ED 415 530   CS 509 653

AUTHOR   Sheeler, Kristina K. Horn
TITLE   Leadership, Communicator Style, and Gender: A Propositional
                Analysis.
PUB DATE   1997-11-00
NOTE   26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National
                Communication Association (83rd, Chicago, IL, November
                19-23, 1997).
PUB TYPE   Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *Administrator Effectiveness; Communication Problems;
                Communication Research; *Communication Skills; Interpersonal
                Communication; *Leadership; Literature Reviews;
                *Organizational Communication; Sex Differences; *Sex Role
IDENTIFIERS   *Communicator Style; *Gender Issues; Management Skills;
                Propositional Analysis; Prototypes

ABSTRACT
        This essay is a propositional analysis of the literature on
the interrelationship of communicator style and gender as evidenced in the
organizational setting. Pavitt's (1989) notion of the prototype is extended
to the realm of organizational communication in developing five propositions:
(1) the prototype of the effective manager is more likely to influence
perceptions of individuals in the organizational setting than are gender
stereotypes; (2) however, other studies indicate that our notion of the
prototype of a leader/manager/superior is gendered; (3) the prototypical
female manager is more collaborative relative to the prototypical male
manager; (4) a gendered prototype may negatively affect women in the
organizational setting; and (5) a cultural/diversity model that moves beyond
gender can help to eliminate the gender gap. (Contains 54 references.)
(Author)

ED 415 530

Running Head: LEADERSHIP, STYLE, AND GENDER

Leadership, Communicator Style, and Gender:

A Propositional Analysis

Commission on Training and Development

National Communication Association Convention

November 1997

Chicago, IL

Kristina K. Horn Sheeler

ksheeler@indiana.edu

Department of Speech Communication

809 E. 7th Street

Indiana University

Bloomington, IN 47405

1

CS S09653

2

Abstract

This essay is a propositional analysis of the literature on the interrelationship of communicator

style and gender as evidenced in the organizational setting. Pavitt's notion of the prototype is

extended to the realm of organizational communication in developing five propositions: (1)

The prototype of the effective manager is more likely to influence perceptions of individuals in

the organizational setting than are gender stereotypes; (2) However, other studies indicate that

our notion of the prototype of a leader/manager/superior is gendered; (3) The prototypical

female manager is more collaborative relative to the prototypical male manager; (4) A

gendered prototype may negatively affect women in the organizational setting; and (5) A

cultural/diversity model that moves beyond gender can help to eliminate the gender gap.

Leadership, Communicator Style, and Gender:

A Propositional Analysis

Research on women in organizational settings begins trivially with studies on how to

"dress for success" (Kleiner, 1983) or on conversational differences between women and men

(Bischoping, 1993). As women begin to move into management positions, the amount of

research increases, focusing on communication needs and how to manage home and the

workplace. However, the majority of the research concerns itself with the differing needs of

men and women in the workplace, much of it asserting that women should develop more

masculine traits to succeed in the "rough and tumble" world of business. Just recently, the

research on women in the workplace has shifted from a model of difference to a model of

cultural/diversity training, focusing on the skills women and men bring to the workplace. Yet

this research is clearly overshadowed by the numerous studies which have emphasized the

perceived differences between women and men.

This essay is a review of the literature on the interrelationship of communicator style

and gender as evidenced in the organizational setting. Guiding this study are the questions:

What, if any, differences are perceived in the communicator style of women and men in the

organizational setting and what effect do perceived differences have on individual effectiveness

in the workplace? This analysis considers any study published in communication journals and

business journals with a communication focus done between the years 1979 to the present;

however, it also includes two 1974 studies and one 1976 study. Several databases were used

to begin the study: PsychLit, SocioFile, Business Index, MLA, EXAC, Lexis/Nexis, and the

internet as well as the most recent edition of <u>Matlon's Index to Journals in Communication</u>

<u>Studies</u>. In addition, the following terms were targeted in several combinations: gender,

women, communication, communicator style, organization, and business. An initial working

bibliography, consisting of several hundred potential studies to use for this propositional

analysis, was obtained from the data bases as well as bibliographies. However, given the

parameters of the assignment as well as manageability, a narrower focus was necessary. I

began to eliminate sources on situations other than the formal organizational setting (e.g.,

marriage, health, media). In addition, any sources which could be considered popular rather

than scholarly were eliminated as well as studies from Europe and studies involving children.

While still having well over one hundred sources, I began to make more serious eliminations.

A final decision was made to eliminate books as well as psychology and sociology journals. As

indicated by the word grid (see Appendix A), this propositional analysis is based on

approximately 45 primary studies from communication and business journals on the

relationship between communicator style and gender in the organizational setting. Realizing

that the last "elimination round" was a serious one, any future research must take into account

books as well as journals in psychology and sociology.

The propositions discovered revolve around the notion of the prototype as developed

by Pavitt and Haight (1985, 1986) and further evaluated by Pavitt (1989). Loosely defined,

the prototype concept suggests that individuals possess an "implicit theory" of the

communicatively competent individual that they use to assess others as well as themselves. I

extend Pavitt's notion of the prototype to the realm of organizational communication in

developing five propositions: (1) The prototype of the effective manager is more likely to

influence judgments of individuals in the organizational setting than are gender stereotypes; (2)

However, other studies indicate that our notion of the prototype of a leader/manager/superior

is gendered; (3) The prototypical female manager is more collaborative than the prototypical

male manager; (4) A gendered prototype may negatively affect women in the organizational

setting; and (5) A cultural/diversity model that moves beyond gender can help to eliminate the

gender gap. As my propositions progress I also develop the argument that the value of the

prototype may be a negative one when it is focused on individuals. Instead, as Rosener (1995)

argues, a shift in the organizational culture from one that values gendered contributions

differently to one that finds value in the various contributions of individuals could be beneficial

to all.

I. The prototype of the effective manager is more likely to influence perceptions of

individuals in the organizational setting than are stereotypes regarding gender.

Andrews (1984) and Bunji and Andrews (1985) in their research on college students

who participated in group discussions indicate that persons who are perceived as having more

skills are the emergent group leaders. In particular, prototypical leadership skills are identified

as task oriented and problem solving skills as well as giving opinions which lead the group to

task accomplishment. In addition, performance self esteem is indicated as the overall predictor

of leadership emergence. If the participants possess a high level of self esteem, the authors

posit that those individuals are more likely to participate in the group discussion in the first

place. While the 1985 study does indicate that the gender of the group members comprising

the majority of the group could be a factor in predicting the gender of the emergent leader, the overall assessment is that gender is less important than self esteem and skill as perceived by group members in predicting leadership emergence.

In an early study in gender research, Miner (1974a, 1974b) suggests that there is no difference in the motivation of female managers as compared to that of male managers. Both genders perceive themselves to be equally successful and equally motivated to take on management positions. Further, college students with high motivation to manage are indeed going into management professions. In addition, Harlan and Weiss (1982) claim that male and female managers have similar overall psychological profiles as determined by self perceptions as well as interviews. Thus, the prototype of the successful manager possesses not only problem solving and task completion skills, but also stable personality characteristics not influenced by gender.

In studies of managers' use of power, Ragins (1989) posits that regardless of gender, individuals prefer that male and female managers use referent and expert power bases. This finding is based on a questionnaire on perceived power and leadership. Previously, Solomon, Brehony, Rothblum, and Kelly (1982) analyzed tape recordings of men and women in the business setting and their findings also indicate a power preference, that the self-effacing approach is not preferred in either gender. Finally, Hirokawa, Kodema, and Harper (1990) in a study of men and women managers who have equal power in the organization to fire subordinates, find that managers more often use punishment-based strategies when taking action with a subordinate. With this, power bases become part of the prototypical manager.

Related to the issue of power, an "Editorial" in <u>Business Week</u> (1994, October 24) suggests that speech styles depend on the status difference between the speaker and the audience, not gender. In particular, this editorial takes issue with Deborah Tannen's book <u>You Just Don't Understand</u> that explores speech differences between men and women. The "Editorial" asserts that women must not blame their lack of success on their speech style, but instead must search for access to networks and mentors, for example, in order to gain power within the organization. For, with increased power and tenure with the organization, gender related differences in task related values diminishes, according to a study conducted by Gomez-Mejia (1983). Finally, Donnell and Hall (1980) in a study of managers, indicate many similarities between men and women in their self perceptions of managerial philosophy, style, competence, motivation, and participation.

Based on the above research, the prototype of the effective manager is more likely to influence perceptions of individuals in the organizational setting than are stereotypes regarding gender. In particular, the effective manager is one who possesses task and problem solving skills, high self esteem, high effectance motivation and other stable personality characteristics, a varied repertoire of communicator style characteristics, and uses power bases effectively. However, other studies indicate that our prototypical notion of the effective leader not only possesses more specific characteristics, but also that those characteristics are gendered.

II. Our notion of the prototype of a leader/manager/superior is gendered.

Three studies provide a more general notion of the competent communicator as gendered. First, Stephen and Harrison (1985) provide an example of a study which reinforces

cultural stereotypes. In a study of 225 elementary school teachers who completed the Bem

Sex Role Inventory, the study concludes that males tend to repress emotional expression, have

confidence, and are willing to use manipulation while females perceive themselves as "smelling

pleasant," using emotions, gossiping, and possessing a soft voice. This study goes on to

indicate that androgynous individuals have a more varied repertoire than do males or females.

Gudykinst and Lim (1985) in a study of self perceptions of communicator style determine that

males rate themselves higher in the dominant, contentious, impression leaving, dramatic, and

relaxed dimensions of the Norton Communicator Style measure than do women. Finally,

Duran and Carveth (1990) extend gendered prototypes as indicated above to the notion of

communication competence. Participants in this study were asked to fill out a semantic

differential scale for each of the possible situations indicated by the statement:

"Valerie/Michael is more self assured/quiet." While the self assured trait produced a more

competent rating than did quiet, the more significant conclusion was that Michael rated as

more competent than Valerie regardless of the trait listed. Thus, this research supports a claim

that males are considered more competent than females and by extension masculine traits are

considered more competent that are feminine traits.

The research supporting gender stereotypes feeds our managerial prototype. The work

of Rosenfeld and Fowler (1976) develops democratic and autocratic models of male and

female leadership styles. The female democratic leader is emotional, helpful, and affectionate

while the male democratic leadership style is forceful, intelligent, analytical, and indicative of a

high moral-ethical self concept. The autocratic leadership style is perceived more negatively

for each gender and is aggressive, revengeful, and desirous of being perceived as an authority.

More obvious indications that gender stereotypes influence the managerial prototype are found

in the research of Powell and Butterfield (1979) which indicates that 65% of male and female

business students believe that a good manager possesses masculine traits. Finally, Wong,

Kettlewell, and Sproule (1985) in a survey of 66 businesswomen ascertain that women in male

dominated businesses are more likely to perceive they have masculine personality traits.

Perhaps this is an attempt to circumvent the similarity-attraction hypothesis from the research

of Tsui and O'Reilly (1989). This hypothesis purports that superiors are more likable who

share demographic traits with the subordinate, including gender similarity. However, women

who develop masculine traits to cope in the workplace are not always comfortable with their

decision to do so as indicated by the findings of Sheppard (1989), which state that professional

women perceive a conflict between appearing feminine and being businesslike, the "double

bind," and the topic of a book length study by Jamieson (1995).

**III. The prototypical female manager is more collaborative than the prototypical male
manager.**

A collaborative approach to leadership is in contrast to a more instrumental or control

oriented approach. If a collaborative approach is used, more emphasis is placed on the people

involved in the interaction. The leader attempts to involve everyone in the discussion in an

open, friendly manner. Edelsky's 1981 study determines that women prefer this type of

approach in meetings over a control oriented approach. Specifically, when a collaborative

approach is used, women talk as much as men; whereas if one person is in charge, women do

not take part in the discussion as often. Baird and Bradley (1979) surveyed 150 subordinates and their findings show that subordinates perceive women supervisors as exceeding men in interpersonal relations and other receptiveness. In addition, such behavior was found to have a positive effect on employee morale. Baird and Bradley tentatively suggest that females may be more effective supervisors than the male managers in this study. Many of these findings are echoed by Berryman-Fink (1985), whose research also indicates that female managers are perceived to be more interpersonally competent. Specifically, women managers are perceived to be better listeners, verbally skilled, nonverbally astute, empathic, receptive, sensitive, honest, flexible, and personable than male managers. She suggests that the perceived differences indicate a need for men and women to discuss together what women do bring to the organizational setting and work toward behavior flexible management. However Berryman-Fink also indicates areas in which managers perceive women need training: assertiveness, confidence-building, public speaking, enhancing credibility and authority, professionalism, and controlling emotions. These traits are more stereotypically male, and Berryman-Fink suggests that women may simply need to learn to succeed in the male management atmosphere.

Other studies that support the collaboration model for women include Josefowitz (1980) whose conclusions indicate that women managers are more available to subordinates than are male managers based on observations as well as interviews; Smeltzer and Watson (1986) whose findings indicate that women managers use networking for social support; Lamude and Daniels (1984) who reveal that female subordinates perceive female managers as more dramatic and open than male managers based on Norton's Communication Style measure;

and Fowler and Rosenfeld (1979), who corroborate Rosenfeld and Fowler's (1976) findings that the male democratic leader is forceful, analytical, and utilitarian, while the female democratic leader is helpful, affectionate, and desirous of unity/stability.

When disciplining a non-compliant subordinate, three studies indicate women manager's other-oriented style. Harper and Hirokawa (1988) indicate that male managers use punishment strategies as opposed to women managers who are more likely to rely on altruism and rationale-based strategies when convincing a subordinate of an obligatory task. This finding is confirmed by Hirokawa, Kodama, and Harper (1990). Also, women managers are much slower to shift to coercive communication with non-compliant subordinates than are male managers as indicated by Conrad (1991).

Three studies indicate women managers' verbal collaboration skills during meeting situations. Kennedy and Camden (1982), while finding that women interrupt more than men during meetings, also indicate that women more often do the interrupting for the purposes of clarification or agreement, rather than disagreement or control. Smeltzer and Fann (1989) in research on verbal contributions, conclude that women managers use more disclaimers, interruptions, and attempted interruptions than male managers, indicating an attempt to take part in the collaboration. Finally, Haddock (1995) posits in a non-empirical study that powerful women encourage others to express themselves and empower others in the process. Much of this research indicates that a collaborative model indeed has a positive effect on the workplace environment, elevating morale and producing relationships. However, not all gendered prototypes are valued as productive.

IV. Gendered prototypes may negatively affect women in the organizational setting.

As proposition two indicates, the prototype of the competent manager may indeed be modeled after masculine stereotypes. As a result, feminine characteristics are devalued in the workplace which has a negative effect on the morale and productivity of women. For example Brass (1985) discovers that men and women more often form gender-segregated networks in the workplace and that male networks are perceived as more influential than female networks. Recall the above study by Smeltzer and Watson (1986) that indicates that women managers use networking for social support, whereas men use networking for instrumental support. While social support may be more valuable for the workplace environment, it still seems that the bottom line is task accomplishment over relationship development. While this may be a practical need, it does not serve to value or advance a collaborative model which is more often used by women.

Siegerdt (1983) in a study involving almost 3000 participants based on the International Communication Association data bank, determines that women perceive they have less communication influence in the organization and are less satisfied with their communication even though they rely on more formal job communication. Perhaps this speaks again to the findings of Sheppard (1989) who confirms that professional women perceive a conflict between appearing feminine and being businesslike, the "double bind."

Dobbins, Long, Dedrick and Clemsons (1990) in a study about the role of self monitoring and gender on leader emergence ascertain that high self monitors emerge as leaders more often than low self monitors. The authors define self monitoring behavior as initiating

more structure and conforming to the leadership prototype held by the group. While this at first may appear to be unrelated to gender, the authors further indicate that men more often than women utilize high self monitoring behavior; thus women less often conform to the leadership prototype. The study moves on to claim that women are at an unfair disadvantage in becoming the leader of a mixed sex group. This study has serious implications for women emerging as successful leaders in the workplace.

Duerst-Lahti (1990) corroborates the unfair disadvantage claim specifically in a study of verbal contributions made by women in a decision making arena of mixed sex employees. While the overall verbal contributions of women are determined to be similar to men's, women had to expend extra effort simply to achieve the same ends. Interestingly, two of the women in this study held the highest positions in the organization, so status was not an indicator of verbal contributions. Furthermore, women took on more stereotypical functions such as recorder, even though their status was higher.

Similarly, research by Fairhurst (1993) finds that male group members construct a stereotypical role for their female leaders that is not challenged by the women in the group. Fairhurst tape recorded actual leader-member conversations and asked the participants to fill out questionnaires on participative decision making. While this study corroborates the findings indicating that women prefer a more collaborative model of workplace communication, it also indicates that when status inconsistency is present, the power of the leader is countered by the social power of the member. Instead of responding with legitimate authority, women

managers more often counter male members' challenges to their authority with ego-massage, face support, and collaboration.

Finally, Penley, Alexander, Jernigan, and Henwood (1991) surveyed mid and upper level bank managers and their findings indicate that female managers are more apprehensive about public communication and communication in general than are male managers. Additionally, women managers score higher on introversion than male managers and even have more difficulty in writing than men. While many factors could explain this phenomenon, one possible answer is that women are self conscious about measuring up to the managerial prototype which is gendered masculine. As a result they may feel that they are being evaluated or compared to the masculine prototype instead of valued for their individual contributions.

V. A model that moves beyond gender can help to eliminate the gender gap.

Seven non-empirical studies offer ways we may move beyond gender in order to bridge the gender-communication gap. Putnam (1982) suggests that research begin to look at cognitive style constructs rather than gender in order to break away from self-evident assumptions and gender stereotypes. In addition, Putnam asserts that gender research is "theoretically barren," necessitating that researchers ground their communication perspectives in context and process. Finally, Putnam suggests that while androgyny research has its limitations, it does provide a move to the study of multiple categories of gender identity.

Kenton (1989) makes a move to develop a new model of credibility to value women's contributions as well as men's. Instead of the two dimensional model consisting of trustworthiness and expertise, Kenton posits a four dimensional model which includes (1)

goodwill and fairness, (2) expertise, (3) prestige, and (4) self presentation. The author

develops a possible research hypothesis which asserts that with training in self presentation,

women's contributions will be valued as credible just as often as men's.

In "Communication: Bridging the Gender Gap," HR Focus (1994, April) suggests a

general process to bridge the gender gap based on Dr. Judith Tingley's book Genderflex:

Ending the Workplace War Between the Sexes. The main focus of the model is that it

suggests acknowledging differences, but not making judgments based on them. Techniques for

women and men to enhance their communication are also offered.

However, the most useful suggestion, as well as an apparent trend developing in the

research, suggests that researchers conceptualize gender research as a culturally constructed

arrangement of biology and social life (Rakow 1986). Brownell (1993) suggests a model of

cross gender communication that explains the challenges of listening, gaining credibility,

nonverbal and verbal communication. Kennedy and Everest (1991) explore the high context

culture versus the low context culture and suggest that women are more comfortable in high

context cultures whereas men are more comfortable in low context cultures. As a result, cross

gender communication is conceptualized as intercultural communication. In addition, the

authors also explore, for example, Asian culture as another high context culture, asserting that

during the next ten years organizations are going to hire more minorities into the workplace

and must learn to communicate effectively across cultures. In this model, individuals are

valued for their contributions, not devalued for their differences. Finally, Rosener (1990)

suggests that organizations begin developing and valuing leadership behaviors based on

"shared experiences of women" (p, 119) as contributions to the organizational culture. She

generates a fundamental shift from focusing on individual differences within the workplace to

focusing on the organization as a culture with a variety of valued participants.

Conclusions

Clearly, research on leadership and gender in the organizational setting is varied and at

times contradictory as indicated by propositions one and two. Studies determining that gender

is not an issue (proposition one), more often developed hypotheses based on this assumption.

For example, high performance self esteem or a high level of skills will influence leadership

emergence. Gender is not the primary focus of the hypotheses. In addition, these studies more

often discovered more nuanced findings which were more beneficial for future research

developments. Alternately, studies indicating that gender differences do exist developed

hypotheses couched in this assumption. For example, masculine behaviors are perceived as

more communicatively competent than female behaviors. In other words, difference studies

went looking for differences and found them, merely serving to perpetuate gender stereotypes

rather than move beyond them in a truly creative manner. It has only been within the last ten

years that a diversity model has been acknowledged in addition to a model which privileges

difference. However, with no empirical studies published in communication or business

journals, this is a clear line of research just waiting to be explored. Until researchers become

reflexive enough to consider the stereotypes that their research perpetuates, we will continue

to have studies that conclude that men and women are different based on stereotypes. Until

alternative models of leadership are posited, we will still have research that perpetuates the managerial prototype that conforms to a stereotypical masculine model of competence.

While the research findings under proposition one have done more to expand our factual knowledge beyond stereotypes, clearly this research is in the minority. While the majority of research assumes difference along gender lines, that research is lacking in theoretical grounding. In addition, the Bem Sex Role Inventory is a common tool among researchers. However, its usefulness has been questioned. For example, Blanchard-Fields, Suhrer-Roussel, and Hertzog (1994) condemn studies of difference in gender research. In particular they assert that the BSRI can only account for global masculinity and femininity traits; however individuals are multi-dimensional. Thus the BSRI is inadequate as a research tool in gender inquiry, yet it is often relied upon. More development in research methods and theoretical underpinnings is needed in gender research. In addition, the field could benefit from more interdisciplinary work between communication scholars and sociologists, for example, to develop a cultural understanding of leadership and the way it is constructed. In addition, alternative models of leadership are necessary which find space for a collaboration model which would invite more women into managerial positions and eliminate some of the disadvantages already inherent in the current masculine prototype. The collaborative model values individuals in relationships and increases morale, and a logical extension is that productivity would also increase if the employees enjoy the workplace.

This particular study was limited in that it only considered studies from communication and business journals. As a result, the great wealth of books on gender and leadership were

not evaluated for this study. A trend in the research seems to be the development of book

length studies or collections of essays (Rosener 1995, Billing and Alvesson 1994, Tanton

1994, Sekaran and Leong 1992, Woods 1988). In addition, numerous studies have been

published in psychology and sociology journals that were not considered within the scope of

this study.

This review attempted to extend Pavitt's notion of the prototype (1985, 1986, 1989) to

the realm of organizational communication in developing five propositions: (1) The prototype

of the effective manager is more likely to influence perceptions of individuals in the

organizational setting than are gender stereotypes; (2) However, other studies indicate that our

notion of the prototype of a leader/manager/superior is gendered; (3) The prototypical female

manager is more collaborative than the prototypical male manager; (4) A gendered prototype

may negatively affect women in the organizational setting; and (5) A cultural/diversity model

that moves beyond gender can help to eliminate the gender gap. To come full circle we must

return to the initial questions: What, if any, differences are perceived in the communication

style of women and men in the organizational setting and what effect do perceived differences

have on individual effectiveness in the workplace? Answered with propositions two through

four, the explanation is not as important as realizing that this may not have been the most

productive question to guide this analysis. As the development of the propositions suggest, the

value of the prototype may be a negative one when it is focused on individuals. Instead, as

proposition five suggests, a shift in the organizational culture from one that values gendered

contributions differently to one that finds value in the various contributions of individuals could

be beneficial to all. Many opportunities for research exist in the field of gender and leadership

in the organizational setting, research that hopefully will not continue to support gender

stereotypes. This review is structured in such a way as to move the field in a more productive

direction, one that challenges the assumptions that underlie our research and the questions we

ask when conducting it.

References

Andrews, P.H. (1984). Performance, self esteem, and perceptions of leadership emergence: A comparative study of men and women. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 48, 1-13.

Baird, J.E., Jr., and Bradley, P.H. (1979). Styles of management and communication: A comparative study of men and women. Communication Monographs, 46, 101-111.

Berryman-Fink, C., and Fink, C.B. (1985). Optimal Training for Opposite Sex Managers. Training and Development Journal, 39(2), 27-29.

Billing, Y.D., and Alvesson, M. (1994). Gender, Managers, and Organizations. (New York: Walter de Gruyter).

Bischoping, K. (1993). Gender differences in conversation topics. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 28, 1-18.

Blanchard-Fields, F., Suhrer-Roussel, L., and Hertzog, C. (1994). A confirmatory factor analysis of the Bem Sex Role Inventory: Old questions, new answers. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 30, 423-458.

Brass, D.J. (1985). Men's and women's networks: A study of interaction patterns and influence in an organization. Academy of Management Journal, 28, 327-343.

Brownell, J. (1993). Communicating with credibility: the gender gap. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 34, 52-62.

Bunji, J.M., and Andrews, P.H. (1985). Gender and leadership emergence: An experimental study. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 50, 246-260.

Communication: Bridging the gender gap. (1994, April). HR Focus, 71(4), 22.

Conrad, C. (1991). Communication in conflict: Style-strategy relationships. Communication Monographs, 58, 135-155.

Dobbins, G.H., Long, W.S., Dedrick, E.J., and Clemsons, T.C. (1990). The role of self-monitoring and gender on leader emergence: A laboratory and field study. Journal of Management, 16, 609-618.

Donnell, S.M., and Hall, J. (1980). Men and women as managers: A significant case of no significant difference. Organizational Dynamics, 8, 60-77.

Duerst-Lahti, G. (1990). But women play the game too: Communication control and influence in administrative decision making. Administration and Society, 22, 182-205.

Duran, R.L. and Carveth, R.A. (1990). The effects of gender-role expectations upon perceptions of communicative competence. Communication Research Reports, 7, 25-33.

Edelsky, C. (1981). Who's got the floor? Language in Society, 10, 383-421.

Editorial. (1994, October 24). It's power, not the way you talk. Business Week, 3395, 118.

Fairhurst, G.T. (1993). The Leader-Member Exchange patterns of women leaders in industry: A discourse analysis. Communication Monographs, 60, 321-352.

Fowler, G.D., and Rosenfeld, L.B. (1979). Sex differences and democratic leadership behavior. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 45, 69-78.

Gomez-Mejia, L.R. (1983). Sex differences in factors affecting managerial career advancement. Academy of Management Journal, 26, 492-499.

Gudykunst, W.B., and Lim, T.S. (1985). Ethnicity, sex, and self perceptions of communicator style. Communication Research Report, 1, 68-75.

Haddock, P. (1995). Communicating personal power. Supervision, 56, 20.

Harlan, A., and Weiss, C.L. (1982). Sex differences in factors affecting managerial career advancement. In P.A. Wallace (Ed.), Women in the Workplace (pp. 59-100). Boston: Auburn.

Harper, N.L., and Hirokawa, R.Y. (1988). A comparison of persuasive strategies used by female and male managers. Communication Quarterly, 36, 155-168.

Hirokawa, R.Y., Kodama, R.A., and Harper, N.L. (1990). Impact of managerial power on persuasive strategy selection by female and male managers. Management Communication Quarterly, 4, 30-50.

Jamieson, K.H. (1995). Beyond the double bind: Women and leadership. New York, Oxford University Press.

Josefowitz, N. (1980). Management men and women: Closed vs. open doors. Harvard Business Review, 58, 56-60.

Kennedy, C.W., and Camden, C.T. (1982). A new look at interruptions. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 47, 45-58.

Kennedy, J. and Everest, A. (1991). Put Diversity in Context. Personnel Journal, 70, 50-55.

Kenton, S.B. (1989). Speaker credibility in persuasive business communication: A model which explains gender differences. Journal of Business Communication, 26, 143-157.

Lamude, K.G., and Daniels, T.D. (1984). Perceived managerial communicator style as a function of subordinate and manager gender. Communication Research Reports, 1, 91-96.

Miner, J.B. (1974). Motivation to manage among women: Studies of Business Managers and Educational Administrators. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 5, 197-208.

Miner, J.B. (1974). Motivation to manage among women: Studies of College Students. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 5, 241-250.

Pavitt, C. (1989). Accounting for the process of communicative competence evaluation: A comparison of predictive models. Human Communication Research, 16, 405-433.

Pavitt. C., and Haight, L. (1985). The 'competent communicator' as a cognitive prototype. Human Communication Research, 12, 225-241.

Pavitt, C., and Haight, L. (1986). Implicit theories of communicative competence: Situational and competence level differences in judgments of prototype and target. Communication Monographs, 53, 221-235.

Penley, L.E., Alexander, E.R., Jernigan, I.E., and Henwood, C.I. (1991). Communication abilities of managers: The relationship to performance. Journal of Management, 17, 57-76.

Powell, G.N., and Butterfield, D.A. (1979). The "good manager." Masculine or androgynous? Academy of Management Journal, 22, 395-403.

Putnam, L.L. (1982). In search of gender: A critique of communication and sex-roles research. Women's Studies in Communication, 5, 1-9.

Ragins, B.R. (1989). Power and gender congruency effects in evaluations of M and F managers. Journal of Management, 15, 65-76.

Rakow, L.F. (1986). Rethinking gender research in communication. Journal of Communication, 36,11-26.

Rosener, J. B. (1995). America's competetive secret: Utilizing women as a management strategy. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rosener, J.B. (1990). Ways women lead. Harvard Business Review, 68, 119-125.

Rosenfeld, L.R., and Fowler, G.D. (1976). Personality, sex, and leadership style. Communication Monographs, 43, 320-324.

Sekaran, U., and Leong, F.T.L. (1992). Womanpower: Managing in Times of Demographic Turbulence. (NewburyPark, CA: Sage).

Sheppard, D.L. (1989). Organizations, power, and sexuality. In J Hearn, D.L. Sheppard, P. Tancred-Sheriff, and G. Burrell (Eds.), The Sexuality of organization (pp. 139-157). London: Sage.

Siegerdt, G.A. (1983). Communication profiles for organizational communication behavior: Are men and women different? Women=s Studies in Communication, 6, 46-57.

Smeltzer, L.R. and Fann, G.L. (1989). Gender differences in external networks of small business owners/managers. Journal of Small Business Management, 27, 25-32.

Smeltzer, L.R., and Watson, K.W. (1986). Gender differences in verbal communication during negotiations. Communication Research Reports, 3, 74-79.

Solomon, L.J., Brehony, K.A., Rothblum, E.D., and Kelly, J.A. (1982). Corporate managers' reactions to assertive social skills exhibited by males and females. Journal of Organizational Behavior Management, 4, 49-63.

Stephen, T.D., and Harrison, T.M. (1985). Gender, Sex-Role Identity, and Communication Style: A Q-Sort Analysis of Behavioral Differences. Communication Research Report, 2, 53-61.

Tanton, M. (1994). Women in Management. (New York: Routlegde).

Tsui, A.S., and O'Reilly, C.A., III. (1989). Beyond simple demographic effects: The importance of relational demography in superior-subordinate dyads. Academy of Management Journal, 32, 402-423.

Wong, P.T.P., Kettlewell, G., and Sproule, C.F. (1985). On the importance of being masculine: Sex role, attribution, and women's career achievement. Sex Roles, 12, 757-769.

CS509653

Would you like to put your paper or papers in ERIC? Please send us a clean, dark copy!

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Paper presented at the National Communication Assn. Meetings (Chicago)
Leadership, Communicator Style, & Gender : A Propositional Analysis

Author(s): Kristina Kay Horn Sheeler

Corporate Source:

Publication Date:
Nov. 19-23, 1997

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 1** documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____ Sample _____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1

☒
⬆
Check here
For Level 1 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 2** documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____ Sample _____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2

☐
⬆
Check here
For Level 2 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→ please

Signature: Kristina K. Horn Sheeler

Printed Name/Position/Title: Kristina Kay Horn Sheeler

Organization/Address:
Dept. of Speech Communication
809 E 7th St.
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405

Telephone: 812 855 6405

FAX:

E-Mail Address: ksheeler@indiana.edu

Date: 1.29.98

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:

Address:

Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

Requisitions

ERIC/REC
2805 E. Tenth Street
Smith Research Center, 150
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47408

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2d Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com