

University of San Diego

Digital USD

---

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

---

1995

## Women and Men in Collaborative Working Partnerships: Connecting Two Disparate Modes of Experience

Steven Blue Robbins EdD  
*University of San Diego*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

---

### Digital USD Citation

Robbins, Steven Blue EdD, "Women and Men in Collaborative Working Partnerships: Connecting Two Disparate Modes of Experience" (1995). *Dissertations*. 608.  
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/608>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact [digital@sandiego.edu](mailto:digital@sandiego.edu).

**WOMEN AND MEN IN COLLABORATIVE WORKING PARTNERSHIPS:  
CONNECTING TWO DISPARATE MODES OF EXPERIENCE**

**by**

**Steven Blue Robbins**

**A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirement for the degree of  
Doctor of Education**

**University of San Diego  
1995**

**Dissertation Committee**

**Steven Gelb, Ph.D., Director**

**Equilla Luke, Ph.D.**

**Mary Woods Scherr, Ph.D.**

## **ABSTRACT**

### **WOMEN AND MEN IN COLLABORATIVE WORKING PARTNERSHIPS:**

#### **CONNECTING TWO DISPARATE MODES OF EXPERIENCE**

**ROBBINS, STEVEN BLUE, Ed.D., University of San Diego, 1995. 125 pp.**

**Director: Steven Gelb, Ph.D.**

This study provides an in-depth description of mixed gender working partnerships in a collaborative effort over a one year period. The research identified differences between men and women in mutually collaborative working partnerships at the undergraduate level in order to also discover what was productive or problematic between those women and men in the partnerships.

The research studied twenty-two UCSD undergraduate women and men who worked together in partnerships with mutual goals. The research utilized phenomenological interviewing techniques. The focus was the perceptions and experiences of the participants. The interviews were designed to address two primary research questions: 1) What contributes to a mutually agreeable and productive partnership between women and men engaged in collaborative work? 2) What is problematic between women and men engaged in collaborative work?

The findings indicated that positive components for effective mixed gender partnerships included good communication, empowerment, constructive feedback, friendship, humor, common ground and intellectual growth and openness. Elements that were problematic were lack of initiative, poor communication, violation of confidentiality, sensitivity difference, relationships, different "wavelengths", and sexist stereotypes. Gender differences figured prominently in partnership difficulties. Men were generally perceived as being less responsible, nurturing, detail oriented and self-starting than women. The

**specific work tasks required by the partnerships seemed to influence the outcomes.**

**Recommendations based on the findings were to support mixed gender partnerships through gender awareness training, mediation, more accountability and supervisory intervention, facilitating an environment for common ground, reducing gender bias in performance standards, opportunities for social events, encouraging empowerment, and a commitment to affirmative action.**

**Copyright @ 1995**

**by**

**Steven Blue Robbins**

**All rights reserved**

## **DEDICATION**

**I dedicate this work to:**

**Ayeska Danelle Robbins-Juarez, my daughter,**

**and**

**Shelief Yosef Robbins-Juarez, my son,**

**who represent the future generation of women and men in collaborative  
partnerships—  
they are my vision;**

**and,**

**Reina Juarez, my wife, whose endless, loving, and spiritual support  
empowered me to rise to a higher level of commitment and fulfillment.**

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

**I thank my dissertation committee for the generous gift of their helpful comments, time and energy: Dr. Steven Gelb, for his critical insight and constant support; Dr. Mary Woods Scherr, for her guidance and invaluable editorial comments; and, Dr. Equilla Luke, for her careful analysis and encouragement.**

**I also acknowledge my mother, Betty Robbins, whose remarkable life story inspired me to study gender relations; and, my father, Sheldon Robbins, who served as my role model in succeeding as a reentry student in education.**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>CHAPTER ONE.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Statement of the Issue.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>The Problem.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>The Issue.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Need for the Study.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Purpose of the Study.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Significance of the Study.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Research Questions.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Limitations.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>CHAPTER TWO.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Review of the Literature.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Differences among Women and Men.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Women's and Men's Development.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Mutually Agreeable and Productive Relationships.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Women and Men Working Together.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>CHAPTER THREE.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Research Design and Methodology.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Participants.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Selection Criteria.....</b>	<b>31</b>



Data Collection.....	36
Sample Interview Questions.....	38
Data Analysis.....	38
Risks to Human Subjects.....	40
<b>CHAPTER FOUR.....</b>	<b>42</b>
Findings.....	42
Description of Partnerships.....	42
Serena and Jay.....	42
Rosa and Tony.....	44
Shanikwa and David.....	45
Sarah and Lou.....	46
Peggy and Fred.....	47
Ariana and Logan.....	48
Jaime and Vernon.....	49
Maddi and Bernard.....	49
Carly and Jonah.....	50
Margie, Irma, Andy and James.....	51
Research Question One.....	52
Introduction.....	52
Good Communication.....	53
Empowerment.....	57
Constructive Feedback.....	59
Friendship.....	61
Humor.....	62

Common Ground.....	64
Intellectual Growth and Openness.....	65
Research Question Two.....	67
Introduction.....	67
Poor Communication.....	67
Violation of Confidentiality.....	69
Lack of Initiative.....	70
Sensitivity Difference.....	72
Relationships.....	73
Different Wavelengths.....	75
Sexist stereotypes.....	77
Summary.....	78
CHAPTER FIVE.....	79
Discussion and Recommendations.....	79
Introduction.....	79
Discussion.....	81
Differences.....	81
Age.....	87
Student Profile.....	89
Tasks.....	90
Recommendations.....	94
Implications for Further Research.....	99
REFERENCES.....	102
APPENDICES.....	114

## CHAPTER ONE

At the level of humanity in general, we have seen massive problems around a great variety of differences. But the most basic difference is the one between women and men.

Jean Baker Miller, 1986

### INTRODUCTION

In 1980, women made up 43 percent of the total workforce. By the year 2000, they will account for more than 47 percent of the total workforce, and 61 percent of all American women will be employed (Johnston & Packer, 1989). Today, based on a growing need to recruit and retain women, many firms have begun to alter traditional work schedules, leave policies, and other policies in order to support the needs of a more diverse workforce. While the mass entrance of women into the workforce is widely acknowledged to be the impetus behind such changes, the result will be an enhanced work environment that acknowledges a wider range of employee interests and needs (Loden & Rosener, 1991). Given the demand for increased commitment, innovation, and productivity in the global marketplace, most competitive organizations cannot afford to ignore these changing ratios of women in the workforce. To prosper in the future, it is important to value, understand, and better utilize gender diversity in business, government, education and society.

## THE PROBLEM

One study that examined gender prejudice among more than 12,000 corporate respondents found that three out of four women saw evidence of gender discrimination in the workplace (Schachter, 1988). The perceptions of discrimination actually grew more intense as women advanced within management.

Occupations have fostered gender differences among workers in a variety of ways, one of the most pervasive being *internal stratification* (Williams, 1989). That is, women and men in the same occupation often perform different tasks and functions. Even in those occupations that appear gender integrated, the aggregate statistics often mask extreme internal segregation. Some studies revealed that women and men usually performed different tasks and functions within job categories (Reskin and Roos, 1987). The idea that women and men seldom engaged in the same activities on the job meant that certain specialties could be feminine-identified and others masculine-identified; thus, helping to preserve gender differences.

## THE ISSUE

In recent decades, the life patterns of women and men have grown more similar. The gender division of labor is eroding. But significant

variations between women and men remain in the amounts of home and child care responsibilities or unpaid work, communication, employment patterns, occupations, and earnings. Policies in this country concerning child care, work schedules, and parental leave do less to alleviate role strain than those elsewhere, such as the Nordic countries, to help reduce the strains employed women with children encounter in meeting both their paid work and family responsibilities (Kahne and Giele, 1992). These factors have an impact on the phenomenon of women and men in mixed gender "partnerships". Increased understanding, awareness and appreciation of the other gender enhances the collaborative spirit within mixed gender partnerships. These partnerships are male-female. For the purpose of this study, partnerships are assigned working relationships that are conditions of formal employment.

A key component in leadership is a call for the experience of mutually connecting women and men in order that they be deeply linked in relationship. Both women and men have experienced violations which interfere with healthy mutual relationships. The implication for leadership in understanding the gender differences is a hope for living and communicating in harmony, entering a realm of common good--mutuality.

Gilligan (1982) maintained that women see themselves through the eyes of others and develop in relationship. Men's experience, according to Gilligan, is rational and in terms of justice. Women's experience is through connectedness, responsibility or care. But even though there are gender differences in the way we resolve our moral dilemmas,

communicate, make decisions and interact in relationships, there is hope in everyone appreciating those differences in a leadership relationship. The dialogue between fairness and care not only provides a better understanding of gender relations, but also gives rise to a more comprehensive portrayal of adult work and family relationships.

The implication for leadership is that an ethic of care needs to be more prominent. Gilligan stated that the principal caregivers are women. Working with this model of thought, if men can be empowered to develop an ethic of care we can achieve some common ground toward our gender differences. Giele (1992), a researcher on gender role crossover, feels that the crossover between genders is currently happening and that we are in a transitional state of crossover converging on more common ground.

Recognizing the important framework that Erikson (1982) had established in Childhood and Society, we can broaden our perspective appreciating contemporary theorists that claim gender developmental differences. Clatterbaugh's Contemporary Perspectives on Masculinity showed distinctions in gender roles in terms of separate masculine behaviors and attitudes, stereotypes of masculinity and what people think it is, and gender ideals or what people think it should be.

Miller (1986) showed that in spite of divergent theories, all human beings begin life as infants in a relationship with a caregiver. This beginning is in a "being-in" relationship. There is effectiveness and accomplishment by staying in relationship. However, it is during the

autonomy stage that girls are talking about relationships and boys learn war games and winning. In fact, Miller said that during adolescence girls contract and boys open up. Boys are discouraged from being in relationship. Similarly, Erikson asserted that men develop in separation.

As Miller pointed out, it is easy to polarize this dichotomy. There is a basic division between males and females. Miller suggested that women and men can build connection through dialogue.

There is a problem though. McIntosh (1988) argued that men are unwilling to recognize their male privilege. This dominance distorts humanity, and is a barrier in a mutually influential relationship in a process of leadership. The inability of men to realize they achieved their dominance through their unearned entitlement needs to be resolved through intellectual growth and openness. When this is achieved, the barrier of gender and other polarizations can begin to break down.

The concept of mutual empathy is "being with and seen, being heard and felt and mutually hearing, sensing and understanding the other (Miller, 1986). The outcomes are growth enhancing and it is the process that establishes an influence process. According to Gilligan and Miller, mutual empathy is more developed with women than men. There is a need in leadership and the work environment to find common ground where mutuality in a noncoercive influence relationship is developed. If one accepts the position that the self is connected to the other, then the self is relational in response to the others. Considerations to preserve

relations, avoid hurt and responsibilities are seen in terms of taking care of others.

If women and men listen to each other, intellectually grow in partnership and communicate well, then the "different voices" will be heard and understood-- and the world will mutually benefit. Women and men can converge and find common ground in working together by understanding and appreciating their differences.

### **NEED FOR THE STUDY**

Women and men are interacting in the workforce in increasing proportions. Over the past century, women in particular have seen an improvement in their political, economic, and social status. There is still ample room for improvement regarding attitudes and policies governing women and men in the work environment. Consequently, the phenomenon of mixed gender working partnerships needs to be studied to further understand, develop and improve the relationship between women and men who work together.



## **STATEMENT OF PURPOSE**

This study provided an in-depth description of mixed gender partnerships, those in which a male and female worked together, in a collaborative effort that extended over a one year period. The research identified differences between men and women in mutually collaborative working partnerships at the undergraduate level in order to uncover productive and nonproductive behaviors between those women and men in the partnerships. The purpose of the study was to discover what was perceived as mutually agreeable and productive as well as problematic in the partnerships.

## **SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

This dissertation will contribute to the understanding of what may work, improve and benefit women and men in similar collaborative working partnerships. My qualitative study describes the experience of those partnerships during a one year period. Hired student leaders in undergraduate college residence halls are the subjects in this study. The purpose of studying House Advisor (HA) partnerships was to gain insights about the nature of shared leadership. All the HA partnerships were male-female, which is typical for most HA partnerships historically. The findings will increase the current knowledge base on mixed gender

working partnerships, help HA's for the future and assist HA partnerships at other universities.

## **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

In order to accomplish this purpose, the research questions asked were: What contributes to a mutually agreeable and productive partnership between women and men engaged in collaborative work? What is problematic between women and men engaged in collaborative work?

## **LIMITATIONS**

One of the limitations of this study is that all of the subjects were from a similar age group, nineteen through twenty-three. The nature of their position required that they be college undergraduates.

Geographically, most of the subjects were raised in California. The majority of University of California, San Diego students are from California. A large percentage are from the Los Angeles, San Diego and San Francisco Bay areas.

Another limitation to the study is that the subjects were predominantly from upper middle class privileged socio-economic backgrounds. The profile of students at UCSD reflects that socio-economic level.

Additionally, I am a man who conducted a study relating to gender. It is possible that my gender affected the subjects' responses in the interviews. This limitation is hard to measure, but it is conceivable that had a woman researcher interviewed the subjects, responses might have differed.

## CHAPTER TWO

### LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of women and men is necessary in order to reconsider stereotypes about each other and the ways in which social systems work. Research of gender relations raises questions about the ways in which we think about the social order and hierarchy.

Women and men differ in communication styles; in employment—in income and work roles; health and stress; power and status at work, in relationships in society; and kinship obligations. In terms of women and men working together, it would behoove women and men to stop thinking in terms of "them" and to focus on "us". A useful question to pose is: What shall "we" (women and men) do about us, so that our work flourishes?

#### DIFFERENCES AMONG WOMEN AND MEN

Differences between women and men can potentially create impasses within partnerships that are challenged to collaborate with each other. To understand the differences between women and men and their paths of development is a continuing challenge for today's leaders. Just what constitutes "differentness" is a vexing question for the study of gender. I use gender in place of terms like *sex* and *sexual difference* for the

explicit purpose of creating a space in which socially mediated differences can be explored apart from biological differences (Unger, 1979).

Alpha bias is the exaggeration of differences. The view of male and female as different and opposite and thus having mutually exclusive qualities transcends Western culture and has deep historical roots. Ideas of male-female opposition are present in Eastern philosophy and in the works of Western philosophers from Aristotle, Aquinas, Bacon, and Descartes to the liberal theory of Locke and the romanticism of Rousseau (Grimshaw, 1986). Alpha bias, or the inclination to emphasize differences, can also be seen in theories such as those of Chodorow (1978), Eichenbaum and Orbach (1983), Gilligan (1982), and Miller (1976).

Speculation about gender differences is a national preoccupation, but there is a continuing need to be aware of the problems of bias emerging from this renewed interest in gender differences. Historically, there has been a tendency to overstate gender differences. As research indicates, there has recently been a focus on similarities between genders. Jacklin (1989), a psychologist, addressed some of the common problems of interpretation and analysis she found in her review of the gender difference. She observed that when both genders are included in a sample there is a tendency to overemphasize the magnitude of the gender difference. Epstein (1988) reported in Deceptive Distinctions that the major problem in studies of gender differences lies in the failure to report findings of no difference.

Beta bias is the inclination to ignore or minimize differences. Until recently, beta bias has gone unnoticed in theories of personality and adult development. Prior to the last decade, most generalizations that psychologists made about human behavior were based on observations of males (Wallston, 1981). The male was measured, and male experience was assumed to represent all experience.

There is considerable experimental evidence to support the existence of gender differences in the United States. Studies conducted in the 1960's (Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, & Broverman, 1968), 1970's (Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972) and the 1980's (Canter & Meyerowitz, 1984; Spence & Sawin, 1985) have demonstrated that there exists strong agreement about the differing characteristics of women and men.

Research has shown that women and men differ in their use of language and differing communication styles. Sociolinguists have shown that communication systems are heterogeneous and multilayered. Thus, factors such as gender can affect speech behavior, as do the specific situation, the topic of conversation, and the roles of the individuals involved. Kramer (1974) discussed evidence for there being "systems of co-occurring, gender linked, linguistic signals in the United States." In a review of studies on language, Kramer, Thorne, and Henley (1978) asserted that many studies have been rooted in the traditional academic linguistic disciplines, pursuing possible gender differences in phonology, pitch and intonation, lexicon, and syntax. Lakoff (1973), for example,

suggested that women were more likely to use "tag" questions that convey uncertainty. Some of the theorists who pointed out these communication differences between women and men are Tannen (1990), Maccoby (1988), Lakoff (1990), Thorne, Kramarae and Henley (1983), Brouwer and Haan (1987), and Coates (1986). Tannen's book, *You Just Don't Understand*, advances the two-cultures theory of miscommunication: the idea that men and women have trouble understanding one another because they come from two different worlds.

Gender differences between men and women come in different forms. The work of Lynn Rosener and Peter Schwartz distinguishes between "Alpha" and "Beta" styles of leadership, and provides useful hypotheses about possible differences in leadership styles. Alpha leadership, which one would expect to be the dominant style found among men, is characterized by "analytical, rational, quantitative thinking. It relies on hierarchy relationships of authority" and "tends to look for deterministic, engineered solutions to specific problems." In contrast, Beta leadership, which might be more common among women, "is based on synthesizing, intuitive, qualitative thinking. It relies on adaptive relationships for support" and "tends to look for integrated solutions to systematic problems" (Rosener and Schwartz, 1980, p. 25).

Rosener (1990) noted that men are more likely to describe themselves in ways that characterize what some experts call "transactional" leadership. That is, they view job performance as a series of transactions - exchanging rewards for services rendered or punishment

for inadequate performance. Women more often described themselves in ways that characterize "transformational" leadership, getting people to "transform their own self-interest into the interest of the group through concern for a broader goal. Moreover, they ascribe power to personal characteristics like charisma, interpersonal skills, hard work, or personal contacts rather than to organizational stature" (Rosener, 1990, p. 120).

Gender differences are created relationally, that is, in relationship. The whole notion of "separation-individuation" as the basis of human development implies that the person must first disconnect from relationship in order to form a separate, articulated, firm sense of self or personhood (Surrey, 1991). Miller (1986) implied that in spite of divergent theories, human beings begin life as infants in a relationship with a caregiver. It is then that the tendencies of males being more separation oriented and females being more relationship oriented occurs. Chodorow (1990) suggested that gender difference is not absolute, abstract, or irreducible; it does not involve an essence of gender.

Gilligan (1982) summarized the gender difference as two disparate modes of experience that are linked. "To understand how the tension between responsibilities and rights sustains the dialectic of human development is to see the integrity of two disparate modes of experience that are in the end connected (Gilligan, 1982, p. 174). She explained that her women's oriented model of caring and responsibilities is in contrast to Kohlberg's male oriented model of justice and rights. Gilligan's "different voice" has the self connected to the other; relationally responsive to



others in their terms; considerations are to preserve relations, avoid and alleviate hurt ; and responsibility is in terms of taking care of the other. The male oriented model of self is separate; sees others in terms of self; considerations are institutional rules, policies and standards; responsibilities are duties and evaluations. These two orientations contrast, but they can coexist and need to for productive collaboration.

## **WOMEN'S AND MEN'S DEVELOPMENT**

Modern American theorists of psychological development from Erik Erikson (1950) to Daniel Levinson (1978), tended to see development as a process of separating oneself out from the matrix of others- "becoming one's own man," in Levinson's words. Intimacy and generativity in adulthood (in Erikson's terms) are seen as possible only after the "closure" of identity. Some developmental theory stressed the importance of separation from the mother at early stages of childhood development (Mahler, 1975), from the family at adolescence (Erikson, 1963), and from teachers and mentors in adulthood (Levinson, 1978) in order for the individual to form a distinct, separate identity.

Another theory of individuation is outlined by Kohlberg. The six moral stages of Kohlberg (1985) are divided into three levels: pre-conventional, conventional, and post-conventional, or principled. Two stages initially existed within each level, with first and second stages being an egocentric view of "heteronomous morality" and individualism. Stage 3 moves to

**"mutual interpersonal expectations, relationships, and interpersonal conformity" or living up to what others expect. Social system and conscience embody the fourth stage, in which a person differentiates between the societal point of view and the interpersonal. The post-conventional level shifted from the stage 5, social contract, and Stage 6, universal ethical principles, to stage 5 and 5 1/2 after Kohlberg no longer claimed the existence of Stage 6, calling it a matter of theoretical and philosophical speculation" (Kohlberg, Levine, & Hewer, 1983, p. 8).**

**With regard to morality, Gilligan pointed to two well known theorists: Freud and Piaget, who both identified morality with justice. Gilligan suggested that morality really included two moral orientations; first, the morality of justice as stressed by Freud and Piaget and second, an ethic of care and response which is more central to understanding female moral judgment and action than it is to the understanding of judgment and action in males. Gilligan noted that Kohlberg's (1958) original work began with an acceptance of Piaget's conception of morality as justice and of moral development as a movement toward autonomy. After working within the Kohlbergian framework for several years, Gilligan became convinced that it systematically excluded a "different voice" (women). Kohlberg's account emphasized reciprocity, justice, rights, duties, impartiality, and individual autonomy, or independence. In contrast, Gilligan's "different voice" emphasized responsibility, care, special relationships, and interdependence. Thus, she contrasted Kohlberg's "ethic of justice" with an "ethic of care".**

At midlife, many men suddenly discover the value of intimacy, relationships, and care, the importance of which women have typically known from a very young age . "In young adulthood, when identity and intimacy converge in dilemmas of conflicting commitment, the relationship between self and other is exposed" (Gilligan, 1982,p. 156). Gilligan's (1982) research indicated that the female need for connectedness is the reason that women, unlike men, defined themselves through relationships.

Gilligan argued that the failure to recognize the difference in men's and women's understanding of relationships poses a problem of measurement and interpretation. According to Gilligan, women speak *In a Different Voice*. Instead of engaging in confrontation, women are more apt to negotiate. Instead of dealing in win-lose terms, women are more apt to see the gray area in between. Instead of thinking of only today, women are more apt to think in terms of the needs of generations to come.

Gilligan's research, it should be noted, used a very small sample size in a clinical research model to draw conclusions about the differences between males' and females' constructions of reality. At the same time that Gilligan generated new insights from this clinical approach, her research methods raised familiar questions about the utility of small samples and the limits they create (Wirtenberg and Richardson, 1983). Another rebuttal to Gilligan are some recent studies that found few significant differences between men and women in their level of moral reasoning as measured by Kohlberg's procedures. Walker and de Vries

(1985) examined the results of 80 studies that involved over 10,000 subjects and found differences based on gender in only a few investigations.

However, it is important to understand that what Gilligan provided was a new paradigm to view gender tendencies and not "absolutes". Gilligan and her colleagues discovered through in-depth research that more females than males prefer the care orientation and more males than females prefer the justice orientation, though both orientations are used by most subjects. This notion of tendencies supports the recurrent theme in the literature review that indeed there are differing tendencies between women and men. As proof of her belief that both voices (caring and justice) exist in both genders, she began In a Different Voice (Gilligan, 1982) with a section of dialogue from Chekhov, who was exquisitely capable of writing from both female and male points of view. The point was that we all, women and men, have the capability to develop the feminine and masculine within ourselves. Through that route of development, women and men can connect two disparate modes of experience. Additionally, Gilligan's research was significant because her research and methodology highlighted the importance of using both women and men in psychological studies. Gilligan's criticisms and ideas have broadened views of what constitutes morality.

In Erikson's model, after the first stage of development of basic trust, the aim of every other stage, until young adulthood, is some form of increased separation or self-development. Gilligan and other critics of this

model contended that when an individual arrives at the stage called "intimacy", that person has spent all of her prior development geared to something very different. Where women's development has been seen as parallel or mirroring men's development-- for example in these works of Freud (1920), Erikson (1950), Sullivan (1953), Kohlberg (1966) and Piaget (1928)- it has led to what Jean Baker Miller described as the "deficiency" model of female psychology.

Gilligan and Chodorow argued persuasively that women are often better at love in relationships because of their skill at connection, whereas men may have trouble with attachments because they are reared to overvalue independence and fear connection. Simeone (1987) added that historically and currently, women are more likely to be found in "people-oriented" fields and men more likely to be in "things-oriented" fields. She wondered whether this is due to women's granting greater value than men to relationships, as suggested by Gilligan's work (1982).

Gilligan's (1982) work in developmental psychology suggested that women's sense of self and of morality revolves around issues of responsibility for, care of, and inclusion of other people. Surrey (1992) added that the vision of women's development is moving from a relationship of caretaking to one of consideration, caring, and empowering.

Miller (1986) added to the list of recent writings on the psychology of women that indicated how women are seen as lacking and defective when evaluated according to male models of personality theory and

developmental psychology. These past models failed to recognize the qualities of female development and experience.

The two meanings of the word "responsibility" - commitment to obligations and responsiveness in relationships-are central to the mapping of the moral domain put forth in this chapter. Since moral judgments reflect a logic of social understanding and form a standard of self-evaluation, a conception of morality is key to the construction of the individual (Gilligan, 1990). Within this framework of interpretation, the central metaphor for identity formation becomes dialogue rather than mirroring; the self is defined by gaining perspective and known by experiencing engagement with others.

Miller (1986) emphasized that each person becomes a more developed and more active individual only as s/he is more fully related to others. Similarly, Belenky et al. (1986) gave us a picture of different modes of knowing which has enhanced our understanding of women's special and different ways of knowing, in particular "connected knowing". Connected knowing means taking the view of the other and connecting this to one's own knowledge, thus building new and enlarged understanding of broader human experience. The more numerous and diverse the perspectives one has connected with, the broader the relational context and the more enhanced will be the sense of being both connected to and empowered to respond to a larger human reality. The psychology of women is distinctive in its greater orientation toward relationships and interdependence, which implies a more contextual mode

of judgment and a different, rather than lesser, moral understanding than men.

Women's growth in connection reflects a crucial aspect of women's moral development, described by Gilligan (1982) as the development of an ethic of care, whereby the negative injunction against "selfishness" or hurting others can be transformed into the energy of positive responsibility for our mutual security, survival, and well-being.

Crucial to a mature sense of mutuality is an appreciation of the wholeness of the other person with a special awareness of the other's subjective experience. In a mutual exchange one is both affecting the other and is also receptive to the impact of the other (Jordan, 1986). Surrey (1984) has pointed to the centrality of mutual empathy in psychological development and of intersubjectivity in relationship. The concept of intersubjectivity emphasizes understanding the other from her/his subjective frame of reference.

Surrey suggested that the challenge to "stay present with" and "responsive to" continues to create a mutually empathetic context of dialogue which is the core of relational development. Although it appears that women are more likely than men to receive self-disclosures from men (Chafetz, 1978; Komarovsky, 1974; Olstad, 1975), communication is not necessarily two-way. Rather, females often provide a listening and support service ("ego boosting") for males without receiving any reciprocal service. Some males may not know how to listen or give support; others may not realize such behaviors are desired; and still others may not want

to share the burden (Hacker, 1981; Pleck, 1976). When interest in, and concern about, other people is assessed after childhood, women tend to show a greater interest in affiliation and more positive feelings about social interactions than do men (Ickes and Barnes, 1977; Pollak and Gilligan, 1982; Eisenberg and Lennon, 1983).

Sexual segregation begins in kindergarten, or before, and by second grade, children start trusting same-gender peers more than opposite-gender peers (Rotenberg, 1984). Best (1983) wrote her book based on a four year study of intense observation showing how boys and girls in elementary school are socialized into different paths of development. She found that there is differential treatment of children of both genders and, consequently, there is a different socialization of boys and girls. She discovered that parents, teachers and peers teach children which roles are feminine and which are masculine.

Best felt that the traditional roles the children were being socialized into were not suitable for the world they were going to live in as adults. She considered it important to have them challenge the stereotypes with reality.

Williams (1989) asserted that the gender role perspective focuses on how boys and girls learn to conform to society's expectations about gender-specific activities, norms, and attitudes. Parents, teachers, peers, television, and various other socializing agents teach children which roles are feminine and which are masculine. Williams' point was that by the time they are adults, they have been exposed to sufficient formal and



informal "role training", or conditioning, to make them properly socialized individuals ready, able, and for the most part willing to assume their appropriate and complimentary roles.

## **MUTUALLY AGREEABLE AND PRODUCTIVE RELATIONSHIPS**

Despite these paths of increasing separation between women and men, an *empowering* relationship between women and men is critical for mutually agreeable and productive relationships. For collaborative working relationships, empowerment and mutuality are essential.

"Empowerment is the process by which the team emerges and functions collectively" (Astin, 1989, p.1). Collective action is the synergetic behavior in the sharing of responsibilities, the distribution of tasks according to each group member's unique talents, knowledge and expertise.

Relational empowerment refers to the process of enlarged vision and energy, stimulated through interaction, in a framework of emotional connection.

Surrey (1991) defined psychological empowerment as: "The motivation of the energies, resources, strengths, or powers of each person through a mutual, relational process." Personal empowerment can be viewed only through the larger lens of power through connection, that is, through the establishment of mutually empathic and mutually empowering relationships. Thus, according to Surrey, personal empowerment and the

relational context through which this emerges must always be considered simultaneously. Miller (1986) described in further detail the nature of an empowering interactive process resulting in increased zest, knowledge, self-worth, and desire for more connection for all participants.

Burns (1978, p. 12) wrote "To understand the nature of leadership requires understanding of the essence of power, for leadership is a special form of power." Miller (1990) defined power as the capacity to produce a change. She focused on women's use of power to empower others- defining empowerment as increasing the other's resources, capabilities, effectiveness, and ability to act. For example, in "caretaking" or "nurturing", one major component is acting and interacting to foster the growth of another on many levels- emotionally, psychologically and intellectually.

Advocates of empowerment view power as an expandable resource that is produced and shared through interaction by leaders and followers alike. This conception views power as energy that transforms oneself and others to act in their own interests (Carroll, 1984). Leaders do not have to exercise power over others, that is, control. Instead, in leadership, leaders can mobilize power and engage in leadership activities that empower others--by exercising power with others, or shared power. Thus, empowerment represents a process by which a leader provides a climate where each group member of the collective participates fully in planning and carrying out the activity.

Rogers (1978) has suggested some process elements that empower others. These include: giving autonomy to persons and groups, delegating and giving full responsibility, encouraging creativity, expressing one's own ideas and feelings as one aspect of the group data, offering feedback and receiving it, and finding rewards in the development and achievement of others. These components can contribute to mutually agreeable and productive relationships, which plays a major role in leadership.

## WOMEN AND MEN WORKING TOGETHER

Despite increasing similarities in women's and men's work lives, significant areas of difference remain – in particular, earnings and occupations. Women's average earnings have been lower than men's. The concentration of women and men in different jobs that are predominantly of a single gender has been labeled *sex segregation* in the labor market (Reskin & Hartmann, 1986) . The overall degree of sex segregation has been a remarkably stable phenomenon until recently. Other recent changes include from 1978 to 1989 that the median weekly salary of full-time female workers increased from 61 percent to 70 percent that of full-time male workers (Sorenson, 1991) .

One of the most visible indicators of change in gender roles is the increase in women's time spent in the labor force. Whereas forty years

ago it was somewhat unusual for a woman to be employed outside of the home, and even more unusual for a woman with children to be in the labor force, today the majority of women are in the paid labor force and over half of women with children under the age of six are employed outside the home (Shelton, 1992) .

Historically, today there are more women and men working together in partnership than ever before. There have been some studies focussing on the work relationship between women and men (Gray, 1987; Williams, 1993; Spencer & Podmore, 1987; Pena 1991).

Gray (1987) maintained that sexism co-existed and often was at war with class consciousness and trade union solidarity among factory men. Many of the men in Gray's study had resisted the female entry into the workplace because for them it was the last sanctum for male culture. It was somewhere they would be away from the world of women, away from responsibility and children and the civilized society's cultural restraints.

"Crossover", meaning working in an occupation traditionally represented by the other gender, has had an effect on attitudes between women and men. Men who cross over often emphasize their masculinity and attempt to distance themselves from their female colleagues, as a way to legitimize their working in female jobs (Williams, 1993) . Women who cross over are subject to suspicions that they are not "real women" , but they are far more constrained than men in how they respond to these prejudices by the men (Spencer & Podmore, 1987) .

Pena (1991) conducted a study in Mexico about working-class men's attitudes toward women. Pena found that the men had a sexist orientation and viewed women as simply part of a man's dominion, to be completely subjected to their will. Potentially, these attitudes could affect a partnership by creating tension between women and men. Problems such as sexual harassment, power differential and poor communication could ensue.

In many cases in the mixed gender work environment outside the home, women are viewed as subordinate, and when they enter the workplace, they are expected to fill subordinate roles. Caplow (1954) elaborated this point, arguing that attitudes governing interpersonal relationships in our culture sanction only a few working relationships between women and men and prohibit all others. Consequently, women are rarely hired in positions of authority (Wolf & Fligstein, 1979) . Within the mixed gender partnerships, males emerge as leaders of mixed gender groups, even when the members of the group are presumably equal in ability (Eagly, 1983) .

Attitudes in the workplace are changing. Male managers surveyed in the 1960's indicated that they felt both women and men would be uncomfortable under a woman supervisor (Bass, 1971) . In more recent studies, two-thirds of the respondents in a Roper survey said it made no difference to them whether they worked for a man or woman (Barron & Yankelovich, 1980) .

Sexual relations, as well as power relations, are also relevant in the workplace, and fears of sexual relations particularly may contribute to occupational segregation. Mackinnon (1979) cited the example of the South Carolina Senate, which refused to hire women as pages in order to foster public confidence in the Senate by protecting its members from appearing in a possibly damaging way. Such reasoning ultimately led several states to pass laws making it illegal for women to hold a variety of occupations including bartender, meter reader and elevator operator, but it did not prevent women from entering the office environment in large numbers .

Attitudes between women and men in the workplace, their rights and appropriate relations have changed substantially over the past 40 years, coinciding with awareness movements and institutionalized legislation. The growing participation of women in the labor market has caused attitudinal changes.

Communication and the level of commitment in relation to others seem to be two factors that are especially important in understanding the potential for both problems and successes in male-female working partnerships. Communication can create impasses or build roads enabling collaboration. Commitment and responsibility in relation to others can affect a partnership's dynamics in many ways, both positive and negative. These issues will be explored more thoroughly in the discussion of chapter five.

## CHAPTER THREE

### RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

#### INTRODUCTION

The research studied UCSD undergraduate women and men who worked together in partnerships with mutual goals. The research utilized qualitative research methodology.

Qualitative research methods recognize that reality is "experiential, not singular, convergent, or fragmentable" (Guba & Lincoln, 1981, p. 59). A qualitative research design will add quality, depth, and richness in the research findings. "Thick description" (Geertz, 1973, p.5) and detailed analysis will yield valuable explanations of the phenomenon of mixed gender partnerships. Qualitative methods are particularly oriented toward exploration, discovery, and inductive logic. Qualitative research, particularly through phenomenological interviewing techniques, can reveal the meaning of an experience in a way that cannot be duplicated through statistics and probabilities. The focus of attention was on the perceptions and experiences of the participants. What individuals say they believe, the feelings they express and explanations they give, are treated as significant realities. In that sense, there is a profoundly relativistic view of the world. I was not seeking, as a researcher, the kind of verifiable "truth" that functions in a cause and effect model of reality. The working

assumption was that individuals make sense out of their experiences and in doing so create their own reality. In qualitative research, understanding both the content and construction of such multiple and contingent truths is regarded as a valuable task of science.

Spradley (1979) described how data are gathered through in-depth interviewing and then analyzed qualitatively to identify domains of understanding.

In-depth interviews with a phenomenological aspect were implemented. For the purposes of this study, I was interested in the phenomenon of mixed gender working partnerships. Phenomenological inquiry focuses on the question: What is the experience of this phenomenon for these people.? Phenomenology as a philosophical tradition was first established by the German philosopher Edmund H. Husserl (1964). Alfred Schutz's work was an important influence in extending and firmly establishing phenomenology as a major philosophical and social science perspective (Schutz, 1977). Other important influences have been Merleau-Ponty (1962), Whitehead (1958), Giorgi (1971), and Zaner (1970). More recently, phenomenology has become an important influence in certain approaches to psychotherapy (Moustakas, 1988).

The phenomenological approach focuses on the essence of the shared experience, in this study the mixed gender working partnership experience. Phenomenology is the chosen approach when examining subjective experiences and emotion laden issues with the capacity to



create a psychological imprint because phenomenology views reality as a social construct that is developed by each individual through a mental process unique to the experience being defined (Taylor & Bogden, 1984). The purpose for the method of this research was meaning-making.

Phenomenological interviews involve immersion and intense reflection (Tesch, 1984). Through this approach, the true meanings of the experience for the individuals were targeted. I attempted to look beneath the affect inherent in the experience to deeper meanings for the individuals.

## **PARTICIPANTS**

Participants in this study were twenty-two undergraduate students at the University of California, San Diego. All twenty-two students served as House Advisors during the academic year 1992-1993 between the months of August 1992 and June 1993. All the students were between the ages of 19-23. There were nine partnerships, each being a dyad with one woman and one man. There was one quartet with two women and two men.

The H.A. position is a live-in student leader job in the UCSD residence halls where the H.A.'s are hired to be peer counsellors, policy enforcers, developers of social programs, role models, administrators, and providers of support to the other student residents in the residence halls.

The subjects included eleven men and eleven women. They were a multicultural sample of student leaders with a varied range of religion, ethnicity and national ancestry. The ethnic diversity included 5 Latinos, 2 African-Americans, 2 Asians, 12 European-Americans, and 1 Eastern Indian. The religious breakdown was 5 Jews, 10 Catholics, 6 Protestants and 1 Buddhist. All were UCSD juniors or seniors. Eighteen of the student leaders were in didactic mixed gender partnerships specifically to work with one other person of the opposite gender on shared mutual goals. The other four worked in a mixed gender quartet with collaborative intent on mutual goals also. This structure to the partnerships was maintained all year.

I knew the subjects through my position in Student Affairs at UCSD, yet I was committed to an ethical and fair research process that minimized any risks and bias toward the participants. My role currently at UCSD is in Student Affairs as an advisor and resource person for educational and college programming. I knew all of the subjects through this advisory capacity, and have supported various programs in the past that were facilitated and planned by the participants. I have never supervised the subjects participating in this study, nor have I maintained any close relationship with any of the subjects.

All of the human subjects were House Advisors, H.A.'s. Most universities actually call this position Resident Advisors, R.A.'s. The job description specifies that the house advisors work in a shared advisory capacity to approximately 70 students in the Muir residence halls or

apartments at John Muir College. They assume responsibilities for programming for their residents, counseling, crisis intervention, referrals, academic advising and administrative duties in this live-in position. They serve as advisors to their house government. They need to respond effectively in emergency situations. They are expected to be dependable, exhibit leadership and to be sensitive to the needs of others. They are expected to be good listeners. House Advisors must also maintain an acceptable level of academic performance. The position demands both time and energy.

The criteria for an HA are the following: Must be a registered UCSD undergraduate student; must have a 2.5 overall grade point average at the time of application; must maintain a minimum 2.0 grade point average for each quarter while employed as an HA.; must maintain minimum academic progress of 12 units for each quarter while employed as an HA.; must have completed a minimum of five academic quarters; must maintain current CPR and basic first aid certification for the duration of the HA position; must display sensitivity to student needs; and evidence of sincere enthusiasm, energy, commitment and interest in the HA position.

House advisors are chosen by a student and staff committee which reads applications and conducts interviews. The committee is primarily composed of student peers who make recommendations to the House Advisor supervisors. After the HA applicants submit an application, they participate in both a group and individual interview. Additionally, three

recommendations are required. Based on all these data, final decisions are made as to who gets hired.

Training begins in the Spring quarter on a weekly basis. After a summer break, Fall orientation training is an intense two week term that provides indepth training on a daily basis. Many of the workshops focus on interpersonal communication such as counselling, listening, assertiveness, crisis intervention and mediation. Throughout the year, training and regularly scheduled meetings continue on a weekly basis. Many professional development opportunities are offered each quarter, as House advisors are required to attend some of these workshops. There are also some mandatory leadership retreats.

The supervisor for this entire process is the resident dean. There is a student evaluation of HA's once each quarter. The HA's meet with the resident dean at the beginning of the second of three academic quarters regarding their job performance. Other than that meeting, the HA's only meet with their supervisor if there is a problem or concern. Partnerships meet occasionally, but most of the partnership time is scheduled by and for the HA's themselves. The actual supervisor, the resident dean, has limited time to meet with the HA's and consequently the partnerships can avoid accountability. However, as a staff, the house advisors meet adequately on a regular basis.

The subjects were selected as undergraduate student leaders at UCSD for many reasons. Perry (1970) stated that there was considerable growth in intellectual and ethical development in the college years.

Gilligan's studies and Kohlberg's research, which included college students, presumed that undergraduates can provide valuable data. Many of the other theories in this dissertation were based on data utilizing college students as human subjects. The burgeoning study of adolescents and similar growth in the field of gender issues has given us rich material (Zager, 1992).

Perry (1970) also justified a study of college undergraduates at the university. He stated that the young person's discovery of diversity in other people's points of view is part of "growing up" in the college years. Perry presumed its relevance to the understanding of the intellectual and ethical development of late adolescence in a pluralistic culture. Perry generalized to other student populations from a limited sample. Despite this limitation, Perry showed how development continues during the college years, the characteristic changes in development, and the way that these changes affect the thought and values of undergraduates.

A different approach to growth and development in the undergraduate years is through the use of personality typologies. Heath (1976) used this approach at Princeton interviewing students in search of a framework to explain observed differences.

Chickering (1969) has sought to envision the college student as a total person engaged in an educational process that can significantly influence development; these processes range from classroom experiences to resident hall interactions. The breadth of his framework provides a panoramic view of complex variables without resort to reductionism.

**"College provides an opportunity of meeting people of varying backgrounds with different ideas, at a time of life when self-examination is maximized and in an institution that legitimizes the identity task of exploring and reevaluating one's values and ideologies" (Withey, 1971).**

**In addition to all of these theorists supporting the sample of undergraduate students at a university as subjects, a diverse group of student leaders in pairs is significant for the interviews. Studying pairs, or in this study HA partnerships, provides a medium for studying moral thought and moral action in a real-life context that naturally creates moral dilemmas. By shifting the study of morality from abstract or hypothetical scenarios to the historic examination of developing interpersonal relationships, we see first hand how people are connected to their ethical positions in relationship with others (Nakula & Selman, 1991).**

## **DATA COLLECTION**

**The subjects were selected if they were House Advisors on the 1992-1993 Muir, UCSD staff. The initial contact was made by sending them a letter in the mail. All twenty-two House Advisors from the 1992-1993 staff participated. They were interviewed in my office at UCSD. Transcripts from the interviews were returned for corrections. The data in this study were collected using phenomenological interview techniques. Data collected were derived solely from the interviews.**

The interviews consisted of individual interviews as well as partnership interviews. Each participant was interviewed twice, once with the partner(s) from their working partnership and one time alone. Interviews were approximately one hour each in length. All interviews were audiotaped. This facilitated accuracy of documentation of the interviews. Research questions were presented in an open-ended manner to encourage each participant to respond from his or her own frame of reference.

A pilot study was conducted with the first four subjects to reveal how adequate the research questions were. Other purposes for the pilot testing were to ensure that the subjects responded in accordance with instructions, and to uncover and decide how to handle unanticipated problems. I asked for feedback from the subjects in the pilot study at the end of their interviews.

The pilot testing could have uncovered a problem that required a change in the questions. Had there been a need for changes for the interview questions, I would not have used the pilot subjects' interviews in my research. However, the sample questions facilitated a thoroughly self-disclosing interview by the pilot subjects, and their responses from the interviews were used accordingly with the remaining subjects for the purposes of this study.

## **SAMPLE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS**

- 1. Can you describe your experience of working together?**
- 2. What are the first adjectives that come to mind when you think about your partnership experience?**
- 3. How has your H.A. partnership experience affected you?**
- 4. Could you describe any similar partnerships that you currently are working in with the opposite gender?**
- 5. What would be your recommendations to women and men who work together, based on your H.A. partnership experience?**

## **DATA ANALYSIS**

The analysis of these data was highly intuitive, in that everything heard or read had to be interpreted and put into context. Patterns were spotted, but other patterns may have been missed, and the favored patterns may be misconstrued or over emphasized. Enormous amounts of redundancy occurred in the interviews. Each of the themes discussed in this study recurred in at least three transcripts. There was so much repetition, that many of the themes were prominent in a majority of the interviews. Whereas questionnaires are constrained by the questions, the phenomenological interview allows clarifying, paraphrasing and summarizing to strengthen the collection of information.



The audiotapes were listened to carefully to obtain a thorough sense of the entire interview before analysis commenced. Complete and accurate transcriptions were made. Transcriptions were read thoroughly in order to help derive general meaning.

To make sense of all these data, I reduced the volume of information to significant patterns, and constructed a framework for communicating the essence of what the data revealed. Guba (1978) suggested that in focusing the analysis of qualitative data an evaluator must deal first with the problem of "convergence". The problem of convergence is figuring out what things fit together. This leads to a classification system for the data.

Van Maanen (1982) explained that qualitative work begins with close-up, detailed observation. In the analysis, qualitative work seeks a description for what is occurring in a given place and time. The basic qualitative question is: "What is going on here?"

I developed a framework for analysis based on Spradley (1979) and Van Maanen, Dabbs & Faulkner (1982). In this analytical process, I utilized bracketing. A dimension that differentiates a phenomenological approach is the assumption that there is an essence or essences to shared experience (Patton, 1980). These essences are the core meanings mutually understood through a phenomenon commonly experienced. Patton explained that the experiences of people are bracketed and analyzed which involves the following steps: (1) Locate within the personal experience key phrases and statements that speak

directly to the phenomenon in question. (2) Interpret the meanings of these phrases, as an informed researcher. (3) Inspect these meanings for what they reveal about the essential, recurring features of the phenomenon being studied. (4) Offer tentative statements of the phenomenon in terms of the essential recurring features identified in step 3.

I looked for recurring regularities in the data. Prior to this step, as the researcher, it is critically important to become aware, as much as possible, of personal bias and to attempt to eliminate personal involvement with the subject material. According to Ihde (1977), judgment must be suspended until all the evidence (or at least sufficient evidence) is in. He describes this concept as *Epoche*. *Epoche* is an ongoing analytical process rather than a single fixed event.

The composite summary was analyzed by the researcher in terms of evaluating the types of leadership implications regarding what is mutually agreeable and productive or problematic among mixed gender working partnerships.

## **RISKS TO HUMAN SUBJECTS**

Risks were minimal to the human subjects in this study. All subjects had the study explained to them. There was informed consent with each subject. I provided confidentiality safeguards which included using

pseudonyms as well as camouflaging potentially identifying information, and providing a complete oral and written consent agreement emphasizing voluntary participation and consent for the research to cite quotes from the interviews. Interviews were recorded, but all tapes were destroyed after completion of the research. Interviews took place at my office at UCSD.

The subjects participated in a process that I hope professionally and personally enhanced their development and awareness of women and men working together in partnerships and leadership relationships. Those that choose to read the final study, which will be accessible to all participants in the study, can possibly learn from this microcosm model on what can work better to improve gender relations in collaborative work partnerships. The prior benefits to the participants in this study far outweighed any of the risk factor.

I have worked at universities with college students for over 20 years. I am sensitive and aware of students' needs and understand the importance of ethics and guidance for this special population. I have an extensive background in counseling, student development, leadership studies, interpersonal communication, ethics and conflict resolution.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### FINDINGS

The partnerships included the following participants: Serena and Jay; Rosa and Tony; Shanikwa and David; Sarah and Lou; Peggy and Fred; Ariana and Logan; Jaime and Vernon; Maddi and Bernard; Carly and Jonah. The quartet included Jonah; Margie, Irma, Andy and James.

The findings consist of three sections. The first section is a synthesis of partnership descriptions as perceived by the subjects. The second section addresses the first research question: What contributes to a mutually agreeable and productive partnership between women and men engaged in collaborative work with members of the opposite gender? The third section addresses the second research question: What is problematic between women and men engaged in collaborative work with members of opposite gender?

### DESCRIPTION OF PARTNERSHIPS

#### Serena and Jay

Serena and Jay had a "solid" partnership based on friendship. Consider the following statements: "I think that both Serena and myself

were very personal and intimate kind of people that were willing to give of ourselves a lot, and were willing to make a friendship work. We were both willing to be each other's friend first." "It wasn't a relationship based on a partnership; it was a relationship based on Jay and me."

The partnership was based on trust. Serena reflected: "As I went through my reasons for my ability to open up to him totally, the first thing that came to mind was that I trusted him."

Additionally, Serena and Jay perceived that each listened well to the other and maintained a high level of communication. "He really knew how to listen. He showed me that what I had to say was extremely important to him." Serena and Jay had a partnership based on respect and consideration.

Serena commented: "I think we both had a lot of understanding about each other. For one, I was raised primarily with my brothers so I am used to guys and being around them. I know it was hard for him at first because he was not used to getting close to other females within living proximity [Jay was not close to other women besides his girlfriend] aside from his girlfriend." Jay confirmed this with his thoughts: "The real gender issue for me had been.... being Serena's friend and being so close, geographically and emotionally. For myself in our relationship, I had a latent fear that our relationship would interfere with my relationship with my girlfriend, so that held me back some. This was a brand new experience, no flirting, no worries; just friendship. I had to break a lot of

the stereotypes of male-female relationships, and the need for romance. It was a learning process and great experience."

### Rosa and Tony

This partnership was also a partnership based on friendship. "We had a friendship behind the partnership. I feel like it was a good supportive and friendship type of partnership. We tried to compromise."

They saw the distribution of work responsibilities as being balanced fairly but usually independently of each other. Statements by both Rosa and Tony supported this concept: "I think we were equal in our workload." "I think we were both very independent." "We gave each other projects to work on and we didn't work together on them. I guess that meant that we were both individualistic and we did things our own way."

Both Rosa and Tony maintained busy schedules during the year of their partnership and mutually wished they had spent more time together. "I think we needed to spend more time together." "It's always better to have more communication."

Being in a mixed gender partnership for Tony was a benefit: "I think it was easier with a woman. I get along better with women; I can talk better to women and relate better to women than I can with men and I really think that aided in our relationship and partnership to me. The males in the house went more to Rosa and felt closer with her, while the females went more to me and felt closer to me." However, Rosa said: "I was

closer to more of the women on staff." [There were twenty-two HA's on staff--eleven women and eleven men.]

### Shanikwa and David

Shanikwa and David lacked good communication in their partnership.

"Communication was one of the biggest frustrating things in our partnership." "Yeah, it was a lack of communication."

They were very different people that could not overcome their differences to work together well. Shanikwa stated: "There were just too many differences. I saw myself more into relationships and I saw David more into separateness. I played the counselor role and David played the 'take care of business' role." These comments were typical of the gender roles that were an integral aspect of Shanikwa and David's partnership.

David added: "I noticed that if residents had a personal problem they would go to Shanikwa because they felt that she would be more sensitive in dealing with the situation. I think it was good to have male-female partnerships because of the different points of view which they brought to the role. But people we interacted with had their own stereotypes about who to approach about what based on gender."

Shanikwa and David made attempts to improve their partnership. Shanikwa said: "At least we had a willingness to work together." David added: "We definitely supported each other." Despite those positive

elements, the partnership suffered from a lack of good communication and major differences in style.

### Sarah and Lou

Sarah and Lou had an understanding of their roles within the partnership. Sarah was people oriented while Lou was project oriented. These gender roles were consistently practiced throughout the year. They recognized they would not be friends, but focused on the positive aspects of their differences and getting tasks accomplished. "We got along really well, we communicated well; but we weren't close friends."

Sarah explained it this way: " Men look at the big picture and say, okay, these are the big things that need to get done, and then, women tend to pick up the little pieces that fit into the whole box. Gender roles were portrayed subconsciously in my partnership. Women are socialized to pick-up pieces and know if they do not do it, then it won't get done. That's the philosophy that I based my actions on."

Lou would gladly accept projects while Sarah worked out the details. Lou also noticed that women were more comfortable approaching Sarah with their problems.

Sarah reflected on a comment that one of their residents made which Sarah felt summed up the partnership: "Lou and you (Sarah) are like the perfect mom and dad. You (Sarah) take care of worrying about us while Lou fixes things around the house."



## Peggy and Fred

This partnership had a breakdown in communication. Peggy attributed the problem to gender: "I think there is a difference in the way men and women communicate with each other. When I hung out with my guy friends, there was a usually more kind of random theater of jokes and harassing and stuff like that. When I hung out with women, it was more usually of a serious nature. That communication difference was what Fred and I had. But what made it worse was that we just stopped communicating in a productive way."

Peggy mentioned: "My partnership was a business partnership, not so much a friendship partnership. We had a tumultuous year, but once we had an understanding of each other, it wasn't really a problem anymore." Fred reflected in a similar way: "I think most of the time with the partnership we had been working against each other than working it together. I think we had a lot of really strong personal beliefs and that came into play in the partnership, and kind of ended up making it very difficult for us to work together."

Peggy had some additional insights on their partnership: "Most people came to me for emotional support. It could have been because I am a woman, and women are often seen as nurturers. I had difficulty with Fred's spontaneous (or leave-it-to-the-last-minute) style of working. I had talked with many of the women on staff, and found that most of them had

shared the same feelings about their male partners." Fred confirmed that most people went to Peggy for nurturing or counselling.

### Ariana and Logan

Ariana and Logan had an extremely close partnership for the first half of the year, but lost the openness and friendship after that point. Initially, the partnership was based on a strong intimate (sexual) relationship, but the communication broke down when problems occurred within the relationship. Ariana reflected on the partnership: "We had one of the most balanced partnerships in the amount of work we did. But our personal relationship made it very difficult because once we had broken up, it was very difficult to know boundaries. It was difficult to have to work with him still daily and yet not try to get my emotions caught up in his reactions or how he dealt with me on a business level, and yet after the breakup he didn't deal with me on a personal level very well."

Logan recognized that he was not the most open person in terms of communication. That aspect, coupled with problems in Logan and Ariana's personal relationship, complicated the communication lines within the partnership.

## Jaime and Vernon

Jaime and Vernon had an excellent friendship as the foundation for their partnership. Jaime noted: "I think our friendship was really strong and that was very important in the house, for people to have seen see us as good friends. I think we worked well together. We developed a friendship first, and then it was get down to business."

Another strong point in their partnership was good communication. Vernon mentioned: "We had a lot of communication and I think we talked a lot and we had similar ideas. Even though we were very different, we worked around that, and that actually strengthened our partnership." Jaime agreed: "I am very organized; I like to get things done and I like to be efficient and on time. Vernon is kind of the opposite. We were good friends. The friendship helped to overlook the differences and accept them as personal style differences. I may have gotten angry at times initially, but I didn't stay angry very long because of the friendship."

## Maddi and Bernard

Maddi and Bernard were extremely different, had a lack of communication and never established a friendship. Eventually they developed an understanding of each other, but not enough to salvage the partnership. Maddi stated it bluntly: "We had a lot of miscommunication and misunderstandings." To further substantiate the confusion in

communication within the partnership, Bernard added: "We had a communication problem and it was hard for me because also I didn't realize what I had to communicate and what not to."

Maddi also pondered over the issue of gender in her partnership: "There were times when I wished I had a female partner. Sometimes I feel that a woman would have been more sensitive to my needs or how I felt. Often, I felt that if I had a female partner there would have been more commitment and dedication to our partnership and HA in general."

### Carly and Jonah

Carly and Jonah tolerated each other, accomplished all their responsibilities but aggravated the other throughout the year. Carly reflected on many of the negative aspects of her partnership: "We were complete opposites about the way that we approached tasks or things like that. I tended to be more vocal. I was frustrated and angry with him many times. I made a real effort to be honest with him and to not let him get away with saying anything that was offensive. I feel like I did more work than he did."

They mutually agreed that many times each partner would empower the other ; but there were enough times to annoy each other throughout the year to dampen the experience. Jonah commented: "It was difficult to get things done her way. If she didn't get her way, she sometimes would be a baby about it."

Gender affected the partnership in different ways. Jonah emphasized: "Gender was another obstacle to overcome. People had expectations from each one of us because of our gender. Carly added: "Being a woman had affected my partnership in that I ended up being the one to initiate programming because I cared a lot about our house and what happened in it. I think I also did more counselling of residents because being female, I may have seemed more sympathetic or approachable."

### Margie, Irma, Andy and James

A quartet involved more individuals and created a more complicated set of group dynamics. As Irma stated: "I would describe my partnership as uneven. There was miscommunication; it was awkward and uncomfortable for so long." James acknowledged romantic interests at different times by both men towards Margie. Margie and Irma had tension all year long. Margie discussed how that affected her: "The tense feelings that Irma and I had caused me in the process to lose some self-worth, but in the end I gained more." All agreed that gender affected the partnership by complicating matters.

Irma acknowledged her biases: "My biased view against the way James dated multiple women and flirted made it difficult for me to take him seriously. The flirtatious, close relationship he shared with Margie sometimes caused me to feel left out and possibly jealous because my relationship with my boyfriend would not allow for such playfulness with

another male." These feelings that the partners had towards each other affected their work throughout the year. Andy summarized: "The dynamics went from two-two to three-one; back and forth. The partnership was constantly evolving; it was a very wacky group."

All four partners agreed that having more than two people collaborating in a partnership complicated matters and added difficulties in areas of communication and balance of work responsibilities.

**FIRST RESEARCH QUESTION: WHAT CONTRIBUTES TO A  
MUTUALLY AGREEABLE AND PRODUCTIVE PARTNERSHIP  
BETWEEN WOMEN AND MEN ENGAGED IN  
COLLABORATIVE WORK WITH MEMBERS OF THE  
OPPOSITE GENDER?**

**INTRODUCTION**

The interviews disclosed numerous answers to the research question. By synthesizing the responses from the subjects interviewed in this study, I have developed seven categories that answer the first research question: What contributes to a mutually agreeable and productive partnership between women and men engaged in collaborative work with members of the opposite gender? The seven categories include: Good communication, empowerment, constructive feedback, friendship, humor, common ground; and, intellectual growth and openness.

## **GOOD COMMUNICATION**

The subjects repeatedly emphasized how significant good communication was for women and men to successfully collaborate in a productive partnership. "I learned how important communication is" was a common statement throughout the interview process.

Understanding was one key concept within the communication category. Irma emphasized: "Remember what your partners like or don't like something. Remember their reaction. Develop an understanding so you know how to act and react once you understand your partner." Maddi and Bernard had achieved this level by the mid-year point of their partnership. For example, Bernard explained: "She was very understanding. She told me what was on her mind most of the time and she knew what she wanted; which was good. I knew what to expect. Maddi added support for this view: " He was very understanding. He listened to what I had to say and he seemed to understand where I was coming from."

Shanikwa had actually wished that David would be more understanding: "I think it would have really helped had David took more of an effort; to try to be more understanding and to be more communicative."

One common thread through most interviews was the issue of honest communication. Many of the subjects agreed that honest communication

was an essential ingredient for successful and productive mixed gender partnerships that are mutually agreeable in collaborative work. Serena asserted: "You need to be brutally honest as a foundation in your partnership." Rosa agreed: "It's so important to talk very honestly and very openly." Peggy expressed some regrets about her partnership: "I wish we had talked more consistently and honestly. Honest communication would have helped our partnership grow." Vernon also commented that he valued honest communication highly: "Honest and open. It's a communication style that is very flattering to me." Carly reflected that honesty was the best aspect of her partnership: "The best thing about my partnership was that we were really honest with each other in that I know that I could go to him and say I'm having a problem with such and such. He was responsive to that honesty and reciprocated. We were able to get to a better place when we had problems." In at least half the interviews, the theme of honest and open communication was emphasized.

Another key issue that was emphasized by a large percentage of the subjects was open and direct communication. In at least five interviews, there was a recurring perception that by achieving this high level of direct communication one can diminish the danger of making false assumptions. Rosa talked about assumptions: "Don't make assumptions. It was a lesson I learned from my partnership; to just try harder at the start and not make assumptions and to mellow out about my own views at times because you don't share all views in common with the person that you



work very closely with." Carly shared her thoughts: "I wished that Jonah and I had never harbored even the slightest resentments about each other or really could just completely accept the other person. We could have been more open and direct with each other." Vernon exclaimed that open communication was the best phase of his partnership: "The best part of my partnership was the openness, because I felt I could go to Jaime with problems and everything. I felt like I could go to her anytime so that I didn't have to go into things alone. I felt that I could open up and share honest ideas with her and I didn't have to be afraid." Peggy declared that when her partnership did work initially, it was because it started out with open and direct communication: "I think as long as we kept our lines of communication open, we worked towards solving our problems. Unfortunately, that didn't last too long." Shanikwa philosophized about a few partnerships: "One of the partnerships had really open communication, so they just kind of worked things out. Another partnership lacked communication, so they developed into knots. Mine had problems, but we kept communicating so it wasn't a total failure. There were efforts made, so that was good."

Another major area within communication that many subjects felt was important was the amount of time commitment to communication. Peggy added her advice: "In a partnership, just talk a lot in the beginning. Always talk a lot about knowing each other, and like I said before that women communicate differently and men communicate differently, but also depending on my history, I'm going to communicate better with

women. If I'm communicating with a woman, most likely we're communicating in the same way. What was helpful was structured time within our partnership because our schedules were so different. If the structured time was not initiated for us, we might never have gotten together. Rosa supported this point: "Something that was helpful to me was the meetings I had with a supervisor. If it wasn't for that time together, we didn't get together all too much on our own time." Vernon thought of another partnership on staff: "I knew of one that seemed to have stagnated. I think their issue was a lack of open communication, lack of quality time communicating and therefore, a lack of awareness."

Listening was also stressed as an important element of communication. Peggy indicated the significance of listening: "We could have listened more carefully to what we were saying. Our problem was that the other one would assume the other was saying something slightly different." Serena agreed: "Listening was so crucial for us. Listen to each other, and know your views on everything. Jay really knew how to listen. I've experienced that listening is a skill, not a given characteristic, and Jay really knew how to listen. He kept great eye contact and physically responded to things I said. He really showed me that what I had to say was extremely important to him."

There were some other significant factors in communication that were elaborated on through the interviews. Communication was a learning experience in the partnership. Fred summarized it this way: "Learning from all the problems I think that we had, I really think a lot of that was

due to communication. I think there was a difference in the way men and women communicate with each other." Serena added: "I learned how to communicate better from my partnership experience. I actually even learned a lot more about the qualities I'm looking for in a mate." Treating a partner as an equal in communication as well as consistency in communication were other noteworthy points by the subjects.

### **EMPOWERMENT**

The consensus of the interviewed subjects was that empowerment contributed to a mutually agreeable and productive partnership between women and men engaged in collaborative work with members of the opposite gender. The subjects' meaning of empowerment is a process where the partners respect, support and share responsibilities with each other. Therefore, through empowerment the partnership would emerge and function collectively in a mutual and relational process.

Logan admitted: "One of the most empowering things to me was Ariana's sensitivity to me and others. Her caring attitude was empowering." James commented on empowerment: "I think empowerment is something that you really have to give someone else in a relationship of any kind, it's not something that you take." Carly gave her version of the significance of empowerment: "I think that what's been even more empowering for me is that he had allowed me to take power and be motivating, and the initiator; and he really gave me a lot of reign.

He never said, like my father would have said, 'well, you're a woman, you don't really know what's going on'. I think what's really important was that I was allowed to be my own person and to have as much equal power as Jonah. I was never considered any less important or different because I'm a woman." Tony agreed with the correlation of empowerment and freedom: "I think what had been most empowering was that we gave each other free reign in what we wanted to do. We never stopped each other from planning something or doing something, and we supported whatever the other person did." Bernard found it very empowering when they both made an effort within the partnership.

Many of the subjects related empowerment to a sense of support and caring by their partner. Sarah underscored the significance of support: "He was supportive, and when I needed him to do something, he would do it. We shared responsibilities." Serena harped on the importance of caring in a partnership: "We really cared about what each one was feeling; we cared about each other's feelings and stuff. We wouldn't want to disappoint each other." Fred dreamed of having that support: "It would have been nice to know that there would have been someone there that I could have fallen back onto when I needed to, you know what I mean? Most of the time with the partnership we were working against each other than working together. It was very difficult for us to work together." His partner Peggy agreed: "I would have liked someone to be more of a support. I needed to be able to trust my partner. I needed to be able to

trust that person enough to say I'm really having a hard day now...I didn't get that from my partner."

The support being discussed could be interpreted as a willingness to work together. Shanikwa explained: "It would have been more empowering to have a willingness to work problems out. Like trying to make a better partnership. Like a willingness together. But we backed each other up and that support was empowering." Ariana and Logan agreed what was empowering in their partnership was being reliable and accomplishing what you committed to.

### **CONSTRUCTIVE FEEDBACK**

Many of the subjects commented on the positive effect that constructive feedback had on the partnerships. Recognition by the partner was one factor mentioned. Margie stated: "I think when people recognized me for the things that I did, I felt good about it. My self-esteem really feels built up when somebody appreciates me for just being there for them, for showing support to them or something." Tony continued with a similar thought: "I think appreciativeness is a big thing with feedback. I also appreciated when we gave feedback that we wouldn't walk away from each other until both were satisfied with the discussion." Serena supported this concept: "One thing that helped my self-esteem was when Jay gave me compliments relating to our work and responsibilities. Body language also reinforced to me what I was saying

or doing was good or important. That made me feel comfortable." James made some insightful comments on constructive feedback: "What would have helped my self-esteem and promoted my personal growth would have been able to talk and share at any time at any level; honest, straightforward and open talk. It happened occasionally and that was great."

Another component of constructive feedback was a sense of equality. Shanikwa spoke on this idea: "In terms of verbal communication, I respect being on the same level as the person giving me the feedback." As good as Serena and Jay's partnership was, there were challenges to overcome according to Serena: "I probably would have made our skin a little thicker than what it was. We could have accepted constructive criticism better. We tended to personalize or get defensive at times which wasn't necessary." Jay agreed that what enhanced their partnership was "...constructive criticism, taking positive comments which would build our self-esteem and growth. Sharing and compromise were critical for our feedback and communication in our partnership." Sarah also spoke of compromise: "What was helpful and powerful in our communication was that my ideas were respected and there was compromise within the partnership."

## FRIENDSHIP

The idea of friendship developed as a major theme for many of the subjects as a positive phenomenon within the partnerships. Friendship would actually override most negative aspects of a partnership. The foundation of friendship in a partnership was so strong, it became apparent that its positive impact on a partnership was a critical bonding factor. Perhaps Jaime and Vernon's biggest asset within the partnership was their friendship. Jaime commented: "I think that our friendship started from the very beginning. The best part of our partnership was that we were friends and that we could talk and I could tell him pretty much anything. Our friendship was a common denominator, but we also went out of the house to have fun. Sarah expressed her desire for friendship: "It would have been nice if he wasn't such a stranger to me. In actuality he was a complete stranger; I knew nothing about him."

Serena was content on her level of friendship that she and Jay had maintained: "The best thing about our partnership was that we had fun together. We called it playing." Jay agreed: "The best part of our partnership was the friendship factor. It was more fun to walk into a room and talk about something if it was your friend than just a business acquaintance. The most empowering thing for me in the partnership was her friendship."

Shanikwa accentuated the desire for friendship in a partnership: "I would have liked if we were more friends; talked to each other more, hung

out together. We just didn't spend that much time together. I think we started to do that, but being friends is something I would have liked." Rosa saw her friendship with Tony as an opportunity to self disclose to each other: "I would say that we could talk about personal things. We went to each other as friends on personal issues. We supported each other in that regard." Margie also valued friendship in her partnership: "The best thing in my partnership was the friendships; but, it went through all the stages. I was really good friends with James for a long time and then I kind of lost that friendship. Then I got closer to Andy, but we went through some rocky times too." Peggy and Fred reflected on their lack of friendship in their partnership: "I would have made us better friends; found a way to be more compatible and spend more time with him." Fred described the partnership even further: "I like more than just business communication. I would have thrived with a friend level kind of communication in our partnership."

## HUMOR

This category was not an overwhelming answer to the first research question, but it was significant and noteworthy as a common thread in various subjects' responses. Humor can bond individuals in a positive manner. Tony discussed this subject: "We shared a sense of humor. We both took the world lighter than most people. Things are funny, you know. If things would get so bad instead of breaking down and crying we would



kind of smile or just laugh; laugh at our misfortunes. Serena contributed her thoughts on humor: "We would act goofy around one another and just make each other laugh, and it's funny. I think we had both extremes, like when things weren't too good, they were bad; but, when things were good it was really good, and we laughed. It felt great."

James illustrated how humor can be connected to other positive components in a partnership: "In our partnership, we eventually came to a place where we could all respect each other, respect our differences and accept them; and subsequently we could laugh with each other. That was an important breakthrough for us."

Lou indicated that what he liked best about his partnership was: "...I liked Sarah's sense of humor. The best thing is that we were so different and we still communicated and got things done." Actually, Vernon perceived his role in the partnership was to provide humor: "I think I was the humorist break. I wasn't a great planner and I wasn't great at getting things done, but once I got started I could do it. I filled in the section of being comic volunteer. My whole thing was trying to make Jaime really laugh. I felt that basically strengthened our partnership." Vernon was right on that accord. Jaime declared: "It was a good thing that he made me laugh because otherwise I think I could have gotten very frustrated with him."

## COMMON GROUND

Discovering common ground in a partnership was essential to contributing to a mutually agreeable and productive partnership between women and men engaged in collaborative work with members of the opposite gender.

For some partnerships, friendship in itself was the common ground. For other partnerships, mutual goals were common ground. Vernon described his feeling: "I think that the most common ground was to make the house work. We really wanted to see it work; we shared that goal. I think that was one of our most common ties." Jonah reiterated the same point: "We both wanted to make things work. So we both had the same goal. That was a glue that bonded us together." Similarly, Sarah and Lou shared the same common ground: "Our common denominator was our goals in our house; that we didn't want to be planners for everything. Our common ground was that we agreed on that." Jay posed the thought in a different manner: " We cared for the people around us. That shared goal was the cement between us."

Fred wondered what could have been common ground in his partnership: "If we had both been accepting of each other's choices, that support could have overcome other obstacles that negatively impacted our partnership. Unconditional acceptance would have been a resolution for us."

Others found experience as common ground within the partnership. Tony expounded: "It was past experience that we were both former HA's that was our common ground. That was nice to start out with." Andy elaborated: "At various times during the year, our experience would be a common ground within our partnership. We had shared time during training and we all did some learning and growing."

Jaime and Vernon's common ground, in addition to friendship, was acceptance of differences. They both agreed that being accepting within the partnership, as well as with others, was a quality they respected and shared.

### **INTELLECTUAL GROWTH AND OPENNESS**

The final category that enhanced mixed gender partnerships is intellectual growth and openness. This occurs when one person or persons develop a greater understanding by being intellectually enlightened by another individual or persons. Many of the partnerships described how intellectual growth and openness positively affected their partnership. In at least four interviews, men reported that they broadened their perspective on gender because they were in a mixed gender partnership with women.

Rosa and Tony had one such partnership that was based on intellectual growth and understanding. Rosa explained: "I would try to explain the other point of view. We may not have agreed, but we agreed

to disagree. If there was some political issue that we were divided on, I would ask him to explain his side again. We would talk about issues, or compromise; we were very honest with each other." Tony collaborated: "The dialogue was beneficial because we got different perspectives. I learned about this particular woman; her thoughts and what made her tick. In fact, I don't think that the partnerships that had troubles had dialogues or mutually compromised."

David complimented Shanikwa for her insights that were helpful to him: "She had different points of view on stuff, which was very helpful. I could go to her and she would see the situation differently which was helpful to determine what I wanted to do." Shanikwa added her perspective: "I learned a lot more communication skills and working with someone of the other gender. It helped me to break down the stereotypes of men, not to clump them all together."

Vernon found that intellectual growth and openness was empowering for him: "Jaime committed much of her time to women's studies and issues. She shared her points of view a lot. I think that it was very empowering for me in that it gave me a lot of insight into different views, different aspects of working with people. I learned a lot more about gender values through her, because Jaime was very aware of that thing. She liked to incorporate it in everything that she did."

Even Maddi confessed that one of the few positive aspects of her partnership was that because of Bernard, she expanded her outlooks in

situations. Her broadened perspectives she attributed to being in a mixed gender partnership.

## **SECOND RESEARCH QUESTION: WHAT IS PROBLEMATIC BETWEEN WOMEN AND MEN ENGAGED IN COLLABORATIVE WORK WITH MEMBERS OF THE OPPOSITE GENDER?**

### **INTRODUCTION**

There were a variety of responses that indicated problems between women and men engaged in collaborative work with members of the opposite gender. After analysis, these responses were synthesized into seven categories which included: Poor communication, violation of confidentiality, lack of initiative, sensitivity difference, relationships, being on different wavelengths and sexist stereotypes.

### **POOR COMMUNICATION**

Maddi was bothered by the lack of good communication: "It would get to me because I'm really one of those people who likes to know what's going on. Overall, the lack of communication annoyed me."

Assumptions became problematic within the partnerships. Irma warned about the assumptions that were made based on first

impressions. Fred confirmed that thought: "The worst thing about my partnership were the preconceptions of what we thought about each other, and expectations of our partnership. That got us into trouble." Jonah agreed: "One thing I learned is if you want open communication, don't assume. I realized that assume is simply making an ass out of 'u' and 'me'. The assumptions that were made would be based on what she had experienced in her life different than mine." Logan contributed another perspective on assumptions: "It was awkward to have to assume when and where and how it was okay to communicate. Sometimes I wouldn't want to talk about anything for a day or so being a typical male closing up and just not talking. And then Ariana would try to be helpful; be concerned and optimistic; but I'm in a real "pissed off" mood and saying she's a nag and she just doesn't leave me alone." Ariana added to that thought: "Although not all men fit this stereotype, most men are not as open communicators as women. This proved to be true in Logan and my partnership."

Sometimes nonverbal communication could be problematic. Irma expressed this concept: "What would make me defensive or withdraw in my partnership would be certain nonverbal cues. If it was just body language; if someone was having a problem with me and they gave me that look or something with their face or body, but actually didn't speak to me, that would upset me."

Peggy had a different perspective on the problem with communication within their partnership: "I felt misunderstood. By being misunderstood it

affected my self-esteem but angered me too. Generalizations were really unproductive. I was labelled close-minded by Fred at one point. That was putting me in a box."

The lack of time spent communicating was problematic within some partnerships. Shanikwa spoke on that issue: "Communication was like one of the biggest frustrating things. We needed a day to day basis of communication in our partnership. There was such a lack of communication." David supported that thought : "We tried to communicate and spend more time together. It got a little better but faded in time."

### **VIOLATION OF CONFIDENTIALITY**

Subjects mentioned that negative talk, as opposed to constructive criticism, irked them. Sarah had a number of thoughts on this subject: "I asked Lou to talk directly to me; not to 'backstab', criticize unproductively or be accusatory. I appreciated that he would honor these requests. We communicated well and directly because of these guidelines."

The issue of confidentiality being violated upset Fred: "The negative things about our partnership being discussed with outside people bothered me. The whole idea that issues going wrong in a partnership was not being resolved directly, but being discussed behind my back was disturbing."

A problem thematically perceived by some male subjects was when women on the staff organized sessions to get together and wound up complaining about the men. David shared his thoughts: "I had heard about the women's HA bitch session; getting together. I'm not saying it was a negative thing, but the men partners were only hearing that their partner was pissed off at them. We would hear through the grapevine that our partners were mad at us." Fred explained further: "The female HA's had been saying things about us (men) that we were jerks. I would get mad that it couldn't be said to my face."

Shanikwa defended the sessions: "It was more of a sharing, venting time to gain support from each other. The get togethers weren't designed to attack any one or the men. We actually had some good talks during those chats."

The subjects indicated through various comments that talking about their partner to other colleagues could and did distort communication, feelings and harmony within the partnership.

### **LACK OF INITIATIVE**

A common thread that was brought out by many of the subjects was the difference between women and men's initiative. For this particular study, the findings showed that women were seen as having had more initiative and being more detailed as well as organized than the men in their partnerships.



Shanikwa expressed her sentiment: "I don't want to be man-bashing, but on staff that year women did most of the work and men just did kind of whatever." Carly spoke of how much more initiative she had than Jonah. Jonah agreed with Carly on that point.

Jaime repeatedly emphasized how problematic it was in her partnership that Vernon lacked initiative: "I had heard a lot of the partnerships where the women did most of the work. I am task oriented and I like things to happen in a timely manner and I really follow through with things and I like it to go well. And sometimes I didn't get that support from him, of wanting it to go well. I had to really struggle with the fact that I was going to try to be done by this date whereas he just didn't care. In my partnership, I initiated things. I handled the details." Vernon verified Jaime statements: "The worst thing about our partnership was the difference in our planning styles, probably because Jaime was very on the ball, very task oriented and would have things organized in her datebook. Whereas, I tended to take things a little bit more laid back, I guess."

Irma reconfirmed the consensus about the women on staff: "In all the other partnerships, the women felt that they were doing five to ten times as much work as the guy was, and the guy was getting just as much credit in the eyes of the residents." Maddi continued on the same subject: "Women tended to be the initiators and the guys more laid back. That's how it was in my partnership."

## **SENSITIVITY DIFFERENCE**

Another theme that was common in many interviews was the issue of sensitivity. Many of the subjects interviewed expressed the general notion that women are more sensitive than men and are more empathetic and emotional than men. This perceived difference in sensitivity levels became problematic in some partnerships.

"There was an innate difference between us in our partnership," stated Maddi. "I tended to be one of those people who gets emotional, and I'm not afraid to show my emotions. At times, that difference between us became a problem."

Other perspectives included the need for a sensitive environment within the partnership. Rosa spoke on this topic: "What was important was that I would be appreciated, respected and listened to. I needed sensitivity from my partner or we would have had problems." Vernon expressed similar feelings: "If someone said something, like if they sighed or had that look on their face, that distasteful negative look, I would cringe. Fortunately, that was never the case with Jaime and me."

What became problematic for a number of partnerships was the expectation by others to approach the women on sensitive issues because they were perceived to be better in counselling on sensitive issues. Peggy elaborated further: "Most people came to me for emotional support. I am a woman, and women are often seen as

nurturers." Carly substantiated the same claim: "I think I did more counselling of residents because being female I may have seemed more sympathetic and approachable."

David contributed his views: "If the residents had problems or something, they would go to Shanikwa for counseling. I didn't have people come to me for that. They came to me for the vacuum or if they wanted to know where something was, or how to drop a class. But for the more psychological stuff, they went to Shanikwa. That's what we were each good at." Lou agreed: "Sarah's gender made people more comfortable going to her with their problems. But that's what she was good at. My strength was projects."

## RELATIONSHIPS

What became extremely problematic between women and men engaged in collaborative work with members of the opposite gender in this study were issues on relationships. Sexual harassment came up once as a problem that was quickly resolved. Irma shared an initial concern about her partner Andy: My discomfort with Andy's physicality led to a discussion about a respect for difference in physical boundaries. However, I would speculate that Andy overstepped that boundary with other women."

The subjects perceived that the major problems with some partners were intimate relationships, flirting and the significant others of partners.

Regarding intimate relationships, one of the best examples of how romance in a partnership could become problematic was the partnership between Ariana and Logan. Ariana concluded: "Our personal relationship made it very difficult, because especially after we broke up, it was difficult to know boundaries. It was difficult to have to work with him daily and yet not try to get my emotions caught up in his reactions or how he dealt with me on a business level as opposed to a personal level, which wasn't very good." Logan remarked: "The worst part of our partnership was breaking up the relationship. It changed everything. Things became different. It definitely put a new twist on the partnership. It was uncomfortable. There were uncomfortable silences."

For other partners, there were concerns of flirting that became problematic. Irma had commented on how the flirtatious relationship that James had with Margie alienated Irma and upset her. James complicated the issue further: "At the beginning of the year, there was an attraction between Margie and I. That was good in that we grew really close, and spent a lot of time together. I think Andy resented me for that. It was interesting, however, that Margie and Irma had some kind of separation between them."

Some subjects offered other aspects of relationships as problematic within their partnerships. The concept of the significant other affecting the partnership was an issue. Serena initiated the idea: "There need to be boundaries as far as a romantic relationship which could develop and maybe work out or eventually backfire." Jay expressed how he held back

because of the fear that it would affect either his partner or significant other and possibly both. In Rosa and Tony's partnership, both had significant others that occasionally interfered with the partnership. Tony exclaimed: "I didn't want to interrupt... but I had problems at times with her boyfriend."

### **"DIFFERENT WAVELENGTHS"**

The final category that created problems in partnerships was the concept of not being on the same "wavelength". If partners could not discover common ground, that meant that they would be at different levels within the partnership. This concept of being on a different wavelength was a popular theme for many of the subjects interviewed.

Rosa and Tony discovered a solution to this problem: "We would be compromising and accepting of each other's difference. Otherwise, we wouldn't have made it that far." Carly and Jonah achieved similar wavelengths through "...shared time in training, learning and growing through in-service workshops and attempting to understand our differences. Communication and understanding were the key." Jonah philosophized further: "One thing was when I realized that someone's not on the same wavelength as me, I would back off and withdraw. There were some things that would make me withdraw once I realized they're kind of on a different wavelength."

Maddi commented: "A lot of the difficulties and differences I had in my partnership could have been because of gender difference. We were on different plateaus. We seemed like opposites in so many ways that it had been hard for us to reach middle ground. There were times that I wished I had a female partner. Sometimes I felt that a woman would have been more sensitive to my needs or how I felt. Often, I felt that if I had a female partner there would have been more commitment and dedication to our partnership and HA in general."

Shanikwa supported the wavelength theory: "David and I were on totally different planets. We just didn't get along a lot of times. We were so different. Our communication style was so different. At least with a female there would have been more emotions, feedback, feelings expressed. It would have been a lot easier." Maddi made similar remarks: "We were so different in how we thought. It was hard for us to understand each other. We were at different levels."

There was shared frustrations at the differences between partners. Carly offered her frustration: "In the beginning of the partnership, I realized that we were so different, and I think that we each had our own initial frustration with the other of why isn't he just like me. But in time, we came to an understanding." They achieved common ground by meeting on the same wavelength.

## SEXIST STEREOTYPES

Ariana complained that by doing the same thing as Logan, she was perceived differently because she was a woman. "If I enforced a policy I was a bitch, but he was just a man in control." That unfair perception was encountered by other subjects in this study.

Peggy raised a question concerning this issue: "Why is it that most people came to me for emotional support? I just think that men and women are different and are perceived that way by people because of the stereotypes. I don't think it should be a gender thing but it is. Men and women think differently." Logan complained of gender stereotyping: "One thing that popped into my head was I was supposed to be in charge of intramural athletic programming. Now why did people in the house assume that I should be in charge and not Ariana? I mean, there were men on the staff that were not athletic, but it just showed how gender based every one's thinking was."

Tony declared: "People, I remember, had certain expectations in the house because I was a guy and she (Rosa) was a woman. For example, I was supposed to take care of the camping trip while she would counsel people." Maddi was frustrated: "Residents didn't take Bernard seriously as an HA. He was more fun, but I felt he was actually neglectful of his responsibilities. Consequently, since I was so concerned with details I became the bad person."

Shanikwa stated: "It was definitely a gender thing. Perceptions were I was supposed to be this way and David had to be that way. The sad part was that most of the time it was true."

Sexist stereotypes were an integral theme throughout the interviews. The stereotypes were acknowledged by the subjects to be perceived and perpetuated by most people including HA's and residents of the houses.

### **SUMMARY**

Two research questions were addressed in this study. The first research question was: What contributes to a mutually agreeable and productive partnership between women and men engaged in collaborative work with members of the opposite gender? The responses were synthesized into seven categories: Good communication, empowerment, constructive feedback, friendship, humor, common ground and intellectual growth and openness.

The second research question was: What is problematic between women and men engaged in collaborative work with members of the opposite gender? The responses were synthesized into seven categories: Poor communication, violation of confidentiality, lack of initiative, sensitivity difference, relationships, different wavelengths and sexist stereotypes.



## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The study identified perceived differences between women and men. These differences ranged from different levels of communication to initiative. The research established how critically important good communication is for partnerships. Empowerment played a major role for the success of a collaborative partnership. Constructive feedback was essential for mixed gender partnerships. Friendship was a major asset for a number of the partnerships. Humor complemented well any partnership that utilized that component. Achieving common ground was significant for a successful partnership. Intellectual growth and openness contributed to a positive and healthy partnership.

On the other hand, the research showed that there were elements particularly problematic between women and men engaged in collaborative work with members of the opposite gender. Poor communication disabled partnerships. Violations of confidentiality created impasses within some partnerships. A lack of initiative by one partner

created resentment and anger in the other partner. Different levels of sensitivity needed to be overcome to avoid potential problems.

Relationships had negative impact on some partnerships, depending on the situations. It was problematic when members of a partnership were on different wavelengths and could not achieve common ground. Sexist stereotypes caused challenges and difficulties for many partnerships.

This study included ten mixed gender partnerships, twenty-two subjects, that substantiated most claims in the review of literature. Only one partnership (Serena and Jay) perceived themselves as mutually agreeable and productive; and, they initially had problems which they overcame. Four partnerships (Rosa and Tony; Sarah and Lou; Jaime and Vernon; Carly and Jonah ) had mixed reviews from their own perceptions but found ways to coexist despite many concerns over differences. The other five partnerships (Shanikwa and David; Peggy and Fred; Ariana and Logan; Maddi and Bernard; Margie, Irma, Andy, and James ) were problematic to the point that they could not effectively collaborate within the partnerships.

In most of the individual interviews, I found the participants to be more revealing and critical of the partnership and gender issues than in the joint partnership interviews. This seemed to suggest that there was an underlying problem with the participants that still remained in their minds. The uncomfortableness and unwillingness to share as openly with each other than in the safety of a confidential individual interview indicated a

fundamental communication problem that still existed between these women and men.

The following discussion will attempt to process the findings in relationship to the review of literature. The discussion will include findings that substantiate elements of the review of literature and will raise concerns as a result of the research.

Hopefully, these insights can contribute to the understanding of what could work, improve and benefit women and men in similar collaborative working partnerships.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **DIFFERENCES**

Chapters one and two both began with citing differences between women and men. Miller (1986) noted that gender is the most basic difference at the level of humanity. The review of literature discussed alpha bias, the exaggeration of differences, citing many scholars who were inclined to emphasize differences between women and men. The ideas of male-female opposition were present in the works of Aristotle, Aquinas, Bacon, Descartes to the liberal theory of Locke. Alpha bias can also be seen in the theories of Chodorow (1978), Gilligan (1982), Eichenbaum and Orbach (1983) and Grimshaw (1986).

Jacklin (1989) observed that when both genders are included in a sample there is a tendency to overemphasize the magnitude of the difference. Additionally, it has been claimed that research finding no differences is less often reported and circulated than the findings of studies that point to differences (Kramer et al., 1978). Kramer theorized that researchers tend "to presume and over-report differences rather than similarities between the sexes because our culture is infused with stereotypes which polarize females and males (p. 640)."

This study showed that the perceptions by most of the subjects indicated vast differences between women and men within the partnerships.

The differences of race, religion, ethnicity and other potential categories were almost completely absent in the subjects' perceptions of differences between partners. Gender differences figured prominently in partnership difficulties. Men were generally perceived as being less responsible, nurturing, detail oriented and self-starting than women. Usually, women had many more complaints which included that the men lacked initiative, planned poorly and neglected their responsibilities. The women came together and talked about their problems. Peggy commented: "I had talked with many of the women on staff, and found that most of them had shared the same feelings about their male partners being lazy, spontaneous but not organized and not nurturing. That led me to believe there is a gender difference, not that women work more, but they plan more, and are more attentive to the details of the work."

The literature review cited theorists who pointed out communication differences between women and men. Some of the researchers that showed how women and men differ in their use of language, communicative misunderstandings and differing communication styles are Thorne, Kramer and Henley (1983). They concluded that women are more actively engaged in insuring interaction than the men. They ask more questions and use more attention beginnings. "The women labor the hardest in making interactions go" (Fishman, p. 98). Fishman added that there is a division of labor in conversation. The women did much of the necessary work of interaction, starting conversations and then working to maintain them.

Many of the women subjects felt that burden. Jaime reflected that very thought: "I remember that I always had to initiate seeing him. The point is that he did not say hi to me first. I always felt that I was the one making the effort. I just wished that sometimes he would have taken the initiative in asking me how things are going, how I am, what's new or whatever." This statement actually supported two points. One was that her male partner communicated differently; and secondly, that he lacked initiative in their communication. Communication, as a critical difference between the partners, was a central theme by the subjects.

In terms of moral development, the literature review cited Kohlberg (1985), Erikson (1950), Gilligan (1992) and others on various theories. The findings seem to support the "growth in connection" theories of Gilligan, Chodorow, Miller, Belenky, and Surrey that were already cited.

Their research indicated that the female need for connectedness is the reason that women, unlike men, defined themselves through relationships. They go on to say that there are different tendencies between women and men. Women seem to have a more mature sense of mutuality; an appreciation of the wholeness of the other person with a special awareness of the other's subjective experience. The research in this study consistently substantiated these claims. If one considers mutuality as a creative process which builds on different contributions of each person, it is understandable why so many partnerships had difficulties when one partner failed to contribute. The level of commitment to connectedness or working relationship within the partnership appeared to be lopsided in this study. The women's commitment seemed far greater than that of the male subjects.

Gilligan (1982) suggested that women's sense of self and of morality revolves around issues of responsibility for, care of, and inclusion of other people. The findings strongly supported the greater orientation of caring and responsibility by the female subjects as opposed to the men. The women's developmental level, compared to the male subjects, was at a more advanced level, as shown in consideration of others, caring and empowerment.

Some of these issues could exist in same gender partnerships. There seem to be, however, special areas that magnify differences in a mixed gender partnership. First of all, the literature and findings support the notion that women and men generally communicate differently. Methods

of feedback, self disclosure and a willingness for intellectual growth and openness are affected by communication differences. Women tend to have a more open communication style than men. Women seemed to talk about how they felt. Men talked about what they did.

Communication differences between the women and men created impasses; and these caused the partnerships to act less effectively. By thoroughly engaging and understanding this basic difference, women and men can move towards mutuality. Some ways to achieve this would be to listen carefully; judge the content, not the delivery; find an area of interest; be flexible in the communication; resist distractions; and keep an open mind.

Another concept supported by the literature and findings was that women are generally geared toward relationship, while men are relatively disconnected. This relational difference has a correlation to responsibility. If one accepts that responsibility is a commitment to obligations and responsiveness in relationships, then it is imperative to address this distinction between women and men. An empowering relationship between women and men is critical for mutually agreeable and productive relationships. The one clearly mutually agreeable and productive partnership, Serena and Jay, focussed on the concept of "we". Stressing the idea of "we" was their step towards mutuality. For collaborative working partnerships, empowerment and mutuality is essential. The majority of mixed gender partnerships lacked empowerment and consequently suffered.

Regarding the seven categories addressing the first research question, two of them seemed to enhance partnerships but were not critically necessary. I am referring to the categories of friendship and humor. Based on the responses in the interviews, I would suggest that while friendship and humor are assets to a partnership, they are not essential components to a mutually agreeable and productive partnership between women and men engaged in collaborative work.

I mentioned earlier that race, religion, ethnicity and other categories other than gender were not considered to be significant differences by the subjects. It seemed that many of the partners were on different "wavelengths". Consider Jonah's comment about Carly: "Sometimes I remember when we needed to meet she was late. I would get annoyed when I learned the reason was she had to get ready; you know, take a shower, get dressed, put on make up, blow dry hair." This comment reflected other statements by different subjects in the study that seemed to suggest a pattern of gender related differences that overrode other kinds of differences.

Questions can be raised about these findings. Is it the specific task that affects the outcomes? Are there certain tasks that women or men do better? Would it have made any difference if the subjects were a different age or not college students?



## **AGE**

Age could have influenced the findings regarding the subjects' perceptions towards gender. One study examined the attitudes of men toward women (Astrachan, 1986). No clear generalization could be concluded because in every season of a man's life from his twenties through his fifties, Astrachan found opponents, ambivalents, pragmatists and supporters of women.

Opponents are men who explicitly deny the equality of women, or who claim that it can be established only by destroying society as we know it. Ambivalents recognize intellectually that women have a legitimate claim to equality, but they can't live up to it. Ambivalents feel, for instance, that women are competent at many traditional jobs, but they don't like working with women who take those jobs. Pragmatists are men who often say, "I'm not for women's lib" and then add a "but" and a statement that feminists could accept or support. They would approve of a woman's earning money, and they would recognize the need for a woman to be able to change a flat tire by herself or acknowledge that a woman's bank might help the right to equal credit into a reality. Supporters, according to Astrachan, are men who like the idea of women's asserting their equality and their right to choices. They want women to have careers that mean something to them. They try to be sensitive to women's thoughts and feelings, and if they are married, they give their wives' careers equal

weight when it comes to changing jobs or locations and take responsibility for a major portion of housework and child care.

Wainrib (1992) described the young adult male's developmental stage. "Dependency needs of a boy require alternative objects to attach to as they separate from the body of the mother. The masculine club or network around sports, business, violence becomes the substitute of mother's nurturance." Wainrib felt that many men stop in their development at this point.

Women's self development during the college years is quite different and at a similar level to the relational model discussed in the literature review by the "growth in connection" theorists. The basic motive is towards connection. The essential goal is increased capacity toward growth fostering relationships. "In our work (Kaplan & Klein, 1991), college women often demonstrate their wishes to keep conflict from distorting basic relational ties and to work out conflict within key relationships. Within self-in-relation theory the task for the college woman is to build on parental and peer relationships so as to enhance her sense of self as a competent and able being, thus becoming empowered toward the fullest utilization of her abilities." Collins, Gilbert and Nycum (1988) maintained that most successful working women were first ambitious, hard-working college students.

Other literature suggested that women become more assertive and men softer and less stereotypically masculine in the second half of adult life (Neugarten et al., 1964). Guttman (1987) argued that as women and

men age, they may become freer to express both the male and female parts of their personality.

## STUDENT PROFILE

The background, such as financial information, of the subjects was not part of this study, but I can provide a profile of the typical University California, San Diego (UCSD) college student, based on the 1993 UCSD Student Digest.

The proportion of women and men at UCSD was split evenly. Ethnically, 69% were white, 2.7% were African American, 10.3% were Asian, 4.1% were Chicano, 1.8% were Latino, 3.5% were Filipino, 0.4% were Native American and 8.1% were other. Twenty eight percent majored in science/math; 26% were in engineering; 21% were in social science; 16% were undeclared; 5% were in humanities and 4% were in the arts. The average combined income of UCSD parents was over \$100,000. The subjects interviewed for this study reflected this profile. They were actually more ethnically diverse than the profile, similar in the academic breakdown and it could be assumed that most subjects were from a privileged socioeconomic background.

Another point to contemplate is that the subjects could have been perceived to be in a privileged position. They applied and were hired as House Advisors, considered to be an elite status position in student leadership. Throughout the contemporary world, class and gender are

among the fundamental "fault lines" (Papanek, 1985), or major divisions of people, in society. The intersection of class and gender means that there is no unitary, undifferentiated category; no abstract, universal woman but rather, "women immersed in systems of social class relations" (Jelin, 1982). Education and employment often reflect and indeed perpetuate these divisions. Occupations and professions are largely class phenomena for both men and women, but they exhibit a pronounced gender hierarchy as well. There is considerable gender-typing within the labor market, and around the world certain occupations are typically male or female (Hartmann and Reskin, 1986), even though at times in the developmental cycle or during periods of social change, class structures and gender relations may be altered.

It is a realistic possibility that some or all of these factors concerning the age and student profile of the subjects could have influenced the findings in this study. Even though the findings substantiated most of the claims in the literature review, another concern needs to be addressed. That is the issue of the specific tasks of the work assigned to the women and men in the collaborative partnerships.

## **TASKS**

Williams (1989) wrote the concept of internal stratification: Women and men in the same occupation performing different tasks and functions. Williams explained that the specificity of the tasks could be much more

complicated than we realize. In studying the relationships of working men and women, one must consider what kind of tasks are being done. Williams concluded from her research studying women as marines and men as nurses that there were many complications regarding gender differences.

One strategy used to maintain gender differences in supposedly integrated occupations was the use of sumptuary and etiquette rules. When women entered male-dominated occupations, certain rules were often introduced to govern their dress and demeanor. Informal practices also played a role in constituting femininity in female marines and the masculinity of male nurses. As members of visible minority groups, they stand out at work while attempting to achieve their tasks. This added pressure at approaching tasks may result in different job performances from women and men in nontraditional occupations and exacerbate gender differences.

Williams also discovered that male nurses and female marines actively construct their own gender by redefining their tasks in terms of traditional masculine and feminine traits.

One theory of gender formation and maintenance is Parsons' (1952) sex role theory maintaining that differentiated male and female roles are functional or stabilizing forces for both the family and the rest of society. He argued that society, not biology, dictated that women and men develop different personality traits and assume different roles.

Historically, Milkman (1987) offered her insights on gender segregation of tasks in the workplace. She stated that the wartime (World War II) idiom of gender segregation combined such prewar themes as women's dexterity and lack of physical strength with an emphasis on the value of women's multivariied experience doing housework and an unrelenting glamorization of their new work roles. Although the initiative came from management, neither unions nor rank-and-file workers of either gender offered much resistance to the general principle of differentiation of jobs into female and male categories. Milkman's theory seems to suggest that the gender division of tasks in jobs developed as an integral part of the labor process and was shaped by the economic, political, and social forces operative at the historical moment when the labor process first crystallized. Although overt discrimination has lost its former legitimacy, and some progress has been made toward integrating women into traditionally male jobs, in general occupational gender-typing still continues to occur. That secretaries and nurses are and should be female and that truckdrivers and construction workers are and should be male continues to be an unexamined presumption of many employers and working people themselves. Williams' (1993) concept of crossover, meaning working in an occupation traditionally represented by the other gender, was discussed earlier. Historically, crossover has had an effect on attitudes between women and men.

The question that should be raised at this point is: Were specific tasks in the HA position oriented more to the strengths in tendencies of women

or men? Perhaps that answer influenced the outcomes of the findings. The findings indicated that many tasks of the HA position were geared toward women's strengths. One example would be the nature of interacting with and nurturing people as an integral component of the HA position. The literature review emphasized the significance of the value of relationships and connection to women ( Simeone ,1987; Gilligan, 1982; Jordan,1986). The findings overwhelmingly substantiated women's greater orientation toward relationships and interdependence. One could ask: Would the outcome of the findings be any different if the nature of the tasks in the HA position were different? It would seem that the tasks could very well change the outcome of how partnerships interacted and collaborated. Yet we are dealing with societal and historically embedded tendencies that women and men are more apt to be proficient in, develop initiative and display competence.

Thematically, in many interviews with the female participants, the concern was that the men were avoiding certain tasks. Those tasks included counseling, programming with other residents, crisis intervention, advising, and an initiative to communicate within the partnership. Generally, these tasks fall under the umbrella of interpersonal skills. My analysis from the data strongly suggests that the women were more committed, conscientious and competent in that scope of the HA role.

Another perspective offered by Epstein (1988) is that women and men have contact with each other, so ways must be found to specify that they are different even when they engage in similar activities and exhibit the

same behavior in the same social space. One such device is the different terminology used to describe what men and women do when they perform identical tasks. Thus men are chefs; women are cooks. Men who work the land are called farmers, but women who do so are usually called farmers' wives.

The notion of tendencies supports the recurrent theme in the literature review that indeed there are differences between women and men. It is fair to assume that many of these differences could affect the level of expertise and style toward achieving various tasks. Therefore, in this study as well as others, it should be noted that certain jobs and tasks may favor the strengths of women or men depending on the situation.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

In light of these findings, there are a number of recommendations that I can suggest that focus on programs and methods that promote the seven categories that contribute to a mutually agreeable and productive partnership between women and men engaged in collaborative work with members of the opposite gender. Simultaneously, these recommendations could help to resolve the seven categories that indicated what is problematic between women and men engaged in collaborative work with members of the opposite gender.



In-service training and personal development workshops could be conducted on a regular basis. These could include pertinent topics such as gender, communication, inclusiveness, diversity, empowerment, common ground, leadership, and acceptance. Workshops regarding gender could enhance understanding between women and men which could prevent misunderstandings and miscommunication. There could be special training offered to women and men in nontraditional roles. Training should naturally commence when hiring new employees, but ongoing education is critical for an environment conducive to personal and professional growth. Education enhances levels of awareness, sensitivity and understanding within the partnerships. Workshops on communication could explore women's and men's tendencies, understanding other people's communicative style as well as understanding one's own style. The responsibility lies initially with ownership and management. The leadership begins at that level to promote good leadership within all partnerships.

Facilitating an environment where members of partnerships can achieve common ground would be important. One method to help reach common ground would be to increase employee awareness of gender differences and similarities. In organizations committed to establishing common ground, partner retraining to support the value of gender awareness could be viewed as an essential part of the change process. Just as these organizations would not expect an untrained employee to operate a sophisticated equipment piece without training, they should not

assume that employees have the personal awareness and the skills necessary to deal with gender awareness as a vital resource. Establishing common ground should require that all partners become more familiar with the other gender.

Another way to reach common ground would be to develop collaborative alliances based on gender similarities and differences, common needs, and interests. In the future, as more employees redefine and strengthen their partnerships with others, many will form collaborative partnerships targeted at increased workplace equity and the elimination of stereotyping. Alliances could cross the boundaries of core differences. Women and men can be educated to recognize their own interdependence and become willing to work together to lobby for continued change.

Also, reducing gender bias in performance standards would be critical. An in-depth reexamination of traditional performance standards should occur. There should be considerable open dialogue in order to set more inclusive, unbiased standards. That discussion should be a key step in the transformation to an environment that comfortably values the strength in gender diversity as well as quality performance. It would enhance an organization to align its objectives with gender relations in mind.

Social and recreational events could be organized regularly with an opportunity for all partnerships to participate. Variety in these events should be encouraged to reach a diverse population. Challenges,

charities and other common causes could be arranged for partnerships to collaborate in outside of the work environment. Additionally, recognition for various partnerships can be created and implemented for positive reinforcement.

There needs to be a neutral outlet or mediation center provided for partnerships as a method of venting, discussing and sharing their feelings on different issues without penalty or fear of reprisal towards their job security. An opportunity for feedback and dialogue could be managed in a friendly environment.

Management should provide leadership by encouraging empowerment within all partnerships. Support, autonomy and emphasizing creativity will foster an enjoyable environment. This gives people a sense of control. Supporting employee efforts can enable them to realize the vision by providing coaching, feedback and role modeling, thereby helping people grow professionally and personally. Motivation and inspiration energize people, not by pushing them in the right direction as control mechanisms do but by satisfying basic human needs for achievement, a sense of belonging, recognition, self-esteem, a feeling of control over one's life, and the ability to live up to one's ideals.

Also, personal self-disclosure between members of partnerships should not be discouraged. A totally work oriented environment is not a healthy one. Within reason, it is appropriate to allow some personal dialogue to enhance increased understanding between partners.

The regulations and guidelines, if any, concerning relationship issues between women and men should be clear and specific. Expectations should be communicated to all members of partnerships so that there is a clear understanding of consequences. This study has shown that there are dangers of intimacy within partnerships in the work environment. Partnership relations in which intimacy had occurred were strained. Effectiveness of the partnership was influenced negatively by the dating, relationship and breakup of some partners in this study. Perceptions by others were sometimes negatively affected by the intimacy of the partners. Flirting between partners also had a negative impact on others in the findings. I would strongly discourage intimate relations between partners based on the findings.

Daily communication among partners should be facilitated to insure good communication and to avoid an imbalance within the partnerships. Supervisors could help facilitate some meetings to oversee that the positive elements of a productive partnership are being achieved.

These are suggestions that could help to achieve good communication, empowerment, constructive feedback, friendship humor, common ground and intellectual growth and openness within partnerships. The recommendations are an attempt to improve relations within mixed gender partnerships. They are not intended to change women and men, but to merely create an atmosphere of increased understanding and awareness between women and men. The research

findings and recommendations are limited, but the study is available to benefit women and men in collaborative working partnerships.

Finally, in light of the current challenge to the status of affirmative action, I am compelled to strongly support the concept of affirmative action. Affirmative action emerged as the key instrument used to enforce antidiscrimination legislation in the 1970's. Although it did produce increases in women's representation in some traditionally male jobs, this success had its price. In a contracting economy, affirmative action has engendered a strong popular backlash, not least among those who stand to lose job or promotion opportunities as a result of it. Part of the problem is that affirmative action is widely misunderstood to involve quotas or preferential hiring of women (and minorities) over more qualified white men. Actually, affirmative action involves making special efforts to recruit members of underrepresented groups and giving them preference over equally qualified majority group members. Strategies that can win broader support (from men as well as women) are more likely to be successful, especially in the present period of economic recession and restructuring.

### **IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

The literature and findings suggested that women and men have trouble understanding one another because they come from two different

worlds. Lakoff (1990) argued that men's language is the language of the powerful. "It is meant to be clear, direct, succinct, as would be expected of those who need not fear giving offense...It is the language of people who are in charge of making observable changes in the real world. Women's language developed as a way of surviving and even flourishing without control over economic, physical, or social reality." Further research could explore women's and men's language to help create a better understanding between them.

If mutually agreeable and productive partnerships utilize collaboration and collective action, then studies should be designed to examine the motivation for and dynamics of collaboration in mixed gender partnerships. Various questions could be asked: How does collaboration begin? How is it sustained? How do individuals coalesce? How does the concept of collaboration become valued by individual partners?

Further studies can address the concern of age raised in the discussion. Does age affect the mixed gender partnership? Could age influence attitudes toward the opposite gender? Do mixed ages affect attitudes between women and men? Do the different life experiences of cohorts affect the partnerships? Does social class play a significant role in gender relations? Can the findings be applied to all age groups, or are they limited?

The nature of the task was another issue of discussion that should warrant further research. Studies should look at the specificity of the tasks and issues of context. Questions that could be raised are: Are

women or men generally more competent, take more initiative or more comfortable at certain tasks? What needs to be studied is how specific tasks interact with gender roles to affect women and men's competence and motivation in working with one another.

Drawing attention away from the women and men in partnerships, it may be helpful to study national programs worldwide that address the issues of gender relations and interactions at work. There may be a correlation between national programs targeting principles of economic and social parity between the genders and the effect that has on gender relations in partnerships in the work environment. The literature review raised this issue with Kahne and Giele (1992) concerning United States work-family policies that are not favorable to women.

Other samples of mixed gender partnerships should be studied to further substantiate or contradict the findings in this study as well as the literature. This study used a very small sample size with college age students utilizing phenomenological interviewing techniques. Other studies could have larger samples with different age groups implementing quantitative research methods or alternative qualitative designs.

The purpose of this study was to discover what was perceived mutually agreeable and productive as well as problematic in the mixed gender partnerships. With these findings and future results from further research, we can attempt to connect two disparate modes of experience between women and men in collaborative working partnerships.

## REFERENCES

- Astin, H. & Bayer, A. (1972). Sex discrimination in academe. In M. Mednick, S. Tangri, & L. Hoffman (Eds.), Women and achievement: Social and motivational analysis. New York: Wiley.
- Astin, H., & Leland, C. (1991). Women of influence, women of vision. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astrachan, A. (1986). How men feel. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.
- Barron, D. & Yankelovitch, D. (1980, December). Today's American woman: How the public sees her. Prepared for the President's Advisory Committee for Women by the Public Agenda Foundation.
- Bass, B. (1971). Male managers' attitudes toward working women. American Behavioral Scientist, 15, 221-36.
- Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice and mind. New York: Basic Books.
- Best, R. (1983). We've all got scars. Bloomington, IN.: Indiana University.
- Block, J. D. (1980). Friendship. New York: McMillan.
- Blackmore, J. (1989). Educational leadership: A feminist critique and reconstruction. In J. Smyth (Ed.), Critical perspectives on educational leadership (pp.93-129). New York: Falmer Press.
- Bridges, W. (1980, February). Industry marginality and female employment: A new appraisal. American Sociological Review, 270 - 294.



- Brouwer, D. & de Haan, D. (1987). Women's language, socialization and self image . Providence: Foris.
- Broverman, I., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. (1972). Sex role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 28, 59-78.
- Burns, J. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.
- Burton, C. (1985). Subordination: Feminism and social theory. Sydney: George Allen and Unwin.
- Canter, R. J., & Myerwitz, B. C. (1984). Sex role stereotypes: Self reports of behavior. Sex roles , 11 , 657-676.
- Caplow, T. (1954) . The sociology of work. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Carroll, S. J., (1984). Feminist Scholarship on political leadership. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Chafetz, J. (1978). Masculine/feminine or human? (2nd ed.). Itasca, IL: Peacock.
- Chickering, A. (1969). Education and identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chodorow, N. (1978). The reproduction of mothering. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Coates, J. (1986). Women, men and language. New York: Longman.
- Collins, N., Gilbert, S., & Nycum, S. (1988). Women leading. Lexington, MA: Stephen Greene Press.

- Decker, B. (1975). The Women's Movement. New York: Harper & Row.
- Eagly, A. H. (1983) . Gender and social influence: A social psychological analysis. American Psychologist , 38 , 971-981.
- Eisenberg, N., & Lennon, R. (1983). Sex differences in empathy and related capacities. Psychological Bulletin , 94, 100 - 131.
- Epstein, C. (1970). Woman's place: Options and limits in professional careers. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Epstein, C. (1988) . Deceptive distinctions. New York: Russel Sage
- Erikson, E. (1950/1963). Childhood and society. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Fishman, P. (1980). Conversational insecurity. In H. Giles, W.P. Robinson, & P. M. Smith ( Eds.) , Language: Social psychological perspectives ( pp. 127 - 132 ). New York: Pergamon Press.
- Freud, S. (1920). Beyond the pleasure principle. Standard Edition, 19, 173-179. London: Hogarth.
- Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In C. Geertz (Ed.), The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays . New York: Basic Books.
- Giele, J. & Kahne, H. (1992 ). Women's work and women's lives: The continuing struggle worldwide. Oxford: Westview Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1979). Woman's place in man's life cycle. Harvard Education Review , 49 , 440.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Gilligan, C. (1990). Remapping the moral domain: New images of self in relationship. In C. Zanardi (Ed.), Essential papers on the psychology of women (480-495). New York: New York University Press.
- Giorgi, A. (1971). Phenomenology and experimental psychology. In A. Giorgi, W. Fischner, & R. Von Eckartsberg. (Eds.), Duquesne studies in phenomenological psychology. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- Gray, S. (1984). Sharing the shop floor. In B. Nemiroff (Ed.), Women and men. Montreal: Fitzhenry & Whiteside Limited.
- Grimshaw, J. (1986). Philosophy and feminist thinking. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gross, E. (1968). Plus ca change...? The sexual structure of occupations over time. Social problems, 16, 198-208.
- Guba, E. G. (1981). Investigative reporting. In N. L. Smith (Ed.), Metaphors for evaluation. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1985). Effective evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Guttman, D. (1987). Reclaimed powers: Towards a psychology of later life. New York: Basic Books.
- Hacker, H. M. (1981). Blabbermouths and clams: Sex difference in self-disclosure in same-sex and cross-sex friendship dyads. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 5, 385-401.
- Hartmann, H. & Reskin, B. (1986). Women's work, men's work: Sex segregation on the job. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

- Hartsock, N. C. M. (1979). Feminism, power and change: A theoretical analysis. In B. Cummings & V. Schuck ( Eds. ), Women organizing ( pp. 2-24 ). Metuchen, NJ : Scarecrow Press.
- Heath, D. (1976, March - April). What the enduring effects of higher education tell us about a liberal education. Journal of higher education , 47 , 173 - 190 .
- Husserl, E. (1962). Ideas. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Ickes, W., & Barnes, R. D. (1977). The role of sex and self-monitoring in unstructured dyadic interaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 315-330.
- Ihde, D. (1977). Experimental phenomenology. New York: E.G. Putnam.
- Jacklin, C. N. (1989). Female and male: Issues of gender. American Psychologist, 44, 127-133.
- Jacobs, J. (1982). On comparing the social standing of men and women. PA: University of Penn.
- Jelin, E. (1982). Women and the urban labor market. In R. Anker, M. Buvinic & N. Youssef ( Eds.), Women's roles and population trends in the Third World . London: Croom Helm Press.
- Johnston , W. & Packer, H. (1989, August). Handbook of labor statistics, Bulletin 2340. Washington, D.C. U.S Dept. of Labor, pp. 19-20.
- Jordan, J. V., & Surrey, J. L. (1986). The self in relation: Empathy and the mother daughter relationship. In T. Bernay & D. W. Cantor (Eds.), The psychology of today's woman: New psychoanalytic visions ( pp. 81 - 104 ). New York: Analytic Press.

- Kahne, H. & Giele, J. (1992). Women's work and women's lives. The continuing struggle worldwide. Oxford: Westview Press.
- Kohlberg, L. (1966). A cognitive-developmental analysis of children's sex role concepts and attitudes. In E. Maccoby (Ed.), The development of sex differences (pp.82-173). Stanford, CA.: Stanford University Press.
- Kohlberg, L.(1981) The philosophy of moral development. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Kohlberg, L. (1985). A current statement on some theoretical issues. In S. Modgil, C. Modgil & L. Kohlberg (Eds.), Lawrence Kohlberg: Consensus and controversy ( pp.125-148 ). Philadelphia: Palmer Press.
- Kohlberg, L., Levine, C., & Hewer, A. (1983). Moral stages: A current formulation and a response to critics. Basel: Karger.
- Komarovsky, M. (1974). Patterns of self-disclosure in male undergraduates. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36, 677-687.
- Kramer, C. (1974). Women's speech: Separate but unequal? In B. Thorne & N. Henley ( Eds. ), Language and sex: Difference and dominance . Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Kramer, C., Thorne, B., & Henley, N. (1978, Spring). Review essay: Perspectives on language and communication. Signs , pp. 638-651.
- Lakoff, R. (1990). Talking power: The politics of language. New York: Basic Books.
- Levinson, D. (1978). The seasons of a man's life. New York: Alfred A.

Knopf.

- Lodin, M. & Rosener, J. (1991). Workforce America! Managing employee diversity as a vital resource. Homeland, Illinois: Business One Irwin.
- Maccoby, E. (1990). Gender and relationships: A developmental account. American Psychologist, *45*, 513-520.
- Mackinnon, C. (1979) . Sexual harassment of working women. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Mahler, M., Pine, F., & Bergman, A. (1975). The psychological birth of the human infant: Symbiosis and individuation. New York: Basic Books.
- McIntosh, P. (1988). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies. Working paper No. 189. Wellesley, MA.: Center for Research on Women.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). The phenomenology of perception. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Milkman, R. (1954). Gender at work. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Miller, J. B. (1986). Toward a new psychology of women ( 2nd ed.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Miller, J. B. (1986). What do we mean by relationships? (Work in progress No. 22). Wellesley, MA: Stone Center.
- Morell, D. (1993). University of California, San Diego Student Digest. La Jolla , CA: UCSD.
- Moustakas, C. (1988). Phenomenology, science and psychotherapy.

---

- Sydney , Nova Scotia, Canada: University College of Cape Breton, Family Life Institute.
- Nakkula, M. & Selman, R. (1991). How people treat each other. In W. Kurtines & J. Gewirtz ( Eds. ), Handbook of moral behavior and development ( pp.179-211). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Neugarten, B. (1979). Time, age and the life-cycle. American Journal of Psychiatry , 136 , 887-894.
- Olstad, K. (1975). Brave new man: A basis for discussion. In J.W. Petras (Ed.), Sex: Male: gender: Masculine ( pp.160-178 ). Port Washington, NY: Alfred.
- Oppenheimer, V. (1968). The sex labeling of jobs. Industrial relations. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Papanek, H. (1985). Gender and class in education-employment linkages. Comparative Education Review , 29 , No. 3 , 317-346.
- Parsons, T. (1970). Social structure and personality. New York: Free Press.
- Patton, M. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Pena, M. (1991) . Class, gender, and machismo: The treacherous woman folklore of Mexican male workers. Gender and Society , 5, 30-46.
- Perry, W. (1970). Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

- Piaget, J. (1965). The moral judgment of the child. New York: Free Press.
- Pleck, J. H. (1976). The male sex role: Definitions, problems and sources of change. Journal of Social Issues, 32, 155-164.
- Pollak, S., & Gilligan, C. (1983). Differing about differences: The incidence and interpretation of violent fantasies in women and men. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology ,45 , 1172-1175.
- Reskin, B. & Roos, P. (1987). Status hierarchies and sex segregation. In C. Bose & G. Spitze ( Eds. ), Ingredients for women's employment policy ( pp. 3-21). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Rich, A. (1976). Of women born. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Rogers, C. (1978). Carl Rogers on personal power. London: Constable.
- Rosener, J. (1990, November - December). Ways women lead. Harvard Business Review , 119-125.
- Rosener, L. & Schwartz, P. (1980). Women, leadership and the 1980's: What kind of leaders do we need? New Leadership in the Public Interest , 25.
- Rosenkrantz, P., Vogel, S. R., Bee, H., Broverman, I. K., & Broverman, D. M. (1968). Sex role stereotypes and self-concepts in college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32, 287 - 295.
- Rotenberg, K. J. (1984). Sex difference in children's trust in peers. Sex Roles ,11 , 953-957.
- Schacter, J. (1988, April 17). Unequal opportunity. Los Angeles Times ,



Part 4, p.5.

Schutz, A. (1977). Concepts and theory formation in the social sciences.

In F.R. Pallmayr & T.A. McCarthy ( Eds. ), Understanding and social inquiry . Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Seidler, V. (1989). Rediscovering masculinity. London: Routledge.

Shakeshaft, C. (1987). Women in educational administration. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Shelton , B. A. (1992) . Women, men and time. New York: Greenwood Press.

Simeone, A. (1987). Academic women working towards equality . South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Smelser, N. J., & Erikson, E. H. (1980). Themes of work and love in adulthood . Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Smith, S. (1982, March) . New worklife estimates reflect changing profile of labor force. Monthly Labor Review , 105 , 15-20.

Sorenson, E. (1991) . Exploring the reasons behind the narrowing gender gap in earnings. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Spence, J. T., & Sawin, L. L. (1985). Images of masculinity and femininity: A reconceptualization. In V. O'Leary, R. Unger, & B. Wallston (Eds.), Women gender and social psychology ( pp.35--36 ). Hillsdale , NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Spencer, A. & Podmore, D. (1987) . In a man's world: Essays on women in male-dominated professions. London: Tavistock.

Spradley, J. S. (1979). The ethnographic interview. New York: Holt,

- Rinehart & Winston.
- Stevenson, M. (1977). Internal labor markets and the employment of women in complex organizations. Paper presented at Center for Research on Women. MA: Wellesley College.
- Sullivan, H. S. (1953). Conceptions of modern psychiatry. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Surrey, J. (1991). Relationship and empowerment. In J. Jordan, A. Kaplan, J. Miller, I. Striver, & J. Surrey (Eds.), Women's growth in connection. New York: Guilford Press.
- Tannen, D. (1990). You just don't understand. New York: William Morrow.
- Tavris, C. (1992). The mismeasure of women. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Taylor, S. J., & Bognan, R. (1984). Qualitative research methods: The search for meanings (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Tesch, R. (1984, April). Phenomenological studies: A critical analysis of their nature and procedures. Paper presented at the AERA Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA.
- Thorne, B., Kramarae C. & Henley, N. (1983). Language, gender and society. London: Newbury House.
- Unger, R. K. (1979). Toward a redefinition of sex and gender. American Psychologist, 34, 1085-1094.
- Vaillant, G. (1977). Adaptation to life. Boston: Little Brown..
- Van Maanen, J., Dabbs, J. & Faulkner, R. (1982). Varieties of qualitative research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Wainrib, B. (1992). Gender issues across the life cycle. New York: Springer.
- Waite, L. (1981). U.S. women at work. Population Bulletin ,36 , 1-44.
- Walker, L. J. & de Vries, B. (1985, August). Moral stages/moral orientations: Do the sexes really differ ? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles.
- Wallston, B. S. (1981). What are the questions in psychology of women? A feminist approach to research. Psychology of Women Quarterly ,5, 597- 617.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1958). Modes of thought. New York: Capricorn.
- Williams, C. (1993) . Doing women's work : Men in nontraditional occupations. London: Sage.
- Wirtenberg, J. & Richardson, B. (1983). Sex role research. New York: Praeger.
- Withey, S. B. (1971). A degree and what else? Correlates and consequences of a college education. New York: McGraw -Hill.
- Wolf, W. & Fligstein, N. (1979, April) . Sex and authority in the workplace. American Sociological Review , 44 , 235-52.
- Zager, K. (1992). Introduction: Gender issues in adolescence. In B. Wainrib (Ed.) , Gender issues across the life cycle ( pp. 3-15.). New York: Springer.
- Zaner, R. M. (1970). The way of phenomenology: Criticism as a philosophical discipline . New York: Pefasus.

## CONSENT TO ACT AS A RESEARCH SUBJECT

Steven Blue Robbins is conducting a study about gender relations in leadership. The qualitative research will study the partnership development of the Muir House Advisor staff. I have been asked to take part in this study because I was a member of the Muir House Advisor staff.

My participation will involve 2 interviews about the 1992-1993 academic year and these will be audiotaped. Interviews will be approximately one hour each for the individual and partnership interview.

I understand that my participation in the research is entirely voluntary. I may refuse to take part or withdraw at any time without penalty or influence on my prospects for present or future employment. In addition, if I do agree to participate, I am free to skip any questions I do not want to answer and to refuse to have any or all of the interview audiotaped. The researcher intends to quote from the interviews. The information I give in the interviews will in no way identify me as a subject or reveal my identity. My name will not be used in the study. The interview results will be used solely for research purposes. Steven Blue Robbins is currently a doctoral student in educational leadership at the University of San Diego utilizing this research for his dissertation.

Steven Blue Robbins has explained this study to me and answered my questions. If I have any questions at a later time, I may reach Steven Blue Robbins at 534-4200.

Based on the foregoing, I agree to take part.

Subject's name \_\_\_\_\_

Subject's Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

**JOHN MUIR COLLEGE RESIDENTIAL LIFE OFFICE  
1992 HOUSE ADVISOR SELECTION PROCESS**

**TO:** All House Advisor Candidates

**FROM:** Pat Danylyshyn-Adams, Resident Dean  
Blue Robbins & Kathie Poff, Assistant Resident Deans

The House Advisor selection process for Muir College is divided into four steps. House Advisors will be selected from those candidates who successfully complete all four of the steps as they are stated below.

**\*STEP I: Application procedure includes completion of:**

1. The House Advisor Application
2. Recommendations
  - A. One peer recommendation.
  - B. Two faculty/staff/previous employer recommendations (one may be a student staff person, e.g. House Advisor, TA, intern, etc.)
3. Candidates interested in Wilderness, Cultural or Wellness House **MUST** fill out an application supplement. (You must request this supplement at the Residential Life Office.)

**DEADLINE FOR ALL APPLICATION MATERIALS IS 4 P.M., FRIDAY, JANUARY 24, IN THE MUIR RESIDENTIAL LIFE OFFICE.**

**\*STEP II:** You must attend a mandatory informational meeting on either Wednesday, January 15 at 7:00 p.m. or Thursday, January 23 at 7:00 p.m. in Half Dome Lounge.

We will discuss: 1. The role and expectations of a House Advisor as seen by this year's staff.  
2. The House Advisor job description. 3. The selection process.

**\*STEP III:** Those selected on the basis of their application will be interviewed in a group interview. A group of approximately 6-8 candidates will be interviewed by the Selection Committee and the Resident Deans.

**\*STEP IV:** The Selection Committee and the Resident Deans will interview all candidates interviewed in Step III individually.

## 1992 MUIR COLLEGE HOUSE ADVISOR SELECTION SCHEDULE

- Mon., Jan 6                      Job referral available at the Student Employment Office, Ad. Complex 214.
- Mon., Jan 6 -                    Applications available at the Muir Residential Life Office. You Must  
have a job referral from the Student Employment Office.
- Wed., Jan 15                    **Mandatory** candidate orientation. You must attend one of these meetings.  
or Thurs., Jan 23              7:00 p.m., Half Dome Lounge.

**YOU MUST ATTEND ONE OF THESE MEETINGS TO CONTINUE IN THE SELECTION PROCESS.**

- Thurs., Jan 23                    4 p.m., last day to pick up application packet from the Muir Residential Life  
Office with referral from Student Employment.
- Mandatory candidate orientation. 7:00 p.m., Half Dome Lounge
- Fri., Jan 24                      4 p.m. Application deadline. All application materials must be turned in to the Muir  
Residential Life Office.
- Sat., Jan 25 -                    Application screening.  
Sun., Feb 9
- Wed., Feb 12                    Notification of those candidates who will continue through the process.
- Thurs., Feb 13 -                Schedule group and individual interviews at the Muir Residential Life Office.  
Tues., Feb 18
- Fri., Feb 21                      Group interviews begin.
- Tues., Feb 25                    Individual interviews begin.
- Prior to Friday,  
March 13                        Notification of the 1992-93 HA staff.
- Sun., April 5                    4 p.m., 11th floor Tioga Hall, new staff meeting.
- Sat., May 2 -                    **Mandatory** new student leader retreat. Palomar Conference Center.  
Sun., May 3

## JOHN MUIR COLLEGE HOUSE ADVISOR JOB DESCRIPTION

### REQUIREMENTS FOR EMPLOYMENT:

1. Must be a registered UCSD undergraduate student.
2. Must have a minimum 2.5 overall GPA at the time of application.
3. Must maintain a minimum 2.0 GPA for each quarter while employed as an HA.
4. Must maintain minimum academic progress of 12 units for each quarter while employed as an HA.
5. Must have completed a minimum of 5 academic quarters by fall quarter, 1992. (This requirement must be satisfied by "on-site" experience and not by advanced placement units.)
6. Must maintain current CPR and basic first aid certification for the duration of the HA position.
7. Knowledge of Muir general education requirements.
8. Evidence of sincere enthusiasm, energy, commitment and interest in Muir College and in the HA position.
9. NO involvement in drama productions or in intercollegiate athletics. An HA may not hold any other employment position, office within any college or student organization or in the Greek system without the prior approval of the Resident Dean.
10. Must display sensitivity to student needs.
11. Some prior on-campus (not necessarily at UCSD) living experience required.
12. To maintain employment, an HA MUST have Tuesday evenings (7-10 p.m.) available for mandatory weekly staff meetings. There will be NO exceptions made to this policy at any time during the academic year.
13. MUST be available for some training in spring quarter, 1992 and fall, 1992 training beginning on Wednesday, September 2, 1992 (before Labor Day).
14. MUST be available for the mandatory Muir College student leader retreat, Saturday through Sunday, May 2 - 3, 1992.
15. MUST be available for a Muir residential life staff mini-retreat on Sunday, January 10, 1993.
16. MUST successfully complete all steps in the Muir House Advisor selection process.

**JOHN MUIR COLLEGE RESIDENTIAL LIFE OFFICE  
HOUSE ADVISOR APPLICATION - 1992**

- INSTRUCTIONS:**
- \* A. This application **MUST** be typed.
  - \* B. Your completed application should be no longer than 5 typewritten pages.
  - \* C. Please attach this sheet to the top of your written application.
  - \* D. **ALL** application materials are due by 4 p.m., Friday, January 24, 1992.

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ PHONE \_\_\_\_\_

LOCAL ADDRESS or MAILBOX# \_\_\_\_\_

COLLEGE OF REGISTRATION \_\_\_\_\_ CLASS STANDING \_\_\_\_\_

Is your overall GPA a 2.5 or better? \_\_\_\_\_ Are you a transfer student? \_\_\_\_\_

If so, from where? \_\_\_\_\_ STUDENT ID# \_\_\_\_\_

At what college/university do you have your on-campus living experience? \_\_\_\_\_ # of quarters at UCSD \_\_\_\_\_

Are you interested in being a House Advisor in Wilderness, Cultural or Wellness House? \_\_\_\_\_ (If so, please pick up a supplemental application from the Muir Residential Life Office.)

1. Explain the general role of a House Advisor. Describe in detail several aspects of the HA position you feel would affect residents the most.
2. Taking into consideration your skills and abilities, write a brief critical analysis of yourself. Include your strengths, the areas you have the most need for improvement and your specific plan for improvement.
3. As an H.A. you will be working with people from different backgrounds and with different values. What challenges will you face when dealing with those people who are different from yourself.
4. If you had the opportunity to initiate a new idea that would enhance Muir residential life, what would that be and how would you implement it?
5. What are some of the specific issues and concerns you have observed among residents? Focus on one issue you have identified and explain what creative approaches you would take as an HA to assist your residents in dealing with that issue.
6. What two experiences have you had which helped you develop the skills and abilities you feel are necessary to perform the H.A. role?

You are being considered for a House Advisor position in the Muir residential life complex. **ALL** application materials (including recommendations) are due at the Muir Residential Life Office no later than 4 p.m., Friday, January 24, 1992.



**CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT:**

1. This position is for the 1992-93 academic year. Continual employment as an HA is contingent upon a personal evaluation and recommendation by the Resident Deans. Their recommendation will be based on the satisfactory performance of duties by each HA, indicated in part by direct feedback from peers and other HAs. The person must re-apply if employment is desired for the following academic year.
2. There can be no outside employment without prior permission from the Resident Dean. All activities must be adjusted so they will not conflict with the HA program and the availability that it requires, including all required training and weekly staff meetings.
3. The HA applicant must participate in the selection process as determined by the Resident Dean. The final selection for HA will be based on satisfactory completion of the process, including quality of participation; understanding of specific duties and responsibilities; and genuine appreciation for student needs, their concerns and the Muir residential life program.
4. The HA will be responsible for coverage during 1) the opening and closing of the Muir residential life complex 2) Fall Welcome Week 3) holiday breaks when the residence halls must remain open 4) a portion of evening/night and weekend duty coverage each month and 5) any other coverage as determined by the Resident Dean.
5. The HA will participate in all scheduled workshop programs. This includes 1) training in the spring quarter, 1992 2) training prior to fall quarter, 1992 beginning on Wednesday, September 2, 1992 3) attendance at the Muir College student leader retreat on May 2-3, 1992 and 4) at the Muir residential life staff mini-retreat on Sunday, January 12, 1993.
6. The HA contract compensates an individual for 19 hours of work each week. The number of hours per week can vary depending upon the time of year, quarter and the circumstances.

**SPECIFIC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES:**

1. Each HA is expected to initiate, encourage and participate in the community development of this/her particular living unit.
2. Through individual and group interaction, each HA is expected to know each student in his/her living area. Apartment Advisors are expected to know who resides in the apartment complex.
3. Each HA is expected to be sensitive to problems that individuals or groups of individuals may have. In counseling these students, the HA should strive to build and maintain a relationship of trust and confidentiality.
4. Each HA is expected to provide appropriate referrals for students to various individuals, offices and services within the College, University and the San Diego communities. This involves specific knowledge and awareness of students' interests and concerns, skills in facilitating referrals and a general knowledge of available resources.
5. Each HA is expected to coordinate regular house government meetings. The HA is expected to work with students in facilitating individual and group decisions through normal problem solving processes.
6. Each HA must assume a major project for the academic year that focuses on a special interest. Each Apartment Advisor must assume a second supplemental project for the academic year. All projects must benefit the Muir College community and the Muir residents in particular. All projects must have the prior approval of the Resident Dean.

7. Each HA is expected to develop an environment conducive to study and educational pursuits, and encourage residents to respect the rights and privileges of each person in accordance with acceptable social and community living behavior.
8. Each HA is expected to carry out administrative duties including the interpretation, implementation and enforcement of both University and residential life regulations and policies; the supervision of facilities; the prevention of damages from the misuse of the facilities; and the collection of damage charges on a quarterly basis. House Advisors are expected to comply with all University and residential life policies and regulations.
9. Each HA, as a member of the residential life staff, is expected to work cooperatively and consistently with other staff members. It is the combined responsibility of the Muir residential life staff to work together to develop and continually review residential life policies.
10. When necessary, the HA is expected to notify and confer with the Resident and/or Assistant Resident Deans regarding disciplinary and/or counseling situations arising in his/her area.
11. Each HA must attend weekly staff, and other pertinent scheduled meetings, unless given prior permission from the Resident Dean to be late or absent.
12. Each HA is expected to develop, implement and evaluate a balanced program of social, cultural and academic activities within their living area. Each HA must provide or sponsor and coordinate all arrangements for at least one educational program each quarter.
13. Each HA is expected to be an effective liaison of information between the Residential Life Office and the residential community.
14. House Advisors in the residence halls will work in pairs in their particular house; Apartment Advisors will work with three other Apartment Advisors as a team. All partnerships are expected to cooperate, communicate and share equally in all house/apartment responsibilities.
15. Each HA is directly responsible for all of the above duties and responsibilities and is expected to maintain close contact with the Resident Dean and Assistant Resident Deans.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN DIEGO

JOHN MUIR COLLEGE  
RESIDENTIAL LIFE OFFICE

HOUSE ADVISOR APPLICATION - RECOMMENDATION FORM

APPLICANT'S NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

APPLICANT: Please complete either A. or B. before this recommendation form is distributed. If this section is not completed, it will be assumed that section A. has been completed.

A.	If I choose to read this recommendation, I may do so. Therefore, this recommendation will be NON-CONFIDENTIAL to me.	_____ Applicant signature
B.	I choose not to read this recommendation. Therefore, this recommendation will remain CONFIDENTIAL to me.	_____ Applicant signature

**TO THE EVALUATOR:** Please be sure that either A. or B. is completed by the applicant. If neither section is completed, we will consider this recommendation to be NON-CONFIDENTIAL.

**Please type or write legibly in ink.**

**JOB DESCRIPTION:** House Advisors work in a shared advisory capacity to approximately 70 students in the Muir residence halls or apartments at John Muir College. They assume responsibilities for programming, counseling, academic advising and administrative duties in this live-in position. They serve as advisors to their house government. They need to respond effectively in emergency situations. They are expected to be dependable, exhibit leadership and be sensitive to the needs of others. House Advisors must also maintain an acceptable level of academic performance. This position demands both time and energy and requires that a House Advisor be in good physical and mental condition.

Your help in honestly completing this recommendation form will be greatly appreciated by the House Advisor candidate and will be helpful to us in our selection process.

Thank you for your cooperation in filling out this recommendation form. Upon completion of this form, please return it to the Muir Residential Life Office, 9500 Gilman Dr., 0118, La Jolla, CA 92093-0118 no later Friday, January 24, 1992.

Please circle the number, not the individual statement, that best describes the applicant. In addition, comments you may add would be extremely helpful.

**A. ABILITY TO RELATE AND WORK WITH A WIDE RANGE OF PEOPLE:**

1. Does not relate or work well with others.
2. Has difficulty relating or working with others.
3. Satisfactory relationships with most people.
4. Good relationships with most people.
5. Excellent relationships with most people.

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**B. LEADERSHIP ABILITIES:**

1. No ability to inspire others. Lacks initiative.
2. Some ability to inspire others. Weak initiative.
3. Satisfactory ability to inspire others. Needs occasional prompting.
4. Easily inspires others. Good self-motivation.
5. Excellent ability to involve others. Excellent initiative.

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**C. RESPONSIBILITY:**

1. Avoids responsibility. Just gets by. Not reliable.
2. Accepts some responsibility but works best under supervision.
3. Works well with only limited supervision. Reliable.
4. Accepts most responsibility. Very reliable hard worker.
5. Accepts responsibility easily. Always does excellent work.

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**D. ORGANIZATIONAL ABILITY:**

1. Completely unorganized.
2. Has difficulty getting organized.
3. Organized in a satisfactory manner.
4. Good organizational ability.
5. Superior organizational skills.

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**E. INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION SKILLS:**

1. Withdrawn. Does not communicate well.
2. Evasive. Has minimum communication skills.
3. Good listener. Satisfactory skills.
4. Very attentive. Good skills.
5. Able to listen & respond sincerely. Excellent skills.

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**F. PERCEPTIVENESS:**

1. Fails to comprehend. Over anticipates.
2. Often confused as to main issues and problems.
3. Satisfactory understanding of problems.
4. Seldom confused in comprehending main issues.
5. Readily comprehends main issues.

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**G. CONCERN FOR OTHERS:**

1. Generally self-centered. Little or no concern for others.
2. Occasionally concerned about others.
3. Balanced concern between self and others.
4. Generally concerned about helping others.
5. Deeply concerned for and very effective in helping others.

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**H. DISPOSITION, GENERAL OUTLOOK:**

1. Often depressed. Frequent ups and downs. Gloomy.
2. Has some difficulty with moodiness. Outlook varies.
3. Average temperament. Even-keeled.
4. Usually in good spirits. Positive outlook. Optimistic.
5. Very positive. Realistic outlook. Inspires others.

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**I. FLEXIBILITY:**

1. **Obstinate. Cannot deal with change. Will not take any risk.**
2. **Deals with change with extreme difficulty.**
3. **Can adapt to change in a reasonable way. Will take some risk.**
4. **Supports new directions & group decisions. Readily adapts to change positively.**
5. **Always looks for new & creative approaches to problem solving. Takes risks easily. Always open to new ideas.**

**COMMENTS:** \_\_\_\_\_

---

**J. CRISIS MANAGEMENT:**

1. **Total loss of control Shows no judgment in crisis situations.**
2. **Panics. Shows poor judgment in crisis situations.**
3. **Able to handle crisis situations in an acceptable manner.**
4. **Able to control crisis situations. Can give positive directions.**

**COMMENTS:** \_\_\_\_\_

---

If you have additional comments to make that would be helpful to us, please do so in the space below. The following two points are offered for your consideration:

1. Provide a brief explanation of your rating.
2. Comment on your relationship with the applicant and why you feel that person would be an effective House Advisor.

YOUR NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_

TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_ ORGANIZATION: \_\_\_\_\_

ASSOCIATION WITH THE APPLICANT: \_\_\_\_\_

WHERE MAY WE REACH YOU FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:

\_\_\_\_\_

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE IN COMPLETING THIS RECOMMENDATION. PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM BY FRIDAY, JANUARY 24 TO:

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO  
MUIR RESIDENTIAL LIFE OFFICE  
9500 GILMAN DR., 01 :3  
LA JOLLA, CA 92093-0118