High self-monitoring individuals respond to cues from others and adapt their self-presentations to suit their audience. Since one of the goals of this behavior is to create a favorable impression in the audience, self-monitoring has been identified as a factor that might be related to an individual's being perceived as a leader. Although several studies have revealed a significant relationship between self-monitoring and leader emergence, relatively few have examined the relationship outside the laboratory setting. The purpose of the two studies reported in this article was to examine whether self-reported scores on a measure of self-monitoring would be related to leader emergence in student groups working on realistic, sustained projects. Study One revealed a low, but significant, correlation between self-monitoring and leader emergence. Study Two found a negligible relationship in the overall sample, but a significant moderate correlation in a group of preferred leaders who were examined separately. The variation in magnitude of correlations in the overall sample seemed to be explained by fluctuations in correlations for females. The relationship between self-monitoring and males remained at a low but stable level over the two studies.

The Relationship Between Self-Monitoring and Leadership in Student Project Groups

Judith A. Kolb
Pennsylvania State University, University Park

As teamwork becomes prevalent in today's organizations (Ancona, 1990; Bettenhausen, 1991; Gallucci, 1985), instructors from a variety of disciplines increasingly incorporate collaborative learning experiences and group projects in many of their classes. Through these experiences, participants gain an awareness of the characteristics and skills required of group members and leaders and have an opportunity to practice the interpersonal and teamwork skills that are necessary for professionals in almost any field. "Experience with groups is particularly relevant for students who aspire to become managers in organizations" (Freeman, 1996, p. 266) and should be part of any business curriculum (Forman, 1986). Glaser, Guilar, and Piland (1992) agree that the ability to work in teams is a crucial job skill and add that these skills don't develop naturally when people are placed in teams, but must be developed. Freeman (1996) claims that exposure to group projects and assignments provides a vehicle by which students learn to compare and defend their own views with opinions or approaches espoused by others. Such experiences may prepare individuals to work effectively in a diverse workforce (Schreiber, 1996).

Bosley (1995) notes that methods of managing organizational workers and students are becoming more similar. Professors are changing classroom processes by focusing more on students learning together and less on the professor disseminating knowledge. This seems to be true in business communication classrooms. Several recent articles

The Journal of Business Communication, Volume 35, Number 2, April 1998, pages 264-282

in business communication journals (Scheffler, 1992; Smith, 1992; Wallace, 1994; Winter & Neal, 1995) report on classroom collaborative projects.

One of the results of today's emphasis on teamwork has been an increased amount of research attention focused on team leadership. Effective leadership has been found to play an important role in the success of organizational teams (Hirokawa & Keyton, 1995; Kolb, 1996; Larson & LaFasto, 1989). Even in groups without official leaders, the process of leadership is still much the same (Seers, Petty, & Cashman, 1995). Unofficial leaders emerge and perform many of the same functions as traditional leaders. In emergent leadership, contrasted to officially designated leadership, the perception of leadership is key. Individuals only serve as leaders for as long as others see them in that role.

Individuals whom others in the group come to view as leaders exert significant influence over the other members (Schneier & Goktepe, 1983). Leaders emerge when group members reach a consensus that "one (or more) individual(s) could serve the group more usefully in attaining group goals than the other members" (Bass, 1981, p. 13). Some factors that have been identified as being related to leader emergence include task-related behavior (Anderson & Blanchard, 1982), frequency of talk (Fisher, 1985), performance self-esteem (Andrews, 1984), gender (Kent & Moss, 1994), interpersonal attraction (Goktepe & Schneier, 1989) and self-monitoring (Ellis & Cronshaw, 1992; Kent & Moss, 1990; Zaccaro, Foti, & Kenny, 1991).

Self-monitoring, the focus of the two studies reported in this article, is particularly relevant for business communication scholars and instructors. Since self-monitoring often aims at the creation of favorable impressions and remaining in good stead with others, audience analysis and adaptation of behaviors to suit that audience is a primary component. While an audience is generally viewed as those who read a document or listen to a presentation, audience can also be viewed as group members who determine whether or not a person's behavior is appropriate to fulfill a given role, such as group leader. People often tailor their self-presentations to the social goals they hope to achieve (Leary, Robertson, Barnes, & Miller, 1986). It seems reasonable to expect that high self-monitors might exhibit behaviors that others – in this case, other members of a group – take as evidence of leadership.

Research on Self-Monitoring

According to self-monitoring theory (Snyder, 1974, 1979), people differ in the extent to which they observe and control their expressive and self-presentational behavior. High self-monitors (individuals who

score high on a measure of self-monitoring) respond to cues from others and adapt to what is expected of them, whereas low self-monitors are less concerned with assessing the social climate and rely instead on their own instincts in determining how to behave in social situations (Snyder & Gangestad, 1982).

Dabbs, Evans, Hopper, and Purvis (1980) refer to self-monitoring as a strategic communication style. In their research, high self-monitors, as contrasted to low self-monitors, (a) communicated in a more sophisticated manner; (b) were more verbally assertive, enthusiastic, and quick to respond; and (c) were more likely to influence their partners than to be influenced by them. Self-monitoring also has surfaced as a cognitive component of communicative competence (Duran & Spitzberg, 1995). Spitzberg (1990) reported that self-monitoring was significantly related to communication knowledge (knowing what to say and do in communication contexts), which led Duran and Spitzberg (1995) to conclude that both communication knowledge and self-monitoring are at the core of perceptions of self-efficacy (confidence in one's ability to employ communication to attain positive outcomes). Duran and Spitzberg suggest that such confidence has motivational consequences. An individual who believes that he or she is likely to experience a positive outcome will, in fact, improve the chances of such an outcome's occurrence.

Self-monitoring has shown strong positive relationships to interpersonal competence (Athay & Darley, 1981), organizational success (Sypher & Sypher, 1983), and career success (Snyder & Campbell, 1982). High self-monitors, in comparison to low self-monitors, appear to perform better in boundary-spanning jobs that require sensitivity to social cues (Caldwell & O'Reilly, 1982), resolve conflicts through collaboration and compromise (Baron, 1989), receive more promotions (Kilduff & Day, 1994), and emerge as leaders of small groups (Ellis & Cronshaw, 1992; Kent & Moss, 1990; Zaccaro, Foti, & Kenny, 1991).

Research on Self-Monitoring and Leader Emergence

Kenny and Zaccaro (1983) have proposed that the ability of emergent leaders to perceive varying needs of groups and change their behavior in response to these needs explains much of the consistency in leader emergence across situations. Although Kenny and Zaccaro do not give a name to this ability, Ellis and Cronshaw (1992) point out that the description is similar to one for self-monitoring. High self-monitors are both sensitive to cues and able to modify their behavior (Lennox & Wolfe, 1984). Ellis and Cronshaw (1992) claim that there are strong conceptual grounds for assuming a relationship between self-monitoring and leader emergence. Indeed, a growing body of literature (e.g., Cronshaw & Ellis, 1991; Ellis, 1988; Ellis, Adamson,

Deszca, & Cawsey, 1988; Ellis & Cronshaw, 1992; Foti & Cohen, 1986; Garland & Beard, 1979; Kent & Moss, 1990; Zaccaro, Foti, & Kenny, 1991) has linked self-monitoring and leader emergence.

Despite past linkages, close examination of the results of recent research on self-monitoring and leader emergence reveals inconsistencies and casts some doubt on the stability and strength of this relationship. Ellis and Cronshaw (1992) detected a relationship between self-monitoring and a group-reported measure of leader emergence in student groups. Upon looking at the biological sex differences in the data, however, they concluded that this relationship was significant only for males. Kent and Moss (1990), also using student groups, found significant correlations between self-monitoring and leader emergence for both self-reported and group-reported data; however, subsequent analyses caused them to conclude that high self-monitors may, in fact, only be more likely to see themselves as leaders. Since research has shown that leaders' perceptions of their own strengths and abilities may differ markedly from those of their team members (Kolb, 1995) or subordinates (Schnake, Dumler, Cochran, & Barnett, 1990), it seems likely that individuals may view themselves as leaders even when group members do not share that perception. This difference in perception is important since individuals are emergent leaders only if group members view them in that light.

In both the Ellis and Cronshaw and Kent and Moss studies, the group tasks were realistic, business-oriented projects, although the Ellis and Cronshaw task involved two projects lasting only two weeks each. Kent and Moss gave little detail on the nature and duration of their tasks, other than to indicate that the groups worked on task-oriented projects over the course of a semester. It could be that as group tasks become more realistic and task-oriented and take a longer time to complete, the ability of high self-monitors to observe and control expressive and self-presentational behavior becomes less important than do other aspects of behavior. Zaccaro, Foti, and Kenny (1991), whose data was collected from student groups working for 15-20 minutes on a variety of tasks over two days, did find a significant relationship between self-monitoring and group-reported leader emergence rankings.

The two studies discussed in this article address the concern voiced by Cragan and Wright (1990) that natural groups should be used in research. This concern seems especially relevant for research on leader emergence. Much of the early research was done on groups working on brief tasks that have little relevance for the types of projects encountered by the majority of classroom and organizational teams. Studies dealing with realistic task-oriented groups are needed if we are to determine whether the relationship between self-monitoring and leader emergence applies to project-oriented groups or is simply an

artifact of laboratory conditions. A student sample was used because students, for the most part, do not have formal or informal positions of authority that might cause others to prejudge them as group leaders. The same is generally not true of members of organizational work groups. The students in the studies reported here did interact and form perceptions of each other prior to working together in groups, which is typical of what is experienced by members of most organizational groups.

Ellis and Cronshaw (1992), using Lennox and Wolfe's Revised Self-Monitoring Scale (1984), reported data for subscales of sensitivity (awareness of social cues) and modifiability (behavior adaptation resulting from awareness of cues), which led them to suggest that behavioral modifiability, rather than sensitivity, is the primary mechanism by which high self-monitors emerge as leaders. It appears that the additional information gained by the reporting of subscale data might help us to better understand the relationship between self-monitoring and leader emergence. For this reason, subscale data are included for the two studies reported in this article.

Study One

The purpose of the first study reported here was to explore further the relationship between self-monitoring and self- and group-reported leader emergence using groups engaged in realistic relatively long-term tasks. In light of Kent and Moss's (1990) discovery of a significant relationship between self-monitoring and self-reported leader emergence, the first hypothesis was

H1: Self-monitoring will have a significant positive relationship with self-reported scores of leader emergence.

The most recent data concerning the relationship between self-monitoring and group-reported scores of leader emergence appear to be too inconclusive to venture a hypothesis. Therefore, the following question was posed:

RQ1: Is there a significant positive relationship between self-monitoring and group-reported scores on a measure of leader emergence?

Ellis and Cronshaw (1992) concluded from their studies that behavior modifiability, rather than sensitivity to social cues, was the primary mechanism by which high self-monitors emerged as leaders. Hence,

H2: Scores on a modifiability subscale of self-monitoring will have a higher positive relationship to both self-reported and group-reported scores on a measure of leader emergence than will scores on a sensitivity subscale.

Sample

Participants in Study One were 60 undergraduate students (28 female; 32 male) enrolled in two sections of an upper-division applied

organizational communication class at a large eastern university. Both classes were taught by the same instructor and were the only sections of the class offered that term. Two-thirds of the students were seniors, and one-third were juniors. Just under 50 percent of the sample were business majors, one-fourth were liberal arts majors, and the remaining one-fourth majored in environmental research management. The average age was 21. The majority of students reported that they had taken no courses in leadership or small group process, but they did have experience working on group projects in previous classes. No information was collected on the extent to which individual students were known by others in the class or viewed by other class members as campus leaders. In retrospect, this information might have been useful.

Measures

The Revised Self-Monitoring Scale, developed by Lennox and Wolfe (1984), was used as the measure of self-monitoring. This instrument contains 13 Likert-type scaled items (1, certainly, always false; 6, certainly, always true) designed to assess the two components of self-monitoring: (a) sensitivity to expressive behavior of others (6 items) and (b) ability to modify self-presentation (7 items). In this scale, self-monitoring is considered a continuous variable, in contrast to scales developed by Snyder (1974) and Snyder and Gangestad (1986) in which responses to true-false questions are used to place respondents into dichotomous categories of high and low self-monitors. Sample questions from the sensitivity subscale include: "In conversations, I am sensitive to even the slightest change in the facial expression of the person I'm conversing with" (Item 4), and "I can usually tell when I've said something inappropriate by reading it in the listener's eyes" (Item 8). Sample questions from the modifiability subscale include: "I have the ability to control the way I come across to people, depending on the impression I wish to give them" (Item 3) and (reverse scored) "I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations" (Item 9). Responses to items were summed to yield scores for the total Revised Self-Monitoring Scale and for the sensitivity and modifiability subscales. Reliability coefficients in this study were .77 for the sensitivity subscale, .90 for the modifiability subscale, and .88 for the self-monitoring scale overall, and were considered sufficiently high for research purposes (Nunnally, 1987).

Leader emergence was assessed by means of a three-item scale developed by Kent and Moss (1990). The scale allows for assessment of both self-perceptions of leader emergence and group perceptions, and is based on research summarized in Bass (1981) that suggests that emergent leaders in groups talk more than others, participate more

actively, and make more attempts to influence the group. In this study, reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) of .76 for self-reports and .93 for group assessments were considered sufficiently high (Nunnally, 1987). Instructions for using the measure were worded as follows: "Please rate the extent to which you and each member of your group (1) assumed a leadership role, (2) led the conversation, and (3) influenced group goals and decisions" (1, never; 7, always).

Each group member completed a measure of leader emergence for her- or himself and one for each of the other group members. Self-perceptions of leader emergence were obtained by averaging self-ratings on the three items. Leader emergence scores based on the perceptions of group members were obtained by combining the average rating for the three items into a composite of the responses of all other group members.

Procedures

Participants were assigned to permanent groups after the first seven weeks of the semester. Prior to this time, each person had given two speeches for which feedback was received from other class members, had worked with a variety of classmates on case-study discussions and short group projects (lasting one class period), and had participated in group discussions and activities involving the entire class. Final group placement depended mainly on the speaking group that each student was placed in at the beginning of the semester. The three speaking groups, which were formed for the purpose of determining the date of each student's presentations, were composed of males and females from each of the three majors. At the beginning of the eighth week, the students were assigned to mixed-sex and mixed-major groups of four or five members each by dividing each speaking group into two sections.

Each group formed a mock company, developed a mission statement, and completed two projects during the second half of the semester. The first was a human resource task involving the hiring and development of an employee. This task involved developing a job description for the professional position of their choice, writing a position announcement and planning a recruitment strategy, determining what would be required of the applicants during the application and interview process, and providing an overview of training and development and mentoring opportunities that would be provided for the successful applicant. The task involved research, several written products, and an oral group report.

The second task required the groups to choose a problem or decision that would realistically be faced by professional employees in their chosen companies, conduct research on the problem or decision,

choose and demonstrate a methodology that would be appropriate for the members to use in solving the problem or making a decision, and present the outcome of their deliberations. This task also required research, several written products, and an oral group demonstration. Groups met outside class for an average of 14 hours over a 7-week period. Grades on group projects and on individual assignments related to the group projects accounted for 45 percent of each person's class grade.

Participants completed the first questionnaires containing demographic information and the self-monitoring scale during the second week of class. At the end of the semester, they completed the second questionnaire containing leader emergence scales.

Results

Means and standard deviations (in parentheses) for all measures are as follows: self-monitoring – 4.38 (0.64), sensitivity subscale – 4.40 (0.68), modifiability subscale – 4.37 (0.80), self-reported leader emergence – 4.99 (0.81), and group-reported leader emergence – 4.35 (1.09). Since Ellis and Cronshaw (1992) reported a significant positive relationship between self-monitoring and group-reported scores of leadership only for males, sex differences are reported in this study. No significant differences between males and females emerged for the overall self-monitoring scale, either of the subscales, or self- or group-reported leader emergence scales.

Hypothesis 1, which predicted that self-monitoring would have a significant positive relationship with self-reported scores of leader emergence, was supported. Scores on a measure of self-monitoring showed a significant positive correlation to self-reported scores on a measure of leader emergence ($r = .56$, $p = .000$). The subscales of sensitivity and modifiability also each correlated positively with the leader-emergence measure ($r = .41$, $p = .006$; $r = .52$, $p = .000$, respectively). Hypothesis 2, which predicted that scores on a modifiability subscale would have a higher positive relationship to leader emergence than would scores on a sensitivity subscale, also was supported. Correlations between modifiability and both self-reported and group-reported leader emergence were higher than those for sensitivity. Results relevant to Hypotheses 1, Research Question 1, and Hypothesis 2 are reported in Table 1.

The correlation between self-monitoring and group-reported leader emergence was significant ($r = .21$, $p = .054$). Thus the answer to RQ1, which asked, "Is there a significant positive relationship between self-monitoring and group-reported scores on a measure of leader emergence?" is a qualified yes for the overall scale; the magnitude of the correlation was low, however. The subscales, in contrast to the results

from the self-reported data, were not significantly correlated to group-reported leader emergence.

Self-monitoring was significantly correlated with self-reported leader emergence for both males ($r = .53$, $p = .001$) and females ($r = .59$, $p = .001$). The correlation between self-monitoring and group-reported leader emergence was significant for females ($r = .32$, $p = .054$), but non-significant for males ($r = .14$, ns). Fisher's r to Z transformation and comparison of correlations (as described in Glass & Hopkins, 1984) revealed no statistically significant differences between the correlations.

Table 1
Pearson *r* Correlations Between Leader-Emergence and Self-Monitoring Scores in Study One

Leader Emergence	*n*	Self-Monitoring Total Scale	Sensitivity Subscale	Modifiability Subscale
Self-Reported:				
Total Sample	58	.56***	.41***	.52***
Male	31	.53**	.40*	.51**
Female	27	.59***	.43*	.52**
Group-Reported:				
Total Sample	59	.21†	.14	.21
Male	32	.14	.08	.16
Female	27	.32†	.26	.28

Notes: †$p = .05$; *$p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; ***$p < .001$

Study Two

The first study produced results consistent with those reported by Kent and Moss (1994) and showed a significant positive relationship between self-monitoring and self-reported leader emergence. The relationship for group-reported leader emergence, however, while statistically significant, was of low magnitude and does not justify labeling self-monitoring as a meaningful factor in explaining the emergence of individuals as leaders in extended task-oriented groups.

Zacarro, Foti, and Kenny (1991) reported a significant correlation between self-monitoring and group-reported leader emergence when a forced ranking of leadership was used, but not when scores on a leader emergence measure calculated on all group members was used. The fact that tests for rankings were significant but those for ratings were not indicates, perhaps, that the manner in which participants are asked to report perceptions of leadership may affect the relationship between self-monitoring and leader emergence. Zaccaro, Foti, and Kenny (1991) observed "a tendency in several groups for members to give each other very similar if not identical ratings" (p. 312). They suggested that this tendency would attenuate the possible correlations with leader emergence.

In Study One, the group-reported correlations might have been constrained by the fact that all group members were scored on a leadership scale by all other group members. To check for this possibility, I decided to include a second measure of leader emergence in Study Two. Group members were asked to make a forced choice of one preferred leader in addition to rating every group member on a leader emergence measure. Sociometric choice of the leader by peer ratings and secret ballot has been used repeatedly in the leadership literature and has demonstrated strong predictive validity (Bass, 1981; Gaktepe & Schneier, 1989).

The first two hypotheses and Research Question 1 in Study Two repeat those posed in Study One.

H1: Self-monitoring will have a significant positive relationship with self-reported scores on a measure of leader emergence.

RQ1: Is there a significant positive relationship between self-monitoring and group-reported scores on a measure of leader emergence?

H2: Scores on a modifiability subscale of self-monitoring will have a higher positive relationship to both self-reported and group-reported scores on a measure of leader emergence than will scores on a sensitivity subscale.

Study Two expanded Study One by including an analysis of a select group of preferred leaders, as well as a larger sample. If the relationship between self-monitoring and leadership is significant and has perhaps been constrained by the tendency of group members to be generous in attributing leadership behaviors to all group members, presumably a significant relationship would emerge when examining the relationship in a subsample of preferred leaders. For ease of discussion, the remaining subsample henceforth is referred to as non-leaders, although technically it is the other-than-preferred-leader group. The following additional hypothesis was tested:

H3: The relationship between self-monitoring and self- and group-reported leadership will be stronger in magnitude for the subsample of preferred leaders than it will be for either the overall sample or the non-leader subsample.

Sample

Participants in this study were 123 undergraduate students (64 female; 59 male) enrolled in four sections of an upper-division applied organizational communication class at a large eastern university. Again, these classes were the only sections offered at the time. Three different instructors taught the classes; one was the instructor who taught the classes in Study One. All had similar teaching styles. The demographics of the sample were similar to those reported for Study One. Sample size was increased in this second study. Although this

larger sample size creates greater confidence in the results, readers should also keep in mind that the differences in sample size may account for at least some of the differences in the correlations reported in Study One and Study Two.

Measures

The Revised Self-Monitoring Scale, developed by Lennox and Wolfe (1984) and the three-item leader emergence scale developed by Kent and Moss (1990) used in Study One again were used. Additionally, participants were asked to respond to the following question: "If you could choose just one person from your group to serve as the leader for another similar group project, who would that person be?" Individuals who were identified as preferred leaders by at least two group members other than themselves were labeled the "preferred leader group." Individuals who shared leadership with another person in their group were included in the category of preferred leaders, but those who were mentioned by just one person (usually the individual everyone else named as the leader) were not.

Procedures

The procedures were the same as those reported in Study One. The choice-of-preferred-leader question was included in the second questionnaire and administered at the same time as the leader emergence measure.

Results

Means, standard deviations (in parentheses), and reliability coefficients for all measures are found in Table 2. Biological sex differences were again examined. For the overall sample, no significant differences between males and females were found for the total self-monitoring scale, the modifiability subscale, or self- or group-reported leader emergence scales. A significant difference was found, however, for the sensitivity subscale [$t = 2.45$, $df = 121$, $p = .02$; male $M = 4.20$ (0.58), female $M = 4.47$ (0.61)]. Females scored significantly higher than males on self-reported sensitivity to the expressive behavior of others.

Because of the unequal *N*s in the preferred leader and non-leader samples, a GLM ANOVA procedure in SAS was used to examine differences between the means. ANOVAs revealed significant differences between the two means on both self-reported ($F = 33.27$, $df = 1/114$, $p = .001$) and group-reported ($F = 73.81$, $df = 1/111$, $p = .001$) measures of leader emergence, which indicated that the forced-choice method of leader emergence did distinguish leaders from non-leaders. No differences were found in the scores between the two groups for self-monitoring ($F = 0.01$, $df = 1/21$, ns), or for either of the subscales of sensitivity ($F = 0.37$, $df = 1/121$, ns) or modifiability ($F = 0.18$, $df = 1/121$, ns).

Table 2
Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliability Coefficients for Self-Monitoring and Leader-Emergence Measures in Study Two

Measures	*n*	Mean	*SD*	Reliability Coefficient
Self-Monitoring				
Overall Sample:				
Total Scale	123	4.37	0.47	.77
Sensitivity	123	4.34	0.61	.74
Modifiability	123	4.40	0.60	.77
Leader Sample:				
Total Scale	31	4.40	0.48	
Sensitivity	31	4.40	0.55	
Modifiability	31	4.41	0.64	
Non-Leader Sample:				
Total Scale	92	4.36	0.47	
Sensitivity	92	4.36	0.62	
Modifiability	92	4.39	0.58	
Leader Emergence				
Overall Sample:				
Self-Reported	116	4.69	0.93	.80
Group-Reported	113	4.23	1.11	.94
Leader Sample:				
Self-Reported	31	5.42	0.49	
Group-Reported	32	5.34	0.60	
Non-Leader Sample:				
Self-Reported	85	4.43	0.91	
Group-Reported	81	3.80	0.94	

The prediction that scores on a measure of self-monitoring would have a significant positive correlation with self-reported scores of leader emergence (Hypothesis 1) was supported in the overall sample ($r = .30$, $p = .001$). The correlation between modifiability and self-reported leader emergence was slightly higher ($r = .24$ compared to $r = .23$) than that for sensitivity. Thus, Hypothesis 2, which predicted that the relationship for modifiability would be higher for both self- and group-reported data, was technically supported for the self-reported data. For all practical purposes, however, there was little difference between scores on the two scales. Hypothesis 3, which predicted a stronger relationship between self-monitoring and leadership for preferred leaders, was supported. In self-report data, leader emergence was greater in magnitude for the preferred leaders ($r = .48$, $p = .003$) than for either the overall sample ($r = .30$, $p = .001$) or the non-leaders ($r = .29$, $p = .004$). Fisher's r to Z transformation and comparison of preferred leader and non-leader correlations revealed a marginally significant difference at ($.10 > p > .05$, one-tailed). Results

relevant to Hypotheses 1, 2, and self-report data for Hypothesis 3 are reported in Table 3.

Table 3
Pearson 4 Correlations Between Self-Monitoring and Self-Reported Leader Emergence Scores in Study Two

Leader Emergence	*n*	Self-Monitoring Total Scale	Sensitivity Subscale	Modifiability Subscale
Total Sample:	116	.30***	.23**	.24**
Male	58	.35**	.28*	.26*
Female	58	.25*	.18†	.21†
Leader Sample:	31	.48**	.40*	.37*
Male	16	.23	.16	.16
Female	15	.72**	.65**	.65**
Non-Leader Sample:	85	.29**	.19*	.26**
Male	42	.37**	.29*	.30*
Female	43	.20†	.10	.21†

Note: †$p < .10$; *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$

Self-monitoring was significantly correlated with self-reported leader emergence for both males ($r = .35$, $p = .003$) and females ($r = .25$, $p = .032$) in the overall sample. For preferred leaders, the correlation ($r = .23$) for males was nonsignificant; the correlation for females ($r = .72$, $p = .001$) was significant. Among non-leaders, the correlation for males ($r = .37$, $p = .007$) was significant; the correlation for females ($r = .20$, $p = .098$) approached significance. Fisher's r to Z transformation and comparison of means revealed a significant difference only in the case of the preferred group; that difference was marginally significant at ($.10 > p > .05$).

Results relevant to Research Question 1 and to group-reported data for Hypotheses 2 and 3 are reported in Table 4. Research Question 1 asked if there was a significant positive relationship between self-monitoring and group-reported leader emergence scores. Since the correlation between self-monitoring and group-reported leader emergence for the overall sample was not significant ($r = .07$, ns), the answer is no. Hypothesis 2, which predicted that modifiability scores would have a higher relationship to leader emergence than sensitivity scores, was not supported for group-reported data. The correlation between modifiability and group-reported leader emergence ($r = .02$) was lower than that for sensitivity ($r = .09$).

Hypothesis 3, which predicted a stronger relationship between self-monitoring and leader emergence in the sample of preferred leaders, was supported for group-reported scores (as well as for self-reported scores as previously discussed). The correlation between self-monitoring and leader emergence for the preferred leaders was

greater in magnitude ($r = .34$, $p = .030$) than for either the overall sample ($r = .07$; ns) or the non-leaders ($r = -.01$, ns). A comparison of correlations between the preferred leader and non-leaders subsamples revealed a significant difference at $p < .05$, one-tailed.

The correlation between self-monitoring and group-reported data was not significant for either male or female samples, although the correlation for males ($r = .14$) was higher than that for females ($r = -.05$). In the sample of preferred leaders, the correlation was significant for males ($r = .48$, $p = .028$) and nonsignificant ($r = .28$) for females. For non-leaders, all correlations were nonsignificant. A comparison of correlations revealed no significant differences.

Table 4
Pearson *r* Correlations Between Self-Monitoring and Group-Reported Leader-Emergence Scores in Study Two

Leader Emergence	*n*	Self-Monitoring Total Scale	Sensitivity Subscale	Modifiability Subscale
Total Sample:	112	.07	.09	.02
Male	56	.14	.12	.10
Female	56	-.05	.01	-.09
Leader Sample:	31	.34*	.22	.31*
Male	16	.48*	.31	.35†
Female	15	.28	.20	.26
Non-Leader Sample:	81	-.01	.02	-.04
Male	40	.00	.02	-.01
Female	41	-.12	-.06	-.12

Note: †$p < .10$; *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$

Discussion

Self-monitoring appears to be a significant factor affecting perceptions of leadership for student groups engaged in realistic, reasonably long-term tasks. Results of the studies reported in this article indicated a moderate relationship between self-monitoring and leader emergence when members were asked to identify only one leader and a low, but statistically significant, relationship when all members were scored on a leadership emergence scale. The correlation between self-monitoring and group-reported leader emergence was stronger in a subsample of leaders than in either the overall sample or the subsample of non-leaders. The relationship between self-monitoring and leader emergence clearly merits further study.

Results also suggest that the common research practice of using leader emergence scales to rate everyone on leadership may obscure variables that have a statistically weak, but perhaps meaningful, relationship to leadership. The range of scores resulting from the lat-

ter practice may not be wide enough to distinguish leaders from nonleaders.

Another interesting finding relates to Ellis and Cronshaw's (1992) observation that self-monitoring is significantly related to group-reported leader emergence only for males. Results of the present studies suggest that sex may act as a moderator of the relationship between self-monitoring and leader emergence in a more complex fashion than previously suspected. In Study One, this relationship was significant for females but not for males. Correlations for the overall sample in Study Two were not significant for either sex. In the sample of preferred leaders, however, the correlation between self-monitoring and leader emergence was significant for males but not for females. An examination of the magnitude of the correlations reveals that the correlation for males in the overall sample remained constant, whereas for females, it fluctuated. Tasks were identical in both studies, but for some reason, self-monitoring in females had a stronger association with perceptions of leadership in Study One. Although the correlations for both males and females were low to moderate, the question of why the relationship between self-monitoring and leader emergence appears to be more variable for females than for males is of theoretical interest and perhaps may have practical implications for females aspiring to leadership positions.

In terms of self-reported data, both studies confirmed findings reported by Kent and Moss (1990) that self-monitoring is significantly related to self-reported leader emergence. This relationship can be explained, at least partially, by self-enhancement bias (Zacarro, Foti, & Kenny, 1991). The rater served as both the source and the target for trait and influence ratings. Although self-reports provide a meaningful comparison to group-report data, it is group perceptions of leadership that allow group members to assume leadership roles. Perception of oneself as a leader does not create the reality.

Finally, although results of these studies provide partial support for Ellis and Cronshaw's (1992) contention that modifiability of behavior, rather than sensitivity to social cues, was the primary mechanism by which high self-monitors emerged as leaders, further research is needed to support this claim.

Implications for Future Research

As research on the relationship between self-monitoring and leader emergence continues, care should be taken to examine individual and/or organizational factors that may work singularly or in combination with self-monitoring to explain perceptions of leadership. In particular, variables that may lead group members to view other members as potential leaders prior to interaction in the group setting need to be

identified and assessed to the extent that this is possible. Questions that explore the preconceptions each member has about other members' backgrounds, positions, and expertise might be useful.

Future research should also explore variables and conditions that might account for the differences noted in these studies between males and females on the relationship between self-monitoring and leader emergence. The relationship for males remains constant, but the relationship for females varies. At this point, not enough is known about the relationship between self-monitoring and leader emergence to offer an explanation of this sex difference.

Another expansion of this area of research might be an examination of the self-monitoring behaviors of group members as a factor that affects the importance of various leader behaviors. This relationship has been examined in studies of appointed leaders. Anderson and Tolson (1989, 1991) reported that all aspects of leadership are crucial to high self-monitoring nurses because of "their dependence on external social cues to guide their behaviors" (p. 72). Perhaps the level of self-monitoring that occurs in group members affects perceptions of leadership. Groups that consist of high self-monitoring individuals may have different leadership needs than groups of low or moderate self-monitors.

Finally, researchers should examine the methods they use to identify individuals who fulfill leadership positions in small groups. In particular, the practice of having group members rate each group member on a leadership scale may constrain the identification of factors that legitimately affect perceptions of leadership.

NOTES

The author thanks Dennis Gouran, the editor, and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this manuscript.

Judith Kolb is an Associate Professor in Workforce Education and Development at The Pennsylvania State University. Her research interests include leadership, teamwork, and training and development.

Send correspondence to Judith Kolb at 301 Keller Building, University Park, PA 16802-1303 <jak18@psu.edu>

REFERENCES

Ancona, D. G. (1990). Outward bound: Strategies for team survival in an organization. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*, 334-365.

Anderson, L. R. (1990). Toward a two-track model of leadership training: Suggestions from self-monitoring theory. *Small Group Research, 21*, 147-167.

Anderson, L. R., & Blanchard, P. N. (1982). Sex differences in task and social-emotional behavior. *Basic & Applied Social Psychology, 3*, 109-139.

Anderson, L. R., & Tolson, J. (1989). Group members' self-monitoring as a possible neutralizer of leadership. *Small Group Behavior, 20*, 24-36.

Anderson, L. R., & Tolson, J. (1991). Leaders' upward influence in the organization: Replication and extensions of the Petz effect to include group support and self-monitoring. *Small Group Research, 22*, 59-75.

Andrews, P. H. (1984). Performance self-esteem and perception of leadership emergence: A comparative study of men and women. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 48*, 1-13.

Athay, M., & Darley, J. (1981). Toward an interaction-centered theory of personality. In N. Cantor & J. Kihlstrom (Eds.), *Personality cognition and social interaction* (pp. 65-83). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Baron, R. A. (1986). Self-presentation in job interviews: Where there can be "too much of a good thing." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 16*, 16-28.

Baron, R. A. (1989). Personality and organizational conflict: Effects of the Type A behavior pattern and self-monitoring. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 44*, 281-296.

Bass, B. M. (1981). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership* (2nd ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Bettenhausen, K. L. (1991). Five years of groups research: What we have learned and what needs to be addressed. *Journal of Management, 17*, 345-381.

Bosley, D. S. (1995). Collaborative partnerships: Academia and industry working together. *Technical Communication, 42*(4), 611-619.

Caldwell, D. F., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1982). Boundary spanning and individual performance: The impact of self-monitoring. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67*, 124-127.

Cragan, J. F., & Wright, D. W. (1990). Small group communication research of the 1980s: A synthesis and critique. *Communication Studies, 41*, 212-236.

Cronshaw, S. F., & Ellis, R. J. (1991). A process investigation of self-monitoring and leader emergence. *Small Group Research, 22*, 403-420.

Dabbs, J. M., Evans, M. S., Hopper, G. H., & Purvis, J. A. (1980). Self-monitors in conversation: What do they monitor? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*, 278-284.

Duran, R. L., & Spitzberg, B. H. (1995). Toward the development and validation of a measure of cognitive communication competence. *Communication Quarterly, 43*, 259-275.

Ellis, R. J. (1988). Self-monitoring and leadership emergence in groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 14*, 681-693.

Ellis, R. J., Adamson, R. S., Deszca, G., & Cawsey, T. F. (1988). Self-monitoring and leadership emergence. *Small Group Behavior, 19*, 312-324.

Ellis, R. J., & Cronshaw, S. F. (1992). Self-monitoring and leader emergence: A test of moderator effects. *Small Group Research, 23*, 113-129.

Fisher, B. A. (1985). Leadership as medium: Treating complexity in group communication research. *Small Group Behavior, 16*, 167-196.

Forman, J. (1986, Fall). The group report: A problem in small group or writing processes? *The Journal of Business Communication, 23*(4), 23-35.

Foti, R. J., & Cohen, B. A. (1986, August). *Self-monitoring and leadership emergence.* Paper presented at the 94th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Freeman, K. A. (1996). Attitudes toward work in project groups as predictors of academic performance. *Small Group Research, 27*(2), 265-282.

Gallucci, S. L. (1985). Increasing profits through teamwork. *Training & Development Journal, 39*, 56-67.

Garland, H., & Beard, J. E. (1979). Relationship between self-monitoring and leader emergence across two task situations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 64*, 72-76.

Glass, G. V., & Hopkins, K. D. (1984). *Statistical methods in education and psychology* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Glaser, S. R., Guilar, J. D., & Piland, J. (1992). *Teambuilding: A three-year case study of change.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Goktepe, J. R., & Schneier, C. E. (1989). Role of sex, gender roles, and attraction in predicting emergent leaders. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 165-167.

Hirokawa, R. Y., & Keyton, J. (1995). Perceived facilitators and inhibitors of effectiveness in organizational work teams. *Management Communication Quarterly, 8*(4), 424-446.

Kenny, D. A., & Zaccaro, S. J. (1983). An estimate of variance due to traits in leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*, 678-685.

Kent, R. L., & Moss, S. E. (1990). Self-monitoring as a predictor of leader emergence. *Psychological Reports, 66*, 875-881.

Kilduff, M., & Day, D. V. (1994). Do chameleons get ahead? The effects of self-monitoring on managerial careers. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 1047-1060.

Kolb, J. A. (1995, July). Leader behaviors affecting team performance: Similarities and differences between leader/member assessments. *The Journal of Business Communication, 32*(3), 233-248.

Kolb, J. A. (1996). Let's bring structure back: A commentary. *Management Communication Quarterly, 9*(4), 452-465.

Larson, C. E., & LaFasto, F. M. J. (1989). *Teamwork: What must go right / What can go wrong.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Leary, M. R., Robertson, R. B., Barnes, B. D., & Miller, R. S. (1986). Self-presentations of small group leaders: Effects of role requirements and leadership orientation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 742-748.

Lennox, R. D., & Wolfe, R. N. (1984). Revision of the self-monitoring scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*, 1349-1364.

Nunnally, J. D. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Scheffler, J. (1992). Using collaborative writing groups to teach analysis of an RFP. *The Bulletin of the Association for Business Communication, 55*(2), 26-28.

Schnake, M. E., Dumler, M. P., Cochran, D. S., & Barnett, T. R. (1990, Winter). Effects of differences in superior and subordinate perceptions of superiors' communication practices. *The Journal of Business Communication, 27*(1), 37-50.

Schneier, C. E., & Goktepe, J. R. (1983). Issues in emergent leadership: The contingency model of leadership, leader sex, leader behavior. In H. H. Blumberg, A. P. Hare, V. Kent, and M. F. Davies (Eds.), *Small groups and social interaction* (Vol. 1, pp. 413-421). Chicester, UK: John Wiley.

Schreiber, E. J. (1996, October). Muddles and huddles: Facilitating a multicultural workforce through team management theory. *The Journal of Business Communication, 33*(4), 459-473.

Seers, A., Petty, M. M., & Cashman, J. F. (1995). Team-member exchange under team and traditional management: A naturally occurring quasi-experiment. *Group & Organization Management, 20*, 18-38.

Smith, T. (1992). Human relations in organizations: Collaborative writing by beginners. *The Bulletin of the Association for Business Communication, 55*(2), 29-31.

Snyder, M. (1974). The self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30*, 526-537.

Snyder, M. (1979). Self-monitoring processes. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 86-128). New York: Academic Press.

Snyder, M., & Campbell, B. H. (1982). Self-monitoring: The self in action. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Social psychological perspectives on the self* (Vol. 1, pp.185-207). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Snyder, M., & Gangestad, S. (1982). Choosing social situations: Two investigations of self-monitoring processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43*, 123-135.

Snyder, M., & Gangestad, S. (1986). On the nature of self-monitoring: Matters of assessment, matters of reliability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 125-139.

Spitzberg, B. H. (1990). The construct validity of trait-based measures of interpersonal competence. *Communication Research Reports, 7*, 107-115.

Sypher, B. D., & Sypher, H. E. (1983). Perceptions of communication ability: Self-monitoring in an organizational setting. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 9*, 297-304.

Wallace, D. L. (1994, January). Collaborative planning and transforming knowledge. *The Journal of Business Communication, 31*(1), 41-60.

Winter, J. K., & Neal, J. C. (1995). Group writing: Student perceptions of the dynamics and efficiency of groups. *Business Communication Quarterly, 58*(2), 21-24.

Zaccaro, S. J., Foti, R. J., & Kenny, D. A. (1991). Self-monitoring and trait-based variance in leadership: An investigation of leader flexibility across multiple group situations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 308-315.