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**Introduction**

The success or failure of a group depends in part upon the clarity of the mission of the project and on the resources that the group may draw upon. However, it is the researcher’s belief that a group project’s success is also largely a function of the leadership which emerges in the framing and the performance of the task. It is a common practice within the business community and the academic community to employ the “group project” as a useful tool to take an idea from conception to implementation. In other words, on many occasions groups may be formed with no readily apparent person in charge of the group. That is, with no assigned leader, the group is “leaderless. This means that each group member has an equal amount of formal power.

Conflict is inherent in a leaderless group because, as roles and norms form within the group, many individuals may vie for the position of leader. Roles, such as leader and follower, are important to the group for they "imply a division of labor amongst the group members which can often facilitate the achievement of the group's goal, an important motivating factor" (Brown, 1988, p. 55). In other words, role stratification is necessary for the successful completion of the task at hand. Roles bring an order to the interaction of group members which would be absent if all members remained on equal footing with equal influence; therefore, it is crucial to the success of the group that one or more members be accepted as the "leader(s)."
Creative, original, and somewhat dominating individuals usually emerge in a group setting as the leader, bringing into consideration the usefulness of the trait approach to leadership, which by many was dismissed years ago (Hare, 1976, p. 279). In the early 1900s when the first empirical studies of leadership were initiated, scholars believed that the key to leadership was found in the traits and characteristics of leaders. Leaders were born, not made, according to trait models of leadership (Northouse, 1997, p. 13). Lists of "leadership" traits were fashioned through analysis of the actions and personalities of "great" leaders. However, in general, trait theories of leadership did not prove highly effective in predicting leader emergence or effectiveness across situations (Northouse, 1997, p. 21). As a consequence, researchers turned to situational approaches more to explain the phenomenon of leadership, and began to explore the extent to which leaders are expected to change their leadership style based upon the needs of the followers and the demands of the situation.

Although "trait-oriented" leadership research is not popular today, there may be value in revisiting research in this area, and, in particular, examining traits that were not objects of study in earlier decades. One unalterable characteristic or trait which every individual holds is his or her birth order. This placement within the family affects the personality development of the individual because of the interactions he/she has with parents and siblings, and, for this reason, the emergent leadership
capabilities of an individual may be influenced by birth order. A firstborn will have different strengths and weaknesses than a laterborn in adulthood because of the different familial roles which they played as children.

"The individual learns that he has a certain role in the family; that other people see him in certain ways in terms of that role. He tends to think of himself in those ways and he learns to behave in accordance with his role. He tends to think of other people in ways that accord with their status relative to his and he learns ways of using his own position that will enable him to compete successfully with his family rivals. Inevitably, he carries these attitudes toward himself and other people and his ways of relating to siblings into the world outside his home" (Forer, 1969, p. 7)

This self-perception and personality carry over to actions taken as an adult. Therefore, the likelihood that one will emerge as a leader in a leaderless group is, in part, dependent upon personality, which is established in large part as a result of the birth order and participation in the family. This study will analyze the connections, if any, between the birth order of individuals and their emergence as leaders in leaderless groups.

Specifically, the researcher will be utilizing birth order literature to gather information on how the unalterable trait of birth order shapes personality, and then will conduct a study which will examine birth order and how it relates to emergent leadership in a problem-solving, group discussion scenario. In order to ground this research in the section that follows, the most common characteristics of emergent leaders are compared with the common characteristics of different birth orders, such as firstborns, middle children, only children and lastborns.
Subsequently, a series of hypotheses are posited concerning relationship between birth order and leader emergence.

Emergent Leaders

**Task-Oriented vs. Relationship-Centered Behavior and Leadership**

Studies show that the most important characteristics of an effective emergent leader are his/her ability to concentrate on the group's task (Hare, 1976). Those who emerge as leaders are not necessarily the most popular members of the group. Other factors are more crucial to group members. Group members place the most trust in an individual who presents original ideas to the group, defines how his/her plan can be carried out, and then works toward successful implementation of his plan (Hollander, 1964, 194).

Most research supports the conclusion that the task-oriented individual who hopes to become the leader of a leaderless group will be more successful than would the relationship-centered person. A task-oriented individual "is more attentive to task-related aspects of the leadership situation, more concerned with task success, and under most circumstances, more inclined to behave in a structuring, directive, and somewhat autocratic style" (Wren, 1995, p. 86). This behavior would include actions such as keeping the group focussed, setting and achieving the final goal, and taking actions which will further the progress of the group. The relationship-centered leader has a very different approach to his/her position of leadership and relations with followers, for he or she is "more attentive and responsive to interpersonal
dynamics, more concerned with avoiding conflict and maintaining high morale, and more likely to behave in a participative and considerate leadership style" (Wren, 1995, p. 86) A relationship-centered individual will take whatever actions necessary so that all voices are heard, will be very respectful of each individual and will strive to ensure that group members work well together.

In an influential 1955 study completed by Slater, evidence was found that the individual regarded by peers as the most influential person in the group was not the most popular man or woman (Brown, 1988, p. 53). In fact, further studies have shown role differentiation between the social-emotional, or "best-liked," individual and the "idea-person" who is task-oriented and more aggressive in the group situation (eg. Hare, 1976; McGrath, 1984; Bales, 1950.) The group places more confidence in the emergent leadership of an individual who has many ideas and attempts to find means of implementation of ideas than that of a person who concerns him/herself with establishing strong intra-group relations (eg. Hare, 1976). Group's members prefer these task-directed individuals because these individuals will have

"the persistence and dominance to keep talking at what at first may be a somewhat dubious and easily distracted group. They have the ability to talk down opposition and to speak rapturously and engagingly on the advantages of the new course of action, the problems that will be resolved, the extraordinary gains for all that will be obtained" (Sayles, 1979, p. 34).

When a group is determining the leader in whom to place their trust, popularity is not necessarily a major criterion. In fact, studies comparing leaders who have emerged because of their
qualifications and those who have been appointed show that a leader is accepted by the group more when he or she has emerged than appointed. In research focused on leader emergence and phases of group development, Hollander (1964) found that,

"gradually [over time] a useful distinction between appointed leaders and those who emerged through the willing response of followers was recognized. During this phase, popularity as a feature of group-emergent leadership was given disproportionate importance. .Eventually both the trait and popularity emphases were subordinated to an approach which focused on the varying demands for leadership imposed by an immediate situation" (Hollander, 1964, p. 18).

Paul Hare wrote on the changes in leadership style found in discussion and problem-solving meetings. In his Handbook of Small Group Research (1976) he summarizes research exploring how and under what circumstances a task-oriented style will change to a more relationship-centered behavior or vice versa. Near the beginning of group work, the relationship-centered leader is appreciated for the ability to pull the group of strangers together into a cohesive group. However, popularity wanes and changes over time. A task-oriented individual is not as concerned with the feelings of the members towards him/her; he/she focuses on completing the task by directing the actions taken by the group. And, according to Fiedler's contingency theory of leadership, a leader's relationship- or task-orientation in a problem-solving or group environment are constant and developed trait (Northouse, 1997, p. 76).

Skilled Communicators
Not only are emergent leaders generally creative and skilled in task-oriented behavior, they also are proficient in communication, specifically displaying capabilities in creating a vision or outlining plans for the group. Many studies have determined that the likelihood of emergent leadership is related to the number of times an individual speaks in group meetings. In other words, participation is seen as initiating action, and is highly rewarded. Morris and Hackman (1969) found that an individual who participated greatly in the group process was often identified as a leader. "Similarly, participation rate predicts task performance, status in the group, and emergent leadership," according to Clyde Hendrick (1987, p. 99) in his book Group Processes and Intergroup Relations. Similarly, "Riecken (1958) found that the more talkative group member was more effective at generating task-oriented solutions" (Hendrick, 1987, 101). This would suggest that an emergent leader would be both creative in determining a plan of action and self-confident enough that he/she would be comfortable in sharing his/her ideas and plans with others in the group.

Not all loquacious individuals will emerge as leaders in a problem-solving discussion setting. The potential emergent leader must be able to put his/her vision into words, as well as convince the group members, individually and as a group, that his/her plan is worth adopting. By effective communicative skills, an emergent leader will be able to share his/her vision with the other members of the group.
**Competency**

Emergent leaders are also seen as being particularly competent in the specific field of knowledge necessary for the completion of the task at hand. Members of a group are more likely to listen to the thoughts of the emergent leader when his/her past successes in the field are proven. This competency in the subject matter may come by way of the individual's background, knowledge, or competency as demonstrated by the individual's actions. Hollander describes the process through which an emergent leader gains acceptance from the group:

"A member may show such competence by individual actions that further the attainment of group goals. ... a person who exhibits both competence and [perceived adherence to the normative behaviors and attitudes of the group] should eventually reach a threshold at which it becomes appropriate in the eyes of others for him to assert influence; and insofar as these assertions are accepted, he emerges as a leader" (Hollander, 1964, p. 194).

In terms of self-confidence, often these emergent leaders will have proven their competency to themselves in the past. This self-confidence in his/her own abilities aids the person in proving to the group members that he/she has the competence to lead.

**Goal: Obtaining Position of Power**

Emergent leaders desire positions of power in which they can influence the actions of the group. They are often so enthusiastic about their plans that they display no fear of taking risks. "Scholars have discerned among leaders an inclination from early childhood for risk taking and a willingness to go to great lengths--often in defiance of others, including those in positions
of authority—in order to achieve their ends," writes Gardner (1995, p. 33). "A motive to gain power—either for its own sake or in pursuit of a specific aim—is invariably present" (Gardner, 1995, p. 33). Emergent leaders usually have the self-confidence and desire for control that leads to their heightened position of authority within the leaderless group. They are willing to rely on themselves. This self-confidence breeds confidence among other members of the group. Group members are searching for direction and this is provided or enhanced by the emergent leader, who desires a position of authority within the group.

Occasionally this individual will be unsuccessful in his/her attempt for emergent leadership because of intragroup conflict. Conflict occurs at many different points in the group process for various reasons. For instance, conflicts may arise when there is no leader to provide answers, when the appointed leader of the group does not hold the same vision or values as the group, or when a leader attempts to emerge who has a personality or vision that conflicts with other members of the group. With this understanding, we come to realize that even if an attempt to emerge as a group's leader is made, it may not always be successful. There are many variables which will influence how receptive a group is to a potential emergent leader.

To review, individuals who concentrate upon the task at hand instead of developing strong relations within the group are usually effective emergent leaders. This individual is often not the most popular member of the group, but provides more
information and proposals than other members of the group. The emergent leader is often the most vocal individual and effectively communicates his/her vision or solutions to the group for discussion. The confidence that this individual has gained over years of participation in other activities and ventures leads him to desire a position of authority within the group. When an individual has these traits, he/she will most likely be successful in emerging as a leader in a leaderless group scenario.

Birth-Order and Personality

The Effect Birth-Order has on Personality

Whether or not a potential emergent leader will be successful in gaining the confidence of the group is dependent in a large part on his/her personality and the manner in which he/she interacts with others. Personality "refers to the structures (intrapsychic processes such as hopes, fears, aspirations, motives, complexes) within a person that explain why that person creates his or her unique social reputation" (Hendrick, 1987, p. 98). One characteristic of an individual, which does not change over time and is influential in shaping personality, is birth-order, i.e. where the individual falls in the familial line. Birth-order has a life-long effect in determining who and what an individual will become over time (Leman, 1998, p. 69).

What is a "Firstborn?"

A firstborn is unique because of the familial pressures associated with being the first child in the family. For the purposes of this study, it is necessary to lay a foundation for
what constitutes a firstborn. The first child born into a family will obviously be a "firstborn;" however, a laterborn child can also be described as a "firstborn" if he or she is the first child of his/her gender to be born into the family (Forer, 1969, p. 18). For example, if a husband and wife have a son and then a few years later, a daughter, both children may show firstborn characteristics because they face different challenges and expectations as a consequence of their different genders (Leman, 1998, p. 43). The personality traits of both sexes are very similar in firstborns because the "firstborn boys are usually pressured to be the 'crown prince' of the family and firstborn girls get almost as much pressure to be the 'crown princess'" (Leman, 1998, p. 92). Most literature on birth order does not distinguish children based upon their gender--they focus upon how the position which they hold in their family affects their personality development.

An issue that needs clarification for purposes of this research concerns the "disorder" which occurs when birth-orders are combined in divorced or nontraditional families. The traditional family can be described as that which has a natural father, a natural mother, and siblings. Nontraditional families can be described as those in which two families of children are brought together as step-siblings or in which there is one parent; however, this does not affect the birth order characteristics which will be displayed by children in a family. "The first born is always a first-born, a middle child is always a middle-child
and so on. Blended families do not create new birth-order positions" (Leman, 1998, p. 61). Because in most cases the introduction of step-siblings into the family comes after the child's personality is already started to develop, the child will see him/herself in their original birth order position (Leman, 1998, p. 61). Introduction of an older step-sibling will not change their original birth order.

**Common Characteristics of Firstborns**

### Seeking Approval of Others

Because of the high expectations family members place on the firstborn, many typical behavior characteristics have been observed as to the personality and manner of this individual. Because firstborns believe themselves to be displaced in the hearts of their parents when a younger sibling arrives, they are conditioned at an early age to continually strive for the affection and admiration of others, including family members, other adults and friends (Forer, 1969, p. 98). Firstborns often believe that they were "not enough" to fulfill the wishes of their parents and that is the reason for the birth of the second child. Current Health 2 magazine sums up the roller-coaster of emotion which the firstborn experiences at a very young age:

"Firstborns get a lot of attention from their parents. Their first step is carefully recorded in the baby book, and their first words are reported joyously--and repeatedly--to Grandma and Grandpa. It's not long before baby gets the message that the way to keep parents' attention is to continue achieving wonderful new skills. Along comes baby number 2. It must be a mystery to the older child why parents need another baby if they are so delighted with the first. Now the firstborn must be super-conscientious in order to keep his parents pleased. Obviously, that means working hard
in school. Firstborns tend to be serious and hardworking and the kind of students teachers love" ("Your Place. . .Family. 1991. Current Health 2.").

Generally, firstborns do not feel complete until they are assured of the love and honor which others hold for them. "Love that is earned takes the form of approval, admiration and respect. To get this conditional attention which passes for love, the first born seeks approval from superiors, admiration from equals and respect from inferiors. . .[R]ather than asking, the firstborn hopes to receive what he/she wants by pleasing others" (Issacson, 1988, p. 10). They are different from children of other birth order positions because, to non-firstborn children, parental approval is not always the most important thing to obtain. However, because firstborns strive to please, they often are more amenable to the parents' wishes and desires and will adopt many of the same values without question (Sulloway, 1996, p. 69).

**Overachievers**

Because firstborns are continually striving to prove themselves and win the respect of others, they are the most likely birth order group to become perfectionists and overachievers (Leman, 1998,p. 95). Firstborns hold high standards for their coworkers in groups, especially in terms of the effort put forth to accomplish the task and maintaining order in the group. As a consequence, firstborns can be difficult for others to work with.

"If I have to single out one word to describe firstborns. . .it has to be perfectionist. It's almost as though they have inner forces working on them that are hard to control. If things don't go exactly right in life, [the perfectionist] gets frustrated, even edgy.
It's the little things, not the really big things, that bother the perfectionists of this world" (Leman, 1984, p. 61).

However, the perfectionistic quality in firstborns is many times a positive attribute. The overachieving firstborn "may work long hours, try to achieve perfection, be highly disciplined, do creative thinking, and expend great effort in trying to get admiration from others" (Issacson, 1988, p. 11). There is a diligence to the work of firstborns which is essential to getting a job done well, and this is reflected in the overabundance of firstborns in high-profile positions. Firstborns make up 35% of the United States population, but they dominate fields such as science and business (Koselek and Shook, 1997, p. 146). Forbes magazine conducted a survey in early 1997 of the fifty businessmen that they determined to be the best and the brightest. Almost half of these men were firstborns, demonstrating the ability of firstborns to strive and achieve positions of power. Firstborns are also "over-represented among Who's Who in America and American Men and Women of Science, as well as among Rhodes scholars and university professors" (Leman, 1984, p. 44).

**Powerful and Demanding/Inclination for Dominance**

Because they are often given the most responsibility among the children in the family from a young age, firstborns often expect to be in charge. A firstborn is given the responsibility of taking care of younger siblings when the parents need a break from caring for the children. This positively reinforces their
feelings of competence and self-confidence. They feel that they are the boss, and thrive on the respect which must be shown to them by younger siblings because of their position of power (Leman, 1989, p. 168). They tend to enjoy the position of authority from a young age, which makes them look at the world more in terms of organization and power. They do not concern themselves as much with building strong relationships but with taking charge and making sure that every situation runs smoothly (Leman, 1998, p. 82). This is so because their elders, the people with whom they have related for a significant part of their childhood, entrust such responsibility in their hands.

"Firstborns and only children tend to be given a more responsible place in the family and thus exhibit more of the characteristics of the task leader, in contrast to later-borns, who have more of the characteristics of the social-emotional leader. Firstborns are more likely to be seen as powerful, and to be more authoritarian, more anxious, more affiliative, and more responsive to cues from others, but less empathic than later borns" (Hare, 1976, p. 212).

Although firstborns are not as peer-oriented as later borns, they are more focused on organization and goals (Forer, 1969, p. 103). As literature shows, their dominance and authority comes from a more task-related and less relationship-oriented behavior. This concentration upon organization and authority is tied to their birth order, for "status-enhancing behavior is a firstborn tendency" (Sulloway, 1996, p. 77). This desire for dominance and power can be tied to the characteristics discussed before; firstborns see dominance as a way of controlling the group's work
and achieving the perfectionism which will bring them respect. Though, of course, there are exceptions and some firstborns may place high value on relationships and service, many firstborns are "assertive, strong willed, high achievers, and hard drivers. These assertive firstborns set high goals and have a strong need to be 'king or queen'" (Leman, 1998, p. 82).

**Leaders by Nature of Birth Order?**

Because firstborns have the desire for power and a "need" for organization and achievement, they have often been characterized as "natural leaders." Dr. Kevin Leman, a well-known lecturer and author on the impact of birth order on personality, writes,

"Firstborn children often go on to become the leaders and achievers in life. This isn't necessarily their idea, but with only parents for role models, they naturally take on more grown-up characteristics. This is why firstborns are often serious and not much for surprises. They prefer to know what's happening and when; they thrive in being in control, on time, and organized—all characteristics that stand adults in good stead" (Leman, 1998, 88).

Research has shown that firstborns are well suited to emerge as leaders in some situations and not in others. Firstborns are often the leaders in a working scenario where task-behavior is necessary to the effective completion of a job. Firstborns have been shown to be the initiators, organizers and creators, but not your typical joiners (Wilson and Edington, 1981, p. 93).

Firstborns have a self-confidence helpful to leadership positions because of the contact they have always had with older, more mature individuals. From the very beginning, the firstborn was surrounded by adults and "cared" for the younger children in
his/her family; therefore, he/she has a "confidence in being taken
seriously by those around him" (Leman, 1984, p. 44).

A 1954 study by Helen Koch, a psychologist at the University
of Chicago, gives supporting evidence (Sulloway, 1996, p. 76).
Koch studied the influence of birth order on psychological traits.
In one study centered on 384 children ages 5-6 from schools near
Chicago from among white, intact, two-child families, she asked
teachers to rate the children on 58 behavioral measures. Based on
these responses, she concluded that "relative to laterborns,
firstborns were judged to be more self-confident, competitive,
insistent on rights, emotionally intense, and upset by defeat"
(Sulloway, 1996, p. 76). She reached the ultimate conclusion that
firstborns were so anxious and intense because they often worried
about their status amongst their peers. The self-confident that
was so typical of firstborns was really only hiding their need for
acceptance and high status/authority (Sulloway, 1996, p. 76).

**Firstborns' Weaknesses and their Approaches to Leadership**

The firstborn's greatest weakness, and that which could
affect their leadership capabilities, is their conservative nature
and fear of risk-taking. That is not to say that firstborns will
not take risks, but they are much more cautious in the chances
which they take. Many times, they take less dangerous risks when
the results will most likely be favorable. Though they are often
the activists, they are also described as typically "fighting
rear-guard actions against the encroachment of new ideas"
"Birth Order, Self-concept, and Participation in Dangerous Sports" in March, 1993, which stated that because firstborns become accustomed for caring for younger siblings:

"Such socialization experiences are the basis for the expectation (and sometimes the perception) that firstborns are more dependable, responsible, cautious, conservative, and higher achievement motivated than later born children" ("Birth Order, self-concept, and Participation in Dangerous Sports." The Journal of Psychology, March, 1993, p. 221).

Firstborns may be the "responsible" ones to whom others can turn, but their conservative nature can get in the way of success. It is suspected that firstborns' conservativism may be related to their predilection for orderliness and organization. Firstborns do not like surprises or questions which would either throw their organizational balance "off kilter" or make them question themselves or their own actions (Leman, 1998, p. 196). They would rather face a clear situation in which all of the facts are laid out in front of them and they can design a plan of action.

After years of study, Sulloway contributes this fear of change and surprises in firstborns to many of Darwin's hypotheses on "survival of the fittest." Firstborns have to fight to maintain the attention and admiration of their parents following the "surprise" arrival of a younger sibling. They faced change and, in a sense, lost. "Change favors the underdog" (Sulloway, 1996, p. 54). According to Epstein (1997, p. 51), throughout history,

"firstborn children have tended to be preservers of the status quo, both worshipful of authority and authoritative themselves. Later born children, by contrast, have always exhibited a much greater openness to experience and have been more likely to give themselves to radical causes. The reason for this is,
and yet they are displaced with the arrival of another sibling. 
Surprises do not fit neatly into their comfort zone of 
orderliness, and therefore is undesirable and difficult to handle.

The Other Birth Orders

To elucidate the differences that exist in the personalities 
of individuals of different birth order, I extracted several 
tables from The Birth Order Book, written by internationally known 
psychologist, Dr. Kevin Leman, which highlight the strengths and 
weaknesses of persons of different birth orders (See Tables A-D). 
As shown in Table A, firstborns tend to be dominating, 
overachieving, demanding, responsible, and attention seekers. The 
firstborn enjoys starting new ventures, but is cautious in the 
risks that he/she takes. These strengths and weaknesses may 
easily be examined in leadership terms and compared to the 
necessary characteristics of emergent leaders.

The Middle Born

Middle born children (See Table B) differ from firstborns, in 
most instances, because they suffer some of the negative 
repercussions of being stuck in the family's middle their whole 
lives. They engage in "the lifelong and never ending search for 
belongingness. Because it is often the fate of [the] ordinal
position to feel like a fifth wheel; an extra; a leftover who lives in dread of being completely bypassed and upstaged by elder and younger siblings" (Wilson and Edington, 1981, p. 121). The middle born grows up, knowing the benefits and negatives of being an outsider and, therefore, often develops into a very secretive, independent individual. The strong point for middle-born children is the ability to mediate other peoples' conflicts, for they can typically see both sides of the argument clearly, and they easily become popular figures amongst friends and colleagues (Leman, 1998, p. 165). At the same time, secretiveness and independence are also troublesome to the communication process when middle children are involved because middle borns do not open up, but rather allow anger and fears to fester.

---

**Insert Table B Here**

---

**Last Born Children**

Last borns are the flip side of the firstborn "coin." Last borns of a family are the charmers, the show-offs, and the socialites who are always trying to steal the stage away from others by use of their humor or energy (Wilson and Edington, 1981, p. 138-9). This birth order "is characterized by a burning desire to make an important contribution to the world [he/she] lives in... Not only [is he/she] inclined to make backbreaking efforts to reach this goal, but [he/she is] also often outraged" to think that efforts taken are not sufficiently appreciated (Leman, 1998, p. 138). Last borns are more candid and open with others, for they are accustomed to having others very involved in
their lives (See Table C). While firstborns and middle children are more secretive or private, last borns are very affectionate, sometimes to the point where they make decisions based more upon feeling than thought and facts (Leman, 1998,p. 189).

Insert Table C

Only Children

Comparisons are often made between firstborns and only children for the simple fact that firstborns are only children for the first number of years of their lives. However, while firstborns find their position of sole child impinged upon by a baby, only children remain the center of their parents’ attention throughout their development. Only children have "a unique advantage/disadvantage: He or she has never had to compete with siblings for parental attention, favor, or resources" (Leman, 1998,p. 130).

This is labeled as an advantage and a disadvantage for many reasons. For instance, an only child does not have the advantage of having socialization and responsibility forced upon him/her with the birth of another child in the family. However, at the same time, this means that an only child has had "a lot of creative solitude which provided you with the kind of environmental enrichment that made possible your imaginative and innovative approaches to many events" (Wilson and Edington, 1981, p. 28). Only children grow up surrounded by adults, so therefore they were accustomed to being taken seriously, and therefore
willingly throw their energy into whatever challenge they take on (Wilson and Edington, 1981, 27) (See Table D). As shown, many of the characteristics of firstborns are similar to those held by only children.

---

Insert Table D Here

---
This comparison of birth order characteristics among only, first, middle and last born children serves as a backdrop for an analysis of how birth order may be associated with the probability that an individual will emerge as a leader in a leaderless group situation.

**Emergent Leadership and the Firstborn**

The traits of individuals who emerge from a group setting as a leader and the characteristics of the firstborn are quite similar. The impact of birth order on "greatness" and emergence into high profile positions was studied as early as 1869, with an experiment conducted by Francis Galton, the author of *Hereditary Genius*. Galton, a lastborn, investigated the extent to which firstborns assume positions of authority and high profile in fields such as government, law, business, and science. He believed that the birth order of the individual would determine their potential of success. He conducted his study by distributing questionnaires to nearly 200 English scientists of note. "Among the development factors he unearthed was ordinal position in the family. Notable scientists were disproportionately first-born children. . .The odds favored those born earliest. . .They receive higher creativity ratings at the hands of experts in their discipline" (Simonton, 1994, p. 145).

It seems reasonable to expect that, in a problem-solving discussion or planning tasks, the firstborn will likely emerge as a leader from a leaderless group. A discussion or planning
situation needs structure for task progress to occur and the situation appeals to the organized, overachieving and self-confident firstborn. As Hare writes, "leaders who emerge in leaderless group discussions tend to be more authoritarian in their behavior than leaders who are appointed" (Hare, 1976, p. 279). He goes on to argue that the reason for this is that dominating behavior is necessary to establish a position of authority—more so than for maintaining that position.

Firstborns have a drive for a position of power and tend to be demanding and authoritative. This is their key to success, and, in a situation in which the task is unclear and the plan is not determined, this type of individual will be admired and accepted by coworkers or group members because of his/her ability to take charge and plan a course of action. Literature on emergent leadership shows that this task-centered behavior is valued in an emergent leader, and that at the beginning "storming" stages of group processes, relationships within the group are put on hold, while members concentrate on determining the route to be taken in accomplishing their goals (Wren, 1995, p. 356).

Leadership experts also emphasize the necessity of vision in an emergent leader. Because firstborns are overachievers and great planners, they will not only produce an inspiring, if not far-reaching plan, but they will also clearly outline how the group can obtain that goal. Intellectual achievement and creativity are strengths of the firstborn (Sulloway, 1996, p. 69). These traits help the firstborn to create and effectively outline a plan toward
achieving the group's goals. Thus, it appears that because group members look for an emergent leader who is task-oriented and can pave the way for the group, the firstborn will be successful in emerging as a leader (Hare, 1976, p. 145).

In conjunction with these traits, it is hypothesized that firstborns will emerge as leaders because they will outline a plan through use of strong communication skills and a willingness to speak up in discussions, occasionally dominating the conversation because of their energy, vigor, and subconscious need for power. Firstborns are naturally more socially dominant, and this dominance will translate itself into a need to be heard (Sulloway, 1996, p. xiv Introduction). An emergent leader will distinguish him/herself from the other members of the group because of contributions made through planning and oral communication. Studies have shown that "the person who initiates the most action [ie. talks more than others] tends to receive more [attention] than anyone else" (Hare, 1976, p. 82). Hare goes on to write that in leaderless groups in which all members "have approximately equal amounts of information and no one holds more cards or points at the outset, the leadership rank is established by the relative amount of talking of each member. The person who talks the most generally wins most of the decisions and becomes the leader" (Hare, 1976, p. 135). This study will therefore also seek to pinpoint a relationship between the firstborn, the individual who talks the most in a group situation, and emergent leadership. A positive correlation between these factors is anticipated.
A firstborn's potential to emerge as a leader may be hindered, however, by his/her tendency to display a high level of self-confidence. As a result of this tendency "a firstborn may obstruct communication by trying to impress others. In trying to impress, the firstborn may appear to be arrogant, boastful and egotistical" (Issacson, 1988, p. 7). This confidence, especially in a situation where the firstborn knows that he is the most qualified in the subject area, can be a drawback to his/her ability to emerge as a leader.

It is also expected that firstborns identify themselves as emergent leaders in leaderless groups and perceive themselves to be more responsible than others because of their organizational skills, critical thinking skills, and accomplishments. Since they have taken on many responsibilities in outside organizations, they will characterize themselves as "mature," "goal-oriented," "organized," "creative in planning," and "concentrated on achievement." As children, firstborns "are more likely to be given responsibility and control over younger siblings and to have higher expectations associated with their own performance" ("Birth Order, Self-Concept, and Participation in Dangerous Sports. The Journal of Psychology, March, 1993). This behavior will be most evident in a leaderless group situation, for firstborns feel themselves to be capable of bringing the group together, establishing clarity and order, and designing a plan which will accomplish the goal. This behavior will contrast to the behavior of later borns, who will characterize themselves as "active
members of the group," "social," and "friendly." Later borns are also anticipated to be more "relationship" oriented than task-directed. This, of course, is opposite of firstborns.

In sum, this study will test the following hypotheses:

**H1:** Firstborns and firstborn by genders will identify themselves through self-report as being strong in leadership/taking control and organizational skills in a group setting. This information will support birth order information on the identified traits of different birth order

**H2:** In a leaderless group situation in which the group is challenged with a group problem-solving task, a firstborn or firstborn by gender will emerge as the leader in the following manner:

**H2a:** Firstborns and firstborns by gender will be more task-oriented than their group colleagues. This will be displayed through the following coded, task-oriented behaviors: (2) directs the actions of the group; (3) proposes the course of the action for the group; (4) makes suggestions which could solve the assigned problem; (7) supports one's proposals by giving relevant facts or restating his/her suggestion in the hopes of gaining support; and (10) offers an opinion to the group.

**H2b:** Firstborns and Firstborn by genders will dominate the talking time of the group.

**H2c:** Firstborns and firstborns by gender will be identified by their group colleagues as the emergent leaders of a group problem-solving task

**H2d:** Firstborns and firstborns by gender will take advantage of the opportunity to hold a position of power by volunteering for the position of editor-in-chief in the assigned exercise.

**H2e:** Firstborns and firstborn by genders will volunteer through exit questionnaires that they enjoy being the initiator or in control. In contrast, later borns will
state that they would rather not be in charge or the initiator.

Methodology

Procedure

Initial Questionnaire. Permission to carry out this experiment was granted by the University of Richmond Institutional Review Board on March 18, 1999. The first step in the process was the distribution of an initial questionnaire to first year students in six different Core sections to obtain subjects for the experiment (See Appendix A). Core, or "Exploring Human Experience" class, is described as a

"two-semester course [which] explores some of the fundamental issues of human experience through close analysis of relevant texts drawn from a number of cultures, disciplines, and historical periods. In this course all first-year students, together with a significant portion of the faculty, share a common syllabus, and thereby engage in a common conversation. . .This course is to be taken and passed by all students, without exception, in their first year of matriculation" (Undergraduate Catalogue, University of Richmond, 1998, p. 46).

Because all student participants in this course are freshmen, they are of the same approximate age. In addition, since students are assigned to sections of the core class on a fairly random basis, this subject pool can be considered fairly representative of first year college students.

The specific sample of first-year students was obtained in the following manner: The researcher contacted six Core professors for assistance and was given the first five minutes of class time to give instructions, inform the participants of the study and
distribute the Initial Questionnaire. The students who volunteered to participate completed this questionnaire and returned it to the researcher. A standard list of instructions was read to the participants to avoid any confusion in directions (See Appendix B).

The initial questionnaire (see Appendix A) asked respondents to provide information about their own birth order, the birth order of their siblings (to distinguish children who are born in the middle of the family from those who are considered firstborn as a result of gender) and contact information. The subjects also provided information about times they were available to participate in the second stage of the study. The primary use of these data were to allow the researcher to create experimental groups that would vary in terms of participants' birth order.

Also included in the Initial Questionnaire was the question, "In a group setting, what are your three greatest strengths?" This question asked in order to verify the information gathered in the literature review concerning the characteristics of persons of different birth orders. In particular, responses to this question will be examined to determine the frequency with which firstborns mention leadership, initiative, and using their organizational skills to lead the group as one of their three greatest strengths. It is not expected that firstborns will frequently mention their friendliness, socialbility, and charm as strengths since these relationship-oriented behaviors are associated with last borns.
**Experiment Group Sessions.** From among those respondents to the Initial Questionnaire, individuals were assigned to participate in one of five group meetings. Each group was intended to have six participants, 2 firstborns/firstborn by genders, 2 middle children, and 2 lastborns. However, four firstborns, four middle, and four last born children were asked to attend each session, in anticipation of the absence of some participants. Invitations to participate in the group meeting were made through telephone calls. In the end, four of the five groups were comprised of six members. Group one was comprised of three firstborns, two middle borns, and one firstborn by gender. Group two was made up of two firstborns, two firstborns by gender, and two last borns. Group three was comprised of three firstborns, one middle born and one only child, or five group members. Group four was comprised of one firstborn, one firstborn by gender, one middle child, one only child, and two last borns. The final group session was comprised of two firstborns, two middle borns and two last borns. Subjects were assigned to groups based on birth order and availability and every effort was made to arrange the groups so that the participants were not from the same Core class section, thus controlling for effects associated with "familiarity." Extra students who came to the meeting time and did not participate in the problem-solving/planning discussion were asked to fill out a second short questionnaire.
After the researcher selected the participants and explained the situation, group members were directed to a classroom and asked to discuss the experiment topic (See Appendix C). For anonymity's sake, groups were assigned identification numbers, one through five, and participants were given "Letter" (A,B,C,D,E,F) names and were referred to by these letters in transcripts of the taped sessions and the final written project. All group sessions were videotaped for analysis and transcription. The students were given 20 minutes to come to a resolution as to how they would solve the three problems. Subsequently, students were asked to complete a questionnaire in which they identified who emerged as a leader from the group, who participated the most in the group session, and the extent to which they enjoyed being the initiator in group settings in general.

**Exit Questionnaire.** Following the fifteen to twenty minute group sessions, participants were given ten minutes to complete an exit questionnaire in which they commented on both the group process which they had just experienced and a bit on their own personality, strengths, and traits (See Appendix D). Participants were asked, "In the exercise, did a leader emerge from the group setting and how? Who was this leader? What made them a good or bad leader?" The answer to this question pertains to proving hypothesis H2c, for it would show who the group members felt was the emergent leader. This would be studied as a comparison or contrast to the emergent leader identified by the researcher by coding results and talk time.
Participants also were asked, "Who participated the most during the session? How does that impact on the group? Would you consider them the leader or not and why?" These answers were used to gauge who the group members felt talked the most and whether or not this influenced who they believed emerged as a leader. The researcher hypothesized, as stated in H2a and H2b, that firstborns will emerge as a leader from the group because they are directive and communicate much in the group setting.

The researcher asked the students to complete two "fill in the blank" questions to determine whether a pattern developed in the answers given by the different birth order groups. These questions were to measure the task- or relationship-orientation of the participants.

As stated before, the exit questionnaire asked students whether they "enjoy being the initiator or in-charge and why?" The answers given by participants were used to prove or disprove hypothesis H2e. In addition, subjects indicated whether they would rather be the leader, a contributing member, or a follower in a group session.

The final question of importance to this study instructed the student to "circle the five adjectives below that best describe you and your personality." The researcher compiled a list of characteristics of first, middle and last children, attempting to prove that the ties between birth order and personality were extremely strong. The students were then to pick the best five of the twenty-two traits.
**Analysis of Initial Questionnaire.** This set of answers focused on proving the truth to hypothesis (1). Open-ended responses in the initial questionnaire were analyzed in terms of the following set of questions: (1) Do firstborns indicate that they enjoy taking the position of leadership in group settings? (2) Do firstborns indicate that organization is a strength in group settings? (3) Do they tend to give task-directed answers as opposed to relationship-oriented answers? (4) Do last borns mention taking positions of leadership often on the initial questionnaires? Is there a large difference between the percentage of firstborns that mention leadership or taking control or directing action and the percentage given by other birth orders? (5) Which birth order gives task-oriented descriptions, such as organization, keeping the group on task, and accomplishing the goals? (6) Are firstborns giving strengths which are notably less social than other birth orders, such as the last borns?

Answers to these questions were examined among the birth order groups to determine their similarities and differences.

**Coding of Experiment Transcripts.** The rules and definitions for coding the transcripts of the five groups were established in accordance with a method developed by Carter, Haythorn, Meirowitz and Lanzetta (1951). The specific coding rules for this study are included in Appendix E. This coding scheme was designed to study behavior exhibited by members of a leaderless group. The adaptation's main purpose was to identify the individuals whose
actions drove the action and helped them to emerge as leaders. The literature and hypotheses above focus on emergent leaders as initiating action and engaging in task-centered behavior. These rules and directions for coding provides a standard for analysis of the five transcribed leaderless group sessions (See Appendix F-J) and test hypothesis H2a. In particular, the coded interactions will be used to identify particular forms of task-related behaviors exhibited by group members. The researcher will compared the number of times each participant exhibited coded behaviors two and three to identify which individual made the most directive statements in the group (behavior 2) and which made the most proposals for the group's course of action (behavior 3). The researcher will next compared how many times each individual made a suggestion for one of the headlines (coded as [4]) and how many times each individual supported a proposal or provided an alternative manner that a proposal could be stated (coded as [7]). Finally, coded behavior ten was considered important, for it showed how willing the individual was to share his or her opinion with the group, thereby influencing the actions of the group. The frequency with which these behaviors exhibited will then be compared across the birth order of group members.

The researcher will also provide a complete tally of numbers indicating the number of times each group member demonstrated one of the coded behaviors, as well as a count of how many comments in all were made in each session. Table E provides a break-down of
the coded behavior activities of each subject in the course of the group sessions.

To prove hypothesis H2b, the total talk time (in minutes and seconds) of each group member will be measured with a stop watch to determine if any particular birth order dominated the conversation during the group session. An emergent leader is often the individual who spoke the most in the group setting, making this information useful (Morris and Hackman, 1969).

**Results**

**Hypothesis H1**

One hundred and seventeen initial questionnaires (Appendix A) were distributed to six Core classes and completed by the first-year students in the classes. Of these 117 students, forty-two students were firstborn by position, or actual firstborns; twenty-six students were firstborn by gender; twenty-six students were last borns; fourteen students were only children; and nine students were actual middle children. There were no meaningful differences in the number of males and females any of the birth order groups.

As noted earlier, participants were asked the open-ended question of, "In a group setting, what are your three greatest strengths?" They were given the ability to freely respond by offering a sentence or adjective which described them best. The answers given by the participants were grouped into the following categories in accordance with the behavior noted earlier:

**A. Leadership**--Respondents wrote that they "took on the leadership role," "made decisions
for the group," "took control of the group" or "initiated action."

B. Organizational skills--Respondents wrote that their "organizational skills" or "ability to organize the group" were one of their three greatest skills.

C. Listening skills-- Respondents wrote that they were "good listeners," "willing to listen," "good at listening to other's suggestions."

D. Social skills indicated, such as "talking a lot," "easy to get along with," "sense of humor," "charming," "energetic."

E. Followership/Group skills-- Respondents wrote that they were "good group member", "like working in groups," "good at cooperating", and other related comments.

F. Focus/task oriented-- Respondents gave these specific answers.

G. Creative--Respondents used "Creative" or "Creativity in ideas" as their answers.

Answers which could not easily and clearly be classified into any of the above response categories, such as "good common sense" or "practicality," were grouped into a category titled "miscellaneous." Thirty-four percent, or one hundred and seventeen, of the answers were included in the miscellaneous category. Of the 117 individuals responding to the initial questionnaire, a total of 342 strengths were mentioned. Forty-two firstborns by position completed the initial questionnaire. Twenty-two respondents, or 52.4% of firstborns, gave an "A" (Leadership) characteristic or trait as at least one of their three greatest strengths. Thirteen respondents, or 31% of
firstborns, gave organizational skills as another of their greatest strengths. Forty-eight percent of firstborn respondents reported "C," they re "good or willing listener," as a strength. Positional firstborns did not often describe themselves in terms which would fit categories "D" or "E"; only nine respondents described themselves as social or charming, while eleven firstborns said that their greatest strength was in cooperating or working well in groups. Only fourteen percent of firstborn respondents stated specifically that their strength was in creativity (G). Four respondents stated specifically that they were task focussed (F).

Forty-two percent of the firstborns by Gender (n=26) described themselves in leadership terms. No firstborn by genders mentioned organization as one of their greatest group strengths. Ten respondents, or 38.5%, said that listening skills were a strength. Nine of the twenty-six respondents stated that their social skills such as charm or energy were one of their greatest strengths. Eight respondents stated that their followership or group skills were their greatest strength. One firstborn by gender mentioned creativity as a strength, while none of these respondents mentioned their focus on task.

A significantly smaller number and percentage of other birth order members mentioned leadership as one of their greatest strength in a group setting. Nine of twenty-six lastborns, or 34.6%, mentioned leadership; six of fourteen only children, or 43% of respondents, mentioned their leadership skills; four of the
nine middle children mentioned "Leadership" as one of their three greatest strengths.

While firstborns by positional birth order mentioned "Organizational Skills" as their greatest strength in thirty-one percent of the responses, other birth orders did not consider this to be one of their greatest abilities. Five of the twenty-six lastborns, or 19% of respondents, mentioned organization as their greatest skill while only one of fourteen only children described themselves as strong in organization skills. Three of the nine middle children named organization as one of their greatest skills.

As predicted, last born children were a great contrast to firstborns by position in self-reported strengths. Lastborns described themselves as social/energetic/charming on thirteen of the twenty-six initial questionnaires or 50% of the time, as compared to the 21% or nine firstborn by position "E" responses. Only children described themselves as strong in listening skills (D) on four of the fourteen questionnaires. Three of the nine middle children described themselves as energetic, charming, or social.

Analysis of Experiment Sessions

Hypotheses Results of the analysis of the transcripts of the experimental groups are presented below for each of the experiment groups.
**Analysis of Group One.**

**Hypothesis H2A**—Group One made 245 total comments/sentences which were coded. As indicated above, coded behavior traits (2), (3), (4), (7), and (10) would be studied to prove or refute previously stated hypotheses because of the concentration of these behaviors on the task. Emergent leadership literature states that the leader who emerges from a leaderless group will be a vocal individual who offers many suggestions for the group’s consideration (Hollander, 1964, 194). Table F provides a numerical count of how many of each of the specific task- and leadership-behaviors were exhibited by each member.

Seventeen comments were coded as (2), or making directive statements on how the group would progress. 1E, a firstborn by gender male, made five of the seventeen directive statements, just slightly surpassed by 1C, a female middle child who did initiate action at times, but was not confident in her behavior and therefore, was not taken as seriously as other members. 1C was more social and talkative than directing or leading.

Seventeen comments were coded as (3), or making a proposal of action for the group. 1E made seven of these comments, or 41% of the proposals made to the group, far more than any other group member.

Seven comments were making a suggestion for a headline, or (4), i.e. making a suggestion which would complete one of the task’s parts. There was not a significant difference in how often comment(4)’s were made by the different group members.
Thirty statements were coded as (7), or supporting one's suggestion by giving relevant information or restating his/her case. 1E, the firstborn by gender, made the most of these task-directed comments, with eleven of the suggestions being made by him.

Seventeen statements were coded as (10), or offering an opinion. In this category, 1D, a middle female, dominated with six statements. 1E, 1A, and 1B all were coded with two (10) statements.

**Hypothesis H2B**- Group One members willingly interacted and there were few breaks in the conversation. The researcher noted that 1C was the most social of the group members, laughing and not taking a very solid position on different topics of conversation. 1F and 1B, both firstborn males, interacted with one another more so than with the group and 1A was fairly quiet, offering an occasional suggestion, but not often directing the course of action for the group. 1D and 1E both took many actions which made the group take notice. When 1E made a statement, the group members often stopped speaking and paid attention to 1E's words.

The talk-time indicates how involved the members were with the group (See Table J in Appendix). 1E, the firstborn by gender male, dominated the talk time of the group with 3:22 minutes and seconds of talk-time, with 1D coming close in the number of minutes and seconds that she spoke. 1B, an actual firstborn male, and 1C also made significant contributions with two minutes of talk time.
**Hypothesis H2C:** As stated above, this hypothesis suggests that firstborns or firstborn by genders will be identified by group mates as the emergent leader of the group. 1E, the firstborn by gender male, was identified by three of his group mates as one of the individuals who participated the most. Although he didn't identify himself or any other group member as an emergent leader, he was identified by one of his colleagues as the emergent leader and by another group mate as a "leader" (See Appendix F). 1D, a middle born female who was also identified as an emergent leader by her peers, wrote on her exit questionnaire that she did not see 1E as an emergent leader because he "just tried to voice a little too much opinion." 1D was identified as the emergent leader by two group members, 1C and 1B.

**Hypothesis H2D:** A firstborn male was the editor-in-chief, the highest positional power in the exercise, however, he was more appointed to the position than a volunteer. The group members were discussing the different positions and 1F mentioned that he had taken a journalism class; however, he did not appear to be vying for the position. 1A and other group members then appointed him to that position. 1F also did not take advantage of the position of editor-in-chief to be controlling of the group.

**Analysis Group Two**

**Hypothesis H2A:** Group two was also a very interactive group in which the group members came to an agreement on the task and also displayed relationship behavior by joking and teasing one another. Two hundred and sixty-four coded statements were made by
Group Two participants during the course of their session. These comments and statements were broken down by the researcher, giving each a value (See Table G). Table G shows the task-directed and leader behavior comment comparison between group members.

2D, a firstborn by gender, dominated many of these task and leadership behaviors. He made 50% of the proposals for the group’s action (3) and also demonstrated task-behavior by suggesting more headline titles than any other member (4 of 12). 2C, a firstborn female, also demonstrated task-behavior by supporting proposals/restating ideas (7) more than any other group member (12 of 37). She also demonstrated opinionated behavior more than any other group member. The one exception to the hypothesized behavior was found in 2F. Although his relationship behavior was typical and he made by the most humorous/relationship-oriented comments, he also made many suggestions and directive statements for the group's course of action. 2F made five of the twelve directive comments and three suggestions toward solving the problem.

Hypothesis H2B: Of all of the groups, Group 2 spent less time reading the instructions and had the most talk time within the twenty minute time period allotted. 2D, a firstborn by gender, spoke the most and 2C also spoke for much of the time (See Table L under Talk Time). 2A and 2E were the quietest members of the group; however, when 2A, a firstborn male, made a comment, the entire group paid attention.
Hypothesis H2C: While 2D commented that "no real leader emerged," all four of his group mates indicated that he took control and got the job done because "D brought ideas together so we could all decide" (See Appendix G). 2A and 2C were also mentioned by four of the group members as active participants in the task. 2F, the last born, showed his allegiance to the group and equal regard to all by saying that "all participated about the same. It was almost comparable to a round table discussion," despite the fact that Table L shows that this was not the case. 2F, 2D, and 2C all dominated the discussion.

Hypothesis H2D: The selection of this group's editor-in-chief was influenced by the fact that 2F and 2D knew each other from a class other than Core. When the question was posed, "Who's going to be the Editor-in-chief?", 2F volunteered 2D saying, "you know what, D, I think that could be you." 2D agreed to the nomination with a laugh but noted later on his exit questionnaire that the head position was not desired by him.

Analysis Group Three

Hypothesis H2A: Only sixty-seven statements were coded in this session which was a notable exception to the interactions of other groups. Despite this fact, firstborns dominated the session. 3A and 3B, both firstborns, made two propositions for the group's course of action. They also together made four of the group's five coded (7) comments, restating possible ideas to gain the group's support. Table H in the Appendix shows the lack of
comments made by the group, making reliance on this group's session difficult.

**Hypothesis H2B:** As shown in Table M (See Talk-Time tables), 3A spoke for the most time, making propositions and suggestions for one minute and twenty-five seconds. The closest other individual was another firstborn male, who spoke for forty-five seconds. The other group members spoke for only a few seconds.

**Hypothesis H2C:** Three of the group members identified 3A as the emergent leader of the group, but 3A did not note any individual having emerged as the leader.

**Hypothesis H2D:** Group three member 3A, a firstborn male, volunteered willingly for the position of Editor-in-Chief of the *Norfolk Sentinel*. No other group member argued for the position, but they all agreed to his own appointment to the highest position.

**Analysis Group Four**

**Hypothesis H2A:** Group Four members enthusiastically interacted with one another and their interactions supported many of the ideas of birth order and its affect on behavior. The group consisted of 4A, a firstborn female; 4B, a firstborn by gender male; 4C, a middle child female; 4D, an only child female; 4E and 4F, last born females.

4B and 4D controlled much of the conversation by making proposals and suggestions for the group, while 4F was displayed "typical" last born traits with enthusiasm, charm, and asking lots
of questions. She was also willing to disagree with suggestions, leading others to think twice over headlines, etc.

One hundred and eighty-one statements were coded from the interaction of Group 4 members. (See Table E and Table I) Interestingly enough, there were nearly equal numbers of comments made from each individual (4A-28; 4B-35; 4C-29; 4D-31; 4E-26; 4F-32). The most distinct difference was in the types of statements, questions, or comments which were made by the individuals. As shown in Table I, 4B made the most proposals to the group as to action, which they could take, which was coded as (3). Seven of the thirteen propositions came from 4B. He also made far more restatement of proposal/supporting the proposal comments than did any other member (8 of 23). 4D made five directive comments toward the group, while 4B made three. 4A made more directive comments than 4B.

**Hypothesis H2B:** As found in Table N, found at the end of this paper, 4B led the discussion with two minutes of talk-time, while 4D and 4F were also extremely active and involved with one minute fifteen seconds and one minute twenty-five seconds respectively. The talk-times of this group shows a fairly equal amount of talking, for every individual spoke more than forty-five seconds. However, one must note that the firstborn by gender male spoke the most and that 4A, a firstborn female, was actively involved in the discussion.

**Hypothesis H2C:** While 4B did not identify himself as the "emergent leader," 4C, 4E, and 4F all noted that B was the leader,
had been a good leader, and had encouraged the participation of all other members. 4A stated that 4D was the emergent leader. 4D wrote on her exit questionnaire in response to the question concerning the identification of an emergent leader, "we all did well interacting and making effective worthwhile decisions; each person 'shined' at a moment comfortable for them" (See Appendix I).

**Hypothesis H2D:** One of the theories associated with this paper was that firstborns would take advantage of the opportunity to hold a position of power and influence within the group and would volunteer for the position of leadership. In this experiment, that position was of editor-in-chief, as stated before. The manner in which an individual in Group Four became editor-in-chief was interesting, because it was the first instance in which an individual had an obvious interest in the position and made it clear to the group.

When the conversation turned to the positions within the newspaper, 4E asked who wanted to be editor-in-chief. When 4E turned to 4D and asked her if she wanted the position, 4B interrupted before she could state a preference and said "I'll be the editor-in-chief." 4B, the firstborn by gender, took advantage of an open position of authoritative power by volunteering for it.

**Analysis Group Five**

The largest indicator of the veracity of this study's hypotheses comes with the analysis of Group Five. Group Five was
the "ideal" group, in that there were two firstborns (2A and 2B),
two middle born males (2C and 2D), and two last born, one female
and one male (2E and 2F). The two firstborn females emerged as
leaders within the group by directing action, making suggestions,
and being overall involved participants.

**Hypothesis H2A:** In all, one hundred and seventy-eight
comments were coded in Group Five's discussion. The firstborns
dominated the discussion, making ninety-five of those comments.
As Table J shows, 5A and 5B contributed the most suggestions,
proposals, and directive statements to the group. In making a
comparison between 5A and 5B, 5B was a more commanding presence,
presenting more proposals for action (8 of 16, or 50% of those
provided in total), and giving more opinions than any other. Both
members provided leadership for the group in giving information
and suggesting solutions to the problem.

**Hypothesis H2B:** As Table O demonstrates, 5A and 5B were very
involved in the process. 5B by far dominated the conversation
with 3:32, but 5A also spoke for two minutes and five seconds.
The middle children who participated in this study were nearly
silent the entire session, offering very few suggestions, but
between the firstborns and last borns, the conversation proceeded
actively throughout the fifteen minutes which it took to come to
resolution.

**Hypothesis H2C:** 5B and 5A were both identified as leaders
who emerged from the group. 5B was identified as the emergent
leader by three individuals, as was 5A by three different
individuals. The three group members may have identified 5A as the emergent leader because she agreed more often with the comments and suggestions of the other group members than did 5B (See Table E). One group member wrote on the exit questionnaire, "B emerged as a good, thought-provoking leader in the beginning and A was a good leader in that she challenged B" (See Appendix J). All members identified 5B and 5A as the most participative in the session.

**Hypothesis H2D:** While 5B and 5A were competing for emergent leadership, they did not compete for the head position of editor-in-chief. 5B volunteered to be the copy-editor immediately after the conversation turned to the positions of authority, saying that she had had that duty in her high school's yearbook group. 5A volunteered readily to be the editor-in-chief and no one in the group challenged her to the position (See Appendix J).

**Exit Questionnaires**

**Hypothesis H2E:** More evidence of the sought-for leadership by firstborns is found in the answers given on the exit questionnaires. Of the eight firstborn by positions, five responded that, given the choice, they would rather be the leader of a group than a contributing member or a follower. Three firstborn by position$ responded they would rather be a contributing member. Firstborn by gender$ also preferred the position of leader.
When asked "Do you Enjoy Being the Initiator or In-Charge and why?," firstborns responded:

*Yes, because I usually like the way I do things (this sounds really selfish).

*Yes, because I hate having to deal with a decision that I am not satisfied with.

*Yes—gets things moving, shows my interest in solving the problem and makes things easier on other group members.

*Yes, I am comfortable in that position because I’ve spent a lot of time as a leader.

*Yes, I feel I can bring ideas together and give reasons or alternatives to reach an overall agreed upon solution.

*Yes, I like to be in charge but not a dictator. I want to get my point across so everyone understands. If they don’t I must look at what they say. I usually won’t let a decision be final unless I feel it is the right one. (first by gender.)

*Yes, because that way I can make sure everyone gets a say.

*Sometimes. If I feel I am competent in an area, I will assume "initiator."

*Yes, because I often like to do things a certain way, and the only way to ensure this is done is for me to take charge.

*Sometimes I do, but only if the issue is pressing and of importance to myself.

*I enjoy being the initiator at times, because without one the process of getting things done is much slower.

*I like making a contribution. Initiation is not particularly important to me unless the discussion stops.

*I don’t mind being an initiator, as long as I can then step back and let others contribute. I am comfortable guiding discussions.

*No, not really, because I usually complement better than I initiate. (first by gender)

A contrast can be made to the group members of other birth orders. Of the other participants, eight of the later born children stated that they did not like to be the initiators or the leaders. Only three of the laterborn children stated that they liked being the initiators or leaders.
On the exit questionnaire question "Give five adjectives that describe best you and your personality," no correlations could be given as to the strengths given by respondents and their birth order. In other words, though respondents often identified themselves according to their birth order's strengths on a few answers, others fit with other birth orders. No clear cut distinction could be made from this information. The same was true for a distinction between task- and relationship-oriented answers to the questionnaire. The most important questions to this study on the exit questionnaire were those that asked whether or not the participants enjoyed being the initiator or leader and who was the emergent leader/most participative in the group.

**Discussion**

**Hypothesis H1** stated: "Firstborns and firstborn by genders will identify themselves through self-report as being strong in leadership/taking control and organizational skills in a group setting." This hypothesis was largely proven and the characteristics assigned by birth order literature verified, for, in contrast to laterborns, firstborns gave an affirmation for their belief in their leadership and organizational skills. They also did not describe themselves as particularly strong in areas of relationship/social skills. These responses showed a more task-oriented manner of working. There was a large, randomly gathered sample of firstborns so that any coincidences would have been eliminated.
There was also a large sample of firstborns by gender and, while they did describe their strengths in leadership terms, not one firstborn by gender mentioned organizational skills as a strength. This was an unexpected result, for they seemed to be very similar to firstborns except for this trait.

Another surprise to this hypothesis and the expected results was the respondents who mentioned creativity (G) and task-focus (F). Only a small number and percent of firstborn respondents mentioned these traits as strengths. However, the definitions for inclusion of these two categories was limited to written answers which stated "creative, creativity in ideas" and "focus/task-oriented," so this may explain why this number was so low in firstborns and firstborns by gender.

Hypothesis H2: Firstborns and firstborn by genders did emerge as a leader from the leaderless groups in many ways. Firstborns and firstborn by genders accumulated the most talk-time in every one of the five sessions. Other firstborns than the "emergent leader" in most of the sessions were participative as well, offering ideas and giving suggestions.

In terms of the coded behaviors, as Tables E-J demonstrate, the firstborns and firstborns by gender who emerged as a leader did so by acting out the most task-directed behaviors. In two of the sessions, the coded behavior shows a second individual very close as the emergent leader and both the firstborn/firstborn by gender and the other individual were identified by group mates as emergent leaders. In Group Four, 4D, an only child, was very
involved and made many suggestions. She was mentioned as an emergent leader by many. This fact merely substantiates the literature which points out the similarities in certain behavior traits. However, over all, the firstborns and firstborns by gender dominated the group session with the highest talk-time and the most task-directed comments and involvement. Firstborns and firstborns by gender were involved and focused on the task at hand. In Group Two, the firstborn by gender, 2D, had been nominated to his position of editor-in-chief and reminded his group mates jokingly on a few occasions, "I'm the editor-in-chief and what I say goes!"

In Groups Two and Five, the firstborns/firstborns by gender of the group shared leadership in directing the groups and their peers noted this in the exit questionnaires. Even in the exception group, Group Three, in which conversation was tedious and slow, the identified emergent leader by the group members and the individual whom the coding suggested was the leader was a firstborn male.

This study showed that the emergent leadership was not a gender issue, for both men and women emerged as leaders, but was influenced by the firstborn position some individuals hold to be the leader. Each member of these groups had an equal opportunity to emerge as the leader, dominate the conversation, make suggestions which would direct the group's action or solve the existent problem. However, as found in this study, it is the firstborns who take charge, direct the action, propose
possibilities, make suggestions, restate a proposed solution and offer opinions more so than any other birth order. This gives validity to the claims in birth order literature that firstborns are the "natural leaders," who enjoy taking charge.

Lastly, the exit questionnaires completed by the participants further support the hypotheses made, specifically H2E. Firstborns and firstborn by genders stated overwhelmingly that they enjoy being the individual in charge or the initiator because, among other reasons, they have more confidence in their own ability to direct than in others'. However, in contrast, the majority of laterborn participants stated that they would rather have someone else fulfill the necessary leadership position; they want to be contributing members. This shows that firstborns have the drive for the position of authority, the skill in task-oriented behavior, and the leadership skills, which make them emerge from a leaderless group as the leader.

At the same time, hypothesis H2D was shown to be true in some instances and not true in others. On occasion firstborns volunteered enthusiastically for the position of authority within the group. At others, they were happy with whatever role came their way. Interestingly enough, most of the firstborns and firstborn by genders who were identified by their group mates as the emergent leaders did not state that they felt they were the emergent leader. Some stated that all people emerged as leaders and others believed that no one person emerged as the leader.
This does not support the idea that all firstborns/firstborn by genders see themselves as the most capable at all times.

Limitations of Study

The most substantial limitation of the study is the importance of the coded behavior to numerically determine a leader and the room for error in coding behavior. Though the researcher attempted to be as specific in her definitions and reasoning as possible, there could possibly be problems in the accuracy of the researcher's coding. However, because of this, the researcher has included the coding rules as well as the coded transcripts for the review of readers.

Also because there were few true middle children among the one hundred and seventeen subjects who completed the Initial Questionnaire, the researcher was not able to get as many true middle children to participate in the study or complete the initial questionnaire because there was a small sample found in the randomly gathered sample. This most likely indicates that analysis of information gathered regarding middle children in the analysis of initial questionnaire data is not one hundred percent accurate.

Also, in analysis of the Initial Questionnaire, 34% of responses were not easily grouped into a category study and were included in the "Miscellaneous" category. More categories could have been created to have a higher rate of studied answers.

There was only one "ideal" group of two firstborns, two middle borns and two last borns, which could be considered a limitation. The subjects of the experiment were also volunteers—
that is, they responded to the invitation to participate and attended the group meeting. This could indicate that they are more outgoing or interested in leadership, for the students knew that this study was being completed by a Leadership Studies major.

Conclusions

This study was initiated as an attempt to understand how personalities affect emergence in a group as the leader. What makes other group members accept one person as the leader over another? Because birth order has been discussed as an influential factor in the development of one's personality, this variable was chosen in order to see if perhaps leader emergence from a group is influenced by the personality, which, in turn, has been shaped by something else.

This study proved that firstborns and firstborns by gender emerge from a leaderless group to guide and direct the other members, and shape the task at hand. It is because of the upbringing they receive as a result of their birth order that these firstborns become driven overachievers who strive to reach a position of leadership with their organized, task-directed behavior. The characteristics which are deeply embedded in them are valued traits of an emergent leader. In this specific instance, a leaderless group in a problem-solving discussion, firstborns hold the valued traits which group members look for in an emergent leader.
However, at the same time, this study should not discourage individuals who are not firstborns from emerging as leaders. As shown, leaderless groups are looking for a person to guide and direct them toward an obtainable goal. Though firstborns are accustomed to this type of role because of their role as model and care-taker of younger siblings and the directed, focused child with parents, these skills which are necessary for emergence may be gained by all. This study does not prove that only firstborns will emerge as leaders, but shows that these valued traits are innate in firstborns and they have the drive to "take the reins" and give direction.

Further studies can be conducted to support this study and extend upon it, indicating how birth order affects emergent leadership in other types of situations.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typical Traits</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Ability</td>
<td>Take charge, know what to do.</td>
<td>May undermine the initiative of those who lean on them too much or may come off as too overbearing or aggressive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Commands respect; others want to follow their unflinching leadership.</td>
<td>Can run roughshod over others; may be insensitive and tend to be selfish; too focused on the goal and not enough on the feelings of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliant</td>
<td>Cooperative, easy to work with. Good team player.</td>
<td>Can be taken advantage of. Bullied, bluffed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionistic</td>
<td>Always do things right and leave no stone unturned to do a thorough job.</td>
<td>Tend to criticize themselves and/or others too much; never satisfied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>Have everything under control; always on top of things.</td>
<td>May worry too much about order, process and rules and not be flexible when its needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>Ambitious, enterprising, energetic, willing to sacrifice to be a success.</td>
<td>Put themselves or those they work with under too much stress and pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical</td>
<td>Known as straight thinkers; can be counted on not to be compulsive.</td>
<td>May believe they're always right and fail to pay attention to the more intuitive opinions of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly</td>
<td>Tend to be voracious Readers and accumulators of information and facts. Good problem solvers.</td>
<td>May spend too much time gathering facts when there are other things to be done.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Leman, 1998, p. 93)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typical Trait</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grew up feeling squeezed and rootless</td>
<td>Learned not to be spoiled.</td>
<td>May be rebellious because they don't feel they fit in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable Expectations</td>
<td>Because life hasn't always fair, they are unspoiled, realistic.</td>
<td>Being treated unfairly may have Made them cynical, even bitter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Lion</td>
<td>Relationships are very important; they make friends and tend to keep them.</td>
<td>Friends can be too important and not offending them may cloud judgement on key decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Thinker</td>
<td>Willing to do things differently, take a risk, strike out on their own.</td>
<td>May appear to be bullheaded, stubborn unwilling to cooperate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromising</td>
<td>Know how to get along with others; can be skilled at mediating disputes or negotiating disagreements</td>
<td>Can be seen as willing to have peace at any price.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomatic</td>
<td>Peacemakers; willing to work things out; great at seeing issues from both sides</td>
<td>May hate confrontation; often choose not to share their real opinions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretive</td>
<td>Can be trusted with sensitive information; know how to keep secrets.</td>
<td>May fail to admit it when they need help help-it's just too embarrassing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Leman, 1998, 165)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typical Trait</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charming</td>
<td>Likable, fun to be around, easy to talk to.</td>
<td>Manipulative, even a little flaky; seeming To be too slick and a bit unbelievable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People-oriented</td>
<td>Read others well and know how to relate and work well one on one in small groups.</td>
<td>May come across as undisciplined, prone to talk too much and too long;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenacious</td>
<td>Keep on coming with tireless persistence, not taking no for an answer.</td>
<td>May push too hard because they see things only their way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectionate and</td>
<td>Caring, lovable, wanting to help; like to get strokes and to give them.</td>
<td>Can be gullible, easily taken advantage of; make decisions too much on feeling and not enough on thought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging</td>
<td></td>
<td>May appear to be absent-minded, a little out of focus--like an airhead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncomplicated</td>
<td>Appear relaxed, genuine, and trustworthy-no hidden agenda.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention-Seeking</td>
<td>Entertaining and funny, know how to get noticed.</td>
<td>May appear self-centered, unwilling to Give others credit, having a big ego.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D: Strengths and Weaknesses of Only Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typical Traits</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confident, self-assured</td>
<td>Trust own opinion, not afraid to make decisions.</td>
<td>May be self-centered from being treated by parents as &quot;center of universe.&quot; Also fearful, ambivalent about trying new things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionist</td>
<td>Always do thing right and leave no stone unturned to do a thorough job.</td>
<td>Tend to criticize themselves and/or others too much; Never satisfied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>Have everything under Control; always on top of Things.</td>
<td>May worry too much about order, process, And rules and not be flexible when it is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>Ambitious, enterprising, energetic, willing to sacrifice to be a success.</td>
<td>Put themselves or those they work With under too Much stress and pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical</td>
<td>Known as straight thinkers; can be counted on not to be compulsive.</td>
<td>May believe they're always right and fail to pay attention to the more intuitive opinions of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly</td>
<td>Tend to be voracious readers and accumulators of information and facts. Good problem solvers.</td>
<td>May spend too much time gathering facts when there are other Things that need to be done.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Leman, 1998, 147)
Table E: Coding Results for Transcribed Experiments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Born by Gender</th>
<th>Only</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1F</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>3A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 26 26 20 25 69 22 14 5 28 41 54 57 85 35 10 31 56 60 16 29 7 10 23 62 26 32 22 44

Coding:
1. Calls for attention of group members.
2. Directive statement made by the individual.
4. Makes a suggestion for a headline.
5. Asks for facts from other group members.
6. Asks for opinion of other group members.
7. Supports a proposal with info. OR restating idea.
8. Agrees with or approves of another's previous comment.
9. Disagrees with or is skeptical of another's suggestion or comment.
10. Offers an opinion.
11. Volunteers self for a position in exercise.
12. Volunteers another for a position in exercise.
13. Individual repeats something already said.
14. Miscellaneous comments.
15. Gives Information.
Table F: Group One—Members' coded task- and leadership-behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coded (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded (4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded (7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded (10)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table G: Group Two—Members' task- and leadership-behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coded (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded (4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded (7)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded (10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table H: Group Three—Members’ task- and leadership-behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coded (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded (3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded (4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded (7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded (10)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I: Group Four—Members’ task- and leadership-behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coded (2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded (4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded (7)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded (10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table J: Group Five—Members’ task- and leadership-behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coded (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded (4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded (7)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coded (10)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Talk Time

### Table K: Group One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Talk-time (min: sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>0:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>2:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>2:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D</td>
<td>3:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1E</td>
<td>3:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1F</td>
<td>:57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL Session:** 20 min

### Table L: Group Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Talk-time (min: sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>1:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>3:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D</td>
<td>4:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td>:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2F</td>
<td>3:55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL Session:** 20 min

### Table M: Group Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Talk-time (min: sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>1:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>0:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>0:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D</td>
<td>0:09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3E</td>
<td>0:04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL Session:** 10 min

### Table N: Group Four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Talk-time (min: sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>0:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>2:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>1:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>1:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>0:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4F</td>
<td>1:25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL Session:** 15 min, 02 sec.
Table 0: Group Five

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Talk-time (min: sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>2:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>3:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5C</td>
<td>0:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D</td>
<td>0:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5E</td>
<td>0:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5F</td>
<td>0:58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL Session:**

16 min
Appendix A
Questionnaire: CORE form

Name: ___________________________ Phone Ext: ______

Core Class (Professor, Days, Times): ____________________________

Gender: (circle one) Male Female

How many children are in your family: (including yourself) ____

In terms of birth order, what number child are you?: (Circle One)

1 2 3 4 5 6 Other Only child

In your family: Gender Age
(include yourself)
1 _____ ______
2 _____ ______
3 _____ ______
4 _____ ______
5 _____ ______

In a group setting, what are your three greatest strengths are: (please answer all with a word OR a phrase/sentence)

1. ________________________________
2. ________________________________
3. ________________________________

Provide three, One-Hour blocks of time (days and hours) during the week which you are available for further involvement in this project (Actual participation only takes 30 minutes):

1. _______________ 2. _______________
3. _______________
Appendix B
Information--Set of Directions given to Core students

To be read to students: You are being asked to complete this short questionnaire right now as I explain the scenario. My name is [Redacted]. I am a senior Leadership major, English and German minor who is completing her senior thesis on leadership in groups. After completing this memo, you may be asked to participate in a group meeting which will last no longer than 20 minutes. The group meeting should be a very easy, fun role-play scenario in which I will be studying how group members interact when performing a task. Participants will then complete an exit questionnaire about the experience. The entire time commitment will only be 30 minutes. All information gathered during my study is confidential. No names will be used and participants will be identified by letter and number. Prof. [Redacted] has allowed me five minutes of class time for you all to complete this memo. For those of you who may later be selected to participate in a group session, I offer my own services upon completion of the study to help you as a writing fellow or study buddy, for the rest of this semester. You may now complete the questionnaire. Once you are done, flip the page upside down and pass it to the front, where I will collect it.
You have twenty-minutes for this entire project. It is being filmed for later usage. Each individual is to take a numerical tag, but you can refer to each other by your names.

Assignment 1: Introduce yourselves to each other. You are six individuals who work at the new Norfolk Sentinel. Your first duty is to assign or vie for the following positions: Editor-in-Chief (head individual in charge of the newspaper), Lay-out Editor (in charge of the paper's layout and the visual aspects of the paper), 2 writers/investigators of the newspaper stories, 2 copy editors (who check stories for spelling and grammatical errors), and a business manager. If more than one individual wants to be, for instance, editor-in-chief, discussion of credentials may follow and the group can decide who gets what position.

Assignment 2: There is room for one story above the paper fold on the front page and two other stories on the front page. There are five stories to consider.

1: An inmate who is on death-row for a double murder's final appeal has been denied and he is scheduled to die in two days. Death penalty protesters have been staging protests at the capital. Two of the most vocal activists against the death penalty are the parents of one of this man's victims.

2: NATO has agreed to the inclusion of 3 of the former Soviet republics in the organization, and critics speculate on how this will affect certain countries still being excluded.

3: A local school district wins the honor of being included in the Department of Education's TOP TEN school districts who have reached overall excellence.

4: A verdict has been reached in the case of Nguyen versus Wesson Gun Manufacturers. Nguyen, a 40 year old store owner and father of two, was robbed by a gang of 16 year olds with a Wesson Gun by five juvenile members of a gang. Nguyen won and the jury stated that the gun manufacturer should have taken precautions to keep the gun out of the hands of children/gang members. This is touted as a pivotal verdict which will be a turning point in its field. 

5: Local college student and basketball star at Old Dominion University, Geoff Richmond, wins a Rhodes Scholarship. He is the first student ever to be selected from the school. There is speculation that the publicity surrounding this event will increase the number of applications the school receives, giving it a higher ranking in US News and World Reports' yearly study and making a degree from ODU more valuable.

Participants must decide as a group the placement of each story within the newspaper and give reasons why each piece should be placed where they are. Then, Assignment 3, headlines should be formulated for each story.
Exit Questionnaire:

Name: ___________________________ Gender: (circle one) M F

Number Child You are in Your Family (circle): 1 2 3 4 5 6+ only

* What position did you become in the exercise: ____________________________

* How did you get this position? (exp. Volunteer, get chosen): ____________________________

* Was it the position you wanted? Why/why not? ____________________________

* In the exercise, did a leader emerge from the group setting and how? Who was this leader? (use letter assignment) What made them a good or bad leader? ____________________________

* Who participated the most during the session? (distinguish using name or assigned letters) How does that impact on the group? Would you consider them the leader or not? Why? ____________________________

* When my Group is making a decision, I: (place an “X” in the appropriate space)

___ am most comfortable passively deferring to others.

___ work for a decision that satisfies everyone without worrying about how good it is.

___ look entirely at the merits of the alternatives without thinking about how the members of the group feel or how satisfied they are.

___ look for alternatives that work, though I might not personally think they are the best.

___ work for a strong, creative decision having a common basis of understanding among group members.

* When my group is facing a decision, I:

___ show little interest in the decision or the other group members.

___ think mostly about how the members of the group are getting along, without worrying about what the decision will be.
push for a really good decision and view the other members only as contributors of resources that will help make a better decision.

work for good relations among the members and a good solution, though I am willing to sacrifice a little of each to get the job done.

* Do You Enjoy Being the Initiator or In-Charge and why?

* What are the three best characteristics of a group's leader (a general group leader)?
  1. 
  2. 
  3. 

* Circle the five adjectives that best describe you and your personality:

  others feel you are most likely to succeed
  appearance of toughness to others
  diplomatic/mediator
  a private person/sense of distance
  reasonable expectations
  independent thinker
  attention seeking
  Beginner of things
  experienced
  persistent
  Loyal
  responsible
  Less outwardly emotional
  Popular
  Charming
  Expect to be Taken Seriously
  a “show-off”
  affectionate
  overachieving
  affectionate
  desires recognition
  Demanding

* I would rather be a group's: (circle one)
  Leader
  Contributing Member
  Contributor
  Follower

* How accurate/true to life did you feel this exercise was? (Circle a number, one being not accurate, ten being very accurate)

  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Appendix E

Coding Rules for Transcript Analysis

A. Researcher will place brackets ([ ]) around the units of coding, i.e. each sentence, question or statement given by experiment participants. This means that if there are numerous sentences given by one speaker during a speech moment, each sentence will be enclosed within its own brackets to separate it for analysis. The enclosed information in each set of brackets will be analyzed separately.

Example: D: [Should we cover the positions?]
F: [Do you think that the vast majority of the population will find it confusing like you just did?] [Cause I was automatically like, 'Wow how are they going to keep the guns out of people’s hands?']

B. Sentences and statements which are unintelligible in the videotape will be marked on the transcript in brackets, with three asterisks filling in the lacking words.

Example: A: [***]


1. Calls for attention of group members. Makes Brief statement which is geared toward getting the group on task or attracting the notice of the group. Usually including an interjector comment, such as 'Listen up', 'Alright,' 'But,' 'Wait a minute,' etc. Often followed by a suggestion or a proposal statement.

   Example: E: [But hold up, really quick now, think about this.] (21)
   D: [Alright, we need to finish.] (21)

2. Directive statements made by the individual which instructs group members on what action will be taken. Often the statement indicates that the issue is not up for question, i.e. said in a matter-of-fact manner. Statement
indicates how the group will progress in completing the problem-solving discussion. No questions will be coded as a (2).

Example: C: [Well the first thing we have to do is to determine our jobs.] (2)
E: [We have to figure out who is what.]
E: [It's simple.] [Y'all take A since that's the head story.] [You two] do C and B, and we'll take D and E.
F: [We gonna have something positive.]

3. Makes a proposal for the course of action for the group—a suggested way for the group to solve the problem at hand. Will be stated without "I think"'s. Anything with "I think" is considered an opinion, therefore coded as (10). Can be done in the form of a statement or a question. Purpose is to give alternatives to the group to discuss. Not delivered in a directive manner, but allows the topic up for discussion.

Example: C. [I want to put good news. I don't want all bad stuff.] (3)
B: [I kinda feel like B can be tossed out because if this is a really local, small paper which is devoted to the community, B wouldn't really affect it.] (3)
E: [I'd say B and C should be numbers 4 and 5.] (3) [And then A and D]. (3)
B: [Should we read the whole paper, or just the first (assignment)?]

4. Makes a suggestion for a headline. Will be coded the first time stated as a (4). If a similar headline (with small changes such as the order of words, etc) is suggested by the initiating individual (i.e. the person who suggested the original) the original suggestion will be coded as a (4), while the following similar suggestions will be coded as (7), because they are a restatement or alteration to support the original proposal. Also, if individual A offers a suggested title and then individual B offers a similar suggestion with changed wording, individual A's comment will be coded (4), while B's will be coded (7).

Example exchange: D: ["Victim's parents protest Virginia Death Penalty."] (4)
E: [How about "Victim's parents protest tonight's death."] (7)
F: [What if you say execution instead of death penalty?] (7)
5. Asks for facts from others which will help to solve the problem at hand. (i.e. Questions how something should be done or what facts are available for the group to consider.)

Example: F: [Do we know where this gun thing was?] (5)
D: [Aren't there seven positions here? (indicating the problem sheet.)] (5)
C: [Don't we need a layout editor, cause aren't we laying out the paper here?] (5)
D: [Are we supposed to go in, like, letter order?] (5)

6. Asks for opinion of other group members on personal suggestion or how to solve the problem. Also asking for opinion on the problem. Not asking for outside factual information.

Example: D: [So, do we all kinda agree on E?] (6)
D: [Does anyone have any strong feelings on any of these?] (6)
B: [Does it really make sense though?] (22)

7. Supports a proposal given by the group by giving relevant facts that support his suggestion or restating his/her case in a different way which might be more convincing. Will often be a statement of support for a proposed subject, such as a suggested headline. A statement can also be coded (7) when it is supporting a statement of disagreement in response to a proposition.

Example: E: (on his suggestion that the NATO article be put on the front page) [It says, 'keep in mind it's a local paper' and I guess it is northern Virginia.] [Norfolk is a huge navy base—the largest one in the nation.] (7)
E: [I know this is a local paper and all, but hink of the Times Dispatch.] (7) [It's a local paper and the chances are that it would include something like (this NATO article).] (7)

Example Exchange: F: [But that (title) is not really about guns...] (9)
C: [Well if it's a big case, people will probably already know...] (7)
A: Or we could say something like "Ngyun Verdict a national Spotlight."] (4) [It could be going toward...] (14)
F: [Is it national?] (5)
B: [But it's probably been going on for a while, so if we just say that a verdict was reached, I'm sure that everybody would probably know about it.]

8. Agrees with or approves of another's previous suggestion/comment. Need not begin with Yes, or yeah.
   Example: C: [Yeah, that's great.] (8)
   F: [Yeah, that's in Virginia.] (8)
   D: [Right.] (8)

9. Disagrees or is skeptical of the suggestion made previously by another group member. Usually followed by a reasoning for the disagreement. Is stating a specific opinion.
   Example exchange: E: [I'd say "Geoff Richmond wins Rhodes Scholarship."]
   F: [I don't know—that's sort of like...] (9)
   B: [Tells the whole story] [The reader will be like, 'ok, Next?'] (9)
   Example: D: [I don't know. I think the death row inmate is more important than the two stories about the schools.]

10. Offers an opinion which is not included as (8) or (9).
    Example: E: [I'd say B is last] (3) [Just cause I don't really care about NATO] (10)
    F: [I'm so bad at coming up with titles.] (10)
    C: [And then the basketball one didn't seem important enough to be on the front page.] (10)

11. Volunteers self for a position in the exercise

12. Volunteers another group member for a position in the exercise.
13. Individual repeats that which has already been said word-for-word. Often times, they are audibly mulling over the suggestion made, so they will repeat when they just heard within the last few comments.

Example exchange: D: [Something like "Parents lead...]
F: [Fights?] 
D: [Protest...]
F: [To save...]
C: [To save...] (13)

14. Miscellaneous--comment made is an utterance without meaning or necessarily agreement, such as "Oh." Also included will be comments that are not completed.

Example: D: [Well, I just...] (14)
D: [And then the other two...] (14)
E: [It's... ] (14)

AND/OR Makes comment which causes self or others to laugh. Relationship behavior such as teasing or joking which offers no specific information to the group to assist in answering the problem.

Example: D: [That's what the Editor says...]
(laughter follows)
F: [Wave to the Camera.]
    All laugh or smile.
F: [I'm sorry]
D: [Who wants to be writers?] (6) [F is illiterate.] (14) (D and F laugh)

15. Gives information--this comment did not fit into the coding schemes, but information is given in the course of the comment, so it is not miscellaneous information.

Example: F: [I'm F] (14) everyone laughs. [Or ____.] (15)
A: [You'd find some major stuff on the first page.] (15)
F: [Local (news) is usually an entire section.] (15)
Appendix F: Group 1 Session-Transcription

Participants:
A. First born male
B. First born male
C. Middle female
D. Middle female
E. First born by gender/male
F. First born male

Researcher: I am going to give you guys each a copy of the problem and one answer sheet which you will solve. The first thing I ask you to do and then I will let you guys alone so you won't have me breathing over your shoulder, cause that's not something you need, is for you to introduce yourselves from this way going down. And here is the final answer sheet. You answer it. I will be timing it. I will be out of the room and will be out of here for 20 minutes and then I will come back in and you can tell me what your answers are. So go to it.

Introductions starting from A and going down the table.

(silence as group reads the instructions)

D: [Aren't there seven positions here?] (5)

C. [There are seven positions.] (15) [It says there is an Editor in chief, a lay-out editor, 2 writer/investigators, 2 copy editors, and a business manager.] (15) [And there are six of us.] (15)

B. [There is one of us who is still outside right now.] (15)

C. [Oh all right.] (8)

(pause as they examine the problem)

C. (finishes reading, looks to E to see if done and then looks back down at sheet)

A. (looks up, is done reading says nothing)

C. [Well the first thing we have to do is to determine our jobs.] (2) (laughs)
B. [Does it really make sense though?] (6) [I mean, not like we are actually working for the paper.] (15)

C. [No, all we are going to do is, like, is to figure out what order we are going to put these in and give a title to each one.] (2)

**General agreement:** [Yeah, yeah.] (8)

C. [I don't think it matters or anything, but aren't they videotaping this.] (1)

E. [Yeah, not like we can cheat or anything.] (8)

D. [Has anyone ever worked for a newspaper?] (5)

F. **(not vying for the position)** [I took a journalism course once.] (15)

A. [Well there you go] **(points at F)** (12)

C. [There you go.] **(laughs)** (13)

A: [Alright, there's the Editor in chief.] (12)

D. [Has anyone had art or graphic design or anything like that?] (5)

E. [Anybody do yearbook or something like that?] (5)

E. [Did you do yearbook?] (to B.) (5)

B. [Nah.] (15)

**(silence)**

C. [Ok.] (1)

F. [Well, we could go straight to business manager.] (2) [Is anyone a business major or taking classes or something?] (5)

C. [I'm an economics major.] (15) **(big grin)** [Or I'm going to be.] (15)

A. [Nice, nice, sweet.] (8)

C. [Alright, I'll be the business manager.] (11) **(laugh)**

E. [How about a copy editor?] (3)

C. [Do you want to be a copy editor?] (to D) (6)

D. [Excellent, yes.] (8)
C. [Don't we need a layout editor, cause aren't we laying out the paper here?] (3)

F. [Yeah.] (8)

C. [Well we'll all be doing this pretty much.] (2)

C. (jokingly) [We'll all be the editor.] (2)

E. [Who's the editor in chief?] (5)

A. [That's him] (15) (indicating F)

D. [Does anyone have any strong feelings on any of these?] (6)

E. [It says "keep in mind it's a local paper" and I guess it is northern Virginia.] (15) [Norfolk is a huge navy base--the largest one in the nation.] (7) [Obviously anything that has to do with war will really affect it.] (7) [And ODU is a right there in Norfolk.] (7)

D. [So, do we all kinda agree on E, as a big local....] (7)

C. [Yeah] (8)

A. [Yeah, that's a great.] (8)

B. [I kinda feel like B can be tossed out because if this is a really local, small paper which is devoted to the community., B wouldn't really affect it.. It probably wouldn't be something put on the front page.] (10)

C. [Yeah, we could put it on the last page.] (8)

(all look to E.)

E. [But hold up] (1) [Really quick now] (1) [Think about this.] (1) [Norfolk basically is a navy base and then stuff around it.](7) [This is the Soviet republic that we're bombing right now isn't it?] (5)

Different voices: [No, no no.] (9)

C. [North American Trade Agreement.] (15)

B. [This is groups like Ukraine, or Belarus of the former Soviet republic having joined up.] (15)

E. [I understand.] (15) [I seriously...if it's off campus...] (14)
A. [If it's off campus, I don't really care about it.] (10)

C. [Seriously we are in such a bubble here.] -R (10)

D. [Alright] (1) [What about the Death Row dude?] (3) [That's local.] (7)

F. [Yeah that's in Virginia.] (8)

D. [And it's pretty big.] (7) [I mean death penalty is like...]

(silence)

F. [Do we know where this gun thing was?] (5)

D. [No it didn't mention that at all.] (15) [It did say it was nationally pivotal verdict though, so it might not have been local.] (15)

F. [Well we basically have to get rid of two first of all, and then put one above the fold and then two others below the fold.] (2)

E. [I know this is a local paper and all, but think of the Times Dispatch.] (7) [It's a local paper and the chances are that it would include something like...but I don't know how important this NATO thing is...]

C. [***]

B. [But I'm thinking if this is strictly a local paper like the Times Dispatch, then it is only a supplement to any other paper that you receive which takes care of world news.] (9) [You get the Times Dispatch...and then in our paper it would focus on strictly local stuff like the ODU article here.] (7)

E. [Well like, see I've never seen the Norfolk Sentinel or whatever but...I just think Times Dispatch is not singularly focused on local.] (7)

F. [Well how big is Norfolk?] (5)
(talking over C...looking just at B and F through most of discussion)

E. [It's &*%^$#! big...It's really big.] (15) [I mean not THAT big, but it's just that... It's not that big but at the same time there are a lot more people in Norfolk than there are in Richmond.] (15) [Just because it is so compact and the base and
everything.

If you are there, there is just tons of traffic at every time of the day.

I mean it's a pretty good size and it's got a lot of readers.

B. [This article, the NATO article though, it's not really...they would read it, but it's not like it's front page stuff.] (9) [I mean it's not like NATO decided to attack, it's actually just that two countries decided to possible join it. ] (15)

E. (commanding tone) [I'd say B and C should be numbers 4 and 5.] (3) [And then A and D.] (3)

D: [See I think the school thing should be front page.] (10)

C. [Well what should be the cover story?] (6) [Like, what do we need to figure out?] (5)

D. [Yeah, out of A, D, and E, what do you guys think?] (6)

A: [I think C might actually be good on the front.] (10)

C. [It's just this is local...I mean it says 'a Local school district.'] (15) [It's within the community so it might be of more interest to them.] (7)

D: [Maybe D should be on the back page.] (3)

A: [I think D should be on the back page too.] (8)

C: [Yeah.](8) [It doesn't talk anything about local whatsoever.] (7)

F. [So what do we have on the back page?] (5)

D: [B and D.] (15) [I don't know, I think I think the death row inmate is more important than the two stories about the schools.] (10)

A. [Yeah because it's immediate.] (7) [It'd be really important because it's about tomorrow.] (7)

D. [Right.] (8) [Yeah. 'scheduled to die tonight'.] (15)

A. (to D) [We're supposed to assume these roles, but we are all kinda like ...] (14) (laughs)
C. (to B, E, F) [Well then it says, the headlines should be formulated for each story.] (15) [We have to write headlines for each story.] (2)

A: [Yeah, that's true.] (8)

E: [What's going to get number two?] (6) [Or does it matter?] (6)

C. [I guess it doesn't really matter because they are both on the front page and they aren't the cover story, so I guess it doesn't really matter.] (10)

F. [Aren't the people who are the writers supposed to write the headlines?] (3) [Are we supposed to just edit them or what, I mean...] (5)

E. ***

D. [Um, I think it's supposed to be like an assumption of authority.] (10) (B nods) [Like if I said I really wanted this title and you said NO, I'd just have to listen to you because you are editor in chief.] (15)

F: (F nods) [Oh, ok.] (8)

D. [We didn't really do anything of that, but I think that's how it works.] (10)

C. [Six words.] (15)

D. [Alright so we have A right?] (5) [This is our number, right? (to C)] (5)

C. [Uh-huh.] (8)

A. [How much time do we have left?] (6)

C. (checks watch) [8 minutes.] (15)

A. [Should we all just write these up?] (3)

B nods.

D. [Why doesn't everyone just come up with ideas for each one...for all three, or I guess that is four or five?] (3) (all looking at E as he speaks)
E. [Why don't you two (indicating A and D) do the first two, we (E and C) will do the third two and you two (B and F) will do the last two.] (3)

C. [Yeah.] (8) (D nods) [And everyone focus kinda on the front page.] (3) [Well I don't know.] (14) [I guess it doesn't really matter.] (14) [We'll just combine and see how we do.] (2)

A. [Alright, so we are doing B?] (5)

(All looking at E.)

E. [It's simple.] (10) [Y'all (pointing to A and D) take A since that's the head story.] (2) [You two (pointing to B and F) do C and B, and we'll take D and E.] (2)

B. [Ok.] (8)

[A and D begin working together, however all others bend heads to their desks to work. E and F actually look up, surprised that A and D are talking.] (side conversations)

D. [We want to focus on the fact that he's an inmate and is getting the death penalty and that it's tomorrow.] (2)

A. [We want to mention that the parents of the victim are opposed to it or else it just becomes another guy getting executed. ] (2)

{A muttered discussion between F and B on what is important to include and then}

F. (leaning in and directed at E) [Nah, we are doing B and C, right?] (5)

E. [Yeah y'all do B and C and we are doing D and E.] (2)

D. [He's an inmate.] (15) [Oh wait, it was their son who died.] (15) [Not the parents of the death row inmate.] (15) [Their son was the one who was killed.] (15)

A. ***

D. [Yeah the parents of the victim...like the parents of the victim are the ones protesting.] (15)

C. (Laughs)...[so bad.] (14)

A. [The son, right?] (5)
D. [Doesn't say son.] (9) [We are just assuming.] (15)

(A and D are working together as are B and F. C and E talk toward the end.)

C. [Looking at E's paper] [That's fine, I mean, I guess.] (8) [I think one of the key words is local.] (10)

E. [What about "Richmond wins Rhodes"?] (4)

C. [Will they know who he is?] (6)

E. [Yeah.] (8)

C. [Don't you think we should mention local?] (4)

C. [Doesn't really matter....] (9)

E. [You don't have to put much into it, I don't think.] (9)

C. [You're right, you're right.] (8)

E. [How about "ODU's Richmond wins Rhodes Scholarship"?] (7)

C. [Yeah, that might be better.] (8)

C: (to A and D) [ok.] (14) [indicating ready]

E. (to B and F who have been sitting quietly.) [Ready?] (1)

C. [Who wants to write them down?] (3) [Want me to write them down?] (3) [picks up the answer sheet]

D. [Ok... we should probably like--] (14)

C. [Here, [pushes paper at D] why don't you just write them down?] (2)

D. [Well, I just would rather...] (9)

E. [We should talk about them first before writing them down.] (2)

D. ["Victims parents protest Virginia Death Penalty?"] (4) [Victims parents protest Virginia death penalty.] (13) [We wanted to focus on the fact that it was the victims parents, Virginia and
the death penalty. ] (7) (B nods) [We wanted to put "tomorrow" in there, but it wouldn't fit.] (15)

F: [It's above the fold so you can't have too many words.] (15) [It will be enough.] (8)

D. [Right.] (8)

B. [Sounds good.] (8) (gives thumbs up)

E. [How about "Victims parents protest tonight's death."]] (7)

D. [We wanted to focus on Virginia though.] (9) ['Cause we want to show...I mean it does focus on the fact that it's Virginia's death penalty.] (15)

C. [Yeah.] [It is hard because we have a limited number of words.] (10)

C. (talking to D) [Cause the key is tonight.] (15) [And since it is on the front page they might figure it is tonight.] (7) (silence)

B. [How about "Victim's parents..." ] (7) [What was yours....] (5)

F. [What if you say execution instead of death penalty?] (7)

B. [Right, right.] (8) [Good.] (8)

D. ["Victim's parents protest Virginia Execution tonight."]] (7)

C and A. Laugh

D. [That sounds really dumb...] (10) (laughs). [Sorry.] (14)

A. [I'd leave it out, I think]. (9)

B. [How about "Virginia Parents"?] (7)

E. [I don't think you need it in there.] (9)

C. [It is local.] (15)

E. [I mean if we are covering it and he is going to die, obviously it's in the state.] (9) [I mean why would we cover it otherwise.] (7)
B. [You figure that right below the headline, it will show exactly where the story is taking place.] (15)

D. [That's true.] (8) ["Victim's parents protest execution tonight"].] (7)

F and B: [Tonight's execution.] (7)

D. [Tonight's execution.] (13)

F. [Sounds good right there.] (8)

C. (grin)

D. [Alright, we need to finish.] (1) [Number 2 was C.] (2)

B. ["Controversy rages over national recognition."] (4)

E. (interrupts) [Shouldn't we do E next?] (3) [I think that is a little more important than a high school....] (10)

D. [Well they are right next to each other.] (15)

B. [Yeah, if you think about it (gesturing) the headline here, and you have one here and one there.] (8)

E. [Alright, cool.] (8)

B. ["Controversy rages over national recognition"] (13)

C. [That sounds great.] (8)

E. [Perfect.] (8)

A. [Yeah, but controversy over WHAT?] (9) [Recognition of what?] (9)

B. [That is what they'll learn after they read it.] (15)

E. [Yeah, that's the purpose of a headline] (15)

D. (writes) [Ok.] (8) [E?] (3)

C. [We said, "ODU's Richmond wins Rhodes Scholar."] (4)

A. [That works for me.] (8)

D. [Scholarship?] (7)

C. [Yeah, scholarship.] (8)
A. (quietly...to D more than anyone) [Now do we have to assign an order for the last two lines?] (5)

C. [I don't think so because they are on different pages.] (10)
E. [The NATO one.] (15)

**General consensus.**

F. ["NATO to include former soviet republic."] (4)
B. ["Republics"] (7)
F. [Republics.] (13)
E. [The last one is "Verdict reached against Gun Manufacturer"]
(4)
(B nods).
A. [Shouldn't we say something about the kids or kids and guns?] (15)
A. (grins) [A cliffhanger, huh?] (6)

E. (Shakes head) [Not needed.] (9)

Researcher: enters...asks for answers.

B. [The Victims parents article is going to be the cover story.] (15)

D, the recorder, reads: [We have "Victim's Parents Protest Tonight's Execution".]} (15)

Researcher: Ok, what are the other two front page stories?

D: [We have "Controversy Rages Over National Recognition" and "ODU's Richmond wins Rhodes Scholarship."] (15)

Researcher: Great word choice. And how about the ranking on the last two.

D. [We didn't.] (15)

C. [We figured they were right beside each other, so we didn't.] (7)

E. [Do you want us to order them?] (3)
Researcher: If you want to, go ahead. Which would be the most important of these two?

E: [Let me see the sheet] (2) [I'd say...I mean, a high school as opposed to a college?] (3)

A. [Think of your readership though.] (9) [Which do you think the parents will care about...the college or the high school?] (6)

D. [High School.] (10)

E. [But ODU is the middle of Norfolk...it's really central.] (9)

C. [I don't really have a preference on it.] (15)

B. [I really think ODU, because how many times does that school get a Rhodes Scholar?] (10)

C. [Yeah, I was going to say... that is excellent.] (8)

D. [So second we have ODU's Richmond wins Rhodes Scholarship, 3rd is Controversy Rages Over National Recognition, fourth is NATO to Include Former Soviet Republics and last is Verdict Reached Against Gun Manufacturers.] (15)

General Comments: E--When E talks, everyone looks at him. Offers a lot of facts and opinions. Is corrected if his facts aren't straight, but his opinion generally matters. However, he wasn't regarded by all as a leader in part by his attitude. Literature gathered on birth order mentions that firstborns run the risk of being seen as obnoxious or know-it-alls. Researcher believes that E wasn't identified as an emergent leader by more of his fellow participants because of this.

C. Makes many, "I don't knows" and "what do you thinks." Looks toward B, F, and E when making her comments, as does D.

D becomes the official reporter of facts, though not the leader. C, D, E are those who push the action.
Many turn to E to make decisions/give clarification on responsibilities, etc. E often does not make eye contact when giving instructions.

Two factions form with one person sort of on the outside. A and D work closely together and seem to agree a lot. B, E, and F discuss things amongst themselves. C on the outside.
## Exit Questionnaire Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ID</th>
<th>ID'd Emergent Leaders</th>
<th>Most Participated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>&quot;E was the relative leader.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Participation was fairly spread out. A, C, D, E were prominently involved. Each of these contributed ideas that directed the discussion.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>&quot;I believe that a Leader, D, arose, but did not dominate the session which is characteristic of a good leader.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;E participated the most which had a positive impact. I would not consider him the leader, because he raised questions but did not take as much action.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>&quot;D, during the assignment we pretty much all worked together, but she wrote the titles and told them to the researcher. She was easy to work with.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;D, E. They had very good ideas. I would consider them leaders b/c they were confident in their ideas.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>&quot;Not really an emergent leader. E was sort of opinionated, but not really the leader.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;F, B, A less vocal, but C and D were pretty involved and cooperating. While E just tried to voice a little too much opinion.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>&quot;No one leader really.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;B or A&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>&quot;No one leader.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;B participated most, usually as the voice of reason and people tended to listen when he spoke.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: Group Two Session-Transcription

Participants
A. first born male
B. first born by gender/male...absent.
C. first born female
D. first born by gender/male
E. last born female
F. last born male

*Seated in this order.* Despite attempts to eliminate the familiarity factor, subjects D and F knew each other previously.

Researcher: Here's the problem. Take this seriously. Pretend that this is a real world situation in which you are faced with this sort of problem and you have to solve it. Here's the answer sheet. You have twenty minutes. I will come back in in twenty minutes and you will let me know then what you decided. And the first thing you want to do is introduce yourselves from left to write and speak clearly so that the videotaping will pick up your names so I can identify you later.

Introductions follow.
A: [I'm _____.] (15)
C. [I'm _____.] (15)
D. [I'm _____.] (15)
E. [I'm _____.] (15)
F. [I'm F.] (14) (laughter follows by group). [Or _____.] (15)
D. [I prefer F.] (14)

(Subjects read the assignment)
D. [Should we cover the positions?] (3)
F. [That's what I'm saying.] (8)
D. [Who wants to be editor-in-chief?] (3)
F. (laughs) [You know, D, I really think that could be you.] (12)
D. (laughs) [Alright, I'll be the editor in chief.] (8)
F. [That means you'll have to grow a ponytail or something.] (14)
(D laughs)

D. [Editor in chief, ok.] (8)

C. [Who's going to be the layout-editor?] (looks to A) (3)

A. [I can do that.] (grins) (11)

(F says something that makes A and C laugh).

F. [We can't have two writers]. (2)

D. [Yeah, we'll have to have one writer.] (2) [Who's going to be the writer?] (3) [____ (F) is illiterate.] (14)

C. [I'll be the writer because I don't really prefer either of the other two positions.] (11) [If that's ok with F and E.] (6) (looking at D, E, F).

F. [That's quite alright.] (8) (laughs) (pause) [What do ya think there, E?] (6) (E laughs) [Are you thinking copy editor or business manager?] (6)

E shakes her head.

F. [You let me know.] (14)

E. [Copy editor sounds good.] (11)

F. [Ok, that leaves the business manager.] (11)

D. [Ok, so what do we have to do?] (5)

C. [Pick three out of five stories right?] (2)

A. [Yeah.] (8) [Three for the front page.] (2)

C. [What do our positions have to do with anything?] (6) (looks to A, then other side of table)

A. [***]

C. (looks to D) [Cause whatever we decide (grins) you could just override us all.] (14)

D. [Yeah, that's right.] (8) [I'm in charge.] (14) (C laughs)

F. [So do I get to just chill...kinda hang out?] (6)

C. [We'll let you decide.] (2) (indicating F with pencil)
F. [At least you'll let me feel like I can...] (14)

(silence as they read over the problem)

C. [I want to put good news.] (3) [I don't want to put all bad stuff.] (3)

D. [We have what...one for the front page?] (5)

A. [Yeah.] (8)

D. [And then the other two...] (5)

C. [And then two others for the bottom.] (15) [Right?] (5) (looks to A)

A. [The other two are like on the bottom fold of the page.] (15)

D. [Ok, so the one above the fold is the most important?] (5) (looks to C)

C. [Yeah.] (8)

D. [We are supposed to keep in mind that its local, right?] (3) [C is pretty local, right?] (5)

C. [There's one about basketball] (14) (to F [a basketball player] and laughs).

D. [A would be pretty important, wouldn't it?] (3)

A. [It's similar to the Richmond Times Dispatch.] (15) [I mean if you think about the Richmond Times Dispatch, it's not all local.] (15)

D. [Yeah.] (8)

A. [You'd find some major stuff on the first page.] (15)

C. [Do you EVER find anything local on the front page?] (5)

F. [Local is usually an entire section.] (15)

A. [Even if it is a local paper.] (8)

D. [I think we could do without B then.] (10)
A. [Yeah.](8)
C. [Yeah.](8)
D. [A might be the most important one.](10)
F. [I would say A and E are two of the most important ones.](10)

D. [So which one goes above the fold?](6)
C. [Even though E is really good, I can't see it as being front page.](9)

F. [Yeah, I mean D would be more of a front page thing when he got robbed.](7) [I mean, this is the verdict.](7) [Maybe it would if it was a huge, huge case, but--](10)

D. (interrupts) [Yeah but--](9)
F. (agrees with E) [Like the OJ verdict or something.](8)

D. [I don't know.](9) [The last line says, "This is touted as a nationally pivotal verdict which will be a turning point in its field." ](7)

E. [Yeah, they are saying like in the cigarette cases.](7) [Like they are held responsible when people get sick or whatever.](7)

D. (interrupts, looking to A and C) [So are we agreeing on {articles} A,C, and D?] (3)

C. [I think so.](8)
A. [Yeah.] (8)
D. [Ok, so which one will be above the fold?] (6)

F. [I think we can get it down to A or D.](10)
C. [A.](10)
A. [I would say A.](10)
D. [I'd say A too.](10)
F. (somewhat sarcastically) [Wow, this is REAL hard...] (10)

D. (chuckles) [It doesn't really matter what you all say, because I am the editor in chief.] (14)
(A and C laugh)

F. [Why don't I just fire you... I am the business manager.] (14)

D. [That doesn't give you the right to fire me.] (14) (D and F laugh at each other).

F. [So write that down there, Mr. Editor in chief.] (2)

(stop to read Assignment 3)

C. [Well, we already talked about why we are including the different articles.] (15) [We think that the others we didn't include would be in a different section and] (7) [...why did we pick A over D?] (6)

D. [Because it's more local.] (7)

F. [What did you say?] (to D) (5)

D. [It's more local.] (13)

F. [Local?] (13) [Oh, it is Virginia.] (15)

C. [Alright.] (8)

D. [So now we have to write the headlines for each.] (2) [Yeah, ok, so... ] (3)

F. [Something... it has to have something about the parents.] (2)

D. [Something like "Parents lead... ] (4)

F. [Fight?] (4)

D. [Protest ...] (7)

F. [To save] (4)

D. ["To save son."] (7)

F. [To save...] (13)

E. [But the killer isn't their son.] (9)

F. [Parents lead protest to save killer](7) [I don't know.] (10) [Does that give enough information?] (6)

F. [But it isn't their son.] (9)

C. [But you could change son to killer if it was the victim's parents.] (15) ["Parents fight to save son's killer's life."](7)
A. [***]

D. ["Parents fight to save son's killer."] [7] [That's six words.] [15] (grins and laughs)

A. [I don't know.] [9] [You just want to leave it like that...] [9]

C. ["Against death of son's killer?"] [7]

D. [Don't you think that's too many words.] [9]

A. [Yeah.] [8]

D. [I figured six words.] [15]

(D writes down decision.)

C. [It may not be pretty but there aren't a million things that that can mean.] [7] [It's straight forward.] [7]

E. [Yeah like someone killed their son, they are trying to save him.] [7] [It's ...] [14]

E. [You have the alliteration...Save Son's.] [7]

D. [Ok, so number one's down.] [8] [Now we have to do D in the second spot.] [2]

(Pause)

C. [How are the gun manufacturers supposed to--] [10]

A. [I don't know.] [10]

E. (suggests) [Something like "Gun Manufacturer found liable."] [4]

F. [Do you think that the vast majority of the population will find it confusing like you just did?] [6] (indicating C by looking at her). [Cause I was automatically like, 'Wow how are they going to keep the guns out of people's---'.] [10] Why is it their fault?] [10] [Could we include a word, such as debatable decision made...] [4]

C. [Like 'pivotal.'] [7]

(big laugh by something D says, followed by D mocking in a deep voice)

D: [General Verdict says--] [14]

A. (Interrupts and attention goes straight to him) ["Controversial verdict has gun man...."] [4]
F. ["Controversial verdict has" ...] (13) [We gotta say what happened.] (2) ["Controversial verdict has ...'"] (13)

D. [For the headlines, we could just say "Controversial verdict in--"] (7)

A. ["Controversial Verdict Reached in Nguyn?"] (7)
C. ["Gun Manufacturer found liable?"] (4)

(someone walks in) Excuse me, guys.

F. [Wave to the Camera.] (14)
(all laugh or smile)

D. (writes) ["Controversial verdict reached in Nguyn/Wesson Case" (7)
(discussion of the spelling of Nguyn...)

D. [That's what the EDITOR says...] (14) (laughter follows)

C. [When you read C, I don't understand why, when they are talking about multicultural students, but the big deal isn't that...](10)

F. [((The Big deal)is that they got the award.)] (15)

E. [Well, it could be that there are allegations that since the school is all white children they are given more funding or something like that.] (3)

C. [But they are only...I mean out of the top ten, they are the only one.] (15)

F. [The lowest percentage of...] (15)

E. [So they are implying that because there is such a small number of multicultural students, they did poorer?] (5)

C. [No, better.] (15)

F. [Better.] (13) (pause) [It's also the percentage (given as opposed to the numbers) .] (15)

D. [We could say "Local school district-] (4)
E. [But the other school districts have higher rates of multicultural students.] (15)

C. [Yeah, but what is that saying?] (6) [It doesn't make sense.] (10) [What are they trying to prove?] (6) [It's not like they are the number one school.] (15) [Or the number two school.] (15)

D. [What they are trying to say is the lack of multicultural students.] (15)

F. [This doesn't prove s*^&].] (10) (covers mouth, embarrassed). [Oh jeez.] (14)

D. (teasingly. Points at F) [We want a PG rating on this thing.] (14)

F. [This doesn't prove anything, because there are still two more schools that did better than this ...] (10)

C. (completes sentence) [-that are culturally diverse.] (15)

D. [Well we know what they are trying to say.] (15) [It's just not worded correctly.] (10)

F. [It's just pretty crappy wording.] (10)

C. [But wouldn't they be excited that like...] (10)
A. [Yeah, I think the main thing is that they won.] (10)

F. [Yeah, that they won.] (13) [I mean if it was number one, then you could say--.] (10)

C. [I would think that when they post this ranking, they would probably post percentage of multicultural.] (10) [I mean, wouldn't they post all that information?] (6) [Isn't that just one minor detail?] (6)

D. [Well they say in the article that it's important.] (15)

C. [Well, why don't they just discuss that in a later article?] (14) [Why do they have to have this in this article?] (14)

D. (jokingly) [Cause I am the Editor, damn it!] (14) [And I say what goes.] (14)

E. [I'm the writer.] (15) [I probably wrote this.] (15)
D. (jokingly, laughing) [Well, you better be clearer next time.] (14)
E. [I know.] (8)
F. (laughs)
C. [What are you thinking (to D)?] (6) [Like "Honor Tainted by..."] (4)
D. [Yeah, "Honor Tainted by Multicultural...".] (4)
E. [But if we want to have something positive, maybe we should use another article.] (3)
F. [We gotta have something positive.] (2)
E. [Maybe we should use E instead, because it's ...] (3)
C. [It's a big deal though.] (10) [Not that the scholarship isn't.] (10)
D. (jokingly) [We're just here to report the news.] (15) -R
E. [Let's just be a sorta mellow paper here] (14) (laughs comes from others).
C. [The top ten school districts...that's a huge deal.] (10) [That would be in like Time Magazine.] (15)
D. [Yeah, top ten in the nation.] (15)
E. [It's not a big deal to me.] (10)
F. (jokingly) [Shut Up Copy-editor.] (14) Just go make some copies.] (14)
   (D,E, F laugh)
A. (all quiet down and listen to him) [What about "Local School District's Honor...Local School District Honored Despite Lack of Diversity?"] (4)
C. [What about when they put something like "School Receives Great Honor" and then a Semi Colon, and then like "Multiculturalism Examined" or "Diversity Examined"?] (7)
D. [School's Honor...](13) (to A) [What did you say?] (5)
A. ["School District Honored Despite Lack of Diversity."] (7)
D. [Despite, um...](14)
C. [Is it really a lack of diversity or is it just low diversity?] (9)
D. [Yeah, that is what I mean.](8) [It's not like you can really DO anything with ...] (10)
C. (interrupts) [Just because the school isn't like 50/50, doesn't mean...] (7)
E. [Yeah, we don't know that its really that low...] (10)
F. ["Low diversity."] (7)
D. [Could we say 'lowest?'] (6)
F. [No, because it's only in the top ten.] (9)
C. [Yeah, not (lowest diversity) in general.] (10)
C. [***]
F. [mumbling the proposed topic. Then. . [That's kinda like...I mean, yeah you did a good job, but, you know.] (14) We should make it...](3)
F AND A together: [As non negative sounding as possible.] (3)
E. [Well the negative is in the article.] (15)
D. (laughs) [Yeah.] (8) [We can't just ignore half of what is in the article cause that's what the article is about.] (2) [The fact that they won it and they have such low diversity.] (15)
C. [Why did we cut the NATO thing?] (6) [Just because it's not local?] (7) [And you don't think that would be like...] (14)
D. (interrupts)[Cause NATO is like front page when it comes out, but six months after that, it sorta (motions going downhill, indicating losing interest).] (10) [I mean this is like...well, it's not going to happen again until next year and whatever.] (7)
E. [Who's to say this [C] will ever happen again?] (9)
D. [I say it goes on the front page because it is so local.] (3) [We don't have much time left.] (1) ["School wins highest honor with lowest diversity?"] (7)
F. [That's like twelve words.] (9)
D. (counts) [That's seven words.] (15)

C. [Take out "Highest".] (3) [Sounds like they are being honored FOR low diversity.] (7) ["School Honored Despite Diversity." (7)

D. ["School being Honored Despite Diversity?"] (13)

F. [Low or lack of?] (7)

C. [It's not lack of, though, is it?] (6)

D. ["School being Honored Despite Lowest Diversity"] (13) [Is that even grammatically correct?] (6)

(somebody enters the room, sees the group and leaves. F says "Random people" causing giggles and chuckles) (14)

D. [Ok, what else do we have to do?] (5)

C. [We still have to do headlines for the other two?] (3)

D. [Yeah, headlines for four and five.] (13)

C. [The order?] (5)

D. [I don't think it really matters.] (10) [B.] (3) ["NATO has agreed to..."] (4)

F and C. ["Two Soviet Republics join NATO."] (7)

D. [Or something like that.] (8)

A. ["Former Soviet Republics...."] (7)

D. [Should we use 'Join'?] (7)

A. [Included in?] (7)

C. [Can you just join or do you have to be, like taken in, or whatever?] (5)

F. [See that's what I'm saying...NATO agreed to it...] (15) [How about 'TO JOIN']? (7)

E. ["Former Soviets To Join NATO."] (7)

D. [AND, the local college student/ basketball star.] (3)

C. [I think that the article will focus more upon.] (10) [Wait is he from around there?] (5)
F. [Yeah.] (8)

C. [I think it will focus on that more so than that it will help ODU.] (10)

Researcher enters the room....

The titles of the news articles and the ranking came from D. (15)
Researcher: That's good. How did you decide upon these?

D: (jokingly) [I just decided because I was the editor in chief, things were going to be done my way.] (14)

Things to Note:
E was very quiet throughout. F was the jokester who tried to make for a comfortable atmosphere. He made silly comments and lounged back during the session, though he did offer some great comments and was very participatory. He could also be overwhelming, I think. E was positioned between D and F, which was most likely limiting her participation because both of them talked a lot. D took charge and was task-oriented, though he was relationship oriented too with some silly comments. He made reference often to the fact that he was "editor-in-chief." C was very involved. Moved the action along. Offered up new ideas. A was happy to sit back for a lot of the time and let the others run the show, but the comments he made were well thought out and often accepted by the group. On two occasions the group was in the midst of joking around and laughing when A made a task-oriented comment (such as a possible word choice, etc) and the laughter stopped and the others in the group listened to what he had to say.
### Exit Questionnaire Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ID</th>
<th>ID'd Emergent Leader</th>
<th>Most Participated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>&quot;Actually I felt everybody Emerged about the same but D (the editor) brought control to group to bring ideas together.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;D,C,A-I would not consider one major leader, but again D brought ideas together so we could all decide.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>&quot;D did. We all contributed though but he was writing.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;D-wrote&quot; &quot;C,A spoke or suggested a lot. I don't think one person led all the time. I think it shifted.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>&quot;No real leader emerged—Everyone participated evenly.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Really I didn't think anyone participated more than others.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>&quot;D sort of led us because he was the editor-in-chief.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;D,F,C, and myself Participated the most probably about in that order. I think we really all worked together.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>&quot;D, took control of the situa. and the head of the paper, and allowed all voices to be heard while still displaying executive decision making.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;A,C,D,E,F all participated about the same. It was almost comparative to a round table discussion.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: Group Three Session-Transcription

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arranged group:</th>
<th>Actual Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. first born male</td>
<td>A. first born male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. first born male</td>
<td>B. first born male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. middle born female</td>
<td>C. middle born female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. first born male</td>
<td>D. only child; male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. last born female</td>
<td>E. first born male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. last born female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E and F in Arranged group were no-shows. Actual Group member D showed up unexpectedly.

Seating arrangement around a table. A and B on the far left side, facing one another. C sat next to B, D next to C and E was opposite of C and next to A. It took the group twelve minutes to come to conclusions. Little talking actually occurred within the group. All students were soft spoken. E appeared very disinterested.

Researcher: This is the group role play situation you will be completing. Take it seriously. I'm going to give you twenty minutes to discuss this. I will leave the answer sheet with you all, and whoever wants to will fill out the answer sheet. The first thing I ask you to do is to introduce yourselves to each other and, if you'd do so loudly as well, I'd appreciate that too. So I'll let you go to it. I'll be back in twenty minutes. (leaves)

(subjects read over the sheet).

B. (looks up at A and then back down)
C. (Looks at E and then back down)
B. and C: (watch the group silently, look at one another and smile).

D: [I guess we should start by saying our names.] (2) [I'm _____.] (15)
B. [______] (15)
A. [I'm _____.] (15)
E. [_______.] (15)
C. [_______.] (15)
D. [Does anyone want to be any of these positions?] (6)
C. [I'll be layout editor.] (11)
(pause)
A. [I'll be editor in chief.] (11)
(short pause)
B. [I'll be copy-editor.] (11)
D. [I'll be the business manager.] (11)
E. (mumbling) [I'll be writer.] (11)
(pause)
C. [Do we need two writers?] (5)
A. [I think the other person didn't show up.] (10)
(pause)
C. (reading) [Ok.] (8)
(pause. C looks to A.)
A. [I guess the first thing we need to decide is what order to put these articles in.] (3)
(pause)
D. [I think E should go at the top of the page.] (3)
B. [Or maybe C.] (3) [What do you think?] (6)
(pause)
C. (very quietly--hard to detect) [It's a local paper so...] (15)
A. [So we got C and E.] (15) [But we can only have one main story.] (15)
B. [So three go on the front and two on the back.] (3)
A. [So, is it between C and E?] (6)
C. [Yeah.] (8)
D. [Yeah.] (8)
B. [I think probably C should be the main one, cause, I mean, E deals more with the college level because people will be more interested in like a--] (10)
E. (interrupts) [Yeah, because the high school is smaller and they are local kids.] (7)

C. [Yeah, local kids.] (8)

B: (to E) [Yeah, I mean one kid versus a local school district.] (7) [The community will have more interest in the local school.] (7)

E. (interrupts) [Yeah.] (8)

A. [Ok, for the top we have C.] (15) [For the bottom two we have E and...] (6)

D. [Maybe A should also be on the front because it's also in Virginia.] (3)

A: [Yeah.] (8) (writing)

(pause)

C: [The other ones we have to put inside somewhere.] (2)

B. [Yeah.] (8)

C. [Obviously the front page is now filled.] (15)

A. [So the order of appearance would be C, E, A.] (15)

(pause)

D. [So now we have to come up with the headlines.] (2)

A. [Yeah.] (8) [Why don't we just start at A?] (3)

(long pause)

C. [Maybe something like "The Last Call" for A?] (4)

A. [That's good.] (8) (bends to write it down)

(long silence)

(C looks to A, who is reading)

C: [New NATO members?] (4)

D. [***]

A. [We should just say something like "NATO Newcomers." ] (7)

C. ["NATO Newcomers."] (13)

A. (writing) ["NATO Newcomers."] (13)

B. ["NATO Newcomers."] (13)
(pause)

C: (to D) [What were you saying about the other one?] (5)

D: [''Local School Makes Top Ten.''] (4)

(C makes a very slight nod to the head and starts to write down. A writes it down, as does B)

(long pause. E plays with his hair [again])

A: (suggests) [How about ''Wesson Shoots Itself in the Foot'']? (4)

B: (looks doubtful).

C: [***]

D: (mutters) [sounds good.] (8)

All write (including B)

C: [Are we supposed to be writing these down on this?] (5) (picks up the answer sheet)

B. [Yeah, we will.] (8) [But if we did now and wanted to change anything... ] (15)

(long pause... all looking down at papers)

B. [What about ''ODU Student-Rhodes Scholar'']? (4)

A: (starts writing) [ODU Student-Rhodes Scholar.] (13)

B. [Or--don't we have to put ''Athlete'']? (6)

A: [Student-Athlete] (7)

B. [Yeah, Student-Athlete.] (8)

(all write)

E. [That didn't take twenty-minutes.] (14)

A and C: (reach for the answer sheet at the same time)

A: [Oh, do you want to do that?] (5)

C: [No, you go ahead.] (2)

A: [Ok, the first one was C, ''Local School Makes Top Ten.''] (15)

(writes #1 and all following without a word.)

C: [Is that it?] (5)

A: [I think so.] (10)

Students sit in silence. Had no questions for researcher after project.
### Exit Questionnaire Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ID</th>
<th>ID'd Emergent Leader</th>
<th>Most Participated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>No emergent leader.</td>
<td>&quot;It was equal. This generates a feeling of equality/fairness which made the task easier to finish.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>&quot;I think A emerged as the leader, as he kind of shot out ideas on how to do things.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Everyone pretty much put forth the same effort.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&quot;No real leader. Some spoke more than others. (myself and A were major contributors.)&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;either myself or A. A was editor-in-chief so he set the flow. I guess he's a leader, took charge somewhat.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>&quot;A spoke the most however it was an open forum for the most part.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;A said the most. Not really a leader-Maybe the most interested in leading.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&quot;A came up with more of the headlines than anyone, so he may have been the leader. He was generally effective, but not overbearing.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Since A came up with most of the headlines he could be considered the leader.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: Group Four Session-Transcription

Participants
A. First born female
B. First born by gender/male
C. Middle female
D. Only child/female
E. Last born female
F. Last born female

Seated around the table in the following order: D, E, B, F, A, C.

Group talking with one another from the very beginning.

Researcher: Here's the problem. The first thing I ask you all to do is to introduce yourselves to one another out loud, so that I can later see on the videotape who each of you is. Introduce yourselves to one another. Here is the problem. Here is the answer sheet. I will be back in here in twenty-minutes and you all will let me know what your answer was. So you have twenty-minutes. And take this very seriously. Take it like this is a real world situation in which you are really encountering this.

D. [So we have to read over this] (indicating the sheet)? Researcher: yeah, introduce yourselves first and then read over the sheet and it should be self-explanatory.

F: (laughs) [Should we introduce ourselves?] (3)

D. [Let's read it first and then introduce ourselves.] (2)

E. [I don't like any of these [job options].] (10) [Wait....]

(14)

B. [Should we read the whole paper, or just the first (assignment)?] (3)

A: [Nah, just the beginning that we need to know.] (2)

D. [Are we supposed to go in, like, letter order?] (5)

A. [Nah, I don't think it really matters.](2)

D. [Ok, my name is ___ and I'm from ___.] (15)

E: [my name is ___ and I'm from ___.] (15)

B: [my name is ___ and I'm from ___.] (15)

F: [my name is ___ and I'm from ___.] (15)
A: [my name is ____ and I'm from ____.] (15)
C: [my name is ____ and I'm from ____.] (15)

B. [Alright...We have to...] (2)
E. [We have to figure who is what.] (2)
B. [Who's going to get which job?] (3)
C. [Who wants to be editor in chief?] (3)
A. [Not me.] (15)
E. [says the name of D] (12)
B. [I'll be editor in chief.] (11)
E. [Ok, you'll be.] (8)
F. [giggles and hands the answer sheet to B]
C. [Layout editor?] (3)
D. [I'll be the layout editor.] (11)
C. [Ok.] (8) [Anybody else?] (6)
E. [Wait, do we have two writers?] (5)
F. [What's the business manager?] (5)
E. [Manages like, finances...] (15)
C. (simultaneously with E) [finances...] (15)
F. [I'll do that.] (11) [That could be cool.] (10)
C. [I wanna be the copy-editor.] (11)
E. [Well, I guess there goes that job...] (15)
C. [Oh, did you want to be copy-editor?] (6)
E. [Nah, that's cool.] (10) [I guess I'll just be a writer.] (11)
[pause]
E. [So...] (14)
A. [Now we have to come up with headlines.] (2)
[pause]
F. (somewhat confused by silence) [What are we doing?] (5)
D. [indicating the paper] [We have to read over this and then decide...] (2)
E. [looks up and then back at paper when she sees all others reading.]

C. [looks up]

B. [making marks on paper].

E. [to D] [Do you want to decide?] (3)

D. [Ok, editor, take it away.] (2)

[F and C laugh]

B. [Alright.] (8) [We need to put these in order, right?] (3)

D. [We have to decide where we want to put these in the newspaper.] (2) [she indicates answer sheet]. [We have to fill that out, like what should be on front page, etc.] (2)

B. [Front page, I think that A should be on the front page, and B should be on the front page.] (10)

C. [I agree.] (8)

A. [Wait, we need to pick three, right?] (5) [Like one on the top and-] (5)

D. [I kinda think a local one should be on the top.] (10)

A. [I like letter C for the head story cause it relates to people in the community.] (10)

F. [Right.] (8) [I like A and D ] (10) [giggles]

C. [Yeah, a big one on the top-] (14)

D. [interrupts/talks at same time] [A big one on the top] (13)

B. [Ok, so do we want to do A for the big one on top and then C and D?] (3)

D. [nods]

A. [That sounds good.] (8)

C. [Cause A is kinda local too. ] (7)

A. [Is A like a national story or--] (5)

C. [It's the Death Row in Virginia.] (15)
D. [Yeah, for a moment I thought it was national too.] (10)
C. [I think it's local.] (10)
D. [Yeah] (8) [reads] ['Virginia has executed more people in the last three years.'] (15)

B. [Ok, now we have to think of a headline for it.] (2) [pause]
[For A?] (3)

E. [A... ...] (14) [thinking out loud]
D. [It should be something about Virginia tops numbers on death row, because it makes a point of saying there have been progressively more people in the last three years.] (4)
E. [We should say something about death row... ] (8)

B. [Yeah.] (8)
D. ["Virginia adds another to the death penalty count?"] (4)
E. [Sounds good.] (8)

A and F: [laugh... F laughs longer].
D. [Does everyone agree?] (6)
F. [What is it?] (5)
D. ["Virginia adds another to the death penalty count."] (13)
A. [Is that less than six words?] (5)
D. [It has to be less than six words?] (5)
A. [Yeah.] (8)

F: [counts on fingers while D says the headline aloud]
B. [Death-row could be one word.] (7)
A: [with grin]. [Sure.] (8) [Hyphenate it.] (7)
B. ["Virginia adds another to death-row" and death-row is hyphenated.] (7)
D. [Yeah.] (8)
E. [Adds another....] (9) [makes tongue-tied face.]

D, E, and A laugh.
B. [writing] [What about for B?] (3) [Or C?] (3) [reads to self]
[How about Virginia wins top ten?] (4)
D: [It should be "Virginia School wins top ten."] (7)
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A: [Yeah.] (8)
B. ["Virginia school"]? (13)
A and D: [Yeah.] (8) [B writes]
D. [to A] [Is it possible to say "Top Ten Ranking"]? (6)
A: [Yeah.] (8)
E. ["In the nation"...we could also say in the nation.] (4)
B. [How about "Local School wins national Top Ten." ] (7)
C. ["Makes national Top Ten?"] (8)
F: [counts on her fingers]
E. [Yeah, yeah.] (8)
B. [Ok.] (8) [writes.] [***] [the group laugh.]

C. [jokingly] [Are you hyphenating that?] (14)
C: [As the copy-editor, I couldn't let you do that.] (14)
D. [leans across and consults with B as he writes]. [National...]
(14)
E: [Ok, D.] (2)

[pause]
D. [If we were to say something like "justice served" wouldn't that be, like, opinionated or something?] (6)

A and F: [Yeah.] (8)

[silence]
A: [We could say something like-] (3)
B. ["Verdict reached in Ngyun/Wesson trial."] (4)
E and D: [count on fingers]
A: [That's six.] (15)
B. [starts to write]
F: [offers hesitantly] [But that's not really about guns...] (9)
C. [Well, if it's a big case, people will probably already know...] (7)
A. [Or we could say something like "Ngyun Verdict a National Spotlight."] (4) [It could be going toward...] (14)
F. [Is it national?] (5)

B. [But it's probably been going on for a while, so if we just say that a verdict was reached, I'm sure that everybody would probably know about it.] (7)

C. ["Nation Shocked by Verdict."] (4) [laughs at her suggestion]

F. [I don't know.] (9) [I just think that like the focus is on the guns and that's just kind of taking away from it a little, but that's fine with me.] (9)

A: [Or we could say something like "Gun Manufacturer Held Responsible."] (7)

F: [Yeah---] (8)

C. ["Jury finds Gun Manufacturer Responsible."] (7)

F: [Yeah.] (8)

D. [Yeah.] (8)

F. [That's good.] (8)

B. [Alright, what was that?] (5)

C. ["Jury finds Gun manufacturers responsible."] (13)

[silence]

E. [And now we have to do...whatever [looks at B's sheet], 4 and 5.] (2)

A. [Now we have to do B and E.] (2)

E. [I'd say B is last] (3) [Just cause I don't really care about NATO.] (10) [makes group laugh and laughs herself].

[F continues to laugh after group stops]
[short discussion {a few words} between B and D over what the problem-sheet says.]

E. [I'd say for E, "Geoff Richmond wins Rhodes Scholarship."] (4)

F. [I don't know--that's sort of like...] (9)

B. [Tells the whole story.] (8) (scoffs) [The reader will be like 'ok, Next?'] (7)

[group laughs]
C. ["ODU star wins scholarship"] (4)

E. [Big Honors.] (7)

C. [Basketball star?] (7)

F. [Well, I don't know.] (9) [It makes it seem like it's a really big honor because he's the first student ever selected and one of the three athletes nationally.] (7) [I'm not saying that that is the title, but it seems like that is the focus.] (9)

C: ["Richmond, ODU's first ever scholar..." ] (4) [cuts off laughing]

A: ["ODU's star athlete wins Rhodes Scholar."] (7)

F: [I'm so bad in coming up with titles.] (10)

B. [How about "ODU basketball star wins national honor."] (7)

C. [Yeah, cause then you have to read the story to figure it out.] (8)

B. [That's six [words]. ] (15)

A. [Yeah.] (8) [That's good.] (8) ["National Honor."] (13)

[B writes]

F. [***] laughs. A smiles

[pause]

D. [Could we just say "NATO brings back former republics"?] (4)

[F counts on fingers]

B. ["NATO brings back former Soviet Republics"] (7)

F. [That's so boring.](10) [laughs] [I'm sorry.](14)

D. [You can't really...] (7)

F. [continues to laugh]. [Yeah, you can't really say anything else.] (8)

C. [Do we know they came back?] (5)

F. [What?] (5)

C. [I mean, we are saying "brings back," but it never really said that they had ever been a part before. ] (15)

D. [True.] (8)
C. [If we were to say, "NATO includes former Soviet Republics," that would probably make more sense.] (7)

D. [nods]
B. [So "NATO includes former Soviet Republics?"] (13)
C. [Yeah.] (8) [B writes]
F: [Can I look at it?] (14) [reads the list aloud. Corrects something on the paper, laughing] [I'm sorry.] (14)
B. [sits back]. [Let's wave to the captain.] (14)
F. [turns to camera and yawns, then laughs]
[social conversation about Easter and then B takes the list.]
B. [reads aloud] [We have to give reasons for why we picked each one..] (2)
F. [Oh no.] (14)

Researcher [enters room]: Oh, you aren't done yet. Well, we can just talk about why you picked each one while I'm in here. What was your decision, first off.

B: [reads off the list the order and titles] (15)
Researcher: Ok, and why did you all decide to put those three on the front page.

D: [Well, we were thinking about the general reading public and how relative it would be to them.] (7) [Like the top, cover story, that's a general one that concerns all of Virginia and the two on the bottom, well, like the one about the local school is very specific to the area and then the gun one, well that's the sort of thing that people will read.] (7) [That's the sort of thing people are into.] (7)

B. [Yeah, whatever is most interesting to the readers should be on the front page.] (7)

Researcher: And what are the two titles you got for the last two?

B:["ODU athlete wins National Honor" and "NATO includes former Soviet Republics." ] (15)

Researcher: And why did you put those two on the back page.
[two second silence]
A: [laughs a bit]. [Well, first of all, they didn't seem all that interesting.] (10)

F: [Significant enough...] (7)
[two second silence]

C: [And then the basketball one didn't seem important enough to be on the front page.] (10)

Researcher: And do you guys have any comments on the process you used. Who made the most decision or your interactions.
F: [jokingly] [Editor-in-chief.] (15) [laughs] [You did a good job.] (14)
B. (grins) Thanks. (14)

Researcher: Ok, well, thanks so much for helping. I have an exit questionnaire for you all to fill out and then I will come back in and tell you a little about what I am studying, so you can better understand what I was watching for.
Exit Questionnaire Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ID</th>
<th>ID'd Emergent Leader</th>
<th>Most Participated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>&quot;I think D emerged as a leader because she had opinions and voiced them well. D probably guided the group the most, but everyone was able to offer ideas and opinions.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;D probably talked the most, but really everyone had the opportunity to guide the discussion.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>no emergent leader</td>
<td>&quot;B, D, F participated more than most, which gave our decisions a sense of dominance.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>&quot;B was editor in chief, but I think we all participated and voiced our opinions. B did a good job of getting us started.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Probably B because he kept the discussion going and wrote down the headlines. I don't think anyone really dominated.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>&quot;We all did well interacting and making effective worthwhile decisions; each person &quot;shined&quot; at a moment comfortable for them.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;For deciding positions of authority, D and F contributed most, while C and I tossed out ideas mainly for title headings.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>&quot;Yes, B was the leader. He was a good leader because he came out with what he thought was right and started all of the conversations but was at the same time open to others' opinions.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I feel that everyone participated equally and everyone was open to other's ideas. This makes a more comfortable environment.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>&quot;I didn't think there was a particular leader- B just basically led the Group, and we each tried to contribute something.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Probably D and B and maybe C and A. I didn't really consider anybody as the Leader, although D contributed the most.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J: Group Five Session-Transcription

Participants

A: Firstborn female
B. Firstborn female
C. Middle born male
D. Middle born male
E. Last born female
F. Last born male

Seating order: Randomly—students told to sit at a table and they arranged themselves. 3 girls on one end, 3 guys on the other. D sitting at far left, next to C. F next to C, across the table from D. B sitting next to F and E. E sitting between B and A. A and B are across the table from one another.

Researcher: Let me explain to you all what is going on. The first thing I ask you to do is to introduce yourselves to one another. Let me hand out the problem. Here is the answer sheet which you all will have to fill out at the end (places answer sheet in the middle of the table). And here is the problem. You all will have twenty-minutes to decide upon how you want to answer this problem. Take this as if it was a real life situation in which you are truly being asked to complete this task. I'll be back in 20 minutes and will find out what you have decided.

(group reads the problem)

F: (having finished the problem, looks around at others, leans back in chair. Pause. Directed toward A) [Should we start introducing ourselves so we can start on the problem.] (3)

A: (nods) [sounds good.] (8)

F. [Because if we read it all first, we will have probably already started to think about it.] (7)

E: I'm __________. (15)
A. [______________] (15)
D. [______________] (15)
C. [______________] (15)
F. [______________] (15)
B. [______________] (15)
F. [Ok.] (14)
A. [What about the jobs?] (3)
F. [Who wants to be the "Big Man"] (6)
A. (volunteers) [I'll be the editor.] (11)
F. [I'll be layout.] (11)
A. [Ok.] (8)

B. [I'll be copy editor because that is the kinda stuff I do for yearbook staff.] (11)
A. [Ok.] (8)
C. [I'll be the business manager.] (11)
A. (to D) [Do you guys want to be the writers?] (6)
D. (to E) [I guess we'll be the writers.] (11), (12)
E. (laughs)
A. [Ok.] (8)
F. [So what do we do?] (6) [Pick the most important article for above the paper fold.] (3)

B. [If I understand this correctly, three go on the front page and then the other two go later.] (15)
A. Yeah. (8)
F. [Right.] (8)
B. [Ok.] (8)
E. [Then there's one that goes on the very top...] (15)
B. [The main headline.] (15) [Should, um-] (3)
D. [The title's going to go on the front, though, right?] (5)
B. [I think basically what this is saying is that if this was the front page (turning her assignment paper and indicating it for the group to see), there's the one big story that encompasses the entire front half and then the other two stories go below the fold.] (15)

B. [Um, how about we go around in a circle and each of us say what we think should be the main, head article?] (3) [We could give our reasons.] (15) [What do you guys think?] (6) [That way, we could discuss it and all...(voice dwindles off)] (15) [That is if everyone has had a chance to read through them.] (5)
A: [The other thing we need to keep in mind is that it is a local paper for a community, so they might not cover large stories like NATO.] [That might not be their top priority.] (2)

E. (breaks pause. Somewhat to B) [That's a good idea—to go around.] (3)
B. [Ok.] (8) [Would you like to start?] (6)

E. (laughs) [No.] (9)
B. [All right.] (14)

E. (interrupts) [Just kidding.] (14) [I can start. I can start.] (15) [I think for the local one, the first one is most important...the death penalty one.] (10)

B. (almost interrupts..right on tail end of E's comment. To the group). [I agree with her.](8) [I think A—and not only that, but A is an intriguing article because their son—No wait, Two of the victims' ...two of the parents of a victim are against the death penalty yet their child was killed by this murderer who is about to be killed.] (15) [If they advocate him being killed, they are hypocrites but if they ask to let him off (death row), what if he doesn't get the full jail sentence.] (7) [What if they release him?] (15) [It's sort of a catch-22 type of thing.] (10) [It's an intriguing article which would probably draw more readers.] (10) [Feature article at the top—I would think.] (10) (indicates F)

E. [Yeah that's what I think too.] (8)

F. [I agree that it is interesting.] (8) [It's just that...it seems like it's not reaching many people.] (9) [Like E that is one person.] (15) [I think A is the most intriguing, B has to do with a lot more things, but it's a local paper.] (10) (pause) [C, C is pretty important.] (10) I think it should go on the front page.] (10)

B. [Especially because that has been a big issue, especially in the state of Virginia.] (7) [It's on the radio almost every day.] (7) (indicates C, but A interrupts)

A: [I think C and E are like community morale.](10) [I see it as definitely...] (10)

D. [Instead of A being the main one, what about C and E? ] (3)

B. [I see E as sort of your feature on the front of the sports page.] (10)
E. [Yeah, that's how I see it.] (8) [Me too.](8)

C. [I don't see E as really being worthy of the front page.] (10)

B. [I kinda see B as being worthy of the front page because most people buy a newspaper because they want to know what's going on, not just in their community, but in their world as well.] (3) [That is a lot of people.] (7) [Yes, this is a community newspaper, but community now extends beyond (wide arm motion) the area.] (7) [So I would say... A as the cover story, with B and C as the other two.] (3)

F: [Which ones?] (6)

E and B: [A, B and C.] (15)

B. [Does everybody pretty much agree that A makes a pretty good...] (3) [Does anyone DISAGREE that A should be the cover story? ] (3) (no one speaks) [Ok.] (14) (begins to write). [As for the sub-articles, does anyone have any---have we pretty much agreed on E...?] (3)

D. [Is E just about a scholarship?] (5)

B. [Yeah] (8)

E. [Yeah.] (8)

B. [So we have pretty much decided that E...] (3)

D. [So E should be on the sports page.] (10)

B. [Yeah] (8)

B. [So what about the thing about the school on the front page because—] (2)

A: (interrupts) ['cause it's local.] (7)

B. [It's a good human interest type thing.] (7)

D. [I think NATO should be on the front page too.] (10)

E. [So A, B, and C?] (3) [Everybody thinks that?] (6)

F. (nods)

B. [Is anybody strongly opposed?] (6) (no one speaks up)

A. [So now now we move on to headlines.] (2)

(silence as they read)
F. [It has to be under six words.] (15) (pause) [Does anyone have anything for A?] (6)

E. [It has eight words.] (15)
B. [Go ahead.] (2)
A. [If you have something, maybe we can help you.] (3)
E. [I don't know.] (14) [Something like "Death Penalty Scheduled at Dismay of Victim's Parents." ] (4) [I don't know.] (14) (pause)

F. [This is really hard.] (10)
B. [looking to A] [What about something like "Twist of Fate Challenges Ideals."] (4) [Or Ideals or morals or something because that's pretty much the most intriguing thing about this article because of the fact that they really can't say anything either way because they aren't in favor of the death penalty, but it is their child who was killed.] (7) [As a parent, they want something to be done to the person who has done something to their child.] (7) (pause)

F. [It sounds pretty good, but maybe it's just too much....] (9) (looks to A)

A. [We want to say something in it about what the article is actually about--] (9) (end as E starts to talk).

E. [What it's about, yeah.] (8)
F. [It might make it a little easier on reading.] (10) (pause)

B. [Or how about "Death Penalty Ruling Challenges Ideals" ?] (7)
A. (nods) [That's good.] (8)
E. (nods)

A: [grabs the answer sheet that was put in the middle of the table and begins to write on it].

F. (watching A write)
A: [Could we just say for B "Former Soviet Republics Join NATO")] (4)
B: [Yeah.] (8)
F: (says something inaudible)
A: (writes)
(pause)
A: [For E, how about we just say "ODU Athlete Honored with Rhodes Scholarship"]? (4)
B. [Yeah.] (8)
E. [Yeah.] (8)
F. [That works.] (8)
(A writes)
E. [This is kinda hard.] (10) (laughs)
C,D,F: [Yeah.] (8)
E. [Do you wanna leave out the multi-cultural thing in the title?] (6)
A. [That was what I was wondering.] (8) [But I thought that is what makes the article interesting.] (10)
E. [Yeah.] (8)
A. [It's hard to explain it all in under six words.] (10)
(pause)
B. [What about for D, I don't know how you say that name, Ngyun, "Ngyun Verdict Sets Precedent"]? (4) (looking at A) [They are saying it should be a turning point in its field and it is a kinda interesting case that does set a precedent.] (7)
A: [Why don't we, ok, how many words is that?] (5)
B.[Five.] (15)
A. [Ok, if we say "Sets Gun Precedent" it would let the readers know what the article is about.] (7)
B. (nods) [Sure] (8)
A. [Ok.] (8) (writes)
B. [Or if you prefer "Arms".] (7)
A. [Ok.] (8)
E. [Seems like the only way you can do C is to put a colon in there.] (3) [Like "Local School Gets Honored" and then put a colon—] (4)

A: [Yeah.] (8)

E: [-and then something about the --but I don't know how to do it.] (giggles) (14)

B. ["Diversity Issue Questioned?"] (4)

A. ["Diversity Questioned." ] (7)

B and E: (simultaneously) ["Diversity Questioned"-- That works.] (13)

A: (begins to write and stops. Looks at other side of table) [Is that ok with you guys?] (6)

C, D, F: (shrug, nod) [yeah.] (8)

C: [What was it again?] (5)

A looks to E, then simultaneously: ["Local School Honored: Diversity Questioned."] (13)

C: [Sounds good.] (8)

A. [Ok.] (8) (writes)

A: (Leans back) [Ok.] (8)

F: [We done?] (5)

A: [I think so.] (8)

(Researcher enters after a few minutes of silence/chit-chat between group members)
How'd it go?
A, B: Good.

Researcher: (to whole group) ok, I want to hear all about what you all decided upon. So what did you decide?

E. Ok, Editor in chief.... (14)
A. [Ok, um. We decided the death penalty case should be the first article because we thought it was local and had a human touch in it.] (15) [The other two front page articles were the NATO article and the local school's chosen for the honor.] (15) [And then the weapon verdict and the athlete scholarships were in later sections.] (15)

Researcher: (to whole group) Now about titles, what did you all come up for on titles?

A: [First was "Death Penalty Verdict Challenges Ideals," "Former Soviet Republics Join NATO".] (15) [Then we said "Local School District Honored: Diversity Questioned." ] (15) [Number four we put "Ngyun vs Wesson Gun Verdict Sets Precedent".] (15) [And Last we put "ODU athlete wins Scholarship." ] (15)

Researcher's General Comments: B controlled the first half of the exercise by offering suggestions and often taking over conversation. However, A became the central figure later as people offered suggestions to her. A volunteered to be editor in chief. B volunteered for a position for which her past experience qualified her. The males became quieter and less involved as the exercise went on. Opposite occurred for female E.
### Exit Questionnaire Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ID</th>
<th>ID'd Emergent Leader</th>
<th>Most Participated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>&quot;I don't think one specific person did-but myself, B and F were more talkative.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;B spoke the most while A/E/F participated with the most interest. the others tended to keep quiet until asked a question. the leaders definitely moved things along and kept everyone involved.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>&quot;A,E, and B arose fulfilling different types of leadership roles. They were good b/c they sought everyone's opinion.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;B, the person talked a lot and helped to keep activities rolling. Yes, that person could be considered a leader type.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&quot;A,E, and B all took leadership roles and it worked out well.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;A helped to keep everything going Smoothly. Yes, the person was a leader because she took control of the situation.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>&quot;A was the leader and B helped out a lot. B was the main brainstormer and A put it all together. They had good ideas.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I'd say B, she has done stuff like this before. I don't consider her THE Leader just b/c she through out ideas. A took charge.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&quot;B emerged as a good, thought-provoking leader in the beginning and A was a good leader in that she challenged B.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;B and A participated the most. They were good leaders b/c they took away some of the initial timidness.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&quot;We all chipped in.&quot;</td>
<td>B participated the Most. Yes, she was a Leader, &quot;she was creative and got things moving.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>