95. The means for the WR variable
range from a low of 47.64 to a high of 62.33 with standard deviations from 7.80 to 9.38.

**Hypothesis One: Leader Rank and CPI Dominance (DO)**

To test hypothesis one, a one-way ANOVAs was calculated. This analysis answers the question of whether there is a difference in DO scores by leader rank. Table 6 illustrates the information for a one-way ANOVA for leader rank and the DO scale.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>309.68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77.42</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>5665.16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>113.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5974.83</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 6 shows, there was not a significant difference on the CPI DO scales among the different leader rankings. The F-ratio for between ranking groups was .68 which did not reach the criterion for significance at the .05 level. Hypothesis one is not supported by this study.
Hypothesis Two: Leader Rank and CPI Leadership Potential Index (LPI) Scale

Hypothesis two was tested using a one-way ANOVA analysis. This analysis answers the question of whether there is a difference in LPI scores by leader rank. Table 7 illustrates the results from this analysis.

Table 7
ANOVA for Leader Ranking and CPI Variable LPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>19.93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>748.87</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>768.80</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 demonstrates that there is no significant difference between leader ranking and LPI scores. The between groups F-ratio was .33 which did not reach the criterion for significance at the .05 level. Consequently, hypothesis two is not supported.

Hypothesis Three: Leader Rank and BASIS-A Taking Charge (TC) Scale

This research question asks whether there is a difference in TC and WR scores by leader rank. To test this hypothesis two one-way ANOVAs were calculated. Table 8
illustrates the information for a one-way ANOVA for leader rank and the TC scale.

**Table 8**

**ANOVA for Leader Ranking and BASIS-A Variable TC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>139.12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43.78</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>4104.99</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>82.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4244.11</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows no significant difference between leader ranking and variable TC. The between groups F-ratio was .40 which did not reach the criterion for significance at the .05 level. This result does not support hypothesis three that differences would be found in TC scores between leader rank groupings.

**Hypothesis Four: Leader Rank and BASIS-A Wanting Recognition (WR) Scale**

This research question asks whether there is a difference in WR scores by leader rank. To test this hypothesis a one-way ANOVA was calculated. Table 9 illustrates the information for a one-way ANOVA for leader rank and the WR scale.
Table 9

ANOVA for Leader Ranking and BASIS-A Variable WR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1343.89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>335.97</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>4144.78</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>82.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5488.67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from Table 9 demonstrated a significant difference between leader rankings and WR scores. The between groups F-ratio was 4.05 which exceeded the criterion for significance at the .05 level. A post hoc multiple comparison test was run to decide which combination of group (leader rank) means were different. The Tukey Studentized Range Test was run on the WR variable for pairwise contrasts (Hinkle, Wiersma & Jurs, 1988). Critical value of Studentized Range was set at 4.00 with alpha at the .05 level. The Tukey test statistic Q was found to be 5.89 for pairwise comparison of group (leader rank) 1 and group (leader rank) 4 which exceeds the critical value of 4.00. Because variable WR was statistically significant, hypothesis four is supported.
Hypothesis Five: Relationship Between All Dependent Variables.

Testing hypothesis five, the Pearson product-moment correlation was used to test the relationship between the four assessment scales, TC, WR, DO and LPI. The two conditions for using this statistic were met: using the same set of individuals on two or more measures, and measuring interval or ratio scale variables (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1988).

This study used the raw score formula to calculate the Pearson-r indexes. These calculations were performed on all pairings of variables to satisfy hypothesis three. Table 10 indicates the relationships between all four test variables.

Table 10
Correlations Among Test Variables DO, LPI, TC and WR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>LPI</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>WR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPI</td>
<td>.850***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>.530***</td>
<td>.351**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05 two-tailed; ** p < .01 one-tailed; *** p < .005 one-tailed

Hypothesis five stated that there would be a significant positive relationship between the test variables assessed from the CPI and BASIS-A instruments. Correlational results
partially supported this hypothesis. Within the CPI instrument, the LPI scale was found to be significantly correlated with the DO scale. Similarly, within the BASIS-A instrument, the TC scale was moderately, yet significantly, correlated to the WR scale. Between instruments, the BASIS-A TC scale showed a significant correlation to both the CPI DO and LPI scales. However, the BASIS-A WR scale did not significantly correlate to either CPI scale assessed. Therefore, hypothesis five is partially supported.

**Discussion**

This study was designed to determine if leader ranking is influenced by assessment scores on four scales, Dominance, Leadership Potential Index, Taking Charge, and Wanting Recognition. An additional objective was to examine the relationship between these four assessment variables.

**Leader Ranking and Assessment Scores**

No significant differences were found between leader ranking and mean scores on the first two assessment scales, Dominance and Leadership Potential Index. These results do not support current thinking that emergent leaders are high in CPI Dominance and Leadership Potential Index scores (Gough, 1969; 1984; Hogan, 1978; Mann, 1959; Rawls & Rawls, 1968). However, in accordance with Mann (1959), Dominance only increases the chances of leadership designation; leadership is a function of personality and group setting.
Group setting may have influenced the results of this study in two ways. First, subjects were high in homogeneity. They were from the same Master's program seeking similar career outcomes. Scores from Table 4 illustrate very little score variation from the mean score of 51. Second, useable group data came from groups with a predominance of female membership. And, according to the research, all-female groups are more flexible in their ranking of each other (Aries, 1976). This phenomenon could have occurred reducing the effectiveness of the sociometric ranking procedure.

No precedence has been set for Taking Charge or Wanting Recognition in the area of leader emergence. This study found no significant differences between mean scores on Taking Charge by leader rank. Again, the results may have been influenced by the population sampled. Taking Charge may be a common personality characteristic among individuals in the counseling profession. Curlette, Wheeler, and Kern (1993) describe the Taking Charge theme as taking control of, and directing, one's environment and other people, speaking up, and being strong willed. The converse could also be true. Individuals in the counseling profession may not be highly represented by the Taking Charge theme. There is no data to support either possibility. However, this finding was not expected and suggests that the sample population may have reduced the effect of the Taking Charge variable.
There was a significant difference between mean scores on the Wanting Recognition scale by leader rank. The highest ranked individuals (rank 1) scored highest in Wanting Recognition with each respective rank scoring lower. Table 11 illustrates a linear trend with respect to Wanting Recognition and leader rank (Hinkle, Wiersma & Jurs, 1988). This finding supports the hypothesis that being concerned about what others think and wanting to please others (Curlette, Wheeler, & Kern, 1993) are personality dynamics that influence leader emergence. This concurs with previous research stating that empathy (Gough, 1981), supportiveness (Sorenson & Savage, 1989), and affiliation-orientation

Table 11
Linear Trend Between Leader Rank and Wanting Recognition

![Graph showing a linear trend between leader rank and mean score on Wanting Recognition scale. The graph plots mean score against subject groupings by leader rank, with a downward trend from rank 1 to rank 5.]
(Sorenson & Field, 1986) are personality characteristics influencing leader emergence in discussion groups.

Individuals who want recognition tend to hold back early in interactions (Curlette, Wheeler, & Kern, 1993) which concurs with Zuccaro et al. (1991) that leader emergence is related to one's ability to control one's expressive behaviors. It may be that individuals who observe others' interactions cautiously and then plan their interaction based on current dynamics (Hogan, 1978) are best positioned to take advantage of appropriate interactional leader-follower patterns (Mann, 1959; Stogdill, 1948).

Although not significant, other trends were found that are worth mentioning. Dominance resulted in a moderate quartic trend with two highs, leader rank 2 and 4, and two lows, leader rank 1 and 5. Taking Charge demonstrated a non-significant cubic trend. The two highs were leader rank 2 and 5. Although the F-ratio of these trends were not statistically significant, leader rank 2 consistently scored higher than leader rank 1 on the Dominance and Taking Charge scales in this study. This did not support part of the research hypotheses. However, this result coupled with the significance of Wanting Recognition common in leader rank 1, supports Bales' (1955) contention that two leaders emerge in groups, a task and social leader. Additionally, the lower ranking individuals (rank 4 and 5) who scored high on
Table 12
Quartic Trend Between Leader Rank and Dominance

Table 13
Cubic Trend Between Leader Rank and Taking Charge
Dominance and Taking Charge also scored low on Wanting Recognition which may support Hogan's (1978) proposal that leaders are made when Dominance is tempered with good impression.

**Relationship Between Assessment Variables**

Significant relationships were found among three of the four assessment variables. Within the CPI instrument, Leadership Potential Index and Dominance were found to have a high positive correlation. This concurs with previous studies (Gough, 1969; Hogan, 1978). Gough (1959) heavily weighted the Leadership Potential Index to favor Dominance and to disfavor conventional social desirability.

Within the BASIS-A instrument, Taking Charge and Wanting Recognition showed a low positive correlation (.30). This does not agree with prior correlation data presented by Curlette, Wheeler and Kern (1993). They demonstrated negligible correlation between these two variables (.01). However, because Wanting Recognition was the highest significant factor in this research, the higher inter-correlation would suggest agreement with many researchers that emergent leaders have a combination of Dominance and social orientation (Baril et al., 1989; Day & Stogdill, 1972; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Gerber, 1988; Gough, 1981; 1990; Noble, 1987; Sorrentino & Field, 1986; Sorenson & Savage, 1989).
Another explanation may be possible. It should be noted that this study may have resulted in a higher Wanting Recognition and Taking Charge inter-correlation due to the sample population. Counselors-in-training may be individuals who have a desire to take charge but who are also interested in the welfare of others. Consequently, the directiveness and empathy combination may be inherent in individuals who participated in this study.

Information for across-instrument correlations were not found in the literature perhaps due to the infancy of the BASIS-A instrument. This study found Taking Charge and Dominance to have a significant positive correlation (.53). Curlette, Wheeler and Kern (1993) reported a high correlation between Taking Charge and Dominance in the Jackson Personality Research Form (PRF) while Gough (1987) reported a high correlation between the CPI and PFR Dominance scales. From this, it would seem to follow the literature that Taking Charge and Dominance are related.

Taking Charge and Leadership Potential Index produced a significant positive correlation (.35). This agrees with the literature as the Leadership Potential Index favors self-confidence, assertiveness, and independence (Curlette, Wheeler, & Kern, 1993; Gough, 1969; Hogan, 1978).

There were no significant relationships between the BASIS-A Wanting Recognition and the CPI scales, Dominance and
Leadership Potential Index. This concurs with Gough's (1969) conceptual analysis of the Leadership Potential Index. First, it's loaded to favor Dominance, and second, it is, "diagnostic of Dominance, self-confidence and aggressiveness at one pole, and of caution, patience and submissiveness at the other" (p. 283). Although Wanting Recognition is not submissive, it does represent a cautious nature (Curlette, Wheeler, & Kern, 1993). This study finds that Wanting Recognition is not related to the CPI Dominance and Leadership Potential Index scales.

Other Group Factors

While most group factors were controlled for, it appears that some group factors may have influenced the results. Knight and Saal (1984) reported that perceived expertise influences emergent leadership. Stogdill (1948) concurred stating that demonstration of capacity is a factor. The sociometric (APPENDIX D) that was given to the research participants requested them to rank group members according to their preference for a group leader. Because these groups consisted of counselors-in-training participating in a group facilitation training class, the sociometric rankings may have been influenced by class members who were accelerated in their learning of group facilitation competencies. Comfort about one's ability to lead the group using skillful facilitation techniques may have been a qualification used to
rank leadership. If this was the case, personality characteristics associated with Dominance, Taking Charge, and Leadership Potential Index may have been deflated in the ANOVA calculations. This could explain the noticeable cubic and quartic results, yet not significant, between leader rank and Taking Charge as well as leader rank and Dominance.

Another possible influence on the results of this study involve the length of time the research groups met, 14 weeks. Several studies suggest that the long-term success of a group necessitates a strong supportive individual rather than a task-oriented individual (Bales, 1955; Eagly & Karau, 1991; Wentworth & Anderson, 1984). Since only 47% of the investigated groups provided useable data, it could be possible that non-participating groups did not feel good about their group experience. If so, it could be suggested that participating groups had a successful group experience. Using this assumption, the results of this study would concur with the literature: Individuals highest in Wanting Recognition, a theme that demonstrates empathy and sensitivity toward others, would emerge most frequently as leaders of long-term research groups.

Implications and Recommendations

The findings of this study were mixed. It did not support the research premise that Dominance, Taking Charge, and the Leadership Potential Index are major contributors to
emergent leadership. It did, however, demonstrate Wanting Recognition as a statistically significant variable of emergent leadership. From these results, it appears that comparing the two instruments on only two leader dimensions was too limiting. There are a total of five BASIS-A themes and 18 CPI scales. Until further testing is done that includes additional scale evaluation, a case cannot be made to use the BASIS-A, a psychologically consistent instrument, as a leader diagnostic tool. A larger sample size would make possible such research.

In addition to a larger sample size, researching groups that are more heterogeneous is needed. A different sample population may generate more significant results. Groupings of individuals that have fewer similarities in personal and career goals may provide a broader perspective into personality characteristics of emergent leaders for the coming decade.

The results from this study suggest that psychological testing may not be enough to forecast an individual for potential leadership. Consequently, changing other group variables may be of benefit. Varying the ratio of gender participants would be one variable of interest in the emergent leadership studies. While some research has been done on gender distribution changes, all of it has represented short-term groups. Information about the effects
of gender distribution on leader emergence in long-term groups would add to the literature.

Using counselor-in-training groups as the sample population for this study brought about some interesting thoughts regarding leader profiles in the counseling profession. This research suggests that there are factors important to the success of a counselor. These factors may include counseling competency, effective leader-follower interaction, and personality characteristics that include a high Wanting Recognition score. Further emergent leader research on counselors could provide data to assist university counseling programs with their entrance criteria.
APPENDIX A

PARTICIPANT INSTRUCTIONS
Dear Group Member:

I am writing to ask your participation in a doctoral dissertation research project. The research concentrates on small group settings such as the one you participated in this semester. Your participation is completely confidential and voluntary.

About the Research
This research looks at how personality dimensions may or may not affect sociometric measures of women. Consequently, this packet contains two personality measures, the California Personality Inventory and the Basis-A Inventory. The California Personality Inventory (CPI) takes about 45 minutes to complete. The Basis-A takes about 12 minutes to complete.

To measure sociometrics, a form called the Ranking Sheet for Group Members is enclosed. Please fill this out completely and rank all the female members of your group, including yourself. Please rank with #1 being your first preference, #2 being your second preference and so forth.

Confidentiality
Your participation in this research is greatly appreciated. It is important for you to know that it in no way affects your group counseling class grade. The personality assessment results will be scored by the researcher and coded so that no names or identifying information will appear in the research document. No other group members, nor any university professors will be privy to your specific data!

What To Do
Please sign the Informed Consent Statement and fill out the Demographics sheet with this packet. Enclose all the test booklets, answer sheets and forms in the envelope after you have completed them. Please return them to your professor before the end of the semester.

If you would like a copy of the completed research project, please list your name and address below. If you have no interest in the results, leave it blank.

Thank you for your assistance and participation in this exciting research!

Sincerely,

Virginia Gray, M.Ed.

Yes, send me a copy of the completed research.

Name: ________________________________

Address: ________________________________

City/St: ________________________________
MALE PARTICIPANT INSTRUCTIONS

Dear Group Member:

I am writing to ask your participation in a doctoral dissertation research project. The research concentrates on small group settings such as the one you participated in this semester. Your participation is completely confidential and voluntary.

About the Research

This research looks at how personality dimensions may or may not affect sociometric measures of women. To measure sociometrics, a form called the Ranking Sheet for Group Members is enclosed. Please fill this out completely and rank all the female members in your group. Please rank with #1 being your first preference, #2 being your second preference and so forth.

Confidentiality

Your participation in this research is greatly appreciated. It is important for you to know that your rankings in no way affect your group counseling class grade. Your responses will be coded so that no names or group identifying information will appear in the research document. No other group members, nor any university professors will be privy to your specific data!

What To Do

Please sign the Informed Consent Statement and fill out the Demographics sheet with this packet. Enclose the three forms in the envelope after you have completed them. Please return them to the class professor before the end of the semester.

If you would like a copy of the completed research project, please list your name and address below. If you have no interest in the results, leave it blank.

Thank you for your assistance and participation in this exciting research!

Sincerely,

Virginia Gray, M.Ed.

Yes, send me a copy of the completed research.

Name: ________________________________

Address: ______________________________

City/St: _______________________________
Dear Group Facilitator:

I am writing to ask your participation in a doctoral dissertation research project. The research concentrates on small group settings such as the one you facilitated this semester. Your participation is completely confidential and voluntary.

About the Research
This research looks at how personality dimensions may or may not affect sociometric measures. To measure sociometrics, a form called the Ranking Sheet for Group Members is enclosed. Please fill this out completely and rank all the members in the group you facilitated. Please rank with #1 being your first preference, #2 being your second preference and so forth.

Confidentiality
Your participation in this research is greatly appreciated. It is important for you to know that your rankings are confidential. Your responses will be coded so that no names or group identifying information will appear in the research document.

What To Do
Please sign the Informed Consent Statement and fill out the Demographics sheet and Ranking Sheet for Group Members. Enclose all forms in this envelope after you have completed them. Please return them to the class professor before the end of the semester.

If you would like a copy of the completed research project, please list your name and address below. If you have no interest in the results, leave it blank.

Thank you for your assistance and participation in this exciting research!

Sincerely,

Virginia Gray, M.Ed.

Yes, send me a copy of the completed research.

Name: ______________________________

Address: ______________________________

City/St: ______________________________
INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

I agree to have Virginia Gray, a doctoral candidate in Counselor Education at the University of North Texas, include the data I provide in her dissertation research on the relationship between life-style themes and member rankings in small groups.

I understand that I will complete two life-style assessment instruments, a confidential demographics sheet, and a sociometric ranking form. I also understand that information will be collected from all members in my group setting, and when reported in the dissertation, will conceal my identity as well as the identity of the group I participated in. I further understand that my group and my name will be assigned a number to ensure confidentiality in reporting data.

The foreseeable risk of completing two life-style instruments and filling out a sociometric ranking form have been explained to me. I understand that it is possible that negative memories or negative emotions may arise from filling out these instruments. Knowing this, I agree to participate.

The benefit of my participation have also been explained to me. I recognize that the benefit of my participation is the expansion of research literature on the relationship between life-styles and member rankings in discussion groups. Knowing this, I agree to participate.

Additionally, I understand that should I have questions about the research, concerns about research procedures, or concerns about my rights as a research subject, that I can contact the researcher. I also understand that in the event of a research-related injury, I can contact the researcher. The researcher has given me two methods of contact: telephone and written.

Virginia Gray
9304 Western Trail
Irving, TX 75063
(214) 506-7177

I also understand that my participation in this research is voluntary, and that I am free to withdraw from this study at any time without penalty, prejudice, or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled to as a group member or University student.

I have read and understand the above information and agree to participate in this study.

Printed Name______________________________
Signature _________________________________
Date __________________________
DEMOGRAPHICS

NAME:__________________________________________

GENDER: Male    Female
(Circle One)

AGE: _______________

OCCUPATION: ______________________________________
(If a Student, please list your major)

NUMBER OF YEARS IN THIS OCCUPATION: _________

MARRITAL STATUS: Single    Married    Divorced
Separated    Widowed
(Circle One)
APPENDIX D

RANKING SHEET FOR GROUP MEMBERS
RANKING SHEET FOR FEMALE GROUP MEMBERS

1). Please list the first name of female group members in the left column. (Do not include your assigned group leader).

2). Rank all female group members according to the questions below: (1 being 1st choice, 2 being 2nd choice, and so forth...)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female Group Member Names</th>
<th>How would you rank each group member as someone you would pick as a friend?</th>
<th>If your group leader were not available, in what order would you choose a female group member to be the group leader?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RANKING SHEET FOR FEMALE GROUP MEMBERS BY FACILITATORS

1). Please list the first name of female group members in the left column.

2). Rank all female group members according to the questions below:
   (1 being 1st choice, 2 being 2nd choice, and so forth...)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female Group Member Names</th>
<th>How would you rank each group member as someone you would pick as a friend?</th>
<th>If you were not available to facilitate, in what order would you choose a female group member to be the group leader?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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