1994

The experiences of women leading in an all-women's residence hall: a qualitative study

Becki Sue Elkins Nesheim
Iowa State University

The experiences of women leading in an all-women's residence hall: A qualitative study

by

Becki Sue Elkins Nesheim

A Thesis Submitted to the

Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department: Professional Studies in Education
Major: Education (Higher Education)

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1994

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people contributed to the completion of this research project by offering their assistance and support. To each of them, I offer my deepest gratitude and appreciation. Specifically, I would like to thank:

- the respondents, for willingly sharing their time and experiences.

- my thesis committee (Drs. Virginia Arthur, Ann Marie Fiore, Kathy Hickok, Daniel Robinson, and Elizabeth Whitt), for their interest, suggestions, and challenges. Special thanks also go to Ginny Arthur for her everpresent support throughout the research process.

- the ISU Department of Residence and Women's Center staffs.

- Robin Shaffer, for serving as a peer mentor and offering constructive criticism and a listening ear. Most importantly, for sharing her friendship and helping me keep my perspective.

- my family (Bob and Susie Elkins, Troy Elkins), for their support, encouragement, and love. I especially would like to thank my parents for teaching me the value of education and providing me educational opportunities.

- my grandmothers, Gladys Elkins and Flora Barnett, and my mother, Susie Elkins, for inspiring my interest in women's contributions to society.

- my partner, Jeff Elkins Nesheim, for believing in me and rowing with me when the water was too wide.

- my major professor, Liz Whitt, for her tireless effort in reading and critiquing these pages. In particular, I owe her my most sincere thanks for believing in me when I did not believe in myself and for gently guiding me through the research process.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Introduction

> It is becoming evident . . . that educational institutions are adopting the posture that leaders are made, not born. Currently, there is a growing recognition that leadership is composed of a philosophical outlook which manifests itself in a series of actions that can be encouraged, fostered, and taught. (Bennett & Shayner, 1988, p. 29)

As colleges and universities begin to embrace the position that leaders are made, more emphasis must be placed on encouraging and teaching students to be leaders, rather than on relying on the idea that natural-born leaders will emerge. Educators have a responsibility to develop students' leadership potential by providing leadership training and by recruiting and supporting potential leaders (Guido-DiBrito & Batchelor, 1988).

Student organizations and activities in colleges and universities have the potential to offer students practical leadership experiences. Such activities offer students the opportunity to practice leadership and explore new roles, thereby contributing to the enhancement of their self-esteem (Guido-DiBrito & Batchelor, 1988). In fact, research (Guido-DiBrito & Batchelor, 1988) indicates that student activities and organizations serve as "a laboratory for leadership development in which students learn, are tested, succeed, and sometimes fail" (p. 51).

Statement of the Problem

The development of students' leadership potential requires that institutions of higher education recognize and create programs to address the diverse abilities, needs, and interests of student populations (Sagaria & Koogle,

1988). Specifically, researchers (Guido-DiBrito & Batchelor, 1988; Sagaria & Koogle, 1988; Shavlik, Touchton & Pearson, 1989) contend that institutions must do more to provide for women's needs, interests, and values. Because colleges and universities were established largely by men, they have traditionally reflected male values and expectations (Bennett & Shayner, 1988), creating a system in which men have served as the standard whereby women are evaluated (Pearson, Shavlik & Touchton, 1989). In other words, women students at coeducational institutions operate within systems that judge them based on male standards.

Research (Pearson et al., 1989; Guido-DiBrito & Batchelor, 1988; Sagaria, 1988) does, indeed, indicate that female and male leaders often possess different values and styles of leadership. Female leaders, for example, emphasize such characteristics as group affiliation, commitment, caring, interdependence and relationships (Bennett & Shayner, 1988), whereas male leadership styles stress power, competition, and independence (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Heller, 1982). Thus, women and men tend to bring differing values and expectations to leadership participation.

Despite the potential of student organizations and activities to provide for the leadership development of all students (Guido-DiBrito & Batchelor, 1988; Strand, 1983), many of these activities fail to address gender as an issue in the leadership development of women and men (Guido-DiBrito & Batchelor, 1988). Women and men participating in these programs receive the same treatment, without consideration for their potential differences. Given the predominance of male values at coeducational institutions, receiving similar treatment, in most

instances, means that women are treated according to male needs, interests and expectations.

At coeducational institutions, then, the organizations and activities that appear to be most beneficial to women are designed specifically for women (Sagaria, 1988). These single-sex programs emphasize women's leadership development, addressing the values which many women hold, and provide opportunities for women without requiring that they compete with men. The programs cited by women student leaders as benefiting their leadership development included sororities, women's studies, and women's centers (Sagaria, 1988).

Research on the benefits afforded women student leaders by participation in single-sex programs has not addressed the role of women's residence halls. If, as research indicates, single-sex programs at coeducational institutions provide for women's leadership development better than mixed-sex programs, what role do women's residence halls play in developing women's leadership potential?

The purpose of this study was to describe the leadership experiences of women leading in an all-women's residence hall. The specific objectives of the study were:

1. To understand and describe the experiences of women living in a single-sex house (floor) in a single-sex residence hall.

2. To examine whether these women articulated leadership styles described as models of feminine ways of leading.

3. To examine whether these women believed their leadership styles were supported by their house members, the Richardson Court Association student government, and the Department of Residence staff members.

To meet these objectives, the following questions guided the study:

1. How do the women describe leadership in general?
2. How do the women describe their present experiences as leaders?
3. What are the characteristics of their leadership styles?
4. How, if at all, do the Iowa State University Department of Residence staff members, the house cabinets, the house members, and the association assembly support and/or inhibit the women's styles of leadership?
5. What institutional policies and practices foster the leadership development of women?

Thesis Overview

The report is divided into four chapters. Chapter Two provides a review of the literature related to women's leadership experiences. The chapter includes a definition of leadership and an explanation of models of feminine ways of leading. The chapter also reviews the experiences of women students leading in single-sex and coeducational settings.

In the third chapter, the methods used to carry out the study are set forth. Specifically, the chapter explains the use of qualitative research methods and describes the data sources and procedures for data collection and analysis. The chapter ends with a discussion on the steps taken to establish the trustworthiness of the study.

Chapter Four offers a description of the setting of the study and of the respondents and reports the results of the study. The results are reported as themes with the respondents' actual words used to illustrate the key findings.

In Chapter Five, the results of the study are discussed and interpreted. Recommendations, based on the conclusions of the study, are offered for

administrators within the Department of Residence to review and consider. Recommendations for further research are also included.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature related to women's leadership experiences. The literature review moves from a definition of leadership to an explanation of current models of feminine ways of leading. Finally, women students' leadership experiences in single-sex settings and coeducational settings will be addressed.

Leadership Defined

Defining leadership is a task that has consumed many researchers' thoughts, efforts, and time. Despite the number of studies, papers, and books on leadership, researchers and practitioners have failed to agree on one definition of leadership (Burns, 1978).

Male-oriented leadership models have served as the predominant leadership models because leadership has been perceived in American culture as men's responsibility (Guido-DiBrito & Batchelor, 1988). Characteristics of male-oriented leadership include power, aggression, competition, and independence (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Heller, 1982).

Whereas some women's leadership styles can be described by male-oriented styles of leadership, many women's styles cannot be described by them. The values held by women often differ from those held by men, a phenomenon which affects leadership styles (Bennett & Shayner, 1988; Guido-DiBrito & Batchelor, 1988). Specifically, many women's styles of leading emphasize such characteristics as commitment, affiliation, human responsibility, and interdependence (Bennett & Shayner, 1988; Sagaria, 1988). Definitions of

leadership which emphasize such masculine characteristics as power and aggression fail to address characteristics and values that are descriptive of many women's leadership styles.

For the purposes of this study, Gardner's (1990) definition of leadership -- the "process of persuasion or example by which an individual (or leadership team) induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her followers" (p. 1) -- will be used. Gardner's vision of leadership involves aspects other than position, authority, and power, aspects which are typically associated with male-oriented leadership models. Rather, the many tasks of leaders include affirming diverse values, developing and maintaining group unity, motivating others, building trust, and empowering others, as well as balancing budgets, setting agendas, and ensuring the organization's functioning (Gardner, 1990).

Gardner's (1990) definition also recognizes many kinds of leaders and many styles of leadership, thereby acknowledging the leadership potential of all individuals. Seeking to explain the implications of diversity in leaders and styles, Gardner stated:

> Most of those seeking to develop young potential leaders have in mind one ideal model that is inevitably constricting. We should give young people a sense of the many kinds of leaders and styles of leadership, and encourage them to move toward those models that are right for them. (p. 5)

Thus, one model of leadership, which historically has been male-oriented, cannot account for all leaders and leadership styles. Rather than attempting to make all leaders fit within one model of leadership, then, leadership models should reflect the diverse styles and values of the individuals using them.

Models of Feminine Ways of Leading

As explained earlier, women and men may possess different styles of leadership, accentuating different values and characteristics (Guido-DiBrito & Batchelor, 1988). Many women's styles, for example, emphasize values such as interdependence, affiliation, caring, and commitment (Bennett & Shayner, 1988; Sagaria, 1988) whereas male-oriented leadership styles emphasize such values as power, authority, and aggression (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Heller, 1982).

Models of feminine ways of leading serve as alternatives to male-oriented models. Although some women, and not all men, lead according to male-oriented models, models of feminine ways of leading, in general, are more descriptive of women's leadership styles than male-oriented models. Models of feminine ways of leading recognize feminine leadership characteristics and values, such as collaboration, interdependence, affiliation, trust, and shared power (Bennett & Shayner, 1988; Josefowitz, 1980).

The models of feminine ways of leading include, among others, web of inclusion (Helgesen, 1990) and generative leadership (Sagaria, 1988). Both models acknowledge the differences and similarities between women's and men's styles of leading. The priority of both models, however, is to foster women's leadership potential.

The focus of the web of inclusion model of leadership is connection with other group members as opposed to hierarchy. Hierarchy places the person with the most authority at the top of a ladder and the person with the least authority at the bottom. In a hierarchical system of leadership, for example, the president stands apart from the rest of the group as the individual responsible for making decisions and taking risks for the group. Within this structure, each person is

aware of their place on the ladder and operates accordingly. Hierarchical concepts, according to Helgesen (1990), "have continued to influence institutional structures because they represent a particular manifestation of male psychology, meeting male needs for limits and boundaries on relationships . . . ." (p. 52). Thus, the emphasis on hierarchical structures addresses male needs for independence but fails to address the needs for interdependence and affiliation expressed by many women.

Unlike a hierarchical structure, the web of inclusion fosters a system of direct communication by "providing points of contact and direct tangents along which to connect" (Helgesen, 1990, p. 50). The leader is located in the center of the web, rather than at the top of a ladder, as is the case with a top-down leadership approach. The emphasis is on group affiliation and access to all members rather than individual achievement. The web "affirms relationships, seeks ways to strengthen human bonds, simplifies communications, and gives means an equal value with ends" (Helgesen, 1990, p. 52). A leader in such a system, for example, can communicate directly with all members of the group and strengthens interpersonal relationships by doing so. Rather than being the sole decision-maker for the group, the web leader involves group members through communication, emphasizing process as well as outcome.

Similarly, generative leadership exhibits a collaborative approach to leading (Sagaria, 1988). Defined as "person-oriented and devoted to enriching the lives of others by enhancing their capabilities and self-esteem" (Sagaria, 1988, p. 7), generative leadership makes the empowerment of other group members central to its purpose. Sagaria and Johnsrud (1988) described the generative leader as follows:

> Generative leaders work with participants; they do not look for followers. They value interdependence and work as leaders with apprentices to cultivate the leadership capacity of others. Thus, generative leaders have no investment in safeguarding their roles for their own ends or hoarding their insights. On the contrary, they share their experiences and take collective risks for the good of others. (p. 16)

Generative leadership, then, stresses working together, a process whereby leaders may learn from one another. Sagaria and Johnsrud (1988) used student organizations as an example to assert that generative leadership allows students to work together to achieve group goals. An illustration of this collaborative effort is the use of consensus rather than voting as a method of deciding various issues. The group members negotiate and compromise with one another until reaching a decision that is agreeable to all participants. Unlike voting, in which members either win or lose, this process of building consensus allows each member to contribute to the decision-making and to be satisfied, at least to some degree, with the outcome.

By facilitating connection among and empowerment of group members, feminine ways of leading provide individuals an alternative to the male-oriented models of leadership which stress power, authority, and aggression. Models of feminine ways of leading validate styles that emphasize connection, commitment, relationships, and caring (Bennett & Shayner, 1988; Helgesen, 1990). Thus, these models recognize the diversity in leaders and leadership styles, as indicated by Gardner (1990), and offer individuals a variety of approaches to leadership.

Student Leaders

Student organizations and activities provide students opportunities to develop and practice leadership skills. "Student activities and organizations play an especially critical role as a laboratory for leadership development in which students learn, are tested, succeed, and sometimes fail" (Guido-DiBrito & Batchelor, 1988, p. 51). Because of their laboratory-like setting, student organizations and activities should also provide students opportunities to explore various leadership models.

Women Student Leaders: Single-Sex or Coeducational Settings

Despite the potential benefits of student leadership, women students have not achieved equality with men students in leadership opportunities (Leonard & Sigall, 1989; Strand, 1983). Although women now constitute a majority of the nation's college student population (Hafner, 1989; Sagaria, 1988), research (Leonard & Sigall, 1989) indicates that, at coeducational institutions, men continue to hold the majority of elected student organization or student government positions. The reasons for this phenomenon include, among others, women receiving biased treatment and being intimidated by competitiveness, especially with men (Leonard & Sigall, 1989).

To understand the experiences of women student leaders, Sagaria (1988) surveyed women who participated in the 1987 National Conference for College Women Student Leaders and Women of Achievement. Sagaria found that "the most helpful programs for developing women's leadership seem to be those intended primarily or exclusively for women" (p. 9). Examples of the programs and activities cited by the respondents included sororities and women's studies, both of which "focus on supporting and affirming women's identity, aspirations,

and accomplishments" (p. 9). Women students perceived programs designed solely for women as not only providing them opportunities to lead but also as supporting their leadership styles.

Women's colleges appear to be more successful than coeducational institutions at facilitating the development of women's leadership. Women's colleges, by their very nature, provide women students with significant leadership opportunities. The environments of women's colleges may be better for women's leadership development because women's education and development are the priorities of these institutions (Pearson et al., 1989; Strand, 1983; Tidball, 1989).

An important consideration for women's leadership opportunities, perhaps, is that, at women's colleges, there are no male students with whom to compete for leadership positions. In a study addressing the value of women's colleges, Strand (1983) claimed that women students at coeducational institutions are not afforded the same opportunities as men to develop their leadership potential because the presence of men inhibits women's leadership development. For example, women students appear to be intimidated by the competitiveness of male students and also appear hesitant to assert themselves for fear of losing the approval of both male and female students (Leonard & Sigall, 1989).

Recent research (Astin, 1977, 1993; Guido-DiBrito & Batchelor, 1988; Sagaria, 1988) on the impact of women's colleges and coeducational institutions on women's leadership concluded that women students were not likely to pursue leadership positions when men were present. According to Astin (1993), women were more likely to achieve and hold leadership positions at women's colleges than at coeducational institutions. In fact, Astin (1993) asserted that the

increased likelihood of women attending women's colleges to participate in leadership activities is a direct result of the fact that these colleges are designed solely for women rather than a result of other characteristics such as size or private control. His research maintained that "the women's movement has not served to eliminate these differential effects between women's and coeducational institutions" (Astin, 1993, p. 325).

Women's change colleges substantiate the contentions about male presence. Change colleges are women's colleges that have begun to enroll men. Evidence (Lally, 1990) from these institutions indicates that men students hold leadership positions out of proportion to their enrollment numbers. For example, after four years as a coeducational institution, Goucher's student government president, co-editors of the student newspaper, president of the junior class, and editors of the yearbook and literary magazines were all men (Lally, 1990). In the past, of course, these positions were held by women students, affording them excellent opportunities to practice and improve their leadership skills. The suggestions that women students conformed to general society by voting for men and that women students' enabling nature allowed the men to dominate are among the explanations for what has happened at Goucher (Lally, 1990).

While the women's colleges provide the strongest example of women's leadership access and support, single-sex programs and activities within coeducational institutions have also been recognized for the potential leadership benefits to women students (Guido-DiBrito & Batchelor, 1988; Sagaria, 1988). In fact, research (Lockheed in Strand, 1983) indicates that women are equally as likely as men to assume leadership positions in coeducational settings only after

participating in single-sex leadership settings. Thus, at coeducational institutions, the importance of single-sex leadership opportunities for women must not be overlooked.

Conclusion

To provide for the leadership development of all students, colleges and universities are being called on by researchers (Bennett & Shayner, 1988; Guido-DiBrito & Batchelor, 1988; Sagaria, 1988) to expand their definitions of leadership to be more inclusive of the values and styles held by women students. For the purposes of this study, a definition of leadership that stressed empowering and motivating others, developing and maintaining group unity, and building trust as well as balancing budgets and setting agendas (Gardner, 1990) was used. This definition encompassed, rather than excluded, models of feminine ways of leading, as expressed by the web of inclusion and generative leadership.

Despite the fact that women's colleges appear, overall, to better provide for women's leadership development than coeducational institutions, single-sex leadership opportunities within coeducational colleges and universities have been highlighted for their potential benefits to women students. Researchers (Astin, 1993; Sagaria, 1988) have pointed to the importance of such single-sex programs as sororities and women's studies as providers for women's leadership development within coeducational institutions. What the research has failed to address, however, is the potential of the all-women's residence hall to provide opportunities for women's leadership development. The goal of this study was to begin to fill that void by describing the leadership experiences of women leading in an all-women's residence hall. The research methods used in this study, including the research questions, are described in Chapter Three.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the use of qualitative research methods in this study, including data sources and procedures for data collection and analysis. This chapter also outlines the steps taken to establish the trustworthiness of the study.

Qualitative Research Methods

Qualitative research methods were used to conduct this study. Qualitative research methods consist of techniques, such as interviewing and observation, which use the researcher as the instrument for collecting and analyzing data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The data collected and analyzed by these methods consist of words rather than numbers.

Qualitative research seeks depth in understanding, meaning that the focus of such research is to describe and explain the experiences of those involved (Merriam, 1988). The purpose of this study, which was approved by the Iowa State University Human Subjects Committee, was not to generalize from the findings, but, rather, to understand the experiences of women's leadership from the perspectives of the individuals actually experiencing it (Scott, 1991). Qualitative inquiry methods are used most appropriately when the reseacher is "interested in insight, discovery, and interpretation rather than hypothesis testing" (Merriam, 1988, p. 10). Rather than making predictions based on hypotheses, this study sought to understand women student leaders' experiences through their own words.

Data Sources

Data sources for this study were people and documents. Sampling was purposive in that I chose as data sources individuals and documents from which the most could be learned (Merriam, 1988). In other words, rather than using random sampling, I selected the data sources for this study based on the amount of information they could provide. For example, the respondents with the most information for this study were women student leaders involved in single-sex settings because they could speak directly to the experiences of women leading in single-sex settings. Criteria used for selection of the data sources are discussed in the specific data source sections.

Respondents

The respondents were selected from Maple Hall in the Richardson Court Residence Halls. Maple Hall was chosen as the site of the study because it is an all-women's residence hall. The Richardson Court Residence Halls were selected because they are the only residence hall group at Iowa State University which include single-sex residence halls.

The undergraduate residence halls in the Department of Residence operate what is referred to as the house system. The house system establishes each floor as its own student organization with its own governing body. Each house, viewed as an individual entity, has its own name and its own identifying personality. For instance, 1st floor Maple Hall is known as Cranor House, 2nd floor as Forbes House, and so on. Each house is governed by a house cabinet, consisting of a president, vice-president, treasurer, secretary, intramural chair, social chair, conduct representative, and programming board representative.

The house cabinet is advised by the house resident assistant, a Department of Residence staff member.

The criteria according to which the primary respondents of the study were selected were: (a) that they were women students, and (b) that they were holding the house cabinet position of either president, vice-president, or social chair on a single-sex house in a single-sex residence hall. The reasoning for the selection of these particular house cabinet positions will be discussed in the following paragraphs. Two students were selected in each position to provide a broader discussion of the experiences related to the positions. Although two students were selected in each position, one of the social chairs withdrew from the study. Thus, the study involved a total of five respondents.

The house president was selected because the person holding that position is viewed as the leader of the house. The house president is responsible for the functioning of the house cabinet, runs the house meetings, and attends the Presidents' Council meetings. The house cabinet is responsible for planning and carrying out house functions and activities. The Presidents' Council meetings consist of all the presidents in a residence hall and the hall director. A Department of Residence professional staff member, the hall director's responsibilities include supervising resident assistants who work with the house cabinets and working with various student government organizations. In an all-women's residence hall, the Presidents' Council consists only of women. Thus, a president of a women's house in an all women's residence hall interacts only with other women leaders, both on her house and at the Presidents' Council meetings. Leading only in single-sex settings, the presidents possessed a multitude of

experiences upon which to draw in their discussions of leading in an all-women's environment, enabling them to contribute significantly to this study.

The house vice-president assists the president in managing the house cabinet, runs house meetings in the absence of the president, and represents the house at association assembly meetings. The vice-president is referred to by Department of Residence materials as second in command, which requires a close working relationship with the president. The vice-presidents also are responsible for attending the weekly assembly meetings of the Richardson Court Association, the student leadership organization of the Richardson Court Residence Halls. The assembly represents the legislative body of the Richardson Court Association. Because the Richardson Court Association is a coeducational association in which both women and men hold leadership positions, the assembly meetings are coeducational. Therefore, the vice-presidents perform their duties in both single-sex and mixed-sex settings, allowing them to speak to leadership experiences in both settings. The vice-presidents, then, were selected because of their ability to share experiences within both single-sex and mixed-sex settings, as well as because of their role within the house cabinet and association governments.

Finally, the house social chair is responsible for conducting interest surveys, planning and promoting social activities, knowing and enforcing party policies, and getting people involved in house activities. The social chair is also responsible for helping find a brother floor for the house. The social chair leads primarily within the house but may have contact with social chairs from other houses when planning activities. Because of their involvement in creating and implementing activities for the house, social chairs are often viewed by house

members as an important part of the house cabinet. Social chairs were selected because of their level of involvement within the house and because of their interaction primarily in an all-women's setting. Their interaction, on a limited scale, with other social chairs, including men, also contributed to their selection.

To identify specific respondents, the hall director of Maple Hall was asked to identify two presidents, vice-presidents, and social chairs based on the following leadership criteria: (a) run meetings efficiently, accomplishing goals without wasting large amounts of time, (b) initiate and involve house members in house meetings and programs/activities, and (c) regularly attend house and hall or association meetings. As adviser to the Presidents' Council for Maple Hall, the hall director had biweekly contact with the house presidents, and thus was familiar with their leadership qualities. Vice-presidents and social chairs were identified by the hall director in part with the use of performance evaluations that house members had just completed. These evaluations asked house members to rate cabinet members on their involvement within the house and their commitment to carrying out their responsibilities. The hall director selected the best rated vice-presidents and social chairs as indicated by the evaluations.

The respondents in this study were not identified by name, either in the coding or reporting of the data, so as to maintain confidentiality. The respondents were also openly informed about the purposes of the research and how the findings would be used (see Appendix A). At the first interview, they were asked to sign a consent form (see Appendix B). If a respondent, at any stage of the research, chose to withdraw her participation, all raw data collected from her was returned to her.

Documents

Documents were used to obtain information about the departmental and house contexts in which the respondents led, to help determine whether these contexts were supportive of the women's leadership styles. For example, house position descriptions were used to determine whether individuals with certain styles of leading were preferred and/or valued over individuals with different styles of leading.

The documents were obtained from the Department of Residence, the Richardson Court Association, and the participating houses. These documents included The First 100 Years of Residential Housing at Iowa State University: 1868-1968, Richardson Court Association House President's Manual, and participating house constitutions. The purpose of reviewing such documents was to help guide the formation of interview questions for the respondents.

Data Collection

Qualitative research involves the simultaneous collection and analysis of data (Merriam, 1988). It is emergent in that information from the previously collected and analyzed data guide the future direction of the study (Merriam, 1988). For instance, the information gathered from a first interview guides the development of questions for a second interview. This allowed the researcher to determine the direction of further information gathering through the analysis of previously collected data (Merriam, 1988). In other words, as the data were collected and analyzed, they served to identify areas where further information was needed. Data collection occurred through the use of interviews.

Interviews

Interviews were conducted with each respondent to gain her perceptions of leadership in general and of her present leadership experience. Each respondent was interviewed individually four times for approximately sixty to ninety minutes. The respondents also participated in one focus group interview, which was scheduled between the first and second individual interviews. The purpose of the focus group interview was to generate discussion among the participants about their leadership situations and experiences, allowing the participants to explore their own perspectives as well as to respond to others.

A tape recorder was used to record interviews. Tapes from the interviews were transcribed verbatim. However, because of the time-consuming nature of the transcription process, an interview log was also kept, by which exact quotes from the taped interviews were recorded (Merriam, 1988). The purpose of the log was to capture the main points of the interviews in order to help direct further interview questions without having to wait for tape transcriptions to be completed. The log was completed by listening to a tape, recording important statements and ideas expressed by the respondents, and taking notes on such statements and ideas (Merriam, 1988).

Respondents were asked to answer questions regarding their views on leadership, their perceptions of their present positions, and their views on being women leaders in the residence hall system. The initial questions (1-7) were developed from the research questions. Questions were added throughout the interviewing process, including those intended to provide clarification.

1. Tell me about yourself and how you got to be where you are today. The purpose of this question was to get acquainted and learn more about the respondents.

2. What organizations and activities have you been involved in prior to your present house leadership position? This question was to elicit background leadership information from the respondents.

3. Are you presently involved in organizations and activities outside of your house cabinet? What positions, if any, do you hold in these organizations? Again, the purpose was to gather background leadership information.

4. Why did you choose to live in the residence hall (or association) that you are living in? Did you start in this location or move here from another floor/hall? The purpose of this question was to determine the respondents' motivation, or lack thereof, behind their residence hall selection.

5. When you hear the word "leadership," what do you think of? This question was intended to elicit characteristics the respondents would associate with leadership, thereby beginning to develop a leadership definition.

6. Picture someone whom you would consider to be an ideal leader. Describe that person. What characteristics do they have? What makes them an ideal leader? Why do you think so? This question allowed respondents to talk about characteristics they believed were important for a leader to possess. In this manner, they could construct a working definition of leadership, without actually having to define the concept.

7. Do you consider yourself to be a leader? Why/why not? How do you see yourself fitting into your picture of the ideal leader? The purpose of this

question was to determine the extent to which the respondents would describe themselves as leaders according to the definitions they had given.

8. Describe what it is like to be a leader in an all-female context. How is that different from or similar to leading in a coeducational context? Which context is more comfortable for you? These questions were designed to have the respondents think about the contexts in which they lead and their levels of comfort with those contexts.

9. Describe your house leadership position. The purpose here was to learn the responsibilities each respondent associated with their position.

10. Who or what influenced you to get involved in your house cabinet? Why did you become involved in leadership activities in your house rather than in other organizations? These questions addressed the respondents' house leadership motivation.

11. What were your expectations going into the position? This question was intended to assess what the respondents hoped to derive from their house leadership involvement.

12. Describe your initial goals for this position. This question addressed what the respondents intended to accomplish.

13. What do you like best (and least) about being a house leader? What do you get out of being a house leader? What does it cost you? The purpose of this question was to assess the perceived rewards and disadvantages of house leadership.

14. Describe your interactions with the cabinet. The purpose of this question was to learn more about the contexts in which the respondents were leading.

15. How, if at all, has the RCA student government helped your growth as a leader? How has the RCA staff helped your growth as a leader? These questions were designed to determine the amount of support the respondents believed they were receiving in their leadership development.

16. What have you learned about leadership by being a house leader? What would you like to learn about leadership? This question addressed the respondents' leadership development through their house leadership involvement.

17. What is your next leadership goal? How will your present position help you achieve that? This question assessed the respondents' leadership goals and motives.

18. Describe any leadership training that you have had. The purpose was to have the respondents reflect on their leadership development and learning through conferences, workshops, etc.

19. Look at the two lists of characteristics (see Appendix C). Which list most accurately describes your leadership style? Is one list more reflective of women's styles or men's styles of leadership? Is one leadership style more common than the other? These questions were designed to have the respondents evaluate leadership styles and the characteristics which define them as well as to determine their perceptions of the prevalence of certain leadership styles.

20. Your house vice-president tells you she is frustrated with Assembly meetings because the male members do not take her seriously. Describe how you would handle this situation. The purpose of this question was to determine how the respondents would help a cabinet member, whether they viewed the

issue of not being taken seriously as common, and whether they believed being a woman affected others' perceptions of their leadership abilities.

21. Maple Hall house elections have just taken place. As a former house leader, you've been asked to work with the elected leaders, helping them get adjusted and making sure that their needs are being met. Describe how you would approach this situation. The purpose of this question was to determine the respondents' beliefs about the needs of women student leaders and how they would address such needs.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted using the constant comparative method (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Data were "unitized" (p. 334) or separated into "chunks of meaning which come out of the data itself" (Marshall in Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 345). According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), a unit of data must possess two characteristics: (a) it must be heuristic, providing some understanding needed by the researcher, and (b) it must be "the smallest piece of information about something that can stand by itself . . . ." (p. 345). For the purposes of this study, a unit of data included any single statement, which could be as small as a phrase or as large as a paragraph, concerning the leadership experiences of women students (see Appendix D).

Each unit was entered on an index card and coded according to source, respondent type, and collection episode (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Because the study yielded approximately 2,000 units of data, coding the data in such a manner was important to being able to track, if necessary, the original source of the information. The units were coded in such a way, however, as to prevent the identification of the respondent by anyone other than me.

After all of the data were collected, intensive, or final analysis (Merriam, 1988) began. In final analysis, the units of data were placed into categories of likeness based on the concepts they addressed. The process used to categorize the data is outlined below.

1. The first card was read, its content noted, and then placed in an unnamed category.

2. The next card was compared with the first to determine whether the second unit of data was the same as or different from the first unit of data. If the second unit was the same as the first, it was placed in the same category. Otherwise, the second card was placed in a second unnamed category.

3. Comparison continued with each unit until all of the cards had been placed in a category. I sought to make categories "internally as homogeneous as possible and externally as heterogeneous as possible" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 349). The characteristics of the units within one category were as similar as possible while the characteristics separating categories were as distinguishable as possible. For example, a category of data addressing responsibility as a leadership characteristic should be distinguishable from a category addressing motivation. A complete listing of the category sets may be found in Appendix E through Appendix I.

4. Once all data units had been placed into categories, the categories were reviewed for overlap. The set of categories, then, was reviewed for possible relationships among categories. Categorization continued until larger themes encompassing the categories emerged from the data.

5. The conclusion of data categorization was based on the following criteria: exhaustion of sources, saturation of categories, and the emergence of regularities (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Trustworthiness

Efforts were taken to insure that the results of this study can be trusted. To establish trustworthiness in qualitative research, Lincoln and Guba (1985) asserted that three issues must be addressed: (a) the extent to which the findings of the research are credible to the respondents and the researcher, (b) the extent to which the findings of the research are applicable in other settings, or "transferable" (p. 297), and, (c) the extent to which the inquiry process is dependable and confirmable.

Credibility

The methods used in this study to establish credibility included triangulation, member checks, and peer debriefing, all of which are suggested by Lincoln & Guba (1985). Triangulation is a method wherein the researcher utilizes multiple data sources, methods, investigators, and/or theories to check the findings against one another (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In this study, multiple data sources were used. Multiple respondents were interviewed, both individually and in a focus group setting. Documents were also reviewed to check the constructs of the respondents as well as to guide future interview questions. The use of these sources allowed me to check the findings against one another for credibility.

The member check is a technique in which the researcher takes "data and interpretations back to the people from whom they were derived" to confirm their credibility (Merriam, 1988, p. 169). Member checks were carried out

throughout the duration of this study. At the end of each interview, and the beginning of subsequent interviews, I summarized what I believed I had heard from the respondents and asked that they either confirm or clarify my interpretations.

Peer debriefing was the final technique used to establish credibility. Peer debriefing is a technique in which colleagues review and comment on the research procedures and the findings as well as providing a sounding board for a researcher (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1988). A masters student in higher education served as peer debriefer for this study. Debriefings were used to critique the research process and the research findings as they emerged. Throughout data analysis, the peer debriefer was asked to evaluate and comment on the constructions of the respondents.

Transferability

The determination of transferability of the study is dependent on the degree to which the sending (the setting in which the study was conducted) and receiving (the setting to which the study may be applied) contexts are similar (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Lincoln and Guba (1985) asserted that "the naturalist cannot specify the external validity of an inquiry; he or she can provide only the thick description necessary to enable someone interested in making a transfer to reach a conclusion about whether transfer can be contemplated as a possibility" (p. 316). In reporting this study, I attempted to provide as much detail as possible about the setting and the respondents without compromising their confidentiality. I also provided a detailed discussion of the themes that emerged from the data.

Dependability and Confirmability

To address the issues of dependability and confirmability, an audit trail was utilized. An audit trail allows for an external auditor to assess the process as well as the product of a study for its dependability and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I established an audit trail consisting of: (a) raw data, including interview notes and recorded tapes, (b) data reduction and analysis products, including interview summary notes and unitized data, (c) data reconstruction and synthesis products, including category development and definitions, theme development, conclusions, and a final report, and (d) researcher notes, including the study proposal and personal notes.

Reporting the Data

The data are reported as a case study. The case study includes a description of the context of the study and descriptions of the respondents' constructions, expressed as themes. A discussion of the results, including implications and recommendations for practice and further research, is also included. The results are presented in Chapter Four.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This chapter begins with a description of the Richardson Court Association and Maple Hall, the setting of the study. The chapter then includes a brief description of the key respondents. The respondents are presented as a group in order to protect their specific identities. The results of the study follow, reported as themes developed from the data. The actual words of the respondents are used to illustrate the key findings.

Setting of the Study

Richardson Court Residence Halls

The Richardson Court Residence Halls are one of three single student, undergraduate residence complexes in the Department of Residence at Iowa State University. The Richardson Court area includes seven residence halls: one male hall, two female halls, and two coeducational halls. Two additional residence halls are predominantly single-sex halls with the exception of one coeducational floor in each.

The Department of Residence states the following mission:

> The mission of university housing and food service is to provide affordable housing and food service for residents in a responsive environment that promotes personal growth, academic achievement, community responsibility, and respect for individual differences. (House President's Manual, 1989, p. 10)

Student government falls within the realm of this "responsive environment," providing students with many leadership and personal growth opportunities. The governing body of the Richardson Court Residence Halls is the Richardson Court Association (RCA) Student Government. According to the

RCA House President's Manual (1989), RCA Student Government encompasses an executive committee and an assembly. The executive committee consists of the president, vice-president, treasurer, secretary, and two Government of the Student Body senators (all of whom are elected by RCA students) as well as an educational/cultural chair, social chair, intramural chair, and conduct committee (all of whom are appointed by the RCA president). The executive committee also includes a representative from the minority student support group, an individual who is elected by ethnic minority students living in the Richardson Court Residence Halls. The assembly includes one representative from each floor (house) in the RCA. These representatives typically are the house vice-president and are elected by their house members. The RCA Student Government proposes and considers legislation that affects the entire RCA, oversees an annual budget, and provides educational, recreational and social events for residents.

Undergraduate residence halls in the Department of Residence operate under what is referred to as the house system. The house system was first introduced at Iowa State University in 1949 and was first introduced in an ISU women's hall in the fall of 1965. A relatively unique system of self-governance, the house system establishes each floor as its own student organization with its own governing body. Viewed as an individual entity, each house has its own name and, in some instances, its own identifying personality. For example, 1st floor Maple Hall is known as Cranor House, 2nd floor as Forbes House, 3rd floor as Friant House, and so on.

Each house, according to the RCA House President's Manual, is governed by a house cabinet, consisting of a president, vice-president, treasurer, secretary,

intramural chair, social chair, conduct representative, and programming board representative. The house cabinet is advised by the house resident assistant, a Department of Residence staff member. The RCA House President's Manual (1989) portrays the cabinet as "the most influential group in the house." The cabinet oversees an annual house budget, serves as the organizing body for the house, proposes policies that will affect the house (such as quiet hours or visitation policies), and provides educational and social opportunities for the house members.

Once a year, the Richardson Court Association sponsors a day-long leadership conference for all house cabinet members and other interested student leaders. The conference includes an inspirational keynote speaker and smaller training sessions. The training sessions are presented by hall directors and other student affairs professionals on campus as well as by experienced student leaders and resident assistants. The session topics range from current social and diversity issues, such as rape and racism, to specific leadership topics, such as leadership styles and running meetings. One time period during the day is set aside for people in similar positions to meet. For example, all of the house presidents would attend a workshop presented by a hall director and the RCA president to discuss the specific challenges of their position.

All of the respondents selected, with the exception of one, had requested living arrangements in the Richardson Court Residence Halls. Several of the respondents requested to live in the Richardson Court after hearing positive comments from people who lived there. In their words:

> I chose RCA in general . . . because I knew of a couple [of] people who lived here and said they really liked it.

> . . . I chose to live here because I have some friends that went to Iowa State last year and they lived on 7th floor in Maple. And, they [said] "well, this would be a really good spot to be."

Maple Hall

The respondents selected for this study were residence hall leaders in Maple Hall. One of the two all-women's residence halls in the Richardson Court complex, Maple Hall, a tower-like structure, consists of eight individual houses and approximately 400 women. Although men are allowed by house policies to visit women in their rooms, men do not live in Maple Hall and, therefore, do not participate in its governance.

Four of the five respondents selected requested to live in an all-women's residence hall because they were uncertain about living with and being in social settings with men.

> . . . I wasn't quite socially ready to mix and match with . . . different [sexes]. I . . . didn't think I'd fit in right to start out with, so I thought an all-girls hall would be better.

> . . . I find myself a shy person when it comes to the opposite sex and things like that. And I really draw in sometimes and don't express a lot of my feelings when [in situations] like that.

Even the one respondent who listed an all-women's residence hall as her second choice indicated being happy that she was placed in Maple because she believed she studied more there than she would have in a coeducational environment.

> . . . my second choice was all female and I'm glad I ended up here because I think if I would have been in a coed dorm I wouldn't study [nearly] as much as I do.

Respondents

Respondent Descriptions

Five key respondents participated in this study, representing three different residence hall leadership positions. Two respondents were house presidents, two were house vice-presidents, and one was house social chair. At the time the interviews began, two of the respondents were juniors, two were sophomores, and one was a freshman. During the course of the interviews, one respondent left her position because it was the end of the year and she was moving off campus. Two respondents changed positions, one moving to a Resident Assistant role and the other to a house president position. The other two respondents remained in their original positions, but both had decided not to run for reelection at the end of their terms. One of these two respondents had decided to move off campus while the other had decided to seek a Resident Assistant position.

Positions Held

The respondents selected for this study, as indicated above, held three different house leadership positions. Two of the respondents held the position of house president. According to the RCA House President's Manual (1989), the role of the president included the following responsibilities: (a) conducting house and cabinet meetings, (b) serving as a communication link between the Richardson Court Association and house members, (c) providing leadership for house activities and programs, (d) becoming acquainted with individual house members, (e) helping cabinet members understand their positions, (f) enforcing house policies, (g) serving as a role model and motivator, and (h) helping

promote a positive living and learning environment in the house. One president described her responsibilities:

> I suppose you'd say being house president, my job mainly was to help organize, maybe delegate more than really do all the jobs.

Two of the respondents were house vice-presidents. The RCA House President's Manual (1989) described the responsibilities of the vice-president as: (a) attending and participating in weekly RCA Assembly meetings, (b) representing Assembly to their house, (c) running meetings in the president's absence, (d) supporting the resident assistant and house president, (e) form task forces to investigate grievances and problems, and (f) supporting house activities. One vice-president summed up her understanding of her position as follows:

> . . . my job is to go to the [Assembly] meeting, to get the information and bring it back to the floor.

One respondent in the study held the position of house social chair. According to the RCA House President's Manual, the social chair's responsibilities consisted of: (a) knowing and enforcing party policies, (b) coordinating party planning, (c) taking care of social event paperwork, and (d) serving as a liaison with other houses to plan activities, including conducting interest surveys, arranging and promoting house social activities, and getting people involved in activities. The social chair described her responsibilities:

> Our responsibilities were . . . posting and talking about things that we could be doing with our brother floor . . . .
>
> . . . we are responsible for functions as far as our brother floor goes and then if we want to set up things within our own house . . .

House Leadership Motivation

Despite holding different positions for varying amounts of time, the respondents became involved in house leadership for similar reasons, one of which was the mere availability of opportunities. Rather than seeking positions in a large university system they knew little about, the respondents chose to involve themselves in activities that were very close to home.

> . . . when I started school last year . . . I didn't know much about the University . . . . They didn't give us information on how to become involved. And then this [house position] was kind of at my feet. It was something that I could take advantage of without having to look for it.

Floor leadership opportunities also were appealing because they involved working with the people with whom the women lived. Floor relationships influenced their leadership motivation in two forms: (a) the respondents viewed getting involved as a way to get to know people on their floor, and (b) they felt more comfortable working with people they already knew.

> Well, I just felt like it was a really good way to get to know people on my floor and other people . . . .

> . . . and these were people I knew. It wouldn't really have to be a strange situation. So, I think it was real easy because, not only was it just down the hall, but it wasn't anything that I'd have to feel self-conscious about, or wonder how other people would think, because I knew all of them.

The importance of relationships and availability of opportunities inspired the respondents to become active leaders within their houses. Although the fact that the opportunities were available in their living environments was an important motivator, other factors did contribute to their decisions. Motivators included career aspirations. For several of the respondents, particularly those

interested in careers in management, house leadership positions were viewed as a means to evaluate their career plans.

> To get into the cabinet, I just figured that if I'm going to start anywhere I might as well start here. Because . . . I can't just jump into a management position without any underlying positions held before.

Another motivational factor was the belief that they could help improve the cabinet or house environment.

> The thing I saw was . . . a lot of things that I thought I could help . . . . I guess I thought I could get in there and influence a change . . . .

A wide variety of motivators inspired the respondents to become involved in house leadership, including the availability of opportunities.

Results

Interviews from the key respondents yielded data which, when analyzed, developed into four broad categories of data, or themes. The four themes were: (a) residence hall living and leading environments (discussed in the previous sections), (b) general leadership characteristics, (c) women and leadership, and (d) personal experiences with leadership.

Each theme is discussed separately here. Results are summarized at the end of each theme. The respondents will not be identified by their names or houses in order to protect confidentiality.

General Leadership Characteristics

The respondents used a variety of terms to describe leaders, including: (a) able to motivate others, (b) responsible, and (c) able to relate to others.

Motivating Others

The respondents identified the need to be a motivator as a general leadership characteristic, believing that leadership involved being able to motivate others to be their best and to accomplish goals.

> I think it's someone [who] really needs to help others . . . find their potential and . . . motivate them to be the best that they can be. I think of my coaches and my high school teachers that were really good . . . . They just motivated their students.

> I think if you can get people to kind of talk about how they're feeling and how things are going, they're going to get a little bit motivated to keep things working instead of getting down on themselves. And if you can have them bring up some positive things that they've done, they're going to focus on that instead of sitting there dwelling on things that they should be doing or things that they can't do.

To motivate others, the respondents believed a leader needed to possess a positive attitude. Without a positive attitude, the respondents did not think that motivation would be effective.

> I think you need a good attitude towards things. I think a person with a negative [attitude] . . . it's not going to work because a negative attitude proposes a negative attitude toward everybody and about anything that the house would do.

> . . . I can't have a negative outlook and tell them about it and expect them to go ahead and do it . . . and do the best that they can because they're not going to want to if I have a bad attitude about it.

A positive attitude, then, represented a tool which could be utilized to motivate others, something a leader needed to be able to do.

Being Responsible

The respondents also believed that a leader must be a responsible individual. Leaders needed to be able to direct others and to be responsible for the group they were leading.

> The first thing I think of is someone that needs to be able to . . . take the responsibility to direct people in a certain way, whether it be just getting them involved in floor activities or even outside the hall.

Part of being responsible, for the respondents, meant being competent. In other words, leaders needed to be knowledgeable about their positions and about whatever situations they were dealing with.

> I think more of somebody who knows more about the situation . . . and can help you if you have more questions. The person that would know what was going on more than anything.
>
> . . . if you're going to be a leader, you've got to know a lot of things. You have to know everything about who's working for you, or who you're working for. I mean everything. It's not just your specific job; you don't have just one specific thing.

In order to be responsible, a leader also needed to be organized and be able to keep others organized as well.

> A person who's organized, who knows what's going on, what can happen, what this person or what this situation can or cannot do.
>
> [A person who] will be able to work in a group but is the person that keeps the group organized.

Responsibility, then, including being competent and organized, marked a characteristic important to being a leader.

Relating to Others

The respondents also believed that the ability to relate to other people was an important characteristic of a leader. They stated that a leader needed to be able to work with a variety of people, regardless of their backgrounds or differences.

> I think they need to know how to relate to people with good social skills and with good communication skills.
>
> . . . I think a leader needs to have the personality to be able to work with a million different people. And be [it] race, age, creed, you need to be able to work with all those people and not be a prejudiced person.

Relating to people, for the respondents, involved a number of elements, including being friendly and not being uptight.

> They have to be able to be friendly and say, "come on, let's go do this." If the leaders aren't going to do it, nobody's going to do it. The leaders have to go to the activities because if they don't go, no one else will go.
>
> I think . . . that the friendlier and more open you are, probably the better chance you have of running something . . . . So, I think it's more important here as a leader to just be really easy-going and say "hey, we're here to have fun, let's do it, and let's have fun doing it."
>
> Being more easy-going instead of uptight . . . . People find that kind of offensive if you're uptight about situations, little things.

In addition to be friendly, the respondents emphasized being understanding of others as a component of relating to people.

> I think being understanding of other people's needs and not thinking of themselves, [saying] "okay, if I do this for them, they're going to like me better." You've got to think "okay, if I do this for them, it's going to help them."

For the respondents, then, relating to and getting along with people involved attempting to understand their needs. The respondents also stated that communication skills played an important role in one's ability to relate to people. In their words:

> A person who's easy to talk to. If they do have a problem, they can talk to them about it and they're not going to blab it to anybody else.
>
> Communication is a big one. Both as communicating openly and listening and speaking. You have to be able to be open to them and hear their ideas. And if you don't like it, you can't just say "no, that sucks."

Thus, the ability to relate to people, identified by the respondents as an important characteristic of a leader, included being friendly and understanding, as well as possessing good communication skills.

Summary Discussion of General Leadership Characteristics

The respondents identified several characteristics as being descriptive of leadership. Leaders needed to be able to motivate others, be responsible and relate to others.

According to the respondents, motivating others was an essential element of leadership. Being a motivator involved encouraging others to achieve their potential and to accomplish their goals. The ability to motivate required a leader to possess a positive attitude. The respondents believed that a leader with a negative attitude could not effectively encourage people to be involved or to work towards their goals.

To be a leader, the respondents believed that an individual needed to be responsible. The respondents defined responsibility as being able to direct others, being organized, and being competent. A leader needed to be responsible enough to direct a group of people, whether that involved providing

guidance for people to be involved in house activities or offering direction to help people get involved outside of the house. In addition, a respondent needed to be organized and also able to keep others organized.

The respondents believed that being competent was an important aspect of responsibility. In other words, leaders needed to be knowledgeable about their positions, including specific position requirements, as well as about general constructs of leadership. In addition, leaders needed to be knowledgeable about the specific situations with which they were dealing and about the people or leadership positions involved.

The respondents also believed that the ability to relate to other people was an important leadership characteristic. Relating to others, including people from various cultures and backgrounds, involved being friendly, being understanding, and possessing good communication skills. According to the respondents, a leader needed to be friendly in order to get people involved in the activities they were promoting. In fact, the respondents believed that the more friendly a person was the better chance they had at being a leader, particularly in the house leadership environment. To relate to others, a leader also needed to be able to understand people and their needs as well as being able to listen to and communicate openly with them.

Women and Leadership

The theme of women and leadership includes two categories of data: (a) overcoming obstacles, and (b) working with men. Each category is discussed separately.

Overcoming Obstacles

The respondents believed a woman must overcome stereotypes to prove her leadership abilities to others, particularly men. The category of overcoming obstacles deals with the perceptions, held by men and some women, that women are not equal to men and that women lack leadership skills. The subsections in this category include: (a) stereotypes faced by women, (b) women proving themselves to others, (c) women leaders' needs, and (d) overcoming obstacles.

Stereotypes Faced by Women

Female leaders, according to the respondents, had to struggle to overcome gender-based obstacles. For example, the respondents indicated that women had to overcome such obstacles as the concept that women were not equal to men and, therefore, belonged in the home rather than working or taking on leadership positions. In their words:

> It's just, I mean, society tends to . . . still somewhere society tends to be kind of like that, where the woman's place is in the home. Not everybody thinks like that. I know not everybody thinks like that, but there's still people out there who do, who really believe that women shouldn't be working. You know, "they can work, but they shouldn't have higher up jobs" or things like that.

The respondents also were aware of perceptions that women lack leadership abilities.

> I mean, I've read . . . stuff just through school and business magazines about women having problems getting to the leadership positions because the males don't believe they can do it.
>
> . . . I think it happens a lot. That, you know, there can never be a woman president because that just wouldn't happen because she's a woman . . . . So, I think there's a lot of that kind of stereotyping that there's certain jobs

> that we just can't do. I guess it's kind of frustrating that people still think that.

Generally speaking, then, the respondents quickly pointed out the stereotypes associated with being a woman. On a personal level, however, the respondents did not associate those stereotypes with their experiences. Asked to reflect on how being a woman would affect the perceptions others held of them as leaders, several respondents indicated that they did not notice any difference.

> I haven't noticed it on me. But, I have heard of males or of people thinking "oh, she won't be as good a leader because she's not male." Or, like if it's a boss, "she won't be as good a boss as a man would be." But I can't say that's ever happened to me.

One respondent identified a situation in which she was on the receiving end of negative perceptions, but was not certain whether those perceptions were based on the fact that she was a woman or on something else.

> I guess when I got my R.A. position, a fellow R.A. that used to work at food service found out about it. And he was obviously upset about it or something because he didn't think I had the qualities to be an R.A. and such. And he was . . . we're also in the same program, as far as degrees go, and he doesn't think I'll be a good teacher, either. He just doesn't think I'll be good at anything. So, I don't know if I'd take that because of something personal he sees in me or if it's because . . . I don't think it's because I'm female but maybe that could be part of it, though.

Thus, the respondents believed that the perceptions of women as not being equal or as lacking leadership skills were problems that women, in general, had to deal with. But, at a personal level, the respondents stated that they had not had to deal with negative perceptions based solely on their gender.

Women Proving Themselves to Others

When asked to consider others' perceptions of them as leaders who are also women, the respondents described an expectation that women prove themselves to the public at large, but particularly to men.

> [Men] maybe expect more out of [women] to prove to [men] that they're worthwhile, or whatever.

> There's so many stereotypes and generalizations and stuff that just being a woman you have to try harder for everything you do, I think. Even as far as political positions or even city council or something, you're going to have to try twice as hard as any man just because they're a man. And that's because there's . . . it's so traditional that the men are going to be in the powerful positions. And so women just have to, I guess, prove that they can do it, or whatever.

The respondents identified with the concept that women, in general, have to prove their abilities to men and, occasionally, to other women. At a personal level, however, the respondents did not perceive that they needed to prove themselves to others.

> They said [women] couldn't do this, and [women] did it. They said we couldn't do this and we did it. So, we've just proven men, people in general, wrong over and over again out of all the aspects and all the things that women have conquered in the history. But . . . unless somebody is specifically telling me or someone I know that I couldn't do it, then it doesn't affect me as much.

Thus, the stereotyped views of women as leaders mandate going to extra lengths to prove their abilities, especially to men. The respondents, did not, however, believe they were required to prove themselves.

Women Leaders' Needs

Given that women must deal with stereotypes and others' perceptions of them as leaders, the respondents believed that women had specific leadership

needs. These needs, according to the respondents, included the need for respect, the need to be self-confident in one's abilities, and the need for support.

Respect

Statements by the respondents revealed that the need for respect is an essential element for female leaders. Female leaders needed to receive respect from both men and women.

> They need to be respected by their colleagues, male or female.
>
> I like people that can respect me and want to treat me the same way they like to be treated . . . .

Respect was an elemental need for women for a multitude of reasons, not the least of which was that it was easier to respect someone who respected you and that people who respected you were more likely to work well with you.

> If they [house members] can give respect, then I can give them respect back.
>
> And then, I think once you gain their respect, it's really easy to get people to do what you want them to do.

The respondents also believed that an indicator of respect was to be taken seriously in their efforts as leaders. Being taken seriously included being recognized as leaders and being listened to.

> I suppose [female leaders need] to be recognized as a leader.
>
> To be heard [by] whoever's listening. I mean, I guess I tend to feel that . . . everybody likes to have people listen to what they're saying and take them seriously.

Thus, being respected, which included being recognized and taken seriously as a leader, was an essential need for women leaders.

Feeling comfortable with one's abilities

Although respect was something gained by leaders, it was also something bestowed upon them by other people. The respondents believed that, to be successful, women leaders needed to feel comfortable with themselves and their abilities.

> And they need to be comfortable with themselves so that they can . . . so that they're willing to express themselves in a situation where someone else might not say something. They need to be able to speak up. And to do that, they're going to have to be comfortable with themselves, too.
>
> And they need to feel comfortable and secure in what they do.

Women leaders needed to feel comfortable with themselves, according to the respondents, in order to be able to carry out their responsibilities, especially those that required them to speak out.

> Like as far as when issues go, you need to be able to say "no, this is what I think and this is important."
>
> They need to be able to feel like they have the opportunity and the right to say their mind or to say whatever is within limits.

Women leaders, then, needed to feel comfortable with themselves and their abilities, especially in terms of expressing themselves.

Support

In addition to respect and self-confidence, women leaders needed to receive support from those around them. This support included people getting along with one another and having someone to listen.

> . . . female leaders, I think, feel the need to get along, need to feel that they get along with everybody.

> Because they're going to have just as many problems as the people that they're leading and they're going to need somebody that they need to talk to if they don't know how to do something. So, I think it's important.

One respondent, in particular, emphasized the importance of having a cabinet that worked together and, essentially, became a support system for one another.

> . . . and they need to have a good cabinet or a good support group. And maybe make them all make their whole cabinet feel like they're leaders, too, so it takes some of that leadership responsibility off of that person. So, there's not your sole leader, and so instead you'll have nine girls or twelve girls or however many cabinet members as leaders and not just one person. So, their need I think is just to have someone else there that they can talk to.

Hence, the respondents recognized a support system, whether established by everyone simply getting along or by working together as a team, as a need for female leaders.

Overcoming Leadership Obstacles

Although the respondents did not identify with the stereotypes and expectations with which female leaders struggle, they did recognize the importance of finding ways to overcome such obstacles. The respondents believed that a female leader needed to be strong.

> And they're going to deal with other women that think they're being too aggressive or whatever. And then they're going to just have other personal problems . . . it's going to be really hard for a woman that's in . . . a large leadership position, to have to get up and face that every day. . . . I'm sure it's going to be pretty constant to face something like that every day. And so she's going to have to be a strong person herself to be able to deal with that.

Asked how they would respond if they were the cabinet member who was not being taken seriously by her male colleagues, the respondents' responses were in keeping with this "strong woman" sentiment. They said they would not quit, but would continue expressing their thoughts and opinions.

> But it wouldn't stop me because I have a right just as everybody else does.
>
> . . . if I had something to say and . . . I thought I was . . . right, I would still say it whether I was going to get mocked . . . by the males. But if I didn't have a deep concern about it or didn't have really anything to say about a situation, I'd probably just keep quiet and just do my job and just get through it.

In essence, the only "method" of overcoming obstacles based on stereotypes identified by the respondents was to be a "strong woman." To handle such situations, one needed to be strong and able to continue in the face of adversity.

Working with Men

In examining the role of leadership in women's lives, one cannot discount the presence of men and the fact that female leaders often work with male leaders. The respondents spoke about: (a) experiences working with men, (b) how women may feel when working with men, (c) working with women as compared with working with men, and (d) leadership characteristics utilized by women and men.

Experiences Working with Men

The respondents stated that they had not had a great deal of leadership interaction with men. Of course, the fact that the respondents lived in and led in an all-women's residence hall contributed significantly to this lack of interaction. There was some difference among the positions held by the respondents as to the

extent to which the respondents had had dealings with men. For instance, the presidents' responsibilities were largely contained within the all-women's residence hall and, thus, they worked less with men than the social chair, whose responsibilities included planning social events with a brother floor. According to the presidents:

> In the past I didn't [work with men] much because all the presidents and everyone were female and the hall director's female, and that's due to the dorm and everything.
>
> As president, I really haven't at all. It's been all females.

Because of the difference in position responsibilities, the vice-presidents and social chair had more experience working with men in the residence halls.

> [I worked with men a] little with our brother floor. Like I met with him a couple of times and talked with him on the phone a few times about getting together for an exchange . . . . I didn't have a whole lot of interaction with them.
>
> Through vice-presidency I did work with male leaders a lot. Our exec board was a lot of males and a lot of the other vice-presidents were males so.

Although one person did state that she had significant experience working with men in the residence halls, most respondents had not had a great deal of opportunity or reason to work with male leaders. Their experiences, however, revealed that they had worked with men in leadership situations outside of the residence halls. Most of these experiences occurred in high school or work.

> . . . I've been on a couple of other boards and stuff like that where there were other guys. And we all knew each other and so . . . like I knew that if I interrupted him that he's going to be mad because he didn't like to be interrupted. And he knew that if he cut me down somehow that I would be mad because I didn't like

> that. So, we kind of all knew each other well enough to know that you can say certain things and not say other things.
>
> I've never really lead anything with males, yet, except for [working in Hilton Colliseum]. That's the only thing I've really dealt with before.

Hence, with the exception of occasional encounters with male leaders, the respondents' dealings with men were largely restricted to high school experiences and work situations. As leaders holding cabinet positions within the residence halls, the respondents worked very rarely with male leaders.

How Women May Feel When Working with Men

When asked to reflect upon the prospects of working with men, the respondents stated they believed men wanted women to be passive and that men did not take women seriously. In fact, according to the respondents, women working with men could feel stereotyped and belittled. In their words:

> Well, I think working with men, I think you can have the tendency to feel belittled.
>
> If you went back to this thing again where we have that stereotype of us being submissive and passive and all that kind of stuff. And I think that if you get two women in a room full . . . with three or four guys that are their president and vice-president and all that, you're going to sit down and you're going to let them talk first. Just because that's pretty much the way it's always been.

Feeling belittled and not valued stemmed from their belief that assertive women were perceived differently than assertive men and from the tendency, on the part of some men, not to listen to what women had to say.

> . . . if some woman takes charge of a meeting, they might be considered a bitch, instead of being aggressive and straight-forward and doing what they're supposed to be doing.

> Like males not taking orders or not doing what they're told. Thinking they don't have to because they're being told to by a woman, I guess.
>
> Because I've had guys [when working at Hilton] where you tell them "please sit down"and they're like "yeah, whatever." But if a guy comes up and says that to them, they'll move. . . . I've had to go actually get a guy. It doesn't matter if he's a cop, it doesn't have to be somebody, it just has to be a guy. He could be wearing the same jacket as I am, but it's just different.

Several of the respondents were able to relate to the expectation that they be passive and the feeling that they were not being taken seriously.

> And if people are going to screw around, I'm going to tell them to quit it and get it done. And I think . . . that could be a downfall because . . . women that are like that aren't considered to be powerful. They're considered to be a bitch and that's what you're called.
>
> They [brother floor] kind of expected for it to be exactly what they wanted but for me to do all the work. And obviously I'm not saying that's men everywhere but it was kind of like "okay, you plan it . . . but it better be like this or it better be cool or it better be fun."

The respondents believed, however, that problems working with men were not prevalent within the residence halls. In fact, the residence halls, according to the respondents, provided leadership opportunities for women that were safe from the problems typically associated with working with men, especially that of not being taken seriously.

> See, I don't think [not being taken seriously by men] is [a problem] in the residence halls as much. It's still there but not as prevalent as in other places . . . . And so I don't think it's as much of a problem in the residence halls. I really think it's probably a lot better here than it is anywhere else because of [the Department of Residence's Standards for Community Living].

> I feel like everybody thinks we're all here together and just as well get along. It's not permanent. We're not here forever.

The respondents clearly illustrated that women who are working with men, especially in leadership situations, can feel belittled or even ignored because of the tendency for men to expect women to be passive and to not listen to women or take them seriously. Again, although the respondents could identify such struggles for women, they were personally able to relate to them only on a limited scale, believing for the most part that the residence hall environment was not problematic for female leaders because it was a better environment for women than most others.

Working with Men as Compared with Working with Women

In comparing working with men with working with women, the respondents based their perceptions of working with men on prior experiences or on generalizations. They compared working with men and women on a variety of issues, including dominance, willingness to work, and ability to deal with arguments.

For the respondents, a key difference in working with men and women was the belief that men perceived themselves as dominant over women whereas women were more likely to listen and compromise.

> Males are just always . . . . They always think they're much better. Or think they're dominant.

> Females may not always follow, but they usually give you enough respect to at least listen or understand. They might have a totally different opinion, but usually, at least, they have the brain capacity to say "oh, well, at least I could listen to her." And it depends a lot. But the male thing is "she's a girl, I don't have to listen to her."

An additional issue in differences and similarities between working with men and women was a willingness to work and the level of commitment to accomplishing stated goals. According to the respondents, women were excited and willing to work whereas men did not appear to take work commitment seriously.

> . . . most all of the women I've worked with are very anxious and very willing to do whatever it is that needs to be done.

> I would say that women, I think a lot of us took everything a lot more seriously than the guys. I don't know if that's really true, but that's the way I felt. We were more concerned with pulling off a good party and making sure we had enough food, and a good DJ and all that kind of stuff. And the guys didn't really care. That was what kind of impression I got.

Despite the fact that men were perceived as taking their work less seriously, women, according to the respondents, often deferred to men.

> But, I would say a lot of the women would have let the guys run the meetings and things like that.

According to some of the respondents, however, women bickered and held grudges more than men.

> I find [that guys] don't bicker over little things. When something happens, they kind of let it go, or if someone's mad or whatever. Where girls, they get so upset about it and they fall apart over it.

> I think women hold grudges too much . . . . I'm just saying a lot of times, if you do knock down an idea though, they're saying . . . "you're knocking me as a person" and they get all ticked off at you. And that's not what you're doing . . . . So, I think women hold grudges too much and they do tend to clique a little bit more than men and get half the floor against the other. They still are more open-minded, definitely more open-minded. But they have their cliques and everything else.

In spite of the belief that women can be less willing than men to let go of a negative situation, the respondents preferred working with women to working with men. Several respondents stated emphatically that they would rather lead in an all-female environment than in a coeducational environment. One reason was that working with all women meant that one was rarely, if ever, criticized solely on the basis of her gender.

> . . . where if you worked with women, you're the same gender. And . . . you can cut each other down, but it's not because of something you can't control. Usually it's something you can control.

A similar reason involved the idea that women would be more understanding of another woman whereas men would label and talk about a woman with whom they had had a disagreement. For example:

> . . . I mean girls all get bitchy, that's just the way we are . . . . I would rather have one of my friends or one of the people on my floor think "god, she's having a bad day" than guys [who] tend to take things out of proportion . . . .

The negative consequence, however, of leading in an all-women's setting, despite the stated advantages, was the lack of access to men's perspectives. Indeed, for those respondents who considered seeking a leadership position in a coeducational environment, a great deal of the motivation for doing so rested with the potential to have greater access to male perspectives.

> I think in the all-female building, it's hard to relate the men's issues to it because all we see is the women's side of it. Where like over in Willow, it might be different because you can see both aspects.
>
> . . . you get a lot of different views from male and female side of views, whereas some of the things we wouldn't think of, guys would think of, just because it's male and female. But, I find that you get a lot more

> sides of view which makes it easier to figure out what is going on and deciding "is it right, is it not right."

Overall, then, the respondents preferred working with women, finding them to be more enthusiastic and committed than men as well as to be less likely to criticize one another for things beyond their control, such as gender. Although they preferred the all-women's context for leadership, several of the respondents entertained the idea of leading in a coeducational setting to gain more access to, and a better understanding of, men's perspectives.

Leadership Characteristics of Female and Male Leaders

Asked to examine two lists of general leadership characteristics, the respondents, despite their admitted limited leadership experiences with men, identified one list of characteristics as being more common to men's leadership styles and the other list as being more common to women's leadership styles. The list of qualities (List A) that they claimed were more common among women included such leadership characteristics as empowering others, interdependence, group affiliation, information sharing, cooperation, process-oriented, and nurturing. The second list (List B), which they claimed was more descriptive of men's leadership styles, included such characterstics as individual achievement, competition, autonomy, hierarchical, aggressive, outcome-oriented, and communication through appropriate channels. In their words:

> You've got your control and your competition and [aggression], and that's what men are more supposed to be like . . . . And, here on the list, "A" has nurturing and you think about women as . . . caring about everybody and everything like that.
>
> But I think a lot of times, unless it's because the woman feels that they have to compete with men in order to keep their place, that men are the ones that are more aggressive.

Thus, the respondents identified List A as being more descriptive of women's leadership styles and List B as being more descriptive of men's leadership styles. In terms of the prevalence of those leadership styles described by the lists, the respondents believed that the leader described by List B is more prevalent in society. In other words, the more common leadership style in society tends to be that which fits with men's leadership styles.

> But I would say there are just more List B kinds of jobs in the world, where maybe whether you like it or not you do have to compete. Or, it is a hierarchy, so it does go from the top down. That's just, I think, the way a lot of things are run.
>
> Well, probably there is more of the type "B" just because there are more male leaders. And, yet, not all male leaders are going to be like that. But I do think that there's probably more type "B" leaders than there is type "A."

Despite their belief that the List B leader is more prevalent in society, several of the respondents claimed that the leader described by List A is more prevalent in the residence halls. In other words, the characteristics associated with List A, such as cooperation and nurturing, were the characteristics most often used by residence hall leaders. Thus, these respondents believed that a style they identified as being more descriptive of women's leadership styles was the prevalent style within the residence hall leadership environment.

> I'd say List A just because you have to work with the group and have to get the floor involved, [and] have to work with the cabinet to get the floor involved. I think List A goes better that way. I would say more follow List A because it's not such a thing where you are competing or have to have control or [be] aggressive or anything like that. It's more communicating . . . .
>
> I would say that it prevails to the point where we do all help and nurture each other and we do cooperate with

> each other to make the whole system run. A couple of them are combined, but I wouldn't say that there's a whole lot of control or aggressiveness or competition . . . it's more cooperation and sharing and working together. So, probably List A is more common.

Several other respondents, however, believed that the residence halls supported many different types of leaders, providing for a balance of styles rather than a prevalence of one style.

> I think there's a good mix of different types of leaders in the residence halls. And, I don't know if that's because there's . . . an even number of [men and women] . . . . But there's a good balance. I think there's a lot of different types of leaders and it seems to be a good balance in the residence halls.

Hence, the respondents identified leadership characteristics such as cooperation, nurturing, direct communication, and group affiliation as being associated with women's styles of leadership and characteristics such as aggression, competition, and individual achievement as being associated with men's styles of leadership. The respondents believed that the List B characteristics, those they associated with men's leadership styles, described the most prevalent leadership style in society. In terms of the residence hall leadership environment, however, many of the respondents believed that the List A characteristics, which they associated with women's leadership styles, were the most prevalent, while others believed there was more of a balance of leadership styles.

Summary Discussion of Women and Leadership

The respondents believed that a women involved in leadership must overcome stereotypes and other obstacles in order to prove their leadership abilities to others. In fact, overcoming gender-based obstacles, according to the respondents, embodied a general problem confronting female leaders.

The stereotypes with which female leaders must struggle included perceptions that they are not equal to men and that they lack leadership skills. Although the respondents were able to cite examples highlighting the beliefs that women's roles were in the home and that women did not possess the skills necessary to hold leadership positions, they did not associate such stereotypes with their personal experiences. Rather, several of the respondents emphasized that they had not had to deal with negative perceptions based on their gender. The respondents also stated that women who are leaders have to prove themselves to the public at large, but particularly to men. Female leaders needed to work harder than men to prove to men, and some women, that they possessed the abilities to hold leadership positions. On a personal level, however, the respondents did not perceive that they needed to prove themselves to others.

Because women were faced with such obstacles, they had specific leadership needs. The needs that the respondents associated with women leaders included a need for respect, a need to be self-confident, and a need for support. In addition, the respondents believed that women had to develop strategies for overcoming the gender-based obstacles they faced as leaders. The only strategy highlighted by the respondents, however, was for women to be strong and continue in the face of adversity.

In spite of their perceptions about gender-based obstacles, the respondents did not report a great deal of experience working with male leaders. With the exception of the experiences of one respondent, most of the respondents indicated that they had little, if any, leadership contact with men leading in the residence halls. The respondents relied on knowledge gained from other

experiences, such as high school activities or work, to guide their discussions about working with men.

Working with men, according to the respondents, brought into light male tendencies to expect women to be passive and to fail to listen to women or take them seriously, leaving women to feel belittled. Although the respondents asserted that such problems working with men were not prevalent in the residence halls, they asserted a preference for working with women rather than men. They believed that women were more likely than men to listen and to be committed to their work whereas men were more likely to perceive themselves as dominant over women. They also stated that women were less likely than men to criticize one another for things beyond their control, such as gender. Even so, several of the respondents expressed a desire to lead in a coeducational environment in order to gain access to and understanding of male perspectives.

Leadership styles were viewed by the respondents as being distinguishable among women and men. Examining two lists of leadership characteristics, the respondents identified one list as being more descriptive of women's leadership styles and the other as being more descriptive of men's styles. The respondents identified the leadership characteristics of cooperation, nurturing, direct communication, and group affiliation with women's styles and the characteristics of aggression, competition, and individual achievement with men's styles. Although they believed that the characteristics they associated with men's styles described the typical leader in society, the respondents stated that the characteristics that they associated with women's leadership styles were more illustrative of residence hall leaders.

Personal Experiences with Leadership

Much of the information shared by the respondents addressed general perceptions of leadership, as indicated in discussion of the previous two themes. The respondents did, however, discuss their personal experiences with leadership. This theme includes five categories of data: (a) learning about leadership, (b) setting goals, (c) receiving encouragement and support, (d) leadership responsibilities, and (e) the costs and rewards of leadership. Each category will be dealt with individually.

Learning about Leadership

In reflecting upon their experiences, the respondents discussed how they learned to be leaders. The methods of learning addressed by the respondents included: (a) learning through observation, (b) learning through experience, and (c) learning through educational opportunities such as leadership conferences.

Learning through Observation

One of the methods the respondents utilized to learn about leadership involved watching others. They observed other leaders and followed their examples.

> I learn a lot by watching others, and I just see how other people relate and communicate. I think that this experience is just practicing and going through the motions to see what works.

Each of the respondents stated that they had learned from watching their role models. Coaches, teachers, and family members taught the respondents a great deal about leadership, both directly and indirectly.

> . . . I had a high school coach that, my softball coach was very good. He taught me a lot about how you should be the person that takes charge and gets things done.

Thus, whether they watched role models or other leaders, the respondents maintained that they learned about leadership by observing others.

Learning through Experience

Prior leadership experience was of importance to the respondents in learning about leadership. They viewed leadership skills as something which developed and improved with practice.

> I don't think what I'm doing now, even though it's not extraordinary, I don't think I'd be in the position where I am now if I hadn't had any prior experience in leadership. No matter what it be in, whether it means being captain or just on a committee, trying to control a group of kids or whatever it may be. I don't think I could do it or do it as well if I hadn't had prior experience.

> I just think that's how you learn, is through experience. I know everyone's got to start somewhere, but I feel fortunate that I started at a young age, like seventh or eighth grade, probably before that, but more in groups at that age. From that and babysitting and working, having responsibilities. I think without [them] I just wouldn't feel as confident of myself.

Each of the respondents had significant prior leadership experience upon which to draw for the position she presently held. Much of their prior experience was in high school activities, including choir, yearbook, sports, and pom squad. Many of the respondents cited having been captains of sports teams as beneficial leadership experience. Other experiences included having been officers of their high school class or in organizations such as Future Homemakers of America, National Honor Society, and 4-H. These high school experiences provided many of the respondents with important opportunities to learn about leadership.

> It's that mostly in high school I was very involved in everything from sports to being a class officer and

> being in music and on annual, that kind of stuff. I would say most of my leadership came from my sports teams.
>
> In high school, I was involved in everything. As far as leadership roles, if these are included, in sports I was captain of all the sports.

In addition to their high school experiences, most of the respondents also had college leadership experiences prior to the position they presently held. These experiences were almost exclusively other house cabinet positions, such as intramural chair or educational/cultural chair.

> I think my freshman year I was intramural chair on the floor. Someone asked me, and I [said] "yeah, sure, okay" . . . . And the next year, I became social chair and then president. I just have always been something. I just like to be involved . . . .
>
> And then I got up here and the first semester I wasn't really into anything . . . . But I was educational/cultural chair . . . . It was no big deal, but it was just getting involved with stuff. And then this whole last year, I've been vice-president on my floor. And now, I've just been elected president of my floor. So, I'm going to be president next semester.

Thus, in learning about leadership, experience was important to the respondents.

Learning through Leadership Conferences

The respondents also utilized leadership conferences to learn about leadership. The conferences, some of which were attended in high school and others during college, offered the respondents opportunities to learn about specific leadership skills as well as current social problems. The conferences described included keynote speakers, sessions focusing on specific positions (i.e., presidents, vice-presidents, etc.), and general workshop sessions focusing on

such topics as communication, social problems, and leadership styles. In their words:

> . . . that's where we go to programs, or in the day we have a speaker and we learn how to better our leadership qualities . . . . That's mostly where the officers get a lot of their information.
>
> . . . then at the President's meeting . . . along with their expectations, they talk about ways you can be a good president. So, I think that's the main point. And then each position has their own separate meeting, so I'm sure they get a lot of the same stuff.
>
> Most of the programs were just how to deal with different issues on campus. Well, that's nice, but how much does that have to do with leadership, really. But yet it does in the fact that if you come up to that situation you will know how to handle it. And you could become a leader in a group or something and help compromise with it, or whatever the problem is, solve it or get yourself out of it.

Although to a large degree the respondents found the leadership conferences, particularly the conference sponsored by the Richardson Court Association, to be instrumental in learning about leadership, they would expand such conferences to be more interactive and to focus more on interpersonal relationships.

> I'd probably have [the participants] be in the position of being a leader and do a lot of scenario-type work . . . . Because you can sit there and tell somebody how to do something as long as you want, but there's always going to be something in that situation that is not normal.
>
> I believe that interacting with people is a very big issue in leadership, just because I've seen a lot of things go downhill, just because the leader could not interact with people, could not relate to them, could not compromise with them . . . . I would do a lot of . . . programs [to] show them that each person is different. Each person is going to have different views, and you

> just need to take them into consideration. Self-awareness programs, personality-wise.

Thus, to the respondents, leadership conferences provided many opportunities to learn about leadership. Even those sessions which highlighted social problems were viewed by the respondents as valuable leadership awareness and training opportunities.

Ultimately, the respondents utilized a variety of methods to learn about leadership. Whether it was through observation, experience, or attendance at a conference, learning about leadership was deemed an important element in becoming a leader.

Setting Goals

The respondents identified setting goals as an important component of the leadership development. In discussing goal-setting, the respondents referred to establishing (a) career-oriented goals, and (b) future leadership goals.

Career-Oriented Goals

In identifying future leadership goals, the respondents often referred to their careers. Indeed, each of the respondents strongly identified with her academic major and possessed well-defined career objectives.

> My major is pre-kindergarten and elementary [education]. And I'm just dying to be a kindergarten teacher. So that's probably my biggest goal.

> I've always been interested in positions. My major's business management, but management positions.

> I do someday plan on being the owner or the manager of a store. I've made up my mind about that, someday.

> I want to go to graduate school for counselor education and then I want to be placed in a role up by home. And hopefully be a part of the community depending upon what area I'm into, either as a family

> counselor or [elementary education] counselor. That's a big [goal].
>
> Then I think eventually I want to get my masters, and get it in administration, so like be a principal or superintendent would be the next step up.

In fact, in many respects the respondents' involvement in leadership activities appeared to be motivated largely by their career interests and aspirations. For example, managing a store or department was a career goal for several of the respondents. According to these respondents, leadership skills were a necessary component of management ability.

> . . . in management, you must have a lot of leadership because you're going to deal with a lot of different situations. . . . if I am the manager, I need to know how to interact with my employees. I need to be respectful of their needs . . . . But to be a manager, you have to show that you have the responsibility and the leadership . . . to head maybe 50 people, or 100 . . . .

Other comments from the respondents reflected the belief that leadership involvement is essential to achieving career goals. According to the respondents, leadership involvement was important because of the learning opportunities it provided as well as the potential to highlight activities on a resume.

> I think with me working with a group, and working with my peers, that will really help when it gets time for me to be in the principal job, or something like that, because obviously you're going to be working with your peers. It's helped me learn to communicate with them . . . .
>
> Either, I mean, if you apply for it, being the President on your floor looks very good. It shows them that you are able to get along with people. You must be sort of organized, anyway; that you had leadership abilities. I feel it looks really good on a resume.

Thus, the respondents, in large part, drew leadership motivation from their commitment to their career goals as well as the belief that leadership experience and knowledge were necessary to achieving those goals.

Leadership Goals

The respondents also established goals with regard to leadership involvement. Many of these leadership goals involved positions within the residence halls. In fact, each respondent that intended to continue her involvement within the residence hall system expressed interest in a leadership position that had more authority than the position she was currently holding. For example, one of the vice-president's goals was to be president of her house.

> I want to be president. I guess now that I see the different positions, now I see where I could, in the president position, maybe I could change some other things. That I could do some other things in her spot.

The Resident Assistant position was also viewed as a desired leadership position on the house.

> R.A. maybe. I've thought about that. That's me down the road. I don't like thinking about it a lot right now, because I've got things to do right now. I've got enough going on right now that if I want to do that I'll think about it when the time comes.
>
> I have seriously thought about being an R.A. . . . .

There were, however, other individuals whose future leadership goals did not involve residence hall leadership opportunities. These respondents planned to discontinue their residence hall leadership involvement for a variety of reasons, the most common of which were a lack of time to commit to their positions and a desire to be involved in other activities.

> I just decided that, I'll be doing more labs and stuff like that for my major, and I thought it would be better for

> somebody who could dedicate more time to the position.
>
> I know it's probably not hurting my studies, but I know I'd have more time for it then. That's my basic reason, though, because if I didn't have to study so much I would love to keep doing it.
>
> I kind of miss being involved in a variety of things.
>
> I don't really know a whole lot about what there is to do, as far as the university goes, but I want to go over and get a job list, ISU Volunteers, and just kind of ask around and see what else [there is].

Many of the activities, outside of the residence halls, that the respondents were considering participating in were related to career and/or academic majors. These leadership goals, then, exemplified the importance of the career-oriented goals to the respondents and highlighted the close relationship between their leadership and career goals.

> The group I'm in, the Alpha Kappa Psi's, I'd like to be an officer in there. I'd also like to be on Business Council [someday].
>
> Business Council. But I don't know if I want to hold a position there. I don't know what it's about yet.
>
> I'm trying to get into the P.E. majors club.

The respondents varied in their leadership goals, particularly when discussing specific next-step positions. The two aspects which were similar, however, were their commitment to their career aspirations and their majors and their desire to be involved in some form of leadership activity.

Receiving Encouragement and Support

The respondents also believed that (a) receiving encouragement and (b) receiving support were important elements in becoming and remaining leaders.

Receiving Encouragement to Be a Leader

The respondents highlighted the importance of being encouraged to be leaders, particularly with regard to becoming house leaders. The respondents' house leadership experiences revealed that they, more often than not, were encouraged by others to seek leadership positions. The resident assistant was an individual identified by most of the respondents as having strongly encouraged them to run for a position.

> My first R.A. did [encourage me] when we were freshmen. She wanted me to run for an office and she [said] "it'd be nice to have freshmen who are enthusiastic on the board" . . . . And [she said] "I really think you should do it."
>
> And then the second semester, my R.A. said that I should be on the cabinet of some kind, be something anyway.

Respondents also received encouragement from family members. One respondent was encouraged by an older sibling who also had been involved in house leadership activities.

> I would say my sister probably did the most because she had already gone to school out here for three years. And she was currently the house president on her floor and had held social or something the previous year. And, she told me that, first of all, the most important thing for me to do is get involved with just the meetings as a freshman because then you get to meet people.

In addition to resident assistants and family members providing encouragment, other house members also urged the respondents to seek house leadership positions. Being encouraged to get involved and run for a position fostered, for the respondents, a knowledge that someone else believed in their abilities and that they would be supported if elected.

> I suppose by them saying they'd support me, that I'd be good, then I figured if I had an idea on the floor . . . that I would have support and that these people would say "yeah, that sounds cool" and it might be easier to get things done if a lot of people on the floor think I can do this job and that kind of thing. I think what actually helped me the most was just the fact that I knew these people had confidence in me to be able to do what needed to be done.

Thus, receiving encouragement was a critical element for the respondents in becoming leaders, especially in seeking house leadership positions. The encouragement not only made them aware of available positions but also contributed to their self-confidence and their comfort with seeking such positions.

Receiving Support as Leaders

With regard to leadership, the respondents credited family members and friends with providing support for them and for their aspirations. People close to the respondents offered reassurance and confidence.

> . . . my mom's very good support. [She says] "you can do anything you put your mind to," that kind of thing. And every time I see her, it's "oh, I'm so proud of you." And so, I mean, she's good at that help.

> My mom and dad are really good about it. And [they say] "as long as you do okay, it's no big deal; as long as you don't get below a 'C,' you're fine; and don't worry about it." There's been a lot of times when I've called home and I've been studying and "oh, I'm so sick of this; I study all of the time and I'm not getting any better grades." It's still the same old thing. "Oh, it doesn't get any better in the working world; don't worry about it, you'll be okay." They're real supportive of me.

Several of the respondents, typically the presidents, stated that they also received support in their leadership development from the hall director.

> I would say . . . the [hall director] helped a lot because we had meetings every other week . . . with just the presidents . . . . she'd have something for us every time [such as] "what a leader is" or "what your job as a president is" . . . .

As is often the case, however, leaders tend to be involved in a variety of projects and activities, and occasionally find themselves over-committed and dealing with high stress levels. The respondents recognized these tendencies and the importance of support in dealing with over-commitment, stress, and possibly burnout.

> A lot of times that helps. I can get so busy doing so many things that someone comes along and says "maybe if you would just take on a few less things." Then there's times when . . . I'm usually at my best when I'm really busy doing things, I usually make the final decision. By, sometimes it does help to have someone there to give moral support . . . .

> And I know how it feels to be in both positions. I know how it feels to be the supporting one and to be supported. And my friends, in return, are supportive of me when I need . . . and it's just a circle there that keeps going. I don't get down, upset, too often, but when I do there's always someone that's there that can say "hey, now look."

For the respondents, support came not only from a variety of people but also in a variety of forms. Confidence in the respondents' abilities, reassurance of the respondents' abilities to succeed, and continued encouragement for the respondents to recognize their accomplishments and efforts provided the respondents with a broad basis of support.

Leadership Responsibilities and Styles

The respondents illustrated, through their own words and examples, the responsibilities they associated with their house leadership positions and the leadership styles they used to carry out those responsibilities. They described

ten leadership responsibilities they associated with their house positions: (a) being responsible, (b) running meetings, (c) telling others what to do, (d) delegating, (e) being approachable, (f) being a role model, (g) helping others, (h) encouraging involvement, (i) stressing teamwork, and (j) handling negative situations. The respondents also addressed their styles of leading, examining their (k) personal fit with the general characteristics they utilized to describe leadership. Each of these areas is explored separately.

Being Responsible

The respondents identified being responsible as an important component of their leadership positions. Each respondent described herself as being responsible and as having had experience with being given responsibilities.

> I've had a lot of responsibility. It doesn't scare me as maybe it would somebody who hadn't been given any [responsibility].

> I guess in all . . . three main positions that I can think of, even though we always had fun with it, I always felt a sense of responsibility to whatever we were there for. So, things usually got done.

One of the reasons several of the respondents described themselves as leaders was the fact that they believed themselves to be organized and task-oriented, which they claimed were essential to being a leader. In their words:

> . . . basically I guess I'm pretty organized and I like to see things get done. And it just looks really bad if you plan something and it doesn't get done. So, lots of times I'll just carry it through so it does . . . .

> I find myself really intense, because if I am in charge of something, I may be open-minded about stuff, but yet I push it to the point where it gets done. And, I'm on top of it, making sure this is going right and is on schedule, things like that. Not to say I'm taking over control, in charge of it, saying "this is the way I want it

> done." Just making sure that it's going through and keep it going at a straight pace.

The respondents also claimed that they were willing to take control of situations when necessary, usually when tasks were not being completed.

> . . . I like the feeling of having control of knowing it's getting done, or [being assured] it's getting done, I guess. I'd rather know instead of not know . . . . And, that's part of control, making sure it's being done.

An additional component of being responsible involved the need to be committed to follow-through as a role model for others. In other words, being responsible included holding oneself to the same standards and expectations to which the other cabinet members were held.

> I would say that I learned that it's important that I hold up my end of the bargain, more or less. That if I expect my cabinet members to do it, they're expecting the same thing from me and so I'm just as responsible as they are to get things done. Just because I'm the president doesn't mean that I can say "well, I couldn't do it tonight" or something. But, if we had a deadline, I had to meet it just as well as everybody else.

In addition to keeping cabinet members and others focused on completing their tasks, the respondents' feelings of responsibility included continuing to learn about their positions. Being responsible to their house, in other words, meant continuing to learn about position expectations as well as recognizing and learning from their mistakes.

> The last couple of meetings and after the first MISC meeting when we did not fund them, I got to thinking that maybe I should look back and start to think, "wait a minute, what is this, what is that? Where is it going to come from? How's it going to affect us? How is it going to affect everybody on the floor? How's it going to affect Iowa State?" I just had to realize what was going to happen.

> . . . I never thought about it so much [at] the first house party . . . that I should be really pretty sober and keeping everybody in line and stuff. The second one it kind of hit me. It was like "I've got to be one of the ones to help out if something's going wrong."

In fact, for several of the respondents, learning the importance of being responsible meant that they began to understand the need for a leader to be competent and aware of what takes place around her.

> I learned how important it is to have someone who knows what's going on and to be a leader. Someone who is going to be there and know what's going on all the time. So if one of the committees or somebody had a question they'd come talk to me and I'd know exactly what they were talking about . . . .

Being responsible, according to the respondents, largely referred to following through on tasks and goals and continuing to learn about their positions.

Running House Meetings

Running house meetings was a responsibility specific to the house president, with the possible exception that a vice-president would run the meeting in the president's abscence. The house meeting, as described by the respondents, was primarily a time for the cabinet to inform floor members of current activities and issues of interest. The respondents involved employed various methods in running their meetings.

> . . . each of the cabinet members would be sitting around in a semicircle facing the house members. And, we'd go around . . . and if [the cabinet members] had something to say, I'd take turns with them. And then, after they each said what they needed to say, I would take my turn. Mine was more [talking about] discipline things, [such as] don't brush your teeth in the water fountain . . . . And then it would be on a more positive note . . . . Then we could plan house parties or whatever was coming up . . . . And then we'd do house

> awards and the R.A. would talk, and that would be about it.
>
> . . . I'd start off talking and I'd [say] "this is what's going on." And then . . . [the vice-president] would tell what she got at her meeting. And then I'd just go right on down [the cabinet] and let people talk, and then . . . if people in the house had things to express, we'd let them do it. So that's pretty much all we did.

One of the key variables in how the respondents lead their meetings involved the manner in which house members were encouraged or allowed to participate. Several respondents maintained that involving house members in the actual meeting was essentially not possible.

> Usually you didn't get a lot of involvement unless there was something that really involved the floor. [For example], the house parties. Pretty much then [the cabinet] would tell them the ideas and then we'd [ask] "okay, what do you guys think."
>
> Really you can't [involve house members] with our house meeting. I'd encourage questions, but . . . I don't think you're going to get many people that want to ask that question. Sometimes they don't have any questions, so that doesn't help either.

In contrast to these approaches, one respondent indicated running a house meeting in such a way that house members could participate at any time.

> They're free to say anything. We try to keep it at a low level instead of everyone yelling . . . . if you have a question, just raise your hand . . . instead of just shouting it out because . . . depending on the issue it could get really hectic. But, they can just cut in any time.

Thus, in terms of running house meetings, those respondents involved varied in their approaches to the house meetings, some seeking floor involvement while others attempted to minimize it. Therefore, the house

meeting was largely viewed as a time for cabinet members to inform house members of existing issues and activities.

Telling Others What to Do

For the respondents, keeping people focused on tasks and goals often meant telling them what to do and how to do it. Several of the respondents felt comfortable telling cabinet and house members what to do. In their words:

> . . . even though I don't, nobody likes to be the grouch or the one that says what's going to happen, it doesn't bother me to say "well this is the way we're going to have to do this or this and that" . . . .

> I feel I am really good at giving orders and not worrying about what people think about me because most of the time I feel if I give the orders I must be in the right if I think that's what is supposed to be done.

Not only did these respondents find telling people what to do something they could do easily, they also claimed not to be concerned when people were upset with them. If, for example, a situation required them to take control, they did so without regard for the fact that people might not respond positively to them.

> . . . I wouldn't want to be hated by my entire floor, but it doesn't bother me if people are upset, because usually there's a reason behind it. So, I don't mind taking control or being the one that people are upset with.

These respondents, however, did think about how they approached people, trying to do so in a friendly, non-threatening manner.

> . . . I'm not real mean about it or anything. I try to be friendly, but if it's something that I know needs to get done, it's like "come on, you guys, we're not this dumb, it needs to be done."

> Usually when I tell people what to do, it goes over smoothly because I try not to be obnoxious about it.

For other respondents, however, telling others what to do was not a positive aspect of their leadership positions. In other words, they did not like having to tell others what to do.

> I might say the dictatorship part of it . . . I don't have problems saying "let's organize and get it done" but I have problems going and telling them that it needs to be done. And if they don't have the time, then I'm usually like "okay" and I'll go do it. So, I don't like that part of the job, to have to go tell someone that they have to get the job done and they have to do it now.

Unlike the respondents who easily could tell someone what to do, these respondents were more concerned with other house and cabinet members' responses to their instructions. These respondents were specifically concerned with these individuals' responses to being told they were doing something incorrectly.

> You have to be able to criticize creatively . . . so that the person doesn't take offense either because you don't want those people mad at you either because you're all trying to do the same goal. And so you need to be able to criticize them and they have to be able to understand that you're not saying the whole idea is bad, but maybe just parts of it we need to take out.

> I don't like to criticize, and I suppose that's because I don't like to be criticized. So, I have a lot of problems telling somebody that they're not doing it right, or that that idea is just not quite what we're looking for . . . because I don't like to hurt people's feelings.

Thus, the respondents identified telling others what to do as part of how they lead. Some respondents, however, appeared very comfortable with this aspect of leadership whereas others did not.

Delegating

Delegating responsibilities was associated more with the president's position than with any other position. In fact, those respondents who served as presidents identified delegating as one of their primary responsibilities.

> I suppose you'd say that, being house president, my job mainly was to help organize, maybe delegate more than really do all the jobs. I was supposed to help form the committees and kind of be an overseer of all those committees . . . . I was in charge of making sure that all the committees worked together and that we got everything done by the time it was supposed to be done.

According to one respondent, the importance of delegation varied with the level of experience of the cabinet with which she was working.

> I didn't really have to delegate a lot because our cabinet . . . knew what they needed to do. They had been around so they knew their positions. I was a new president coming in with this old cabinet, so as far as delegating, I didn't have to do that much. Then, when I was first here this year, we had only half a cabinet. And I was president. Then I had to delegate, [such as] "okay, this is what you do; this is how you do it; and this is what you're going to do."

Thus, delegating proved to be an important part of how several of the respondents lead.

Being Approachable

Each of the respondents identified being approachable as an important component of leadership. Approachability, according to the respondents, included relating to and listening to people.

> I don't like dominating relationships or other people, or to say "that's just the way it is because I said so." I don't like that kind of style. I like to relate to other people, and they understand and then you try to understand them. That's good leadership.

> I would say probably especially with the floor things, I think you have to be a fairly outgoing person and fairly friendly and easy to talk to, open minded and you can listen to everybody else's ideas without yelling at them and things like that. I think it just makes it easier for people to come talk to you if there's a problem with the floor . . . or they might think the meetings are more fun if I'm in there with an open mind and I'm having fun at the meetings. Maybe that would get more people to come to the meetings I think. I would say I'm pretty laid back and so I was always doing something stupid in meetings . . . .

One component of creating this approachability or comfort involved being open and not being too serious, characteristics the respondents used to describe their leadership styles.

> I would also [say] that I think I'm pretty easy-going and laid-back. So that if there are concerns . . . I'm going to have an open enough mind that I'm going to see what other people see that I may not see. Or, that I'm open enough to say "hey, I was wrong and you're right and that's fine, we can do it that way." And that's the only way you get things done a lot of times, if you're willing to give up some of those things you think are right.

> One of my strengths, I feel, is not taking things too seriously; being light-hearted about things but [taking] a business-like fashion with it.

Another component of being approachable involved talking with people from the perspective of a friend rather than on the basis of a leadership position.

> . . . when we're not in meetings or when we're not talking about floor activities, I leave that [position] aside. I don't want to bring anything like that into it, and then it's just a friendship. And we still go out and have fun and have a good time.

> I try to act more as a friend or just a caring person than a top position holder.

The respondents also highlighted the importance of being respectful of and maintaining confidentiality as an aspect of making themselves approachable.

> I'm not a . . . high-up person, but yet I'm very respected because I believe in confidentiality. If they tell me something, I believe that they told me that for a reason and I don't need to tell anybody else about it.

Being approachable was something the respondents strove for in their leadership. By treating people with respect and focusing on personal relationships, rather than position relationships, they attempted to create an atmosphere in which people felt comfortable talking with and working with them.

Being a Role Model

For several of the respondents, part of leadership included being a role model for other people. They believed that leaders are role models and, therefore, should monitor what they do both as leaders and in their personal lives because other people are watching them.

> If I'm [going to] be the vice-president, I want them to be able to look up to me and not to say "oh, yeah, she goes out every weekend and does this." I don't want them talking about me like that.

In fact, if they were to give advice to newly elected leaders, these respondents would stress the importance of serving as a positive role model.

> . . . they need to know what they can and can't do because they are role models of the house. [If] people see them out at parties getting wasted . . . they can't be a house leader, because people aren't going to respect them and look up to them if they are doing stuff like that.

> . . . if you're going to be a leader . . . all [of] these people are following you and you want them to follow the way . . . you're leading. And if you're going to

> cheat and lie . . . then these people are going to cheat and lie right back to you.

Other respondents, however, while agreeing with the fact that leaders are role models, disagreed with the extent to which they must model positive behavior. For these respondents, role modeling referred to their positions and not what they did in their personal lives.

> I would say . . . that you're a role model in some senses, like as far as house meetings . . . go. But, then if it's going to go as far as partying, I'm not going to take the blame because somebody saw me partying and messing around and [then] they got in trouble for [partying]. Because some of those things are just personal decisions.

> . . . in a way we're role models, but in a way we're not. Because up here it's a whole different situation. Everybody's growing up on their own and they're not looking for anybody to follow anymore. [They] want to be more their own person.

Thus, several of the respondents believed that being a role model involved all aspects of their lives, including both their leadership time and their personal time. Other respondents, however, claimed that was taking the concept of role modeling too far, believing that college students do not need personal-life role models. Despite their differences, the respondents did agree that, as leaders, they often serve as role models for other house members.

Helping Others

Helping others was a characteristic with which each of the respondents identified. From their perspectives, helping others was an important aspect of leadership.

> [an ideal leader is] someone who will do anything any time of the . . . not any time of the day, but it won't bother them if they happen to get a phone call, if it's not too late. Because like me, I wouldn't mind if

> somebody wants to call me anytime of the night, if they have . . . if it's a problem, that's fine with me because if they need help, they need help. I'm there for anybody.
>
> I like to help people help themselves figure things out. And to do that, you need to cooperate with them and try and figure out what their style of working is.

Helping others, for the respondents, often meant listening to their concerns about other people and helping them find ways to begin understanding other perspectives.

> I try to get them to basically tell me what is wrong, how they feel about it, what they want done, or what they feel should be the right way . . . .
>
> . . . you've just got to sit and listen and maybe try to put something in their head that they don't look at. They're only seeing it one-sided. So, I'm seeing it both ways, so I'm just trying to say "well, you know, you've got to look at it this way and what she's doing, too, and not only the way you see her because she's got other things going on, too, just like everybody else." I try to let people see both sides when they get to just going one way and so try to open it up a little bit so they can see more of what's going on.

Ultimately, however, the respondents claimed that listening to other people's concerns and feelings was the most essential element in helping them.

> But I listen to them and usually that's what they need, is someone to listen.
>
> I like to take people's feelings into consideration when I'm dealing with anything . . . .

Helping others, though, meant balancing among listening to them, offering options, and not giving advice. Giving advice or telling people what they should do was viewed negatively by the respondents, largely because they believed most people would not appreciate such help.

> If they have a problem with something, I suggest maybe other things they could do. I don't ever tell them what to do because it's their decision.
>
> And then I try not to give advice, sometimes I do, just because I know that I never listen to advice. You always have to figure things out for yourself usually because you're the one that's making the decisions.
>
> You can't tell someone to do something and expect them to say "oh, okay, I'd love to." Because they're going to say "well, how am I going to learn if I don't try different things."

The respondents were asked to illustrate how they would help a house vice-president who was not being taken seriously by male members of the Association government. For several of the respondents, the most important first step they could take in providing support for the cabinet member was to listen to her concerns and attempt to provide some reassurance.

> Just talk about it. Because there's nothing really that I can do about it except for listen and to give my examples. "Oh, they're just being pig-headed about it" or "they're just being closed-minded about something." Just to be there helps a person a lot, I think. Just being there to hear her side of the story and let her know that I am with her.
>
> And maybe just try to reassure her that we all take her seriously and we know that she wouldn't be speaking if she didn't have something to say.
>
> The only thing I can even think of is just to tell her that they're the ones missing out, they're the ones that are wrong, that [she has] a good point and it should be known.

Aside from merely listening to the cabinet member, urging her to take action was also a support mechanism utilized by the respondents. This action took many forms, including encouraging her to continue regardless of the response of many of the male cabinet members.

> Right off hand, I'd probably encourage her to keep going. That even though they may not be appreciating what she's saying, to keep saying it because there is somebody out there who does appreciate it, who is listening to what she has to say. And even though she may not believe me, I'd still encourage her, I would really encourage her to stay with it . . . .
>
> And then I would probably ask her to stick it out just for herself more than anything. And for the floor just because the floor needs her to go. I would tell her to make her point known at Assembly still and to make sure that people realize that she is serious about what she is talking about and that she takes a stand for what she believes.

Thus, as leaders, the respondents attempted to help other people, partially because they believed it was the right thing to do and partially because they enjoyed it. Helping others, according to the respondents, referred to listening to them, mediating situations when necessary, and being careful not to give advice.

Encouraging Involvement

Encouraging other people on the house to be involved appeared to be, for the respondents, an important aspect of being a leader. The importance of motivating people to be involved was associated with the desire for people to have opportunities to learn and grow as well as with the desire for people to have input into the activities in which they were being asked to participate.

> . . . even if you don't have the best people . . . the people who aren't really outgoing and things like that . . . even if you can get those people involved just in the floor, then you've accomplished something. Because you're getting them out of their shell a little bit.
>
> And I don't like it when people don't talk either, because that's not how you get something done. You have to have a lot of input in order to get it done.

The respondents identified a multitude of methods for encouraging people to be active with the house. These methods included asking house members for their ideas, announcing events at house meetings, utilizing sign-up sheets, talking with people one-on-one, and recognizing the importance of motivation. Each of these methods varied in effectiveness, given the particular respondent and the house; what worked for one respondent did not necessarily work for another respondent. Despite the varied means to encourage involvement, one successful method appeared to be talking with people individually.

> And I think the best way I go about it is going door-to-door and talking to people and saying "this is what we're going to do and would you like to be involved." Because it doesn't work to put signs up on the doors saying "okay, come" and people are going to go "yeah, right, I wasn't invited."
>
> . . . maybe if I said "oh, I think you should go with us to" whatever function we have and then they end up going, I feel like "maybe if I wouldn't have said anything, they wouldn't have gone."

Although the respondents were able to identify a variety of methods to foster involvement, motivating people to become involved occasionally proved to be a frustrating endeavor.

> [For example], all the cabinet's goal is to get everybody involved. Well, everybody on the floor's goal is not to get involved. So, it's hard to be able to figure out how to motivate them to get involved because not all of them care and some people just stay in their room and lock themselves in their room.
>
> And I don't, I honestly have no idea how to motivate them to get them to come do it besides tell them it's fun. And it's a cheap way to have fun, once you pay your dues. It's a really cheap way to have fun and meet people. And you get your brother floors

> involved and you can meet other people. But, sometimes that just doesn't work. So, you've got to try to switch, which I don't think I've found yet how to switch over and get them motivated.

Finding ways to motivate people to be involved in planning and participating in activities, then, was a frustrating but worthwhile component of being a leader for the respondents.

Stressing Teamwork

Each of the respondents valued working together with their cabinet members as a team and believed that teamwork was what allowed them to accomplish their house goals. Working together as a team meant supporting one another as well as establishing good and close relationships.

> If I say there's something not right or something's wrong or "this is the way to do it," and people back me up, then it shows that we're working together and that we have talked and that we have our stuff straight between each other.

According to the respondents, the relationships that developed among cabinet members did so out of an attempt to get along with one another. Indeed, for the cabinet to work well as an entity, the respondents believed that the members had to get along and attempt to work together. With the exception of an occasional cabinet member, each of the respondents claimed to have been part of a cabinet that maintained positive relationships.

> All is good from what I can tell, except for the [cabinet member who] doesn't come . . . . As far as I can see, everybody gets along with each other well that's on cabinet. I know our freshmen [representatives] are working well together. I know our social chairs will work well together. The treasurer and I have had no problems getting the budget . . . set up, getting it signed, and getting stuff like that done.

> Everyone works pretty well together; we're pretty understanding of each other . . . .

For the respondents, the fact that cabinet members got along with one another directly resulted from respecting one another and treating one another as regular people rather than as positions.

> I find in our cabinet meetings that we're just there as people. And, it tends to work a little bit better that way. When I'm interacting with cabinet, I interact just like anybody else. I don't walk in with my head up, chip on my shoulder, or anything like that because . . . that wouldn't work.

For several of the respondents, close relationships with cabinet members presented the ideal working situations. Knowing how people would respond to them proved important for these respondents, who also believed that their friends would respond better than people whom they did not know well.

> But it ended up being that we were really good friends, which, in the end, I think would help the way we worked together. Nobody likes to get mad at anybody, but if you know someone, I think it's easier to disagree or to say your opinion. Whereas if you don't know someone, you don't want them to get the wrong idea.

> . . . the first year were people who . . . were already on [cabinet]. . . . and they were more my friends. And so it was much easier to get things done or much easier to tell them that they were doing something wrong.

Occasionally, however, there existed relationship problems with cabinets. These problems ranged from two cabinet members simply not getting along to presidents whose attitudes did not appear to fit well with the cabinet.

> There are a lot of people who don't like [the president's] attitude towards the cabinet [or] the way she puts things.

> There's been problems with the cabinet and stuff. The president hasn't been getting along with some of the people and it just doesn't work very good.

Despite their seemingly legitimate concerns, in most of these situations, the cabinet members, including the respondents, chose not to confront the individuals involved. Although this was occasionally because they believed the resident assistant was dealing with the situation, the lack of confrontation also stemmed from the desire not to cause more problems.

> I think it really didn't hurt anybody too much because our R.A. kind of told us all to blow it off. And I know she met with those two alone. And I think just the fact that we thought that somebody was trying to work on it with them . . . it helped us.

> Overall general feeling is that everybody realizes that that's the way she is. And we won't say anything to her, so it slides by fine. I mean, we don't raise a big fuss and start a fight . . . . We don't want to cause a big controversy or anything.

For many of the respondents, working together as a team called for closer individual working relationships among members of the cabinet. Two of the respondents saw a need for a closer working relationship between the president and vice-president, something both were going to strive for in the future.

> I suppose, if I could change my position, I'd put more of a relationship between the president and the vice-president. That they would have to deal a lot more with each other, and so I would know what went on with her meetings, and she would know what went on with mine.

> . . . I know I plan on being a lot closer to my vice-president. And when I'm going to make decisions, I'm going to go to her and get her and then go to the R.A. and have us all three do it instead of just the president and the R.A. or just the president making decisions.

Teamwork was something the respondents emphasized as leaders because they believed that leadership was teamwork and that working together was instrumental to accomplishing goals.

> If we're constantly conflicting in what we believe, there isn't much leadership there. People aren't going to believe in what you say. They will have a tendency to not follow and that's what leaders are for.
>
> I tend to think that a group working together is going to get more accomlished than each person doing his own thing. I just learned this in management. But, I do agree with it because I know even working this summer, if two of us set out to get something done, it didn't take us nearly as long as if one person did one thing and one did the other.

The respondents also believed that, in order for the house cabinet to work together to accomplish house tasks, compromise was necessary.

> But I think that on our floor . . . probably the most important [thing] is to be able to compromise but still let everybody talk . . . .
>
> Because everybody has such different views that you have to compromise. Otherwise, it's not going to work . . . or people end up fighting over it. But if you compromise, things can be done smoothly . . . .

For several of the respondents, the importance of compromising extended from their belief that people do not work well with individuals who appear to be "taking charge."

> . . . people might resent you if they get the feeling that [you're taking charge]. Just for the fact that people don't like people that say "do it my way and that's the only way there is." They don't like that. You need to compromise to get things done.
>
> If somebody starts to think you're a real witch, then that doesn't help at all. Usually they're just going to back away and not help out at all. I think it depends

> on the situation . . . . But I think compromise is very important.

Hence, compromise was an important tool to establishing a teamwork concept in a house leadership situation. The respondents believed teamwork was an essential component of leadership and, therefore, was a component they emphasized in their own leadership styles.

Handling Negative Situations

As leaders, the respondents stated that they often had to deal with negative situations. The respondents spoke about (a) lack of involvement, (b) cabinet members not following through, (c) receiving criticism, and (e) confronting others.

Lack of involvement

A common problem the respondents faced as leaders was that of a lack of involvement in house activities.

> . . . right now we have a lot of athletes on the floor that don't have time to be involved. And there's a lot of girls . . . moving into sororities that [think] "well, I could care less what you guys are doing." And because we have a lot of those kinds of people on the floor, our floor involvement is pretty low this year.

> . . . the floor will only be as involved as the people want to be. But when some of your cabinet isn't helping or involved, then it doesn't get you anywhere either.

Given the opportunity to change anything about the leadership situations, several of the respondents claimed they would increase the level of involvement.

> More involvement and more people to come, but you can't force people to come.

> I wish that people always wanted to be involved, but that's not really realistic.

According to the respondents, the lack of involvement stemmed from a lack of awareness of events and opportunities. Several of the respondents expressed exasperation with people who either did not attend house meetings or who did not read posted information.

> . . . we have a problem where we'll have a house meeting and we'll talk about something and decide on it and post it. And then three weeks later, somebody that's lived there [all this time] will say "what do you mean" and [will] get . . . [an] attitude about it. So, [I'll say], "well, we decided on that about a month ago." Not that everybody should be made to go to house meetings, but . . . .

> Then, if they keep doing it [not paying attention], I tend to yell at them . . . . We post house minutes in both bathrooms right after the meetings. People three days later will [say] "what did you talk about in the house meeting" and [I'll say] "why don't you go to the bathroom with me." [I] walk in there and point it out to them. I don't like to do that, but sometimes you've just got to hit people upside the head and say "this is how it is."

> I wish more people would come, because they would know that there are things going on, whereas . . . they're kind of like "well, I didn't know that." Well, if you'd come, you'd know.

Thus, as leaders the respondents confronted a lack of involvement on the part of the house members and, occasionally, on the part of other cabinet members. For the respondents, this lack of involvement was related to people's failure to attend house meetings and to read posted house information.

Lack of cabinet follow-through

The failure of some cabinet members to fulfill their duties or to follow through on assigned tasks irritated many of the respondents, who often found themselves covering for these individuals.

> [For example], sitting at the voting [table]. Give me half an hour of your time. That's all I asked my cabinet people to do, is a half an hour. We signed up a week ahead and, by the time that week gets there, they can't remember when they have to work. I guess that just irritates me to death.

According to the respondents, the problem typically occurred when cabinet members were asked to devote some time to a project, such as watching the voting tables or helping monitor a house party. They believed that these particular cabinet members simply did not want to take on the responsibility.

> . . . I'll go into a cabinet member's room and talk for two hours and it will be no big deal. But the minute I ask them for help [they say] "I've got this to do and this to do and this to do." I think it's just because they don't want to take [the] responsibility to do it.

> At our floor party this year, we were over in Larch and everybody had signed up to work at a specific time. And the later the night got, the less people were showing up to work. And I ended up working from 10:30 to 1:30 for everybody just because [they didn't show up]. And there wasn't much I could do about it . . . . I just worked it and I didn't say anything. I just figured that was the way the night was going to go anyway, so I had expected. So that's just lack of respect . . . not doing what your responsibilities are.

Several of the respondents responded to such situations by expressing their discontent to the cabinet as a whole rather than addressing the responsible individuals.

> . . . when it came to the cabinet meeting . . . I said "thanks to everybody who came and helped decorate, who was there to work and who helped clean up. You know who you are. Thanks a lot. It's well appreciated. And to those of you that didn't show up, I don't have anything else to say." And I didn't say anything else about it because they knew who they were and they knew I was upset with them. But I wasn't going to press it. There wasn't anything I could do about it anymore.

Other respondents, however, stated that they never had to deal with such problems because their cabinet members were enthusiastic and involved.

> I wouldn't say that so many people were involved that that's what has really kept us going, but all the people on cabinet really ended up wanting to be there.

Thus, lack of cabinet follow-through proved to be a problem for several of the respondents, who often found themselves in the position of covering for others. Other respondents, however, did not encounter such problems but rather had cabinet members who were actively involved in the house.

Receiving criticism

The respondents often found themselves in the situation of having to deal with the criticism they received from other leaders or house members. The respondents varied in how they handled receiving such criticism. One respondent admitted to getting angry easily while another stated that she tried to allow such criticism to bounce off of her.

> . . . I get mad [easily]. So if someone does [criticize me], I usually go to another cabinet member and I just let loose. But usually after I do that, then it's like well there's no reason for me to get mad.

> It takes me awhile to get mad. I just sit there and [think] "yeah, okay" . . . . If they have a problem with me, that's their problem because whatever I am, I am. I'm not going to change for them only.

For several of the respondents, handling criticism meant learning to accept it, take the relevant parts of it into consideration, and let go of the rest.

> . . . I wasn't going to lose major sleep because of something that didn't work out. Not everything always does. So kind of that acceptance part of it, that you kind of learn to deal with what people say or how people feel.

> You just have to have the attitude to . . . bounce it off because you're going to take crap in a leadership position no matter where you're at. You've got to let some of the things bounce off of you [even while you] take them into consideration.

Through experience, then, the respondents learned to deal with criticism from others. While some of them responded angrily, others attempted to consider the helpful information and let go of the rest.

Confronting others

Whether it be for discipline reasons or a cabinet member's failure to fulfill her responsibilities, the respondents also had to confront their peers. The respondents varied in their approach to confrontation and in their comfort level with it.

> . . . I've never written anybody up in my president's position. But as far as enforcing quiet hours . . . I just go and [say] "okay, you guys, it's quiet hours" . . . . [I don't say] "okay, now don't be doing this."

> The one thing that I had a small problem with . . . was . . . that I didn't like to have to be the enforcer one-on-one, which only happened once or twice and probably won't . . . very much because I'm not in a president or RA position. But I guess if I was in a position like that or . . . if it took place again this year, I hope that I would feel better about it.

The fear of making other people angry or upset was a strong consideration for respondents when confronting people.

> [I was] kind of scared because I didn't want her to be mad. But I knew she needed to know that what she had done was wrong and that [it] had been very rude.

This fear of upsetting other people combined with the fear of losing a relationship caused one respondent to change her approach when confronting friends.

> If I was good friends with one of the girls, I tended to almost say it in a kind of sarcastic, joking [way] so that they wouldn't take it nearly as seriously. But they knew "maybe I'm not doing it the right way." And the people that I had a tendency to have a short fuse with were people who . . . didn't do their [job] or they were always skipping stuff. I had a tendency to just say "hey, get it together and do it right."

Despite their fears of confrontation, the respondents believed it to be an important part of a leader's responsibilities. When asked how they could help a vice-president who was not being taken seriously by her male colleagues, as discussed earlier, the respondents varied in whether they would encourage the vice-president to confront the men. Reflecting, however, on how they would handle the situation if they were the vice-president, most of the respondents said they would confront the men.

> I would probably confront the men myself. I think that's one of the best ways to go about it. Because if they don't know that it bothers you, they may not even know that they're doing it . . . . I think if you go up and confront them, they're going to have more respect for you than [if] you [tell] someone else.

Thus, the respondents had to deal with confronting cabinet members or house members for a variety of reasons. The individual confrontations made some of the respondents uncomfortable because they did not want to upset other people or possibly damage relationships. Given a negative situation, however, the respondents appeared willing to confront the people involved.

Personal Fit with General Leadership Characteristics

When presented with two lists of general leadership characteristics, one of which the respondents stated was more common to women's leadership styles while the other they claimed was more common to men's leadership styles, the respondents identified most closely with the characteristics they associated with

women's leadership styles (List A). List A included such leadership characteristics as empowering others, interdependence, group affiliation, information sharing, cooperation, process-oriented, and nurturing. List B included such characteristics as individual achievement, competition, autonomy, hierarchical, aggressive, outcome-oriented, and communication through appropriate channels. Each of the respondents claimed that List A was more descriptive of their leadership style than List B. In their words:

> Probably "A." Because most of the time I don't have a need to be in complete control or be real aggressive. There's really not much competition.

> Because I'm going to be a kindergarten and elementary school teacher, so all of the things in List "A" kind of describe me anyway.

The respondents identified several specific List A characteristics as being most descriptive of their leadership styles, including cooperation, information sharing, direct communication, and group affiliation.

> Cooperation. Information sharing. Direct communication because most of what we do is either by talking or by something written on a sign. It's not like "you tell her, she'll tell her, and she'll tell them." And then through group affiliation and connection.

> Group affiliation, connection, making sure everybody knows. Information sharing . . . . Make sure everybody knows the same thing. Don't keep someone in the dark. [For] example, cabinet. Don't keep one cabinet member out because they're just as important as . . . the social chair is just as important as the president is, because everybody has to have the same information.

The respondents also identified List A characteristics which did not describe their leadership styles. Each respondent cited "empowering others" as a characteristic which did not fit with their leadership styles.

> I don't know about "empowering others" because I don't think anybody can empower over someone else.
>
> Maybe "empowering others" because I don't feel like I completely power over other people. I guess I think of being overpowering. So it's kind of like someone [who says] "we will do this and we will do that" and just being real big over someone.

As indicated by the respondents' words, they believed that "empowering others" meant that they were exerting power over other people, a characteristic with which they did not want to identify.

> Probably the "empowering others" one is kind of [questionable]. I think that means that I'm trying to be in charge, that I'm trying to be the one to make all of the rules . . . .
>
> I just don't think that's the way it should work. I shouldn't be . . . the almighty saying that it's important to make sure that everybody's involved and has a voice and all that kind of stuff. I think that I'm making their decision, that I may be saying something that will kind of pull them over the way I want it done. Maybe not listening as much. So that I'm putting a power on them to make them do what I want done, I think. That's how I understand it.

Given a definition of "empowering others" that referred to giving power to other people and helping others become leaders, several respondents then stated that "empowering others" fit with their leadership styles.

> If it was helping others and helping them become leaders in themselves, I think that would fit more into my style because I try to help others maybe . . . see the potential in themselves so that they can be leaders.

Despite the fact that each of the respondents more closely identified with the leadership characteristics in List A, each of them also identified with some characteristics in List B. These characteristics included aggressiveness, individual achievement, and autonomy.

> Aggressive. I get what I want.
>
> Maybe individual achievement because . . . I haven't always gotten help from [the cabinet]. Sometimes it's something I need to do on my own. For example, if I planned our entire dinner exchange and . . . I did the work, then that's an achievement.
>
> Autonomy because I'm independent. And when I'm dealing with my own problems and working through things that I need to do, I usually don't want help.

Thus, the respondents claimed that the characteristics in List A most closely described their leadership styles. They did, however, identify characteristics in List A that did not fit with their styles and characteristics in List B that did fit with their styles.

Leadership: Costs and Rewards

In examining their personal experiences with leadership, the respondents spoke of the benefits and disadvantages of being a leader. This category of data involves two sections: (a) rewards of leadership, and (b) disadvantages of leadership. Each section is addressed separately.

Rewards of Leadership

According to the respondents, the benefits reaped from their involvement in leadership activities extended far beyond the realms of career interests. The three rewards identified included: (a) improving leadership skills, (b) personal fulfillment, and (c) knowing others and being known.

Improving leadership skills

The opportunity to learn more about leadership through experience was cited as a benefit of leadership involvement. Growth ranged from improved communication skills to a better understanding of the importance of getting along with people.

The respondents learned a great deal about their own ability to communicate, through their involvement with leadership activities.

> I learned . . . to get along in a larger group. To not be so scared to speak what I have to say. That was the biggest thing, to be able to amend a bill or to say "I call the question" in front of a million people when you didn't know if it was the right time to do it or not.
>
> . . . I kind of learned that you can always talk and that people won't always listen, but that you can speak up once in a while, and if you try not to be all negative or anything like that, people are bound to listen and understand.

Leadership offered insight into getting along with other leaders and house members.

> Other than that, how to interact with people. I've gotten, since I've been on cabinet, I've learned a lot about how to get along with people. I've really learned how to go out and talk to them and just be friendly with everybody . . . .
>
> It's going to be hard to get along with everybody. But when you're in a leadership position, and everyone has their opinion, I just learned that you've got to, regardless of personal feelings, you've got to try to get along with everbody. You can't please everybody, but you can at least try and get along with them. It makes the job a lot easier.

Recognizing the value of learning and the opportunities provided by leadership involvement, the respondents continued to be motivated to learn and improve their skills through continued leadership experience. The areas in which they wanted to continue to learn were, in large part, identical to the areas in which they claimed to have learned the most from leadership. For instance, one respondent believed that she had grown significantly in her ability to

communicate, especially with regard to a group setting. However, she wanted to continue working on her communication skills.

> Probably the communication. I got better, but I still think that was a major weakness. Not so much communicating in front of people but the one-on-one . . . . But, communication skills were probably still lacking when I got out of there.

Similarly, several respondents hoped to learn more about relating to people, getting along with people, and being able to communicate with different types of people.

> Maybe more about different ways of communicating with different personalities and things. I get along with people; I can communicate really well with people, but having the same personality. Of course, everyone does have other ways. People that are really bashful or really extremely hyper, it's "okay, let's see how they go about this." So, I'd like to know more about that kind of stuff.

> I would like to know how to get along with everybody. I mean, I know that's probably never going to be possible, but I'm really scared of another cabinet member and I maybe not agreeing, not getting along at some point in time, because I've seen it happen. And I don't want it to happen. I think that makes me less aggressive, because I don't want to step on anybody's feet. I don't want anybody to get mad; I want everybody to be happy and so I hold back on things maybe. I haven't yet, but I'm sure I would just so somebody wouldn't get mad.

Thus, the respondents identified learning about themselves and about leadership as a direct benefit from their involvement in leadership activities.

Sense of fulfillment

Not only did the respondents believe that leadership involvement was benefitting them by providing opportunities to learn and develop, they also claimed that leadership gave them a sense of fulfillment. Helping others,

including listening to their problems, provided the respondents with this feeling of fulfillment.

> . . . I like to feel as if maybe I've helped someone do something. Or that, if I've been behind them and maybe [pushed] them just a little bit farther, that they've been willing to do it.
>
> I like to see other people happy. And if there's any way I can contribute to that . . . it makes me feel better, too, because if I can listen to someone and see them resolve their problems just by me sitting and listening to them, it's a really good feeling. And I didn't do anything, I just sat there, but still I know that if, maybe if I wasn't there that they would still be holding all their feelings in. And it's good to see that kind of thing happen.

In addition to the feeling that came from helping other people, the sense of fulfillment also came from having been involved in the creation of and/or implementation of house activities as well as from having been involved within the cabinet.

> . . . even though we didn't do a whole lot on our floor as a whole . . . what we did do was partially my doings. And that . . . some of the friendships that were made and . . . the things that we did . . . , were things that I had worked at.

A sense of fulfillment, for the respondents, was directly related to leadership involvement and stemmed largely from the value they placed on relationships with other people. Helping others, whether by listening to their problems or by providing activities for them, contributed significantly to this feeling of fulfillment.

Knowing others and being known

As illustrated by their commitment to helping others, the respondents placed a high value on being connected with other people. Indeed, for several of

the respondents, the most enjoyable aspect of their residence hall leadership positions was the opportunity to continue meeting and getting to know new people.

> The best part about it was probably when we come back to school in the fall. I love to meet people. Well, I didn't start off that way, but by my junior year I had fun meeting people.

Meeting people, in this instance, also implied getting to know them and developing relationships with them.

> . . . the satisfaction of people knowing who I am and where I live then. And . . . I like it, because people come to my door and they come in and say "oh, I like your room" or come in and talk, and then I feel a little bit closer to that person.

> Knowing everybody. I enjoy being friends with everybody or just enjoying being nice with everybody. I may not have to be their best friend and talk to them all the time, but we're nice to each other because they know who I am and they'll always say "hi" and I always say "hi" back to them. I just, it makes me happy . . . .

House leadership positions provided opportunities to meet people and establish positive relationships with them, leading to a feeling of being connected with people.

Disadvantages of Leadership Involvement

Of course, no evaluation of leadership would be complete without an examination of its disadvantages. Despite the fact that the advantages outweighed the disadvantages, the respondents did identify several costs they perceived to be associated with being a leader. The costs claimed by the respondents included: (a) time, and (b) relationships.

Time

Leadership clearly was viewed by the respondents as work. In order to successfully carry out their leadership responsibilities, the respondents gave a great deal of time.

> That it's not always fun. I mean, I had to get up and go to the leadership conference earlier than everybody else. It takes a lot more time usually. I was outside in the freezing cold weather playing games when everybody else, all my friends, were back here in their bed and nice and warm.
>
> It takes up a lot of time.

Consequently, the time commitment required to be a good leader for the respondents was a disadvantage to be considered by the respondents when evaluating the role of leadership in their lives.

Potential for losing relationships

Although they could not identify a personal relationship that they had lost because of their leadership involvement, several of the respondents professed to considering relationship loss a potential disadvantage of being a leader.

> It may cost you friendships. I would say not on the floor that much because most of the time you know who you like and don't like, without the floor president and vice-president type thing. But I would say it could cost you friendships. It could cost you just a good relationship with somebody. I would [say] that's probably the biggest thing.
>
> Sometimes it cost friends. I don't think I've ever really lost a friend. But like telling that girl at work what to do, she was very upset and she went to the boss and said she was offended because I told her what to do.

The fear of damaging a relationship, for several of the respondents, was most real when they had to confront one of their peers. One respondent

especially believed confrontation to be a problem because people had a tendency to take it personally.

> . . . if you go and tell them they need to do their job this way and not another way, then they are taking it personally and they're saying "she doesn't like me, she's mad at me, she doesn't like the way things are being done" when in reality all I'm doing is saying that I don't like the way you're doing your job. It has nothing to do with the personal part of it, but people tend to take things way too personally when you tell them something. So that's when the tensions get high . . . and you might end up losing a friend or . . . a relationship of some sort.

Whether the loss of a relationship was an actual occurrence for the respondents or a potential to be seriously considered, there appeared to be some agreement that people did not always understand or appreciate their leadership efforts. At times, they felt unappreciated and as though they were to blame when people did not like the outcome of their work. The respondents also believed that misunderstandings could lead to problems with relationships, and, at the very least, were a disadvantage of leadership involvement.

> I would have to say it was probably my last semester as president. There [were] just a lot of other things going on, besides being the president. And I didn't get involved in a lot of things . . . . [For example], we have Big Brothers and stuff like that. Well, for three years, I'd done it and didn't have fun doing it. So, I just didn't do it. Well, that ticked a lot of the cabinet people off. They didn't understand why I was doing that. And so I think at that time, they didn't appreciate . . . the other things that I was trying to do because they were more concerned with things that I was doing that made them mad.

Situations such as the one above, in which a leader does not feel appreciated because of other leaders' lack of understanding, were the types of situations highlighted by the respondents to indicate the potential for losing or

damaging relationships. Because of the emphasis the respondents placed on being connected and developing positive relationships, even the potential for losing one such relationship must be considered a disadvantage to leadership involvement.

Summary Discussion of Personal Experiences with Leadership

The respondents' discussions of their personal experiences with leadership revolved around five central topics: (a) learning about leadership, (b) setting goals, (c) receiving encouragement and support, (d) leadership responsibilities and styles, and (e) the costs and rewards of leadership.

Observation, experience, and educational opportunities such as leadership conferences served as the methods used by the respondents to learn how to lead. They learned to lead largely by watching others, such as their role models, and by practicing, drawing on previous experiences to help them in their present positions. Leadership conferences offered the respondents opportunities to learn about leadership skills as well as current social problems. The respondents claimed that the conferences were helpful but added that they would make them more interactive and place more emphasis on interpersonal relationships.

A discussion of their goals revealed that the respondents' leadership involvement was motivated, in large part, by their career aspirations. Each of the respondents possessed well-defined career objectives and utilized leadership opportunities to develop the skills necessary to carry out those objectives. In fact, many of the respondents believed that leadership involvement was essential to achieving career goals. With the exception of their desire to be involved in some form of leadership activity, the respondents varied in their specific

leadership goals. Several respondents indicated a desire to hold house leadership positions with more authority than they presently held as well as an interest in the position of resident assistant. Others, however, appeared more interested in exploring leadership opportunities related to their career and/or academic majors, such as participating in the Business Council.

To achieve their goals, the respondents emphasized the importance of receiving encouragement and support. In fact, most of the respondents indicated that they had become involved in house leadership activities largely because of the encouragement they received from their resident assistants. Family members and friends also played a role in encouraging the respondents to get involved in house leadership. Receiving encouragement not only made the respondents aware of available leadership positions, but also contributed to their self-confidence in terms of seeking such positions. Similarly, the respondents credited family members and friends with providing support for them as they worked to fulfill their aspirations. The hall director provided additional support for the presidents, meeting with them on a biweekly basis. These individuals also helped the respondents deal with over-commitment, stress, and burnout.

According to the respondents, their house leadership position responsibilities included being responsible, running meetings, telling others what to do, delegating, being approachable, being a role model, helping others, encouraging involvement, stressing teamwork, and handling negative situations. Although running meetings and delegating tasks were responsibilities which belonged largely to the presidents, the other responsibilities were shared by all the respondents.

The respondents believed that, as house leaders, they had to be responsible, meaning that they needed to follow through on tasks as well as to continue to learn about their positions. They also believed that they had to be able to keep people focused on tasks and goals, which often required them to tell people what to do and how to do it. Although this responsibility came easily for some of the respondents, others found it to be very difficult and uncomfortable. The difference appeared to be whether the respondents were concerned about how people would respond to their instructions. Those respondents who found telling others what to do difficult were the most concerned with how people would respond to them.

Interpersonal relationships, in fact, were an important component of the responsibilities the respondents associated with their leadership positions. They emphasized being approachable as one of their leadership responsibilities and, by treating people with respect, attempted to create an atmosphere in which people felt comfortable talking with them. They also emphasized interpersonal relationships rather than relating to people on the basis of their positions. Although they distinguished helping others from being approachable, it involved many of the same tasks. The respondents believed it was their responsibility to help people by listening to them, mediating situations when necessary, and being respectful enough of people not to give them advice.

Being house leaders, according to the respondents, also required that they be role models, encourage involvement, and stress teamwork. The respondents believed that their positions required them to be role models for others, although they disagreed to what extent. Some of the respondents asserted that role modeling involved all aspects of their lives whereas others claimed that it

involved their leadership time but not their personal time. Because they valued involvement, the respondents stressed working together as a team to accomplish their goals. According to the respondents, such teamwork and collaboration required close working relationships among members of the cabinet as well as the house. They believed it was their responsibility to help facilitate these relationships as well as collaboration.

The final responsibility identified by the respondents involved handling negative situations. The respondents stressed that they had to contend with a general lack of involvement and a lack of cabinet follow-through, both of which they found frustrating. In the instance of cabinet members failing to follow through on tasks, several of the respondents often found themselves covering for others. The respondents also stated that they had to deal with receiving criticism and with confronting others. They had to learn to accept the relevant aspects of the criticism they received while letting the rest go. Confronting others required the respondents to face their fears of upsetting others or damaging relationships, a phenomenon which was not comfortable for several of them.

Reflecting on their personal leadership experiences, the respondents also spoke about their leadership styles. Presented with two lists of leadership characteristics, one of which they identified as being more descriptive of women's leadership styles and the other as more descriptive of men's styles, the respondents identified most closely with the characteristics they associated with women's leadership styles. The characteristics they identified as most descriptive of their styles included cooperation, information sharing, direct communication, and group affiliation. They also, however, identified with aggressiveness, individual achievement, and autonomy, characteristics they

claimed were more descriptive of men's leadership styles. Thus, the respondents described their leadership styles as involving characteristics that they claim describe both women's and men's leadership styles.

The costs and rewards of leadership, according to the respondents, needed to be taken into consideration when determining whether or not to be involved in leadership activities. The respondents asserted that the benefits of leadership included improved leadership skills, personal fulfillment, and connection with others. The respondents believed, as they stated in their discussions of learning how to lead, that their involvement in leadership activities allowed them to develop and improve such leadership skills as communication and ability to relate to people. The interpersonal relationships they developed by getting to know people and the fulfillment they received from helping others and being involved also reflected rewards the respondents associated with leadership.

The disadvantages of leadership included the amount of time involved and the potential for losing relationships. Interpersonal relationships were emphasized again by the respondents' concern for losing or damaging them. Although none of the respondents could identify a relationship that they had lost, the fear of losing or damaging a relationship made them cautious when handling various situations. They also believed that they were occasionally misunderstood in their efforts and intentions. Thus, the disadvantages and rewards of leadership required careful consideration in evaluating the role of leadership in their lives.

Conclusion

The respondents spoke in general terms about leadership, highlighting the characteristics they believed were necessary to be a leader. They spoke of the

obstacles that women pursuing leadership interests face, but emphasized that they did not face such obstacles in the residence halls. Throughout their discussion of leadership, the respondents stressed the importance of interpersonal relationships. This importance was reflected in the responsibilities they associated with their positions, in the characteristics they used to describe their leadership styles, and in the potential rewards and disadvantages that came with leadership involvement.

In Chapter Five, these results are discussed and interpreted in light of their meaning for this study. Implications of the results as well as recommendations for practice and further research are also included.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter begins with a discussion of the results of the study, as outlined in Chapter Four. Following the discussion of the results are the implications of the research and a set of recommendations for administrators within the Department of Residence to review and consider. The chapter concludes with recommendations for further research.

Discussion of the Results of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe the leadership experiences of women leading in an all women's residence hall at a coeducational institution. The specific objectives of the study were: (a) to understand and describe the experiences of women living in a single-sex house (floor) in a single-sex residence hall, (b) to examine whether these women articulated leadership styles described as models of women's ways of leading, and (c) to examine whether these women believed their leadership styles were supported by their house, the Richardson Court Association, and the Department of Residence.

Despite an attempt to address the specific objectives of the study through research questions, responses elicited from the respondents failed to speak to the objectives. Consequently, the results of the study will be discussed in light of the themes developed from the data and, where appropriate, will address the objectives of the study.

Residence Hall Living and Leading Environments

Living in an All-Women's Residence Hall

All of the respondents, with the exception of one, had requested to live in an all-women's residence hall. The fifth respondent requested to live in a coeducational residence hall but was placed in an all-women's hall. Those individuals who selected an all-women's residence hall did so largely because of their uncertainty about being in a living environment with men. In fact, these women lacked confidence in their abilities to interact with men or to express themselves with men present. Even the respondent who preferred a coeducational residence hall indicated that she was happy that she had been placed in an all-women's hall, believing that she would not have studied as much in a coeducational environment.

The respondents' words, here, confirm assertions made by researchers (Bennett & Shayner, 1988; Forrest, Hotelling, & Kuk, 1984; Hall & Sandler, 1984) that women do not always feel comfortable in coeducational university settings. The women in this study felt more comfortable living in a single-sex environment rather than a coeducational environment, emphasizing the importance of all-women's residence halls.

Leading within the Residence Halls

Upon their arrival at Iowa State University, the respondents possessed limited, if any, knowledge about the leadership opportunities available within the university. Although they were interested in becoming involved in the campus community, they were uncertain about the opportunities that existed and about how take advantage of those opportunities. As a consequence, the

respondents became involved in leadership activities on their house because the opportunities were readily visible.

Astin's (1977) research states that students increase their chances of being elected to a student leadership position if they live in residence halls. The availability of leadership opportunities within residence halls and the lack of awareness of opportunities within the larger campus community indicates that the respondents' chances of leadership involvement were increased by the fact that they lived in a residence hall.

Relationships also appeared to influence the respondents' involvement in leadership activities within their houses, exemplifying the idea that interpersonal relationships are important to women even in the context of leadership (Sagaria, 1988). Relationships influenced the respondents in two ways: (a) they believed that getting involved was a good way to get to know people on their floor, and (b) they felt more comfortable working with people they already knew. Thus, their leadership involvement was intertwined with the relationships they had developed and that they hoped to develop.

Other factors, such as their career aspirations and a belief that they could contribute to the improvement of the house environment, also motivated some of the respondents to become involved in house leadership positions. The most important factors, however, seemed to be the availability of opportunities and the development of interpersonal relationships.

Residence halls, then, provided the respondents with valuable leadership opportunities. Not only did they offer the opportunity to get involved in leadership activities without having to survey the campus to find them, the residence halls also provided leadership opportunities that offered the potential

for growth and development of interpersonal relationships. Therefore, residence halls should not be overlooked when assessing the ability of campus programs to provide for women's leadership development.

General Leadership Characteristics

When asked to list the characteristics associated with leadership, the respondents offered a limited perspective on leadership, describing leaders simply as people who are able to motivate others, who are able to relate to others, and who are responsible. The respondents, prior to this study, had not thought a great deal about leadership. As a result, many of their responses involved "I don't know" statements, and they often had difficulty finding examples to support any ideas which they did state. In addition, their language was choppy and convoluted, making their thoughts difficult to interpret. Thus, the respondents did not articulate well-thought out ideas on leadership but rather offered ideas that were narrow in focus.

The respondents emphasized motivating others as a characteristic of a leader. They believed that a leader should work to help others achieve their potential and accomplish their goals, helping them focus on the things which they can do. Several of the respondents stated that a positive attitude was necessary to motivate others because people do not respond well to negative attitudes. The ability to relate to others also characterized a leader, according to the respondents. Relating to others included being friendly, understanding, and not being uptight, as well as communicating openly and honestly with people.

The respondents, stressing the importance of motivating and relating to others, emphasized the importance of interpersonal relationships. They described leaders as being interested in helping others succeed, in being

understanding of people, and in being friendly. The values highlighted by these descriptors include caring about others and helping others to grow, values which are central to the concept of generative leadership (Sagaria, 1988). Generative leaders emphasize working together and value interdependence, making the empowerment of other group members central to their purpose (Sagaria, 1988). Thus, two of the descriptors the respondents used to characterize leaders fit with the idea of leadership as generative, a style more likely to be associated with women's behavior than with men's (Sagaria & Johnsrud, 1988).

The respondents also described leaders as people who are responsible. According to the respondents, responsibility involved being able to direct a group of people, as well as being organized and able to keep others organized. Responsibility also included competence, being knowledgeable about one's position and the situations with which one was dealing. The respondents focused on a leader as being the person who was in charge of, or responsible for, a group of people. Being responsible, as explained by the respondents, reflected a leadership perspective in which the leader operates alone (Sagaria & Johnsrud, 1988). Male-oriented leadership styles emphasize responsibility in this sense, where the leader is in charge of decision-making and taking risks for the group (Bennis & Nanus; 1985 Helgesen, 1990; Sagaria & Johnsrud, 1988).

The leadership perspective offered by the respondents indicated a mixing of male-oriented leadership styles with styles more reflective of women's values. The varied characteristics used by the respondents to describe leaders highlighted an attempt to balance such male-oriented values as responsibility and being in charge with such values as interdependence and empowering

others. They recognized the importance of being responsible and competent but also emphasized the importance of working with and relating to people.

Overall, then, the respondents' descriptions of leadership were very similar to that expressed by generative leadership. However, whereas generative leadership stresses competence and responsibility within the parameters of shared leadership (Sagaria & Johnsrud, 1988), the respondents described being responsible as being in charge of the group and able to direct the group. Although the respondents described leadership in such a way that required a balance between such values as responsibility and interdependence, they appeared unaware of how a leader could be responsible without being the lone person in charge of a group. Thus, the respondents needed information about feminine ways of leading, such as generative leadership, in which responsibility and interdependence are perceived as equally important to collective leadership efforts.

Women and Leadership

Overcoming Obstacles

The respondents believed that women in general have to overcome stereotypes and obstacles to prove that they are capable of leading. They stated that women face such stereotypes as "women are not equal to men" and "women lack the necessary skills to be leaders." The respondents also believed that women were expected to go to greater lengths than men to prove themselves to people in general, and particularly to men.

In discussing the need to overcome stereotypes and for women to prove their leadership abilities, the respondents spoke in general terms. Their language, in other words, referred to society at large rather than to their personal

experiences. For example, one respondent stated "still somewhere society tends to be kind of like that, where the woman's place is in the home." Another respondent stated "there can never be a woman president because that just wouldn't happen because she's a woman . . . ." The respondents, then, drew upon their knowledge of or perceptions about society at-large as well as what they read in magazines or learned in class to provide the examples for these discussions.

Although the respondents described overcoming obstacles and proving leadership abilities as general problems for women, they were unable to relate to such obstacles and expectations on a personal level. Most of the respondents stated that they had never noticed stereotypes being placed on them or needing to prove themselves to others. In fact, not only could the respondents not identify personal experiences of being stereotyped or expected to prove themselves, they also could not see how they might be affected by general stereotyping of, and expectations of, women. One respondent, for example, said that she would not be affected by stereotypes or expectations unless she was specifically being targeted by them. One respondent did identify a situation in which she was on the receiving end of the negative perceptions of a male peer, but was not certain whether those perceptions were based on the fact that she was a woman or something else.

Although they could not relate to the stereotypes and expectations with which they claimed other female leaders struggle, the respondents did recognize the importance for women to find ways to overcome the obstacles. The only strategy for overcoming obstacles identified by the respondents, however, was being a "strong woman." To overcome obstacles and stereotypes, women leaders

needed to be strong and able to persist in the face of adversity. In other words, the respondents could not identify strategies for women to overcome such obstacles other than to simply continue in spite of the obstacles. In fact, when asked how they would handle a situation in which they were not being taken seriously by male colleagues, the respondents said they would continue expressing their thoughts and opinions. They did not, however, identify other methods with which they would address the situation.

Not having thought through methods for confronting such obstacles highlights again the inability of the respondents to relate to the struggles they claim that women leaders face. The implications of the respondents' inability to identify with these struggles are two-fold: (a) the effects of unrecognized discrimination or biased treatment are damaging, and (b) the identification of strategies with which to overcome leadership obstacles is inhibited.

Research on sexism and discrimination indicates that "subtle and/or inadvertent incidents can sometimes do the most damage because they often occur without the full awareness of those involved" (Hall & Sandler, 1984, p. 4). For example, a woman who is unaware that she is receiving biased treatment may interpret such treatment as normal and may, unknowingly, internalize the negative consequences of such treatment. Although it should not be interpreted that the respondents were receiving biased treatment and were simply unaware of it, one must question their level of awareness concerning their treatment. The importance of this question is exemplified by the respondent who claimed that she had received biased treatment but that she did not know whether it was because she was a woman. In other words, the respondents may not be able to

relate to the obstacles they claim women leaders face because they simply may not be aware of the subtle faces of biased treatment.

Inability to identify with facing gender-based leadership obstacles inhibited the respondents' ability to identify strategies for overcoming such obstacles. As long as they do not perceive that they are receiving biased treatment, methods for overcoming gender-based obstacles may not be important. Regardless of their personal ability to relate to these obstacles, the respondents' did indicate that women in society struggle with gender-based stereotypes and expectations. It is feasible, then, that at some point, particularly if they continue their leadership involvement, the respondents will face such obstacles, and, because of their inability to identify strategies for dealing with the obstacles, will be unprepared to address them. Based on their own statements about the obstacles women leaders face, the respondents needed expanded opportunities to learn about dealing with such obstacles.

Working with Men

The respondents stated that they had not had a great deal of leadership interaction with men, particularly in the residence halls. There was some variation in the degree to which the respondents had worked with men in the residence halls based largely on the positions they held. The presidents' responsibilities, for example, were largely contained within the all-women's residence hall, whereas the vice-presidents' and social chair's responsibilities offered more cause for interaction with male leaders. Most of the references the respondents made to working with men, however, involved experiences that occurred in high school or at work rather than in the residence halls. Thus, with

the exception of occasional encounters, the respondents had limited interaction with male leaders in the residence halls.

Despite their limited interaction with male leaders, the respondents did believe that men wanted women leaders to be passive and that men did not take women leaders seriously. The respondents thought that women working with men could feel belittled and stereotyped because they believed assertive women were treated differently than assertive men and because some men do not listen to women. The respondents believed, however, that problems of women leaders working with men were not prevalent in the residence halls. Rather, they claimed that the residence halls provided an environment safe from such problems. Their beliefs, however, could be a consequence of the fact that the respondents had limited interactions with male leaders in the residence halls.

In comparing working with men to working with women in leadership, the respondents stated that they preferred working with women. The respondents claimed that men perceived themselves as dominant over women and that men were less likely than women to take their leadership responsibilities seriously. Based on their experiences, they believed that women were more likely to listen and compromise and that women were more excited about and committed to leadership work. One respondent did state, however, that women often deferred to men, and others stated that women bickered and held grudges more than men. Overall, the respondents said they preferred working with women because women did not criticize one another on the basis of gender and because they were more understanding of women with whom they had had a disagreement. Their preference for leading with other women emphasizes, again, the importance of single-sex environments for women's leadership development.

The respondents, when examining two lists of general leadership characteristics, identified one list of characteristics as more common to men's leadership styles and the other list as more common to women's leadership styles. The list of qualities (List A) that they claimed were more common among women included such leadership characteristics as empowering others, interdependence, group affiliation, information sharing, cooperation, process-oriented, and nurturing (Bennett & Shayner, 1988; Josefowitz, 1980; Sagaria, 1988). The second list (List B), which they claimed was more descriptive of men's leadership styles, included such characteristics as individual achievement, competition, autonomy, hierarchical, aggressive, outcome-oriented, and communication through appropriate channels (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Heller, 1982). Based on the leadership characteristics identified, the respondents perceived women leaders as being more caring and nurturing and men leaders as being more aggressive and competitive.

The respondents believed that the leadership style described by List B is more prevalent in society, meaning that the leadership style in society tends to be that which fits with men's leadership styles. Several of the respondents, however, believed that the leader described by List A is more prevalent in the Iowa State University residence halls. They believed that characteristics such as cooperation and nurturing were the characteristics most often used by residence hall leaders. At least one respondent stated that a mixture of leadership styles existed in the residence hall, although she was unable to state why she believed so. Thus, the respondents' experiences again speak to the importance of residence halls in providing opportunities for leaders to use women's styles of leading.

Personal Experiences with Leadership

Learning to Lead

The respondents identified three methods by which they learned about leadership: (a) through observation, (b) through experience, and (c) through educational opportunities such as leadership conferences.

Each of the respondents stated they learned to lead through observing others, particularly their role models. Research on women's leadership confirms that "women students learn by observing" (Sagaria & Johnsrud, 1988). The people the respondents most often identified as role models included family members, teachers, and coaches. Most of these individuals, however, were people the respondents had known prior to attending college. They did not identify role models while at college, a phenomenon which brings into question the availability of role models for these leaders. In other words, if the respondents learn to lead by observing others, who are they learning from while at college? The implication, here, is that, because they lack college role models, the respondents' opportunities to continue learning to lead are limited.

The respondents also stated that prior leadership experience was an important method by which they learned to lead. They believed that their leadership skills developed and improved with practice, a sentiment reflected in research on generative leadership which contends that women learn by trying behaviors, receiving feedback, and modifying their behavior (Sagaria & Johnsrud, 1988). Much of their prior leadership experience came from high school clubs, sports, and activities, although several of them had also had college leadership experiences prior to the position they presently held. Most of these positions were other house cabinet positions. Thus, the residence halls must not

be overlooked in the opportunities they provide for women student leaders to practice using and to improve their leadership skills.

The third method of learning about leadership identified by the respondents was leadership conferences. According to the respondents, leadership conferences, which they attended in high school and college, offered opportunities to learn about leadership skills and social problems. Although they found such conferences to be instrumental to learning about leadership, the respondents suggested expanding the conferences to be more interactive. They asserted that they learned better by being actively involved rather than being lectured to. Research on women's leadership, again, confirms that women learn through interaction (Sagaria & Johnsrud, 1988).

Thus, although the respondents did not articulate what they learned about leadership from these methods, they did assert that observation, experience, and leadership conferences contributed significantly to their personal leadership development. Clearly, the styles of learning expressed by the respondents are reflected in generative leadership, in which opportunities to observe, to practice, and to interact with other leaders are stressed (Sagaria & Johnsrud, 1988). In addressing the respondents' leadership development, then, the residence halls successfully offered opportunities for them to practice their leadership skills but failed to provide role models or interactive learning opportunities.

Receiving Encouragement and Support

The respondents stressed the importance of receiving encouragement and support to become and remain leaders, particularly in house leadership positions. Most of the respondents indicated that they had been encouraged to seek house leadership positions by others, including their resident assistants,

family members, such as older siblings who had been involved in house leadership activities, and other house members.

According to the respondents, being encouraged to run for house leadership positions helped make them aware of the availability of such positions as well as contributed to their comfort with seeking such positions. Receiving encouragement from their resident assistants and other house members offered the respondents a feeling that someone else believed in their abilities and that they would be supported if elected, contributing to their self-confidence. The respondents' willingness to seek leadership positions, therefore, increased with the feeling that others believed in them, indicating a need to be encouraged to become involved.

Receiving support while they held leadership positions also contributed to the respondents' self-confidence with regard to leadership. The respondents credited family members and friends with providing them support in the forms of reassurance and confidence. None of the respondents, however, indicated that they received support from their resident assistants. In fact, only the presidents indicated receiving support from residence hall staff. This support came from the hall director, with whom the presidents met on a bi-weekly basis. Thus, the respondents had to rely on people other than residence hall staff for support in their leadership efforts.

Receiving encouragement and support were critical elements for the respondents in fostering leadership involvement. Although the respondents received encouragement from their resident assistants in addition to family members and friends, most of the respondents did not profess to receiving support from residence hall staff members. The residence hall staff, while

encouraging the respondents to be involved, clearly failed to provide support for them once they became involved. The exception to this fact was the house presidents who indicated that they received support from the hall director through their weekly meetings. Providing support, then, may require the development of such meetings for all positions, rather than just the president position.

Leadership Responsibilities and Styles

Responsibilities

The leadership responsibilities identified by the respondents balanced more traditional requirements, such as running meetings and delegating tasks, with requirements associated more with models of feminine ways of leading, such as helping others and stressing teamwork (Helgesen, 1990; Sagaria, 1988). The responsibilities the respondents described included running meetings, telling others what to do, delegating, being approachable, being a role model, helping others, encouraging involvement, stressing teamwork, and handling negative situations.

Running meetings was a task assigned specifically to the house president, but could also be performed by the vice-president in the president's absence. The respondents viewed the house meeting largely as a time for the cabinet to provide information to the house members on activities or issues of interest. Most of the respondents stated that they did not attempt to actively involve house members in the meeting, claiming that to do so was essentially impossible. Rather, they asserted that the purpose of house meetings was for the cabinet members to give reports to the house members. House members, according to the respondents, actively participated only in asking questions at the end of the

meeting. In fact, only one respondent indicated running house meetings in such a way that house member participation was actually encouraged throughout the meeting. This approach to meetings typifies the leader and follower concept in which there is not a great deal of participation on the part of the followers.

This description of running house meetings contradicts assertions made by the respondents regarding the importance of interpersonal relationships and interactive learning. The respondents, throughout their discussions of leadership, emphasize the importance of relationships and involvement. With house meetings, however, they, in essence, ignore both of these values, treating the meetings as a time solely to give information rather than to also encourage involvement and the development of relationships. This would indicate, again, that the respondents are attempting to carry out some of their leadership responsibilities using male-oriented styles of leadership. Given that such male-oriented styles stress values such as power and authority (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Heller, 1982), they appear incongruent with the values, such as interdependence and affiliation, stressed by the respondents. Thus, the respondents speak about a set of values but do not necessarily know how to implement those values as they carry out their responsibilities, indicating that they may not be aware of the legitimacy of their styles of leading.

Although delegating tasks and responsibilities was a task largely associated with the president's position, each of the respondents spoke to the responsibility of having to tell others what to do. In order to keep residents focused on tasks and goals, the respondents said they often had to tell them what to do and how to do it. Several of the respondents stated that they did not mind telling others what to do and that, even though they tried to approach people in a

friendly manner, they were not concerned if people were upset with them. In other words, these respondents expressed a willingness to confront other people. Other respondents, however, claimed that they felt uncomfortable telling others what to do. These respondents, as one would suspect, were more concerned with people's responses, emphasizing once again the importance of interpersonal relationships to them. The respondents, again, were attempting to balance their values of affiliation and relationships with male-oriented styles of leadership. The implication of this struggle is that the respondents were not learning how to carry out their leadership responsibilities in accordance with their personal leadership styles.

Other leadership responsibilities identified by the respondents included being approachable, helping others, being a role model, encouraging involvement, and stressing teamwork.

The respondents believed that approachability was an important component of leadership. They believed that being approachable involved relating to and listening to people as well as being open and not taking things too seriously. The respondents also claimed that approaching people from the perspective of a friend rather than on the basis of a leadership position helped create an atmosphere in which people felt comfortable talking with and working with them. Similarly, the respondents highlighted the importance of helping others. They believed it was important to listen to resident's concerns, take their feelings into consideration, and try to help them understand various perspectives without giving advice. The identification of these responsibilities (i.e., being approachable and helping others) was congruent with the importance the respondents placed on interpersonal relationships. Thus, the respondents, in

identifying and stressing these responsibilities, reflected leadership styles described by models of feminine ways of leading in which relationships are affirmed and leaders seek to empower others (Helgesen, 1990; Sagaria & Johnsrud, 1988).

Although the respondents agreed that one of their responsibilities as leaders was to be a role model for others, they disagreed on the extent of this responsibility. Several respondents believed that, as leaders, they were role models not only in leadership situations but also in their personal lives. One respondent, for example, stated that she wanted people to be able to look up to her, something which she did not believe they could do if they were talking about what she had done on the weekend. Other respondents maintained that role modeling referred to what they did in their leadership positions, not what they did in their personal lives. Either way, however, the respondents believed that they had a responsibility to be role models for other women on their houses. This belief indicates that the respondents realized that, as they learn by watching others, others may learn by watching them. Their statements, again, reflected a generative style of leadership in which leaders learn from one another.

The respondents also stressed encouraging involvement, except in house meetings, and teamwork as responsibilities they had to fulfill as leaders. Not only did the respondents want people to have input into the activities developed by the cabinet, they also encouraged involvement out of a desire for people to have opportunities to grow and develop, indicative of a leadership style similar to that expressed by generative leadership (Sagaria & Johnsrud, 1988). The goals of generative leadership, for instance, include developing the leadership abilities of others through empowerment (Sagaria & Johnsrud, 1988). The respondents

valued working together as a team, or collaborating, as much as they valued involvement, believing that working together was essential to accomplishing goals. The respondents asserted that close relationships in which everyone gets along presented the ideal teamwork situation. Both with regard to encouraging involvement and stressing teamwork, the respondents emphasized establishing and maintaining relationships, believing that people work better with friends than with people they do not know well.

In addition to carrying out their general responsibilities, the respondents also indicated that they often had to deal with negative situations. These negative situations ranged from dealing with a lack of involvement and lack of cabinet follow-through to dealing with confronting others and receiving criticism.

The failure of cabinet members to follow-through on their assigned duties often meant that the respondents had to cover for them. Covering for these individuals, as well as dealing with their lack of responsibility, was a source of irritation for the respondents. Rather than speaking to these cabinet members individually, however, several of the respondents stated that their approach was to express their discontent to the cabinet as a whole. This statement reflects the concern many of the respondents expressed about confrontation. While recognizing that confrontation was part of their leadership responsibilities, the respondents feared making other people upset or angry and, thereby, losing a relationship. This suggests, once again, the importance of interpersonal relationships to the respondents as well as the perception of conflict between fulfilling their leadership responsibilities and emphasizing relationships.

Styles

Given two lists of general leadership characteristics, one of which they claimed was more descriptive of women's leadership styles while the other they stated was more descriptive of men's leadership styles, the respondents identified most closely with the characteristics they associated with women's leadership styles (List A). List A included such leadership characteristics as empowering others, interdependence, group affiliation, information sharing, cooperation, process-oriented, and communication through appropriate channels. List B included such characteristics as individual achievement, competition, autonomy, hierarchical, aggressive, outcome-oriented, and communication through appropriate channels.

Each of the respondents stated that List A was more descriptive of their leadership style than List B. The List A characteristics with which they most closely identified included cooperation, information sharing, direct communication, and group affiliation. The one characteristic with which they did not associate was empowering others. The respondents believed, however, that empowering others meant that they were exerting power over other people, a characteristic with which they did not want to identify. Once they were given a definition that involved helping others become leaders, the majority of the respondents were then inclined to say that empowering others did fit with their leadership styles. The need for a definition of empowerment suggests that the respondents were not well-versed in models of feminine ways of leading, most of which stress the use of words such as "empowerment." At the same time, however, they did not want to be perceived as exerting power over people, indicating that they did not relate to male-oriented styles of leading.

Although they did not identify with List B, each respondent also identified with some of the characteristics in List B. These characteristics included aggressiveness, individual achievement, and autonomy. Research (Sagaria & Johnsrud, 1988) indicates that several of these characteristics, particularly autonomy, are also important to women's leadership development.

Thus, the respondents found the characteristics which they claimed were more descriptive of women's leadership styles were also more descriptive of their styles. They did not, however, view the lists of characteristics exclusively, but rather found some characteristics in List B as also being descriptive of their styles. This would indicate that the respondents' leadership styles, for the most part, incorporated characteristics predominantly illustrative of women's ways of leading but also utilized some characteristics typical of male-oriented ways of leading.

Leadership: Costs and Rewards

The respondents spoke of the benefits and disadvantages of being a leader. Although they listed a variety of rewards and disadvantages, the respondents focused largely on interpersonal relationships. In fact, each of the rewards identified by the respondents involved interpersonal relationships in some way. Similarly, the most significant potential disadvantage for most of the respondents was the possibility of losing relationships.

The rewards identified by the respondents included improved leadership skills, personal fulfillment, and knowing others and being known. Even with the discussion of improved skills, the respondents indicated that they had learned better communication skills, which helped them work in groups. They also stated that they learned how to interact with and relate to people, which they

emphasized as being an important aspect of being a successful leader. Being involved in leadership activities, then, provided the respondents opportunities to practice and develop their skills, illustrating, again, the importance of experience for the respondents to learn to lead.

Much of the personal fulfillment they received from their involvement in leadership came from the opportunity to help others, including listening to their problems. Although one respondent claimed that this fulfillment also came from being involved in the implementation of activities, the value the respondents placed on relationships with other people contributed significantly to their feelings of fulfillment. The value placed on relationships also was reflected in the reward of being known and getting to know others. The respondents claimed that meeting people and establishing relationships with them was one of the most enjoyable aspects of their house leadership positions. The implication here is that the respondents perceived leadership activities as person-oriented in which the development of relationships was a reward. Given the importance of relationships to the respondents, then, this particular reward could also serve as a motivator for becoming involved in leadership. In fact, the respondents cited the potential for developing relationships as one reason for their house leadership involvement.

The respondents identified two costs which they associated with leadership involvement, one of which was simply the time involved to be a good leader. More important to the respondents, however, was the potential for losing relationships. Despite the fact that none of the respondents could identify a relationship that they had lost because of their leadership involvement, they claimed that the potential for losing relationships was something they evaluated

when considering leadership involvement. For the respondents, the fear of losing relationships was most real when they were involved in confronting their peers. Thus, in keeping with their emphasis on interpersonal relationships, the most significant disadvantage of leadership involvement for the respondents proved to be the potential for damaging or losing relationships.

Both the rewards and the disadvantages of leadership involvement identified by the respondents dealt with interpersonal relationships. This statement suggests that the ability to develop or the possibility of losing relationships may be a driving force in whether women student leaders become involved in leadership.

Conclusions of the Research

In light of the results, what can we say about the leadership experiences of the respondents?

1. The respondents had not critically evaluated the role of leadership in their lives. Until participating in this study, the respondents had not critically assessed their involvement in leadership activities. Many of their responses involved "I don't know" statements, and several respondents stated bluntly that they had never thought about the issues addressed by the questions. These sentiments were best reflected in the respondents' limited discussion of the general characteristics associated with leadership. The respondents often had difficulty finding examples to support those ideas which they did state. Moreover, their language in expressing their thoughts was choppy and convoluted, requiring that their statements be edited for clarity. Simply put, the respondents had difficulty articulating their thoughts about leadership,

indicating that they had not previously expressed their thoughts on leadership and possibly had not critically evaluated their leadership involvement.

2. Residence halls provide women student leaders opportunities to live in and practice their leadership skills in one of few single-sex environments on campus. The respondents stressed the importance of being able to live in an all-women's environment, claiming that when they arrived at college they lacked the self-confidence to be able to interact with men in a living environment. The respondents also stated that they prefered leading with women rather than with men, suggesting the importance of single-sex leadership opportunities. Their residence hall experiences afforded them such opportunities.

3. Relationships were of primary importance to women students' leadership involvement. Throughout their discussions of leadership, the respondents emphasized the importance of interpersonal relationships. The potential to establish relationships and maintain a feeling of connection with others served as a significant benefit of leadership involvement whereas the potential for losing such relationships was a disadvantage that needed to be taken into consideration when considering whether or not to be involved in leadership activities. In discussing their leadership responsibilities and styles, the respondents stressed relating to others, being approachable, working together, compromising, and encouraging others. They identified group affiliation, collaboration, and information-sharing as leadership characteristics that described their styles. Each of these leadership characteristics and responsibilities held the importance of interpersonal relationships to the respondents.

4. The leadership styles and responsibilities articulated by the respondents balanced traditional leadership expectations with those more characteristic of women's styles of leadership. In discussing their leadership responsibilities, the respondents emphasized the importance of such traditional aspects of leadership as being responsible, being competent, running meetings, and delegating responsibilities. Not only did they believe that their responsibilities included overseeing the completion of tasks, such as house parties, they also believed that their responsibilities included helping other people, listening to people's concerns, encouraging involvement, and stressing teamwork.

Similarly, the respondents described their leadership styles as incorporating such characteristics as group affiliation, information-sharing, collaboration, and direct communication. Their descriptions emphasized characteristics that are commonly associated with women's styles of leading. They also, however, included autonomy and independence, characteristics more closely associated with men's leadership styles, in their personal style descriptions. Thus, both their descriptions of their leadership styles and responsibilities indicated a need for a balanced approach to leadership, one that is reflected in the descriptions of generative leadership (Sagaria & Johnsrud, 1988).

5. Although they articulated leadership styles reflective of models of feminine ways of leading, the respondents possessed limited knowledge of such models. The respondents' attempts at balancing their leadership values with male-oriented styles of leading indicated that they were not aware of legitimate leadership models that emphasized the values they held. Their styles, for

example, of running house meetings were incongruent with the importance they placed on interpersonal relationships and involvement, suggesting that they did not know how to carry out such responsibilities while maintaining their leadership styles.

6. The respondents lacked college role models and support systems for leadership. When speaking of their personal role models, none of the respondents identified role models outside of their family or high school experiences. Although this phenomenon might be deemed understandable for the two first year students, even the upperclass students spoke of high school teachers or coaches when talking of their role models. None of these leaders recognized other student leaders or university staff or faculty, including Department of Residence staff, as role models.

Discussion of support systems elicited a similar response. The respondents indicated receiving support from their family and from friends. Again, however, they did not recognize other student leaders or staff members as providing support, with the exception of the presidents who did receive some support from the hall director through bi-weekly meetings. In fact, even though they stated that resident assistants encouraged their involvement in house leadership positions, none of the respondents listed their resident assistants as part of their support systems. Thus, role models and support systems which included people involved in the university, either students or staff, were lacking for the respondents.

7. The respondents were not learning how to deal with obstacles faced specifically by women. The respondents maintained that women, in general, had to face such obstacles as being perceived as lacking leadership skills and as not

being equal to men. They asserted that women who were working with men might feel belittled and have to face expectations that they be passive.

They were not able, however, to relate to these obstacles, believing that they had not experienced stereotypical perceptions or expectations that they be passive. In fact, they believed that problems with male leaders did not exist to the same extent in the residence halls as they did in society at large. Furthermore, the respondents could not perceive how the obstacles they claimed impeded women's progress in general could impede their own progress. Unless they were directly affected, which they claimed they had not been, the respondents believed that the obstacles and stereotypes facing women had no significant impact on them. Consequently, the only method of overcoming such obstacles the respondents spoke of was that of being strong and persisting in the face of adversity. The implication of this statement is that women student leaders are not adequately prepared to overcome gender-based obstacles, which, according to their beliefs, they probably will face at some point in society at large.

Recommendations for Practice

Based on the implications of the study and on the literature, the following recommendations for practice are offered to the Department of Residence at Iowa State University.

1. Educate staff and students about models of feminine ways of leading. Although the respondents articulated leadership styles that could be described by models of feminine ways of leading, they were unaware that such leadership models existed. Thus, along with discussions of traditional leadership models, women student leaders need education about models of leadership that are reflective of their styles. It is also important to educate staff members who will

be working with these leaders about models of feminine ways of leading, improving their ability to advise women student leaders.

To educate staff and students about these models, include discussions of and examples of leadership based on models of feminine ways of leading in all conversations about leadership. Such models might include generative leadership and the web of inclusion. Offer descriptions of these models along with the more traditional leadership models highlighted in the position manuals. Offer leadership conference sessions specifically designed to educate leaders about models of feminine ways of leading. Similarly, offer opportunities for staff members to learn about these models as well as how to advise leaders using such models. Providing such learning opportunities and including these models in leadership discussions may serve to affirm women student leaders' approaches to leadership while also teaching leaders, in general, about expanded approaches to leadership.

2. Address issues of interpersonal relationships in leadership discussions. Throughout their discussions of leadership, the respondents consistently highlighted the value and importance they placed on interpersonal relationships. Given the opportunity to make changes to the leadership conferences in which they had participated, the respondents stressed that they would offer more sessions dealing with interpersonal relationships. The importance of such relationships to women student leaders, then, must not be underestimated. Provide opportunities, both formally and informally, for women student leaders to discuss their concerns about losing relationships and to learn how to carry out their leadership responsibilities without negotiating their commitment to these relationships.

3. Develop peer mentor programs for women student leaders. Provide opportunities for new student leaders to learn from and receive support from more experienced student leaders by developing peer mentor programs in order to give women student leaders the opportunity to identify and connect with role models. The importance of this recommendation is reflected in the ability of role models to offer opportunities for women student leaders to continue learning to lead through observation as well as in the ability of role models to provide systems of support for women student leaders. Whether structured on the basis of positions or by having more-experienced leaders work with a group of less-experienced leaders, such programs would offer new student leaders opportunities to observe other leaders and to receive feedback from their peers. Not only would such programs have the potential to create support systems and provide role models for women student leaders, they would also allow them to express their concerns outside of their house cabinet environments.

4. Expand the concept of residence hall leadership to include Department of Residence staff. Rather than viewing residence hall staff as advisors and students as leaders, expand the concept of leadership to actively include all members. In other words, create an approach to leadership that involves all members as active participants rather than student leaders as active participants and staff as impartial advisors. Providing women student leaders with more actively involved staff members may serve to provide them with role models and support systems, both of which they claim have been missing in their college experiences. Rather than telling resident assistants that their role is to advise their cabinet members, for example, teach them how to advise from a perspective that is involved and that empowers and supports student leaders. Similarly, involve

hall directors and other full-time staff more in programs like the Presidents' Council, creating more opportunities for student leaders to be in contact with residence hall staff.

5. Provide concrete opportunities for women to learn about sexism and discrimination and to develop strategies for dealing with such obstacles. The respondents asserted that women in general face gender-based obstacles, but they were not able to identify practical strategies for overcoming such obstacles. Given that they plan to continue their leadership involvement through their career aspirations, it is likely that, in society at large, the respondents will face such obstacles at some point. They appear, however, unprepared to deal with these obstacles.

Although opportunities for women to learn about sexism typically exist through residence hall programs or leadership conference sessions, more concrete opportunities to learn about such obstacles in light of leadership activities may prove helpful. Offer opportunities, through formal programs and informal discussions with women faculty, staff, and business executives, for women student leaders to learn about the obstacles women face as well as the strategies they use to overcome such obstacles. Finally, work with women student leaders to begin identifying personal strategies for dealing with sexism and discrimination.

6. Continue to provide single-sex living and leading environments for women students. Throughout their discussions of their personal leadership experiences, the respondents emphasized the importance of being able to live in and lead in an all-women's environment. Thus, the value of these environments in providing for women's leadership development must not be overlooked.

Recommendations for Further Research

Several questions are suggested by this research which may be addressed in future research. These questions include the following:

1. What are the leadership experiences of women leading in an all-women's house in a single-sex hall compared with the leadership experiences of women leading in a coeducational house?
2. What are the leadership experiences of women leading in the residence halls as compared with the leadership experiences of men leading in the residence halls?
3. What are the leadership experiences of women students on the campus at-large?
4. Given a program that specifically emphasized women's leadership development, would a similar study yield different results concerning the experiences of women student leaders?
5. What institutional policies and practices exist to foster the leadership development of women?
6. How do students, especially women, learn about leadership while at college? Or, do they operate on what they learned about leadership prior to college?
7. How do women's developmental levels affect their leadership experiences?

REFERENCES

Astin, A. W. (1977). Four critical years. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W. (1993). What matters in college: Four critical years revisited. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bennett, S. M., & Shayner, J. A. (1988). The role of senior administrators in women's leadership development. In M. A. D. Sagaria (Ed.), Empowering women: Leadership development strategies on campus (pp. 27-38). New Directions for Student Services, No. 44. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row.

Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.

Forrest, L., Hotelling, K., & Kuk, L. (1984, June). The elimination of sexism in university environments. Paper presented at the meeting for Student Development Through Campus Ecology, Pingree Park, CO.

Gardner, J. W. (1990). On leadership. New York: The Free Press.

Guido-DiBrito, F., & Batchelor, S. W. (1988). Developing leadership potential through student activities and organizations. In M. A. D. Sagaria (Ed.), Empowering women: Leadership development strategies on campus (pp. 51-62). New Directions for Student Services, No. 44. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hall, R. M., & Sandler, B. R. (1984). Out of the classroom: A chilly campus climate for women. Washington, DC: Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges.

Heller, T. (1982). Women and men as leaders. New York: Praeger.

Helgesen, S. (1990). The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership. New York: Doubleday Currency.

Josefowitz, N. (1980). Paths to power: A woman's guide from first job to top executive. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Lally, K. (1990, December 2). Big men on campus. Baltimore Sun, pp. 6-18.

Leonard, M. M., & Sigall, B. A. (1989). Empowering women student leaders: A leadership development model. In C. S. Pearson, D. L. Shavlik, & J. G. Touchton (Eds.), Educating the majority: Women challenge tradition in

higher education (pp. 230-249). New York: American Council on Education, Macmillan.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pearson, C. S., Shavlik, D. L., & Touchton, J. G. (1989). Educating the majority: Women challenge tradition in higher education. New York: American Council on Education, Macmillan.

Sagaria, M. A. D. (1988). The case for empowering women as leaders in higher education. In M. A. D. Sagaria (Ed.), Empowering women: Leadership development strategies on campus (pp. 5-11). New Directions for Student Services, No. 44. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sagaria, M. A. D., & Koogle, L. L. (1988). Greater than the sum of its parts: Strategy and resources. In M. A. D. Sagaria (Ed.), Empowering women: Leadership development strategies on campus (pp. 89-103). New Directions for Student Services, No. 44. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sagaria, M. A. D., & Johnsrud, L. K. (1988). Generative leadership. In M. A. D. Sagaria (Ed.), Empowering women: Leadership development strategies on campus (pp. 13-26). New Directions for Student Services, No. 44. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Strand, K. (1983). The case for women's colleges. Unpublished manuscript, Hood College, Department of Sociology and Social Work.

Tidball, M. E. (1989). Women's colleges: Exceptional conditions, not exceptional talent, produce high achievers. In C. S. Pearson, D. L. Shavlik, & J. G. Touchton (Eds.), Educating the majority: Women challenge tradition in higher education (pp. 157-172). New York: American Council on Education, Macmillan.

APPENDIX A

RESPONDENT INTRODUCTION LETTER

February 12, 1992

Dear Student Leader:

As a graduate student working towards a master's degree in Higher Education, I am conducting my thesis research on women's leadership within the Iowa State University residence halls. The purpose of the study is to describe the leadership experiences of women living on a women's house in an all-women's residence hall and of women living on a coeducational house in a coeducational residence hall. I am interested in comparing the leadership experiences of women, from both settings, holding the house cabinet positions of president, vice-president, and social chair.

The Richardson Court Association or Towers Residence Association has identified you as holding one of the listed cabinet positions on your house. I would appreciate it if you would consider participating in this study. Your participation would involve three individual interviews and one group interview, each lasting approximately sixty to ninety minutes. In addition, you would be asked to give your feedback on the collected data and on the written report.

Your responses will remain confidential. The collected information will be coded, and will be accessible only to you and to me. All identifying factors will be eliminated in the written report. Your participation in this study is voluntary. Should you choose to discontinue your participation from the study, which you may do at any time, all data that has been collected from you will be returned to your possession and will not be used in the written report.

Your participation in this study will help in furthering the knowledge of women's leadership experiences within the residence hall system at Iowa State. If you have any questions regarding this study, please feel free to contact me at 294-0450 or 292-6959. I will be contacting you during the last week of February to discuss your participation and to arrange a time for an initial interview. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Becki Elkins
Sloss House
Iowa State University

APPENDIX B

RESPONDENT CONSENT FORM

The purpose of this study is to describe the leadership experiences of women living on a women's house in an all-women's residence hall and of women living on a coeducational house in a coeducational residence hall at Iowa State University. The study will compare the leadership experiences of women, from both coeducational and single-sex houses, holding the house cabinet positions of president, vice-president, and social chair.

Participation as a respondent will involve three individual interviews and one group interview, each lasting approximately sixty to ninety minutes. Participation will also involve giving feedback on the collected data and on the written report. In return for their efforts, the researcher will give each respondent a copy of the written report and will exhibit a commitment to doing rigorous research.

The researcher will keep all responses confidential. All identifying factors will be eliminated in the written report. Should the respondent choose to discontinue her participation in the study, which may be done at any time, all data that has been collected from that respondent will be returned to her and will not be used in the written report.

By signing this form, both the respondent and the researcher agree to uphold the responsibilities outlined.

_____	_____
Respondent Signature	Researcher Signature
_____	_____
Date	Date

APPENDIX C

LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS

LIST A	LIST B
Empowering others	Individual achievement
Interdependence	Competition
Group affiliation, connection	Autonomy
Direct communication	Hierarchical, top-down
Information sharing	Control
Cooperation	Aggressive
Process-oriented	Outcome-oriented
Nurturing	Communication through appropriate channels

APPENDIX D

UNITIZING THE DATA

Units of data, for this study, are defined as pieces of meaningful information which come out of the data (Marshall in Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1988). Lincoln and Guba (1985) state that a unit of data must possess two characteristics: (a) it must be heuristic, providing some understanding needed by the researcher, and (b) it must be "the smalles piece of information about something that can stand by itself . . . ." (p. 345). For the purposes of this study, a unit of data included any single statement, which could be as small as a phrase or as large as a paragraph, concerning the leadership experiences of women students.

Examples of units include:

> . . . I chose to live here because I have some friends that went to Iowa State last year and they lived on 7th floor in Maple. And, they [said] "well, this would be a really good spot to be."
>
> I suppose you'd say being house president, my job mainly was to help organize, maybe delegate more than really do all the jobs.
>
> Females may not always follow, but they usually give you enough respect to at least listen or understand. They might have a totally different opinion, but usually, at least, they have the brain capacity to say "oh, well, at least I could listen to her." And it depends a lot. But the male thing is "she's a girl, I don't have to listen to her."

The following are not examples of units of data:

> Storage closets.
>
> It was a lot of fun.
>
> I suppose the best aspect was that it was just more you just felt more at home and at ease, maybe.

The process for unitizing the data included the following steps:

1. I read the transcript thoroughly.

2. I divided the information in the transcript into the smallest pieces of information that could stand on their own. These pieces of information were considered units and were marked in pencil as such.

3. The units were cut and placed on index cards. Throughout this process, each unit was checked for its heuristic value and its ability to stand on its own. Those pieces of information failing to meet both standards were reassessed and necessary changes were made.

4. Units were then coded according to source, respondent type, collection episode (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), and unit number.

APPENDIX E

CATEGORIES (SET ONE)

1. List A fits
2. Independence
3. Empowering others
4. List A fits women; B fits men
5. List B prevalence
6. Types of leaders -- residence halls
7. Programming
8. Male perspective: Coed setting
9. Opportunity to learn: Living in residence halls
10. Respect: Leaders need
11. Involvement
12. Men's needs
13. Working with men: Experience
14. How men treat/view women
15. Working with men: How women feel
16. Working with women
17. Cooperation
18. Making people feel comfortable
19. Women lack leadership qualities: Stereotype
20. Women have to prove themselves
21. Confronting cabinet: Group
22. Being taken seriously
23. Confronting cabinet: Individual
24. Men don't take women seriously
25. Overcoming leadership obstacles
26. Helping others
27. Confrontation
28. Self-confident
29. Ability to express thoughts
30. Being taken seriously: Residence halls
31. Women's perceptions of women
32. Balancing leadership responsibilities with other issues

33. Dealing with people not paying attention
34. Compromise
35. Lack of cabinet follow-through
36. Dealing with criticism
37. Cabinet involvement
38. Controlling emotions
39. Leadership motivation
40. Open-minded
41. Role models: Women
42. Men's perceptions of men
43. Being understanding
44. Being easy-going
45. Brother floor
46. Freshmen
47. Telling people what to do
48. Men's response to criticism
49. Role models: House leaders
50. Leadership environment: Prefer female context
51. Control
52. Goal-oriented
53. Age issues: Younger vs. older students
54. Responsibility
55. Lack of involvement
56. Social chair position
57. Making a contribution
58. Cabinet relationships
59. Cabinet atmosphere
60. Seeking input
61. Role in discipline
62. Personal involvement
63. Outgoing: Group communication
64. Connection with others
65. Election experience
66. Sister floor

67. Why house leadership: Position motivation
68. Encouraging involvement
69. Position information: Election time
70. Position manual
71. Living environment
72. Living in residence halls
73. What would like to learn from leadership
74. Encouraging women
75. Speaking out
76. Support
77. Women as not equal: Stereotype
78. Being heard
79. Feeling unappreciated
80. Working with new leaders: Meeting their needs
81. Personal role models
82. Careers
83. Importance of experience
84. Empowering others: Perception of meaning
85. Leadership conferences: Not RCA
86. Leadership conference: RCA
87. Leadership conference: What would they include
88. Blaming
89. Individual contact
90. Group interaction
91. List B characteristics: What fits
92. Women's needs
93. Authoritative
94. Leaving the position
95. Importance of personal effect: How they relate to issues
96. Male support
97. Women's needs ignored
98. House meetings
99. Vice President position: Assembly
100. Leaders' needs: What leaders need to know

101. RCA philosophy
102. Delegating
103. RA position
104. Communication
105. Relating to people
106. Motivation
107. RCA staff support
108. Positive attitude
109. Competence: Knowing what you're doing
110. Leadership vs. management
111. Leadership goals
112. Sense of fulfillment
113. High school experience
114. Personal leadership characteristics: Compared to role models
115. RCA executives
116. Cabinet purpose
117. Position expectations
118. Goals and goal-setting
119. Confidentiality
120. Working together
121. Organization
122. Leader is not a dictator
123. Remaining calm
124. Dealing with emotions
125. Offering advice
126. Resource
127. Being a follower
128. Job-related
129. Self-improvement/growth
130. Competition
131. Abuse of power
132. "B" leader description
133. Leadership qualities
134. Leadership not just a position

135. Recognizing accomplishments
136. Mediating
137. Criticism taken to heart
138. Leadership potential
139. Thinking of yourself as a leader
140. Being encouraged to be a leader
141. Seeking information
142. Leadership is work
143. Learning to speak up: Group situations
144. Observation
145. Leadership transitions
146. Collective leadership
147. RCA leadership philosophy vs. your own style
148. Constructive criticism
149. Importance of involvement
150. List A leader: Prevalence in residence halls
151. Being easy-going
152. Telling people what to do: Not comfortable with
153. Role models: College students don't need
154. Control
155. Cabinet: Proud when accomplish goals
156. Responsibility: General leadership characteristics
157. Majority vote process
158. Personal involvement: Outside the house
159. Being outgoing
160. House involvement: Career motivation
161. House involvement: Potential to help
162. Speaking out: Not perfect solution
163. Receiving support
164. Meeting together: Important to meet leaders' needs
166. Small group vs. large group setting
167. Resource: Being one
168. Communication
169. Relating to people: Need to know how

170. Motivating others: General leadership characteristic
171. Competence: General leadership characteristic
172. Goals for their position
173. Organized: Personal leadership characteristic
174. Remaining calm: General leadership characteristic
175. Helping others: Leadership reward
176. Leadership as part of life

APPENDIX F

CATEGORIES (SET TWO)

1.) Personal Leadership Characteristics
- 1. List A fits
- 2. Independence
- 3. Empowering others
- 17. Cooperation
- 40. Being open-minded
- 43. Being understanding
- 44. Being easy-going
- 47. Telling people what to do: Easy
- 152. Telling people what to do: Uncomfortable
- 51. Control
- 52. Goal-oriented
- 54. Responsible
- 159. Being out-going
- 74. Encouraging women
- 76. Supporting others
- 89. Perceptions of empowering others
- 91. List B characteristics: What fits
- 93. Authoritative
- 104. Communication
- 105. Relating to people
- 106. Motivation
- 109. Competence
- 114. Personal leadership characteristics: Compared with role models
- 119. Maintaining confidentiality
- 123. Remaining calm
- 136. Mediating
- 26. Helping others
- 125. Listening without giving advice
- 176. Leadership as part of life

2.) Leadership Characteristics: Describing men or describing women

4. List A describes women; List B describes men

3.) Prevalence of Leadership Characteristics

5. List B prevalence: Society

150. List A prevalence: Residence halls

4.) Residence Halls and Leadership

6. Types of leaders

39. Leadership motivation

94. Leaving the position: Reasons

167. House meetings: Purpose

157. Majority vote process

5.) Meeting Leaders' Needs

7. Programming

163. Receiving support

164. Meeting together

89. Individual contact

90. Group contact

6.) Working with men

8. Male perspectives

13. Working with men: Experience

14. How men treat/view women: Women's perceptions

15. Working with men: How women feel

16. Working with women

96. Male support

24. Men don't take women seriously

42. Men's perceptions of men

48. Men respond to men

12. Male leaders' needs: Similar to women's

7.) Residence Hall Living Environment

9. Living in residence halls: Opportunity to learn

30. Women not taken seriously: Not a residence hall problem

71. Living environment: All women vs. coeducational

72. Living in residence halls: Selection

8.) Women Leaders' Needs
- 10. Respect
- 22. Be taken seriously
- 28. Self-confident: Need to feel
- 29. Able to express themselves
- 78. To be heard
- 80. New leaders' needs
- 100. What leaders need to know
- 168. Able to communicate

9.) What Leaders Need to Do
- 18. Making people feel comfortable
- 38. Controlling emotions
- 151. Be easy-going
- 108. Have positive attitude

10.) Women and Leadership: Overcoming Obstacles
- 19. Women lack leadership skills: Stereotype
- 20. Women have to prove themselves
- 25. Overcoming leadership obstacles: Method
- 31. Dealing with some women's perceptions
- 77. Women as not equal: Stereotype
- 92. Women leaders' needs
- 95. Importance of personal effect: Women's issues
- 97. Women leaders' needs ignored

11.) Working with Cabinet
- 21. Cabinet confrontation: Group
- 35. Lack of cabinet follow-through
- 37. Cabinet members: Involvement
- 155. Cabinet: Proud when accomplish goals
- 58. Cabinet relationships
- 59. Cabinet atmosphere
- 103. RA role as advisor

12.) Leadership Responsibilities

27. Confronting others
61. Role in discipline
98. Running house meetings
102. Delegating
126. Being a resource
18. Making people feel comfortable

13.) Handling Negative Situations

33. Dealing with people not paying attention
36. Dealing with criticism
75. Speaking out: How to handle situation
162. Speaking out: Not always the solution
137. Criticism taken to heart
88. Blame

14.) Working Together

34. Compromise
120. Working together: Striving for
122. Leader not dictator
127. Following
146. Collective leadership

15.) Role Models

41. Role models: Female
49. House leaders: Role models for others
153. Role models: College students don't need
81. Personal role models

16.) Social Activities

45. Brother floor
66. Sister floor

17.) Involvement

46. Freshmen
55. Lack of involvement
60. Seeking input
68. Encouraging involvement

149. Important to make house all it could be
11. House involvement

18.) Female Leadership Environments
50. Prefer leading in all-women's context

19.) Characteristics of a Leader
154. Control
156. Responsibility
63. Being out-going
170. Motivator
171. Competence
121. Organized
174. Remaining calm
133. General leadership characteristics

20.) Age Factor
53. Dealing with age issues

21.) Leadership positions
56. Social chair position
99. Vice-president position
116. Cabinet positions
145. Position transitions

22.) Leadership Rewards
57. Making a contribution
64. Connection with others
112. Sense of fulfillment
129. Personal growth and development

23.) Personal Leadership Experiences
62. Personal involvement: In the house
158. Personal involvement: Outside the house
113. High school leadership experiences
128. Being a leader at work

24.) Becoming a House Leader: Process

65. Election experience
69. Position information
70. Position manual
117. Position expectations
172. Position goals

25.) House Leadership Motivation
67. House position: Living with people
160. House position: Career motivated
161. House position: Believed could help

26.) Leadership Costs
79. Feeling unappreciated
142. Leadership is work

27.) Goals
82. Career-oriented
111. Leadership goals
118. Goal-setting
135. Recognizing accomplishments

28.) Learning about Leadership
83. Learning about leadership: Experiences
85. Leadership conference: Not RCA
86. Leadership conference: RCA
87. Leadership conference: What they would include
144. Observation

29.) RCA Staff and Student Government
101. RCA staff: Philosophy on leadership
107. RCA staff support
115. RCA student government: Philosophy on leadership
147. RCA leadership philosophy compared with own style

30.) Leaders Need to Know
100. Leaders need to know: General
168. Communicate
169. Relating to people

APPENDIX G

CATEGORIES (SET THREE)

I. CHARACTERISTICS OF A LEADER

19.) General Characterisitics
- 154. Ability to control
- 156. Responsible
- 63. Outgoing/Charismatic
- 170. Ability to motivate
- 171. Competence
- 121. Organized
- 174. Ability to remain calm
- 133. General leadership qualities

2.) Leadership Characteristics: Describing women vs. men
- 4. List A describes women; List B describes men

3.) Prevalence of Leadership Characteristics
- 5. List B leader is prevalent in society
- 150. List A leader is prevalent in residence halls

9.) What Leaders Need to Do (to be leaders)
- 38. Controlling emotions
- 151. Be easy-going
- 108. Have a positive attitude

1.) Personal Leadership Characteristics
- 1. List A fits their style
- 2. Independence
- 3. Empowering others
- 17. Cooperation and the importance of working together
- 40. Being open-minded
- 43. Being understanding
- 44. Being easy-going
- 47. Telling people what to do: easy to do
- 152. Telling people what to do: difficult and don't enjoy

51. Ability to control
52. Being goal-oriented
54. Being responsible
159. Being out-going
74. Being encouraging
76. Supporting others
84. Initial perceptions of empowering others
91. List B characteristics that describe their style
93. Authoritative
104. Ability to communicate
105. Relating to people
106. Motivation
109. Competence
114. Personal leadership characteristics as compared with their role models
119. Maintaining confidentiality
123. Remaining calm
136. Being a mediator
26. Helping others
125. Listening to others but not giving advice
176. Leadership as part of their life

II. RESIDENCE HALLS

7.) Residence Hall Living Environment
- 72. Living in the halls: selecting and describing
- 71. Living environment: all women vs. coed environment
- 9. Living in the halls: opportunity to learn
- 30. Women not taken seriously: not as much of a problem in the halls

4.) Residence Halls and Leadership
- 6. Types of leaders
- 39. Why people seek leadership positions
- 94. Why they are leaving their positions

167. House meetings: Purpose
157. Majority vote process

29.) RCA: Staff and Student Government
101. RCA staff: philosophy on leadership
107. RCA staff: support
115. RCA student government: philosophy on leadership
147. RCA leadership philosophy as compared to their own

III. HOUSE LEADERSHIP

25.) House Leadership Motivation
67. House position: live with the people
160. House position: career motivated
161. House position: believing that they could help

21.) House Leadership Positions
56. Social chair position
99. Vice-president position
116. Cabinet positions
145. Position transitions

24.) Becoming a House Leader: Process
65. Election experience
69. Position information: election time
70. Postion manual: receiving information
117. Position expectations
172. Position goals

12.) Leadership Responsibilities
27. Confronting others
61. Role in discipline
98. Running house meetings
102. Delegating
126. Being a resource
18. Making people feel comfortable

11.) Working with the Cabinet
- 21. Confronting issues: dealing with the cabinet as a whole
- 35. Lack of cabient follow-through
- 37. Cabinet members: involvement
- 155. Accomplishing goals
- 58. Cabinet relationships
- 59. Cabinet atmosphere
- 103. RA role as advisor

13.) Handling Negative Situations
- 33. Dealing with people not paying attention
- 36. Dealing with criticism
- 75. Speaking out: method of handling situations
- 162. Speaking out: not always best method of handling situations
- 137. Dealing with people who take criticism to heart
- 53. Dealing with people who discount you based on age
- 88. Dealing with blame

16.) Social Activities
- 45. Brother floors
- 66. Sister floor

IV. LEADERS' NEEDS

30.) What Leaders Need to Know
- 100. Leaders need to know: general
- 168. How to communicate
- 169. How to relate to people

8.) What Leaders Need: Women
- 10. Respect
- 22. Taken seriously
- 28. Self-confidence
- 29. Ability to express themselves
- 78. To be heard

80. New leaders' needs

5.) Meeting Leaders' Needs
- 7. Programming
- 163. Receiving support
- 164. Meeting together
- 89. Individual contact
- 90. Group contact

15.) Role Models
- 41. Importance of having female role models
- 49. House leaders: role models for others
- 153. College students: don't need role models
- 81. Personal role models

V. BECOMING A LEADER

31.) Being a Leader: Getting There
- 134. Leadership is not just a position
- 138. Leadership potential
- 139. Thinking of yourself as a leader
- 140. Being encouraged to be a leader

28.) Learning about Leadership
- 83. Importance of experience
- 85. Leadership conference: prior to RCA
- 86. Leadership conference: RCA
- 87. Leadership conference: what they would include
- 144. Learning through observation

23.) Personal Leadership Experience
- 62. Personal involvement: on the house
- 158. Personal involvement: outside the house
- 113. High school leadership experiences
- 128. Being a leader at work

27.) Goals

82. Career-oriented
111. Leadership goals
118. Goal-setting
135. Recognizing accomplishment

VI. WOMEN AND LEADERSHIP

10.) Overcoming Obstacles: Women and Leadership
19. Stereotype: women lack leadership skills
20. Women have to prove themselves
25. Overcoming leadership obstacles: methods
31. Dealing with some women's perceptions of them
77. Stereotype: women are not equal to men
92. Women leaders' needs
95. Importance of personal effect to see something as an obstacle
97. Women leaders' needs are ignored

6.) Working with Men
8. Male perspectives: gain access to in coed setting
13. Working with men: experience
14. How men view women: women's perspectives
15. Working with men: how women feel
16. Working with women vs. working with men
96. Male support
24. Men don't take women seriously
42. Men's perceptions of men
48. Men respond to men
12. Male leaders' needs: similar to women's

18.) Leadership Environment -- Female
50. Prefer leading in all-female context

VII. LEADERSHIP: COSTS AND REWARDS

22.) Rewards of Leadership: Personal
57. Making a contribution

64. Connection with others: being known
112. Sense of fulfillment
129. Personal growth and development
175. Helping others

26.) Negative Aspects of Leadership
79. Feeling unappreciated
142. Leadership is work: not always fun

32.) Learning from Leadership
143. What have learned from leadership
177. What would like to learn from leadership

VIII. INVOLVING

17.) Importance of Involvement: House
46. Freshmen
55. Lack of involvement
60. Seeking input
68. Encouraging involvement: methods of
149. Involvement: important to make house all it could be
11. House involvement

14.) Working Together
34. Compromise
120. Working together: what they strive for
122. Leader is not a dictator
127. Following
146. Collective leadership

APPENDIX H

CATEGORIES (SET FOUR)

I. RESIDENCE HALLS (Background information)
- 7.) Residence Hall Living Environment
  - 72. Living in the halls: Selecting and describing
  - 71. Living environment: Single-sex vs. coed environment
  - 9. Living in the halls: Opportunity to learn
  - 16.) Social Activities
    - 45. Brother floors
    - 66. Sister floor
- 4.) Residence Halls and Leadership
  - 6. Types of leaders
  - 39. Why people seek leadership positions
  - 21.) House leadership positions
    - 56. Social chair position
    - 99. Vice-president position
    - 116. Cabinet positions
    - 103. RA role as advisor
- 29.) RCA: Staff and Student Government
  - 101. RCA staff: philosophy on leadership
  - 107. RCA staff: support
  - 115. RCA student government: philosophy on leadership
  - 147. RCA leadership philosophy as compared to their own

II. CHARACTERISTICS OF A LEADER
- 19.) General Characteristics of a Leader
  - 133. General leadership qualities
  - 63. Charismatic
  - 170. Able to motivate
  - 108. Positive attitude
  - 156. Responsible (resp., control, organized, competent)
  - 151. Able to relate to people (relating to others, easy-going, remaining calm, communication)
  - 2.) Prevalence of leadership characteristics

4. List A describes women; List B describes men
5. List B leader is prevalent in society
150. List A leader is prevalent in residence halls

1.) Personal Leadership Characteristics
1. List A characteristics that describe their style
91. List B characteristics that describe their style
2. Independence
3. Empowering others
40. Approachable (easy-going, open-minded, calm, respect confidentiality)
54. Responsible (resp., control, achievement-oriented, organized, self-motivated)
114. Personal leadership characteristics as compared with their role models
176. Leadership as part of total life

III. HOUSE LEADERSHIP

25.) House Leadership Motivation
67. House position: Live with the people
160. House position: Career motivated
161. House position: Believing that they could help

24.) Becoming a House Leader: Process
65. Election experience
140. Being encouraged to be a house leader
69. Position information: Election time
70. Position manual: Receiving information
117. Position expectations
172. Position goals

11.) Cabinet
58. Cabinet relationships
59. Cabinet atmosphere
37. Cabinet members -- involvement

12.) Leadership Responsibilities
27. Confronting people and issues

61. Role in discipline
34. Compromise
98. Running house meetings
102. Delegating
18. Making people feel comfortable
49. Being a role model
13.) Dealing with negative situations
    33. People not paying attention
    35. Lack of cabinet follow-through
    36. Criticism
    137. People taking criticism to heart
    75. Speaking out -- possible method of handling

IV. WOMEN AND LEADERSHIP
10.) Overcoming Obstacles
    19. Stereotype: Women lack leadership skills
    77. Stereotype: Women are not equal to men
    20. Women have to prove themselves
    25. Overcoming leadership obstacles
    92. Support
6.) Working with Men
    8. Male perspectives: gain access to in a coed setting
    50. Prefer leading in all-female context
    13. Working with men: experience
    15. Working with men: how women feel
    16. Working with women vs. working with men
8.) What Leaders Need: Women
    10. Respect
    22. Listened to/taken seriously
    28. Self-confidence
    29. Ability to express themselves
    92. Support
    96. Male support
    12. Male leaders' needs vs. female leaders' needs

80. New leaders' needs

5.) Meeting Leaders' Needs

7. Programming/information

164. Meeting together -- group and individual

V. BEING A LEADER

31.) Getting There

28.) Learning about leadership

144. Learning through observation

81. Personal role models

83. Importance of experience

62. Examples of personal leadership experience

85. Leadership conferences

138. Recognizing leadership potential

163. Receiving support

27.) Personal goals

82. Career-oriented

111. Leadership goals

3.) Leading -- how they do it

38. Controlling emotions

76. Supporting others

47. Telling people what to do

93. Responsible

105. Approachable

26. Helping others

68. Encouraging involvement

120. Stress working together

VII.) Leadership: Costs and Rewards

22.) Rewards of Leadership

64. Connection

112. Fulfillment

129. Personal growth

5.) Learning

143. What have learned about leadership

177. What want to learn about leadership

26.) Negative aspects

79. Feeling unappreciated

142. Leadership is work: not always fun

APPENDIX I

CATEGORIES (SET FIVE)

I. RESIDENCE HALL LIVING AND LEADING ENVIRONMENTS
- 7.) Residence Hall Living Environment
- 4.) Residence Halls and Leadership
  - 21.) House leadership positions
  - 39. House leadership motivation

II. GENERAL LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS
- 170. Motivating others
- 156. Being responsible
- 151. Relating to others

III. WOMEN AND LEADERSHIP
- 10.) Overcoming obstacles
  - 19. Stereotypes facing women
  - 20. Women have to prove themselves
  - 8.) Women leaders' needs
  - 25. Overcoming leadership obstacles
- 6.) Working with men
  - 13. Working with men: Experience
  - 15. Working with men: How women feel
  - 16. Working with women compared with working with men
    - 8. Male perspectives gained in coed settings
    - 50. Prefer leading in all-female context
  - 4. List A describes women; List B describes men

IV. PERSONAL EXPERIENCES WITH LEADERSHIP
- 28.) Learning about leadership
- 27.) Personal goals
- 140. Receiving encouragement and support
  - 163. Receiving support

12.) Leadership responsibilities and styles
- 54. Being responsible
- 98. Running meetings
- 47. Telling people what to do
- 102. Delegating
- 105. Being approachable
  - 40. Approachable: Leadership characteristic
- 49. Being a role model
- 26. Helping others
- 68. Encouraging involvement
- 120. Stressing teamwork
- 13.) Handling negative situations
- 1.) Personal leadership characteristics
  - 1. List A characteristics fit
  - 91. List B characteristics fit

VII.) Leadership: Costs and rewards
- 22.) Rewards of leadership
  - 5.) Learning from leadership
  - 64. Connection
  - 112. Sense of fulfillment
- 26.) Costs of leadership
  - 142. Leadership is work
  - 79. Loss of relationships (feeling unappreciated)