

1992

# Gender Differences in Evaluation Styles

Jean B. Hudson

*Eastern Illinois University*

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Speech Communication](#) at Eastern Illinois University.

[Find out more](#) about the program.

---

## Recommended Citation

Hudson, Jean B., "Gender Differences in Evaluation Styles" (1992). *Masters Theses*. 2310.

<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/2310>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact [tabruns@eiu.edu](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

<u>5-4-92</u>	
Date	Author

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

_____	_____
Date	Author

Gender Differences in Evaluative Style  
(TITLE)

BY

**THESIS**

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Arts  
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY  
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1992  
YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING  
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

5/4/92  
DATE

[REDACTED]  
ADVISER

5/4/92  
DATE

[REDACTED]  
DEPARTMENT HEAD

Gender Differences in Evaluation Styles

Jean B. Hudson

Eastern Illinois University

Abstract

There is currently extensive research on gender differences in the area of speech communication. This study explores the gender differences in speaking styles and their relation to evaluation styles. Subjects were students enrolled in Introduction to Speech Communication at Eastern Illinois University. After compiling 722 speech evaluation sheets, an analysis of variance, factor analysis, and content analysis was conducted. Significant results concluded that sex of the instructor, sex of the speaker, and sex of the evaluator influence each other. Implications of this study were that speech instructors must be aware of their own speaking and evaluation style to avoid any biased instructing. Speech instructors should also attempt to master a universal speaking and evaluating style to avoid gender discrepancies. Furthermore, instructors who use peer evaluations in class must educate students on rating error tendencies.

### Introduction

Gender differences in the area of speech communication is a popular area of research study. Many researchers have explored the gender differences of verbal and nonverbal communication behavior. Through the extensive past research the significance of this area is apparent. A notable amount of research has also been conducted on speech rating scales. These scales have been found to be fallible and open to rating discrepancies (Becker & Cronkite, 1965; Bock, 1972; Bock & Bock, 1977; Bock & Munro, 1979; Bock, Powell, Kitchens & Flavin, 1977; Bohn & Bohn, 1985; Brooks, 1957; Miller, 1964; Nathan, B. & Tippins, N., 1990).

The research available on gender and communication has proven that there are different speaking styles among men and women, and that there are discrepancies among raters evaluating speeches. From this information a connection between speaking styles and evaluation styles can be drawn. Since males and females have different speaking styles, can those differences result in different evaluation styles? Because of this connection, a valid research question to ask is "Is there a difference of evaluation styles between men and women?"

### Review of Literature

#### General Gender Differences

Apart from the apparent physical differences between

men and women, there are four main areas in which females and males differ: (1) quantitative ability, (2) visual-spatial ability, (3) creative ability, and (4) verbal ability (Basow, 1986; Doyle, 1989; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). Although this paper is focused on verbal gender differences, a brief overview of the general gender-differences is warranted to show the significance of related variables and evaluation styles.

#### Quantitative Ability

Past research has proven that there is a slight difference between females' and males' quantitative abilities. Research shows that males are somewhat better in quantitative abilities than females (Basow, 1986; Becker & Hedges, 1984; Deaux, 1984; Doyle, 1989; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). No gender differences exist until the age of nine. From that point on males abilities tend to be greater (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974, p. 85). This analytical thinking style can crossover into how an individual evaluates. If one has the tendency to think more analytically, as males do, then the possibility of evaluating more analytically is plausible. This analytic evaluation style might be observed with raters being more attentive on the problem solving aspect of a speech.

#### Visual-Spatial Ability

There is a noted difficulty in assessing the

visual-spatial ability differences between genders. This difficulty is due to the lack of definition of these abilities (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974, p. 91). Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) assessed a variety of research testing visual and spatial abilities. From their research they concluded that on the average, males have higher capabilities in the visual-spatial learning area. This advantage seemed to appear first in early adolescence and continue into adulthood (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). This conclusion has been supported by most researchers studying gender differences (Basow, 1986, p. 45; Wittig & Peterson, 1979, p. 6).

#### Creative Ability

In most of the research conducted on creative assessment two measures are used: the number of different ideas produced and the uniqueness of the ideas produced (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974, p. 113). According to the compilation of research done by Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) females show an increase in creative abilities starting at the age of seven. This advantage is consistent throughout adolescence and adulthood. With higher creativity levels, females may expect creativity in others as the norm. With the expectation of creativity in speech performances anything short of what is anticipated may receive lower ratings.



Verbal Ability

Female superiority on verbal tasks has been one of the most accepted and supported generalizations in the area of gender differences (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974, p. 75). Many aspects make up one's verbal ability, which will be discussed later in this exposition. Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) state that, in general, females have a higher rate of verbal ability starting at about age 11. Stewart, Stewart, Friedley and Cooper (1990) agree with Maccoby and Jacklin's assessment. According to a compilation of studies that they examined, females develop verbal strategies and greater cognitive complexity earlier than males (Stewart et al., 1990, p. 5).

Before going into the specific aspects that make up verbal ability it should be noted that there has been some disagreement about the extent of the gender differences mentioned above. These four differences between abilities have been studied over the years and remained relatively constant. However according to some researchers the differences between genders have decreased (Bass & Stogdill, 1990; Becker & Hedges, 1984; Hyde, 1981; Hyde & Linn, 1988; Rosenthal & Rubin, 1982). When conducting a meta-analysis of cognitive difference studies these researchers found a significant decrease in differences of cognitive gender abilities. According to these studies

gender differences are changing over time with the sexes becoming more equal in ability. There are several explanations for the disagreements, everything from faulty research and oversimplification to changing gender roles resulting in different abilities.

Through the review of all this research many gender differences are being questioned, although one area has remained consistent, verbal abilities. This researcher feels that amid the turmoil of gender research this is a relatively solid and valid research area to study. The critics of gender research have not gone unheard. Tannen (1990) addressed this issue by stating her purpose for gender research in verbal abilities: "I am joining the growing dialogue on gender and language because the risk of ignoring differences is greater than the danger of naming them " (Tannen, 1990, p. 16). This philosophy epitomizes the intentions that this study is based on.

#### Gender Differences in Language

Through past research it has become apparent that females and males have different language styles, techniques, and abilities. These differences have become a growing area of interest for researchers. The focus of this study is the gender differences of overall speech style and their relation to evaluation style. Many factors make up a person's speech style including verbal aspects

such as pitch, expression, content, assertiveness, organization, and use of descriptive language. Nonverbal communication factors also contribute to a person's speaking style. Nonverbal refers to people's communication skills and styles of expression, excluding the actual verbal messages they might be using (Hall, 1984, p. 1). Nonverbal areas such as decoding, expression, movement and stance, and nonverbal feedback all subscribe to an overall speech style. A review of each of these areas will indicate overall speech styles that are commonly seen in men and women and how they affect evaluation styles.

#### Pitch

The sound of a person's voice can express many connotative meanings which can result in actual different speaking styles. Women's speech in general is known to be at a much higher pitch than men's speech tone (Basow, 1986; Berryman-Fink & Wilcox, 1983, p.667, p. 58; Kramarae, 1981, p. 96; Sargent, 1977, p. 201). Men receive more positive ratings from speech evaluators for their lower pitch. According to various studies, a lower tone connotes more credibility, knowledge, and expertise. This credibility allows men to be more authoritative and have more status (Kramarae, 1981, p. 96; Sargent, 1977, p.202). In light of this increased credibility and status of males, speech raters could evaluate females as less

competent. This perceived female incompetence and increased male credibility may result in evaluators committing positive leniency errors for male speakers.

### Vocal Expression

Narus and Fischer (1982) define expression as the communication of feelings and personal concerns and the ease with which those messages are sent. In general most researchers agree that female speakers are more expressive than male speakers (Berryman-Fink & Wilcox, 1983; Haas, 1979; Kramarae, 1981; Pearson, Turner & Todd-Mancillas, 1991; Tannen, 1990;). Some disagreement has occurred with studies developing feminine, masculine, and androgynous roles in accordance to speech (Narus & Fischer, 1982). Berryman-Fink & Wilcox (1983) concluded that females' tone and pitch show more variety and expression than males. Overall the assessment that females are more expressive than males can be stated with relative certainty (Bate, 1988; Berryman-Fink & Wilcox, 1983; Haas, 1979; Kramarae, 1981; Pearson et al., 1991; Tannen, 1990). The more expressive a gender is, the more that characteristic will hold importance to the gender. Since females are more expressive, they will pay attention to the expressive qualities of other speakers. This increase in attention could make the female rater more critical on expressive traits while less critical on other areas of evaluation.

Content

The content of an individual's speech has effects on the overall style of the speech and how that speech is evaluated (Eakins & Eakins, 1978; Tannen, 1990). Tannen (1990) indicates that males and females speak on different content levels which affects their purposes of interaction. Males talk more about "things" while females talk more about "feelings" about things. Bate (1988) also found these different content styles. Evaluating speaker content Bate found females to primarily focus on feelings and relationships while males focused on tasks. These different approaches to relatively the same subject can create completely different speaking styles. Evaluation styles can also be affected by the content of the speech. It would make sense to assume that men and women prefer to listen to speeches relating to their own interests. Therefore a speech that the rater can relate to better will receive higher evaluation scores.

Assertiveness

Female speech is known to be more of a "polite" speaking style while male speech is more aggressive and assertive (Eakins & Eakins, 1978; Lakoff, 1975; Kimble, Yoshikawa & Zehr, 1981; Pearson et al., 1991). This assertiveness has a connotation of a more credible and informed speaker (Bate, 1988; Pearson et al., 1991). Assertiveness is

related to a number of communication skills. Skills such as verbal intensity, talkativeness, and a good communicator style have all been correlated to assertiveness (Pearson et al., 1985, p. 137). Taking an aggressive approach in speaking is not the only aggressive attribute of males. In general males are more aggressive than females. Accordingly, males would be more aggressive than females in evaluating speeches. With this more aggressive attitude males might have less inhibitions than females to evaluate negatively and give negative comments.

#### Descriptive Language

Females use more descriptive language than males in speech (Arliss, 1991; Eakins & Eakins, 1978; Haas, 1979; Stewart et al., 1990). While males refer more directly to the subject at hand, females tend to be more subjective and describe in detail what the subject is about (Haas, 1979). Females also tend to have a larger vocabulary and use more vivid descriptive language (Arliss, 1991; Stewart et al., 1990). Lakoff (1975) noted that this type of "women's" speech style tends to get hung up on the "trivial" aspects of a subject, rather than the important matters. Kramarae (1981) argues that women are not speaking about "trivial" matters but are more interested in the social function of talking. They converse longer than men about what men would say is "trivial"

and women would say is normal conversational pleasantries. The differences in language will directly affect a person's evaluation style. If the rater is female, she will give more positive ratings to speakers who use descriptive language and a larger vocabulary in their speech.

### Organization

In the verbal learning process there are gender differences in ability which leads to females having better organizational skills (Kramer, 1974). Women show superior levels of immediate free recall, delayed free recall, and semantic clustering which helps them organize material better during the encoding process (Kramer, 1988). It has also been found that females have better vocabulary, sentence structure, and fluency in speech (Sargent, 1977, p. 210). These aspects all create a more organized speaking style. It should be noted though that although females have an apparent advantage in organization they are not perceived as being more organized. In a study conducted by Bock and Munro (1979) males received more positive evaluations on organization than females.

### Decoding

Research has shown that women are more skilled at decoding messages and understanding the meaning of the messages than men (Basow, 1986; Eagly, 1987; Hall, 1984; Hall & Braunwald, 1981; Hall & Halberstandt, 1981;

Stewart et al., 1990). In a compilation of studies Eagly (1987) found that 83% of research findings favor females for nonverbal decoding. Some researchers feel that this is largely due to the fact that females feel more empathy and pay more attention to others visually (Hall, 1984; Hall & Halberstandt, 1981). Stewart et al. (1990) attribute females' superior decoding ability to exposure. On the average, females are exposed to a larger range of emotions than males thus can become better at distinguishing those emotions. These superior decoding skills would insinuate that females would notice more details in a speech, such as facial expression or vocal expression. This ability to pick up on the more subtle attributes of a speech could result in females evaluating speeches more positively on expressive characteristics than males.

#### Expression

Not only is it seen that women are more attentive to decoding nonverbal cues, but also to encoding nonverbal cues (Basow, 1986; Cherulnik, 1979; Davis & Weitz, 1981; Eagly, 1987; Hall, 1984; Hall & Braunwald, 1981; Henley, 1977; Stewart et al., 1990). Hall (1984) states that females are especially good in expressing themselves through the facial area; they smile more, laugh more, and gaze more than men. Through research of literature Eagly (1987)



found that 94% of nonverbal gender studies support women in more social smiling and 83% favor females for more gazing. Arliss (1991) and Bate (1988) agreed with Hall's findings. In these studies women were found to smile and use more direct eye contact in positive and negative situations. Hall (1984) also notes that females express a larger range of emotions, changing their range of facial parts as their emotions change. Overall the general pattern of research suggests that females display more submission and warmth while males display more dominance and high status cues (Basow, 1986).

#### Movement and Stance

Males and Females definitely have distinct styles in which they move and stand to portray their attitudes. On the average, males stand in a way to project a more "potent and dominant" attitude than women (Davis & Weitz, 1981, p. 81). Women on the other hand, use their body movement in a way that expresses interpersonal involvement (Hall, 1984, p. 140). Eagly (1987) found females to be less restless (fidgety) than males, yet more involved (nodding) in interactions. Males also tend to set larger distances toward others than females which displayed a less personal attitude (Hall, 1984). Although males have been found to be less interpersonally involved, Davis and Weitz (1981) found males to be more active in nonverbal

movement. Males show a significantly higher level of total body movements and initiated actions while females tended to maintain a proper "ladylike" immobility (Davis & Weitz, 1981, p. 82). These differences might have an effect on evaluations that are not related to evaluation styles but rather strictly speaking styles. If a speech criticism is partly based on movement, then males will have more positive evaluation scores. This is important to consider in the final analysis of evaluation styles.

#### Nonverbal Feedback

It should be no surprise that women display more nonverbal feedback than men (Basow, 1986; Davis & Weitz, 1981; Eagly, 1987; Hall, 1984). This only makes sense with the general increased expressiveness of females on an affiliative and less dominate level (Davis & Weitz, 1981, p. 81). Davis and Weitz note that women have stronger eye contact than men which has been linked to affiliation motivation. Females also tend to nod in approval and smile for encouragement in response to interactions more than males (Arliss, 1991; Davis & Weitz, 1981). Overall men seem to display more dominance and high-status cues and women more liking and warmth in their nonverbal expressions.

In the combination of the above characteristics two very distinct communication (verbal and nonverbal speaking)

styles emerge. Looking at the traits that characterize predominantly women, a relational speaking style can be seen. With the combination of these five major aspects a relational pattern emerges: (1) females are more expressive, verbally and nonverbally, (2) females' message content is oriented to the communicative act more than the subject, (3) females use more descriptive language, (4) females have the ability to decode more, and (5) females send more positive feedback. All of these characteristics point to women being primarily concerned with the relationship at hand rather than the task. In combining the major traits for male speakers, a task-orientated style emerges. Four major characteristics point to this style: (1) males' pitch is lower giving them more status and authority, (2) males' conversations are more oriented to the subject at hand rather than the relationship, (3) males tend to be more assertive in language and expressions, and (4) males' movement is less personal and expresses higher status. These characteristics allow men to accomplish tasks and have an attitude focused on problem solving. Their exchanges are more cut and dry and, what some would say, more productive.

Researchers have studied these two speaking styles in various ways. Kramarae (1981) explains the two styles as a direct result of their environment. "As a consequence

of the division of labor, the separation of spheres, and the differential allocation of resources and legitimate power, women and men will use different strategies to influence others and shape events" (Kramarae, 1981, p.119). Due to this differentiation Kramarae (1981) emerges with the "gender role differentiation hypothesis" where men specialize in instrumental or task behaviors and women specialize in expressive or social activities (Kramarae, 1981, p. 144).

According to Tannen (1990) females and males don't necessarily have different experiences to cause the different styles, but approach the experiences in different ways. Many men approach situations as an individual in a hierarchical social order. With this attitude conversations are negotiations for "the upper hand" and life is a struggle to reach the top (Tannen, 1990, pp. 24-25). This can clearly be seen as a task-oriented style. Females approach situations more as an individual in a network of connections. With this perception conversations now become negotiations for closeness and support, a clear relational speaking style (Tannen, 1990, p. 25).

Lakoff (1975) has suggested that men and women differ in their styles of speech due to gender stereotypes and reinforcement of those gender stereotypes. Men are seen as dominant, assertive, and self-confident. Speech styles

that reinforce this image are rewarded by acceptance of peers and superiors. Women's speech is seen as more polite, vague, and lacking in confidence. When women ask tag questions (questions in which someone is trying to reconfirm the truth) they are rewarded with answers, reinforcing that speech style (Arliss, 1990; Bates, 1988; Lakoff, 1975). Arliss (1990) found tag questions to not just characterize a lack of confidence but to also be viable for initiating conversations. Therefore in Arliss's perspective using tag questions is another indication of the female relational speaking style. Stewart et al. (1991) and Pearson et al. (1991) further indicate that females use the tag questions only in certain situations, and to generalize the use of the questions is incorrect. The overall styles of dominant male and relational female is confirmed by Newcombe and Arnoff (1979). They also found that these speaking styles contribute to how the genders are perceived. Newcombe and Arnoff further insinuated that these styles can be modified if so desired, indicating that they are not concrete classifications.

Coates (1986) agrees with Lakoff (1975) and Newcombe and Arnoff (1979) in the social orientation of gender speaking style differences. In her research of group evaluations, distinct speaking styles emerge, men showing dominance and women support. Coates also believes that

each gender can learn from the other's style but the hopes for differing these styles are "pious" (Coates, 1986, p. vi). Coates states that "as long as society views women and men as different - and unequal - then differences in the language of women and men will persist" (Coates, 1986, p. vi). Berryman-Fink & Wilcox (1983) contradict Coates' opinion. According to their study when females and males were asked to portray each other's speech styles they were perceived differently. Females were seen as having more credibility using a male speech style. This would indicate that different speech styles can be learned and changed to a more universal style, although the chances of this happening in untrained speakers is slight.

Since these different styles do persist, the implications of these styles are important. Besides the apparent miscommunication that occurs between genders, Tannen (1990) hints about a less researched area, evaluation styles. Tannen states that when women confront men's ways of talking to them they judge them by the standards of women's conversational styles and vice versa. These implications are not based on quantitative data, but more on observations. An effective way of obtaining this quantitative data is in the use of speech rating scales. Speech rating scales have been used for various research studies to show different rater errors.

Through a compilation of research studies Pearson et al. (1991) concluded that there are four main areas of research in which gender has been considered to affect evaluation in speaking situations: (1) men have been rated with higher status than women which has been connected with higher effectiveness, (2) women have a higher leniency error when rating others, (3) women receive more positive comments, and (4) women tend to receive higher scores than do men and also tend to give higher scores.

Miller and McReynolds (1973) found male speakers to have higher ratings of credibility and confidence than female speakers when delivering persuasive speeches. Pearson et al (1991) notes that women have been evaluated as having some aspects of credibility. Women were viewed with more trustworthiness and coorientation. Yet, males still dominated in levels of credibility showing more competence and dynamism.

Bock, Powell, Kitchens and Flavin (1977) researched the possibility of rater errors due to the gender of the rater. Conclusions were drawn that females had the tendency to have more rater errors in trait categories and on "the following effect." This was partly attributed to the persuasibility of the rater; females are more easily persuaded than males. In a following study Bock and Bock (1979) investigated the possibilities of different leniency

errors according to the gender of the rater and the gender of the experimenter. They concluded that females do have a positive leniency error but only in the presence of a female experimenter. Bohn and Bohn (1985) agreed with Bock and Bock in the importance of the experimenter. In experiments involving students Bohn and Bohn concluded that the gender of the teacher affected different rating errors.

Other studies in the classroom have found that females generally receive higher grades than males on classroom speeches and receive more positive comments on the speeches (Pearson et al., 1991). Further research is needed to completely understand this relationship between gender and speech evaluation. Tannen (1990) stated that we perceive the world through our own experiences and act upon them accordingly. In light of this statement, research generated toward raters evaluating according to their own speaking experiences is valid and important.

Based upon the literature reviewed, the following hypotheses were generated relating gender speaking styles to evaluation styles:

$H_1$ : Females will give more positive evaluations than males.

$H_2$ : Female students will evaluate other students higher if instructed by a female.



- H<sub>3</sub>: Male students will evaluate other students higher if instructed by a male.
- H<sub>4</sub>: Both female and male students will give more feedback to each other if instructed by a female.
- H<sub>5</sub>: Females' comments will focus more on delivery/style.
- H<sub>6</sub>: Males' comments will focus more on material/content.

### Method

#### Subjects

Participants in this study were students enrolled in an introductory speech course at Eastern Illinois University. Subjects were taken from 20 different speech sections. These sections were instructed by four female and three male teachers/graduate teacher assistants. This population was primarily freshman and sophomore students. The course is a general education requirement consisting of a random sample of majors. Seven hundred and forty one speech rating scales were completed. Nineteen rating scales were incorrectly filled out leaving 722 viable evaluations. This yielded a mortality rate of .0256 (2.5%). Out of these rating scales there were 306 male raters and 416 female raters. The evaluations were conducted on 340 male speakers and 382 female speakers.

#### Instrument

The instrument used was the Bock rating scale (See Appendix A) which has been tested and found to be both

reliable and valid (Bock, 1972). All six traits on the rating scale, organization, language, material, delivery, analysis, and voice are used in analysis. In addition to the six traits, the total score is utilized.

### Procedure

Subjects were to evaluate each other in classroom speech settings. The subjects were instructed to use their social security number for gender identification with still keeping their anonymity. Raters' gender was obtained through matching the number with a class list. Speeches ranging from three to five minutes and four to six minute intervals were utilized for evaluations. The rating scales were collected over a five-month period.

### Statistical Design

Analysis of the data was conducted using a series of three-way analyses of variance, a factor analysis, and a qualitative content analysis.

The three-way analyses of variance,  $2 \times 2 \times 2$  (gender of speaker by gender of rater by gender of instructor), provided an index for any possible interactions. The F-test was also used for the purpose of testing hypothesis one, two, and three.

In testing hypothesis five and six the independent variable was the gender of the rater while the dependent variables consisted of the rating scale traits. A factor

analysis was used in this examination to determine if there was any focus of a trait in evaluation. A content analysis was utilized to support hypothesis five and six in addition to proving hypothesis four.

### Results

The results of the seven three-way analysis of variance indicate the following relationships.

The significant results in Table 1 indicate that there is a significant relationship between the gender of the speaker and the trait of organization. The analysis implies that evaluators rate female speakers higher in organization than male speakers.

The significant differences in Table 2 show that there is a significant interaction effect between the gender of the speaker and the gender of the instructor. The analysis indicates that, when instructed by a female, evaluators rate female speakers the highest in the language trait, while males rate the lowest.

The analysis of the ratings for material indicate no significant results.

The significant results in Table 3 indicate that there is a significant relationship between the gender of the speaker and the trait of delivery. The analysis shows that evaluators rate female speakers higher in delivery than male speakers.

The significant differences in Table 4 imply that there is a significant interaction effect between the gender of the speaker and the gender of the instructor. The analysis indicates that, when instructed by a female, evaluators rate female speakers the highest in the trait of analysis, while males rate the lowest.

The significant results in Table 5 indicate that there is a significant relationship between the gender of the speaker and the trait of voice. The analysis shows that evaluators rate female speakers higher in the trait of voice than male speakers.

The significant differences in Table 6 imply that there is a significant interaction effect between the gender of the speaker and the gender of the instructor. The analysis shows that, when instructed by a female, evaluators rate female speakers the highest in their total score. They rate females highest in comparison to male speakers when instructed by a female and female speakers when instructed by a male.

The results of the two-way factor analysis indicate the following relationships.

Table 7 shows the two underlying factors that males utilize in evaluation. The first factor is a general analysis while the second factor focuses on material. This analysis indicates that when making an evaluation,

males focus on the general speech traits. For further criticism males focus on the material content of the speech.

Table 8 shows the two underlying factors that females utilize in evaluation. The first factor is a content based analysis while the second factor focuses on voice. This analysis indicates that when making an evaluation, females focus on the general content of the speech. For further analysis females focus on the vocal characteristics of a speech.

The results of the content analysis indicate the following relationships.

Out of the male evaluation sheets, 48% of male raters gave positive evaluations, while 37% gave negative evaluations and 15% gave an equal amount of positive and negative. Thirty six percent of the evaluations completed by male raters focused on material, whereas 20% focused primarily on delivery and 44% had no specific focus.

Out of the female evaluation sheets, 74% of female raters gave positive evaluations, while 20% gave negative and 6% gave an equal amount of positive and negative comments. Sixteen percent of the evaluations completed by female raters focused on material, whereas 64% focused on delivery and 20% had no specific focus.

The content analysis also implicates five recurring themes. The first theme indicates that male raters make

fewer comments on the evaluation sheets than females. Second, both female and male raters make more comments on the evaluation sheets if instructed by a female. Third, females direct their comments toward the individual rather than a neutral party. Females use the pronoun "you" with evaluation comments, while males exclude pronouns. A fourth theme implies that females tend to give a negative comment following a positive one, such as; "You have a good voice, but try to work on volume." Males just give the negative comment. The final recurring theme indicates that females give more side notes to the speaker than males. Notes such as "I always wanted to know more about..." or "Your speech really interested me..." are prevalent on evaluations completed by female raters.

### Conclusions

#### Hypothesis One

The first hypothesis states that females will give more positive evaluations than males. This hypothesis is supported by both the quantitative and qualitative measurement studies. These findings support the relational speaking style and proposed evaluation style of females. Females will tend to be more supportive and positive in their evaluations because they place a higher value on the importance of the relationships in the class. These findings also support the previous studies of Bock and

Bock (1979) and Pearson et al. (1991) that found females to give more positive evaluations than males.

#### Hypothesis Two and Three

The data indicate that hypothesis two is partially supported and hypothesis three is not supported. Hypothesis two states that female raters will evaluate other students higher if instructed by a female. This is only partially supported because the data shows that females rate only female speakers higher in the traits of language, analysis, and overall score, they do not rate males higher in this circumstance. Hypothesis three states that male raters will evaluate other students higher if instructed by a male. This is not supported due to male raters having the same rating tendencies as the female raters when instructed by a female instructor. This data indicates that the gender of the instructor is a factor when the speaker is female. Since the traits that the female speakers are rated higher on are relational, one could make a connection between the relational orientation and the female instructor. If the instructor is female, she will more likely teach on a relational level, stressing relational aspects of speech. This in turn will allow the students to become more aware of these speech aspects and distinguish them easier. Since the relational speech aspects that are stressed are naturally inherent in females,

they will receive higher evaluations on these traits when instructed by a female.

#### Hypothesis Four

The qualitative analysis confirms hypothesis four which states that both female and male students will give more feedback to each other if instructed by a female. As stated earlier, females instruct on a more relational level due to their own speech style, and since feedback is a relational trait, more will be apparent in the class taught in a relational style. These findings correspond with Treichler and Kramarae's (1983) analysis which concluded that there is an increase of interaction and feedback among students who are taught by female instructors (p. 121).

#### Hypothesis Five and Six

Hypothesis five states that females' comments will focus more on delivery/style. This hypothesis is supported by the factor analysis and content analysis. The factor analysis and content analysis also supports hypothesis six which states that males' comments will primarily focus on material/content. These findings directly connect a rater's speaking style to his or her evaluation style. Females who have a more relational speaking style pay more attention to the relational traits in the speech. Males who are more task oriented in their speaking style



focus on those aspects during a speech. This confirms Tannen's (1990) philosophy that individuals perceive the world through their own experiences and act upon them accordingly. Evaluators rate speeches according to their own speech experience.

#### Implications

Two major implications can be extracted from this study. The first implication is oriented toward public speakers. Since this study concludes that speeches are evaluated according to individual speaking styles, those who give public speeches can adjust their speech style to the audience's evaluation style. If a speaker is addressing a predominantly male audience, she or he can focus on a speech that is task-oriented. If a speaker is addressing a predominantly female audience a relational approach can be taken. This in turn will allow the speaker to be better prepared and received in the best possible light.

Another implication that this study has is oriented toward teaching speech communication. Male and female instructors must be wary for stressing one style of speech over the other. Neither relational or task-oriented speech style is the better speaking style. To focus on one style is unfair to one gender of the class. Instructors should concentrate on stressing a non-gender specific

style of speaking and evaluating. To help accomplish this, instructors should educate the students on the different types of rating and leniency errors. This concept has been prevalent since 1954 introduced by J. P. Gillford. Gillford (1954) stated that "raters do better if carefully trained with respect to the distribution of abilities, the nature of the scale, and cautions against errors such as the halo effect, central tendency, over rating, prejudice, and the logical error" (p. 295). Now the effects of personal speaking styles can be added to the list of cautions.

#### Limitations

There are some limitations to this research that should be mentioned. Although the rating error tendency is prevalent in the undergraduate population, stating that professional instructors or speech evaluators have these tendencies would be presumptuous. Conducting a study utilizing professionals would greatly increase the validity of this study. It should also be noted that the evaluations were conducted with speeches of various length. Although the time frames did not vary to an extreme, it should be conveyed that there is a possibility of one student having more time to evaluate than another.

This study did discover various significant results that have heuristic value in the research of evaluation

styles. Including professional evaluators and time constraints would increase the viability of the results. The continuation of research in evaluation styles will not only aid us in the unbiased evaluation of speeches, but also in understanding the miscommunication between the genders in everyday communication and more formal speech settings.

References

- Arliss, L. P. (1991). Gender Communication. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Basow, S. A. (1986). Gender Stereotypes: Traditions and Alternatives. (2nd ed.). Belmont CA: Wadsworth.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Maanagerial Applications. New York: The Free Press.
- Bate, B. (1988). Communication and the Sexes. New York: Harper and Row.
- Becker, S. & Cronkite, G. (1965). Reliability as a function of utilized scale steps. The Speech Teacher, 14, 291-293.
- Becker, B. J. & Hedges, L. V. (1984). Meta-analysis cognitive gender differences: a comment on an analysis by Rosenthal and Rubin. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76(4), 583-587.
- Berryman-Fink, C. L. & Wilcox, J. R. (1983). A multivariate investigation of perceptual attributions concerning gender appropriateness in language. Sex Roles, 9(6), 663-678.
- Bock, D. (1972). Reliability and validity of speech rating scales: some error effects. Central States Speech Journal, 23, 145-151.
- Bock, D. & Bock, H. (1977). The effects of the sex of

the experimenter, expectancy inductions, and sex of the rater on leniency, halo, and trait errors in speech rating behavior. Communication Education, 26, 299-306.

Bock, D. & Munro, M. (1979). The effects of organization, need for order, sex of the source, and sex of the rater on the organization trait error. The Southern Speech Communication Journal, 44, 364-372.

Bock, D., Powell, L., Kitchens, J. & Flavin, J. (1977). Influence of sex differences in speech evaluation: situational and media effects. Communication Education, 26, 143-153.

Bohn, C. A. & Bohn E. (1985). Reliability of raters: the effects of rating errors on the speech rating process. Communication Education, 34, 343-351.

Brooks, K. (1957). Some basic considerations in rating scale development: a descriptive bibliography. Central States Speech Journal, 9, 27-31.

Cherlunik, P. D. (1979). Sex differences in the expression of emotion in a structured social encounter. Sex Roles, 5(4), 413-423.

Coates, J. (1986). Women, Men and Language. New York: Longman.

Davis, M. & Weitz, S. (1981). Sex differences in body movements and positions. In C. Mayo & N. M. Henley

- (Ed.), Gender and Nonverbal Behavior. (pp. 81-94).  
New York: Springer - Verlag.
- Deaux, K. (1984). From individual differences to social categories. American Psychologist, 39(2), 105-116.
- Doyle, J. A. (1989). The Male Experience. Dubuque: Wm C. Brown.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). Sex Differences in Social Behavior: A Social Role Interpretation. Hillside NJ: Lawrence Erlbawm Associates.
- Eakins, B. W. & Eakins, R. G. (1978). Sex Differences in Human Communication. Geneva IL: Houghton Mifflin.
- Gillford, J. P. (1954). Psychometric Methods. (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book.
- Haas, A. (1979). Male and female spoken language differences stereotypes and evidence. Psychological Bulletin, 86(3), 616-626.
- Hall, J. A. (1984). Nonverbal Sex Differences: Communication Accuracy and Expressive Style. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hall, J. A. & Braunwald, K. G. (1981). Gender cues in conversation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40(1), 99-110.
- Hall, J. A. & Halberstadt, A. G. (1981). Sex roles and nonverbal communication skills, Sex Roles, 7(3), 273-284.

- Henley, N. M. (1977). Body Politics: Power, Sex and Nonverbal Communication. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Hyde, J. (1981). How large are cognitive gender differences? American Psychologist, 36(8), 892-901.
- Hyde, J. S. & Linn, M. C. (1988). Gender differences in verbal ability: a meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 104(1), 53-69.
- Kimble, C. E. , Yoshikawa, J. C. & Zehr, H. D. (1981). Vocal and verbal assertiveness in same-sexed and mixed-sex groups. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40(6), 1047-1054.
- Kramarae, C. (1981). Women and Men Speaking. Rowley MA: Newsbury House.
- Kramer, C. (1974). Women's speech: seperate but unequal? Quarterly Journal of Speech, 60, 14-24.
- Lakoff, R. (1975). Language and Woman's Place. New York: Harper & Row.
- Maccoby, E. E. & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). The Psychology of Sex Differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Miller, G. R. (1964). Agreement and the grounds for it: persistant problems in speech rating. The Speech Teacher, 13(4), 257-261.
- Miller, G. R. & McReynolds, M. (1973). Male Chauvinism and source competance: a research note. Speech

Monographs, 40, 154-155.

Narus, L. R. Jr. & Fischer, J. L. (1982). Strong but not silent: a reexamination of expressivity in the relationships of men. Sex Roles, 8(2), 159-167.

Nathan, B. & Tippins, N. (1990). The consequences of halo "error" in performance ratings: a field study of the moderating effect of halo on test validation results. Journal of applied Psychology, 75, 290-296.

Newcombe, N. & Arnkoff, D. B. (1979). Effects of speech style and sex of speaker on person perception. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37(8), 1293-1303.

Pearson, J., Turner, L. H. & Todd-Mancillas, W. (1991). Gender and Communication. (2nd ed.). Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.

Rosenthal, R. & Rubin, D. B. (1982). Comparing effect sizes of independent studies. Psychological Bulletin, 92, 500-504.

Sargent, A. G. (1977). Beyond Sex Roles. New York: West.

Stewart, L., Stewart, A., Friedley, S. & Cooper, P. (1990). Communication Between The Sexes. (2nd ed.). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Tannen, D. (1990). You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation. New York: William Morrow.



- Treichler, P. A. & Kramarae, C. (1983). Women's talk in the ivory tower. Communication Quarterly, 31(2), 119-129.
- Wittig & Peterson (1979). Sex-Related Differences in Cognitive Functioning. New York: Academic Press.

**SPEAKER** \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

TOPIC \_\_\_\_\_

## ASSIGNMENT

TRAITS	COMMENTS	SCORE
ORGANIZATION: Clear arrangement of ideas? Introduction, body, conclusion? Was there an identifiable pattern?		
LANGUAGE: Clear, accurate, varied, vivid? Appropriate standard of usage? In conversational mode? Were unfamiliar terms defined?		
MATERIAL: Specific, valid, relevant, sufficient, interesting? Properly distributed? Adapted to audience? Personal credibility? Use of evidence?		
DELIVERY: Natural, communicative, direct? Eye contact? Aware of audience reaction to speech? Do gestures match voice and language?		
ANALYSIS: Was the speech adapted to the audience? Was the purpose clear? Did the main points support the purpose?		
VOICE: Varied or monotonous in pitch, intensity, volume, rate, quality? Expressive of logical and emotional meanings?		

**TOTAL**

**SCALE:**

10-----9-----8-----7-----6-----5-----4-----3-----2-----1  
Superior                    Average                    Inadequate                    Poor

Table 1

Analysis of Variance ResultsOrganization

Source	DF	MEAN-Squares	F-ratio	P
(A) Speaker Gender	1	6.014677	5.32	* .02
(B) Rater Gender	1	7.499878E-02	.07	.743
(C) Instructor Gender	1	3.882147	3.43	.061
A x B	1	3.902557e-05	0	.999
A x C	1	3.333871	2.95	.083
B x C	1	1.676983	1.48	.221
A x B x C	1	2.436549	2.15	.139
Error	714	1.131241		

\* Significant Results at . 05 for Gender of the Speaker

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Male	340	8.120588
Female	382	8.34555

Table 2

Analysis of Variance ResultsLanguage

Source	DF	MEAN-Squares	F-ratio	P
(A) Speaker Gender	1	7.358089	6.13	.013
(B) Rater Gender	1	.1660452	.14	.622
(C) Evaluator Gender	1	.9179558	.77	.533
A x B	1	.0541201	.05	.801
A x C	1	6.911525	5.76	* .016
B x C	1	.1489894	.12	.639
A x B x C	1	4.457067E-02	.04	.828
Error	714	1.199546		

\* Significant Results at .05 for Gender of the Speaker x Instructor

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Male x Male	172	8.127908
Male x Female	168	8
Female x Male	140	8.121429
Female x Female	242	8.413223

Table 3

Analysis of Variance ResultsDelivery

Source	DF	MEAN-Squares	F-ratio	P
(A) Speaker Gender	1	7.441111	5.26	* .021
(B) Rater Gender	1	1.96499	1.39	.237
(C) Instructor Gender	1	1.488839	1.05	.306
A x B	1	7.692938E-02	.05	.744
A x C	1	.3189004	.23	.551
B x C	1	.380707	.27	.531
A x B x C	1	1.078735	.76	.533
Error	714	1.414324		

\* Significant Results at .05 for Gender of the Speaker

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Male	340	7.797059
Female	382	8.007854

Table 4

Analysis of Variance ResultsAnalysis

Source	DF	MEAN-Squares	F-ratio	P
(A) Speaker Gender	1	10.80711	9.05	.003
(B) Rater Gender	1	.2387051	.2	.567
(C) Instructor Gender	1	4.717994	3.95	.044
A x B	1	9.499437E-02	.08	.713
A x C	1	6.766012	5.66	* .017
B x C	1	1.093605	.92	.567
A x B x C	1	2.856894	2.39	.118
Error	714	1.194626		

\* Significant Results at .05 for Gender of the Speaker x Instructor

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Male x Male	172	8.139536
Male x Female	168	8.101191
Female x Male	140	8.157144
Female x Female	242	8.570249

Table 5

Analysis of Variance ResultsVoice

Source	DF	MEAN-Squares	F-ratio	P
(A) Speaker Gender	1	32.21497	5.18	* .022
(B) Rater Gender	1	.3571944	.06	.765
(C) Instructor Gender	1	17.63996	2.84	.089
A x B	1	1.320791	.21	.559
A x C	1	6.959355	1.12	.291
B x C	1	.5379267	.09	.699
A x B x C	1	2.296283	.37	.507
Error	714	6.219997		

\* Significant Results at .05 for Gender of the Speaker

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Male	340	7.838235
Female	382	8.188481

Table 6

Analysis of Variance ResultsTotal Score

Source	DF	MEAN-Squares	F-ratio	P
(A) Speaker Gender	1	104.2933	2.97	.081
(B) Rater Gender	1	31.45726	.9	.562
(C) Evaluator Gender	1	148.8923	4.24	.037
A x B	1	1.221728	.03	.837
A x C	1	323.664	9.22	* .003
B x C	1	1.122815	.03	.847
A x B x C	1	10.56624	.3	.521
Error	714	35.11368		

\* Significant Results at .05 for Gender of the Speaker x Instructor

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Male x Male	172	48.22093
Male x Female	168	47.73809
Female x Male	140	47.63571
Male x Male	242	49.96281



Table 7

Factor Analysis ResultsMale Raters

Trait	Factor 1	Factor 2	Communality
Organization	* 0.7283	0.2270	0.5819
Language	* 0.8013	0.0676	0.6467
Material	0.1517	* 0.8634	0.7685
Delivery	* 0.7841	-.1474	0.6366
Analysis	* 0.7199	0.3380	0.6211
Voice	0.5146	-.4028	0.4271

\*  $> \pm .60$  and  $< \pm .30$

Table 8

Factor Analysis ResultsFemale Raters

Trait	Factor 1	Factor 2	Communality
Organization	* 0.8336	0.0740	0.7003
Language	0.7183	0.3230	0.6202
Material	* 0.7898	0.1289	0.6404
Delivery	0.5734	0.5010	0.5798
Analysis	* 0.7916	0.1240	0.6420
Voice	0.0842	* 0.9448	0.8998

\*  $> \pm .60$  and  $< \pm .30$