

B2 Kepangkatan

by Rina Anindita

Submission date: 17-May-2021 11:41AM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1587653693

File name: Mei_2021_B2.pdf (1.89M)

Word count: 7983

Character count: 42475

A MODEL TO MEASURE EMERGENT LEADERSHIP AMONG EMPLOYEES IN INDONESIA

Juliana Siregar

Rina Anindita

Magister Management, Universitas Esa Unggul, Jakarta, Indonesia

Abstract: The objective of the research is to develop a model to measure emergent leadership among employees in Indonesia. In doing so, this study first developed a theoretical model by identifying the emergent leadership constructs from the literature and identifying the criteria measurement of these constructs from the literature and thirdly was to validate the theoretical model to measure emergent leadership in Indonesia. The theoretical model consists of 6 emergent leadership constructs measured by a total of 60 measuring criteria. The empirical process of the validation employed data collected from 350 respondents who were working with the team working in Jakarta, Banten, and West Java. The validation aimed to validate the variables that were used to measure each of the constructs by determining statistically that the sample number is adequate; using the Keiser-Meier-Olkin and Bartlett's test to ensure the applicability of the data for multivariate statistical analysis; to validate the measuring criteria as relevant to emergent leadership and to determine the reliability of each of the emergent leadership constructs to the model. The result showed that emergent leadership can be measured by the following indicators: dominant, friendly, egocentric, intelligence, creativity, open mind, experiences, caring, positive vibes, discipline, good planner, conscientiousness, team player, communicative, and performance management for knowledge-skills-attitude. Furthermore, the results of this study found that the variable of the construct performance management from the previous research was in the third dominant value.

Keywords: Emergent, Leadership, Emergent Leadership, Positive Vibes, Team Player

Cite this article as: Siregar, Juliana and Anindita, Rina. 2021. A Model to Measure Emergent Leadership among Employees in Indonesia. Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen, Volume 19, Number 1, Pages 55–68. Malang: Universitas Brawijaya. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21776/ubj.am.2021.019.01.06>.

In an organization, the role of teamwork is very important, and it is a part of Human Resource Management (HRM). Teamwork is required for the staff to cooperate, understand each other, and support each other to achieve the goals of the organization or company. For

getting a reliable or good quality team, finding those who have competence, professionalism and commitment is not easy. This is due to the teamwork members having different ethnics, cultural and educational backgrounds, in addition to differing abilities, skills, and positions.

Besides that, the team members also have different characteristics or behavior. Some members have characteristics such as finding it easy to give ideas, who are responsible and diligent, who are

willing to help their colleagues, or who can express a form of proactive attitude. They are certainly favored by the leaders in the organization. Conversely, some employees are not up to taking the initiative. They are only concerned with the responsibility of their work without helping their colleagues. They are unwilling to share information and they are careless when making decisions. This is called a reactive attitude. If this reactive attitude is found in the team members, then generally the result is that the team will not work well or they will not be following the set targets. This can cause company losses. Therefore, the management team or top management should seek to develop the quality of their human resources continuously so then this can lead to achieving their maximum performance.

Theoretically, groups have a strong incentive to place the right person in charge and to strive to do so. In practice, they often fail and one reason for this is that they ascribe leadership quickly before it can be earned by demonstrating competence (Anderson and Brown, 2010). The success of teamwork is usually determined by the commitment of its members and the team leaders who can make their members cohesive and able to work together to achieve their common goals. Choosing teamwork leadership within an organization is not easy because sometimes the leader who is chosen can't lead the team right. Sometimes the team members trust their team partners more than their team leaders. The process of leadership occurs because there are one or more persons who have used their influence to achieve the group or organization's objectives. Without there being a formal authority, this is called emergent leadership (Hoch and Dulebohn, 2017).

The term 'emergent' has been known since 1874 and the pioneer of the term was a psychologist named Lewes G. H., in Blitz, 1988. However, the trend of emergent leadership research began in 1983 with the personality traits Kenny and Zaccaro. Schneider and Goktepe (1983), in Hoch and Dulebohn (2017), stated that if individuals have a significant influence over other members of the group, even though they may not be authorized, then the leader is called an emergent leader. Emergent leaders, as informal leaders, rise through an unpre-

dictable procedure of role-taking and a companion perpetual process that decides who moves towards becoming a leader or not. People with distinct personality traits, mental abilities, and other personal characteristics are more likely to emerge as leaders. Cogliser et al. (2012), included that emergent leadership is described as an individual leadership phenomenon whereby an individual arises as a team leader informally, without being assigned formal leadership responsibility (Hoch and Dulebohn, 2017).

Kickul and Neuman (2000), stated that many group researchers have known that emergent leadership influences teamwork. The influence of emergent leadership can be influenced by many factors, such as personality traits (e.g. Kenny and Zaccaro, 1983; Lord et al., 1986; McCauley, 1990), intelligence (Lord et al., 1986 and Kickul and Neuman, 2000), verbal non-verbal communication (Taggar et al., 1999; Hackman and Johnson, 2000; Yoo and Alavi, 2004) and being task-oriented (Bass, 1990; Taggar et al., 1999). Hollander (1985) suggested that emergent leadership has a positive effect on a group's performance. His rationale was that groups have heightened expectations of emergent leaders. A "social exchange" process is thought to occur in which emergent leaders are expected to produce favorable outcomes for the group in return for being acknowledged as the leader (Souza and Klein, 1995). In recent decades, emergent leadership has been viewed as visionary leadership and its popularity has grown among leadership scholars (e.g. Schneider and Goktepe, 1983; Collins and Porras, 1994; Kotter, 1996).

Yoo and Alavi (2004) examined emergent leadership in seven virtual teams among 63 senior US government agency executives using computer-mediated communication (CMC). This was analyzed and the results showed that the emergent leaders were dominant (over 55%) and that they sent out significantly more task-oriented messages.

Laszlo Bock, the Vice President of Google People Operations in the New York Times newspaper on February 24th 2014, explained that the Grade Point Average (GPA) is not following the proposal for recruitment and that test values are not beneficial. The most important thing is to find talents in a

company that can have and opposes a big idea for the organization. Laszlo Bock also explained to Thomas Friedman of the New York Times about the human resources that Google sought; they were people who had an emergent leadership spirit. Laszlo Bock stated that while all bosses are supposed to lead and have leadership roles, there's no guarantee that they will have the best ideas and motivate their employees to innovate. Bosses are assigned leaders; emergent leaders are the ones who aspire and are respected and followed accordingly. When they have a smart idea, they raise their hands. They have responsible egos and they don't have to come up with the winning idea or the final plan in all circumstances.

Research on emergent leadership can be a positive predictor in terms of improving team performance and it has been studied by many experts outside of Indonesia in various contexts including business, industry, university, military, and classrooms. However, in Indonesia itself, the study research about emergent leadership has been limited. This research deals with the measuring of emergent leadership by developing a new conceptual model with a strong literature base, where after the criteria and constructs have been validated statistically.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership

Leadership is the two-way process of influence between a leader and the other members of a group. The main purpose of leadership is to organize and direct the group towards the attainment of mutual goals on a particular task (Neubert and Taggar, 2004). Maxwell (1997) states that leadership is an activity used to influence the behavior of people to prompt them to work together towards a particular goal that they want. Bass and Bass (2011) defined leadership as the interaction of two or more people in a group structured towards the situation of the members' perceptions and expectations. Yukl (2013) argued that leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, including the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to ac-

complish shared objectives. From the above opinions, it can be said that the core features of leadership include the process of influencing individuals or groups to achieve their common goals.

5

Emergent Leadership

An emergent leader is an individual who is not assigned to a leadership position and who has the same status as other team members initially. They gradually emerge as a leader through the support and acceptance of the team over a while (Acton et al., 2019). The leadership that emerges is informal because it is not predetermined by outside management nor is it formally formed by the team (Gaudencio, 1998). An emergent leader appears when a compilation of other people considers someone to be the most decisive among the group. The leaders accept the roles given by others who support and influence the group members' views and they accept direction as the desired and appropriate leader (Northouse, 2013).

Carte et al. (2006) identified the emergence of leadership in small groups through verbal and non-verbal information. Emerging leadership correlates positively between nonverbal behavior and being perceived as dominant, the person who talks the most. According to Hoch and Dulebohn (2017), some of the research of emergent leaders has examined it in various contexts such as in team-based environments associated with performance (Gupta et al., 2010), traditional organization settings (Judge and Piccolo, 2004), self-managing teams (Manz and Sims, 1987), and small group settings (Kickul and Neuman, 2000; Neubert and Taggar, 2004). Perception leadership in the group members can be measured using a set of Likert-type scales or semantic differential items on a questionnaire (Hollander, 1980; Lord and Alliger, 1985; Yoo and Alwi, 2004).

Most researchers examined the emergent leadership process in virtual teams because, in the virtual team, the members of the team do the task with no prior assigned or designated leaders in the beginning. They must work together as a team. Virtual teams are known as a Geographically Dispersed Team (GDT), which is a group of individuals who

work across time, space, and organizational boundaries with links strengthened by different kinds of new communication technology like web conferences, webcasting, email, and voice calls to accomplish a specific task or project (Robinson, 2006; Hoch and Dulebohn, 2017). On the other hand, some of the researchers found that in the non-virtual team, the certain kinds of social capital and cultural capi-

tal that individuals have are discernable through face-to-face interpersonal communication. In the virtual group environment, there is a lack of social presence, which is a type of cultural capital that cannot be perceived by other members. Many of the constructs which support the emergent leadership characteristics have been found in the previous research as in Table 1.

Table 1. The Characteristics of Emergent Leadership Model in the Previous Research

Dimension	Sub-Dimension	Indicator	Key References
Personality Trait Perspective	Extroversion	sociable, talkative, assertive, activeness, cheerfulness, optimisticgregarious, friendly, and outgoing	Taggar et al. (1999), Kickul and Neuman (2000), Judge, Bono, Ilies, and Gerhardt (2002), Druskat dan Pescosolido (2006), Sanchez et.al. (2010),
	¹⁹ Openness to experience	imaginative, cultured, curious, original, broad-minded, intelligent, creative, complex, refined, sophisticated	Taggar et al. (1999), Kickul and Neuman (2000), Judge, Bono, Ilies and Gerhardt (2002), Druskat dan Pescosolido (2006), (Hoch and Dulebohn,(2017)
Personality Trait Perspective	Agreeableness	trust, morality, altruism, cooperation, sympathy, modesty	McCaulley (1990), Kickul and Neuman (2000), Yoo and Alavi (2004), Judge, Bono, Ilies and Gerhardt (2002), Hoch and Dulebohn,(2017)
	Conscientiousness	Reliable or dependable, careful or thorough, responsible or dutifulness, organized and plan full hardworking and perseverance, achievement-oriented, self-efficacy, orderliness, self-discipline, ambitious or enthusiastic	²¹ Barrick and Mount 1991; Digman,1990), Kickul and Neuman (2000)), Yoo and Alavi (2004).
Cognitive Ability	Interpersonal KSA's	¹⁵ conflict resolution KSA's, collaborative problem-solving KSA's, and communication KSA's	Steven and Campion (1994), Kickul and Neuman (2000), Misiolek and Heckman (2005), Gupta et al. (2010).
	Self-Management KSA's	performance management, planning and coordinating	Steven and C ²⁰ ion (1994), Kickul and Neuman (2000), Hackman, M.Z and Johnson, C.E. (2000).

METHOD

Data Collection

The data collected in this study through a survey in the context of a structured and closed questionnaire focused on a sample of individuals representing the population. The population consisted of full-time employed individuals who worked with the team in Jakarta, Banten, and West Java, Indonesia.

The questionnaire was developed from the literature study and they selected employees to indicate the importance of the 6 emergent leadership constructs by asking them to answer the 60 measuring criteria concerning emergent leadership. The questionnaire used a 5-point Likert scale to indicate the traits and perceptions related to emergent leadership. A total of 350 questionnaires were administered independently by the researcher both online and offline to the respondents.

Data Analysis

This study used a quantitative exploratory method and a deductive analysis using a framework derived from the characteristic of behavioral emergent leadership theory. According to Imandin (2014), to analyze the data, the following statistical procedures and decision criteria were used:

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). Due to its exploratory nature, factor loadings of 0.4 and higher were considered to validate the items that measured each of the MI's business success influences (Field, 2007).

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin's (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was utilized to ensure that the sample used was adequate. Field (2007) suggested that a KMO value of 0.6 should be the minimum acceptable value if exploratory factor analysis is considered. These values are regarded to be mediocre while more favorable values are between 0.7 and 0.8. Values between 0.8 and 0.9 are very favorable while ultimately, values above 0.9 are superb.

Bartlett's test of sphericity was used to determine if the data was suitable to employ in multivariate statistical analysis. This study followed the advice by Field (2007) and it set a maximum va-

lue of 0.005. Values below 0.005 signify that the data is indeed suitable for the multivariate statistical analysis, in this case, exploratory factor analysis.

The variance explained by the factor analysis serves as an indicator to determine the importance of each of the constructs to measure the Emergent Leadership. Field (2007), indicated that a variance of 60% or higher is regarded as being a good fit for the data. This study aimed to achieve a good fit to the data, thus it aimed to achieve 60% of variance per factor.

The reliability of the emergent leadership was measured with Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The satisfactory reliability coefficients exceed 0.70 (Field (2007)). However, a secondary lower reliability coefficient was set at 0.58 because, according to Cortina (1993) in Field (2007), he confirmed in his research that when ratio and interval scales are used (such as the Likert scale used in this questionnaire), it does warrant a lower reliability coefficient.

Statistical Validation

Each emergent leadership variable was validated by calculating the KMO value and by using Bartlett's tests of sphericity. The variance was explained by the specific construct in the factor analysis and by the reliability of the specific construct. Besides, the measuring criteria with factor loadings below 0.40 were omitted from the analysis while strong dual-loading criteria were also omitted because of their dualistic nature (Fields, 2013). This method also determined if all of the measuring criteria loaded as one factor, meaning that the criteria can measure the specific construct as one construct. In cases where more than one factor was identified, the sub-factors were identified and labeled as individual sub-factors of the specific construct (Fields, 2013).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Exploratory Factor Analysis

The questionnaire sheet was conducted to 350 respondents and the total returned is 315 respon-

dents. After being measured through descriptive analysis, the respondents who had a lower score than 3.4 were eliminated²⁵ from the study. Following this, 300 respondents were included in the explor-

atory analysis test. The results related to the exploratory factor analysis have been explained in table 2 below.

Table 2. Exploratory Factor Analysis Result Test, Reliability and Variance Explained

Construct	Sub-Construct	KMO	Barlet	Cronbach Alpha	Variance Expl.
Extroversion	Dominant, Friendly Egocentrics	0.794	0.000	0.810	54.589%
Openness to Experience	Intelligence to Creativity Open-minded Experienced	0.789	0.000	0.719	57.933%
Agreeableness	Caring Positive Vibes	0.782	0.000	0.702	47.367%
Conscientiousness	Conscientiousness Good planner Discipline	0.842	0.000	0.811	59.141%
Interpersonal KSA's Performance	Team Player Communicative	0.912	0.000	0.900	62.123%
Management KSA's	Performance Management	0.882	0.000	0.859	54.898%

Extroversion

The analysis of the construct dealing with extroversion showed that none of the statements should be omitted from the analysis. This is because all of the factor loadings are above 0.5. Based on the analysis result test above, the KMO value is 0.794 which is more favorable. Bartlett's test is 0.000 and the value of variance is 54.58%. This is moderate. Besides, the factor seemed to be very reliable by looking at the alpha coefficient of 0.81. From the 7 indicator questions, the *extroversion* construct was stated to be made up of 3 components with sub-constructs. Each factor component can be named: (1) dominant, (2) friendly, and (3) egocentric. For component (1), *dominant*, this showed in questions number 5 (I participated actively), 6 (I like to speak up), 7 (I like to take control), 8 (I like to lead), 9 (I have a busy and fast life) and 10 (I am energetic and I often feel positive emotions). In general, from those questions, *dominant* can be interpreted as a talkative person or someone who participates actively. Component (2) *friendly* is shown in question number 1 (I find it easy to social-

ize), 3 (I like to amuse others), 11 (I like being accompanied), and 12 (I am friendly and enjoyable). In component (3) *egocentric*, is shown in question number 2 (I love large parties and I enjoy being part of a crowd) and 4 (I like to be the center of attention).

Openness to Experience

Based on the test results of the analysis above, all factor loads are above 0.5, so it shows a variant of 57.933% and is classified as moderate. Further analysis showed that from the 11 questions, the sub-construct consists of 4 components. (1) *Intelligence* is the indicator contained in question number 18 (I can acquire and apply my knowledge and skills), 19 (I find it easy to learn and understand), 20 (I love creative work), and 21 (complex work does not make me give up). (2) *Creativity* is found in questions 13 (I like showing my imagination and creativity), 14 (I love cultured), and 15 (I like ask more questions). (3) *Open-minded* was examined in questions 16 (I like the original) and 17 (I am tolerant or liberal). (4) *Experienced* was found in questions 22 (I treat

people as being refined and with respect) and 23 (I like to reveal a great deal of world). *Intelligence* (1) refers to a person who can learn knowledge and skills. This can be acquired and applied in a new situation or complex situation. *Creativity* (2) is expressed as a person who is imaginative and curious. They have a sense of culture. *Open-minded characters* (3) are people who have tolerant or liberal views. *Experienced* (4) characters are revealed by a person who has experience in worldly matters and who treats a person with respect.

Agreeableness

The construction analysis above shows that no statement should be omitted from the analysis because all load factors are above 0.5. The KMO and Bartlett test results is a favorable value. The construct of agreeableness consists of two sub-factors; (1) *caring* and (2) *positive vibes*. The caring factor (1) states that there is a sense of caring for the team working and working together. Regarding factor no (2) positive vibrations, this refers to someone who has positive energy towards others because of trust and sympathy. The subfactor of *caring* is contained in questions 26 (I could rely on the people), 27 (no need manipulation in socializing), 28 (like helping others), and 29 (I like teamwork). However, the indicator for the sub-factor positive vibes is contained in questions 24 (I easily trust others), 25 (I am usually considerate of another's feelings), 30 (I easily sympathize), and 31 (I am a modest person).

Conscientiousness

Based on the analysis result test above, the KMO and Bartlett's test result and Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the construct *conscientiousness* are up to 0.80. This showed a very favorable value. However, the variance explained at 54.89% is mediocre. The analysis results showed that the construct of behavioral engagement consisted of three sub-factors: (1) consciousness, (2) good planning, and (3) discipline. *Consciousness* characteristics are found in 35 (I work responsibly), 36 (I do work in an organized manner), 37 (I am a hard worker), and 38 (I am achievement-oriented). These express that the person who has a good sense of awareness

is working hard, is responsible, has goals and they are self-efficient.

Interpersonal KSA's

After conducting the analysis, the KMO value was 0.91, and Bartlett's test was 0.000. It thus showed superb values. The variance explained value is 62.12% and the factor also returned a high Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.90, signifying high reliability. This denotes that the *Interpersonal KSA's* construct is the highest out of the other variables. None of the questions were discarded because they all loaded onto the two sub-factors, those are team player and communicative. The interpersonal KSA's factor expressed that teamwork in Indonesia considers the contributions such as sharing information, communicating effectively, listening carefully, allowing everyone to talk and convey ideas, and accepting criticism well.

Performance Management KSA's

The analysis of performance management KSA's showed that no statements should be omitted from the analysis because all of the factor loadings were above 0.5. The KMO and Bartlett's test result of the construct interpersonal is 0.882 and it has an alpha coefficient of 0.000. This is very favorable for reliability. Only one factor was identified by the factor analysis. The factor was labeled *Performance management KSA's*. Although the variance explained at 54.898% is mediocre, the value of the alpha coefficient is 0.859 which denotes the satisfactory reliability of the coefficients as it exceeds 0.70. Performance management KSA's sub-construct explains that the team member can facilitate good performance by cooperating to get the team goal. Everyone contributes to the team, encourages all members, and has responsibility for their respective duties. KSA performance management is one of the variables of self-management that involves knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSA) (Steven and Campion, 1994 and Kickul and Neuman, 2000).

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Result

After the exploratory factor analysis, this was continued by confirmatory factor analysis to con-

firm that each dimension was formed properly as in Table 3.

Table 3. Confirmatory Factor Analysis Result

1 KMO, Bartlett's test, Reliability and Variance Explained					
Construct	Indicator	KMO	Barlet	Cronbach Alpha	Variance Expl.
Dominant	- take control - lead, busy, - energetic	0.706	0.000	0.785	56,820%
Friendly	- easy to socialize - like amuse people - friendly	0.617	0.000	0.608	56.463%
Egocentric	- love large parties - be a center of attention	0.500	0.000	0.672	75,336%
Intelligence	- able to acquire and apply knowledge and skill, easily to understand with new situations	0.645	0.000	0.65	59,143%
Creativity	- like imagination, creativity, cultured - like asking	0.61	0.000	0.52	51.54%
Open-minded	- like original or authentic - tolerant and liberal	0.500	0.000	0.412	63.626%
Experienced	- treat people polite - experienced in worldly matters	0.500	0.000	0.359	61.254%
Caring	- no need for manipulation in socializing, honest and sincere - willing to help - like cooperation	0.59	0.000	0.57	56.19%
Positive Vibes	- trust, considerate - sympathy	0.633	0.000	0.925	54.190%
Conscientiousness	- work responsibly - work in an organized - work hard - oriented achievement	0.806	0.000	0.806	55.826%
Good planner	- reliable person - carefully - detail	0.59	0.000	0.73	65.46%
Discipline	- able to do self-discipline, - desire to achieve something	0.500	0.000	0.372	61.434

Team Player	Team member: - considered the contributions of all team, giving advice - communicate effectively, - shared information - listen carefully	0.884	0.000	0.888	60.319%
Communicative	- the team avoided unnecessary, confrontations - constructive team - no personally threaten, - tried to find a solution - talked and conveyed ideas, - accepted criticism	0.754	0.000	0.771	59.976%
Performance Management	Team suggested: - appropriate and attainable goals - make sure everyone contributed - encouraged members and gave members feedback on their performance	0.882	0.000	0.859	54.858%

Dominant

As in Table 3, the first dimension of emergent leadership is dominant with a KMO value of 0.70, Bartlett's test result of 0.000, Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.785, and variance of 56.82%. Based on these results, dominant can be used as a construct to measure emergent leadership with the following indicators: the desire to take control, leading, busy habits and has an energetic spirit. This variable is appropriate as a construct to use to measure emergent leadership based on the research by Kickul and Neuman (2000). Also, Sanchez et al. (2010) concluded that an emergent leader is perceived as a dominant person who talks the most and has more interruptions.

Friendly

Friendly is the second construct used to measure emergent leadership with a KMO value of 0.617 and Bartlett's test result of 0.000. Both the KMO and Bartlett's tests revealed favorable results. The construct measurement of friendly had a variance of 56.463% and this is mediocre, but Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.608, which shows favorable reliability. Friendliness is very important in emer-

gent leadership because as an emergent leader, they must have a good influence on their team member. If a leader is not friendly, then of course no one will approach him. Friendliness is a trait that can be a variable of emergent leadership (McCrae and Costa, 1992).

Egocentrics

Egocentrics is the third indicator which has the following indicators: love large parties and being the center of attention. The KMO and Bartlett's test values were 0.500 and 0.000 respectively and these results are mediocre but the variance was 75.336%, which is higher and is regarded to be a good fit with the data. Besides, the value of Cronbach's alpha was 0.672, which is favorable. Based on these results, *egocentric* is a construct that can be used to measure emergent leadership.

Intelligence

The fourth dimension of emergent leadership is *intelligence* with a KMO value of 0.645, Bartlett's test result of 0.000, a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.785 and the variance explained was 59.143%. Based on these results, the KMO and the

alpha coefficient are favorable and the variance is mediocre. Therefore *intelligence* is a construct that can be used to measure emergent leadership with the following indicators: the desire to take control, leading, busy habits, and has an energetic spirit. Lord et al. (1986) and Kickul and Neuman (2000) stated that one of the traits of emergent leadership is *intelligence*. *Intelligence* is related to cognitive ability and it is very important for a leader because if the leader doesn't have knowledge and skills, then the team members will underestimate them.

Creativity

The fifth variable was *creativity* with a KMO value of 0.61, Bartlett's test result of 0.000, Cronbach's value of 0.52, and the variance was 51.54. These results show favorable liability. Kickul and Neuman (2000) stated that creativity is one of cognitive ability and it is needed, especially for working. Usually, a creative person likes giving a new idea based on their imagination. Therefore, *creativity* is a construct to measure emergent leadership using the following indicators: imagination, creativity, cultured, and asking.

Open-Minded

The sixth variable is *open-minded*. The KMO value is 0.500 with Bartlett's test value of 0.000 and a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.412, which is mediocre but the variance of 63.626 % is very favorable. Based on the results, *open-mindedness* is a construct that can be used to measure emergent leadership with the following indicators; a person who has a tolerant or liberal view and who is original or authentic. The *open-minded* variable is very important for emergent leadership because a leader must have another opinion or view to developing something

Experienced

The seventh variable has the indicators of the person has to experience in worldly matters and they treat people politely. The KMO value was 0.500 with Bartlett's test result showing as 0.000 with a variance of 61.254 %. These results favor liability

but the result of the alpha coefficient was 0.359, which is low.

Caring

From the analysis, the eighth variable is *caring*. Because the KMO result of 0.59, Cronbach's of 0.57, and the variance of 56.19%, it is favorable as a construct to measure emergent leadership through the following indicators: no need to manipulate when socializing, being honest and sincere, willing to help others and liking cooperation.

Positive Vibes

The ninth variable is *positive vibes* with a KMO value of 0.633 with Bartlett's test result of 0.000. The variance was 54.190% which is mediocre but Cronbach's coefficient of 0.925 showed high significant reliability. The indicators are trust, considerate, and sympathy. Positive vibes are the positive emotional atmosphere of a person that can positively influence the people around them with their body language and social interactions.

Conscientiousness

From the analysis, the tenth variable is *conscientiousness* with a KMO value of 0.80, and Bartlett's test result of 0.000. It showed as being of very favorable value. The variance explained that 55.826% is mediocre but the result of the Cronbach's coefficient is 0.806 and this is satisfactory concerning the reliability of the coefficients. Based on the previous research (Kickul and Neuman, 2000; Yoo and Alavi, 2004), they confirmed that conscientiousness is one of the variables of emergent leadership. The *conscientiousness* variable is a construct used to measure emergent leadership with the following indicators: working responsibly, organized, working hard, and oriented toward achievement.

Good Planner

From the analysis, the eleventh variable of a *good planner* is a construct used to measure emergent leadership with the following indicators: reliable person, careful and detail-oriented. This is due

to the KMO value of 0.597 and Bartlett's test result of 0.000. The variance is 65.465%, which is favorable. Cronbach's coefficient of 0.74 can be used as a measurement of the emergent leadership indicators.

Discipline

The researcher (Kickul and Neuman, 2000; Yoo and Alavi, 2004) expressed that the discipline variable is one of the characteristics of the conscientiousness variable. The discipline indicators are shown by being able to self-discipline and having the desire to achieve something. The KMO value was 0.500 with Bartlett's test result of 0.000. The variance was explained at 61.434% and so it has favorable reliability. However, the Cronbach coefficient of 0.372 is not reliable. This coefficient value needs to be measured by the next researcher.

Team Player

Based on the analysis, the team player is the fourteenth variable and the favorable KMO value of 0.884 indicates an adequate sample. Bartlett's test was also suitable at 0.000. The factor explains the variance of 60.319%, which is regarded to be a good fit for the data (Field, 2007). This factor is deemed to be very reliable with an alpha coefficient of 0.888. The team player variable is the second position variable, which influences teamwork. A team player is someone who not only orders the team members to do something but they also want to know the process, how the job is done and they have to get involved, at least to give support and to offer help if the members of the team find it difficult. This is a construct that can be used to measure emergent leadership with the following indicators: considering the contributions of all of the team, giving advice, communicating effectively, sharing information, and listening carefully.

Communicative

Based on the results of the analysis, the fifteenth variable is *communicative* and it has a KMO value of 0.754 and Bartlett's test value of 0.000. The variance explained at 59.976% is favorable

reliability and that the Cronbach coefficient of 0.771 is also very reliable. Based on the results of the analysis, measuring the communicative variables was expressed with the following indicator: the team must avoid unnecessary confrontations, they must be a constructive team, no-one should be personally threatened, they should try to find a solution by talking and conveying ideas and they should accept criticism. Mumford et al. (2007) concluded that communication skills are fundamental for a leader. Kickul and Neuman (2000) revealed that communication is one of the variables that can be used as a determinant of emergent leadership.

Performance Management KSA's

The result of *confirmatory performance management* KSA's (knowledge, skills, and abilities) variable was the same as the result of the *exploratory performance management* (KSAs). There was no need to do the confirmatory test because only one factor was identified by the factor analysis. Performance management KSA's was one of the variables used to measure the present emergent leadership and it showed that teamwork has appropriate and attainable goals. Everyone contributed, encouraged the members, and gave the members feedback on their performance. Performance management is the sixth variable and it can be a construct to measure emergent leadership. Kickul and Neuman (2000) also stated that the performance management variable is one of the determinant variables of emergent leadership and it has very specific knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) that are essential to the productive functioning of a work team.

CONCLUSIONS

The main objective of this study was to develop a theoretical model and to validate this model. The model can be used statistically to measure emergent leadership among full-time employees in Indonesia. The model also resulted in a validated questionnaire to measure emergent leadership. The questionnaire was tested and found to be valid to use. From the results of the exploratory and confirma-

tory factor analysis, it was found that both the Bartlett test and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value returned high values, thus signifying that the sample was adequate and that the data was suitable to perform factor analysis on. Furthermore, the constructs returned moderate cumulative variances. The reliability of the data employed in this measuring instrument was high (exceeding 00.8) for some of the constructs. The questionnaire used is a valid research tool and suitable to measure employee emergent leadership in Indonesia.

IMPLICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

This section refers to the weaknesses of this study. Some of the limitations contained in this study include that the correspondents of this research are heterogeneous, that they consist of various companies, that it involves different types of business, age, experience, job position, and job department. Besides, there is a possibility that the respondents did not fill in what they were truly like both on the day and when working in a team.

In Human Resource Management, having employees who have leadership potential is very important to develop the organization. How exactly do we know which of our employees is likely to be a good leader or the right person? Moreover, every leadership character is different. Having emergent leadership in the employee's personality is very good because many researchers have already studied that this leadership style can have a good influence on internal teamwork to help to develop the performance and goals of the team. This is due to the emergent leadership spirit having many good characteristics.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Because the results of the reliability of this study do not exceed 60%, it is better to do further research to get the maximum value. Besides, there are still many indicators that measure the variables forming emergent leadership. Further research can be carried out on specific research objects whether in one other company or industry or other organizations, whether it is examined following the field of

work, or whether it is viewed by gender to obtain more objective results.

REFERENCES

- Acton, B. P., Foti, R. J., Lord, R. G., and Gladfelter, J. A. 2019. *Putting Emergence Back in Leadership Emergence: A Dynamic, Multilevel, Process-Oriented Framework*. *Leadership Quarterly*, 30(1), 145–164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.07.002>.
- Anderson, C. and Brown, C. E. 2010. *The Functions and Dysfunctions of Hierarchy*. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 30, 55–89. DOI: 10.1016/j.riob.2010.08.002.
- Barrick, M. and Mount, M. 1991. *The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis*. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1–26.
- Bass, B. M. 1990. *The Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*. Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. and Bass, R. 2011. *The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*. Free Press.
- Blitz, D. 1988. *Emergent evolution: The Problem of Qualitative Novelty in the Evolutionary Process*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Carte, T. A., Chidambaram, L., and Becker, A. 2006. *Emergent Leadership in Self-Managed Virtual Teams: A Longitudinal Study of Concentrated and Shared Leadership Behaviors*. *Group Decision and Negotiation*, 15(4), 323–343. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10726-006-9045-7>.
- Cogliser, C. C., Gardner, W. L., Gavin, M. B., and Broberg, J. C. 2012. *Big Five Personality Factors and Leader Emergence in Virtual Teams' Relationships with Team Trustworthiness: Member Performance Contributions and Team Performance*. *Group and Organization Management*, 37(6), 752–784.
- Collins, J. C. and Porras, J. I. 1994. *Built to last: Successful Habits of Visionary Companies*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Digman, J. M. 1990. *Personality structure: Emergence of the Five-Factor Model*. In *Annual Review of Psychology* (Vol. 41, pp. 417–440). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.
- Druskat, V. U. and Pescosolido, A. T. 2006. *Chapter 2 The Impact of Emergent Leader's Emotionally Competent Behavior on Team Trust, Communication, Engagement, and Effectiveness*. *Research on Emotion in Organizations* 2:25–55. DOI: 10.1016/S1746-9791(06)02002-5.

- Field, A. 2007. *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS, 3rd ed.* London: Sage.
- Fields, Z. 2013. *A Conceptual Framework to Measure Creativity at Tertiary Educational Level*. Thesis – PhD. Potchefstroom: North-West University.
- Gaudencio, V. A. 1998. *Curriculum Planning for Better Schools*. Quezon City: Rex Book Store.
- Gupta, V. K., Huang, R., and Niranjana, S. 2010. *A Longitudinal Examination of the Relationship between Team Leadership and Performance*. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 17(4), 335-350.
- Hackman, M. Z. and Johnson, C. E. 2000. *Leadership: A Communication Perspective*. Prospect Heights, IL: IL: Waveland.
- Hoch, J. E. and Dulebohn, J. H. 2017. *Team Personality Composition, Emergent Leadership, and Shared Leadership in Virtual Teams: A Theoretical Framework*. Human Resource Management Review, 27(4), 678–693. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2016.12.012>.
- Hollander, E. P. 1980. *Leadership and Social Exchange Processes*. Social Exchange (pp. 103-118). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Hollander, E. P. 1985. *Leadership and Power*. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.). *Handbook of Social Psychology* (3rd ed). NY: Random House.
- Imandin, L. B. B. 2014. *Section 2. Management in Firms and Organizations Intellectual Capital in Organizations*. 12 (2010).
- Judge, T. A. and Piccolo, R. F. 2004. *Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analytic Test of their Relative Validity*. Journal of Applied Psychology, 89(5), 755.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., and Gerhardt, M. 2002. *Personality and Leadership: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review*. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 765–780.
- Kenny, D. A. and Zaccaro, S. J. 1983. *An Estimate of Variance Due to Traits in Leadership*.
- Kickul, J. and Neuman, G. 2000. *Emergent Leadership Behaviors: The Function of Personality*. Journal of Business and Psychology, 15(1), 27–51. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1023/A:1007714801558.pdf>.
- Kotter, J. P. 1996. *Leading Change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Lord, R. G. and Alliger, G. M. 1985. *A Comparison of Four Information Processing Models of Leadership and Social Perceptions*. Human Relations, 38(1), 47-65.
- Lord, R. G., de Vader, C. L., and Alliger, G. M. 1986. *A Meta-Analysis of the Relation between Personality Traits and Leadership Perceptions: An Application of Validity Generalization Procedures*. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71(3), 402–410. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.402.
- Manz, C. C. and Sims Jr, H. P. 1987. *Leading Workers to Lead Themselves: The External Leadership of Self-Managing Work Teams*. Administrative Science Quarterly, 106-129.
- Maxwell, J. C. 1997. *Leadership 101: Inspirational Quotes & Insights for Leaders*. Honor Books.
- McCaulley, M. H. 1990. *The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and Leadership*. Leadership Library of America.
- McCrae, R. R. and Costa, P. T., Jr. 1997. *Conceptions and Correlates of Openness to Experience*. In R. Hogan, J. Johnson, & S. Briggs (Eds.). *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 825–847). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Misiolek, N. and Heckman, R. 2005. *Patterns of Emergent Leadership in Virtual Teams*. Proceedings of the 38th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, 1-10. DOI: 10.1109/hicss.2005.486.
- Mumford, T. V., Campion, M. A., and Morgeson, F. P. 2007. *The Leadership Skills Strataplex: Leadership Skill Requirements across Organizational Levels*. The Leadership Quarterly, 18(2), 154-166.
- Neubert, M. J. and Taggar, S. 2004. *Pathways to Informal Leadership: The Moderating Role of Gender on the Relationship of Individual Differences and Team Member Network Centrality to Informal Leadership Emergence*. Leadership Quarterly, 15(2), 175–194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.02.006>.
- Northouse, Peter G. 2013. *Kepemimpinan: Teori dan Praktik*. Jakarta: PT. Indeks Permata Puri Media.
- Robinson, V. M., Lloyd, C. A., and Rowe, K. J. 2008. *The Impact of Leadership on Student Outcomes: An Analysis of The Differential Effects of Leadership Types*. Educational Administration Quarterly, 44(5), 635-674.
- Sanchez-Cortes, D., Aran, O., Mast, M. S., and Gatica-Perez, D. 2010. *Identifying Emergent Leadership in Small Groups Using Nonverbal Communicative Cues*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1891903.1891953>.
- Schneider, C. E. and Goktepe, J. R. 1983. *Issues in Emergent Leadership: The Contingency Model of Leadership, Leader Sex, Leader Behavior*. In H. H. Blumberg, A. P. Hare, V. Kent, and M.F. Daview (Eds.). *Small Groups and Social Interactions* (Vol. 1), Chichester, England: Wiley.
- Taggar, S., Hackett, R., and Saha, S. 1999. *Leadership*

- Emergence in Autonomous Work Teams: Antecedents and Outcomes*. Personnel Psychology 52, 899-926.
- Yoo, Y. and Alavi, M. 2004. *Emergent Leadership in Virtual Teams: What Do Emergent Leaders Do?* Information and Organization, 14(1), 27-58.
- Yukl, G. 2013. *Leadership in Organizations Global Edition*. Pearson Education. [Online]. From: <http://www.mylibrary.com.escweb.lib.cbs.dk?ID=523690>

B2 Kepangkatan

ORIGINALITY REPORT

25%
SIMILARITY INDEX

24%
INTERNET SOURCES

10%
PUBLICATIONS

%
STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1 repository.nwu.ac.za **10%**
Internet Source

2 jurnaljam.ub.ac.id **5%**
Internet Source

3 G. de Souza. "Emergent Leadership in the Group Goal-Setting Process", Small Group Research, 11/01/1995 **1%**
Publication

4 www.washingtonpost.com **1%**
Internet Source

5 epdf.pub **1%**
Internet Source

6 www.cipmlk.org **1%**
Internet Source

7 www.julia-hoch.com **1%**
Internet Source

8 research-api.cbs.dk **1%**
Internet Source

9

Yoo, Y.. "Emergent leadership in virtual teams: what do emergent leaders do?", Information and Organization, 200401

Publication

<1 %

10

journals.plos.org

Internet Source

<1 %

11

Suparak Suriyankietkaew. "Emergent Leadership Paradigms For Corporate Sustainability: A Proposed Model", Journal of Applied Business Research (JABR), 2012

Publication

<1 %

12

www.scribd.com

Internet Source

<1 %

13

ejurnal.ung.ac.id

Internet Source

<1 %

14

faculty.psau.edu.sa

Internet Source

<1 %

15

citeseerx.ist.psu.edu

Internet Source

<1 %

16

infoscience.epfl.ch

Internet Source

<1 %

17

www.stfrancis.edu

Internet Source

<1 %

18

pratchco.com

Internet Source

<1 %

- | | | |
|----|---|------|
| 19 | repository.up.ac.za
Internet Source | <1 % |
| 20 | www.tandfonline.com
Internet Source | <1 % |
| 21 | Gianpaolo Abatecola, Gabriele Mandarelli, Sara Poggesi. "The personality factor: how top management teams make decisions. A literature review", Journal of Management & Governance, 2011
Publication | <1 % |
| 22 | Paul Ziek, Stacy Smulowitz. "The impact of emergent virtual leadership competencies on team effectiveness", Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 2014
Publication | <1 % |
| 23 | archive.org
Internet Source | <1 % |
| 24 | core.ac.uk
Internet Source | <1 % |
| 25 | dergipark.org.tr
Internet Source | <1 % |
| 26 | lib.tkk.fi
Internet Source | <1 % |

Exclude quotes On

Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches

< 1 words

ggul

Universitas

Esa Unggu

Universitas