

Gender and Communication Style:

What Public Administrators Know and Need to Know

Janet Mills and JoAnn Wandell

Abstract

This paper raises two questions: What do public administrators know about gender and communication style—and what do they need to know? As an indicator of what public administrators know, we analyze focus group data gathered from top-level women administrators in Idaho state government. To answer the second question—what public administrators need to know about gender and communication style—we review research on gender and nonverbal communication, verbal communication and conversational style, and present our findings in user-friendly, referenced appendices.

Introduction

What do public administrators *know* about gender and communication style—and what do they *need to know*? These questions surfaced as a group of public administrators met to plan curriculum for the Certified Public Manager Program (CPM) in Idaho. They contacted one of the co-authors for help in answering these questions. That call, of course, was the genesis of this paper. We present this to the Public Administration Teaching Conference, trusting that many public administration outreach programs, in addition to this state's CPM program, will find our work useful in a variety of other public outreach programs. Indeed, questions about how men and women communicate are both timely and timeless.

To determine what the state's public administrators know about gender and communication style, the CPM planners decided to conduct focus groups to collect qualitative data. They reasoned that focus groups would provide a wide range of information, insight and ideas. They further reasoned that women in top-level management positions would provide the greatest depth and breadth of information. Toward that end, they asked the Director of Human Resources to recruit twenty-four top-level women administrators for the focus groups. All agreed to participate. In two sessions, the administrators responded to the following question for about thirty minutes: "Does gender effect communication and relationships at work? If so, how?" A moderator acknowledged contributions and recorded them on a flip chart in bullet form to the satisfaction of each contributor. Focus group members understood they would remain anonymous and that the information they generated might be used for curriculum design and research purposes.

Here is our plan for the paper. First, we provide a summary of the focus group data, and an analysis of this data through the lenses of gender studies and feminist theories. Then, we discuss key information about gender and communication style, relevant to the needs of public administrators in the mixed-sex workplace. We present summaries of feminine and masculine communication style in user-friendly, referenced appendices; these address gender and nonverbal communication, gender and verbal communication, and gender and conversational style. We conclude with a brief discussion of venues for public administration outreach education that might be well served by learning more about gender and communication style.

What Public Administrator *Know* about Gender and Communication Style

Two dominant themes are evident in the focus group data; one highlights men and their communication style and the other highlights women and their communication style. In addition, the data include discussions of tokenism, sex segregation, double standards, and short discussions in which divergent opinions were expressed. Appendix 1 (A Summary of Focus Group Responses) summarizes these themes and discussions.

Observations About Men and Their Communication Style. Focus group members described men as directive, authoritarian and impersonal in their communication style. They described how men in hierarchical arrangements respond to their superiors' power by listening, taking orders and deferring to their superiors' decisions. They illustrated men's behavior by contrasting it with women's behavior. For example, one participant observed that men make decisions with little regard for the people around them, "unlike women, at all levels, who enter into consensus building discussion when there is a decision to be made" (See Appendix 1). Another commented that men who report to her look to her as "boss" whereas women who report to her look to her as "a friend." Yet, another described her director, who talks shop with men who report to him, but treats her more personally and compliments her.

Observations About Women and Their Communication Style. Focus group members described women as nurturing and emotional. They illustrated women's behavior by contrasting it with men's behavior. One noted that she gives the women she supervises more care and attention, as they seem to want that, but the men she supervises "...just want to know if they are doing a good job. They don't care if I care about them personally or not" (See Appendix 1). Another noted that women supervisors assess subordinates' competence and provide less direction and more support for the more competent subordinates. However, men supervisors provide direction but not support, regardless of how competent subordinates are. One member remarked, "There is an *assumption* that

women behave emotionally. This reinforces stereotypes and leads people to expect men and women to behave differently.”

Participants addressed how gender effects what happens in meetings: A woman’s ideas are ignored when she suggests them, but those same ideas receive great interest when a man suggests them later. Women learn to keep quiet because they feel beat up for expressing ideas and having to defend these and answer all sorts of questions. Men’s ideas just get accepted. One participant said she had learned to make herself talk in meetings after being told she was “too gentle and too soft spoken” (See Appendix 1). One member stressed that it was necessary for women to communicate in male overtones because to communicate in female mode is to lose them (the men). Another reported that women have adopted the attributes of men because the role models have been mostly men.

Tokenism, Sex Segregation, Double Standards and Divergent Opinions. One focus group member referred to herself as a “token” and recounted that men treat her as a secretary. She reported that her former peers, now her subordinates, expect more of her than they expected of the previous director. They ask questions of her that she believes they would never ask a man: “Did you get this (position) on your own?” and “Do you have to be so tough because you’re a woman?” (See Appendix 1) She believed her male subordinates have trust issues with her (“Can they trust a woman?”), as well as power issues (“Who is really in charge?” and “What can you do for us?”)

Focus group members had widespread agreement about sex segregation in meetings; men sit with men, and women sit with women. Another observed that men who dress casually on Fridays draw no comments, but that “women can’t dress casually without receiving comments on their appearance” (See Appendix 1).

Participants expressed divergent opinions in two brief discussions. In one, a participant reported that her agency had had a great deal of training aimed at self-directed work teams, and that men seemed to enjoy the same involvement as the women. “We negotiate and collaborate with gender not being a factor” (See Appendix 1). Another retorted that her agency had had training on teams too, but that it was just ‘lip-service.’ “‘Do this,’ is the M.O. We have a clear hierarchy and a military organization way of thinking” (See Appendix 1).

This comment led to a second discussion. A participant pointed out that some agencies are populated with male managers who have military service in their backgrounds, and that military service seems to affect how they manage. “They are insistent on rigid structures, are protocol-intensive and micromanage their employees” (See Appendix 1). Several arguments were raised: Females with military service backgrounds manage similarly, so this is

not a gender issue; women with military experience “out-do their men counterparts in the command-and-control management style;” and not all former military people manage like this (See Appendix 1).

Reading between the Lines: Interpreting the Data through the Lenses of Gender Studies and Feminist

Theories

Using gender studies and feminist theories to analyze the themes and discussions in the focus group data brings to light the pervasive effects of gender roles and gender stereotypes on communication and relationships in the work experience of the focus group participants.

Descriptions of men as directive, authoritarian and impersonal, and of women as nurturing and emotional, align with traditional gender stereotypes that have been described since the late 1950s (McKee and Sheriffs 1957; Parsons and Bales 1955; Broverman et al. 1972; Bem 1974; Williams and Best 1990). In an illustrative statement, a participant described a male supervisor who reports to her, “He has a direct style, but the women need emotional, relational communication as well, and he doesn’t provide this. He says, ‘We’re all adults here.’” The comment attributed to him ascribes greater social value to masculine stereotypic characteristics and lesser value to feminine stereotypic characteristics. Like mental health clinicians who participated in the Broverman study (Broverman et al. 1970), this male supervisor equates maleness with adulthood and dismisses what he perceives as female and not adult – the need for emotional, relational communication.

One participant mentioned that women subordinates seem to want “frequent attention and care,” whereas men subordinates “just want to know if they are doing a good job” (See Appendix 1). These comments are consistent with the conclusions drawn by psycholinguist Deborah Tannen (1994) who found women expect and give more attention and praise at work than men and enjoy these ritual social rewards. By contrast, men interpret too much attention as micro-management or power plays; to men an absence of feedback is evidence that their work is okay (Tannen 1994, 66-68).

In relying on contrasts to make points about men and women, the participants evidenced what Scott (1988, 32) argued: Information about men is necessarily about women, and vice versa. One gender implies the other and the two exist relationally.

In both focus groups, participants discussed men’s communication style first. They may have simply focused on men as “the other” in the context of an all-women group. An alternative interpretation holds they may have implicitly assumed what researchers and laypersons alike have assumed: Men are the norm or the standard

according to which women are compared or contrasted (Cleveland et al. 2000; Tavis 1992). Feminist researchers have noted that when sex or gender differences are evident, women have been considered deficient, deviant or in need of correction; however, no such constructs were found in the focus group data (Cleveland et al. 2000, 33-34; Tavis 1992, 20-21; Schaefer 1981, 27).

A few focus group comments indicate that participants have adopted masculine attributes, largely because their organizations are male-dominated and because available role models have been mostly male. "I must communicate in male overtones. To communicate in female mode is to lose them;" and "I've learned to make myself talk in meetings. I was told I was too gentle and too soft-spoken" are examples, along with "Women with military experience outdo their male counterparts in the command-and-control management style" (See Appendix 1). Morrison describes how successful women corporate managers must show toughness and independence (masculine attributes) in order to be seen as different than and better than women as a group, while displaying essential attributes of femininity, as well (Morrison et al. 1992, 54-57). Behaving within a narrow band of acceptable behaviors seems to be one key to success for corporate women managers; by doing so, they avoid being seen as a traditional nonprofessional woman or as a woman trying hard to be like men. Tannen writes, "Images of authority come drenched in gender" and points out the association between authority and maleness (Tannen 1994, 166).

"In meetings, when a woman suggests an idea, everyone ignores her. Later, when a man suggests the same idea, great interest is shown and his idea is taken seriously," said one participant (See Appendix 1). Tannen offers explanations based on the differing conversational styles of women and men (Tannen 1994, 277-280). Women tend to state their ideas and opinions mildly to see who might support them and men tend to state their ideas forcefully to see who challenges them. Women expect conversational balance in meetings and so may express their idea succinctly, taking up only the time they believe to be allotted to them. Further, they may speak in soft voice tones and offer disclaimers. Men re-introduce ideas a group has ignored when they think they those ideas are good. They expand on them loudly, at great length and in absolute terms. Not only do men not share women's expectations about conversational balance, they expect to dominate the conversation, trusting that others will speak up if they have something to say.

Another focus group participant said women learn to keep their mouths shut because they feel beat up when they express their ideas and have to defend them. Tannen describes how men explore or improve ideas through ritual fighting (Tannen 1994, 57-61). To find out what is true or best, or to explore an idea, men debate, challenge, and

poke holes in arguments. They express themselves vigorously and expect others to counter them vigorously. By contrast, women prefer a climate of mutual support in order to focus on what is good or useful about an idea.

That women and men sat in same-sex groups in meetings is not unusual. Macoby reports the preference for interacting with same-sex peers begins in early childhood and Tannen observed this preference continuing into the workplace (Tannen 1994, 286-289).

One participant described her token status and how her male subordinates expected more of her than they had expected of their previous administrator. Kanter describes this performance pressure as the tokenism eclipse: Tokens must work hard to make their achievements noticed and their visibility as a category member loads their acts with symbolic consequences (Kanter 1977, 212-214). Our focus group participants' male subordinates asked questions she was sure they would never ask a man: "Did you get this on your own?" and "Do you have to be so tough because you're a woman?" (See Appendix 1). Kanter points out that the presence of a token causes the dominants to exaggerate their culture. Further, she asserts that tokens serve as both models of and exceptions to their category – hence the questions (Kanter 1977, 222-224). Tokens also tend to adapt to the dominants, according to Kanter, using the same language and expressing the same interests. So, it is not surprising that our token administrator reported that the presence of a woman who was appointed as a deputy in the past year affected her: "Having her present allowed me to get in touch with my feminine side."

A participant noted that men dress casually on Fridays without comment, but that women receive comments on their casual dress. Tannen acknowledges that women are "marked" by all the choices they make their dress and appearance, but that men can choose a style in their dress and appearance that will not attract attention or subject them to any particular interpretation (Tannen 1994, 108-109).

One participant recounted that her agency had received a great deal of training aimed at self-directed work teams and that the men seemed to enjoy the same involvement as the women. With better communication, she reported, men and women negotiated and collaborated with gender not being a factor. Another participant countered that her agency gave only lip service to team training—it had a clear hierarchy and a military-organization way of thinking" (See Appendix 1). It is plausible to interpret the team context of involvement as more closely aligned with feminine style and the hierarchical, militaristic context of the other agency as more closely aligned with masculine style. In the more feminine context, our focus group participant might view gender as obscured, but would her male counterparts?

Finally, in reading between the lines, we might ask how the focus group members know what they know. Their knowledge seems rooted in their experience and they seem to trust that experience, including their awareness of gender role stereotypes that define socially shared beliefs about the characteristics, traits, skills, or attributes of women and men. An exception exists in only one comment, “There is an assumption that women behave emotionally. This reinforces stereotypes and leads people to expect men and women to behave differently.” This comment reflects a more critical perspective on gender roles, stereotypes and the role of expectation in evoking behavior.

We have no evidence in the data to suggest that the focus group members have academic or scholarly knowledge about gender and communication. This is not surprising. We know that courses devoted to gender and administration or management in NASPAA-accredited and affiliated schools in the United States are scarce to come by; only eight MPA programs offered such courses between 1995 and 2000 (Mills and Newman 2002, 28). It is more likely that public managers will have encountered gender studies in undergraduate courses in sociology, anthropology, psychology, communication, or political science, if at all. Mills and Newman found fourteen undergraduate courses offered by public affairs programs courses focusing on gender in public affairs programs between 1995 and 2000 (Mills and Newman 2002, 29).

What Public Administrators *Need to Know* about Gender and Communication

In order to understand the effects of gender on communication and relationships at work, public administrators need background briefing on both gender and communication. An understanding of these terms is necessary to appreciate how individuals construct and express gender in nonverbal communication, verbal communication, and conversational themes.

Perspectives on Gender. “Sex” refers to biological and physiological differences in genetic composition and reproductive anatomy and function (Cleveland et al. 2000, 28). Sex is generally understood to be fixed and dichotomous in nature: One is either female or male. Although the terms “sex” and “gender” have been used interchangeably in the past, scholars have differentiated the two terms for good reasons. By using the terms interchangeably, it is easy to assume that masculinity and femininity are biologically determined and immutable instead of being a matter of socio-cultural learning (Cleveland et al. 2000, 27). By extension, “sex roles” and “sex role stereotypes” are socially constructed expectations about the activities, interests, occupations and responsibilities that are ascribed to and appropriate for women or men (Cleveland et al. 2000, 43). In their most general sense, sex

roles deem women to be nurturers and men to be breadwinners. Although “gender” is the social correlate of sex, gender is not innate and does not arise from any biological form or function (Newman 2000, 127). Gender is socially constructed and is thus mutable and variable across time and space (Mayo and Henley, 1981, 3; Ivy and Backlund 2004, 33; Birdwhistell 1970, 42; Butler 1990, 472). As social constructs, femininity and masculinity affect appearance, behavior, and ways of being for women and men; and they function as socially attributed and accepted aspects of maleness and femaleness (Newman 2000, Ivy and Backlund 2004, Wood 2002). It is important to note that gender is a relational term, and as such, we understand masculinity and femininity by contrast (Wood, 2001). Unlike sex, gender is neither fixed nor dichotomous. An individual may express masculinity, femininity, or a blend of the two—dubbed androgyny by Bem (1974)—or may express no gendered behaviors, within a specific, evocative social context. “Gender ought not to be construed as a stable identity or locus of agency from which various acts follow; rather, gender is an identity tenuously constituted in time, instituted in an exterior space through a *stylized repetition of acts*” (Butler 1990, 472). Thus, scholars suggest that we “do gender” and that we do gender over and over, but with little or no conscious awareness of these constructive acts (Butler 1990). “Doing gender” permeates thought, behavior, and language. As such, gender is pervasive. It infuses most other social roles, highlighting the interdependence of masculinity and femininity (Burnier 2003, 277). That said, it is important to know that gender is more than the mere performance of an individual based on his/her concepts of the role; gender also includes the perceptions of such performance by others. Therefore, doing gender is an attempt to meet the perceived social expectations of a particular role or situation. “Gender roles” or “gender stereotypes,” then, are socially shared beliefs about the character or attributes of women and men (Cleveland et al. 2000, 43).

Both women and men are rewarded and reinforced for their socially appropriate enactments of gender as traditionally ascribed to them, and both women and men receive special notice when they deviate from their expected sex and gender roles (Cleveland et al. 2000, 54; Tannen, 1994, 166; Deaux 1976, 15). In fact, they are generally punished (Mayo and Henley 1981, 8). “Once we have identified someone as female or male, we call into operation a large set of expectations about how such persons should and will behave. A woman who acts like a man is not praised and rewarded” (Mayo and Henley 1981, 8). This is especially true for the woman public administrator. Stivers (2002) describes how carefully her gendered persona must be managed; she must project an “image that is feminine enough that [she] won’t be called a dyke ... but not so feminine that [she] won’t be taken seriously” (72).

Gender can be reflected at individual, interpersonal, social, and organizational levels of analysis (Unger and Crawford 1992; Duerst-Lahti and Kelly 1995, 41). We have already described how gender functions at the individual and interpersonal levels. At the organizational level, gender can be a property of an organization, per se, and shape both its structures and ethos (Duerst-Lahti and Kelly 1995, 41). Gender helps maintain and extend a social order in which hierarchical arrangements influence access to power and resources (Unger and Crawford 1992).

Some profound questions can be asked about gender by those just learning the basics, and by those who have studied gender extensively: Why are men expected to express masculinity, and why does masculinity include the traits it does? Why are women expected to express femininity and why does femininity include the traits it does? LaFrance and Mayo (1978, 157-158) offer an explanation by revisiting Bakan's (1966) hypothesis that two forces operate in all living forms: "agency" and "communion." Agency refers to any individual living thing's imperative to protect and assert itself, whereas communion refers to the living thing's need to associate with like forms as part of a community. Both agency (getting things done) and communion (building solidarity and giving support to others) must be present in individuals and social groups. LaFrance and Mayo (1978, 157-158) point out that agency and communion functions are not biologically given, but that we live in a culture that charges men with agency functions and women with communion functions—and a culture that values agency and communion functions differently. Agency, with its emphasis on proactive force is valued and rewarded more than communion, with its emphasis on communality.

Any introduction to perspectives on gender needs to note that maleness and masculinity are normative in the culture at large, as well as what this implies. First, research has established that when the vast majority of people are asked to think of "students" or "politicians" or "managers,"—or of the attributes of students, politicians or managers—there is a greater likelihood that they will think of males and masculinity *in the absence of any contrary information* (Cleveland et al. 2000,47). Second, masculine gender roles and stereotypes contain a broader range of acceptable and esteemed traits than do feminine gender roles and stereotypes (Cleveland et al. 2000, 46). Third, male sex roles and sex role stereotypes contain a broader range of occupational categories than do female sex roles and sex role stereotypes (Cleveland et al. 2000, 9). Finally, just because maleness and masculinity are normative, men are not exempt from the constraints of social expectations. They are scrutinized, just as women are, for their ability to proffer the socially expected behaviors, attitudes, language and styles required by the masculine gender role; and, likewise, they are exhorted to engage in appropriate activities, interests, occupations and responsibilities as

dictated by their sex roles and sex role stereotypes. This said, men, nonetheless, hold a privileged place in society, enjoying a broader range of acceptable roles, traits, and behaviors.

An introduction to gender will inevitably include recognition of sex and gender differences, but it should also question the assumption lurking beneath: that differences are important (Cleveland et al. 2000, 32). Scholars from many disciplines urge us to note the great overlaps in gender studies, to remember that women and men share more similarities than differences, and to interpret these similarities as well as differences (Birdwhistell 1960, 41; Josefowitz 1980, 14-15; Cleveland et al. 2000, 48; Adler and Towne 2002, 230).

Finally, Bernard (1968) acknowledges two defensive reactions people tend to express when introduced to gender perspectives. One reaction is to argue that sex and gender differences are minimal and not important. Bernard suspects that fear lies beneath this reaction—fear that open dialogue about such differences will result in (further) sex discrimination. Repeatedly, we have heard some version of, “You’re creating a problem that doesn’t even exist” from such a contingent. Conversely, there is the “Vive la difference!” reaction. Bernard suspects this response is rooted in an attachment to traditional sex and gender roles and in a culture that values agency functions and masculinity more than femininity and communion functions. It is prudent to expect these responses when introducing perspectives on gender, and to be ready with reassuring responses like, “We’re reporting the news here, not making it!” or “We couldn’t abolish gender and sex differences in this session, even if we wanted to. What we can do is move toward a greater understanding of how gender affects communication so that we enhance our own effectiveness and our organizations’ effectiveness.”

Perspectives on Communication. Most succinctly, communication involves the creation of meaning or the eliciting of a response (Barnlund 1962, 197-202). Communication may occur in face-to-face interaction, in small groups, in large groups and organizations, and through various mass media. Models describe communication as a dynamic, transactional process in which people send and receive messages, including feedback, in multiple channels, usually simultaneously, and within some context or system that probably contains ‘noise’ to distort messages (Adler and Towne 2002, 10-12; Wood 2004 31-33).

Communication is a complex process. It can occur intentionally and unintentionally, consciously and unconsciously, and verbally and nonverbally (Adler and Towne 2002, 13-16). It can range from effective (with fidelity or accuracy between intent and effect) to ineffective (with an intent-effect gap) and feedback can range from positive (reinforcing) to negative (disapproving). Communication is symbolic and relies on abstract, arbitrary,

ambiguous representations that may be perceived through any of the senses. We use symbols to construct and reconstruct reality (Wood, 2004, 29). Communication has two levels of meaning, the content level and the relationship level (Watzlawick et al. 1967, 51-52). The content level contains literal messages and the relationship level indicates the nature of involvement between communicators. Similarly, communications contain report and command aspects (Ruesch and Bateson 1968, 21-38). The report aspect contains information and is tied to the content message and the command aspect refers to how the message is to be taken. The term “meta-communication” is used to refer to the “communication about communication” that is implicit in the relational level or command aspect of messages. In the presence of another person, one cannot not communicate (Watzlawick et al. 1967, 48-51). Finally, interactions may be “punctuated,” as people attribute causality to their own and others’ behaviors (Watzlawick et al. 1967, 54-59).

George Herbert Mead and other symbolic interaction theorists maintain that mind, self and society emerge through communication. Through all symbolic processes, but especially through language, we gain the ability to perceive ourselves objectively in the same sense that we perceive others as objects (Duncan 1967, 243-244). Thus, our personal, interpersonal, professional, and civic lives are all influenced by communication (Wood 2004, 17-21). Social construction theorists who write about gender concur. Our notions of gender and our own gender identities develop through communication in concrete, changing social relationships within a culture which has its own evolving customs, rules, and expectations that affect what gender is perceived to be (Thorne et al. 1983, 16). Clearly, it is through communication in its many forms that people create meaning about their biological sex and construct complex images of themselves and others as gendered beings. Language, nonverbal communication, and themes and rituals in conversation itself can be gendered; as such, communication can create, maintain and extend traditional relationships between women and men—relationships that accord men positions of power and dominance and cast women into submissive, supportive roles.

Gender and Nonverbal Communication. Because it is easier to “see” gendered nonverbal communication than it is to “hear” gendered language use or conversational themes, we introduce feminine and masculine nonverbal styles first. We begin with a short theoretical description of nonverbal communication, anticipating questions frequently raised by those who are not scholars or students of communication studies.

First, a definition: Nonverbal communication includes all messages expressed by means other than language (Adler and Towne 2002, 263; Wood 2004, 126). Nonverbal messages are sent and received through multi-

sensory channels continuously. These channels include: body orientation, interpersonal distance, posture, gestures, facial expressions, eye contact and looking behaviors, voice, touch, dress and appearance, territoriality, physical environment, and our use of time and timing (Adler and Towne 2002, 242-262). Even silence has communicative value (Wood 2004, 141).

In addition to its multi-channel nature, nonverbal communication has some other important characteristics. (1) Scholars estimate that nonverbal communication conveys between 65% and 93% of the meaning or overall impact of communication (Wood 2004, 126). Most meta-communication flows through nonverbal communication, conveying the command aspect of the message and relational dimensions of meaning including responsiveness or interest in others, liking or affiliation, and power or dominance-submissiveness (Wood 2004, 128-129). (2) Nonverbal communication is culture bound and reflects the values and rules of a particular culture (Adler and Towne 2002, 226). Therefore, the same nonverbal behavior can mean different things in different cultures. Relevant to this paper, the behaviors that communicate femininity and masculinity in one culture do not necessarily align with gendered behaviors in another culture. (3) The meaning of any nonverbal behavior is highly contextual (Wood 2004, 144). As a result, nonverbal communications have been characterized as vague and ambiguous (Adler and Towne 2002, 237-238; Wood 2004, 126-127). A particular nonverbal behavior may serve multiple functions at the same time – or it may be nothing more than an idiosyncratic expression. Further, meanings vary over time, context, sub-culture and culture. (4) Nonverbal communication is continuous and occurs in an ongoing stream of interaction, unlike verbal communication that occurs intermittently (Adler and Towne 2002, 241). (5) Most nonverbal communication occurs unconsciously (Adler and Towne 2002, 242). Two exceptions are noteworthy. First, gestures are relatively conscious as enacted and observed, and, second, exceptions to expected nonverbal behaviors tend to make their way into the conscious mind to be processed explicitly and cognitively. (6) Nonverbal communications serve multiple functions. Relative to verbal communication they may repeat, complement, emphasize, contradict, substitute for or contradict verbal messages (Adler and Towne 2002, 233-234).

Sex and gender differences in nonverbal behavior have been investigated across disciplinary lines since publication of an essay on “Masculinity and Femininity as Display” by anthropologist Ray Birdwhistell (1970). He distinguishes “gender displays” as patterned social behaviors that are learned and situationally produced (Birdwhistell 1970, 42). He reports that informants in seven cultures readily distinguished male movement and female movement and different degrees of accentuation or diminution, depending on the situation (Birdwhistell

1970, 43). He suggests gender display systems provide not only gender identification, but also information about the division of labor and day-to-day life within a community.

Goffman (1976, 69-07) further defines “gender displays” as the formalized, ritualized behaviors females and males characteristically perform to announce their alignment and intent in social situations. Gender displays are emotionally motivated behaviors that have become stereotypic by simplification or exaggeration so that a brief expression suffices in lieu of playing out an entire act. They affirm basic social arrangements and present information about people and the social order. Gender displays are typically “dialogic” in that a gender statement by one person in the presence of an opposite-sex person tends to call out a reply, and “political” in that gender statement-response pairs tend to occur in patterns showing masculine dominance and feminine subordination (Goffman 1976, 71-71). Henley (1977) concurs with Goffman’s political analysis of gender displays. She maintains the “personal-as-political” feminist perspective in pointing out how power statements and gender displays are fused in micro-political gestures that serve as the glue that holds together a power hierarchy in which females are subordinate to dominant males (Henley 1977, 140).

Appendix 2 (Gender and Nonverbal Communication) contains a summary of research describing sex and gender differences in nonverbal communication. Bulleted descriptions of feminine style and masculine style are provided for research on the following aspects of nonverbal communication: posture; body orientation; use of interpersonal space and distance; positioning of feet and legs, arms and hands, and heads; facial displays; touching; dress and appearance; expression and interpretation of emotion; and voice. In these gendered forms, feminine style can be interpreted as serving the communion functions described by Bakan. However, feminine style also serves as the asymmetrical reciprocal for masculine style, in which case, it functions to indicate submission and subordination.

Let us illustrate how information from Appendix 2 might describe the interaction of two public managers—a woman who displays femininity and a man who displays masculinity. She sits upright, legs crossed, hands folded in her lap. He leans back relaxed and at ease, with his arms behind his head in a “power spread” and his legs crossed in the “broken four” (ankle on knee) position. She cants her head and torso, she smiles, and she looks at him, eyes wide open, brow arched, glancing away and/or lowering her eyes frequently. He holds his head upright, neutralizes emotional expression in his face, and he does not look at her as they speak. The muscles around his eyes and in his brow remain relaxed. Her voice is soft; she uses the higher range of her pitch register and a wide intonation pattern, including

hesitations and rising inflection at the end of her sentences. His voice is louder; he uses the lower range of his pitch register and a narrow intonation pattern, with no hesitations and falling inflection at the end of his sentences. In this stereotypic encounter, we discern reciprocals that display not only gender, but also an alignment of power. His masculinity expresses dominance, whereas her femininity—perhaps intended to express affiliation or connection—expresses the reciprocal of dominance: subordination and submission. This is evident in their relative size, (big/small, up/down, expanded/constricted); their postural alignment (informal, loose/formal, tight); their eye contact patterns (watchful, with gaze aversion/disengaged); and their vocal patterns (soft/loud, higher/lower pitch range; wide/narrow intonation patterns). Gender and power are thus confounded so that men who express their masculinity simultaneously express power and dominance and women who express their femininity simultaneously express subordination and submissiveness.

Numerous scholars point out that these differences make a difference in the context of relationships between women and men. They function to define, maintain, and extend the traditional hierarchical arrangement in which females are submissive to dominant males (Henley 1977; Mayo and Henley 1981; Goffman 1976; Frieze and Ramsey 1976; Mills 1983). Mayo and Henley (1981, 8) say it best, “Nonverbal behavior encodes power well.”

Gender and Verbal Communication. Although popular literature suggests that women and men come from different planets and speak different languages, they decidedly do not. They do, however, use the same language differently. Appendix 3 (Gender and Verbal Communication) provides a summary featuring these differences. Clearly, verbal communication—the use and choice of language—is informed by gender and gender roles, although users may remain relatively unconscious of this (Ivy and Backlund 2004, 154). To understand the gendered use of verbal communication, it is imperative to understand that women and men communicate for disparate purposes, use dissimilar sets of rules to guide their verbal communications, and have distinct paradigms for understanding and interpreting what is said.

First, let us discuss how the very purpose, intent, or goal of communication differs for men and women. There is ample evidence that men communicate to establish independence, control and status, or to resist the control and influence of others, and that women communicate to build rapport and to approach intimacy with others (Wood 2004, 125 & 128; Tannen 1990, 1994). In our discussion of perspectives on gender, we discussed Bakan’s (1966) hypothesis that our culture charges men with agency functions—getting things done—and women with communion functions—creating solidarity and providing support. To get things done, men express themselves assertively and

with confidence, but this style has a cost. It tends to exclude others' ideas or comments, as well as place others in the position of challenging the speaker's competence, should they choose to speak up (Wood, 2004, 130). The task-oriented style men generally use in their verbal communication relies on the use of descriptive and empirical facts, logical arguments, and a sense of authority (Beck 1988; Eakins and Eakins 1978; Tannen 1990a; Wood 1993a). By contrast, women's purpose for communicating is to create solidarity and provide support, hence they use a "participatory mode of interaction in which communicators respond to and build on each other's ideas in the process of conversing" (Wood 2004, 125; Tannen 1990, 1994). This style, too, has a cost: Others may view the initiator as lacking in competence, confidence, or both. The relationship-oriented style women generally use to communicate relies on interpretative, metaphorical description, emotionality, and a high degree of responsiveness with others (Beck 1988; Eakins and Eakins 1978; Tannen 1990a; Wood 1993a).

In addition to having different purposes for communicating, men and women also operate with different sets of rules for verbal communication, which are deeply ingrained aspects of gender role socialization. Floor holding or conversational control rules (masculine style) and rules for turn taking (feminine style) present a remarkable case in point. For men, holding the floor and maintaining control over the conversation is an important end, in itself, as it establishes status, power, and dominance. Hence, men interrupt others more frequently than women, engage in overlaps, speaking simultaneously with another or with others, and fill pauses with nonlinguistic utterances (uh, um, ah). When being interrupted, men respond differentially, depending on the status of the person who interrupts. The rule is to allow one's superiors to interrupt, but to keep talking when peer or subordinates interrupt—or to become inattentive to them, should they gain conversational control. Women's rules about turn taking are quite at odds with men's rules for floor holding. Women expect to take turns speaking, and expect to share relatively equal conversational time with others. Hence, they take fewer turns speaking than men, speak for shorter periods of time, and do not often interrupt others. When interrupted, women tend to stop talking; they are even likely to show interest in the one who has interrupted.

Another equally interesting contrast of rules for women and men concerns tentativeness and politeness that is aimed at including others in conversation. Women use hedges ("Yes, I guess I could support that position, or I could refute it, too, depending..."), disclaimers ("This is what I read, but, you know, you can't believe everything your read"), hesitations ("Well, uh, I'll need to think that one over..."), qualifiers ("I'm not the best source for that information, but here's what I know..."), and tag questions ("We're going ahead with Plan A, aren't we?")

(Borisoff and Merrill 1998, 29-31; Wood 2001, 127). All these verbal forms express tentativeness and politeness, and are designed to open the way for others to respond and express their thoughts and opinions. Men, by contrast, avoid hedges, disclaimers, hesitations, qualifiers, and tag questions in their quest for autonomy, authority, and conversational control. Being polite verbally may mean saying “please” and “thank you”—but it sure doesn’t involve hedges or disclaimers. Further, there is nothing impolite about dominating conversations, in men’s rules, because if others have something to say, men believe, they will speak up, even if it means interrupting. That is, well, as long as the other is a man. Women who interrupt are another story. Women are expected *not* to interrupt, and those who do have broken a norm or rule.

Interpreting others’ verbal communication usually involves using the conventions and rules of one’s own gender to make sense of what others are saying. Consequently, misunderstandings frequently occur between men and women because they are unaware that differing rules are in use. Consider this: using masculine rules of floor holding to judge women who are using feminine rules for turn taking. This is akin to using soccer rules on the football field. Women appear as though they have nothing to say—no opinions, no information. Hence, they appear weak, indecisive, and powerless (Borisoff and Merrill 1998, 32; Cleveland et al. 2000, 109; Wood 2001, 127-128). Now consider this: using feminine rules of turn taking to judge men who are using masculine rules for floor holding. This is equally flawed; men appear impolite, intrusive, and unwilling to share conversational space with others (Wood 2001, 129). In ignoring others’ ideas they impede the development solidarity and preclude building community.

Finally, judgments by feminine and masculine rules about the meaning of overlaps that finish others’ sentences are almost humorous, except for the alarming attributions women and men make when a member of the opposite sex overlaps them finishing a sentence. Men use and view finishing others’ sentences as an act of control and status ranking. Women use and view finishing others’ sentences as an expression of understanding and agreement. He means to pull rank, but she experiences rapport and understanding. She means to demonstrate understanding and build rapport, but he experiences a put-down.

An important argument has unfolded in the scholarly literature. Lakoff (1975) first observed that women use more hedges, qualifiers and tag questions than men; she reasoned that women’s language use was powerless, reflecting women’s subordinate roles and low self esteem. Spender (1984) challenged Lakoff’s interpretation, pointing out that Lakoff was using masculine rules as the standard to judge feminine behavior, hence disavowing

women as a speech community. Wood (2001, 128) puts it well when she writes, “It is much easier to jump into a conversation that has not been sealed with absolute, firm statements.”

By understanding that women generally communicate for relational purposes, to fulfill communion functions, and that men generally communicate to gain power and status, or to expedite tasks to fulfill agency functions, we can begin to bridge the gender gap. By appreciating that different rules govern men and women’s verbal communication, we can grasp their intentions and interpret their meanings with greater accuracy and understanding. Public administrators who are in the position of understanding gender differences in verbal communication are in an influential position. They are well prepared to understand others, provide interpretations to clarify miscommunications, and flex their own styles to enhance their effectiveness with both men and women.

Gender and Conversation Style. Examining conversations in opposite-sex and same-sex encounters for gender themes has been the scholarly focus of psycholinguist Deborah Tannen (1990, 1994) for nearly two decades. Influenced by Goffman’s (1976) work on gender displays, Tannen developed a linguistic approach to understanding communication and relationships. She explains: people have different conversational styles, influenced by gender, as well as by other factors, including the part of the country they grew up in, their ethnicity, their age, and their social class (Tannen 1994, 11). Most—but not all—women and men adhere to gendered patterns, but there is nothing inherently male or female about a particular way of talking (Tannen 1994, 15). Conversational style is perhaps best understood as an implicit subscript or code that reveals a speaker’s assumptions about relationships, preferences for alignment in a social order, norms and rules about when and where people are expected to talk and/or to listen, and strategies for leading and managing others. When conversationalists are unaware of different styles, they think they are simply saying what they mean. They project their own subtext, or code onto the conversation, constructing a gendered understanding of the encounter. When misunderstandings occur, however, they tend to attribute the difficulties to others’ intentions, abilities, or character—or to their own failure to communicate well. Such misunderstandings happen in both private and public contexts. When work is the context, serious consequences may result from failures to understand gendered conversation.

Appendix 4 (Gender and Conversational Themes and Rituals) identifies many components of feminine and masculine conversational style (Tannen 1990, 1994). Public managers who are aware of these themes and rituals will be well equipped to recognize gendered subtexts in conversations, especially in mixed-sex encounters. They will have the tools to avert or clear up many misunderstandings by flexing their style, and they may be able to

explain or remedy mishaps in progress. Knowing about conversational style will provide public administrators with the opportunity to improve their own effectiveness, especially in communicating with those of the opposite sex.

Let's examine a hypothetical interaction between two public managers—a woman and a man whose conversation is sprinkled with gendered themes and rituals. She assumes they are peers, and views the conversation as a negotiation for closeness. He assumes he will be one-up or one-down on some relevant criteria in any conversation, and he views the conversation as a contest in which both will vie to have the upper hand. A translation of the interaction, using gendered subscripts appears in italics, illustrating potential points of disconnect. Our colleagues meet in the hallway one morning...

(1) She: I'm sorry to hear John resigned.

Feminine Style: "I'm sorry" is a ritualistic conversation smoother. She intends to open a "troubles talk" conversation in which the two express and lament the problems caused by John's resignation. She is one step closer.

(2) He: Why are you apologizing? It's not your fault.

Masculine Style: "I'm sorry" is an apology, an admission of wrongdoing. His co-worker's apology makes no sense: she didn't cause John to resign. Besides, apologizing puts you in a one-down position with another. It is very strange that she would do this. He corrects her, restoring balance to the interaction. The score is one to one.

(3) She: I wasn't apologizing...I mean...I feel bad for you, losing him. It has to be disappointing. I know how much you were counting on him during the legislative session.

Feminine style: "I wasn't apologizing," is a quick correction—an opportunity to clarify her intent and indicate her openness. Sure, he took her "I'm sorry" literally, and clearly expressed that she was off the hook, as far as he was concerned. He's come one step closer. She collects her thoughts in her pause, and self-discloses her feeling as sympathy (I feel bad for you). Then she expresses empathy (It has to be disappointing...I know how much you were counting on him). They are several steps closer!

Masculine Style: He is astonished. He believes she has denied that she apologized, when she clearly said she was sorry. Her denial—her disagreement with him—is a put-down. Her sympathy (I feel bad for you) is another put-down. Her empathy statements (It has to be

disappointing...I know how much you were counting on him) are further put-downs, as far as he is concerned. Tit-for-tat, he's down four.

(4) He: Oh, I'll get someone else. Someone better. Don't worry about it.

Masculine Style: He asserts his power (I'll get someone else). One point restored! "Someone better" not only status ranks his new (yet unknown) subordinate with the one who resigned, it also implies he himself will be better off than he was before. Ah, there are two more points for him. "Don't worry about it" is a dig, implying this is none of her business. Hah! The score is even again.

(5) She: Oh, I'm not worried. I was just thinking that maybe I could help you out some out by sharing Lynn with you a few hours a day 'til you get a replacement.

Feminine Style: She thinks she is clarifying her feelings (not worried), being open, getting closer.

Masculine Style: He thinks she is being argumentative—disagreeing with him again. Being "not worried" is a sign of independence. He is down two.

Feminine Style: She negotiates further for closeness with her offer to share an employee. Offering to help is a generous way to show care and concern, to build rapport, and to support another person.

Masculine Style: A helper defines a helpee as incompetent, and weak. She has put him down again. Now he's down three.

(6) He: I can handle it.

Masculine Style: He refuses to be subordinate to her. "I can handle it" is his declaration of independence. He's only down by two now.

Feminine Style: "I can handle it" is a rebuff. He has distanced. She feels isolated. Her attempts at connection have failed.

(7) She: Oh, okay.

Feminine Style: Smooth out the conversation by agreeing.

Masculine Style: She finally agrees with something! Man, this one is a piece of work...

Tannen's contribution to understanding the gendered nature of conversation through themes and rituals, added to an understanding of gendered use of verbal and nonverbal communication equips public managers with

many tools to bridge the communication gap between women and men, and to enhance effective communication in the workplace.

Conclusions

In this paper, we have raised two questions: What do public administrators know about gender and communication style, and what do they need to know? We reported data gathered in focus groups and analyzed this using gender studies and feminist theories to illustrate the depth of understanding that can be brought to public administrators' experiences. Then, we framed an answer to the second question. Our discussion began with perspectives on gender and communication; then, we explored the ways in which feminine and masculine styles differ in terms of nonverbal communication, verbal communication, and conversational style.

You will recall from our introduction, the CPM planners in Idaho posed the questions that framed this paper. Thus, you may be curious to know whether or not they incorporated information about gender and communication in the curriculum. The answer is yes, and no. A one-day course, Communication for Leaders, is offered near the end of the three-year curriculum. Indeed, it focuses on communication for leaders, but it is also laced with information about gendered communication and cross-cultural communication. It has been well received by several cohorts of public administrators. Is there a stand-alone course on gender and communication? Is there a course that addresses gender and public administration, incorporating perspectives developed by leading scholars in the field of public administration—like Camilla Stivers, Rita Kelly, Georgia Duerst-Lahti, Mary Guy or Meredith Newman? Well, no.

So, what is the reader to do with all this in terms of outreach education? We recommend the following: Start small and start local. Find someone nearby who knows about gender and communication and cultivate a relationship with him or her. Let this person know that there are scores of public administrators who need this information in the mixed-sex workplace to enhance their effectiveness in communication, especially with members of the opposite sex.

Consider these possible venues for connecting your expert with public administrators, or others, who need to know more about gender and communication style. City, county, state and federal government agencies provide routine training, as well as special conferences. Professional associations of governmental employees (i.e. Association of Government Accountants) have local, state, and national offices that provide continuing education to their members, as well as periodic conferences. Trade and professional nonprofit organizations also offer continuing

education and conference opportunities. In addition, many government and nonprofit trade and professional groups have women's sections or organizations (including Federal Women's Programs; the Section for Women in Public Administration [SWPA] in the American Society for Public Administration [ASPA]; Women in Construction; Financial Women International; and Executive Women International).

Our paper demonstrates that without an awareness and understanding of gender and communication style, misunderstandings and gender gaps will continue to perplex individuals, and potentially interfere with organizational effectiveness. The mixed-sex workplace does not threaten to go away. In fact, it appears to be here to stay. It behooves public organizations to focus on this timely and timeless aspect of diversity.

References

- Addington, D.W. 1968. "The relationship of selected vocal characteristics to personality perception." *Speech Monographs* 35:492-503.
- Adler, Ronald B. and Neil Towne. 2002. *Looking Out Looking In* (Tenth edition). New York: Harcourt Brace Publishers.
- Aries, E. 1977. "Male -female interpersonal styles in all male, all fe male, and mixed groups." In A.G. Sargent (Ed.), *Beyond Sex Roles*, 292-299. New York, NY: West.
- Aries, E. 1987. "Gender and communication." In P. Shaver and C. Hendrick (Eds.), *Sex and Gender*, 149-176. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bakan, D. 1966. *The Duality of Human Existence*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Barnlund, Dean C. 1962. "Toward a meaning-centered philosophy of communication." *Journal of Communication* 11: 197-204.
- Baxter, J.C. 1970. "Interpersonal spacing in natural settings." *Sociometry* 33:444-456.
- Beck, A.T. 1988. *Love is Never Enough*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Birdwhistell, Ray L. 1970. Masculinity and femininity as display. *Kinesics and Context*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press. 39-46.
- Birdwhistell, Ray L. 1970. *Kinesics and Context*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Bem, S.L. 1974. "The measurement of psychological androgyny." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 42:155-162.
- Bernard, J. 1968. *The Sex Game*. New York: Antheneum.
- Borisoff, Deborah and Lisa Merrill. 1998. *The Power to Communicate: Gender Differences as Barriers* (3rd ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Broverman, L.L., S.R. Vogel, D.M Broverman, F.E. Clarkson, and P.S. Rosenkrantz. 1972. "Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal." *Journal of Social Issues* 28:59-78.
- Burnier, D. 2003. "Giving voice to gender in the MPA classroom: Teaching organization theory with a gender emphasis." *Journal of Public Affairs Education* 4:275-283.
- Butler, Judith. 1990. "From gender trouble: feminism and the subversion of identity." In Wendy Kolmar and Frances Bartkowski (Eds.), *Feminist Theory: A Reader*, 465-473. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Campbell, K.K. 1973. "The rhetoric of women's liberation: An oxymoron." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*. 59:74-86.
- Carli, L.L. 1990. "Gender, language, and influence." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 56:565-576.
- Cleveland, Jeanette N., Margaret Stockdale, and Kevin R. Murphy. 2000. *Women and Men in Organizations: Sex and Gender Issues at Work*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Coser, R.L. 1960. "Laughter among colleagues." *Psychiatry*. 23:81-95.

- Crosby, F. and L. Nyquist. 1977. "The female register: An empirical study of Lakoff's hypotheses." *Language in Society*. 6:313-322.
- Deaux, K. 1976. *The Behavior of Women and Men*. Monterey, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.
- Derlega, V.J. and A.L. Chaiken. 1976. "Norms affecting self-disclosure in men and women." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 44:376-380.
- Duncan, H. 1967. "The search for a social theory of communication in American sociology." In Frank E.X. Dance (Ed.), *Human Communication Theory: Original Essays*, 236-263. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Eakins, B. and G. Eakins. 1976. "Verbal turn-taking and exchanges in faculty dialogue." In B.L. DuBois and I. Crouch (Eds.), *Papers in Southwest English: IV. Proceedings of the conference on the sociology of the languages of American women*, 53-62. San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press.
- Eakins, B.W. and R.G. Eakins. 1978. *Sex Differences in Human Communication*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Fishman, P.M. 1980. "Conversational Insecurity." In H. Giles, W.P. Robinson, and P.M. Smith (Eds.), *Language: Social Psychology Perspectives*, 127-132. New York: Pergammon Press.
- Freedman, N, J. O'Hanlon, P. Oltman, and H.A. Witkin. 1972. "The imprint of psychological differentiation on kinetic behavior in varying communicative contexts." *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 79: 239-258.
- Frieze, Irene H. and S. J. Ramsey. 1976. "Nonverbal maintenance of traditional sex roles." *Journal of Social Issues* 32: 133-141.
- Goffman, Erving. 1976. "Gender advertisements." *Studies in the Anthropology of Visual Communication* 3(2):65-164.
- Grady, K.E., L.J. Miransky, and M.A. Mulvey. 1976. "A nonverbal measure of dominance." Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.
- Grob, L.M. and M. Allen. April 1996. "Sex differences in powerful/powerless language: A meta-analytic review." Paper presented to the Central States Communication Association, Minneapolis.
- Hall, D. and K. Langellier. 1988. "Story-telling strategies in mother-daughter communication." In B. Bate and A. Taylor (Eds.), *Women Communicating: Studies of Women's Talk*, 107-126. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Haslett, B.J., F.L. Geis, and M.R. Carter. 1992. *The Organizational Woman: Power and Paradox*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Henley, Nancy M. 1973. "Status and sex: Some touching observations." *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society* 2:91-93.
- Henley, Nancy M. 1977. *Body Politics: Power, Sex, and Nonverbal Communication*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Heshka, S. and Y. Nelson. 1972. "Interpersonal speaking distance as a function of age, sex and relationship." *Sociometry* 35: 491-498.
- Hewes, G.W. 1957. "The anthropology of gesture." *Scientific American* February: 123-132.
- Holmes, J. 1984. "Hedging your bets and sitting on the fence." *Te Reo*, 27:47-62.
- Ivy, D.K. and P. Backlund. 2004. *Gender Speak: Personal Effectiveness in Gender Communication*. Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.

- Jenni, D.A. and M.A. Jenni. 1976. "Carrying behavior in humans: Analysis of sex differences." *Science* 194:859-860.
- Johnson, F. 1996. "Friendships among women: Closeness in dialogue." In J.T. Wood (Ed.), *Gendered Relationships: A Reader*, 79-94. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- Josefowitz, Natasha. 1980. *Paths to Power: A Woman's Guide from First Job to Top Executive*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Kanter, R.M. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.
- Kramerae, Cheris R. 1981. *Women and men Speaking*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- Kramer, C. 1974. "Stereotypes of woman's speech: The word from cartoons." *Journal of Popular Culture*. 8:624-630.
- Labov, W. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- LaFrance, Marianne and Clara Mayo. 1978. *Gender Gestures. Moving Bodies: Nonverbal Communication in Social Relationships*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Lakoff, Robin. 1973. "Language and woman's place." *Language in Society*. 2:45-79.
- Lakoff, Robin. 1975. *Language and Woman's Place*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Lesch, C.L. 1994. "Observing theory in practice: Sustaining consciousness in a coven." In L. Frey (Ed.), *Group Communication in Context: Studies of Natural Groups*, 57-82. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lewis, E.T. and P.R. McCarthy. 1988. "Perceptions of self-disclosure as a function of gender-linked variables." *Sex Roles*. 19:47-56.
- Mayo, Clara and Nancy M. Henley. 1981. *Gender and Nonverbal Behavior*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- McConnell-Ginet, S. 1983. "Intonation in a man's world." In B. Thorne, C Kramarae, and N.M. Henley (Eds.), *Language, Gender, and Society*, 69-88. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- McKee, J.P. and A.C. Sherriffs. 1957. "The differential evaluation of males and females." *Journal of Personality* 25: 356-371.
- Mehrabian, Albert and S. G. Diamond. 1971. "Effects of furniture arrangements, props, and personality on social interaction." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 20: 18-30.
- Mehrabian, Albert. 1972. *Nonverbal Communication*. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton.
- Mills, Janet. 1983. "Men and women speak different body language." In Roberts A. Braden and Alice D. Walker (Eds.), *Visualizing Ourselves in a Social Context*, 149-161. Bloomington, Indiana: University of Indiana.
- Mills, Janet and Meredith Newman. 2002. "What are we teaching about gender issues in public affairs courses?" *Journal of Public Affairs Education* 8(1): 25-44. Newman 2000.
- Mulac, A., J.M. Wiemann, S.J. Widenmann, and T.W. Gibson. 1988. "Male/female language differences and effects in same-sex and mixed-sex dyads: The gender-linked language effect." *Communication Monographs*. 55:315-335.
- Nierenberg, Gerald I. and Henry H. Calero. 1976. *How to Read a Person Like a Book*. New York, NY: Hawthorne.

- Newman, David M. 2000. *Sociology: Exploring the Architecture of Everyday Life* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Parsons, T. and R.F. Bales. 1955. *Family Socialization and Interaction Process*. New York: The Free press.
- Pearson, Judy Cornelia. 1985. *Gender and Communication*. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Publishers.
- Polit, D. and Marianne LaFrance. 1977. "Sex differences in reaction to spatial invasion." *Journal of Social Psychology* 102: 59-60.
- Ruesch, Jurgen and Gregory Bateson. 1968. *Communication: The Social Matrix of Psychiatry*. New York: Norton. 21-38.
- Sachs, J., P. Lieberman, and D. Erickson. 1973. "Anatomical and cultural determinants of male and female speech." In R.W. Shuy and R.W. Fasold (Eds.), *Language Attitudes*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Saurer, M.K. and R. M. Eisler. 1990. "The role of masculine gender roles' stress in expressivity and social support network factors." *Sex Roles*. 23:261-271.
- Schaeff, Ann W. 1981. *Women's Reality*. Minneapolis: Winston Press.
- Schefflen, Albert. 1972. *Body Language and the Social Order*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Scott, J. 1988. *Gender and the Politics of History*. New York: Columbia Press.
- Scott, K.P. 1980. "Perceptions in communication competence: What's good for the goose is not good for the gander." In C. Kramarae (Ed.) *The Voices and Words of Women and Men*, 199-208. Oxford, UK: Pergamon.
- Spender, D. 1984. *Man Made Language*. London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Stewart, L.P., A.D. Stewart, S.A. Friedley, and P.J. Cooper. 1990. *Communication Between the Sexes: Sex Differences, and Sex Role Stereotypes* (2nd ed.). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.
- Stivers, Camilla. 2002. *Gender Images in Public Administration: Legitimacy and the Administrative State* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stutman, R.K. 1987. "Women's behavior at learned and professional conferences." In B.L. DuBois and I Crouch (Eds.), *The Sociology of the Language of American Women*, 155-160. San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press.
- Swacker, M. 1975. "The sex of the speaker as a sociolinguistic variable." In B. Thorne and N. Henley (Eds.), *Language and Sex Difference and Dominance*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Tannen, D. 1990a. "Gender differences in conversational coherence: Physical alignment and topical cohesion." In B. Dorval (Ed.), *Conversational Organization and its Development*, Vol. XXXVIII, 167-206. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Tannen, D. 1990b. *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. New York, NY: Morrow.
- Tannen, D. 1991. *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. New York, NY: Ballantine.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1994. *Talking from 9 to 5: How Women's and Men's Conversational Styles Affect Who gets Heard, Who Gets Credit, and What Gets Done at Work*. New York, NY: W. Morrow.
- Tavris, Carol. 1992. *The Mismeasure of Woman*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

- Thorne, B., C. Kramarae, and N. Henley. 1983. "Language, gender, and society: Opening a second decade of research." In B. Thorne, C. Kramarae, and C.N. Henley (Eds.), *Language, Gender, and Society*, 7-24. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Treichler, P.A. and C. Kramarae. 1983. "Women's talk in the ivory tower." *Communication Quarterly*. 31:118-132.
- Unger, R. and M. Crawford. 1992. *Women and Gender: A Feminist Psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Watzlawick, Paul, Janet H. Beavin, and Don D. Jackson. 1967. *Some Tentative Axioms of Communication. Pragmatics of Human Communication*. New York: Norton. 48-71.
- West, C. and D.H. Zimmerman. 1983. "Small insults: A study of interruptions in cross-sex conversations between unacquainted persons." In B. Thorne, C. Kramarae, and N. Henley (Eds.), *Language, Gender, and Society*, 102-117. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Williams, S.D. and D.L. Best. 1990. *Measuring Sex Stereotypes: A Multination Study*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Willis, F.N. 1966. "Initial speaking distance as a function of the speakers' relationship." *Psychonomic Science* 5: 221-222.
- Wood, Julia T. 1993a. "Engendered relationships: Interaction, caring, power, and responsibility in close relationships." In S. Duck (Ed.), *Processes in Close Relationships: Contexts of Close Relationships*, Vol. 3, 26-54. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Wood, Julia T. 1993b. "Engendered identities: Shaping voice and mind through gender." In D. Vocate (Ed.), *Intrapersonal Communication: Different Voices, Different Minds*, 145-167. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Wood, Julia T. 2001. *Gendered Lives: Communication, Gender, and Culture* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomas Learning.
- Wood, J.T. 2004. *Communication Mosaics: An Introduction to the Field of Communication*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth Learning.
- Wood, J.T. 2002. *Gendered Lives: Communication, Gender and Culture* (5th ed.). Belmont, California: Wadsworth.
- Wood, Julia T. and C. Inman. 1993. "In a different mode: Recognizing male modes of closeness." *Journal of Applied Communication Research*. 21:279-295.
- Zimmerman, D.H. and C. West. 1975. "Sex roles interruptions and silences in conversations." In B. Thorne and N. Henley (Eds.), *Language and Sex Difference and Dominance*, 105-129. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Appendix 1: A Summary of Focus Group Responses To: “Does gender affect communication and relationships at work?”**Observations about men and their communication style:**

- “Men use a directive style of communication that women aren’t used to.”
- “Male program managers use an authoritarian style, mostly. They are quite directive. They are not patient about process.”
- “When men report to men, the working relationship seems to be kept on professional terms; they don’t develop personal relationships.” “A male supervisor who reports to me has issues with the women he supervises in his unit. He has a direct style, but the women need emotional, relational communication as well, and he doesn’t provide this. He says, ‘We’re all adults here.’”
- “Males treat their superiors differently than they do their peers or subordinates. They respect their superiors for the power they have. They listen to them, take orders from them better “Men tend to defer decisions to their superiors—or make decisions themselves—without regard for the people around them. Women, at all levels, enter into consensus building discussion when there is a decision to be made.”
- “Men who report to me look to me as their boss; women who report to me look to me more as a friend.”
- “The director goes to the men to talk shop; he treats me on a more personal basis. For example, he compliments me.”
- “Men interrupt women, badly and consistently.”
- “One of the four males who reports to me suspects I have a hidden agenda. Turf issues are important to him and any ‘team’ efforts seem to threaten him.”

Observations about women and their communication style:

- “Women relating to other women are more nurturing than men relating to other men.”
- “There is an assumption that women behave ‘emotionally.’ This reinforces stereotypes and leads people to expect men and women to behave differently.”
- “I pay more personal attention to the women who report to me than I do to the men who report to me. I give women frequent attention and care as they seem to want that. The men just want to know if they are doing a good job; they don’t care if I care about them personally or not.”
- “Women supervisors seem to look at subordinates’ competence. If subordinates are competent, women supervisors provide less direction and more support. Men supervisors provide direction and do not provide support, regardless of how competent subordinates are.”
- “In meetings, when a woman suggests an idea, everyone ignores her. Later, when a man suggests the same idea, great interest is shown and ‘his’ idea is taken seriously.”
- “In meetings women learn to keep their mouths shut. They feel beat up for expressing ideas. They have to have a defense ready and answer all sorts of questions. It’s fatiguing. Men suggest an idea and it just gets accepted.”
- “In my mostly male division, I must communicate in male overtones. To communicate in female mode is to lose them.”
- “The role models have been mostly men, so we have adopted their attributes.”
- “I’ve learned to make myself talk in meetings. I was told I was too gentle and too soft-spoken.”
- “The perception is that when a woman finally gets to a high position, she will only hire women. This is simply not the case.”

A “token” administrator:

- “I am a ‘token’ administrator: I have no female peers. In the last year, a woman was appointed as a deputy. Having her present has allowed me to get in touch with my feminine side.”
- “The men treat me as a secretary, even though I am an administrator.”
- “My former peers are now my subordinates and they expect more of me than they expected of the previous director. They are suspicious about how I got this position. They ask questions of me they would never ask a man, such as: ‘Did you get this on your own?’; ‘Do you have to be so tough because you’re a woman?’; ‘How much freedom will we have?’; ‘What can you do for us?’ and, ‘Who’s really in charge?’”
- “Trust is one issue they have: Can they trust a woman? Power is their other issue.”

Sex segregation and double standards:

- “In meetings I notice a segregation of sexes: men sit together and women sit together.”
- “When I was promoted, no one mentioned it. I was in the new job awhile before my subordinates found out. If I’d been a man, there would have been a big ceremony to announce this.”
- “Men can dress casually on Fridays and no comments are made; women can’t dress casually without receiving comments on their appearance.”

**Appendix 1: A Summary of Focus Group Responses To: “Does gender affect communication and relationships at work?”
(Continued)****Divergent Opinions****Point:**

- “In my agency we have had a great deal of training aimed at self-directed work teams. The males seem to enjoy the same involvement as the females. The training has helped us learn new tools for better communication and relationships. We negotiate and collaborate with gender not being a factor.”

Counter-point:

- “In my agency, we’ve had training on teams, but it’s just lip-service. ‘Do this’ is the M.O. We have a clear hierarchy and a military-organization way of thinking.”

Point:

- “Some government agencies are populated with male managers who have military service in their backgrounds and this seems to affect how they manage. They are insistent on rigid structures, are protocol-intensive and micro-manage their employees.”

Counterpoint:

- Females with military service in their backgrounds manage similarly. This is not a gender issue.”
- “My experience is that women with military experience outdo their men counterparts in the command-and-control management style.”
- “Not all former military people manage like this. There are exceptions.”

Appendix 2: Gender and Nonverbal Communication

POSTURE	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Overall Posture Goffman 1976 Henley 1977 Mehrabian 1972 Wood 2001 Cleveland et al. 2000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tense, at attention, formal, tight • Imbalance in body cant • Constrict in space with arms and legs close to body to appear smaller 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relaxed, at ease, informal, loose • Balanced with strong gravitational balance; stand tall • Expand in space; extend arms and legs away from body to appear larger
Pelvic tilt Birdwhistell 1960	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roll pelvis forward • Tuck under buttocks • Flatten abdomen 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roll pelvis backward • Protrude buttocks • Let abdomen hang loose
Gait Birdwhistell 1960	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Body moves as a whole 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sway hips
Who walks ahead? Grady et al. 1976	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tend to walk slightly behind males 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tend to walk slightly ahead of females
Height compensation Goffman 1976	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shrink and shuffle • Drop shoulders • Cant at knees • Compact spine • Head cant, bow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand and walk tall • Square shoulders • Stand straight • Stretch spine • Hold head erect
BODY ORIENTATION	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Body orientation Henley 1977 Goffman 1976 Tannen 1994	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Angle away from males who are not intimates • Pairs directly face each other • Pairs stand closer than male pairs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directly orient toward females • Pairs orient side by side • Pairs stand farther away from each other than female pairs
When passing in front of or behind others Henley 1977	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close limbs • Pass males with back to other 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep limbs open • Pass males with back, front to females
INTERPERSONAL SPACE AND DISTANCE	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Personal space Baxter 1970 Goffman 1976 Frieze and Ramsey 1976 Cleveland et al. 2000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smaller bubble of space surrounds most females • Control less territory than males • Space is violated more than males' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larger bubble of space surrounds most males • Control more territory than females • Space is respected more than females'
Interpersonal distance during conversation Heshka and Nelson 1972 Mehrabian and Diamond 1971 Willis 1966 Henley 1976	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stand closer to same sex friends and farther away from same sex strangers • Stand closest to males or at intermediate distance • Female pairs stand and sit closer than male pairs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpersonal distance is constant with same-sex friends and strangers • Stand closest to females or at intermediate distance • Male pairs stand and sit farther than female pairs
Reactions to crowding Freedman, et al. 1972	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More cooperative • Less aggressive • May expect situation to be social 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less cooperative • More aggressive • May expect situation to be competitive
Spatial invasions Polit and LaFrance 1977	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hold the fort
Moving out of the way when passing another Silveira 1972 Collett and Marsh 1974 LaFrance and Mayo 1978	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move aside when approaching males • Move out of way of other females at same rate males move out of way of other males 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less likely to move aside when approaching females • Move out of way of other males at same rate females move out of way of other females

Appendix 2: Gender and Nonverbal Communication (Continued)

FEET AND LEGS	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Intra-femoral angle when sitting Birdwhistell 1960 Goffman 1976	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intra-femoral angle of zero degrees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intra-femoral angle of 5-15 degrees
Leg crossing patterns Birdwhistell 1960 Goffman 1976	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cross at ankles: thighs tense, together Cross at knees: lower legs parallel and close together, toes pointed downward, feet tucked under chair 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cross at ankles: thighs relaxed and spread "Broken four": ankle to knee
Standing postures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ballet position 3 or 4, with weight on one hip "Bashful knee bend": one knee bent toward the other, toe near instep of other foot 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feet spread shoulder width apart; weight balanced on both feet; knees flexed Self defense position: one foot slightly forward, weight of body pressed down through flexed knees
Shifting weight when standing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pivot with feet, legs, hips, shoulders and head 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shift weight side to side when in rapport with other males Rock toe to heel in hierarchical bidding with other males
Floor Sitting Hewes 1957	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legs folded, angled to one side, or Legs straight ahead, crossed at knees or ankles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use more positions than females, including tailor position, legs angled from the torso, knees up with feet on floor

ARM & HAND POSITIONS	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Birdwhistell 1960 Goffman 1976 Henley 1977		
Upper arms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hold close to body 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hold 5-20 degrees from body
Arms spread Schefflen 1972	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seductiveness: one arm raised to stroke hair or back of neck 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Power spread: arms spread wide with hands behind head at nape of neck
Wrists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flex, bend, limp 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Held stiff
Gestures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small, demure, inhibited 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large, forceful, aggressive
Shoulders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lowered, especially in the presence of males 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Squared, especially in the presence of other males
Hands Birdwhistell 1960 Goffman 1976 Henley 1977	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Palms up Lace fingertips lightly or grasp one finger at front or back Expressive, exploratory touch of objects Use fingers to outline, cradle, caress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Palms down or closed Grasp whole hand at front (fig leaf) or back (parade rest) Utilitarian, instrumental touch and use of objects
Hands on hips	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spread fingers, bent wrists 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mitten hands; stiff wrists
Hands in pockets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jacket spread open arms in front of jacket 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jacket closed; arms under sides of jacket
Carrying books Jenni and Jenni 1976	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compact: Wrap one or both arms around books and rest short edge of book against stomach or chest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expansive: Use one arm and hand at the side of the body with long edges of box nearly horizontal

Appendix 2: Gender and Nonverbal Communication (Continued)

HEAD POSITIONS Goffman 1976 Henley 1977	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Cant (tilt)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frequently To greater degree than masculine For longer time than masculine 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rarely
Bow (chin down, head lowered)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frequently 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rarely
Elevate head on vertical axis (head up)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rarely 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frequently
Nod head	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frequently 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rarely

FACIAL DISPLAY	Feminine style	Masculine Style
Smiling Henley 1977 Mackey 1978 Ragan 1982 Van Hooff 1972 Wood 2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Smile more when alone Greater frequency, intensity and duration of smiling with others Smiles elicit smiles and may create and maintain cohesion and solidarity Smiles may also be interpreted as appeasement gestures, a sign of non-threat 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Smile little when alone Less frequency, intensity and duration of smiling with others
Emotional displays Goffman 1976 Henley 1977 LaFrance and Mayo 1978	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater frequency, intensity and duration of emotional expression Intensify positive emotions Anger not appropriate to experience or express 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less frequent, less intense and shorter duration of emotional expression De-intensity, neutralize, mask Fear and sadness not appropriate to experience or express
Eyes Goffman 1976 Henley 1977 Wood 2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hold wide open, with brows arched 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relax muscles around eyes; relax brow
Looking behaviors Henley 1977 Argyle and Cook 1976 Wood 2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attentive, watchful of environment Maintain high eye contact with others Rarely stare Frequent gaze aversion Lower eyes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less attentive, watchful: look away from others a great deal May look directly at female Direct looking at male signals threat Keep eyes open
Changing direction of gaze Birdwhistell 1960	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close eyelids while shifting gaze 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep eyes open while shifting gaze

TOUCHING	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Initiator/receiver LaFrance and Mayo 1978 Henley 1973 Cleveland et al. 2001 Wood 2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most often, receiver of touch Less likely to reciprocate male's touch of hand Expected to accept touch as normal Expected to express support, affection and comfort through touch 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most often, initiator of touch Men touch women almost twice as much as women touch men More likely to reciprocate female's touch of hand Expected to touch to express power

DRESS AND APPEARANCE	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Marked and unmarked status Tannen 1994	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All choices in appearance mark women and call attention to her 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Men can choose a style in appearance that won't attract attention or subject him to any particular interpretation

Appendix 2: Gender and Nonverbal Communication (Continued)

EXPRESSING AND INTERPRETING EMOTION	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Expressing emotional displays LaFrance and Mayo 1978	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater capacity to produce facial expressions viewers can interpret correctly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less able to produce facial expressions viewers can interpret correctly
Nonverbal sensitivity: Interpreting nonverbal behavior Rosenthal, et al. 1977	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decode better; show greater sensitivity to nonverbal behavior Same sex judgments more accurate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decode less accurately, less sensitivity to nonverbal behavior Same sex judgments more accurate
Responding to others: Gender-linked reactivity Weitz 1976	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjust nonverbal behavior to males who are dominant to become nonverbally submissive Adjust to nonverbal behavior of males who express affiliation to become more dominant No such adjustments found in research with female pairs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No adaptive adjustments in opposite-sex encounters No adaptive adjustments in same-sex encounters

VOICE	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Addington 1968		
Pitch LaFrance and Mayo 1978 Cleveland et al. 2000 Kramer 1974 Sachs et al. 1973 Scott 1980	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tend to use higher pitch range Spread lips (as in smiling) and shorten vocal tract, producing higher pitched sound 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tend to use lower pitch range Don't spread lips and so use full length of vocal tract, producing lower pitched sounds
Intonation patterns Labov 1972 McConnel-Ginet 1983 Sachs et al. 1973 Brend 1975 Lakoff 1973	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dynamic intonation in use of wider pitch range Frequent change of rate Correct forms of intonation Polite, cheerful High/low down glide of surprise Hesitation patterns Polite, cheerful patterns Declarative statements with rising inflection (question) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Narrower pitch range; monotone Infrequent change or rate
Breathiness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceived as feminine, pretty, petite, shallower 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceived as younger or more artistic
Thinness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceived as less mature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No findings
Flatness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceived as less feminine, colder, withdrawn 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceived as more masculine, colder, withdrawn
Nasality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socially undesirable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socially undesirable
Tenseness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceived as younger, more emotional, feminine, high strung and less intelligent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceived as older and more unyielding, cantankerous
Throatiness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceived negatively 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceived as older, mature, sophisticated
Increased rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceived as more animated and extroverted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceived as more animated and extroverted
Wide pitch range	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceived as dynamic and extroverted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceived as dynamic, feminine and aesthetically inclined

Appendix 3: Gender and Verbal Communication

USE OF TITLES Tannen 1994 Cleveland et al. 2000	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Titles “mark” women, but not men	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Miss, Mrs. mark marital status and conservative taste 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr. is unmarked and says nothing about taste
Sex-only titles still mark women but not men	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ms. declines marital information but marks liberated attitude 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr. is unmarked and says nothing about attitude
Changing names with marriage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Taking husband’s name marks women with traditional values (or less than self) Hyphenated names mark women as retaining part of single identity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most men are unmarked at marriage Hyphenated names at marriage mark men with liberated values (or less than self)
TERMS OF ADDRESS Tannen 1994	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Non-reciprocal terms of address	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subordinates address dominants with formality and titles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Superiors address subordinates with informality, first names and nicknames
Reciprocal terms of address	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Address others as they address you 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Address others as they address you
FLOOR HOLDING AND CONVERSATION CONTROL Beck 1988 Carli 1990 Cleveland, et al. 2000 Eakins and Eakins 1978 Mulac, et al. 1988 Stewart, et al. 1990 Swacker 1975 West and Zimmerman 1983 Thorne and Henley 1975 Zimmerman and West 1975 Tannen 1994 Aries 1987 Kramarae 1981	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Interrupt others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seldom 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Often Control conversation
Response to interruptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stop talking Respond or show interest to the one who interrupts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow superiors to interrupt Keep talking when peers or subordinates interrupt
Over-speech and overlaps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seldom 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Often
Filled pauses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seldom 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Often
Inattentiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seldom 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Often
Length of talking per turn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shorter time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Longer time
Number of turns talking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fewer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater
Repeat points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seldom 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Often

Appendix 3: Gender and Verbal Communication (Continued)

CONVERSATION CONTENT	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Topics of conversation Aries 1987 Johnson 1996 Schaefer 1981 Tannen 1990b Treichler and Kramarae 1983 Wood 2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Person centered: • Interpersonal relations • Feelings and Emotions • Opinions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fact centered: cars, sports, and work • Removed from concrete experiences and personal feelings • Abstract • Ideas/plans
Self Disclosure Campbell 1973 Cleveland, et al. 2000 Derlega and Chaiken 1976 Hall and Langelier 1988 Lewis and McCarthy 1988 Saurer and Eisler 1990 Tannen 1990b Wood 2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High disclosure • Volunteer personal information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low disclosure • Withhold personal information
STYLE OF DISCOURSE	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Beck 1988 Eakins and Eakins 1978 Stewart, et al. 1990 Tannen 1990a Tannen 1990b Wood 1993a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpretive • Metaphorical • Emotional • Detailed • Inclusivity/Responsiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descriptive • Empirical • Logical • Terse • Forceful • Authoritative
PURPOSE OF DISCOURSE	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Borisoff and Merrill 1998 Thorne, et al. 1983 Wood 1993a Wood 1993b Wood 2001 Wood and Inman 1993	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commune • Build rapport • Approach or share intimacy • Affiliate • Sustain relationships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Command • Report information • Maintain independence • Establish hierarchy • Solve problems
EXPRESSIVE LANGUAGE	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Borisoff and Merrill 1998 Crosby and Nyquist 1977 Lakoff 1973		
Explicative Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soft and weak (oh, dear) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong and hard (oh, shit)
Adjective Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trivial (precious, darling) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crude, harsh (bloody, damn well)
Qualifiers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diminutive (hardly, possibly) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absolute (never, always, definitely)
Intensifiers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher use (so, such) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower use
Use of Questions to Express Opinions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low
JOKES, HUMOR	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Cleveland, et al. 2000 Coser 1960 Eakins and Eakins 1978 Murphy and Zorn 1996	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower use • Receive or respond • Inappropriate for subordinates to superiors • Responsible for laughing • No teasing upwards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher use • Initiate • Appropriate for higher ups to tell jokes • Expected not to laugh • Teasing downward permitted

Appendix 3: Gender and Verbal Communication (Continued)

POLITENESS	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Beck 1988 Carli 1990 Fishman 1980 Holmes 1984 Lakoff 1975 Lesch 1994 Wood 2001 Eakins and Eakins 1978 Grob and Allen 1996 Stutman 1987 Wood 2001		
Tag Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High • Indicate openness and inclusiveness • Function to maintain conversation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low • Indicate authority and exclusiveness • Request information
Disclaimers, Hedges, Hesitations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low
Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask more 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask fewer

SAME SEX GROUP INTERACTION	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Dominance Hierarchy Cleveland, et al. 2000 Wood 2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain flexible rank • Interactive • Share interaction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish dominance hierarchy • Leadership • Compete
Topics Aries 1977 Cleveland, et al. 2000 Hall and Langelier 1988	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperate to pursue a single topic • Discuss topics of intimacy, interpersonal relationships and socio-emotional issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pursue a range of general topics • Competition and status • Non-intimate, non-personal

Appendix 4: Gender and Conversational Themes and Rituals

COMMUNICATION AND RELATIONSHIPS Tannen 1990, 1994	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
What are relationships for?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intimacy: assume we are close and the same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independence: assume we are separate and different
The goal of communication is to...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seek and give confirmation and support Create community; connect to others Negotiate for closeness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seek dominance; avoid subordination Manage contests; negotiate to have the upper hand Maintain independence
Assumptions about social order	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are essentially peers or equals We avoid superiority, being one-up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are either one-up or one-down on some relevant criteria We avoid inferiority, being one-down
Fear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Isolation or loss of community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engulfment or loss of independence

ALIGNMENT WITH OTHERS Tannen 1990, 1994	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Symmetry and asymmetry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Symmetry</i>: look for and express similarities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Asymmetry</i>: look for and express differences
The value of alignment with others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connection: being embedded comfortably in a network 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Separation: being free and independent of each other

RITUALS OF ALIGNMENT Tannen 1990, 1994	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
"I'm sorry"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A conversation smoother A way to restore balance to a conversation An expression of understanding and care 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An apology or admission of wrongdoing that puts you one-down Accepting an apology from another puts you one-up
Apology: A two-step ritual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One person acknowledges responsibility for something that went wrong and expects the other will reciprocate and share blame in a mutual face-saving ritual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One person admits a fault or wrongdoing (and takes a one-down position); the other person accepts the apology (enjoying the one-up position)
Blame: Assume or assign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assume blame ("I should have...") 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assign blame ("What happened was...")
Thanks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A ritual conversation closer to signal leave-taking or dismissal A ritual invitation to trigger reciprocal thanks Another's failure to reciprocate is hurtful 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An appreciation to which you answer, "You're welcome" and enjoy being one-up
Sympathy is	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The connection of one person who cares to another person 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A reminder of one's weakness by someone stronger or better off
Asking for information or help	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gets you lots of information Does not involve status 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asking reveals what you don't know and puts you one-down Others may not know and will make up answers
Saying, "I don't know, but I'll get back to you" is...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Honest and professional 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weak and incompetent
Responding when asked or told what to do	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Just do it Asking is more polite than telling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resist being told what to do Asking is manipulative if you have the power to tell
Offering to help	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A generous move to show care and concern, build rapport, support another 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implies that the recipient is incompetent and one-down
Responses to being deferred to or protected (i.e. wave car on, hold door)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enjoy the polite gesture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resent the gesture since it puts you one-down and restricts independence

Appendix 4: Gender and Conversational Themes and Rituals (Continued)

RITUALS OF ALIGNMENT (cont.) Tannen 1990, 1994	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Name dropping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows you are connected to or close to someone 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows your status and advertise one's self-importance
Trouble talk is about	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expressing feelings to another who listens and understand 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding the implicit request for advice or solutions
Response to previous speaker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conjunctive—relate comments to those the previous speaker made 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disjunctive—change the subject

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE CONTEXTS FOR CONVERSATION Tannen 1990, 1994	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Rapport talk and report talk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Rapport talk</i>: In private, women establish connections and negotiate relationships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Report talk</i>: In public, men preserve their independence and negotiate their place in the hierarchy
What suffices as evidence in public talk?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use personal examples and stories as valid evidence to inform and persuade others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use objective experience and information as valid evidence One's own experience is not valid evidence
Backstage and onstage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Backstage is when no men are around and women can talk freely Onstage is when men are present and women monitor what they say 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Backstage only happens in private places Men are onstage in any public setting and vie for the upper-hand
Laments, trouble talk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bond in pain Connect in pain, loss and trouble 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Men do not generally discuss problems with anyone—especially other men—well, maybe with women
Contact with friends	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stay in frequent touch Communicate about insignificant details of daily life 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assume friends will be there whenever needed Communicate regularly at public places about local or world problems

BIG TALK AND SMALL TALK Tannen 1990, 1994	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Small talk: Smooths relationships and prepares people for big talk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small talk focuses on personal lives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small talk is mainly banter about sports and politics
Big talk: Addresses tasks and gets things done	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Big talk is about tasks needing to be done 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Big talk is about business issues and office politics
Giving praise and attention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expect attention and praise for work; enjoy these as social rewards Give more praise and attention Without feedback, "Where do I stand?" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interpret too much attention as micro-management or power play or being checked-up on Give less praise and attention Without feedback, my work must be okay
Compliments as conventional praise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compliment more Compliments are a two-way ritual—one compliment elicits another back A prompt for a compliment (i.e. "How did I do?") is not an invitation to criticism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compliment less Compliments are a two-way ritual—one compliments and the other says, "Thank you" "How did I do?" is a request for criticism
Humor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Self-mockery is a high form of humor and play Off color jokes are for same sex groups only, or are not appropriate The ability of some women to "play" with the men can set them apart from other women 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teasing, mock attacks, insults and put-downs are forms of humor and high play Off color jokes are a common source of humor

Appendix 4: Gender and Conversational Themes and Rituals (Continued)

LECTURING AND LISTENING Tannen 1990, 1994	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Obligation during conversation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Listen: give the gift of audience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lecture: give the gift of information
Disclosure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expect mutual disclosure and sharing of topics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expect to change the subject to what we know
Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have I been helpful? Do you like me? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have I won? Do you respect me?
Overlaps and interruptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overlaps express agreement, support or anticipation of how sentences will end 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overlaps are an attempt to get the floor and shift conversational topics

MANAGING AND LEADING AT WORK Tannen 1990, 1994	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
Getting things done	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Giving orders is “bossy” so give suggestions instead to prevent being resented or disliked Work quietly behind the scenes Be humble: avoid the spotlight, be like the others and fit in State opinions mildly and see who supports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Giving orders and pushing others around is a way to gain and maintain high status Get maximum visibility Put yourself forward: get in the spotlight, stand out from the crowd State opinions forcefully and see who challenges
Using indirectness to get things done <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both women and men are indirect, just in different ways Indirectness does not reflect insecurity Indirectness is not manipulative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request, state a need, hint, give another the opportunity to volunteer, presume, or explain the situation and what must be done Hesitations, pauses, tag questions, laughter and approving words also communicate indirectness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Military subordinates must “read” indirectness in those of high rank and take the implied action (i.e. “It’s hot in here” means “Do something about it now”) The burden of interpretation is with the subordinate
Communicating about successes and strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be modest; self-efface Do not call attention to self Depend on others to blow your horn 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boast and brag Call attention to Toot your own horn
Decision-making and “What do you think?”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consult with others for their best thoughts, advice and information before making the best decision Decide by consensus Discuss things and check with others to make plans Do not assume silence is agreement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If you have to ask what others think, you are one-down or incompetent Make the decision yourself and announce it to others Assume people will speak up if they dissent.
Giving criticism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deliver softly; spare others’ feelings Include praise before and after criticism Play down your authority when offering criticism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deliver straight and direct; feelings have no place in business Assume other can take it Just say what is wrong or needs to be changed Use authority and one-up position when criticizing
Negotiating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work from outside-in: Ask what other wants to invite two-way exchange about big picture Work toward specifics Respect other’s feelings Bluffs and threats from others are taken literally; if personal, conceding to other is respectful 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work from inside-out: Tell what you want, and if other has different ideas, then negotiate Work from specifics Respect for feelings is not salient Bluffs and threats are negotiation moves; the other will also bluff and threaten in a balancing move—or call your bluff

Appendix 4: Gender and Conversational Themes and Rituals (Continued)

MEETINGS: A SPECIAL CASE OF PUBLIC TALK Note: No one's conversation style is fixed: Everyone's style varies with regard to context and make-up of the group Tannen 1994	Feminine Style	Masculine Style
An all too familiar pattern...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make suggestion which is ignored—perhaps due to succinctness, low volume and disclaimers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-introduce a suggestion the group has ignored and get the credit for it—expanding on it, loudly and in absolute terms
Turn taking expectations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expect conversational balance: to take a portion of time in meetings equal to others • Expect to take turns; wait for turn and invite or prompt others to speak 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expect to dominate conversation: do as much of the talking as possible • Expect others will speak up if they have something to say
To explore or improve ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a climate of mutual support for creativity and spontaneity • Focus on what is good or useful about ideas before criticizing them • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a ritual fight; debate, argue, object and challenge to find what is true or best, or to improve ideas • Express ideas in absolute terms and expect others to counter these vigorously
Who you are makes a difference	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Talk more with higher position than others in the meeting • Tend to pay attention to a woman whose contributions are equal to man 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Talk more with higher position than others in the meeting • Tend to pay attention to a man whose contributions are equal to woman
Structured and unstructured formats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structured format (i.e. round robin): Women participate as much as men • Unstructured format (i.e. self-structured): Women contribute less than men 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structured format (i.e. round robin): Men participate as much as women • Unstructured format (i.e. self-structured): Men contribute more than women
Structured and free-for-all periods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During structured parts, women talk less than men • During free-for-all parts, women interact as much as men 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During structured parts, men talk more than women • During free-for-all parts, men interact as much as women