DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 624 CG 017 825

AUTHOR Wood, Wendy; Karten, Stephen J.
TITLE Sex Differences in Interaction Style as a Product of Perceived Sex Differences in Competence.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Mental Health (DHHS), Rockville, MD.
PUB DATE Aug 84
GRANT NIMH-1-R03-MH-39285-01A1
NOTE 26p.; A version of this report was presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (92nd, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, August 24-28, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Competence; *Group Dynamics; Higher Education; Personality Traits; *Sex Differences; Sex Role

ABSTRACT

Males' and females' interaction styles were observed while they worked in four-person, mixed-sex groups on a discussion task. In some groups, members were only given information about each others' names and gender. Under these conditions, males were perceived higher in competence than females. Further, males were found to engage in a greater amount of active task behavior than females (e.g., giving information, giving opinions), and females exhibited a greater amount of positive social behavior than males (e.g., agreeing, acting friendly). In other groups, members' competency-based status was manipulated by providing false feedback that they were high or low in overall intellectual and moral aptitude. High status members were then perceived to be more competent than low status ones, and further, high status individuals engaged in more active task and less positive social behavior than low status people. In these conditions, no effects for gender were obtained on perceived competence or on active task or positive social behavior. Correlational analyses supported the idea that the gender differences obtained in interaction when status was not specified were partially a function of inferred sex differences in competence. When direct information concerning members' competence was provided, however, this data apparently blocked the gender-to-competence inference and status alone affected perceived competence and interaction style. (Author)

Sex Differences in Interaction Style as a Product of Perceived Sex Differences in Competence

Wendy Wood and Stephen J. Karten

Texas A&M University

This research was supported by National Institute of Mental Health, Grant #1 R03 MH39285-01A1 to the senior author. A version of this report was presented at the 92nd annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Canada, 1984. The authors thank Karen Ponish for conducting the experimental sessions, Suzanne Daiss for her assistance in coding the videotapes, and Laura Bates and Tara Coker for their help coding data.

Correspondence should be addressed to Wendy Wood, Psychology Department, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843.

Running Head: SEX DIFFERENCES IN INTERACTION

Abstract

Males' and females' interaction styles were observed while they worked in 4-person, mixed-sex groups on a discussion task. In some groups, members were only given information about each others' names and gender. Under these conditions, males were perceived higher in competence than females. Further, males were found to engage in a greater amount of active task behavior than females (e.g., giving information, giving opinions) and females exhibited a greater amount of positive social behavior than males (e.g., agreeing, acting friendly). In other groups, members' competency-based status was manipulated by providing false feedback that they were high or low in overall intellectual and moral aptitude. High status members were then perceived to be more competent than low status ones and further high status individuals engaged in more active task and less positive social behavior than low status people. In these conditions, no effects for gender were obtained on perceived competence or on active task or positive social behavior. Correlational analyses supported the idea that the gender differences obtained in interaction when status was not specified were partially a function of inferred sex differences in competence. When direct information concerning members' competence was provided, however, this data apparently blocked the gender-to-competence inference and status alone affected perceived competence and interaction style.

Sex Differences in Interaction Style as a Product of Perceived Sex Differences in Competence

According to several recent reviews, gender differences have been consistently observed in research on small group interaction (Anderson & Blanchard, 1982; Baird, 1976; Carli, 1982). Following Bales's (1972) Interaction Process Analysis, most of the research in this area distinguished between at least two interaction styles, active task behavior (e.g., giving opinions, giving information) and positive social behavior (e.g., agreement, dramatizing). With few exceptions, males in groups have been found to engage in more task activity than females and females in groups to engage in a greater amount of positive social activity than males.

The most extensive review, covering 21 articles, was conducted by Carli (1982). This meta-analysis examined the magnitude of the above sex differences in terms of their effect size (d), which is a standardized score defined as the difference between the means of the male and female groups divided by the within-group standard deviation assumed to be common to the two populations (Cohen, 1977). Carli reported an effect size of between .35 and .59 for task behaviors,[1] representing a sex difference in the male direction, and an effect size of between -.36 and -.59 for positive social activity, representing a difference in the female direction. In addition, she found a slight tendency for males to have higher overall participation rates than females. These findings held across both same-sex and mixed-sex groups.

Despite the relatively clear-cut evidence for sex differences in interaction, there is at present little indication of what factos might be responsible for these effects One possible explanation emphasizes the impact

of contemporaneous social pressures, stemming from men's and women's roles in society. Research in this tradition has focused primarily on the greater status, or access to power, inherent in the roles traditionally filled by men than by women (Lockheed & Hall, 1976; Meeker & Weitzel-O'Neill, 1977). Yet the sex differences noted in the reviews above have been observed in settings in which men and women occupy exactly the same social role, that of a participant in a newly formed group. Behavioral sex differences in such settings are thought to arise from the tendency for sex to function as a status cue (Berger, Fisek, Norman, & Zelditch, 1977; Berger, Rosenholtz, & Zelditch, 1980; Eagly & Wood, 1982). Status cues lead people to have expectations about each others' behavior so that people who have characteristics (e.g., maleness) ordinarily associated with higher status roles in our society are assumed to be more competent (Berger et al., 1977).

Given that leadership status in small groups is positively associated with high participation rates, particularly high levels of task-oriented responses (Stein & Heller, 1979), men's tendency to engage in these kinds of activities can be understood as one aspect of their high group status. High participation rates and levels of task-oriented behavior may be a consequence of high status, since people at the top of a status hierarchy are allowed to engage in such activities with little fear of censorship from the rest of the group, as well as an antecedent of high status, since one method of attaining a high level position is to have your suggestions and ideas adopted by others. Women's (vs. men's) lower levels of task-oriented responses and their lower participation rates can similarly be explained in terms of their relatively low status.

Sex differences in group members' positive social-emotional behavior may

also be a function of the perceived link between gender and status. If low status group members want their ideas to be adopted, thus enhancing their own status, they must convince others that their contributions are motivated by group-oriented, rather than self-oriented, concerns (Ridgeway, 1978; 1981). According to Ridgeway (1978), the more a contribution is accompanied by positive social-emotional acts, the more likely it is to be labeled group-oriented in intent. In order to be influential, then, women, as low status members, may be required to engage in more positive social-emotional behavior than men, as high status members.

Some support for the idea that status underlies sex differences in small group interaction is provided in a study by Eskilson and Wiley (1976). Males and females in groups were assigned leadership roles either through random assignment, indicating that leaders and followers did not differ in initial competence, or on the grounds that the leader was ostensibly higher in competence than the followers. Although male leaders' behavior was not affected by the assigned vs. achieved manipulation, female leaders who supposedly achieved their status engaged in a higher proportion of the groups' active task behavior and showed a higher participation rate than appointed female leaders. Inspection of the cell means provides additional clarification of this effect: The typical sex difference of male (vs. female) leaders' higher participation rates and task activity when the leader and followers were assigned randomly was not obtained when leaders were higher in competence than followers. Enhancing women's competence relative to their group apparently modified the sex differences usually found in interaction style. It may be that the direct competence information provided with achievement of leadership blocked the

perception that women are less competent than men, and thus the expected sex differences were not obtained.

An alternate explanation for sex differences in interaction focuses on sex-typed attributes and personality traits. According to this approach, males and females acquire particular attributes as a product of socialization pressures that apply differentially to boys and girls. Attributes linked to gender through socialization processes are popularly conceptualized in terms of a two-dimensional model in which men are oriented toward agentic (also called task-oriented or instrumental) concerns and women toward communal (also called social-emotional or expressive) concerns (Bakan, 1966; Block, 1973). Agentic qualities are thought to include self-assertion, self-expression, and the desire to master, whereas communal qualities include selflessness, concern for others, and a desire to be at one with others. This agency vs. communion distinction is an important aspect of measures of gender-differentiating traits that contrast a femininity dimension, which represents mainly qualities of nurturance and expressiveness, with a masculinity dimension, which includes dominance and instrumental competence (Bem, 1974; Spence & Helmreich, 1978; 1980).

From this perspective, attributes related to active task behavior and high participation rates (e.g., assertiveness, competitiveness, the ability to lead) are components of the agentic or masculine dimension of gender. Also, attributes related to positive social behavior (e.g., kindness, awareness of others' feelings, warmth in relations with others) are components of the communal or feminine dimension of gender. Men's (vs. women's) greater participation rate and task-oriented activity and lesser positive social behavior may thus be behavioral manifestations of masculine and feminine

personality attributes. This explanation seems promising given that gender-differentiating traits have been found to predict dominance in small group discussions (Klein & Willerman, 1979), as well as quality of interaction n mixed-sex dyads engaged in a getting-acquainted exercise (Ickes, 1981; Ickes & Barnes, 1978).

The Present Research

The present research was designed to evaluate the extent to which perceived competence and gender-differentiating traits underlie sex differences in interaction. It was not intended to provide a test of the validity of one explanation versus the other, as it is possible that the two mechanisms work simultaneously to produce gender differences.

In some experimental conditions (comparison conditions), group members were initially informed only of other members' names and sex. We anticipated that, consistent with prior work (cf. Anderson & Blanchard, 1982), males would engage in a higher level of active task behavior, a lower level of positive social behavior, and would have a higher participation rate than females. Further, if perceived sex differences in competence underlie these gender differences, males should be viewed as more competent than females.

In other conditions (status-specified conditions), members were initially provided with information about each others' competence and thus potentially had two cues relevant to their own and others' competency-based status, that is, overall intellectual and moral aptitude as well as gender. Based on prior research (Ridgeway, 1978; Stein & Heller, 1979), it seemed likely that members high in such competency-based status would engage in a higher level of active task behavior, a lower level of positive social behavior, and would have a

higher participation rate than low status members. Also, subjects' perceptions of competence in this condition should be greatly affected by the direct manipulation of ability: High status members should be perceived more competent than low status ones.

It is less clear whether gender differences should be anticipated in perceived competence and interaction style in the conditions in which competence is directly manipulated. Some prior work has indicated that people average together two status-relevant attributes such as gender and overall competence, so that a highly competent woman would be perceived higher in status than a less competent woman but lower in status than a highly competent man (e.g., Webster & Driskell, 1978; Zelditch, Lauderdale, & Stublarec, 1980). Other work suggests that people form status judgments by focusing on only one of the status-relevant attributes (e.g., Freese & Cohen, 1973). Perhaps the most general formulation to date argues that status-relevant characteristics are combined according to a weighted averaging model (Hembroff, 1982). More importance, or weight, is assigned to an attribute the more direct its implications for performance of the group's task. In the present experiment, the direct competence information is likely to be weighted more heavily than gender because competence is more likely to provide task-relevant skills. It is anticipated, then, that in the status-specified conditions, the gender differences obtained in perceived competence and interaction style will be relatively weak and perhaps nonsignificant.

As noted above, it is also possible that sex differences in interaction represent behavioral manifestations of gender-differentiating personality traits. To assess this idea, at the beginning of the session all subjects

completed the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence & Helmreich, 1978), a measure of sex-role orientation. This instrument yields two separate scores, representing subjects' ratings on masculinity and femininity items. If gender-differentiating traits underlie sex differences in interaction, the scores on the masculinity scale would be positively related to amount of task-oriented behavior and scores on the femininity scale would be associated with amount of positive social behavior.

Method

Subjects

A total of 72 male and 72 female Texas A&M psychology students participated in an experiment examining how attributes of group members affect group performance. Subjects participated in four-person groups composed of two males and two females. Two of these groups were deleted from the analysis; one because a member was nonEnglish-speaking and one because a member was black. No record of interaction is available for a third group, due to an equipment failure. Thus only the questionnaire data was analyzed for this group.

Procedure

Subjects met in a small lab room, completed the informed consent forms, and were separated into cubicles. In the cubicles they provided some background information about themselves (age, sex, etc.), and then were given a "General Aptitude Test" which supposedly measured mathematical, verbal, and analytical ability, as well as quality of moral reasoning. The moral reasoning questions were adapted from Rest's (1979) test of moral development, and the remainder of the questions were adapted from a SAT study guide. Subjects were given 17 minutes to finish the test. The experimenter then collected the background

data sheets and the aptitude test and distributed a copy of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence & Helmreich, 1978), a measure of gender-differentiating traits.

In the status-specified conditions, the experimenter announced that she would score the aptitude tests while subjects completed the PAQ. After approximately 10 min., she returned to each cubicle and distributed a sheet with the subject's name, sex, and test score, along with this information for the other three group members. The experimenter explained that the scores were (supposedly) calculated by assigning the highest scoring group member 350 points and the remaining members' scores were calculated as a proportion of this total score. In reality, one male and one female were randomly selected to receive the high scores of 350 and 341 (high status positions), and the remaining two members received the low scores of 234 and 226 (low status positions).[2]

In the comparison conditions, the experimenter did not mention scoring the tests. The sheets subjects received describing the group members specified only their name and gender.

For all conditions, subjects then reconvened in the small lab room and were given name tags to wear. They were each given a written description of a discussion problem, which concerned a female college student suspected of using heroin. The group's task was to reach a unanimous decision concerning what the student's roommate should do about the suspected drug use. The experimenter informed the group that they would have 15 minutes to discuss and write their decisions on a blank piece of paper. When the experimenter left the room she turned on a video camera which was permanently affixed to one wall and a microphone built into the ceiling. Subjects were not aware they were being

taped.

At the end of the discussion session, subjects were separated again into cubicles and asked to rate the competence of individual group members (see below).

Finally, the taping procedure was explained to subjects, they were asked to sign a tape release form indicating that the tape could be used for research purposes, were debriefed, and excused.

Scoring of Interaction

For each group, five minutes of interaction was scored. The five-minute segments were taken from the third to the eighth minute, since most subjects had finished reading the problem description by three minutes and most groups were still actively working on the task at eight minutes.

One male and one female coder scored the interaction using Bales's (1972) Interaction Process Analysis. Coders were not able to accurately assess the target(s) of each statement and thus only the originator was recorded. Coders scored the tapes simultaneously, with each coder generating his or her own set of ratings (interrater reliability = 87.30%). Each statement was classified on recording sheets as falling into one of the following categories: agreement, dramatization, acting friendly, giving suggestions, giving opinions, giving information, asking for suggestions, asking for opinions, asking for information, disagreement, showing tension, or acting unfriendly. Following Bales's (1972) analysis, the scores were summed to form four groups of three ratings each, representing positive social behavior (inter-item correlation, mean $\underline{r}$ = .48), active task behavior (mean $\underline{r}$ = .39), passive task behavior (mean $\underline{r}$ = .47), and negative social behavior (mean $\underline{r}$ = .30), respectively.

Competence Ratings

Subjects rated each group member on several competence-related scales, which were adapted from Driskell and Webster's (in press) assessment of perceived competency-based status. On 15-point scales subjects rated the extent to which members (a) should perform well in situations in general, (b) would rate favorably in terms of things that count in this world, (c) are capable at most tasks, (d) have high abstract ability, (e) are intelligent, and (f) have high reading ability. Subjects provided these ratings by writing on each scale their own name and the name of each of the other members beside the scale points. Subjects were told not to assign two people to the same point on any one scale.

Discussion Performance

To evaluate performance, two independent coders determined the number of discrete solutions generated by each group, interrater reliability, $r(32) = .96$, the creativity of the overall product, $r(32) = .85$, and the adequacy of the product, $r(32) = .83$. No differences were obtained between status-specified and comparison groups on any of these measures (all Fs < 1).

Results and Discussion

To allow the comparison and status-specified conditions to be analyzed in the same design, the comparison subjects were randomly assigned to high and low status positions so that one male and one female from each group were designated high status and one male and female low status.

Competence Ratings

Competence ratings were first calculated by averaging across the ratings of the four members to yield scores representing the mean perceived performance, value, capability, intelligence, and abstract and reading ability of the high

status male, the high status female, the low status male, and the low status female. Note that this procedure combines subjects' evaluations of themselves and the other three members' evaluations of them into one score. When analyses were conducted to test for possible differences between own ratings of self and others' ratings, only a tendency toward modesty was obtained on two of the dimensions: Subjects' ratings of their own intelligence and reading ability were lower than others' ratings of them ($ps < .05$).

Factor analyses (varimax rotation) were performed on the six competence dimensions for each of the four combinations of status and gender. In each case this analysis yielded a one-factor solution. Further, the average inter-item correlation for ratings of the high status male was $r(134) = .43$; the high status female, $r(134) = .50$; the low status male, $r(134) = .49$; and the low status female, $r(134) = .38$. Competence indices were formed by taking the mean across the six rating scales to yield, for each group, the overall evaluation of each of the four group members.

An Experimental Condition (status-specified vs. comparison) X Gender (male vs. female) X Status (high vs. low) analysis of variance with repeated measures on the last two factors was then performed on the indices. Main effects were obtained for gender ($p < .01$), indicating that males were perceived to be more competent than females, and for status ($p < .01$), indicating that high status people were perceived more competent than low status ones (see Table 1). These

---

Insert Table 1 about here

main effects were modified by the predicted Condition X Gender interaction, $F(1,32) = 5.29$, $p < .05$, indicating that males were rated more competent than

females in the comparison condition, $F(1,32) = 6.89$, $p < .05$, but no gender difference was obtained in the status-specified condition ($F < 1$). Also as expected, a significant Condition X Status interaction, $F(1,32) = 10.08$, $p < .01$, indicated that high status people were considered more competent than low status ones in the status-specified condition, $F(1,32) = 9.57$, $p < .01$, yet no status effects were obtained in the comparison condition ($F < 1$).

These findings are consistent with the idea that gender serves as a cue to competency-based status in small groups. When status was not directly manipulated, males were perceived to be more competent than females. In contrast, when subjects were provided with information concerning their own and others' competence, this more direct status information formed the basis for competence judgments rather than gender.

Interaction Scores

Experimental Condition (status-specified vs. comparison) X Gender (male vs. female) X Status (high vs. low) analyses of variance with repeated measures on the last two factors were calculated on the interaction indices.

Analyses on the total number of responses subjects gave revealed that, consistent with prior work (Carli, 1982; Stein & Heller, 1979), males ($M = 31.82$) spoke more than females ($M = 25.28$), $F(1,31) = 5.63$, $p < .05$, and high status group members ($M = 32.58$) spoke more than low status ones ($M = 24.52$), $F(1,31) = 9.61$, $p < .01$. The anticipated interactions between status and condition and between gender and condition were not significant ($Fs < 1.30$, n.s.).

The scores for positive and negative social behavior and active and passive task behavior were transformed to proportions by dividing each score by the subject's total participation rate. Main effects were obtained for status and

gender (ps < .05), indicating that females and low status members tended to engage in more positive social activity than males and high status members (see Table 1). As predicted, these main effects were modified by a significant interaction between condition and status, $F(1,31) = 13.38$, $p < .001$, indicating that, for the status-specified conditions, low status people engaged in more positive social activity than high status ones, $F(1,31) = 13.68$, $p < .001$, but not for the comparison conditions, $F(1,31) = 1.90$, n.s. Further, an interaction between condition and gender, $F(1,31) = 6.58$, $p < .02$, indicated that females engaged in more positive social behavior than males in the comparison conditions, $F(1,31) = 17.78$, $p < .001$, but not in the status-specified conditions ($F < 1$).

Analyses on the proportion of active task behavior indicated that males engaged in more of this activity than females ($p < .001$, see Table 1). Further, as anticipated, a significant interaction between condition and status, $F(1,31) = 3.68$, $p < .05$, indicated that for the status-specified conditions, high status members engaged in more active task behavior than low status ones, $F(1,31) = 4.27$, $p < .05$, but not for the comparison conditions, $F(1,31) = 2.25$, n.s. Although the interaction between condition and gender was not significant, $F(1,31) = 2.01$, planned comparisons again indicated that males engaged in more active task behavior than females in the comparison conditions, $F(1,31) = 14.09$, $p < .001$, but not significantly more in the status-specified conditions, $F(1,31) = 2.91$, $p < .11$.

For passive task behavior and negative social activity, the only interpretable effect was the finding that high status members ($M = .021$) engaged in more negative social activity than low status ones ($M = .008$, $p < .05$).[3]

In sum, in the conditions in which subjects received false test-score feedback indicating that some group members were highly competent and others less competent, strong competency-based status effects were obtained. Group members high, compared with low, in status had higher participation rates, engaged in more active task behavior and less positive social behavior. In these conditions few gender differences were obtained. Males and females did not differ in amount of active task and positive social behavior. Only on overall participation rate was a gender difference obtained, such that males talked more than females.

In comparison conditions, in which subjects were informed only about each others' gender, the sex differences obtained were consistent with prior work (cf. Anderson & Blanchard, 1982; Carli, 1982) Males had higher participation rates than females, engaged in a higher level of active task behavior, and a lower level of positive social behavior. The only effect for status was the finding that subjects assigned to high status positions talked more than those assigned to low status ones. This status finding suggests that random assignment of subjects to high and low status positions was not effectively accomplished for the participation rate variable. Thus the greater talkativeness of higher status participants in the status-specified conditions could have been due to initial differences between high and low status subjects, rather than to the competence manipulation. Yet given the absence of any other effects for status in the comparison conditions, the observed links between status and task activity and between status and social activity in the status-specified conditions cannot easily be explained through this mechanism, and instead appear to be a function of the competence manipulation.

To provide a more direct test of the idea that perceived status underlies the gender differences obtained in interaction, partial correlations were calculated between perceived competency and the interaction scores, controlling for the experimental variations. The results indicated that higher perceived competence was associated with greater active task behavior, r (123) = .24, $p < .05$, was slightly related to lower positive social activity, r (123) = -.11, n.s., and was associated with higher negative social behavior, r(123) = .32, $p < .05$. Passive task activity and overall participation rate were unrelated to perceived status.

Gender-Differentiating Traits

The analyses employing sex and masculinity and femininity scores to predict interaction are complicated by the interdependency of subjects' responses within groups. The repeated measures designs used in the analyses above allow for such associations between the responses of members from the same group. However, this approach would be inappropriate when examining the impact of personality on individual subjects' responses, and instead it was decided to randomly select one subject from each group to be used in the analysis (see Kraemer & Jacklin, 1979). This procedure has the disadvantage of severely reducing the available N and thus our power to detect any effects of traits on interaction.

Hierarchical regression analyses were calculated to assess whether masculinity and femininity significantly improved prediction of positive and negative social behavior and active and passive task behavior beyond the predictive power of subject sex alone. When the two personality variables along with interactions between gender and masculinity, gender and femininity, masculinity and femininity, and masculinity, femininity, and gender were entered

into the regression equations after gender, none of the terms were significant.

Conclusion

In sum, the results provide relatively strong support for the idea that a perceived sex difference in competence is one factor underlying gender differences in interaction style. The greater task-oriented activity and lesser social activity of males compared with females in the comparison conditions proved to be partially a function of the greater perceived competence of men vs. women in this setting. In contrast, when status was directly manipulated through false test-score feedback, gender differences were attenuated and high, compared with low, status group members showed greater task and lesser social activity. Further, in the status-specified conditions, subjects' ratings of competence were affected only by the direct manipulation of status and not by gender.

The false test-score feedback in this study proved to be such a potent indicator of competence that subjects ignored the gender cue when this more direct competence information was available. As noted earlier, this finding is consistent with a weighted averaging model of perceived status (Hembroff, 1982) in that the most weight, or importance, was given to the status cue presumably most closely associated with performance of the group's task. It does not seem likely, however, that direct information concerning intellectual competence will block the perceived gender-to-competence link in the majority of settings. First, it is unusual in the real world to encounter data concerning one's own or others' aptitude that is as broad in its implications or as purportedly valid as the feedback we employed. Further, many tasks are more closely linked to gender than the discussion problem in the present work (e.g., comforting a child). For

these kinds of tasks, overall intellectual and moral aptitude may be judged relatively unimportant. Even specific task-relevant experiences (e.g., a father who is a single parent) or more general task-relevant abilities (e.g., a highly nurturant male) may be weighted less heavily than gender in calculations of competence at such highly sex-typed tasks.

The data do not point to perceived gender differences in competency-based status as the only factor underlying men's and women's interaction styles. One aspect of group members' interaction, participation rate, did not covary with their perceived competence. It may be that sex differences in participation rate stem from aspects of perceived status unrelated to competence, such as differences between men's and women's legitimate authority (cf. Fennell et al., 1978). Alternatively, participation rates may be a function of more personality-oriented variables, such as masculinity or femininity. Although the data did not provide much evidence that gender-differentiating traits played a causal role in any interaction sex differences, this null finding may in part be due to methodological limitations, particularly the small amount of power in our design to detect such differences. In addition, Epstein (1979) has argued that attempts to predict relatively specific behaviors on the basis of general personality traits, such as masculinity and femininity, may fail because of the absence of a reliable measure of behavior--one that aggregates behaviors across occasions or settings. An adequate test of the relationship between gender-differentiating traits and interaction style, then, awaits further research.

References

Anderson, L. R., & Blanchard, P. N. (1982). Sex differences in task and social-emotional behavior. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 3, 109-139.

Baird, J. E., Jr. (1976). Sex differences in group communication: A review of relevant research. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 62, 179-192.

Bakan, D. (1966). The duality of human existence. Chicago; Rand McNally.

Bales, R. F. (1970). Personality and interpersonal behavior. New York: Holt: Rinehart, and Winston.

Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 155-162.

Berger, J., Rosenholtz, S. J., & Zelditch, M., Jr. (1980). Status organizing processes. Annual Review of Sociology, 6, 479-508.

Berger, J., Fisek, M. H., Norman, R. Z., & Zelditch, M., Jr. (1977). Status characteristics and social interaction: An expectation states approach. New York: American Elsevier.

Block, J. H. (1973). Conceptions of sex roles: Some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives. American Psychologist, 28, 512-526.

Carli, L. (1982). Are women more social and men more task-oriented? A meta-analytic review of sex differences in group interaction, reward allocation, coalition formation, and cooperation in the prisoner's dilemma game. Unpublished manuscript, University of Masschusetts-Amherst.

Driskell, J. E., Jr., & Webster, M., Jr. (in press). Status generalization: New data. In J. Berger & M. Zelditch (Eds.), Status, attribution, and rewards. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1982). Inferred sex differences in status as a

determinant of gender stereotypes about social influence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, 915-928.

Epstein, S. (1979). The stability of behavior: I. On predicting most of the people much of the time. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1097-1126.

Eskilson, A., & Wiley, M. G. (1976). Sex composition and leadership in small groups. Sociometry, 39, 183-194.

Fennell, M. L., Barchas, P. R., Cohen, E. G., McMahon, A. M., & Hildebrand, P. (1978). An alternative perspective on sex differences in organizational settings: The process of legitimization. Sex Roles, 4, 589-604.

Freese, L., & Cohen, B. P. (1973). Eliminating status generalization. Sociometry, 36, 177-193.

Hembroff, L. A. (1982). Resolving status inconsistency: An expectation states theory and test. Social Forces, 61, 183-205.

Ickes, W. (1981). Sex-role influences in dyadic interaction: A theorectical model. In C. Mayo & N. Henley (Eds.), Gender and nonverbal behavior. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Ickes, W., & Barnes, R.D. (1978). Boys and girls together and alienated: On enacting stereotyped sex roles in mixed-sex dyads. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 669-683.

Klein, H. M., & Willerman, L. (1979). Psychological masculinity and femininity and typical and maximal dominance expression in women. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 2059-2070.

Kraemer, H. C., & Jacklin, C. N. (1979). Statistical analysis of dyadic behavior. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 217-224.

Lockheed, M. E., & Hall, K. P. (1976). Conceptualizing sex as a status characteristic: Application to leadership training strategies. Journal of Social Issues, 32, 111-124.

Meeker, B. F., & Wietzel-O'Neill, P. A. (1977). Sex roles and interpersonal behavior in task-oriented groups. American Sociological Review, 42, 91-105.

Rest, J. R. (1979). Development in judging moral issues. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ridgeway, C. L. (1978). Conformity, group-oriented motivation, and status attainment in small groups. Social Psychology, 41, 175-188.

Ridgeway, C. L. (1982). Status in groups: The importance of motivation. American Sociological Review, 47, 76-87.

Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). Masculinity & femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1980). Masculine instrumentality and feminine expressiveness: Their relationships with sex role attitudes and behaviors. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 5, 147-163.

Stein, R. T., & Heller, T. (1979). An empirical analysis of the correlations between leadership status and participation rates reported in the literature. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1993-2002.

Zelditch, M., Jr., Lauderdale, P., & Stublarec, S. (1980). How are inconsistencies between status and ability resolved? Social Forces, 58, 1025-1043.

Footnotes

1. This assessment of task activity collapsed across active task behavior (e.g., giving opinions) and passive task behavior (e.g., asking for opinions). Reviews such as Anderson and Blanchard's (1982) which distinguished between these two have noted weak or nonsignificant gender differences with passive task activity. Thus Carli's (1982) results may be due primarily to differences between males' and females' active task behavior.

2. Analyses on the scores subjects actually obtained yielded only one significant finding: On the quantitative items, males ($\underline{M}$ = 7.75) correctly solved more problems than females ($\underline{M}$ = 6.75, $\underline{p} < .05$).

3. In addition, analyses on passive task behavior yielded an interaction between condition and sex, $\underline{F}(1,31) = 4.27$, $\underline{p} < .05$, although post hoc comparisons revealed that no cell means were significantly different from each other.

Table 1

Perceived Competence and Interaction Style as a Function of Experimental Condition, Gender, and Status

Variable	Status-specified condition				Comparison condition			
	Males		Females		Males		Females	
	High status	Low status	High status	Low status	High status	Low status	High status	Low status
Perceived competence	11.98	11.04	11.99	10.84	11.80	11.65	10.83	11.05
Positive social behavior	.36	.43	.39	.56	.39	.33	.57	.51
Active task behavior	.58	.45	.50	.46	.54	.61	.37	.43

Note. Higher numbers represent greater competence and a larger percent of social and task activity. Cell ns range from 16 to 17.