1999

Powerless Speech: the Effects of Gender, Gendered Intensifiers, and Attitudes Toward Women on Speaker Credibility.

Frances E. Brandau-brown
Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses

Recommended Citation

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Historical Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.
INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
POWERLESS SPEECH:
THE EFFECTS OF GENDER, GENDERED INTENSIFIERS,
AND ATTITUDES TOWARD WOMEN ON SPEAKER CREDIBILITY

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of Speech Communication

by

Frances Brandau-Brown
B.A., University of Southern Mississippi, 1991
M.A., University of Southern Mississippi, 1994
August, 1999
Acknowledgments

Sincere gratitude is extended to Dr. Renee Edwards for her tremendous effort and expertise in writing this dissertation. This project would not have been possible without her encouragement and motivation. I am proud to call her a mentor and a friend.

A special thank you to Dr. J.D. Ragsdale for his help in this research. He has always been willing to answer questions and offer support. He has provided invaluable insight into the field of communication.

I would also like to thank Dr. James Honeycutt for his help in preparing me to be a researcher. He has been an important part of my education. I am a better researcher because of his guidance.

Thanks to Dr. Susan Siltanen and Dr. Lawrence Hosman, they have been my mentors since I was a freshman. Both are excellent teachers, demanding the highest quality research. Without their assistance in obtaining scholarships I would not have been able to realize my educational goals.

I would also like to thank family and friends for all their support and encouragement. A special thank you to my husband, Darrell, who has always been supportive of my efforts to finish my degree even when it meant making personal sacrifices.
Table of Contents

Acknowledgments........................................... ii
List of Tables............................................ iv
Abstract................................................... v

Chapter 1:
Introduction............................................... 1
Literature Review.......................................... 2
  Speech Styles and Gender.................................. 2
  The Emergence of Specific Powerless Variables........ 7
  Gender and Speech Style................................... 9
  Speech Style Evaluation and Speech Style Production. 14
  Expectancy Violations and Communication.............. 25
  Attitudes Toward Women.................................. 37
Rationale & Hypotheses.................................. 43

Chapter 2:
Methodology............................................... 49
Subjects.................................................. 49
Independent Variables.................................... 50
Message................................................... 51
Dependent Variables...................................... 52
Procedure and Design..................................... 53
Pilot Study and Results.................................. 54

Chapter 3:
Results..................................................... 55
Tests of Assumptions...................................... 55
MANCOVA Results......................................... 58
Univariate Analyses Results............................... 59
Summary of Hypotheses and Research Questions........ 66

Chapter 4:
Discussion of Findings................................... 71
Recommendation for Future Research...................... 80
Limitations of the Study.................................. 81

Bibliography............................................... 83

Appendix: Research Questionaire.......................... 88

Vita........................................................ 96
List of Tables

A. Variable Table.............................................. 53
B. Report of Homogeneity of Slopes......................... 56
C. Correlation Matrix........................................... 57
D. Multivariate Tests.......................................... 58
E. Univariate Tests............................................. 60
F. Means for Sex of Speaker................................. 61
G. Means for Type of Speech Style......................... 62
H. Means for Sex of Speaker by Type of Speech Style....64
I. Means for AWS by Sex of Speaker by Type of Speech Style...................................................... 69
Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine powerful and powerless speech styles in relation to sex of speaker, sex of respondent, and attitudes toward women. Based on research by Bradac, Mulac, and Thompson (1995) it was proposed that the powerless speech style variable, intensifiers, could be divided into separate masculine and feminine domains.

The Attitude Toward Women scale was used to classify respondents as either liberal or traditional. From this classification predictions were made using Expectancy Violation Theory to formulate a priori hypotheses about respondent perceptions of speaker competence, trustworthiness, and masculinity.

Multivariate, univariate and post-hoc tests revealed that speaker sex and respondent sex did not significantly impact respondent ratings of speaker competence, trustworthiness, and masculinity. Additionally, masculine and feminine intensifiers did not produce significantly different ratings on the dependent variables. However, the powerful speech style resulted in higher ratings of speaker competence and trustworthiness. The proposed interaction between sex of speaker and type of intensifiers after controlling for attitudes toward women was not supported.
Chapter 1

Introduction

In 1975 Robin Lakoff claimed that there were two types of speech style, powerful and powerless; additionally, she claimed the selection and use of speech style was gender dependent. Ever since these claims were advanced the link between gender and speech style has been studied. Researchers have challenged her assertions that language can be divided into a feminine and masculine register. Over the years researchers have refined her original list of fifteen feminine or powerless variables to three or four main variables of importance (Bradac, Hemphill, & Tardy, 1983; Erickson, Lind, Johnson, & O'Barr, 1987; Hosman, 1987; Hosman & Wright, 1987). In the evolution of the research, variables that have been found to be significant are hedges (e.g., “sort of”), hesitations (e.g., pauses), intensifiers (e.g., “really”), and tag questions (e.g., “It's hot in here, isn't it?”). Some of the current research claims that the selection of a speech style is not influenced by gender but by power and/or status. However, the research on a gender-linked effect has produced inconsistent findings for the effects of hedges, hesitations, intensifiers and tag questions.

The purpose of this research is to explore gender-linked usage of intensifiers and their relationship to speaker competence and trustworthiness. Additionally,
expectancy violation theory will be examined in an attempt to find an explanation for inconsistent findings for the relationship between speech style and gender. This theory (Burgoon, 1993) posits that observers’ reactions to behaviors are influenced by their expectantations held for the actors who perform the behaviors. Perhaps perceiver expectancies were violated in past research by not considering the expectation that men and women use specific intensifiers differently. Clarifying this relationship may allow more accurate conclusions to be drawn about speech style, gender, and the impact on respondent perceptions of competence and trustworthiness.

**Literature Review**

**Speech Styles and Gender**

Contemporary interest in speech styles developed after Lakoff's (1975) controversial claims about the differences between men's and women's speech styles. She claimed that men and women used different "dialects" to communicate. Women were said to use the feminine register or powerless style, which consisted of approximately fifteen different variables, such as explicit color terms, lack of profanity, hyper-polite and grammatical language, hedges, intensifiers, and tag questions. Lakoff claimed that these variables clearly mark feminine speech and render it virtually powerless. Additionally, Lakoff claimed that there are three rules that guide women's language. First
is the rule of formality. She asserted that formality is probably the most prominent rule because it creates distance between the speaker and the message recipient. The second rule is deference. She claimed that hedges are a form of deference because they allow the message recipient to decide the seriousness of the statement. The third rule is camaraderie. This rule is designed to express friendliness and demonstrate an interest in the other person.

Conversely, she claimed that men use the powerful style, which does not follow these language rules, and is void of any variables found in the feminine register. Her essay created years of research attempting to determine if there were different styles, what differentiated one style from the other, the impact of a particular style, and if style was actually determined by speaker gender.

In the late seventies, Erickson, Lind, Johnson, and O'Barr (1978) tested Lakoff's claims. They noted that a speaker's style can be influenced by his or her gender and ethnic background. They also believed that situational variables could influence the selection of a particular style. Erickson et al. asserted that speech style appeared to be affected by the situation and the context of the communication. For example, people adapt their speech style through the use of different variables in a social setting as opposed to a job interview. Their experiment
was designed to study speech styles by examining the effects of style variation on perceptions of speaker attractiveness and credibility and on acceptance of the communication.

Erickson et al. examined 150 hours of courtroom conversation and found that several linguistic features appeared to vary with social status rather than gender. Individuals with low social status and power, such as inexpert witnesses, used intensifiers, hedges, formal grammar, hesitations, gestures, tag questions, and polite forms more often than high status individuals. Erickson, et al. labeled this the powerless style. High status individuals, such as attorneys, judges and expert witnesses, used a more straightforward speech style, the powerful style. Their analysis suggested that a particular speech style can be better associated with social status than with gender as Lakoff (1975) asserted.

In another study, Erickson, Lind, and O'Barr attempted to determine if one's speech style affects an observer's impression formation. The authors stated that a powerful style could cause the observer to have more favorable reactions to the speaker and increase speaker attractiveness. In contrast, they noted that a powerless style could damage speaker attractiveness by requiring more cognitive effort to process the message. These speech styles could also influence a speaker's credibility. A
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powerful style appears more assertive and confident, while a powerless style appears uncertain. "Since acceptance of a communication is affected by both the attractiveness and the credibility of the communicator, speech style should also affect subjects' beliefs about the issues addressed in the communication" (Erickson et al., p. 268).

The results demonstrated that the "powerful-powerless speech style manipulation affected not only subjects' perceptions of the speaker's credibility and attractiveness but also their acceptance of the information contained in the speaker's testimony" (p. 276). Erickson et al. stated that the effect of speech style on speaker credibility could be explained by "attributions concerning the speaker's own beliefs about the information in the testimony" (p. 276). If the respondent attributed the use of a powerless style to a lack of confidence in the testimony, the speaker's credibility would be weakened. On the other hand, if the respondent attributed the powerful style to confidence in the testimony, the speaker's credibility should be enhanced. The possible explanations given were that the powerful speech style created the perception of a high status and confident individual thus being rated higher on likeability. A competing explanation was that the powerless speech style was more cognitively costly to process. The authors found no significant support for either possible explanation of the impact of
speech style on speaker attractiveness. The results also demonstrated that the respondents did not associate one style or the other with masculine or feminine traits. The style was more likely to be attributed to the person rather than to gender.

These two programs of research offer different explanations for the selection of either the powerful or powerless speech style. Today, the debate over whether speech style is gender-linked or linked to power and status is still active. The works by Lakoff and Erickson et al. serve as a cornerstone for research dealing with powerless and powerful speech styles.

Although a great deal of research has examined powerful and powerless speech since Lakoff and Erickson et al., questions still remain about how individuals select a speech style and how style influences listener evaluations. Is speech style selection based on gender or on status/power? The following review will examine past research that demonstrates consistency in the variables that differentiate powerful and powerless speech as well as research that reveals the inconsistent explanations for individual's speech style selection. The review of powerful and powerless speech styles will be divided into three sections. The first section will focus on the emergence of specific speech style variables, the second section will examine gender and speech style, and the third
section will focus on speech style evaluation and speech style production in combination.

The Emergence of Specific Powerless Variables

Although there has been some controversy over the link between power of speech style and gender, the variables have emerged without much controversy. Bradac and Mulac (1984), Holmes (1990), Hosman (1989), Hosman and Wright (1987), and Mulac and Lundell (1986) have consistently found any combination of hedges, hesitations, intensifiers and tag questions to be "powerless" speech style variables. Most researchers are in agreement that these variables should be considered when studying powerful and powerless speech styles. Wright and Hosman (1983) found that subjects using high levels of hedges were rated lower in credibility and attractiveness. Hosman and Wright (1987) found that messages low in hedges and hesitations were perceived as more authoritative and attractive. Mulac and Bradac (1984) found that hedges, hesitations, and tag questions were judged less likely to create an authoritative impression. Erickson, Lind, Johnson, and O’Barr (1978), using a set of powerless variables, found that speakers using a powerful style were perceived as more credible than speakers using a powerless style.

As intensifiers are the focus of this research, the following paragraphs concentrate specifically on intensifiers in the context of previous research results.
Wright and Hosman (1983) found intensifiers did not significantly affect perceptions of speaker credibility, although a significant difference was found for attractiveness. Wright and Hosman conducted a study examining respondents' evaluations of male and female witnesses in a courtroom setting. They found that female witnesses who used a high number of intensifiers were perceived as more attractive than their male counterparts who used a comparable number of intensifiers. "A woman who increased the force of her statement was perceived as more attractive than a man who similarly increased the force of his statement" (p. 150).

Hosman (1989) found that messages low in hedges, hesitations, and intensifiers were perceived as more powerful than a "prototypically powerless message". That is a message that contains hedges, intensifiers, hesitations, polite forms and "meaningless" particles ("oh, well" and "let's see"). He also found that in the absence of other powerless variables such as hedges and hesitations, intensifiers were perceived as more powerful than a "prototypically powerless message".

Bradac and Mulac (1984) found that powerful and polite messages were rated as the most effective. Intensifiers alone were rated as the second most effective message. This research reveals a hierarchy: intensifiers in the absence of other powerless variables are perceived as more credible
than when used as a part of a composite set. However, the powerful message was rated as the most effective.

The finding that intensifiers may not always result in a negative or powerless evaluation of the speaker has caused some researchers to question the validity of labeling them as "powerless". Additionally, the label of powerful speech could be questioned because the "powerful" speech style is defined by the absence of variables. The powerful style functions as a baseline or control from which deviations are made. Perhaps it would be more accurate to label the "powerful" style as the baseline speech style. However, in order to be consistent with past literature on this subject I will continue to refer to the speech styles as "powerful" and "powerless".

**Gender and Speech Style**

The evaluation of speech style has provided information on how listeners perceive and interpret a speaker's message. The following studies examine speech style production in an attempt to determine if men and women are expected to use different speech style variables.

Berryman and Wilcox (1980) examined speech style in an attempt to clarify "the relationship between objective communication behavior differentiations and culturally based expectations of the behavior of male and female communicators" (p. 52). They noted that females are more likely to use tag questions, intensifying adjectives and
adverbs, words expressing emotion, self references, incomplete assertions, nonobscene expletives and generate more discourse. Berryman and Wilcox stated that not all of these sex-based linguistic characteristics represent empirically documented speech differences between the sexes—rather, they represent stereotypes of linguistic behavior. They claimed that "regardless of whether these stereotypes do or do not correspond to actual behavior, they deserve investigation because of their possible prescriptive power for actual sex-role related speech behavior" (p. 52). These stereotypes may exert real pressure on the individuals to follow the prescribed behavior. Berryman and Wilcox claimed that because of the considerable pressure to conform, "beliefs about sex-related language may be as important as actual differences," and these beliefs may serve as indicators of attitudes toward women and men (p. 52).

In order to test their assertion that certain variables are selectively attributed to men and women, Berryman and Wilcox constructed two messages concerning grading policies in education. Sex of the speaker was not disclosed to the 108 female undergraduate subjects. The feminine message contained intensifiers, references to self, questions, tag questions, phrases implying emotion, and an unfinished sentence. The masculine message contained one reference to self, obscenities, slang, and incorrect grammar.
Berryman and Wilcox found that the sex-anonymous female message was judged as feminine and the sex-anonymous male message was judged as masculine. This supported the assertion that certain linguistic variables are selectively attributed to the sexes. Four factors consistently discriminated between the two messages: command (aggressive/not aggressive dominant/submissive), accommodation (flexible/inflexible, friendly/not friendly), plausibility (significant/inconsequential, rational/irrational), and sex (masculine/not masculine, feminine/not feminine). The authors claimed these findings lend support to previous research on linguistic behavior and are consistent with existing stereotypes. However, due to the all female sample the results are only generalizable to women. Subsequently, Berryman and Wilcox conducted a second experiment with a mixed-sex population. The same four factors emerged for the mixed-sex group as for the all female group. "Subjects perceived differences between treatments as indicated by differential evaluations of the sex-based messages and their anonymous sources, differences which must be attributed primarily to the linguistic distinctions contained in the messages" (p. 59).

Berryman and Wilcox's findings are consistent with Carli's (1990) assertion that the selection of speech style may be tempered by gender expectations. These findings are also congruent with Mulac and Lundell's (1986) and Mulac,
and Mulac, Lundell, and Bradac’s (1986) claim that the gender of the speaker can be determined by speech style when a composite set of variables is used.

The finding of a gender preference for specific variables in speech style production was examined by Mulac and Lundell (1986) and Mulac, Lundell, and Bradac (1986). These two studies demonstrated that certain language features can be used to predict speaker gender. Mulac and Lundell found seventeen variables that, when used as a composite set, could correctly predict gender 87.5% of the time. Some of the variables found to indicate male speech are spatial references, impersonal references ("it"), justifiers ("I would say it...because..."), fillers ("okay") and verbalized pauses (p. 95). Women's speech contained more oppositions ("It's a beautiful scene...but), intense adverbs ("really), and tag questions (p. 95). The composite variables were accurate predictors of gender for speakers ranging in age from eleven to sixty-nine. The authors suggested these sex preferential variables exist with relative consistency from early teens through later years. However, it should be noted that the variables used to predict gender were weighted in the discriminant analysis in order to provide maximum differentiation; thus, it would be an over simplification to say men always use variables a, b, and c and women use variables d, e, and f. The ability to predict gender
consistently and accurately depends on using a composite set of speech style production variables.

Mulac, Lundell, and Bradac's (1986) research produced similar findings. They found a weighted set of twenty composite variables that could be used to predict speaker gender accurately 99% of the time. Some of the variables that indicated a male speaker were egocentric orientation (first person references), grammatical errors, and active voice verbs. Female speech typically contained oppositions, intensive adverbs, and adverbial sentence beginnings. Mulac et al. claimed that a composite set of variables is more accurate for predicting gender than one or two individual variables because of partial overlap of language use. Specific speech style production variables are not always exclusive, rather there is "a degree of 'fuzziness' of the boundaries between male and female language use" (p. 125).

Mulac, Wiemann, Widemann, and Gibson's (1988) findings were consistent with Mulac and Lundell (1986), Mulac, Lundell, and Bradac (1986), and Berryman and Wilcox (1980). However, in this study Mulac et al. found only eight speech style variables that differentiated male and female participants. The men used more interruptions, directive remarks, and conjunctions/fillers to begin a sentence ("And another thing..."'). Women used more strategy questions, justifiers, intensifiers, personal
pronouns, and adverbial phrases to begin a sentence ("Surprisingly, it was an easy assignment.") (p. 330).

Mulac et al. stated that gender-differentiating language variables were used more frequently in same-sex dyads than in mixed-sex dyads. Thus, the composition of the dyad influenced the selection of linguistic variables. The participants in the mixed-sex dyads tended to adopt a style that would be convergent with their partner, rather than divergent. This finding demonstrated that participants expected different interaction patterns based on the gender of the group participants. Mulac et al. stated that there are two factors that influence language usage: "the gender of an individual, and whether the gender of the partner is the same or opposite" (p. 329). Furthermore, the authors recognized the importance of context, and they cautioned that speech style variables should be thought of as gender preferential as opposed to gender distinct.

This section dealt with the link between speech style and gender. The studies discussed in this section found a link between speech style and gender. The following section will examine speech style evaluation and speech style production.

Speech Style Evaluation and Speech Style Production

The speech style production studies provide insight into speaker and listener preferences for specific
variables. The following studies examine speech style production variables in combination with respondent evaluations. The combination of the two provides a more complete examination of how the powerful and powerless speech styles impact communication.

The effects of the powerful or powerless speech style in combination with speaker gender on credibility and trustworthiness remain relatively unclear due to a less voluminous amount of research on this topic. Thus, the effects of speech style, gender, and credibility deserve further study. A few recent studies have examined the effects of speech style on credibility and persuasion (Carli, 1990; Gibbons, Busch, & Bradac, 1991) and provided information about how speech style and gender interact.

Gibbons, Bush, and Bradac (1991) examined the effects of speech style evaluation on persuasion and impression formation. They used Petty and Cacioppo's (1986) Elaboration Likelihood Model to examine and measure persuasive effect. The ELM posits there are two routes to persuasion: central and peripheral. The central route requires the listener to expend a great deal of cognitive effort to process and evaluate the message, whereas the peripheral route requires less processing because message acceptance/rejection is based on cues other than argument quality.

15
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Although Gibbons et al. did not explicitly focus on the relationship between speech style and gender, their findings provide an understanding of how speech style and persuasion interact. They suggested three possible functions of speech style in persuasion. First, a high-power style could establish a speaker's credibility and potentially function as a heuristic for decision making. Second, a low-power style could be distracting and interfere with central route message processing. Third, the speech style could stand on its own and function similar to an argument. This research was an attempt to determine if speech style interacts with the cognitive processing of the persuasive message.

Gibbons et al. found that speech style did not affect persuasion but it did influence impression formation. It was noted that the respondents were persuaded more by argument quality than by speech style. The authors noted that speech style may have "indicated to message recipients something about the communicator but not about the soundness of the position the communicator advocated" (p. 129). If the arguments were unfamiliar and more challenging, perhaps speech style may become more of a factor in evaluating the communicator's persuasive claims. The authors stated that even though speech style did not appear to influence persuasion in this study, to conclude that speech style has no effect would be premature
because this is one of the first studies to examine these two variables in combination.

In an attempt to improve understanding of speech style production, speech style evaluation, gender and persuasion, Carli (1990) conducted a study that focused on these four variables. She examined the specific variables of intensifiers, hedges, disclaimers and interruptions. Additionally, she examined the persuasive effect of messages containing these variables. Expectations States Theory provided the theoretical framework for her study. The theory states that "inequalities in face-to-face interactions are a function of the relative status of participants" (p. 941). The author explained that in American culture women generally have lower status than men. This is evidenced by the positive evaluation of masculine traits and stereotypes and the negative evaluation of feminine traits.

Carli noted that the positive evaluation of masculine traits is carried over into our language usage. Although research on gender-linked language has yielded mixed results, she claimed that differences do exist. Several different explanations are offered for the inconsistent findings. First, gender differences are real, but small; consequently, small differences can occasionally be expected to yield null results. Second, gender differences occur primarily in same-sex dyads as opposed to mixed-sex
dyads. In mixed-sex interaction gender may function as a diffuse status characteristic, or a characteristic that is used in the absence of specific information, to assess competence or ability. Carli noted that past research has frequently been conducted with strangers who may use gender to infer status because they have little specific information about one another. Thus, if gender differences in language are related to status differences between the sexes, the other status characteristics should affect language use. She stated that past research has found that low status individuals, regardless of gender, spoke more tentatively to high status individuals, but did not speak tentatively to an equal.

The third possible explanation for the inconsistent findings is that not all gender differences in language may reflect a greater tentativeness for women. Carli asserted that a woman's use of intensifiers and reinforcers may not reflect tentativeness as much as it reflects her greater emotional expressiveness and sociability. Past research supports this assertion; women tend to be more relationally oriented, whereas men tend to be more task oriented. It is likely that this difference in orientation is due to differences in male and female socialization rather than intrinsically gender-linked characteristics. Carli stated that a reasonable conclusion is "gender difference in social-emotional orientation is a function of
expectancies and behavior norms that depend, in part, on the gender composition of the group in which subjects interact, and not on the gender differences in personality" (p. 943). Thus, because the stereotype expects women to offer greater social-emotional support and men to be more independent and less emotional, a self-fulfilling prophecy may be created, especially for same-sex interactions. However, individuals in mixed-sex interactions may expect sex-typed behavior from the opposite sex; consequently, they may attempt to converge toward their partner by exhibiting behavior they expect of the opposite sex.

The results of Carli's study demonstrated that when interacting with men, women used more hedges and disclaimers. Carli claimed that this could be attributed to women's greater need to justify themselves in mixed-sex groups. She found women used more verbal reinforcers and intensifiers in same-sex interaction, whereas no gender differences were found in mixed-sex interaction. The author claimed that this could reflect women's greater tendency to offer more social and emotional support when interacting with one another. Thus, stereotypical gender use of language may occur for reasons other than status. "Consequently, a careful examination of other such differences would be needed before concluding that a particular form of speech is less powerful simply because it is favored by women" (p. 947).
The results also demonstrated that tentative speech enhances women's ability to influence men, but it reduces their influence with other women. Carli stated the female speaker's use of the tentative style may have been more effective when addressing men because it was congruent with their expectations. On the other hand, the assertive female speaker's ineffectiveness could be attributed to her violation of their expectations which increased resistance to the message. Similarly, expectations can also explain the women's lower ratings of a tentative female speaker. If women are accustomed to hearing other women speak assertively, the tentative speaker violated their expectations and therefore, was less influential. Interestingly, both men and women rated a woman who spoke tentatively lower in competence and knowledge than a woman who spoke assertively. However, speech style was not a significant factor when rating the competence and knowledge of male speakers.

In a recent study, Mulac and Bradac (1995) attempted further to clarify the distinctions between men's and women's speech style production variables and their effects on listener evaluations. They claim that "there is ample evidence [in men's and women's speech style] from other contexts supporting the claim of difference, although it should be noted that the difference here refers to statistical or probabilistic difference rather than to a
difference that is absolute" (p. 5). In this study men and women were randomly placed in same sex or mixed sex dyads and given a problem solving task. Their conversations were then transcribed and coded.

A stepwise discriminant analysis of twenty speech style production variables revealed that certain production variables were more indicative of either male or female interactants. Men tended to use more hedges, vocalized pauses, and interruptions, whereas some of the features common to women were back channels (cues that communicate agreement, disagreement, interest, or disinterest), intensifiers, and sentence initial fillers (vocalized pauses at the beginning of a sentence). Contrary to Mulac et al. (1988) Bradac, Mulac, and Thompson (1995) did not find that participants in the dyads converged toward their partner. Rather the use of the twelve gender-distinguishing features remained constant whether the participants interacted in same-sex or mixed-sex dyads.

Bradac, Mulac, and Thompson (1995) also examined the combination of speech style production variables and respondent evaluations. They focused specifically on the speech style variables hedges and intensifiers. They selected these two speech style variables because the findings of past research have been mixed. The authors posited two reasons for the mixed results on intensifiers and hedges; thus, they examined "hearer sex" and
"assumption of identity" (p. 7). The "hearer sex" explanation claimed that the gender of the listener could affect the use of these language variables. As Carli (1990) and Mulac, Wiemann, Widenmann, and Gibson (1988) found, individuals may exhibit more gender preference for specific variables in same-sex groups. Bradac et al. stated that it is likely that the use of intensifiers would be affected by the sex of the listener. This assertion is consistent with Carli's (1990) findings that women vary their language use depending on the sex of the listener. Carli found that women used more intensifiers when talking to other women and more hedges when talking to men. "To the extent that this is true, there should be a degree of systematic (thus explicable) within-gender instability in the production of intensifiers and hedges across situations" (p. 7).

Bradac et al. speculated that the second possible explanation for the inconsistency in past research is "assumption of identity". Past research has treated "both intensifiers and hedges as unitary categories or, in other words, as unidimensional variables" (p. 7). Bradac et al. posited that there are both male hedges and male intensifiers and there are female equivalents. They stated that linguistic intuitions lead them to speculate that men may use forms such as "real good" and women may use the equivalent, "really good". Additionally, they speculated
speculated that the differences in these variables will produce different respondent judgments. The subtle variations in respondent attribution "suggest that there are hierarchies of effect-producing forms within, as well as between, language features" (p. 8). They claimed that if hedges and intensifiers are multidimensional and this variation is ignored, inconsistencies across studies will occur.

To test these ideas, Bradac et al. designed a study to determine if males and females use different forms of powerless speech. One hundred and sixteen students participated in the study under the guise of an extra credit project on “how people solve problems” (p. 12). These students’ conversations were audiotaped and then transcribed. The item-by-item coder agreement was 96%.

Fifteen variables were retained in a stepwise discriminant analysis and, of these variables, four were hedges and all were more predictive of male speakers (“fairly, kind of”) than female speakers. The other eleven variables retained in the analysis were intensifiers and, of these, six were predictive of male speakers (“real, very”), and five were predictive of female speakers (“so, really”). The use of intensifiers was relatively stable across partners, regardless of gender or situational context. Bradac et al. found no correlation between the use of hedges and intensifiers,
thus indicating the independence of these two speech style variables, contrary to Lakoff's (1975) assertions.

Intensifiers exhibited a within-category variability. The results showed that men and women both use intensifiers, but they differed in their selection of specific forms of intensifiers. Bradac et al. found that male intensifiers reduced ratings of aesthetic quality and social status. However, female intensifiers tended to increase ratings for these two dependent variables. The authors claimed that this finding justifies the distinction between male and female forms of intensifiers and that failure to make such a distinction in previous research could explain some of the conflicting findings from past research. The results also demonstrated no significant difference for diversity level (the overall number of intensifier choices) in men's and women's use of intensifiers as a category: thus, the authors claimed that men and women are equally familiar with intensifiers as a category but there "may be separate 'male' and 'female' regions within this domain" (p. 21).

Bradac et al. concluded by stating that their findings differ "markedly" from the requirements specified to support a "female register" indicative of women's low social power (p. 22). "Put another way, if these men and women differ in social power, their language use failed to give any indication of such a difference" (p. 22).
The research discussed in this section, speech style evaluation and speech style production, lends support to the assertion that intensifiers are linked to gender and may even be a multidimensional variable. Some research has found a gender-linked preference for using powerless variables both in general and for specific variables (Bradac, Mulac, & Thompson, 1995; Carli, 1990; Mulac, Incontro, & James, 1985; Warfel, 1984) while other studies have failed to find a link between gender and speech style choice (Bradac, Hemphill, & Tardy, 1981; Bradac & Mulac, 1984; Hosman, 1989; Hosman & Wright, 1987). Hence, the findings for the link between power of speech style and gender are still unclear. Perhaps this research could be better clarified by considering expectancy violation theory. This theory, discussed in the next section, could be used to help identify the listener's expectation of speech style variables according to gender.

**Expectancy Violations and Communication**

Burgoon (1993) states that expectancy violations theory was originally used to explain nonverbal behavior. However, the theory has been expanded to encompass a broad range of nonverbal and verbal behaviors. Succinctly put, expectancy violations theory is based on the notion that individuals are expected to conform to certain norms. Nonconformity is considered a violation
and will be either sanctioned or condemned depending on the perception of the violator as either rewarding or threatening.

Burgoon (1993) defined expectancy as "an enduring pattern of anticipated behavior" (p. 31). Additionally, she pointed out expectancies may be general pertaining to all members of a language community or they may be specific to individuals. If the expectancy is general, she claimed that it will be based on societal norms that dictate appropriate behavior for that interaction.

Burgoon asserted there are three different classes of expectancy factors: communicator, relationship, and context characteristics. Communicator characteristics are those specific to individuals, such as demographics, personality, and speech style. Relationship characteristics describe the relationship between communicators, such as familiarity, liking, and similarity. Context characteristics deal with environmental constraints and definitions of the situation, such as privacy, formality, and task orientation. Burgoon stated that these characteristics dictate expectancies in a given encounter; thus, expectancies frame situations by defining interpersonal interactions. "People plan and adapt their own communication according to the kind of encounter and communication style they anticipate from another actor" (p. 32). Additionally, Burgoon claimed that expectancies
function as perceptual filters that influence how information is processed. Expectancies tend to be enduring even when the individual is presented with disconfirmatory evidence.

Burgoon stated that relationship and context characteristics of the interaction can be influenced by the participants' expected valence. Valence refers to the positivity or negativity of the interaction. The individual's prior knowledge and observations of behavior during the communication event influence the perceiver's assessment of the target communicator's reward valence. Although these features may be weighted differently, they interact to "yield a net assessment of the degree of positive or negative valence the target communicator holds for the perceiver" (p. 35).

Once a deviation from expected norms, a violation, has been committed, a two-step process is set into motion. The observer interprets the violation and then evaluates it based on his or her perception and who committed the violation. Burgoon claimed that most interpretations are associated with evaluations as a function of social norms and personal preferences. The reward valence may affect the process of interpretation and evaluation if the violation's meaning is ambiguous or open to multiple interpretation. The finding that the reward valence may influence interpretation is congruent with some of her
previous nonverbal research that found that reward valence factors moderate or alter the interpretations assigned to gaze and touch violations (Burgoon, 1992; Burgoon et al., 1986).

Reward valence may also have an additive effect on evaluations: the more rewarding a communicator, the more positive the evaluations of his/her behavior. High-valence communicators are generally allowed to deviate more from the social norm before the behavior is perceived as a violation, whereas low-valence communicators are allotted a much smaller range of acceptable behaviors. The bandwidth of acceptable behaviors may be wider for high-valence communicators than for low-valence communicators. Thus, it would be much easier for a low-valence communicator to commit a violation and the converse would be true of a high-valence communicator.

Burgoon theorized that the valence of a violation can affect interaction patterns and outcomes. Positive violations are expected to produce more positive interaction patterns than conformity to expectations; similarly, negative violations are expected to produce more negative patterns than conformity. This prediction is consistent with Burgoon, Stacks, and Burch's (1982) findings in a proxemic (the use of space) experiment. They found that high-valence confederates were more persuasive and credible when they committed either a close or far
violation. The low-valence confederates undermined their persuasiveness and credibility when they committed either a positive or negative violation. Overall, it appeared that individuals who are well-regarded by their interaction partner can safely commit violations with more desirable effects than individuals who are poorly evaluated. "Expectancies exert significant influence on peoples' interaction patterns, on their impressions of one another, and on the outcomes of their interactions" (Burgoon, 1993, p. 41).

Burgoon and Le Poire (1993) asserted that expectancies are important because they preserve and influence information processing, behavior, and perceptions. Their findings established that preinteractional expectancies cause perceivers to evaluate targets and their communication differently than when no expectations are induced. Furthermore, they noted that expectancies frequently persist in the face of disconfirming information. A positive expectancy combined with a positive-valence communicator resulted in a rating higher in social attractiveness, task attractiveness, character and competence; the converse was found for negatively valenced expectancies paired with a low valence communicator. The authors noted that this main effect was qualified by the communicator's gender. Women engaging in pleasant conversation received positive evaluations.
regardless of the preinteractional expectancy. Burgoon et al. suggested that this effect could be explained by more salient societal norms that condition individuals to expect communicators, especially women, to be pleasant during initial interactions. Thus, when women were pleasant they confirmed both the societal and gender role expectation. The authors suggested confirmatory behavior may have overridden the respondent's induced negative expectancy.

Burgoon and Le Poire also found that when the target's actual communication violated the subject's expectancy the target was rated higher in competence, character, and attractiveness, if the violation was positive. This is consistent with Expectancy Violation Theory. The authors asserted that when behavior reinforces expectancies, respondents are more likely to disregard or distort the actual communication. However, when expectancies are disconfirmed the respondent should be more motivated to attend to and process the actual communication in an attempt to rectify the inconsistencies.

Preinteractional expectancies appear to be enduring, even after a disconfirmatory interaction. They also appear to have an additive effect with the actual communication encounter by influencing the respondent's perceptions and evaluations of the event. Burgoon and Le Poire pointed out that this is particularly true of negative valence expectations and negative behavior violations that have a
detrimental effect on impression formation. The authors concluded that "preinteraction expectancies, as cognitions, are highly relevant to postinteractional cognitions and that they can persevere despite intervening behavior, by oneself or one's partner, that conflicts with these cognitions" (p. 88).

Burgoon and Le Poire's findings that negative expectancies and negative behavior violations have lasting detrimental effects are congruent with Darley, Fleming, Hilton and Swann's (1988) findings. Darley et al. claimed that negative expectancies will persist even after an encounter with the target of those expectancies for two reasons. First, if the perceiver is not motivated to seek expectancy-relevant information about target communicator's characteristics, the expectancy will persist. Second, if the perceiver is motivated to seek expectancy-relevant information and the target communicator does indeed possess those negative characteristics, then the expectancy will persist. Negative expectancies are abandoned only when disconfirmatory information is discovered by the perceiver. Thus, the authors suggested that a factor in determining the acceptance or rejection of expectancies is determined by the perceiver's purpose in the interaction. Person perception and expectancy confirmation/disconfirmation are not only dependent on the tactics of the target communicator, but also on the perceiver's interpersonal goals.
Burgoon, Dillard, and Doran (1983) examined the effects of expectancy violation on persuasiveness. They proposed that strategies that violated normative expectations of appropriate communication behavior would inhibit persuasion and positive violations would facilitate persuasion. They also hypothesized that males who conform to normative communication strategies (more aggressive) would be more persuasive than if they violated the norms by using a more moderate strategy. Similarly, females who conform to normative strategies (less aggressive and more prosocial) would be more effective than those who violate expectations. The latter two hypotheses were proposed based on past research findings (Burgoon, 1975) that showed men were expected to use more intense language in persuasive attempts and were most effective with such a strategy. In contrast, the past research (Burgoon, 1975) demonstrated that women were not effective when employing intense language strategies because it violated societal norms of how women should present arguments. In their rationale, Burgoon, Dillard, and Doran (1983) also included previous research (Burgoon, Jones, & Stewart, 1975) that found women were only effective using low intensity language. However, low intensity language was ineffective for men who were perceived as weak when using this strategy. These findings were further supported by Bradley (1980). Burgoon et al. noted that the traditional
perception of women as timid, passive, and submissive affects the number and type of communication strategies in their acceptable repertoire. For example, a woman strongly expressing a minority viewpoint may be perceived negatively because she is dissenting and because her protest is incongruent with traditional expectations.

Burgoon, Dillard, and Doran's results are consistent with Burgoon and LePoire's (1993) findings. They found that both "males and females are constrained by message strategies as well as language choices in those situations in which they wish to be maximally suasive" (p. 292). Males are expected to use more aggressive strategies and when they do not conform to the preinteractional expectancy their ability to exhibit influence is inhibited. However, females are not expected to use aggressive strategies and they are penalized for using them.

A similar pattern of results holds for source credibility. Highly credible sources are more effective using intense language and less effective and less credible when using messages low in intensity. The opposite is true for low credibility sources; they are more effective with low intensity messages than with highly intense messages.

Burgoon and Miller (1985) argued that low credibility and female speakers have less freedom in message selection, and aggressive strategies would be a negative violation that inhibited attitude change. Thus, they claimed that these
studies demonstrate that "person perception and persuasiveness are relatively independent factors in some persuasive situations" (p. 209).

Burgoon and Miller argued that despite the emphasis on equality for the sexes "most people still accord the two sexes very different roles in the social structure" (p. 209). They claimed that this fixed perception has led to a set of social rules that prescribe that women should be complementary rather than competitive. Thus, these prescriptions translate into the expectation that women's communication strategies differ from men's strategies. Specifically, they asserted that it is more acceptable for a man to advocate a position with intense language than it is for a woman. They found that "males were more persuasive when they used highly intense language features while females fared better when they used language of low intensity" (p. 210). Burgoon and Miller (1985) concluded that differing expectations for appropriate communication behavior are still prevalent, and the effects of the expectancy violations are gender specific.

A study of physician-patient compliance by Burgoon, Birk, and Hall (1991) yielded similar results. They found significant differences in expected communication behaviors of male and female physicians. Burgoon et al. claimed that "societal norms for appropriate or expected communication behavior of females have changed little in the last 15
years" (p. 200). They stated that whether it is due to role socialization or credibility explanations, females have a limited width of acceptable communication behavior. If female physicians want to successfully gain patient compliance then they are restricted to low intensity or nonaggressive messages. Conversely, males are allowed a much broader range of strategies; they have the freedom to be either aggressive or affiliative in their effort to gain compliance. These findings reinforce the link between gender and the availability of effective persuasion and/or compliance-gaining strategy selection.

The findings in the physician/patient study supported the hypotheses. Burgoon et al. concluded that both males and females are constrained by message strategies as well as by language choices. When men do not conform to the expectation of an aggressive persuasive strategy as expected, their ability to exhibit influence is inhibited. On the contrary, women are expected to be less aggressive and more prosocial in persuasion strategies, and they are sanctioned for any violation. Thus, it appears that there are different expectations of appropriate persuasive strategies based on gender.

Language, overall, appears to be influenced by gender expectancies. According to Bem (1981) every society establishes and enforces prescriptive rules that dictate appropriate sex role behavior for individuals in that
society. "The distinction between male and female serves as a basic organizing principal for every human culture" (p. 354). She stated that these rules are a "diverse and sprawling network of associations encompassing not only those features directly related to male and female persons, such as anatomy, reproductive function, division of labor, and personality attributes, but also features more remotely or metaphorically related to sex, such as the angularity or roundedness of an abstract shape, and periodicity of the moon" (p.354). The rules that prescribe appropriate gender behavior also seem to extend to language style and usage. Burgoon and Miller (1985) claimed that the socialization process has "programed" females to be submissive, domestic, complementary, and males to be dominant, business-minded and intelligent (p. 210). "These submissive, dependent stereotypes imply that men and women are expected to differ on certain communicative behaviors" (p. 211). Burgoon and Stewart (1975) predicted that women would be expected to use less intense language than men in persuasive messages. Their assertion was supported. The findings demonstrated a positive linear relationship for males using intense language and a negative linear relationship for females using intense language. Simply, language intensity makes men more persuasive and women less persuasive. These studies show our society has prescriptive rules for language as well as the other associations mentioned by Bem (1981).
Attitudes Toward Women

The studies previously discussed indicate that members of our society have different expectations about behavior "appropriate" for each gender. Clearly, these expectations include language use. As mentioned earlier Burgoon and Miller (1985) claim that socialization has dictated different behaviors for men and women; an example of this is stereotyping women as submissive and domestic. Burgoon, Birk, and Hall (1991) claim, despite the call for equality between the sexes, that "societal norms for appropriate or expected communication behavior of females have changed little in the past 15 years" (p. 200). Thus, measuring individuals' attitudes toward women in society should offer insight into their preconceived expectancies of what is "appropriate" communication behavior for women. The following section will examine some of the general attitudes toward women prevalent in society and the final study discussed will examine attitudes toward women as they relate to communication.

Bierly (1985) examined the interrelatedness of attitudes toward four different contemporary out-groups: blacks, women, homosexuals, and the elderly. These groups were selected because "studies of prejudice have correlated attitudes toward one particular group with attitudes toward another group, or have correlated attitudes toward a particular group with political attitudes or personality
measures" (p. 189). Bierly stated that several studies have found a correlation between prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals and support for traditional sex roles.

Bierly's results support the notion that prejudice is a generalized attitude toward blacks, women and homosexuals; it does not extend to the elderly. Overall, prejudice appears to be a global construct. "Those who expressed negative opinions and beliefs about gay men and lesbian women also expressed adherence to sex-role expectations that constrain possibilities for women" (p. 198). Bierly asserted that this study is particularly important because prejudice is associated with discriminatory behavior that restricts the socioeconomic mobility of those to which the attitude is directed.

Baker and Terpstra (1986) examined two competing theories in an attempt to determine what predicts an individual's attitude toward women. The first possible explanation is based on personality characteristics such as locus of control. Baker and Terpstra noted that, according to past research, an internal locus of control should result in high self-esteem and that, in turn, should predict a positive attitude toward women. The second possible explanation is based on demographic characteristics. This explanation claims that age, gender, religion, and education all influence how an individual perceives women.
There were 170 subjects ranging in age from 18 to 59. Subjects' sex-role attitudes were measured by the 55-item AWS developed by Spence and Hellmreich (1972). Subjects also completed Rotter's (1966) Locus of Control scale and forty items drawn from the Personal Orientation Inventory which assesses self-esteem. Religious affiliation was dummy coded and religiosity was measured by regularity of church attendance.

Baker and Terpstra found that the tests of the locus of control hypothesis failed to reach significance. However, the "full equation [of demographic characteristics] explained 38% of the variance in AWS" (p. 168). Age and education were positively related to liberal attitudes towards women. In contrast religion (Protestant) and regular attendance of church services were negatively related to liberal attitudes towards women. "Hence it seems that factors broadening a person's knowledge base are related to liberal attitudes towards women, whereas conservative religious teachings are related to conservative attitudes towards women" (p. 170). Baker and Terpstra also found that conservative religious beliefs may cause individuals to minimize or discount new and or contradictory information about women. They claimed that the negation of new information could be due to the strong nature of religious teachings which exert more influence than the new information.
Bailey, Silver, and Oliver (1990) assessed the attitudes toward women held by black and white college students. They claimed that college students provide insight into changes in the rest of the population. "Changes which occur first among well-educated people may eventually become more widespread among the population at large" (p. 1143). They stated that over the generations college women have become more liberal in their attitudes toward women. Bailey et al. also noted that past research indicated that white women tend to be more liberal than men and black women. However, past research has only found significant main effects for sex and race but no interaction between the two.

The results of their investigation yielded a significant main effect for sex, indicating that women are more liberal than men. No significant main effect for race was found. Bailey et al. claim that the lack of a main effect for race is consistent with past work by Gackenbach "that with the passage of time, as minorities become more fully assimilated into the majority community, they may begin to accommodate their attitudes and thereby assume the prevailing position" (p. 1144). However, the authors noted that the results could be group specific for two reasons: first, because the data were collected at two separate universities, race was completely confounded. Another possible explanation is that since only 417 subjects were
tested, just under the 500 required by the power analysis, the difference did not emerge as significant. Nonetheless, this study supports an important assertion: women generally have more liberal attitudes toward women's role in society.

Previous studies, by Bierly (1985), Baker and Terpstra (1986), and Baliey, Silver, and Oliver (1990), measured general attitudes toward women and their role in society and assessed the reliability and validity of the AWS. Another study combined attitudes toward women with specific communication variables to determine if attitudes influence communication. Kern, Cavell, and Beck's (1985) research addressed the assertion that different prescriptive rules are used to structure expectations about women and men in our society.

Kern, Cavell, and Beck (1985) claimed that discrepancies in past research examining "differential reactions to males' versus females' assertions were due in part to an uncontrolled variable, subjects' attitudes towards females' roles in society" (p. 63). This study was designed to test individuals' reactions toward women's roles as a predictor of different reactions to refusals by men and women. They expected that "individuals who sex-type females into a traditional female role would evidence biases against females' assertions, males' nonassertions, and possibly females' empathic assertions" (p. 65). The subjects watched video tapes of a male and
female model behaving in an assertive, empathic-assertive, and submissive manner.

Kern, Cavell, and Beck's prediction was supported: different reactions exist for males' and females' assertive, empathic-assertive, and nonassertive behavior in refusal situations. Kern et al. noted that these reactions were not uniform across all subjects, rather, individuals reporting a conservative attitude toward women tended to devalue female assertions and empathic-assertions. They noted that although attitudes toward women were related to the respondents' subjective reactions, the majority of the variance in the study was accounted for by the target's behavior. Assertive and empathic-assertive targets were perceived as more competent but less likable. Further, empathic-assertive targets were seen as more desirable than assertive and nonassertive targets. These findings are consistent with Lao, Upchurch, Corwin, and Grossnickle (1975). In their study, a moderate level of assertive behavior was the most effective for both sexes, but a high level of assertiveness was more damaging for the female speaker. Although Kern, Cavell, and Beck's study found that attitudes toward women accounted for only a portion of the variance, the authors concluded that "contradictory results of prior research examining the stimulus effects of gender on reactions to assertion were due, at least in
part, to an uncontrolled subject variable, subjects' attitudes towards women's roles in society" (p. 73).

Kern, Cavell, and Beck (1985) found differential reactions toward male and female assertive, assertive-empathic, and nonassertive speakers in refusal situations. The important finding was that the differential reactions did not vary uniformly across all subjects, rather "only individuals reporting a conservative attitude toward women's roles in society devalued female models' assertions and empathic-assertions" (p. 70). The studies by Berryman and Wilcox and Kern et al. indicate that listeners' attitudes towards women can influence their perceptions of women's messages. Thus, a listener's preconceived expectations can influence the interpretation and evaluation of a speaker's message.

Rationale and Hypotheses

The literature review has discussed the inconsistent findings in the link between gender and speech style. In some of the past research speech style appears to be linked to the speaker's gender (Bradac, Mulac, & Thompson, 1995; Carli, 1990; Mulac, Incontro, & James, 1985; Warfel, 1984); however, other research did not find a significant link between speech style and gender (Bradac, Hemphill, & Tardy, 1981; Bradac & Mulac, 1984; Hosman, 1989; Hosman & Wright, 1987). Consequently, this study proposes the two following research questions. The first concerns the gender of the
speaker and the second concerns the gender of the
recipient of the message.

RQ1: Does the gender of the speaker affect perceptions
of speaker competence and trustworthiness?
RQ2: Does the gender of message recipient affect
perceptions of competence and trustworthiness?

A number of studies focus on the consequences of using
either a powerful or powerless speech style. Erickson,
Lind, Johnson, and O’Barr (1978) in a study of impression
formation in a courtroom setting found that powerful
speakers were perceived as more credible than powerless
speakers. They also noted that the difference in perceived
credibility was greatest when the speaker and the
respondent were of the same sex. Bradac, Hemphill and
Tardy (1981) examined the powerful and powerless speech
style in the context of the courtroom setting and they
found that the “high-power” style produced higher ratings
of competence than the “low-power” style. The “low-power”
style consisted of hedges, hesitations, intensifiers,
polite forms and hesitations. Consistent with previous
research, Bradac and Mulac (1984) also found that powerful
messages were rated as the most effective. However, it
should be noted that Hosman (1989) found that intensifiers
were perceived as powerful, but only in the absence of all
other powerless variables (hedges and hesitations).
Additionally, Hosman pointed out that intensifiers do not
consistently affect perceptions of speaker power. Because most previous research has found that the presence of intensifiers reduces the credibility of the message, this study predicts a relationship between the use of intensifiers and credibility and trustworthiness.

**H1:** Individuals using a message that does not contain intensifiers (powerful style) will be perceived as more competent and trustworthy than individuals using intensifiers.

Additionally, it is important to understand what messages and expectancy violations will be perceived as positive or negative in order to make reliable predictions. Past research by Bradley (1980), Bem (1981), Burgoon, Jones, and Stewart (1975), and Burgoon and Miller (1985) found that men and women's communication behaviors are still constrained by traditional sex role attitudes. Thus, if men are perceived as high status, they may be allowed a wider scope of messages before their communication is viewed as a violation. This is congruent with J. Burgoon (1993); J. Burgoon and Le Poire (1993); M. Burgoon, Birk, and Hall, (1991); and M. Burgoon and Miller's (1985) findings that high status communicators are allowed greater freedom in their selection of communication behaviors.

In contrast, if women are judged by traditional gender roles they would be rated lower in status and thus allowed less freedom in message selection. Burgoon, Birk, and Hall
(1991) and Burgoon, Dillard, and Doran (1983) found that women are restricted in the number of appropriate communication strategies they could select. Burgoon, Birk, and Hall found that female physicians are more persuasive when they used low intensity or nonaggressive strategies with patients.

Bradac and Mulac's (1984) results indicated that for women, intensifiers produce higher ratings of power and effectiveness. Perhaps this finding is due to the fact that women are expected to use higher levels of intensifiers and by doing so the speaker is behaving in a manner that is consistent with respondent expectations. The positive effect for women's use of intensifiers is in agreement with Wright and Hosman's (1983) findings. Their study produced higher attractiveness evaluations for female witnesses who used large numbers of intensifiers. However, Hosman (1989) found that intensifiers did not "consistently affect perceptions of powerfulness or powerlessness" (p. 402).

Bradac, Mulac, and Thompson (1995) have offered a reasonable explanation for some of the inconsistency in past research findings that have examined the effect of speech style. All intensifiers are not equally evaluated: rather, some are attributed to men and others are attributed to women. These perceiver expectations have not been taken into account in past studies; therefore, the studies produced contradictory findings. Considering gender as well
as context expectancies in future research may yield a clearer picture of speech styles.

One way to try to measure respondent expectations is through the use of the Attitudes Towards Women Scale. It has proven to be a reliable measure for evaluating whether or not respondents expect women to conform to traditional gender roles (Bailey, Silver, & Oliver, 1990; Bierly, 1985). This scale has provided useful data when used in combination with speech variables. Berryman and Wilcox (1980) speculated that preconceived stereotypes of feminine and masculine behavior could influence the selection and use of language. Berryman and Wilcox provided the respondents sex-anonymous messages that either contained high feminine or masculine speech variables and found that respondent's rated the feminine messages to be less powerful than masculine messages. Kern, Cavell, and Beck (1985) found that individuals with a conservative attitude toward women devalued women's assertive and empathic-assertive messages in a refusal situation. Conservative individuals consistently rated women in these conditions as less likeable than their non-assertive counterpart. Hence, it appears that the AWS can provide an accurate assessment of respondents' a priori expectations about appropriate communication strategies for men and women. This study predicts a pattern of interactions among speaker gender, attitude towards women, and gender-related intensifiers.
H2: There will be an interaction between sex of speaker and type of speech style after controlling for attitude toward women.

H2a: Females using “feminine” intensifiers will be perceived as more competent and trustworthy by respondents who score as traditionals on the AWS scale than those who score as liberals.

H2b: Females using “masculine” intensifiers will be perceived as more competent and trustworthy by respondents who score as liberals on the AWS than those who score as traditionals.

H2c: Males using “feminine” intensifiers will be perceived as less competent and trustworthy by respondents who score as traditionals on the AWS than those who score as liberals.

The speech style, the gender of the speaker and the respondent’s attitude toward women are central to respondent perceptions of competence and trustworthiness. There is increasing evidence that speech style variables may be multidimensional and that they may not be used interchangeably.

RQ3: Do messages containing “masculine” or “feminine” intensifiers produce significantly different evaluations of the speaker?
Chapter 2
Methodology

Subjects

The sample size was determined by using the G-power computer program. Considering a medium effect size with a power of .8 and a significance level of .05 three-hundred and eighty-four subjects was the suggested sample size. One-hundred and ninety-four men and one-hundred and eighty-six women completed the questionnaire for a total of three-hundred and eighty subjects. It appeared that all students asked to complete survey complied, however no formal participation rate was calculated. The subjects were students enrolled in introductory communication courses at Louisiana State University. Introductory communication courses draw students from a wide variety of majors, allowing a diverse sample population. This sampling method was selected because it is similar to past sampling methods in research conducted on speech styles (Burgoon, Dillard & Doran, 1983; Burgoon & Le Poire, 1993; Carli, 1990; Gibbons, Busch, & Bradac, 1990; Hosman, 1989; and Wright & Hosman, 1983). The data were collected from courses that do not specifically address powerful and powerless speech styles in an attempt to prevent any exposure that could taint this study’s results. The students were randomly assigned to a research condition. Students remained anonymous and all questionnaires were confidential.
Independent Variables

The independent variables are sex of speaker, attitude toward women, the presence or absence of intensifiers, and the gender of the intensifier. The sex of the speaker in the scenario was manipulated and the questionnaire was randomly distributed to male and female respondents.

The speech style was manipulated by adding intensifiers to a kernel message. The powerful speech style did not include any intensifiers and served as the control condition. The powerless speech style consisted of intensifiers and these variables were further subdivided by gender. Intensifiers were either "feminine" such as "really," "so," and "such a" or "masculine" such as "definitely," "very," and "real." These expressions appeared in the speaker's remarks throughout the scenario.

The Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS) was originally developed by Spence and Hellmreich (1972) to measure attitudes as either liberal or traditional. The original scale consisted of 55 items, but it was later shortened to 25 items by Spence, Hellmreich and Stapp (1973) by an item analysis. The scale is scored in a feminist direction: the higher the score the more liberal the individual. Yonder, Rice, Adams, Priest, and Prince (1982) conducted a study that determined the AWS to be a valid and reliable measure.
Even though the AWS was shortened to 25 items, Parry (1983) believed the wording of the items was still unnecessarily long and complex. Thus, in order to increase the usefulness of the scale Parry simplified the items, and reduced the number of items to 22. The shortened version was also found to be valid and reliable. The revised, 22 item scale was used as a covariate. The alpha coefficient for this scale was .7965.

**Message**

The kernel message for this study was adapted from a courtroom transcript. The specific transcript was selected from public records at a county courthouse on the basis of containing enough information for the respondents to understand what was happening in the trial and ease of manipulation for the different conditions. A courtroom transcript was selected in order to maintain consistency with past powerful/powerless speech research (Bradac, Hemphill, & Tardy, 1981; Erickson, Lind, Johnson, & O'Barr, 1798; Hosman & Wright, 1987; Wright & Hosman, 1983). The transcript is approximately three hundred words or about one page in length. The kernel message did not contain any intensifiers (or other powerless forms) and represented the powerful condition. However, it should be noted that the powerful condition could be more accurately described as a baseline condition. The term “powerful” has been retained in this research in order to maintain

**Dependent Variables**

Respondents rated the speaker on perceptions of competence and trustworthiness using seven-interval semantic differential scales. McCroskey’s Measure of Ethos/Credibility (1997) contains items that measure credibility by rating the speaker on items such as intelligence, expertise, and training. Some of the items that measure trustworthiness are honesty, morality, honor, and ethics. The alpha coefficient for competence was .7954 and the alpha for trustworthiness was .8515. These items were selected based on past research by Bradac and Mulac (1984), Erickson, et al., (1978), and Hosman (1989). Additionally, respondents rated each speaker's masculinity/femininity on three seven-interval semantic differential items (more masculine/less masculine, more feminine/less feminine, manly/womanly). The alpha for this scale was .8889.
Procedure and Design

The data were gathered using a questionnaire completed on a voluntary basis during the regular class period. Students first completed the AWS scale, and read the transcript and rated the speaker on the last page, using McCroskey's Scale. They were not told any information about the purpose of the study.

The data gathered was analyzed using SPSS statistical software. The design was a 2 (gender of speaker) x 2 (gender of respondent) x 3 (powerful style vs. masculine intensifier vs. feminine intensifier). The AWS was treated as a continuous variable in the analysis of covariance.

Table A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Type of Variable</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Respondent</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Demographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Speaker</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Manipulated in the Court Transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Style</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Manipulated in the Court Transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Toward Women</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Parry's Attitude Toward Women Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>McCroskey's Measure of Ethos/Credibilty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>McCroskey's Measure of Ethos/Credibilty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine/Feminine</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>3-Item Scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pilot Study and Results

A pilot study was conducted to examine the length and clarity of the questionnaire. The AWS was presented first, the courtroom transcript followed, and then a 14-item competence and trustworthiness scale which was followed by a few demographic questions. The average completion time was between fifteen and twenty minutes. The pilot study did not produce significant results so some changes were made in the sample transcripts and McCroskey’s scale was substituted for one of the less reliable scales measuring competence and trustworthiness. Once these changes had been made a full scale study was conducted in order to thoroughly investigate the research questions and hypotheses proposed in the rationale. The following chapter will discuss the results of the full study.
Chapter 3
Results

Tests of Assumptions

The results of the statistical analyses are presented in this chapter. A 2 x 2 x 3 multivariate analysis of covariance was conducted to evaluate the effects of speaker gender, respondent gender and speech style (powerful, masculine intensifiers, and feminine intensifiers) on the three dependent variables of competence, trustworthiness and masculinity. There are several reasons a multivariate analysis was selected. First, a multivariate analysis was selected in order to analyze the relationships among the dependent variables of competence, trust, and masculinity simultaneously, thereby reducing the chance of Type I statistical error. Second, the dependent variables competence and trust are moderately correlated. Stevens (1986) states a multivariate test is a useful test when the dependent variables are moderately correlated. Multiple analysis of variance makes three important assumptions and each will be discussed in the following section.

The first assumption MANCOVA makes is homogeneity of slopes (Stevens, 1986). This assumes that in the population, the regression of the dependent variable (Y) on the covariate (X) is the same in each group (all possible combinations of independent variables).
If this assumption is violated then the use of MANCOVA is considered inappropriate.

This assumption was evaluated by examining the significance of all possible interactions between the covariate and the independent variables. If any of the interactions were significant the assumption of homogeneity of slopes is not met. None of the Wilks Lambda’s for these interaction effects were found to be significant. A correlation of the powerful and powerless speech style with AWS did not yield significant results, this is consistent with the results from the homogeneity of slopes test.

Table B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Wilks Lambda</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex * Gender * Type * AWS</td>
<td>.98698</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex * Type * AWS</td>
<td>.98034</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type * Gender * AWS</td>
<td>.98522</td>
<td>.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex * Gender * AWS</td>
<td>.99299</td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * AWS</td>
<td>.98266</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type * AWS</td>
<td>.97675</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex * AWS</td>
<td>.99578</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second assumption that MANCOVA makes is that the dependent variables show a low to moderate correlation. Norusis(1990) states that there is no reason to use multivariate analysis if the dependent variables are not
correlated. A correlation matrix is useful in determining the extent of the correlation between the dependent variables. In a correlation matrix that examined trustworthiness, competence, masculinity, and AWS the highest correlation was between trust and competence at .4404. Moderate correlations are to be expected and this correlation does not appear to be exceptionally large. If the dependent variables have a correlation higher than .80 the dependent variables are considered to be highly correlated.

Table C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
<th>Masculinity</th>
<th>AWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.4404</td>
<td>.1772</td>
<td>.1085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>.4404</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.0230</td>
<td>.2278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>.1772</td>
<td>-.0230</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.0711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>.1085</td>
<td>.2278</td>
<td>.0711</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the third assumption of MANCOVA is that the covariate is correlated with the dependent measures. This correlation shows that the covariate explains some part of the variance, thereby reducing error and increasing power. The Wilks Lambda was significant $F(3, 365)=7.076$, $p<.001$ demonstrating a relationship between the dependent variables and the covariate. Competence $F(3, 365)=4.7709$, $p<.05$ and trustworthiness $F(3, 365)=20.5444$, $p<.001$ were significantly related to the covariate, attitude toward
women. Trustworthiness had a larger correlation with the AWS (Beta=.2618) than did competence (Beta=.1241).

**MANCOVA Results**

The multivariate analysis of covariance yielded significant effects for the covariate and two of the main effects on the dependent variables when taken all together. None of the interactions were significant. The following sections discuss the results of the multivariate analysis. Later sections will present the univariate results and report the means for the groups.

**Table D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>3, 365</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>19.719</td>
<td>3, 365</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>10.160</td>
<td>3, 365</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>3, 365</td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex * Type</td>
<td>1.221</td>
<td>6, 730</td>
<td>.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex * Gender</td>
<td>1.099</td>
<td>3, 365</td>
<td>.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type * Gender</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>6, 730</td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex * Type * Gender</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>6, 730</td>
<td>.507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attitude Toward Women. The analysis revealed a significant main effect for attitude toward women $F(3, 365)=7.077, p<.001$.

Sex of Speaker. A significant main effect was revealed for the sex of the speaker $F(3, 365)=19.719, p<.001$. 
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Type of Speech Style. The analysis revealed a significant main effect for type of speech style $F(3, 365)=10.160, p<.001$.

Gender. The analysis did not reveal a significant main effect for the gender of the respondent $F(3, 365)=.543, p>.05$.

Sex of Speaker by Type of Speech Style. The analysis did not reveal a significant interaction effect for the sex of the speaker by the type of speech style $F(6, 730)=1.221, p>.05$.

Sex of Speaker by Gender of Respondent. The analysis did not reveal a significant interaction effect for the sex of the speaker by the gender of the respondent $F(6, 730)=1.099, p>.05$.

Type of Speech Style by Gender of Respondent. The analysis did not reveal a significant interaction effect for the type of speech style by the gender of the respondent $F(6, 730)=.787, p>.05$.

Sex of Speaker by Type of Speech Style by Gender of Respondent. The analysis did not reveal a significant interaction effect for the sex of the speaker by the type of speech style by gender of respondent $F(6, 730)=.882, p>.05$.

Univariate Analyses Results

The univariate analyses of covariance yielded significant effects for the covariate and main effects on the dependent variables. None of the interactions were
significant. The following sections discuss the results of each of the univariate analyses.

**Table E**

**Univariate Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>20.544</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>4.779</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>55.438</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>3.066</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>1.541</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>10.835</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>27.253</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1.303</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex * Type</td>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>3.037</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex * Gender</td>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>2.011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>2.561</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type * Gender</td>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>1.881</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex * Type * Gender</td>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>2.293</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attitude Toward Women. The analysis did not reveal a significant main effect for attitude toward women on perceptions of masculinity $F(1,367)=.541, p>.462$. There was a significant main effect for both trust $F(1,367)=20.544, p<.001$ and competence $F(1,367)=4.779, p<.05$. As the previously reported (Table C) correlation matrix reveals, the association is positive. More positive attitude toward women is associated with higher ratings of trustworthiness and competence.

Sex of Speaker. The analysis revealed a significant main effect for the sex of the speaker on perceptions of masculinity $F(1,367)=55.438, p<.001$. Male speakers were perceived as more masculine ($M=12.39$) than females ($M=9.25$) regardless of their use of intensifiers. The results for trustworthiness $F(1,367)=3.066, p>.05$ and competence $F(1,367)=.244, p>.05$ were not significant. Although, the results for trustworthiness do not meet the conventional alpha the results do suggest a trend with a probability of .08. The mean values were higher for females than for males. Table F reports the means for males and female for each dependent variable.

Table F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Sex of Speaker</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>12.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>9.251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Type of Speech Style. The analysis did not reveal a significant main effect for type of speech style on perceptions of masculinity $F(2,367)=1.541, p>.05$. There were significant main effects for both trustworthiness $F(2,367)=10.835, p<.001$ and competence $F(2,367)=27.253, p<.001$. The powerful speech style was perceived as the most trustworthy (M=31.79), the feminine intensifiers were perceived as the second most trustworthy (M=29.27), and the masculine intensifiers were perceived as the least trustworthy (M=28.39). Similarly, the powerful speech style was perceived as the most competent (M=28.93), the masculine intensifiers were perceived as the second most competent (M=24.02), and the feminine intensifiers were perceived as the least competent (M=23.02).

Table G
Means for Type of Speech Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Speech Style</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity *</td>
<td>powerful</td>
<td>11.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feminine intensifier</td>
<td>10.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>masculine intensifier</td>
<td>10.726</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No significant difference
N=380
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trustworthiness p&lt;.001</th>
<th>powerful</th>
<th>31.794</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>feminine intensifier</td>
<td>29.270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masculine intensifier</td>
<td>28.398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence p&lt;.001</th>
<th>powerful</th>
<th>28.930</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>feminine intensifier</td>
<td>23.026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masculine intensifier</td>
<td>24.669</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No significant difference
N=380

Gender. The analysis did not reveal a significant main effect for the gender of the respondent on perceptions of masculinity $\mathbb{E}(1, 367)=.252, p>.05$, trustworthiness $\mathbb{E}(1, 367)=1.303, p>.05$, or competence $\mathbb{E}(1, 367)=.432, p>.05$.

Sex of Speaker by Type of Speech Style. The analysis revealed a significant interaction effect between sex of the speaker and the type of speech style on perceptions of masculinity $\mathbb{E}(2, 367)=3.037, p<.05$. Male speakers using the powerful speech style were perceived as the most masculine ($M=13.39$), male speakers using feminine intensifiers were perceived as second most masculine ($M=12.20$) and they were perceived as least masculine when using masculine intensifiers ($M=11.58$). Female speakers were perceived as much less masculine. The female speakers using masculine intensifiers were perceived as most masculine ($M=9.87$). Females using the powerful speech style were perceived as the second most masculine ($M=9.23$) and those using the feminine speech style were perceived as least masculine ($M=8.64$). The analysis did not reveal a
significant interaction effect for the sex of the speaker by the type of speech style on trustworthiness $F(2, 367) = .577, p > .05$, or competence $F(2, 367) = .097, p > .05$.

**Table H**

Means for Sex of Speaker by Type of Speech Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Sex of Speaker</th>
<th>Speech Style</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity p&lt;.05</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>powerful</td>
<td>13.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>feminine</td>
<td>12.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>masculine</td>
<td>11.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>powerful</td>
<td>9.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>feminine</td>
<td>8.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>masculine</td>
<td>9.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness*</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>powerful</td>
<td>30.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>feminine</td>
<td>28.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>masculine</td>
<td>28.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>powerful</td>
<td>32.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>feminine</td>
<td>30.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>masculine</td>
<td>28.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence*</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>powerful</td>
<td>28.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>feminine</td>
<td>23.066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con’d.)
Sex of Speaker by Gender of Respondent. The analysis did not reveal a significant interaction effect for the sex of the speaker by the gender of the respondent on perceptions of masculinity $F(1,367)=.065$, $p>.05$, trustworthiness $F(1,367)=2.011$, $p>.05$, or competence $F(1,367)=2.561$, $p>.05$.

Type of Speech Style by Gender of Respondent. The analysis did not reveal a significant interaction effect for the type of speech style by the gender of the respondent on perceptions of masculinity $F(2,367)=1.881$, $p>.05$, trustworthiness $F(2,367)=.255$, $p>.05$, or competence $F(2,367)=.213$, $p>.05$.

Sex of Speaker by Type of Speech Style by Gender of respondent. The analysis did not reveal a significant interaction effect for the sex of the speaker by the type of speech style by gender of respondent on perceptions of masculinity $F(2,367)=2.293$, $p>.05$, trustworthiness $F(2,367)=.170$, $p>.05$, or competence $F(2,367)=.567$, $p>.05$.

* No significant difference

N=380

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>masculine intensifier</th>
<th>24.370</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>female powerful</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminine intensifier</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masculine intensifier</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary of Hypotheses and Research Questions

The following section will specifically address each research question and hypothesis posed earlier in this work. The first research question asked if speaker sex affected perceptions of speaker competence and trustworthiness. The results demonstrated that the sex of the speaker does not affect perceptions of competence and trustworthiness. However, a non-significant trend suggests that female speakers may be perceived as more trustworthy.

The second research question asked if sex of the message recipient affected perceptions of competence and trustworthiness. There is no evidence to support the notion that respondent sex influenced perceptions of speaker competence and trustworthiness. In fact, respondent sex did not appear to be a significant factor in this study.

Research question three asked if messages containing "masculine" or "feminine" intensifiers produced significantly different evaluations of the speaker. A planned contrast was used because it is more powerful than post hoc methods if a relatively small subset of contrasts is needed. The number of contrasts in the comparison is indicated by a capital C. Dunn's test is flexible and it allows for any number of simple or complex contrasts (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). There was no indication that
messages containing either "masculine" or "feminine" intensifiers resulted in significantly different evaluations of the speaker for competence $t(367)=2.003$, $C=4$, $p>.05$ or trustworthiness $t(367)=-1.158$, $C=4$, $p>.05$.

The first hypothesis proposed that individuals using the powerful speech style would be perceived as more competent and trustworthy than individuals using intensifiers. Again, Dunn's test was used to test this hypothesis because it is more powerful than post hoc tests (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Hypothesis 1 was supported. Tests of pre-planned contrasts revealed that speakers using a powerful speech style ($M=29.930$) were perceived as more competent than those using either masculine intensifiers ($M=24.699$) or feminine intensifiers ($M=23.026$) $t(367)=7.137$, $C=4$, $p<.05$. Perceptions of speaker trustworthiness also demonstrated that speakers using the powerful style ($M=31.794$) were perceived as more trustworthy than those using either masculine intensifiers ($M=28.398$) or feminine intensifiers ($M=29.270$) $t(367)=4.526$, $C=4$, $p<.05$.

Hypothesis 2 and its sub-hypotheses predicted an interaction between sex of speaker and type of intensifiers after controlling for attitudes toward women. In order to test these hypotheses AWS was dichotomized by using a median split of 81. Then the relevant hypotheses were tested by using planned contrasts.
Sub-hypothesis 2a suggested that females using "feminine" intensifiers would be perceived as more competent and trustworthy by traditional respondents than liberal respondents. This hypothesis was not supported as the liberal respondents rated the speaker higher in competence and trustworthiness than the traditional respondents. No further tests were conducted because the means were not in the predicted direction. Table I presents the means for the hypothesis 2 and the sub-hypotheses.

Sub-hypothesis 2b proposed that females using "masculine" intensifiers would be perceived as more competent and trustworthy by respondents who scored high on the AWS than those who scored low. The test of pre-planned contrasts revealed that liberal respondents perceived female speakers using masculine intensifiers more trustworthy than did traditional respondents, but not significantly so $t(367)=1.899$, $C=6$, $p>.05$ (Table H). A similar pattern was found for competence. The difference was not significant, although liberal respondents perceived female speakers using masculine intensifiers more competent than traditional respondents $t(367)=.867$, $C=6$, $p>.05$.

Sub-hypothesis 2c proposed that males using "feminine" intensifiers would be perceived as less competent and trustworthy by respondents who scored low on
the AWS than those who scored high. This hypothesis was not supported as the traditional respondents rated the male speaker higher in competence and trustworthiness than the liberal respondents. No further tests were conducted because the means were not in the predicted direction (Table I).

**Table I**

Means for AWS by Sex of Speaker by Type of Speech Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>AWS Score Type of Speech Style</th>
<th>Sex of Speaker</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>traditional powerful</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>27.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>27.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female intensifier</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>23.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>21.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male intensifier</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>24.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>24.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>liberal powerful</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>29.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>31.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female intensifier</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>23.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>23.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male intensifier</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>24.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>25.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>traditional powerful</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>29.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>31.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>female intensifier</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>28.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>29.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male intensifier</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>27.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>female</td>
<td>26.843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table con’d.)
The results of these analysis will be discussed in the following chapter. Suggestions for future research will also be offered.
Chapter 4

Discussion of Findings

This study examined whether messages exhibiting male or female intensifiers would vary significantly from a prototypical powerful message on perceived competence, trustworthiness, and masculinity. This study found that speech style does affect perceptions of competence and trustworthiness.

The first research question asked if speaker sex affects perceptions of speaker competence and trustworthiness. The analysis demonstrated that the sex of the speaker did not affect perceptions of speaker competence and trustworthiness. There was a non-significant trend that may indicate females are perceived as slightly more trustworthy. However the results demonstrate respondent perceptions of speaker competence and trustworthiness were not based on speaker sex as much as on speech style. This finding is consistent with past research: Bradac, Hemphill and Tardy (1981), Bradac and Mulac (1984), Hosman (1989), and Hosman and Wright (1987) all found that speech style was more influential than speaker sex.

The second research question asked if sex of the message recipient affects perceptions of competence and trustworthiness. The sex of the respondent did not influence perceptions of speaker competence and
trustworthiness. This finding is consistent with past research: Hosman and Wright (1987), and Wright and Hosman (1983) found that respondent sex was not a significant factor in the respondents' reactions to the sample messages. Bradac and Mulac (1984) did find a link between sex of respondent and interpretation of the message; however, the authors claimed this was a tenuous connection. They pointed out that the study only had a total of 29 subjects and only ten of those were men. Therefore, any conclusions should be carefully considered. Another set of studies that found a connection between respondent sex and reaction to the message was conducted by Bradac, Hemphill, and Tardy (1981). They conducted two studies that examined respondents' reactions to courtroom testimony by two defendants using either a powerful speech style or a powerless speech style. Respondent gender was significant in two areas, the rating of the seriousness of the act and potential for future violence. Males tended to judge the act as more serious when the defendant used a powerless speaker, whereas women tended to judge the act as more serious when the speaker used the powerful style. In the prediction of future violence women judged the defendants as less likely to engage in future violence than did men. However, it should be noted these findings were not replicated in the second study. So, it appears there is little connection between respondent sex and the evaluation of speech styles.
Research question three asked if messages containing "masculine" or "feminine" intensifiers produce significantly different evaluations of the speaker. Messages containing either "masculine" or "feminine" intensifiers did not differ significantly on respondent evaluations of the speaker for competence or trustworthiness. This research question was posed based on findings by Bradac, Mulac, and Thompson (1995). They suggested that intensifiers may be multi-dimensional. The authors stated that men and women both use intensifiers but they demonstrated a preference for different forms within this variable. They suggested that future research make a distinction between "masculine" and "feminine" intensifiers in order to avoid confounding the results. This study made the distinction between "masculine" and "feminine" intensifiers, however separating intensifiers into male and female domains did not result in significant differences in respondent perceptions.

However, it is unwise to abandon the possibility of separate male and female domains on the basis of one study. Burgoon, Birk, and Hall's (1991) research demonstrated that when men and women do not use the "expected" speech style they will not be as persuasive. Men were expected to use an aggressive style whereas, women were expected to use more prosocial techniques and any failure to comform resulted in diminished influence.
Similarly, Burgoon and Stewart (1975) found that women were most effective when they used less intense language in persuasion. These two studies seem to demonstrate that listeners have some a priori expectations about what is appropriate linguistic behavior for men and women.

The first hypothesis proposed that individuals using the powerful speech style are perceived as more competent and trustworthy than individuals using intensifiers. This hypothesis was supported. The powerful speech style was perceived as more competent than speech using either masculine intensifiers or feminine intensifiers. The powerful style was also perceived as more trustworthy than either masculine intensifiers or feminine intensifiers. This finding is consistent with previous research that found the powerful speech style is rated higher on variables such as competence, authoritativeness, and credibility (Bradac & Mulac, 1984; Bradac, Hemphill, & Tardy, 1981; Hosman, 1989).

Bradac and Mulac (1984) reported the powerful style was perceived as the most effective. Similarly, Erickson, Lind, Johnson, and O’Barr (1978) found powerful speakers were rated as more credible than powerless speakers. They claimed that the powerless style may undermine listener confidence in the veracity of the testimony. The lack of other powerless variables in Bradac and Mulac’s study could
indicate that intensifiers alone may function more as a
distraction rather than casting doubt about the speaker's
honesty.

Hypothesis 2 predicted an interaction between sex of
speaker and type of intensifiers after controlling for
attitudes toward women. This hypothesis was sub-divided in
order to make specific predictions. In order to have a
cohesive and complete discussion of hypothesis 2 the sub­
components and their results will be reviewed in the
following three paragraphs. A detailed discussion of the
results and the implications for hypothesis 2 will follow
the review of the findings.

Sub-hypothesis 2a proposed that females using
"feminine" intensifiers would be perceived as more competent
and trustworthy by traditional respondents than liberal
respondents. This hypothesis was not supported as the
liberal respondents rated the speaker higher in competence
and trustworthiness than the traditional respondents.

Sub-hypothesis 2b proposed that females using
"masculine" intensifiers would be perceived as more
competent and trustworthy by respondents who scored high on
the AWS than those who scored low. Although hypothesis H2b
was not significant, it was in the direction predicted.
Liberal respondents perceived female speakers using
masculine intensifiers more trustworthy than did traditional
respondents.
Sub-hypothesis 2c proposed that males using "feminine" intensifiers would be perceived as less competent and trustworthy by respondents who scored low on the AWS than those who scored high. This hypothesis was not supported as the traditional respondents rated the male speaker higher in competence and trustworthiness than the liberal respondents.

This set of three sub-hypotheses was based on past research on powerful and powerless speech styles, Expectancy Violation Theory, and attitudes toward women. Bradac, Mulac, and Thompson (1995) found men and women preferred different forms of intensifiers and this resulted in different ratings on aesthetic quality and social status. The "male" intensifiers reduced aesthetic quality and while "female" intensifiers increased aesthetic quality. They suggested that future research distinguish between these two forms of intensifier. Berryman and Wilcox (1980) found that messages high in feminine variables were rated as less powerful than messages containing masculine variables.

Carli (1990) claimed that masculine traits are viewed as positive while feminine traits are viewed as negative and this preference for masculine traits has carried over into language usage. Her study found that women using a tentative speech style were more effective when addressing men. She speculated that even though this speech style may
reduce ratings of competence it was more effective with men because it matched their expectations. However, women were less influenced by a woman using a tentative speech style. Carli suggested this could be due to the fact that other women found the speaker to be "less believable, likeable, competent" (p. 949). She asserted that this could be because women are more accustomed to hearing other women speak assertively and when the tentative style is used it violated their expectations. Overall, women using the tentative speech style risked lower ratings of competence.

Clearly, the past research on speech style (Berryman & Wilcox, 1980; Carli, 1990; Bradac, Mulac, & Thompson, 1995; Burgoon & Stewart, 1975; and Kern, Cavell, & Beck, 1985) has demonstrated that individuals have expectations about what types of speech is appropriate for men and women. For example, Burgoon and Stewart found that women were expected to use less intense language than men in persuasive messages. Expectancy Violation Theory and attitudes toward women were used in order to make a priori predictions about what these expectations would be. In the expectancy violation literature it was demonstrated that violations in respondent expectations would affect perceptions of the speaker.

The attitude toward women scale was used in order to determine if a respondent was either liberal or conservative and then predictions were made about how they
would react to different speech styles. Kern, Cavell, and Beck (1985) found that individuals with conservative attitudes toward women rated women’s assertive messages as less likeable than non-assertive messages. Berryman and Wilcox (1980) claimed that expectations about appropriate masculine and feminine behavior could influence language usage.

Contrary to what would be expected from an examination of the past research, the sub-hypotheses were not supported. Judgements of competence and trustworthiness were based on the presence or absence of intensifiers and not on the type of intensifiers. There are several possible explanations as to why the hypotheses that assumed respondents had expectations based on their attitude toward women about the use of gendered intensifiers were not supported.

The first possible explanation is that the attitude toward women scale was not a good predictor. Because this scale identifies a general attitude it may not be sensitive enough to allow for specific predictions within category of intensifiers. Splitting intensifiers into masculine and feminine is much more specific than examining intensifiers in general. Past studies such as Kern, Cavell, and Beck (1985) use AWS to make predictions about assertive statements used by females. Perhaps assertive statements do not invoke the same reaction as intensified statements.
It is possible that this scale classification of respondents as either traditional or liberal may not have provided the best information when examining non-assertive speech styles.

A second possible explanation is that intensifiers may not be a multi-dimensional variable as proposed by Bradac, Mulac, and Thompson (1995). It is possible that this may be a unidimensional variable. The concept that certain language variables are associated with either men or women has been supported by Berryman and Wilcox (1980), Mulac and Lundell (1986), Mulac, Lundell and Bradac (1986), and Mulac, Wiemann, Widemann, and Gibson (1988). However, Bradac, Mulac and Thompson (1995) were the first to suggest that specific variables may be further subdivided into masculine and feminine domains.

Although the results of this study did not support the notion that intensifiers can be sub-divided into masculine and feminine versions this area warrants further examination. Before reaching the conclusion that intensifiers are unidimensional more research should be conducted that examines gendered intensifiers using a variety of contexts.

The third possible explanation for the lack of significant findings for hypothesis 2 is because the difference between "masculine" and "feminine" intensifiers may be real, but small. Carli (1990) pointed out that in
such cases, it is expected to have a null finding occasionally. It is reasonable to believe that the difference between "masculine" and "feminine" intensifiers would be small; for example, smaller than between powerful speech and intensifed speech. This possibility further reinforces the need for more research on intensifiers as gender specific. The results from multiple studies will allow for more accurate conclusions about how intensifiers are functioning in the interaction.

The fourth possible explanation is that the victim testimony may not cause the respondents to question the trustworthiness or competence of the speaker. The respondents may believe the victim of the robbery to be truthful, therefore the difference in respondent perceptions of masculine and feminine intensifiers may not have a notable effect on their perceptions of trustworthiness. Similarly, the respondents may see the victim as competent to describe the robbery because he or she was the target of the attack. Consequently, the subtle difference between masculine and feminine intensifiers may not have emerged to impact ratings of competence.

**Recommendation for Future Research**

Future research should focus on expert testimony in the courtroom setting. The expert witness would be a better manipulation because expert testimony very often makes interpretations and draws conclusions. The
respondents may be more objective in their assessment of the expert witness. The perceived competence and trustworthiness may be more carefully considered if an expert witness is used because this person has to be convincing to jurors reviewing the facts of the case. It is also possible that respondents may find more reason to question the motivation of a person who is paid for an interpretation, rather than the victim of the attack.

**Limitations of the Study**

At this point it seems reasonable to consider potential limitations of this study. One possible limitation is the use of written transcripts. Can results obtained from written transcripts be generalized to the oral mode? Past research by Erickson, Lind, Johnson, and O'Barr (1978) and O'Barr (1982) found no significant differences in the evaluation of speech styles when comparing the oral and written modes of delivery. These results are consistent with Newcombe and Arnkoff's (1979) finding that there was no significant difference in the evaluation of hedges in the oral and written modes of delivery. A second limitation in manipulation of transcripts is that they may occasionally sound artificial. This could cause problems when trying to generalize the findings to other situations. A third limitation for this study is the use of college students.
The use of this population may preclude this study’s findings from being generalized to the population at large.

In summary, this research examined the influence of masculine intensifiers, feminine intensifiers and the powerful speech style on respondent evaluations of masculinity, competence, and trustworthiness. The results demonstrated that the powerful style results in the highest respondent evaluations and that there was no significant difference in ratings on either masculine or feminine intensifiers. This study demonstrated that the influence of speech style is not easily understood. Future research should continue to clarify the relationship between speech style and sex of speaker, as well as the impact on respondent perceptions.
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## Appendix

### Research Questionaire

For each item, just circle the number that corresponds to your answer:

1 = Strongly Disagree (DS)
2 = Disagree (D)
3 = Neutral (N)
4 = Agree (A)
5 = Strongly Agree (SA)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. It sounds worse when a woman swears than when a man swears.
2. There should be more women leaders in important jobs in public life, such as politics.
3. It is all right for men to tell dirty jokes, but women should not tell them.
4. It is worse to see a drunken woman than a drunken man.
5. If a woman goes out to work, her husband should share the housework, such as washing dishes, cleaning, and cooking.
6. It is an insult to a woman to have to promise "love, honor and obey" her husband in marriage ceremony when he only promises to "love and honor" her.
7. Women should have completely equal opportunities as men in getting jobs.
8. A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage.
9. Women earning as much as their dates should pay for themselves when going out with them.
10. Women should worry less about 1 2 3 4 5 being equal with men and more about being good wives and mothers.

11. Women should not be bosses in 1 2 3 4 5 important jobs in business and industry.

12. A woman should be able to go 1 2 3 4 5 everywhere a man does, do everything a man does, such as going to bars alone.

13. Sons in a family should be given 1 2 3 4 5 more encouragement to go to college than daughters.

14. It is ridiculous for a woman to 1 2 3 4 5 drive a train or for a man to sew on shirt buttons.

15. In general, the father should 1 2 3 4 5 have more authority than the mother in bringing up children.

16. The husband should not be 1 2 3 4 5 favored by law over the wife when property is divided.

17. A woman's place is in the home 1 2 3 4 5 looking after her family, rather than following a career of her own.

18. Women are better off having their 1 2 3 4 5 own jobs and freedom to do as they please, rather than being treated like a "lady" in the old-fashioned way.

19. Women have less to offer than men 1 2 3 4 5 in the world of business and industry.

20. There are many jobs that men 1 2 3 4 5 can do better than women.

21. Women should have as much 1 2 3 4 5 opportunity to do apprenticeships and learn a trade as men.

22. Girls nowadays should be allowed 1 2 3 4 5 the same freedom as boys, such as being allowed to stay out late.
The testimony on the following pages is from an actual trial. The testimony which you will read is the account of a restaurant employee present during a robbery, given as testimony under oath, in response to an attorney's questions in the courtroom.

As you read the transcript, picture the witness. After reading the transcript I will ask you to respond to what you have read. Please read the testimony carefully and do not discuss your impressions with those sitting around you.

Ok, go ahead and read the transcript.
Kernel Message
Courtroom Testimony

Attorney: Did anything unusual happen on January 12th?

John (Joan): Yes, we had a robbery at midnight.

Attorney: Tell us what happened.

John (Joan): Two men entered the store just before close. They ordered a carry out pizza and waited. The one that ordered the pizza was five ten, brown hair. He was wearing a baseball cap, you could only see a little of his hair and he had sloppy features, heavy growth of beard. They were wearing large sports jackets, bright colors.

Attorney: Were there other customers in the store?

John (Joan): There were no other customers.

Attorney: Okay, what next?

John (Joan): I put their pizza in the oven, and let another employee know that it would be coming out, and for her to look for it. I went to the office and started on the nightly paperwork. The next thing I recall, Mary walked up to the door, said she had handed them their pizza, and they stopped at the door and were hanging by the phone; acting like they were going to use it. I saw them there, and I told her to wait a few minutes and they would probably leave. She turned around, and I continued working on the computer, the next thing that happened was one of them rushed around the door with a gun drawn, and he was in my face. He said--its hard to recall exact words in a situation like that, but something to the effect of, "Get the money". I said, no problem, it is out front; I'll get it for you and walked towards the front of the store where the register is. I opened it for him, and he asked if it was all there. I told him it was all there.

Attorney: After the money was taken, what happened?

John (Joan): After the individual with the gun took the money, the second individual returned and I had backed up into the kitchen to get out of his way. Then the one with the gun told him to give it to me. The other pulled out a cylindrical object--it had a bright orange top, and pointed it at me, and then liquid hit my face, my eyes were burning, I couldn't see. Then they shoved me into the big walk-in refrigerator.

Attorney: Thank you. That will be all.
Attorney: Did anything unusual happen on January 12th?

John (Joan): Yes, real unusual, we had a robbery at midnight.

Attorney: Tell us what happened.

John (Joan): Two men entered the store just before close. They ordered a carry out pizza. The one that ordered the pizza was five ten, with extrememly brown hair. He was definitely wearing a very blue baseball cap, you could only see very little of his hair and he had real sloppy features, and a fairly heavy growth of beard. They were wearing real large sports jackets, very bright colors.

Attorney: Were there other customers in the store?

John (Joan): There were definitely no other customers.

Attorney: Okay, what next?

John (Joan): I put their pizza in the oven, and let another employee know that it would be coming out real soon. I started on lots of nightly paperwork. The very next thing I recall, Mary said she had handed them their pizza, and they completely stopped at the door and were hanging by the phone; they were definitely acting like they were going to use it. I told her to wait a very few minutes and they would probably leave. I continued to work on the computer, the very next thing that happened was one of them rushed around the door with a real big gun drawn, and he was completely in my face. He said--its real hard to recall exact words in a situation like that, but something like, "Get the money". I definitely said, sure, no problem, it is out front; I walked towards the front where the register is. I opened it for him, and he asked if it was all there. I told him it was definitely all there.

Attorney: After the money was taken, what happened?

John (Joan): After the individual with the gun took the money, the second individual returned, and I completely backed up into the kitchen to get out of his way. Then the one with the gun told him to give it to me. The other pulled out a real cylindrical object--it had a very bright orange top, and pointed it at me, and then lots of liquid hit my face, my eyes were burning, I completely could not see. Then they shoved me into the big walk-in refrigerator.

Attorney: Thank you.
Feminine Intensifiers

Courtroom Testimony

Attorney: Did anything unusual happen on January 12th?

John (Joan): Yes, really unusual, we had a robbery at midnight.

Attorney: Tell us what happened.

John (Joan): Two men entered the store just before close. They ordered a carry out pizza. The one that ordered the pizza was five ten, really brown hair. He was wearing a such a blue baseball cap, you could only see such a little bit of his hair and he had really sloppy features, and super heavy growth of beard. They were wearing overly large sports jackets, really bright colors.

Attorney: Were there other customers in the store?

John (Joan): There were totally no other customers.

Attorney: Okay, what next?

John (Joan): So, I put their pizza in the oven, and let another employee know that it would be coming out really soon. I started on a lot of the nightly paperwork. The next thing I recall, Mary said she had handed them their pizza, and they totally stopped at the door and were hanging by the phone; they were really acting like they were going to use it. So, I told her to wait a few minutes and they would probably leave. So, I continued working on the computer, the next thing that happened was one of them really rushed around the door with such a big gun drawn, and he was totally in my face. He said—its really hard to recall exact words in a situation like that, but something like, "Get the money". I said, sure, totally no problem, it is out front; so I walked towards the front where the register is. I opened it for him, and he asked if it was all there. I told him it was really all there.

Attorney: After the money was taken, what happened?

John (Joan): After the individual with the gun took the money, the second individual returned and I had totally backed up into the kitchen to get out of his way. Then the one with the gun told him to give it to me. The other pulled out a really cylindrical object— it had such a bright orange top, and pointed it at me, and then a lot of liquid hit my face, my eyes were really burning, I couldn't see. Then they shoved me into the big-walk in refrigerator.

Attorney: Thank you.
Place one "X" on each of the scales according to your reaction to the individual's courtroom testimony. Remember, the "X" should fall on the line not on top of a colon. Respond carefully and quickly. I want your initial reaction, so do not change any of the responses. Be sure to answer each question. Based on the testimony, the witness seemed like a person who is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>a little</th>
<th>unsure</th>
<th>a little</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>more masculine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less masculine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>untrained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unintelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inexpert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uninformed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incompetent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stupid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more feminine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less feminine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dishonest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>untrustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honorable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dishonorable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unethical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phoney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genuine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>womanly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is your age? __________

What is your gender?
    male    female

What is your religion?
Baptist    Catholic    Episcopal    Methodist    Other
Mormon    Pentecostal    Presbyterian    Muslim    None

What is your race?
    White (non-Hispanic)    Black    Asian
    Native American    Hispanic    Other ________

Under which college does your major fit?
    Liberal Arts    Arts
    Science & Technology    Undecided
    Business    Other ________

What is your political party orientation?
    Democrat    Republican    None    Other
Vita

Frances Brandau-Brown has always lived in the deep South. She grew up in Mobile, Alabama, and has attended universities in Mississippi and Louisiana. In the fall of 1987 she entered the University of Southern Mississippi in Hattiesburg. In 1991, she graduated with a bachelor of science degree in speech communication. She completed a master of arts degree in communication from U.S.M. in 1994. After teaching as a graduate student she realized she wanted to have an opportunity to teach and mentor students. The following fall she entered Louisiana State University to pursue a doctoral degree in speech communication. She has served as an Instructor in the Speech Department for 2 years while completing her degree. She is now a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in speech at Louisiana State University in August, 1999.
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