ADVANCING

WOMEN IN

LEADERSHIP

Table of Contents

Preface

Advancing Women in Leadership On-line Journal was launched in 1997 with the intent of publishing manuscripts that report, synthesize, review, or analyze scholarly inquiry that focuses on women's issues. The intent of this journal is to encourage and support the proliferation of women in positions of leadership in all aspects of professional and corporate America. In the encouragement of advancing women in leadership, we present the following manuscripts. They are:

Women Faculty in Higher Education: Impeded by Academe by Dr. Dana E. Christman

Working Against the Grain: Rewards and Consequences of Developing a Personal Voice in Academia by Dr. Pamela LePage and Dr. Gretchen Givens-Generett

Creating Space for Subjectivity: Wandering Discourses of Female/Teacher by Dr. Donna K. Phillips and Dr. J.Camille Cammack.

Magazines: What Adolescent Girls are Reading and the Way They Shape Body Image by Dr. Rebecca A. Robles-Piña and Heidi Sauer

A Study of the Correlation Between the Motives of Female High Self Monitors and Emergent Leadership: A Literature Review by Charles Salter

Hispanic Female Superintendents in America: A Profile by Dr. Margaret A. Manuel and Dr. John R. Slate

Our intent is that this journal is viewed as a professional publication site for scholarly inquiry and perspectives that promote gender equity and advance women in leadership. It is our hope that you find this issue of Advancing Women in Leadership thought provoking, enjoyable, and that you look forward to subsequent issues. Suggestions for improvement, encouragement, and submission for upcoming issues are welcomed and appreciated. Genevieve Brown, Ed.D. & Beverly J. Irby, Ed.D. Editors

Credits

Publisher: Gretchen Glasscock CEO/President, AdvancingWomen.com

Editors: Dr. Genevieve Brown Dr. Beverly Irby Sam Houston State University

Assistant Editor: Danna Ellington

Editorial Review Board

Full Length Research Paper

A Study of the Correlation Between the Motives of Female High Self Monitors and Emergent Leadership: A Literature Review
Charles Slater

Charles Slater: Ph.D. in Leadership Studies at Lady of the Lake University

If women do have a tendency to elicit high self-monitoring behavior because they have a need to get along with others, and if men elicit a high self-monitoring behavior because they have an acquisitive disposition, an acknowledgement of those apposed motivations would lead to a better understanding of the diverse talents that each group brings to the job.

Introduction
In 1972, researchers reported that only 4% of the Master of Business Administration graduates were women. This figure now exceeds 33%. Similarly, in 1972, women occupied about 20% of non-clerical, white-collar jobs. This figure has now grown to more than 46% (Sharpe, 1994). Sharpe also contended that in 1972, only 17% of all managerial positions were held by women, but by 1994 that number had increased by 43%. Although women have flooded managerial positions in recent years, concern still remains about what some refer to as a "glass ceiling" that prohibits women from reaching the topmost levels of corporate leadership. Ragins, Townsend, and Mattis (1998) stated that, of the most highly compensated corporate executives in Fortune 500 companies only 2% are currently women and only .4% of the Fortune 1000 Chief Executive Officer, (CEO), positions are held by women. Maruca (1997) promulgated that male CEOs blamed the "glass ceiling" on women's lack of experience and time in organizations. In the same study, however, female executives disagreed citing exclusionary corporate cultures as the reason for their lack of advancement to top management positions. This paper looks at one of the human behaviors known to be compatible with emergent leadership, self-monitoring behavior, and its possible relationship to the "glass ceiling" prohibiting women's advancement within corporations.

Literature Review

Leadership Emergence
Bass (1981) made a major distinction in leadership research between individuals who are formally appointed to positions of leadership and individuals who emerge as leaders of formal groups. De Souza and Klein (1995) concluded that groups with emergent leaders outperformed groups without emergent leaders. Most of the research investigating emergent leadership has been directed by the trait approach, which assumes that leaders are endowed with certain innate characteristics that predispose them to be effective leaders in a wide range of situations. Empirical support for the trait approach has been lacking and because of this some researchers have concluded that a leadership trait does not exist (Jenkins, 1947). However, Lord, De Vader, and Alliger (1986) found that some variance in leader emergence could be predicted by the dominance, intelligence, and masculinity-femininity of the leader. Hollander (1961;1964) identified task competence and identification as traits of emergent leaders. Task competence encompasses the set of characteristics that are required by a group to attain its goals and includes social competencies. Identification entails a clear involvement with the group task and loyalty toward group members. Sorrentino and Boutillier (1975) found rate of verbal participation to be a predictor of emergent leadership. Emergent leadership has also been positively related to extroversion, openness to experience, and cognitive ability (Kickul & Neuman, 2000). Kenny and Zaccaro (1983) proposed that persons who are consistently cast into leadership positions possess the ability to perceive and predict variations in group situations and pattern their own behavior accordingly. Dobbins, Long, Dedrick, and Clemons (1990) concluded that Kenny and Zaccaro's (1983) characteristics of persons regularly cast into leadership roles were consistent with Snyder's (1979) description of self-monitoring behavior.

Self-Monitoring Behavior
Snyder (1974) related that people who engage in high self-monitoring behavior regulate their behavior in ways that are highly sensitive to situational cues. High self-monitors have a strong concern that their behavior is appropriate for the social situations in which they find themselves. Individuals who are high self-monitors are particularly sensitive to the social cues and self-presentations of others, and use social cues as

guidelines for managing their own behavior and or creating desirable impressions (Synder, 1986). In contrast, low self-monitoring persons display less concern for the situational appropriateness of their behavior, which appears to be guided from their internal cues, rather than by situational specifications of appropriate behavior. Therefore, one might say that high self-monitors are impression managers who are to a great degree concerned with the impression their actions have on others. Their concern for the impression they make results in their adjusting their behavior so as to present themselves in the most favorable light. Low self-monitors are more inclined to act in accord with their own true feelings, attitudes, and values in social settings (Synder, 1986). It has been suggested by Turnley and Bolino (2001) that high self-monitors elicit the same five personality characteristics as those reported by Costa and McCrae (1988). The Big Five personality traits are said to help predict a person's success in organizations. In summary they are: 1) Extroversion- or the extent to which a person is outgoing, 2) Agreeableness-or the degree to which one is cooperative, 3) Openness to experience-defines a nature to be curious and creative, 4) Emotional Stability-or a persons propensity to be calm, self confident, and cool, and 5) Conscientiousness-the degree to which an individual is hard working, dependable, and persevering. Barrick and Mount (1991) reported that these personality characteristics were valid predictors of success for many occupational groups.

Some research has found a strong relationship between self-monitoring and leader emergence in groups (Cronshaw & Ellis, 1991; Ellis, Adamson, Deszca & Cawsey, 1988). Other research has suggested that these effects are moderated by the sex of group members and the nature of the task confronting the group (Ellis, 1988; Garland & Beard, 1979). Ellis (1988) examined the effects of self-monitoring on leader emergence in natural mixed-sex groups and found that leader emergence and high self-monitoring behavior were related for males, but not for females. Dobbins et al. (1990) found that high self-monitoring men emerged as leaders in groups of high self-monitoring women and men disproportionately to women. Nyquist and Spence (1986) reported that 90% of high dominant men became leaders over low dominant women, and only 25% of high dominant women emerged as leaders over low dominant men. Wentworth and Anderson (1984) found that men emerged as leaders in 86% of mixed-sex groups. Carbonell (1984) showed that females with leadership ability assert leadership in interactions with other females but fail to do so in the company of males. It is plausible that high self-monitoring females in mixed-sex groups inhibit leadership behavior because they fear such behavior will be viewed as inappropriate according to sex role stereotypes. In contrast to Ellis' (1988), finding that high self-monitoring behavior correlated with leader emergence in males, Garland and Beard (1979) found that high self-monitoring females, but not males, emerged as leaders in their respective groups. These results in regard to high self-monitoring females can be explained by sex role research demonstrating that females will assert leadership in interaction with other females (Carbonell, 1984; Megargee, 1969). Kent and Moss (1994) found in their study on emergent leaders that masculine subjects emerged as leaders more often than feminine subjects. Another study indicated that sex differences in emergent leadership are due to role-induced tendencies for men to specialize more than women in behaviors strictly oriented to their group's task and for women to specialize more than men in socially facilitative behaviors (Eagly, Karau, & Steven, 1991; Karakowsky, Leonard, & Siegel, 1999). Most if not all the traits that have been studied about emergent leadership are characteristics of those who are high self-monitors.

Other differences in female and male high self-monitors have been documented. Shaffer and Pegalis (1998) reported that high self-monitoring females failed to elicit more self-disclosure than their low self-monitoring counterparts, while male high self-monitors did elicit more self-disclosure. Men high self-monitors clearly promoted male self-disclosure in a collaborative or work setting context, whereas female high self-monitors actually inhibited self-disclosure in collaborative work settings. In contrast to women's reported tendency to self-disclose to other women more in social-expressive contexts, Shaffer and Ogden (1986) and Shaffer and Pegalis (1998) found that women high self-monitors did not elicit more self-disclosure from female acquaintances in social-expressive contexts than in collaborative contexts. Guarino, Michael, and Hocevar (1997) reported differences in the social integration of female high self-monitors and male high self-monitors in relation to student integration into community college life. Specifically, they found that male high self-monitors were socially integrated faster and to a greater degree, than female high self-monitors.

The questions that arise, are: What makes female high self-monitors less likely to be emergent leaders than male high self-monitors in mixed-sex groups? And what stimulates women high self-monitors to be less likely to elicit self-disclosure from other women in a collaborative work setting, and less socially integrating in college environments? Briggs and Cheeks (1988) and Lennox and Wolfe (1984) stated that people vary their self-presentation style for different motives and that these motives should be taken into account in studying self-presentation. According to Wolfe, Lennox, and Cutler (1986), high self-monitors vary their self-presentation for two reasons: 1) acquisition-or trying to get ahead, or 2) self-protection-trying to get along. Research also discovered that the occurrence of protective and acquisitive self-presentations is contingent on: the audience of the presenter, the context, and the person making the self-presentation. Wolfe et al. (1986) also reported that self-presenters chronically adopt either a protective or an acquisitive self-presentation style. He further reports that factors associated with self-presenters adopting a protective style include: social anxiety, shyness, conformity, reticence, low self-esteem, modesty, and neutrality. Conversely people adopting an acquisitive self-presentation style are characterized as being more self-confident and higher in self-esteem.

Understandably a high self-monitor that did not elicit traits found to be those of emergent leaders, such as self-confidence, would probably be less likely to be named as a leader by others.

Conclusion

In conclusion more research should be done to identify the motivation of women high self-monitors. Are those motivations concerned more with the facilitative behaviors or trying to get along with others' motivation rather than an

acquisitive desire. Also, more study should be conducted on the differences in the men and women relate to tasks and group goals and the way men and women engage in problem solving. One would prefer to believe that male bias is not the reason for the "glass ceiling" effect for women. One would further prefer to believe that if this barrier does exist it is borne of a misunderstanding of the differences in which men and women conduct conflict resolution as well as goal setting and attainment. By understanding the motivations of people, even if they are not similar to our own, we can understand the principles on which they base decisions. By understanding the logical reasoning constructs on which they base decisions we can more easily predict their behavior. Being able to predict a manager's behavior is a source of comfort to any superior and leads to a better relationship and more fluidity of communication.

If women do have a tendency to elicit high self-monitoring behavior because they have a need to get along with others, and if men elicit a high self-monitoring behavior because they have an acquisitive disposition, an acknowledgement of those apposed motivations would lead to a better understanding of the diverse talents that each group brings to the job. We could then, as corporate managers, make the best and highest use of all the personnel resources available to us.

Today in corporate boardrooms throughout the United States, we see companies that are finding themselves in one type of predicament or another. Many of these problems are intensified because of a collegiate atmosphere, or a reciprocity that emanates from like thinking. This reciprocity results in board members being hesitant to question the actions of those colleagues that are the Chief Executive Officers of these corporations. For the above- mentioned reason alone, we need to foster an understanding of the motivations of men and women and welcome the difference, if one exists, into a system mired down in like-mindedness.

References

Barrick, M. R. & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job

performance: A meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 51, 577-598.

Bass, B. (1981) . Stodgill's handbook of leadership. New York: Free Press.

Briggs, S. R., & Cheek, J. M. (1988). On the nature of self-monitoring: Problems with assessment and problems with validity. Journal of Personality and Social

Psychology, 54, 663-678.

Carbonell, J. L. (1984). Sex roles and leadership revisited. Journal of Applied

Psychology, 69, 44-49.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1988). From catalog to classification: Murray's needs and five-factor model. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 258-265.

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

De Souza, G., & Klein, H.J. (1995). Emergent leadership in the group goal setting

process. Small Group Research, 26, 475-499.

Dobbins, G. H., Long, W. S., Dedrick, E. J., Clemons, T. C. (1990). The Role of self-monitoring and gender on leader emergence: A laboratory and field study. Journal of Management, 16 (3), 609-618.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (1991). Gender and the emergence of leaders: A meta-analysis. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 60, 685-710.

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 Research, 19, 312-324.

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

Guarino, A., Michael, W. B., & Hocevar, D. (1997). Self-monitoring and student

integration of community college students. Journal of Social Psychology, 138, 754-760.

Hollander, E. P. (1961). Emergent Leadership and social influence. Leadership and

interpersonal behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Hollander, E. P. (1964). Leaders, groups, and influence. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, W. O. (1947). A review of leadership studies with particular reference to

military problems. Psychological Bulletin, 44, 54-79.

Karakowski, L., & Siegel, J. P. (1999). The effects of proportional representation and gender orientation of the task on emergent leadership behavior in mixed-gender work groups. Journal of Applied Psychology, 84, 620-631.

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

Kent, R. L., & Moss, S. E. (1994). Effects of sex and gender role on leader emergence. Academy of Management Journal, 37, 1335-1346.

Kickul, J., & Neuman, G. (2000). Emergent leadership behaviors: the function of

personality and cognitive ability in determining. Journal of Business &

Psychology, 15, 27-52.

Lennox, R., & Wolfe, R. (1984). Revision of the self-monitoring scale. Journal of

Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 1349-1364.

Lord, R. G., De Vader, C., & Alliger, G. M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relation

between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 402-410.

Maruca, R. F. (1997). Says Who? Harvard Business Review, 12, 15-17.

Megargee, E. I. (1969). Influence of sex roles on the manifestation of leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, 53, 377-382.

Nyquist, L. V., & Spence, J. T. (1986). Effects of dispositional dominance and sex role expectations on leadership behaviors. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 87-93.

Ragins, B. R., Townsend, B., & Mantis, M. (1998). Gender gap in the executive suite: CEOs and female executives report on breaking the glass ceiling. Academy of Management Executive, 2, 28-42.

Shaffer, D. R., & Ogden, J. K. (1986). On sex differences in self-disclosure during the acquaintance process: The role of anticipated future interaction. Journal of

Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 76-96.

Shaffer, D. R., & Pegalis, L. J. (1998). Gender and situational context moderate the relationship between self-monitoring and induction of self-disclosure. Journal of Personality, 66, 215-234.

Sharpe, R. (1994). Women make strides, but men stay firmly in top company jobs. The Wall Street Journal, March 29, 1994.

Sorrentino, R. M., & Boutillier, R. G. (1975). The effect of quantity and quality verbal interaction on ratings of leadership ability. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 11, 403-411.

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

Synder, M. (1979). Self-monitoring processes. Advances in experimental social

psychology, 12, 86-128.

Synder, M. (1986). Public appearances/Private realities. New York: Freeman and

Company.

Turnley, W. H., & Bolino, M. C. (2001). Achieving desired images while avoiding undesired images: Exploring the role of self-monitoring in impression management. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 351-360.

Wentworth, D. K., & Anderson, L. R. (1984). Emergent leadership as a function of sex and type. Sex Roles, 11, 513-524.

Wolfe, R., Lennox, R., & Cutler, B. (1986). "Getting along" and "getting ahead":

Empirical support for a theory of protective and acquisitive self-presentation.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 356-361.

Author

Charles Salter received his Masters in Business Administration from the University of Houston, TX and is currently working on his Ph.D. in Leadership Studies at Our Lady of the Lake University in San Antonio, TX.