

Gender, Power, and
Communication in
Human Relationships

edited by

Pamela J. Kalbfleisch
Michael J. Cody

GENDER, POWER, AND
COMMUNICATION IN HUMAN
RELATIONSHIPS

GENDER, POWER, AND COMMUNICATION IN HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS

Edited by

Pamela J. Kalbfleisch
University of Wyoming

Michael J. Cody
University of Southern California

 Psychology Press
Taylor & Francis Group

New York London

First Published by
Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers
365 Broadway
Hillsdale, New Jersey 07642

Transferred to Digital Printing 2009 by Psychology Press
270 Madison Ave, New York NY 10016
27 Church Road, Hove, East Sussex, BN3 2FA

Copyright © 1995 by Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any
form, by photostat, microfilm, retrieval system, or any other means,
without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Cover design by Kate Dusza

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Gender, power, and communication in human relationships / edited by
Pamela J. Kalbfleisch and Michael J. Cody.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

ISBN 0-8058-1403-5 (alk. paper).—ISBN 0-8058-1404-3 (pbk.
: alk. paper)

1. Interpersonal relations. 2. Man–woman relationships.
Communication—Sex differences. 4. Sex differences (Psychology).
5. Interpersonal communication. I. Kalbfleisch, Pamela J. II. Cody,
Michael J.

HM132.G44 1995

305.3dc20

94-36468

CIP

Publisher's Note

The publisher has gone to great lengths to ensure the quality of this
reprint but points out that some imperfections in the original may
be apparent.

In memory of Paul Kalbfleisch
(July 10, 1918–August 17, 1993)

Father, mentor, friend

*He taught me to laugh and to smile,
to love the West and its mountains,
to have faith, and
to never lose sight of my dreams*

—PK

In celebration of Julia Cody
(April 23, 1982)

*Daughter, inspiration, and hope
for the future, may she live
in a world of equality and peace*

—MC

Contents

Contributors ix

Preface xiii

PART I INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

- 1 Power and Communication in the Relationships of Women and Men 3
Pamela J. Kalbfleisch and Michael J. Cody

PART II GENDER-BASED EXPECTATIONS AND BELIEFS

- 2 Body Politics Revisited: What Do We Know Today? 27
Nancy M. Henley
- 3 Gender, Immediacy, and Nonverbal Communication 63
Judee K. Burgoon and Leesa Dillman
- 4 Women's Style in Problem Solving Interaction: Powerless, or Simply Feminine? 83
Anthony Mulac and James J. Bradac
- 5 Masculinity and Femininity: Defining the Undefinable 105
Janet T. Spence and Camille Buckner

PART III WOMEN AND MEN TOGETHER

- 6 Sexual Discourse and Sexual Intercourse: How the Way We Communicate Affects the Way We Think About Sexual Coercion **141**
Rhonda K. Reinholtz, Charlene L. Muehlenhard, Joi L. Phelps, and Arthur T. Satterfield
- 7 Negotiating Safer Sex: The Dynamics of African-American Relationships **163**
Lynn Carol Miller, Diane M. Burns, and Sadina Rothspan
- 8 Power and Equality in Mentoring Relationships **189**
Pamela J. Kalbfleisch and Joann Keyton
- 9 Relating to Spouse and Stranger: Gender Preferential Language Use **213**
Mary Anne Fitzpatrick and Anthony Mulac
- 10 Managing Conflict and Anger: Investigating the Sex Stereotype Hypothesis **223**
William R. Cupach and Daniel J. Canary
- 11 The Dynamics of Power: Money and Sex in Intimate Relationships **253**
Pepper Schwartz, Davis Patterson, and Sara Steen

PART IV WOMEN AND MEN IN SOCIETY

- 12 Television Promotion of Gender Equality in Societies **277**
Everett M. Rogers, Thomas M. Hirata, Ankila S. Chandran, and Jeffery D. Robinson
- 13 Men and Women in the Market Place **305**
Michael J. Cody, John Seiter, and Yvette Montagne-Miller
- 14 Gender and Power **331**
Judy C. Pearson and Leda Cooks
- Author Index **351**
- Subject Index **363**

Contributors

James J. Bradac, Department of Communication, University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA 93106.

Camille Buckner, Department of Psychology, University of Texas-Austin, Austin, TX 78712.

Diane M. Burns, Department of Speech Communication, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487

Judee K. Burgoon, Department of Communication, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721.

Daniel J. Canary, Department of Speech Communication, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802.

Ankila S. Chandran, Annenberg School for Communication, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089-0281.

Michael J. Cody, Department of Communication Arts and Sciences, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089-1694.

Leda Cooks, Department of Communication, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003

William R. Cupach, Department of Communication, Illinois State University, Normal, IL 61761.

Leesa Dillman, Department of Communication, University of Nevada at Las Vegas, Las Vegas, NV 89154

Mary Anne Fitzpatrick, Department of Communication Arts, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI 53706.

Nancy M. Henley, Department of Psychology, 405 Hilgard Avenue, University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1563.

Thomas M. Hirata, Annenberg School for Communication, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089-0281.

Pamela J. Kalbfleisch, Department of Communication and Mass Media, University of Wyoming, P.O. Box 3904, Laramie, WY 82071-3904

Joann Keyton, Department of Communication Studies, 143 Theatre and Communication Building, University of Memphis, Memphis, TN 38152

Lynn Carol Miller, Department of Communication Arts and Sciences, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089-1694; Department of Psychology, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089.

Yvette Montagne-Miller, Department of Speech Communication, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA 92182.

Charlene L. Muehlenhard, Department of Psychology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045

Anthony Mulac, Department of Communication, University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA 93106.

Davis Patterson, Department of Sociology, DK-40, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195.

Judy C. Pearson, School of Interpersonal Communication, Ohio University, Athens, OH 45701.

Joi L. Phelps, Department of Psychology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045

Rhonda K. Reinholtz, Department of Psychology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045

Jeffery D. Robinson, Department of Sociology, University of California-Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90024-9122.

Everett M. Rogers, Department of Communication, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131-1171

Sadina Rothspan, Department of Psychology, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089

Arthur T. Satterfield, Department of Psychology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045.

Pepper Schwartz, Department of Sociology, DK-40, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195.

John Seiter, Department of Speech Communication, Utah State University, Logan, UT 84322

Janet T. Spence, Department of Psychology, University of Texas-Austin, Austin, TX 78712.

Sara Steen, Department of Sociology, DK-40, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195.

Preface

There is power in a word or a gesture. There is power when women and men live together, work together, talk together, or are simply in each other's company. There is power in a smile, a caress, and there is power in sex.

There is power in money, there is power in education, and there is power in access. In some situations, who you know can matter more than what you know. Who you can know may affect what you can become.

There is power in a fist, a gun, and anger. There is power in how we choose to resolve our conflicts, and how we negotiate the most intimate aspects of our lives.

There is power in how we are portrayed in our music and our media; power in what we read, what we see, and what we hear. There is power in how we treat each other both as intimates and as strangers.

As much as we are bound in our society by the ways things are, we are equally drawn to the way things ought to be. This text provides an opportunity to look into the past and to draw conclusions about the future.

This edited book establishes a state of the art perspective on theory and research on gender, power, and communication in human relationships. In one volume are both theoretical essays and review chapters that address issues relevant to female and male differences in power, dominance, communication, equality, and expectations/beliefs. All contributors to this volume share two commonalities. First, each contributor provides a 1990s assessment of power and equality in female and male relationships. Second, each contributor reviews respective programs of research and focuses attention on the relevance of this research on understanding the relationships of women and men.

This volume is unique because it incorporates a multidisciplinary approach to the study of gender and the communication of power in human relationships. This book provides both scholastic breadth and centralized treatment of issues that form

the very foundation of social and personal relationships. This edited work will appeal to scholars working in the disciplines of communication and psychology, as well as other areas of social science research. This book includes the original work of intellectuals with national and international reputations in the social sciences. Each of these chapters presents a state of the art review or a theoretical essay augmented by an empirical investigation of a central concept.

Pamela J. Kalbfleisch

Michael J. Cody

Part I

Introduction and Overview

Chapter 1

Power and Communication in the Relationships of Women and Men

Pamela J. Kalbfleisch
University of Wyoming

Michael J. Cody
University of Southern California

Men who run the world today are “. . . a bunch of shallow, bald, middle aged men with character disorders. They don't have the emotional capacity it takes to qualify as human beings. One good thing about these white, male, almost extinct mammals is that they are growing old. We get to watch them die.”

—a 36-year-old female trucking-company executive (Gates, 1993, p. 49)

I want everything to be just like it was before.

—D-Fens quoted from the movie, *Falling Down*

WHY THIS BOOK NOW?

We write the introduction to this volume in January 1994 exactly 1 year after the inauguration of Bill (and Hillary) Clinton. The Clintons promised change, changes in leadership, welfare program, health care program, domestic programs and, of course, changes in women's roles. Make him president, Bill said, “and you get two for the price of one.” “You do not have to tear a woman down to build a man up,” Clinton admonished during his campaign. Now, 1 year into their term in office, we have witnessed some (limited) changes in public power held by women. Of course, critics are plentiful—changes too slow, changes too fast, or as D-Fens mourns, change should be reversed.

We advocate change in roles for men and women, and our goal in this volume is to chronicle changes, both the changes that are occurring and changes that need to occur. Indeed, all the contributors to this volume are familiar with change: All have devoted considerable attention to women and men in this society and changes that have or that should have occurred. Of course, we are not interested in change just for the sake of change. We are guided by two goals: equality for women and men (in power, income rights and privileges), and improved quality in female/male relationships and human relationships in general. It is clear, considering that what some people have to say (such as those quoted in the introduction), that some women loath men for not changing, and that some men are anxious, defensive, or angry about the changes that have already occurred. Obviously, there is much work to do in order to facilitate change and to improve relationships.

Further, it is clear that all matters concerning relationships between women and men are of paramount interest to scholars and are clearly in the center stage of the public's focus. Of course, there are (highly visible) stories: reactions to the movie *Thelma and Louise*, to the Hill-Thomas hearings, to the Tailhook Incident, to the spousal abuse trials of the Bobbitt couple, and so forth. However, general issues are proven to be important *every day*. Consider a few of the highlights from the *Los Angeles Times* for 1 week during fall 1993:

Los Angeles Times, September 30, 1993, "Early Obesity Tied to Social, Economic Woes for Women." by John Schwartz, *The Washington Post*. This article reports on a publication in the *New England Journal of Medicine* detailing how overweight women complete less education, are 20% less likely to get married, hold poverty rates at 10% higher than non-obese women, and earn \$6,710 less per year than non-obese women. Only one of these findings was replicated for men: Obese men were 11% less likely to be married than thinner men.

Los Angeles Times, October 2, 1993, "Women a Comedy Force? No Joke," by Chuck Crisafulli, in a "Special to the Times." The article deals with the fact that women have to work hard to break into the comedy circuit, or find ways to nurture a career outside the "boys' club" mainstream clubs.

Los Angeles Times, October 2, 1993, "Wilson Signs Bills to Expand Rape Laws," by Daniel M. Weintraub and Mark Gladstone, *Times* staff writers. Incredulous as it seems, only in 1993 did the Governor of California (a state accounting for more than 11% of the nation's population) sign a bill changing the rape laws so that "spousal rape" is now considered a felony, the same as the rape of a stranger. Spousal rape (because of the "assumed consent" for sexual relationships between a husband and a wife) used to warrant a misdemeanor. Governor Pete Wilson also signed a "gender-neutral rape bill" that will now allow women who commit sex crimes with minors to be punished as rigorously as men.

Los Angeles Times, October 4, 1993, "Is Violence a Male Hormone Problem?": "Dear Dr. Brothers . . . It seems that almost all this tendency to violence is somehow related to testosterone. Has anyone considered a medicine that would lessen the amount of this male hormone and act as an antidote to violence?"

Los Angeles Times' Youth Opinion, October 4, 1993, "Does Rap Music Disrespect Women, Girls?" As one 17-year-old woman observed:

Rap gives women a bad image when it calls them things like bitch, slut, and whore. Videos make them seem like sex objects. They focus on their bodies, not their intelligence or their minds. All you ever see is girls in bikinis. Guys listen to that music, and it influences how they talk to girls. If guys look up to rappers, that's a bad role model for them to be following.

Women also give themselves bad images. In Dr. Dre's song, "Nothing But a G-Thing," women do things for the video they didn't have to do if they didn't want to. Women shouldn't put themselves in the position of putting themselves down. If they took a stand, it would help the [women's] cause. ("Does Rap," 1993, p. E5)

Los Angeles Times, October 5, 1993, "Women's Groups Re-emerge in Workplace," from Associated Press. The article details a few successes in the workings of a "Women's Advisory Committee" that promotes the advancement of women in top positions of management. Indeed, J.C. Penney is credited with creating such an advisory committee 3½ years ago in order to help place more women in senior positions. The history of such advisory committees, however, is not overly positive. When such "networking" groups were formed in the 1970s, many were discouraged by management because they were perceived as "adversarial." Still, some died out in the early 1980s when women did make some advances on managerial positions. Frustration with employment during the last recession has prompted networking groups (or "mentoring" partnerships) to organize again. However, the article points out some trouble spots:

Still, high-level women executives often don't participate in the corporate groups, said Dana Friedman, co-president of the New York-based Families and Work Institute. "They have the attitude, 'If I did it, why can't others?'" Friedman said. "Women at the top rarely advocate for women's issues." ("Women's Groups," p. D15)

Los Angeles Times, October 8, 1993, "Caught in a Vicious, Bitter Trap," by Dianne Klein, Times Staff Writer, documents the problem of men who marry noncitizen brides from the Philippines and elsewhere, and the women ultimately are abused. If the women complain, the husbands withdraw sponsorship and the INS deports the woman. Unless laws are changed, an unknown number of women will live in jeopardy, fear, and pain.

If such issues and problems surface in only 1 week, it is clear that society (the media, governments, etc.) are decidedly and keenly focused on reflecting on men and women, their relationships, and their problems.

Further, it is clear that despite several decades of advocacy, persistent problems plague women, their concerns, and their progress. Programs of research that have focused on improving equality of women and men date back to the middle of this century. However, in some ways, little seems to have changed. Today, women's salaries still lag behind men's, and fiscal inequality directly relates to dyadic power inequality among couples. Women's occupational status is strongly and adversely

affected by dated stereotypes. Women have hit glass ceilings and they do not appear to benefit from the same mentoring relationships that benefit men on the job. They, until recently, watched spouses who raped them be charged with only mild misdemeanors, they are devalued in music videos and lyrics, they are judged harshly on the basis of physical appearance, and they watch as backlash occurs whenever solid progress has been made in political, domestic, and employment areas (Faludi, 1991).

What happened? Are things as bleak as they appear to be from reading newspapers and watching talk shows concerning interpersonal relationships?

In sum, we edited this book in order to document research on women and men living, working, and being together. Our concern is to have scholars in special areas chronicle their line of research (theory and empirical evidence) and report on the progress (or lack of) in equality and relational quality. An assessment is long overdue and timely—both given the focus on gender studies today and given the particular time in history in which leaders advocate deliberate, planned changes for gender roles. As we approach the year 2000, just how much have women and men progressed as participants in interpersonal relationships and in society as a whole?

OVERVIEW OF THE VOLUME

This edited book establishes a state-of-the-art perspective on theory and research in many (but admittedly not all) aspects of power in female/male relationships. The goal of the volume is to provide in one text both theoretical essays and review chapters that address issues relevant to female and male approaches to power, dominance, communication, equality, beliefs, and expectations. All contributors to this volume share two commonalities. First, each contributor provides a 1990s assessment of power and equality in female/male relationships. Second, each contributor reviews perspective programs of research and focuses attention on the relevance of his/her research on understanding the relationships between men and women.

The chapters are organized into three parts (Parts II–IV). First we focus attention on *gender-based expectations and beliefs*. Chapters in this part deal with issues concerning our expectations about how men and women are, or have been stereotyped, their roles, their characteristics, and their behaviors as “appropriate” for females and for males. Although expectations and beliefs based on gender are important in the lines of research discussed later in the book, the contributors in this section capitalize in the formation and maintenance of long-term, enduring, gender-based beliefs concerning verbal and nonverbal behaviors and the roles of women and men. Part III focuses attention on men and women interacting with one another—dating, negotiating safe sex, giving and receiving advice, influencing, coping with anger and conflict, and facilitating intimacy in their relationships. It is the longest of the three parts for the obvious reason that *communicating* and *dyadic power* is of central concern to most scholars, students, and members of society. Part IV adopts a macrolevel view of gender research. Contributors to this section focus

directly on proposed *major* changes in television portrayals, in social influence and perceptions of women and men, and in how gender and power are studied by the research establishment. These chapters also propose some fundamental changes in how research should be conducted in the areas of persuasion, relational communication, and gender studies.

In Henley's chapter, she reexamines, extends, clarifies, and defends her 1970s work on "Body Politics" (Henley, 1977). Henley provides a set of testable hypotheses, emphasizing the association of specific nonverbal behaviors to social power. She continues her goal of revealing how certain nonverbal behaviors are seemingly irrelevant to power (behaviors reflecting two functions: intimacy and dominance) and reflect a fundamental gender bias at the societal level, allowing males greater license and freedom to behave and dominating asymmetric unequal patterns of behaviors.

In a companion piece on nonverbal communication and power, Burgoon and Dillman review literature concerning the "classic" view of "gender displays" in nonverbal behaviors. Although previous research clearly suggests that males typically communicate with more gestures, dominance, and behaviors, Burgoon and Dillman's study indicates that men and women tend to use many of the same behaviors to express dominance, and that women can and do communicate dominance behaviors with some frequency. However, the authors note that gender differences persist in that males and females differ in their ability to intensify or modify messages being sent. Males more effectively communicate dominance, whereas female behaviors reflect more solidarity and intimacy.

Mulac and Bradac, in chapter 4, overview research on linguistic variables in analysis of gender differences in powerfulness or powerlessness. Considerable evidence has been provided concerning "female speech," the "female register," "men's language," and "women's language." These authors indicate that some of the earlier research from the 1970s is too often accepted at face value or is rarely challenged, despite the fact that many of these early investigations were limited in a number of ways. Most problematic is the fact that most scholars (until recently) critically questioned which of the linguistic variables validly reflected the concept of "power," and few projects sampled male and female discourse from *ongoing interactions*. As Mulac and Bradac note, communicators often adapt or accommodate to their interactants' communication style or pattern; thus, expected differences between females and males, or power and powerlessness styles of communicating, may disappear as individuals communicate. Mulac and Bradac's results indicate that the *expectations* and *beliefs* that we tend to hold regarding "gender-based" language are probably too simplistic and invalid.

In the final chapter on expectations and beliefs, Spence and Buckner seek to clarify the models that have been proposed regarding the meaning of masculinity and femininity. Spence and Buckner characterize the concepts of "femininity" and "masculinity" as some of the muddiest in social psychology. Models reviewed include (a) the unidimensional model of femininity and masculinity, (b) the dual model of two separate, uncorrelated factors of masculinity and femininity, and (c) a "multifactorial model" that is centered around the notion of "gender identity" but

that allows males and females to hold differing beliefs and experiences part of the psychological sense of being “male” and of being “female.”

Part III of the volume focuses on men and women living, working, and being together. Research colleagues Rineholtz, Muehlenhard, Phelps, and Satterfield pointedly illustrate how popular media (films, rap music, pop music) contain insidious if not pervasive messages concerning sexual beliefs regarding male power and dominance and female response and submissiveness. These researchers suggest that the common messages and themes influence how people “naturally” accept messages about sexuality and sexual coercion. These messages can have alarming if not dangerous consequences for those who are about to date and for those who are dating.

Professors Miller, Burns, and Rothspan (chapter 7) present, in our opinion, one of the most alarming reports in our volume. In their chapter, Miller and her colleagues outline how major discrepancies in sexual practices among African Americans produces a situation in which African-American women have significantly reduced levels of power and are treated with little equality in their intimate relationships. This disparity can place these women at a distinct disadvantage in using safe sex when their partners are unwilling. The implications of this power discrepancy for the spread of AIDS among the African-American community are particularly disquieting.

This report is followed by Kalbfleisch and Keyton’s description (chapter 8) of the power inequality that exists between women and men working together, as men make use of mentoring relationships to advance their careers, women falter in developing these helping relationships. These researchers suggest that women may make use of a differing model for mentoring, and that understanding this model may assist in facilitating the development of these supportive relationships.

In chapter 9, Fizpatrick and Mulac examine the influence of interpersonal or noninterpersonal relationships on the use of “feminine gender preferential” language and “masculine gender preferential” language by both female and male interactants. They find that for men the relationship is a factor in language usage, with men employing more “masculine gender preferential” language with strangers, and more “feminine gender preferential” language with their spouses.

The differing abilities and styles of conflict management and coping with anger is examined by Cupach and Canary in chapter 10. These researchers indicate that the popularly accepted stereotype that men are more aggressive than women may not be supported in the cumulative research findings. In their chapter, this proposition is explicated and tested with a sample study and references to past research that has failed to support this stereotype of the female and male approaches to conflict and anger.

In the final chapter of this section (chapter 11), Schwartz, Patterson, and Stein argue that financial inequalities play havoc with the nature of female/male equalities and power. Specifically, it is the financially less stable female who is in jeopardy of never really achieving equality, and who is also suffering from a reduced status position, reduced levels of self-esteem, and other problems. Further, Schwartz and colleagues outline a number of problems in the self-concepts of both

females and males. For example, women are affected by taboos as to who is to initiate sex and who should or should not control the frequency of sexual contact. On the other hand, men are affected by reduced levels of esteem when they suffer loss of income because so many of them subscribe to the role of “male as provider.”

Part IV of this volume deals with females and males in a global, societal level. First, Rogers and his colleagues (Hirata, Chandran, and Robinson) overview the various attempts made around the globe to increase the status of women—especially in the United States of America and in India. They report on a representative study in the United States and on another one in India. The U.S. study deals with how males and females are portrayed on television, demonstrating a clear attempt (in the shows of the 1990s) to show women in various working roles and to show men in more nurturing roles (among other things). The India study taped receivers’ reactions to television shows designed to prompt receivers to rethink the “traditional” roles of women in Indian society. Still, it may require considerably more time to actually change gender-based expectations concerning roles and behaviors relying on a media-only based approach.

In chapter 13, Cody, Seiter, and Montagne-Miller review 30 years of persuasion research in an attempt to show that women (or some subset of women) are more easily susceptible to influence than men. Actually, if one assesses an individual’s goals, resources, and beliefs concerning purchases, male/females abilities, and so on, men are substantially more easily influenced than women (they spent more money in less time, agreed with more tactics, and spent more time shopping when assisted by a female, compared to when the salesclerk was a male). Still, women were also influenced by a number of tactics when shopping; but generally it is women who are competent shoppers (for clothing); they resist influence, take more time shopping, buy fewer items that are returned, and shop more economically.

In the final “macrolevel” chapter, Pearson and Cooks present a historical and critical view of gender research and provide a number of valuable insights and critiques of how scholars have progressed or not progressed over the decades in studying gender. Of particular interest are their suggestions on how we are to best proceed in order to provide more valuable research conclusions regarding gender and power.

TOWARD INTEGRATION, EQUALITY, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS

The authors of the chapters in this volume review substantial bodies of research, offer intriguing research investigations, present provocative perspectives, and offer unique solutions or implications for the study of women and men, power, and human relationships. Most of these authors are experts and pioneers in their respective areas of study. Their advice, perspectives, and research endeavors bring us to an understanding of the state of the art in the 1990s.

In an attempt to integrate and unify this volume for the reader we offer Table 1.1 as a précis of these contributions, and as a method for placing these chapters into an overarching perspective. However, the synopses contained in this table are no more than an overview designed to assist the reader in digesting what is sometimes an enigmatic volume. The reader should keep in mind that the summary paragraphs are the work of the editors, and that to reach a full and complete understanding of each author's outlook, the individual chapters should be examined and considered at length. It is our hope that this volume will move both scholar and student toward an understanding of the relationships of women and men as we reach the end of this century and stand poised at the precipice of the future.

REFERENCES

- Crisafulli, C. (1993, October 2). Women a comedy force? No joke. *Los Angeles Times*, pp. F1, F12.
- Does rap music disrespect women, girls? p. E5. (1993, October 4). *Los Angeles Times*.
- Faludi, S. (1991). *Backlash: The undeclared war against American women*. New York: Doubleday.
- Gates, D. (1993, March 29). White male paranoia, *Newsweek*, pp. 48–53.
- Henley, N. (1977). *Body politics: Power, sex, and nonverbal communication*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Is violence a male hormone problem? p. E6. (1993, October 4). *Los Angeles Times*.
- Klein, D. (1993, October 8). Caught in a vicious, bitter trap. *Los Angeles Times*, pp. A1, A23.
- Schwartz, J. (1993, September 30). Early obesity tied to social, economic woes for women. *Los Angeles Times*, p. A23.
- Weintraub, D.M., & Gladstone, M. (1993, October 2). Wilson signs bills to expand rape laws. *Los Angeles Times*, p. A21.
- Women's groups re-emerge in workplace. pp. D11, D15. (1993, October 5). *Los Angeles Times*.

TABLE 1.1
Gender, Power, and Communication

Henley (Chapter 2)	
Outlook	
History of research	Professor Henley revises and explicates her 1977 book, <i>Body Politics</i>, reviewing 25 years of research on nonverbal behaviors and nonverbal communication in interpersonal transactions, including experimental research, observational analyses, surveys, and mass media portrayals. One of the central propositions is that nonverbal behaviors that might otherwise appear "meaningless" and unrelated to power are in fact behaviors strongly associated with status and power, and are related to "sex privilege." Special attention is given to behaviors associated with <i>space, touch, gaze/visual, facial expression, posture, gesture, body movement, and compliance</i>.
Equality: The good and the bad	In the view of the editors, Henley's work can be credited with significantly increasing the <i>awareness</i> of how subtle power displays are in all human interaction, especially when focusing attention on asymmetric expressions of dominance and intimacy. However, despite the fact that many men and women are more <i>aware</i> of the meanings of behaviors, and some may alter their behaviors (such as avoiding touch that denotes dominance, or refusing to accept and legitimize a potentially dominating action), gender equality is extremely elusive. For example, Henley notes that increased smiling by women and minorities are clearly present in media portrayals, but women and minorities do not "in real life" smile more than men and "Whites;" thus, stereotypes persist. Further, Henley provides a set of guidelines concerning how research needs to be improved in order to more competently and directly study <i>gender equality</i> and the <i>subordination hypothesis</i>.
Female and male relationships	A case can easily be made that the relationships between men and women have been, and continue to be, improved given greater awareness of the meanings communicators assign to nonverbal behaviors. However, Henley argues that some of the most important research has yet to be undertaken. Parallel work with ethnic groups and subordinate groups is important not only for its own sake, but also as additional support for the general subordination hypothesis. In regard to male/female relationships and social change, some commendable recent research includes work on identifying which types of men are likely to be aggressive, and how women's "little voices" (or gut instincts) enable them to sense that they are interacting with an aggressor, a potential rapist.

TABLE 1.1 (Continued)

Outlook	Burgoon and Dillman (Chapter 3)
History of research	Reviewed are decades of research on "gender displays" on nonverbal communication, research that certainly escalated in the 1980s. This chapter focuses on <i>dominance cues</i> , and the authors conclude that women's nonverbal behavior is just as capable of communicating dominance and power as is men's—especially effective are non-normative distance, touch, and eye contact.
Equality: The good and the bad	The general consensus is that gender differences have been overexaggerated in some recent research. However, the present results indicate that males and females are equally effective in displaying identifiable dominance behaviors. The authors conclude that there are more similarities than differences between men and women. However, women were rated as more <i>composed</i> and as more <i>affectionate</i> than males, still suggesting that women are perceived as more calm, likeable, and trustworthy (see results in chapter).
Female and male relationships	Gender differences, when significant, did not account for much of the variance, suggesting fairly equal reactions on the part of observers. However, the study contains little information concerning the frequency of occurrence of the displays in "real life," and is limited primarily due to the fact that results are not embedded in any contextual framework involving situations, environments, or goals (i.e., if people expect males to display dominance cues in certain situations, will these expectations "cause" observers to see more [male-related] dominance cues?).

TABLE 1.1 (Continued)

Outlook	Mulac and Bradac (Chapter 4)
History of research	Starting with Lakoff's work in the 1970s, traditional research in the area of linguistics posits that women use particular forms of linguistic markers denoting tentativeness, uncertainty, powerlessness; indeed, the term the <i>female register</i> was coined to characterize the "coherent code of powerlessness" in females' use of language. However, over the last two decades, more and more scholars have challenged this "traditional" view, arguing instead that (a) female use of certain linguistic devices has little to do with "power" and more to do with being socialized into different cultures, and (b) there is little evidence in support of a "coherent code" of markers that signify "power." The "cross-situational" consistency of such codes communicated by females is questionable.
Equality: The good and the bad	The authors concluded that they failed to find more than "weak support" for the power-discrepancy hypothesis. Secondly, the authors found that although woman's language was in fact rated lower in <i>dynamism</i> than men's language, women's language was actually rated higher in <i>sociointellectual status</i> and <i>aesthetic quality</i>. Generally, it was concluded that there is no strong evidence in favor of female's use of low-power speech. Among other things, the authors argued that future research needs to focus on the age of the interactants, because (a) males and females may express different levels of power at different times in the life cycle, or (b) different generations may be socialized into using more (or less) power in their language when maturing in the 1950s, 1960s, 1970s, and so on. In sum, there appears to be more equality in fe/male language than what one would expect based on observations made in the 1970s.
Female and male relationships	Today, there is no strong or convincing reason to expect females to demur or to use less powerful language than men (except that there is consistent evidence that females appear to be less <i>dynamic</i>). Additional research needs to confirm and replicate the present results, but it appears that male and female language is more similar than one would expect. Future research also needs to assess whether or not similarities in male/female language will translate into similarities, or equality, in outcomes related to language production—persuasiveness, credibility, impression management, and other perceptions.

TABLE 1.1 (Continued)

Spence and Buckner (Chapter 5)	
Outlook	
History of research	Despite decades of research employing the terms <i>masculinity</i> and <i>femininity</i> , the terms remain some of the "muddiest" constructs in both theory building and research in the social sciences. Adding new terms (sex-role orientation, sex typing, and gender schema) hardly aids in the understanding of the terms femininity and masculinity. Spence and Buckner review both theoretical and empirical uses of the terms, explicate current models of femininity and masculinity, and present an alternative model that provides a better fit to existing empirical data.
Equality: The good and the bad	The authors argue that rejection of the unifactorial model (i.e., masculinity and femininity are bipolar extremes of a single dimension) is long overdue. Further, the two-factor model (positing one dimension of femininity and one dimension of masculinity) is also problematic. A superior approach is one in which scholars adopt a gender identity theory that allows for gender-related phenomena to fall into multiple categories of traits, behaviors and attitudes. In regard to equality, the proposed theory rejects relatively simplistic notions of females or males as being fairly homogeneous types of people who differ from one another on one or two clusters of traits. Women and men are allowed (as evidence indicates) to be quite similar to one another on some categories, while differing on others.
Female and male relationships	Both men and women possess, though in different levels or amounts, and at different intensities, a variety of both masculine and feminine characteristics; characteristics involving more than a composite of basic traits. Although Spence and Buckner do not explicitly address the issue of the quality of male and female relationships, their claim concerning how we study gender equality allows for considerable freedom for the individual to seek out and identify with a range of potential gender related roles, traits, rules and behaviors. Thus, not only are individuals equal on some criteria and different on others, the multifactorial model holds that we should avoid "typecasting" individuals into limited categories of "masculinity" and "femininity." An initial starting point for improved relationships between females and males is to avoid stereotypes. Perhaps social scientists should start by abolishing the words "masculinity" and "femininity" from social science research (and ultimately from "pop psychology").

TABLE 1.1 (Continued)

Outlook	Reinholtz, Muehlenhard, Phelps, and Satterfield (Chapter 6)
History of research	Previous research looked at "mistakes" in flirting and characteristics of date rapists and situations involving rape. The present chapter assesses the messages and themes in popular media that establish or create how we think about sexual coercion. Messages and themes that are pervasive and insidious in society.
Equality: The good and the bad	The situation looks bleak for equality, as it does for improving male and female relationships. Pervasive sexual messages include: Males cannot control sexual behaviors, females are responsible, romance = nonrational behavior, sex is a force of nature, men are untrustworthy, women ask for it, and so on. Virtually all forms of media reinforce attitudes and beliefs that perpetuate a climate of sexual coercion.
Female and male relationships	With few exceptions, movies, novels, and music continue to transmit messages concerning women as submissive, responsible, yet powerless—and they do so with great consistency. Obviously, the first concern in changing the current situation deals with an awareness of how both males and females are influenced, even manipulated, by these messages. More importantly, a critical need exists in adhering to a more enlightened, mature, (egalitarian) set of messages concerning "romance."

TABLE 1.1 (Continued)

Outlook	Miller, Burns, and Rothspan (Chapter 7)
History of research	For a multitude of reasons (war, disease, poverty, etc.), there has often been a disproportionate sex ratio in societies over time, with women often outnumbering males. At such times, women's positions and roles in society may either be elevated, or devalued. Specifically, confronted with a shortage of "available" men, women are likely to be devalued when they have a sense of powerlessness, an inability to select a mate, and when they possess a lack of both "dyadic" and "structural" power. Such devaluation (along with an individual's skills at communicating and negotiating safe sex practices) affects a woman's ability to propose safe sex practices and to overcome resistance to unsafe sex practices.
Equality: The good and the bad	Among many minority members in American society, women possess substantially less power than do men; this is especially true in the African-American culture. Men indicated greater promiscuity than women, both in and out of committed relationships. Confronted with a shortage of available men, women often (but not always) work harder on forming and maintaining interpersonal relationships, being instrumental in using condoms, being persistent in their use, and working to overcome resistance to the use of condoms. However, as economic power decreased, women were more likely to simply focus on the sexual experience and were more likely to be at risk, reflecting extremely low levels of power and equality among the lower SES individuals. Both the current and future potential for creating and maintaining equality between males and females is disturbing.
Female and male relationships	Improved interpersonal relationships are hampered by interpersonal dynamics stemming from a disproportionate sex ratio, by poverty, which reduces structural/economic power, and (often) by a lack in dyadic power. Women continue to work diligently toward two goals: to work on committed relationships, and simply to reduce risk from serious and deadly diseases. It appears the situation is bleakest among the poorest; extremely poor females might use sexual experiences as part of an arsenal to solve short-term economic and financial goals, giving less immediate thought to serious, and possibly long-term health risks. The need for research and intervention, is critical.

TABLE 1.1 (Continued)

Kalbfleisch and Keyton (Chapter 8)	
Outlook	
History of research	The existence of mentors and proteges has been chronicled throughout history. Examples of the presence of these relationships abounds in literature, biography, film, popular press, and social scientific research. Modern research efforts have demonstrated what has been anecdotally described in the literature and popular media. Specifically, mentors significantly facilitate the career success of their proteges.
Equality: The good and the bad	Women have not been as successful as men in developing mentoring relationships. Males appear to be reluctant to enter into mentorships with females. On the other hand, females are more likely to mentor other females than they are males. However, there are relatively few women in positions where they can successfully mentor other women, and those that are in positions of power may hesitate to develop these mentoring relationships. There is evidence that part of the problem women may be facing is that the traditional framework for male-male relationships may not fit female-female relationships, nor female-male relationships. Finding alternate frameworks that successful mentoring relationships use may help empower nontraditional mentors and proteges by giving them a reference for developing mentorships.
Female and male relationships	Women and men are the least common mentoring partners that are found in academe and in business. Mentors and proteges more often seek members of their own sex for these partnerships. Ultimately this leads to a waste of resources and limitation of the sources for professional and social support. One of the problems faced by women and men working closely together may be gossip and innuendo on the part of co-workers and scrutiny by superiors, as well as jealousy expressed by spouses and loved ones. Sexual tension is another problem women and men may face in close working relationships. This sexual undercurrent can lead to mistakes in interpreting friendly behavior as flirting or seductive behavior, issues of sexual harassment, and perhaps the development of romantic relationships that could complicate the working relationship. One suggested possibility is for women and men to learn to transform sexual energy and attraction into mutual creativity and a robust, exciting working relationship. Another suggestion is to look for other models of relationships from which to draw useful frameworks for the development of mentoring relationships between women and men.

TABLE 1.1 (Continued)

Fitzpatrick and Mulac (Chapter 9)	
Outlook	
History of research	Considerable evidence on the Gender-Linked Language Effect supports the general notion that males and females vary significantly in the use of language (specifically, specific linguistic and prosodic features of speech). For example, males tend to use language involving more elements of <i>dynamism</i> , whereas the language of females often reflects higher levels of <i>aesthetic quality</i> , and sometimes higher levels of <i>sociointellectual status</i> . The research supports a general notion, or stereotype, that males and females represent two different sociolinguistic groups. However, much of the existing research has examined language examples taken in isolation of context and in isolation of the effects of the partner (male, female, spouse, etc.)
Equality: The good and the bad	Research reported in the chapter generally supports the claim that women and men vary in use of language, summing over all settings and interactional partners, and reflected only as a weighted combination of variables. More importantly, evidence indicates that communicators did not consistently use certain types of linguistic variables. Husbands used masculine gender preferential language with women strangers, but converged toward their wives' feminine preferential style when interacting with them. Wives, however, did not converge toward husbands and maintained the same feminine style in interactions with others. The conclusions/implications: In home settings, or when interacting with intimates, there is substantially more "equality" or similarity between men and women than what one would expect from extrapolating from the context-free language samples of college students.
Female and male relationships	The results of the reported study, if explicated, represent good news for male and female relationships. Some previous research in speech accommodation indicated that females were more likely to converge toward males (than vice versa), for reasons pertaining to increased social skills, or motivation to show similarity, or linking, or to be liked by the partner. The present results indicate that males are more likely to switch speaking patterns to accommodate to an extremely important area of social participation: intimate settings. Males and females appear to communicate with similar levels of aesthetic quality, sociointellectual status, and dynamism when speaking together.

TABLE 1.1 (Continued)

Outlook	Cupach and Canary (Chapter 10)
History of research	The assumption that men are more aggressive and less cooperative than women in conflict is not supported by the years of research on the topic. The literature reveals that men and women are equally capable of cooperating, competing, or avoiding the partner during conflict interactions.
Equality: The good and the bad	The news regarding equality is quite good. Because men and women largely engage in similar behaviors, neither sex is privileged in this type of interaction. Men, however, should not interpret women's tears as a sign of weakness or acquiescence. In addition, educators should stop perpetuating stereotypes and oversimplified men's and women's conflict behaviors.
Female and male relationships	Conflict probably affects relationships more powerfully than do most other types of interactions. It appears that the dissatisfied person seeks to engage the partner who may want to withdraw. In other instances men and women in conflict tend to mirror each other's behaviors. If the couple engage in the sequences of competitive actions or in demand withdrawal patterns, then the relationship may suffer. If the parties to conflict can break out of competitive sequences, then the relationship will likely be served.

TABLE 1.1 (Continued)

Schwartz, Patterson, and Steen (Chapter 11)	
Outlook	
History of research	Two variables powerfully related to status inequality among married individuals are <i>money</i> and <i>sex</i> . Schwartz and colleagues document qualitative and quantitative research on power and dominance among married or cohabitating heterosexual couples, and among gay and lesbian couples. The "traditional" model involving income discrepancies is that if both the wife and husband believe in the "male-breadwinner ideology," the husband tends to have more power in major decisions, even if his wife has a higher income than he does. The "traditional" model of sexual activities assigns power to the male in terms of both the initiation of sexual activity and the frequency of sexual activity. However, the dynamics of sex and money as resources affecting power and domination often operate differently in homosexual couples.
Equality: The good and the bad	The "male breadwinner/male initiator" orientation is deeply entrenched in society and is hard to change. Even among couples who adopt an egalitarian philosophy, or among couples in which wives earn more money than husbands, people are susceptible to the biases of the male as the decision-maker/initiator. The traditional, dominant practice strongly affects the self-concept of both males and females; males' self-esteem is intimately linked to being a "good provider"; Females often find it difficult to be the initiator of sex. Conclusion: Equality remains elusive, and probably will only follow after significant economic opportunities for women improve (and remain available consistently through recessions, etc.), and both men and women become aware of the way in which the traditional orientation affects their behavior and how they view themselves.
Female and male relationships	There always have been, and there always will be, problems in relationships that are attributable to disputes over money and sex. Being aware of the impact such variables have on power and domination, however, is no guarantee that conflicts can be avoided. Working women may, in fact, find that their income is likely to go entirely toward household expenses, freeing the husband's income to be spent as he sees fits. Lesbian couples know that money exerts a strong effect on power and domination, but they often confront a different kind of problem: They are so in tune with the corrupting effects money has on egalitarian relationships that they become sensitive to even small imbalances in money. However, the view looks especially bleak for working-class wives.

TABLE 1.1 (Continued)

Outlook	Rogers, Hirata, Chandran, and Robinson (Chapter 12)
History of research	After showing women engaged in domestic activities for years, television programs of the 1980s and 1990s incorporate social science theories in a concerted effort to promote the role of women—in several different countries. Although improved roles are portrayed on some programs (which clearly raise awareness of roles), they have yet to produce major changes in beliefs and attitudes.
Equality: The good and the bad	The "good" news is that more and more television shows plan to promote positive roles and egalitarian actions for and by women. Consciousness is raised, topics are debated, and female viewers identify with the plights of women shown on television; perhaps modeling their behaviors. The "bad" deals with the fact that messages are often not as consistently portrayed as we'd prefer, and sometimes female receivers actually identify with a character they were not intended to identify with (e.g., the self-sacrificing grandmother in "Hom Log").
Female and male relationships	Some males "don't get it," some receivers refuse to believe stories presented, and some have begun to backlash against the pro-women messages (e.g., in one story line an Indian girl [a child bride] died. Rather than accept the intended message that children are too young for marriages and giving birth, many males attributed other causes for the death, even blaming the victim of poor health practices. An actual improvement in female/male relationships may rest on combining changes in both interpersonal settings (schools, families, etc.), along with the media (movies, music, as well as television)(like other successful social planning campaigns).

TABLE 1.1 (Continued)

Outlook	Cody, Seiter, and Montagne-Miller (Chapter 13)
History of research	Decades of research in persuasion struggled to show women (or some group of women) as more easily influenced than men. Actually, men were often more easily influenced than women, depending on motives, beliefs, laws, and how resources are allocated.
Equality: The good and the bad	Soon (the authors hope) the myth of female influenceability will cease to persist. But research on "gender differences" probably will persist as scholars in marketing and advertising continue to examine how to appeal to women in "traditionally male" domains (as some recent titles have had it). Nonetheless, the simplistic notions of influenceability based only on gender is a thing of the past.
Female and male relationships	Men are not competent shoppers, which is obviously unfortunate, because shopping should be considered a fundamental or essential aspect of living. Yet, the double inequality for women today exists in that women do engage in shopping more often than do men, but society (or men, at least) <i>de-values</i> the importance of shopping. Such a situation may take time to change, starting (on one hand) with both parents becoming involved with both daughter and son; and with the acceptance of shopping as an important task any adult should be able to complete competently, and on a budget.

TABLE 1.1 (Continued)

Outlook	Pearson and Cooks (Chapter 14)
History of research	As a concluding chapter to the volume, the authors share a dialogue and discuss a chronological series of events leading up to today's orientations on research (and the basic questions of what, and how) "gender" issues are to be addressed and research.
Equality: The good and the bad	Awareness of biases in all fields of study is fundamental, followed by understanding and explaining behaviors from the <i>experience</i> of women; relying on <i>experiential knowledge</i> —cumulative life experiences, values, language, and so on. "Bad." Most social science research is descriptive or relies on hypothesis-testing; methods that hardly allow a scholar to capture the essence of actual experiences. The authors propose some guidelines for conducting research. A challenge is for scholars not to dogmatically reject the "new," and to be open to productive lines of inquiry.
Female and male relationships	A fundamental problem since the 1960s in calling for "equality" is that equality was "good," so long as the basic rules of society are not changed—"equality," "enlightened" men may accept. However, impacting on male and female relationships today is the fact that "equality" also means that the rules themselves change. Hence, some may feel that too many changes occur too quickly, prompting alienation, backlash, and adversarial reactions. The challenge will be to co-exist and integrate experiential worlds that are quite different, not to degenerate into separatist environments in which two spheres of knowledge and ideology remain isolated.

Part II

Gender-Based Expectations and Beliefs

Chapter 2

Body Politics Revisited: What Do We Know Today?

Nancy M. Henley

University of California, Los Angeles

In 1977 my book *Body Politics* (Henley, 1977) reviewed the literature on “power, sex, and nonverbal communication” and put forward from this review a set of theses, which I summarize below for the sake of those who are not familiar with them (and as a reminder for those who are). The theses are here categorized into three broad topic areas (all appear in Henley, 1977, pp. 179–200; the original numbers given them in the book are given below to aid identification).

The first topic area covers *nonverbal behavior/communication* (NVB/NVC) and the previously neglected *domain of power* within NVC studies. Like many others, I stated that nonverbal behavior is a major medium of communication in everyday life. But unlike others, I further stated that power/status/dominance is a major topic of nonverbal communication; that nonverbal behavior is a major avenue for social control and interpersonal dominance; that nonverbal power gestures provide the micropolitical structure, the thousands of daily acts through which nonverbal influence takes place, which underlies and supports the macropolitical structure; and that because of general cultural ignorance of nonverbal communication, its interpretation is highly susceptible to social influences (e.g., explanations utilizing sex stereotypes) that further maintain the status quo (theses 1, 2, 3, and 4).

Later theses were about the *definition and exercise of (social) power*: Borrowing from typical social science formulations, I defined *power* as the capability of influencing or compelling others, based on the control of desired resources (power, status, and dominance are different, though related and often confounded, con-

cepts¹). The ultimate underpinning of power, I maintained, is force, although force is the last-ditch, not the front-line defense. Power is exercised along a continuum, from least to greatest application of force; generally speaking, the mildest form of force that is effective will be used. Nonverbal behavior occupies a crucial point in the force continuum, between covert and overt control and between covert and overt resistance (theses 10, 11, 12, 13, 14).

The final topic area interrelates *nonverbal communication, power, and gender*: I claimed that the overwhelming bulk of sex-differentiated behavior is learned and is developed to display otherwise unobtrusive differences, and that many nonverbal behaviors that seem meaningless and non-power-related in fact are aspects of sex privilege or reflect societal biases ultimately founded in power differences (theses 8 and 9). I stated that sexual attraction cannot sufficiently explain men's greater usage of gestures that indicate both intimacy and dominance. Further, usurpation of the nonverbal symbols of power by subordinates may be ignored, denied, or punished by others, rather than accepted (theses 15 and 16). And much of women's behavior that is interpreted as self-limiting may in reality be the end of a sequence in which assertion was attempted, and suppressed, on the nonverbal level (thesis 18).

In this area I made a number of testable hypotheses, supporting them whenever possible with empirical data collected by others and, sometimes, myself. These are listed individually below so that we may examine their validity in the light of subsequent research; they are preceded by their thesis number from *Body Politics*.²

5. Nonverbal control is of particular importance to women, who are more sensitive to its cues and probably more the targets of such control.
6. Many nonverbal behaviors have the dual function of expressing either dominance or intimacy, according to whether they are asymmetrically or symmetrically used by the partners in a relationship.
7. The behaviors expressing dominance and subordination between nonequals parallel those used by males and females in the unequal relation of the sexes.

Table 2.1, taken from *Body Politics*, illustrates some of the parallels in behaviors of which I wrote.

¹I understand *dominance* in a more personal and interactional way; it may be used to designate individual personality tendencies or dyadic relationships. *Status* concerns a person's social ranking relative to others, one's position in a hierarchy. Because they are highly interrelated concepts, and all three are used at different times in the nonverbal investigations reviewed herein, I will use the terms more or less interchangeably, although attempting to stick with the term or concept used in a particular study I am referring to. Edinger and Patterson (1983, p. 32) also used *status*, *power* and *dominance* interchangeably, citing other researchers' similar usage as well.

²Some readers may wish to question the particular theses I select to treat as testable hypotheses, considering that others of the list should be treated in the same way; however, my own position is that most of the theses are summing up the theoretical framework offered in the book. I believe the ones I have selected are the ones that other researchers have tried to test.