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ABSTRACT

Cartoons and captions were used to examine subjects' perceptions of managerial instrumentality and expressiveness based on polite or impolite speech of the manager, sex of manager, and sex of subordinate, in two work settings, artist and office. The subjects, 129 female and 84 male undergraduate psychology students, found polite managers significantly more instrumental and expressive than impolite managers. Within the polite condition, female managers were found less instrumental than male managers in the artist setting, whereas, in the office setting, no sex of manager differences were found. Also, in the artist setting, female subjects rated the polite female manager/female subordinate dyad more expressive than the other dyads, whereas male subjects found the all-female dyad less expressive. Implications for managers of both sexes are that it is better to be polite than to be impolite. For female managers, it is better to be polite in a status-conferring office than in an ambiguous workspace.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Somewhere there is a statistic of people who, like me, save this page for last, knowing that writing it signals the end of one experience and the beginning of another. It is with this mixture of nostalgia and excitement that I want to thank some very special people who have been a part of this quest.

At California State University, I want to thank Gloria Cowan, my thesis chairperson, not only for encouraging me to enroll in the master's program but also for offering her expert guidance in experimentation and thesis writing. I offer my sincerest appreciation to the members of my thesis committee, Diane Halpern and Martha Kazlo, who so generously read and commented upon each of my thesis drafts and challenged me to do my very best work.

At home, I want to thank my mate, Justin, for his quiet patience and support as I struggled with scientific thought, scientific method, and scientific writing—a far cry from the right-brained hit or miss style I love so much. Huge thanks go to daughter Jennifer, whose chatty "female" cheerfulness, optimism and warmth soothed my ruffled feathers as I fussed over each class paper, exam, and thesis draft. I thank other daughters who are far away, Suzanne, who took the time from her busy schedule to draw the great cartoons which made this entire experiment possible, and Terry, who sent me the Lakoff book
in the first place. Also, a special thanks to our entire group of daughters, including Carol, Meg, Barbara, and Joan, for their enthusiasm and interest in this project and their continuing dedication and concern for women everywhere.

And finally, to Meganne, my baby granddaughter, I am so glad you have already shown a bored dislike for the "rules of conversation" (Grice, 1975) in favor of the warmth and affiliative qualities associated with "women's language."
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract. ........................................ iii
Acknowledgements. .............................. v
Introduction. .................................... 1
  Politeness .................................... 2
  Sex Differences in Linguistic Behavior ...... 7
  Sex Differences in Managerial Behavior ...... 20
Summary of Literature. .......................... 27
Main Effects Hypotheses. ........................ 31
Additional Hypotheses. .......................... 32
Method. .......................................... 34
  Subjects ....................................... 34
  Overview and Design. .......................... 34
  Procedure and Materials. ..................... 35
Dependent Measures ............................. 39
Results .......................................... 41
  Manipulation Check ............................ 41
Reliability. ..................................... 41
Overview of Analysis ............................ 42
Results of Analysis .............................. 43
Discussion. ..................................... 54
Appendixes. ..................................... 74
References. ..................................... 84
A common claim is that women speak more politely and more formally than do men (Brown, 1980; Jespersen, 1922; Kramer, 1975; Lakoff, 1975; Thorne & Henley, 1975). Additionally, it has been claimed that men use these forms of speech more in the presence of women than with other men (Lakoff, 1975). Whether such polite linguistic behavior results from the socialization process, from the differential status of men and women, or from women's limited access to power is in question. The relevant question here is whether women's linguistic style affects their ability to attain equal status in the business community. Lakoff (1975) has claimed that women are caught in a double bind in which refusal to speak in the indirect, hesitant polite speech of women brings criticism for not being feminine and speaking "like a lady" brings ridicule for being trivial, helpless, uncertain, and unable to hold an intelligent conversation. Because aggressive behavior has been typically associated with males (Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972) and because males have controlled and maintained the workforce of this country (Schein, 1973), Lakoff (1975) has suggested that women should adopt the more direct or aggressive language style of men in order to gain acceptance in the business setting. However, other researchers have stressed that polite linguistic behavior is highly interpersonal and is an asset to women in managerial roles (Feild & Caldwell, 1979; McMillan, Clifton, McGrath, & Gale, 1977; Scott, 1980). The overbearing,
blunt, and impolite manager is gradually giving way to the concerned, caring, and respectful manager (Rosen & Jerdee, 1973). This personal approach is inevitably based on polite linguistic behavior, an asset women may not want to throw away, and a style men may want to develop (Scott, 1980).

**Politeness**

Politeness has been defined as a special way of treating people so that the other person's feelings are taken into account (Brown, 1980). According to Brown, this means that polite speech is more complicated and less straightforward than speech which is not concerned with the feelings of others. The complicated nature of polite speech is illustrated in Goffman's (1967) discussion of deference and demeanor in which deference is described as "the appreciation an individual shows of another to that other, whether through avoidance rituals or presentational rituals" (p. 77). That is, a speaker can show appreciation (politeness) to a listener by recognizing what must not be said and done (avoidance), by recognizing what must be said and done (presentational), or by recognizing what combination of avoidance and presentational behavior is best suited to the interaction. In general, Goffman noted that between social equals, symmetrical deferential behavior is "prescribed," but between persons of unequal social status, many variations of deferential behavior may be expected. As an example, Goffman observed that in hospital staff meetings, the doctors were able to swear, change the topic of conversations, and sit in undignified positions, while the attendants were more careful
Lakoff's (1975) intuitive analysis of politeness was similar to Goffman's in that both authors pointed out that certain elements of polite behavior may be combined with one another, may coexist, or may be mutually exclusive. Furthermore, Lakoff (1975) claimed that "the rules of politeness, when fully and correctly formulated, should be able to predict 'why,' in a particular culture, a particular act in a particular circumstance is polite, or not polite" (p. 64). Thus, Lakoff (1975) proposed three ways or rules by which a person may politely address another person--formally, deferentially, or with camaraderie. According to Lakoff, the use of most forms of formal politeness, rule 1, tend to suggest that the social status of the speaker is superior to that of the addressee, that the speaker wishes to maintain distance from the addressee, and that there is no emotive content to the speaker's message. Formal politeness, which is generally more technical and hypercorrect and less colloquial and personal than either deferential politeness or friendly politeness, is likely to be used by doctors, lawyers, and academics to maintain distance from and superiority over listeners. The use of deferential politeness, rule 2, implies that the status of the addressee is superior to that of the speaker, that the addressee has a freedom of choice as to how to behave when actually no such freedom exists, and that the addressee may not wish to be confronted by an issue directly or in plain language. Deferential politeness is generally more hesitant, questioning, hedging, and euphemistic than either formal or friendly
politeness. Politeness which solicits comaraderie or friendship implies that the social status of the addressee is similar to that of the speaker, that the speaker likes and wants to be friendly with the addressee, and that the speaker and addressee can talk about many topics without having to be delicate or covert. The language of comaraderie is generally of the "back-slapping," "we're in this together" variety of speech and may be boisterous, colloquial, joking, and off-color. Lakoff claimed that certain combinations of the rules are logical and other combinations are not. For example, formal and deferential politeness (rules 1 and 2) are compatible ("Please, Dr. Smith, could you possibly get the ball for me?"), but formal and friendly (rules 1 and 3) are mutually exclusive ("Hey Dr. Smith, old buddy, please gimme that damn ball.") However, deferential and friendly politeness (rules 2 and 3) are compatible ("Hey, buddy, how about tossing over than damn ball?")

Lakoff contrasted the rules of politeness with Grice's (1975) four basic rules of conversation which stressed the need to say only what is necessary and true, relevantly, directly, and succinctly and she claimed that the conversational guidelines are only usable in situations in which polite conversation is not required. In other words, the less the speaker and addressee wish to communicate about personal feelings and the more they wish to transmit pure information about the outside world, the more likely it is that the rules of conversation will be in effect. Therefore, of Lakoff's three rules of politeness, only formal politeness is consonant with the rules of
conversation, because deferential and friendly speech both call for statements which may be emotionally laden, repetitious, unclear, or exaggerated.

Thus, Lakoff (1975), in trying to explain why women are usually expected to be more polite than men and why men are usually expected to be more polite in the presence of women, concluded that women tend to speak according to the rules of formal and deferential politeness and men tend to speak according to the rules of conversation (Grice, 1975). When men are involved in friendly interactions with other men, Lakoff claimed they tend to use the comaraderie or friendly form of politeness which encourages male bonding, but when men are involved in interactions with women, they tend to use a more formal style of politeness which discourages bonding and maintains distance. Women, however, do not tend to bond with other women nor are they skilled at the kinds of friendly speech which Lakoff claimed encourages bonding among men.

In an extension of Goffman's (1967) theory of deference, Lakoff's (1975) rules of politeness, and Grice's (1975) rules of conversation, Brown and Levinson (1978) developed a formal model of politeness by which samples of speech can be analyzed to determine what speech strategies are being used and for what reasons. Their model assumes that politeness is motivated by two kinds of "face" (positive or negative feelings held by a listener who may be either offended or pleased) and two related kinds of politeness. Negative politeness is used by a speaker to satisfy a hearer's desire to avoid imposition
(negative face) and is characterized by speaker indirectness, self-effacement, formality, and restraint. Negative strategies of politeness basically provide some assurance that the speaker respects the hearer's need for freedom of action. Through the use of linguistic deference ("Excuse me, sir . . . "), hedging ("maybe, perhaps, possibly, if you please"), and questioning rather than asserting ("Could you do this for me?") , the hearer is allowed a choice of action and not coerced into compliance. Positive politeness functions more subtly than negative politeness and satisfies the hearer's need to belong and to gain approval (positive face). Examples of positive politeness include expressions of interest or approval, joking, seeking of agreement, stressing similarity of point of view, and giving of sympathy, understanding, and cooperation. Brown and Levinson (1978) stated that the presence of these strategies in people's speech implies that they are being polite as well as indicating the level of politeness. Brown (1980) pointed out that three factors seem to be involved in deciding whether or not to take the trouble to be polite. There is a tendency to be more polite to people who are socially superior to oneself or socially important. There is also a tendency to be more polite to strangers or to persons from different walks of life. The third factor has to do with society's ranking of a particular act and the degree of imposition it might incur. The greater the imposition involved in the interaction, the more polite one is likely to be.
Sex Differences in Linguistic Behavior

Grice's (1975) conversational requirements are not in keeping with society's stereotyped view of the way women use language to express themselves (Lakoff, 1975). The stereotypical view of women in our society is that their speech is indirect, repetitious, meandering, unclear, and exaggerated, but men's speech is clear, direct, precise, and to the point. Lakoff (1975) claimed that Grice's rules of conversation pertain only to the conveyance of factual information about the outside world, rather than about the personal and interpersonal feelings of either the speaker or the listeners. Researchers have tried to translate these general stereotypes into specific linguistic terms in order to verify if and to what degree sex differences occur in language. Some differences have been found, but no evidence has emerged for many of the differences hypothesized on the basis of such stereotypes (Brouwer & de Haan, 1979; Brown, 1976; Brown and Levinson, 1978; Kramarae, 1980; Lakoff, 1975; McMillan et al., 1977).

In an early study of language, Jespersen (1922) theorized that the differences between the speech of males and females indicates "feminine weaknesses." He stated that there is "no doubt that women have a great influence on linguistic development through their instinctive shrinking from coarse and gross expressions and their preferences for refined and (in certain spheres) indirect expressions" (p. 246). Jespersen claimed that in the United States, women know but do not use swear or curse words in the same context or with the
same frequency as men, often substituting more polite words such as "oh dear" or "goodness." More recently, Trudgill (1974) summarized the anthropological literature on sex differences and reported that the larger and more inflexible the differences between social roles of men and women in a particular community, the larger and more rigid the linguistic behavior differences tend to be. His review, which was based on analyses of males' and females' use of American English, showed that women consistently or more frequently use speech forms which are closer to standard language or have higher prestige than those used by men. Trudgill's (1975) subsequent examination of Norwich English (urban Norwich, England) conducted with a sample population from five social classes, showed almost identical results as the previous examinations of American English. Trudgill concluded that in our society (English and American), women are more status-conscious than are men and, because of women's subordinate status (as compared to that of men), try to compensate for their subordination by signaling status linguistically. Men, on the other hand, are more likely to be rated on what they do (occupation, earning power, and ability) rather than how they appear, as are women. Thus, Trudgill (1975) claimed that men are more concerned with signaling group solidarity than with obtaining social status and therefore use more nonstandard speech forms having strong connotations of masculinity than do women. Valian (1977) claimed that most of the differences between the speech of women and men occur in the use of language rather than in the grammatical systems of language. That is, men and women
know and are able to use a common language, but choose to use and interpret this common language in different ways and for different purposes. Valian suggested that it is these different uses of language by men and women that can lead us to an understanding of the meanings and functions of particular expressions and why such expressions are used in different frequencies or in different contexts by men and women. Lakoff (1975) asserted that differential use of language by women and men basically reflects the fact that men and women are expected to have different interests and roles, hold different types of conversations based on these interests and roles, and on these bases, react differently to other people. Thus, not only do men and women view a common world from different perspectives, they view different worlds as well (Bernard, 1972). Language, then, reflects the different perspectives and world views of men and women.

Kramarae (1980) claimed that women have often been forced to fit the needs and value systems of their "world" to the vocabulary and the value system of the male custodian group which has largely determined what is labeled as well as the labels themselves. Kramarae (1980) cited Thomas Hardy's heroine in Far From the Madding Crowd, who said that "it is difficult for a woman to define her feelings in language which is chiefly made by men to express theirs" (p. 58). Furthermore, because females have a different relationship to the language, similar speech used by women and men may be perceived as being different even when the words and grammatical constructions are the same. In other words, what we hear will be affected by what we expect to hear or
by what is "appropriate" for females and for males (Kramarae, 1980).

Kramer (1974) examined the stereotypical images of males and females in this society by investigating the popular beliefs about how women and men speak in a popular mass medium, cartoon strips. Her findings indicated that in cartoon strips, women speak less and in fewer places than men, that the subject and content of what women and men talk about differ markedly, that women speak less forcefully than men, and that men's speech is generally more direct and assertive than women's speech. Kramer claimed that stereotypical female speech is restricted and "wishy-washy." These stereotyped images of males and females serve to strengthen the emphasis on feminity and masculinity which prevails in our society and places restrictions on female and male linguistic habits (Key, 1975). For example, women who use speech forms associated with men may be labeled as aggressive and "unfeminine" and men who "talk like women" are called "effeminate" and regarded with disdain (Thorne & Henley, 1975). Although both men and women are constrained to keep on their respective sides of the sex barrier, Austin (1965) claimed that it is more stigmatizing for men to use women's speech, than for women to use men's speech. Thorne & Henley (1975) explained that one obvious reason for the differential stigmatization of males and females for using the speech style associated with the opposite sex is that switching styles involves using a less socially valued speech form and downward mobility for men, but for women, there is some upward mobility involved in using male speech. In contrast to Austin's (1965) claim of stigmatization for both sexes' failure to
adhere to the speech stereotypes, Kemper (1984) reported there may be certain circumstances in which men are expected to "speak like ladies." Her study, in which male and female subjects were asked to judge the appropriateness of requests made by men and women speakers to addressees of either sex about a variety of subjects, showed that although women are expected to speak politely all of the time, men are expected to vary the nature of their speech with the nature of their topic and the sex of their addressee. For example, men are expected to use impolite forms of requests to achieve masculine goals (getting the car door fixed) but are expected to be polite, to use "please," when seeking feminine goals (getting tea made). Men are expected to be more polite when making requests of women than of other men, however, as the level of the task becomes more masculine, the politeness of the requests is expected to increase.

Aside from the stereotyped linguistic images of women and men, Key (1975) reported there are syntactic constructions which illustrate male and female characteristics of language use. McMillan et al. (1974) found that women as compared to men use more syntactic categories that connote uncertainty than do men and that syntax may be one of the most important areas to explore sex differences in language. Syntax is the way in which words are put together to form phrases or sentences. Modal constructions ("Could you give me . . .?") and imperative constructions in question form ("Give me a . . .?") may both connote uncertainty, but they also indicate attempts to be polite and permit others to have different perspectives or desires about an event.
A modal construction is a grammatical transformation that occurs when the speaker expresses doubtfulness about an event that has taken or will take place, using the modal class of words such as can, could, shall, should, will, would, may, might, or verb auxiliaries such as have and been. Imperative constructions in question form are the most obvious vehicles to express politeness and nonaggressiveness (McMillan et al., 1977). Key (1975) claimed that females use alternatives to the imperative command in order to eliminate brusqueness (impoliteness) which is not permitted in "feminine" speech.

Nonaggressiveness is reflected in the tag question formation which Lakoff (1975) claimed is used more by women than by men. Lakoff described the tag question as midway between an outright statement and a yes-no question ("You're getting the laundry, aren't you?"). It is used when a speaker does not have full confidence in his or her statement or does not wish to make a declaration. The tag question has been described as "an interaction between emotional expressiveness and interpersonal sensitivity" (McMillan et al., 1977, p. 555).

Intensifiers are often-emphasized adverbs which are thought by linguists to detract from the content of the sentence and which focus the listener's attention on the emotional message instead of the cognitive meaning of the sentence ("Do you think this is really boring?"). McMillan et al. stated that the intensifier is similar to the hedge in that the sentence is less straightforward than it would have been without the emotional message. Lakoff (1975) pointed out that the longer the request, in number of words, when it is stated as a question,
the stronger the possibility of a negative response because such a request addresses the negative face of the listener by suggesting an imposition. McMillan et al. (1977) reported that women use intensifiers six times more often, modal constructions almost twice as often, tag questions twice as often, and imperative constructions in question form about three times more often than do men. In the presence of men, women do not use intensifiers more often than when men are not present; however, they do use more modal constructions, tag questions, and imperative constructions in question form in mixed-sex groups. Men, on the other hand, use every syntactic category more often when women are present than when they are absent. These findings supported Lakoff's (1975) claim that men are more polite in the presence of women than with other men.

McMillan et al. (1977) offered some alternatives to the traditional interpretation that women's use of language connotes abnormality (Sapir, 1968), feminine weakness (Jespersen, 1922), or uncertainty (Brown, 1980; Lakoff, 1975). They claimed that the changes of frequency in women's use of syntactic forms of speech when men are present is the result of dominant-subordinate relationships and reflect the reality of a women's sub-culture. Furthermore, McMillan et al. questioned whether the three syntactical categories which are thought to connote uncertainty and which typify the polite component of women's speech style, actually connote uncertainty to listeners. They claimed that politeness is, in fact, highly interpersonally-oriented and valuable in forming relationships.
Rokeach's (1973) explanation for the differential speech styles of men and women was based on a study of the way women and men rank-ordered a list of values and norms. Women placed more emphasis on the interpersonal and emotional dimensions of interactions (expressive) while men focused on the instrumental and rational dimensions. These differing emphases are reflected in men's and women's speech patterns with women's speech soliciting emotional involvement from listeners, enabling speakers to assert personal beliefs without being aggressive, and to assert personal wishes without being demanding. Men's speech, in contrast, places emphasis on the "real meaning," the rational, or the instrumental. McMillan et al. (1977) claimed that although the emotional component of women's speech detracts from the cognitive meaning of a sentence, this emotional component expresses women's personal involvement with their stated ideas—an important experience of women. McMillan et al. further claimed that our masculine-defined culture has placed a higher value on the rational than on the affective content of speech interactions therefore inhibiting the entire emotional perspective of men's and women's experience.

According to Kramarae (1981), women's linguistic patterns have been defined by men who have confined women to domestic language and, even in this domestic sphere, men have established the norms. Women are thus obliged to devise and employ their speech strategies within this severely constrained environment. This constraint has forced women to use uncertain, hesitant, polite language in order to avoid criticism from the more prestigious or powerful male participants in interactions.
McMillan et al., 1977). Kramarae (1980) claimed that women ask more questions than men and use fewer declarative sentences than men in order to show subordination or submission to men. The nature of women's secondary status or sense of inferiority was discussed in a psychological analysis in which Lakoff (1975) stated that women feel unsure of themselves because they have been taught to express themselves in "women's language" which abounds in markers of uncertainty. This female insecurity accounts for women's propensity to use more polite forms of speech. Lakoff inferred that women ought to adopt the forms of speech associated with power and, not incidentally, with males.

Brown (1980) suggested that the relationship between women's status in society and the politeness or formality of their speech is not as straightforward as has been suggested by Lakoff (1975). Brown claimed that the bulk of recent research on language and sex not only has focused on documentation of differences between the speech of men and women but also has offered conclusions which suggest that such differences are attributable to the differences in the social positions of men and women. She further argued that there has been no explicit connection drawn between the linguistic facts (traits of women's speech) and the sociological facts (the secondary position of women in society) in such analyses and theorized that there may be a "set of connections" between language usage and social categories which can "make sense of the data" (Brown, 1980, p. 113). This "set of connections" is composed of "social networks" (kinds of people with whom persons regularly interact), "social motivations" (goals and
desires which motivate the speech behavior of people), "communicative strategies" (methods used to achieve the goals and desires of speakers), and "linguistic choices" (speech styles which effectively implement the communicative strategies). With such a model, Brown claimed that the strategic use of language styles, the sex roles, and the social relationships of people in a particular society can be related, thereby connecting the linguistic facts with the socio-political system in which they occur. Brown tested this model in a cross-cultural analysis of the speech of Tenejapan (Mayan municipio situated in the central highlands of Chiapas, Mexico) women and concluded that the strategies women pursue in their language usage give a "woman's eye view of her networks of relationships, who she esteems, who she looks down on, and who she feels intimate with" (p. 133). For example, Brown's analysis of the language usage of Tenejapan women and men showed that women are highly deferent (negative politeness) to men and are extremely warm and supportive (positive politeness) to other women, but men are matter-of-fact and businesslike and their speech is lacking in the elaborate mechanisms for stressing politeness and solidarity found in women's speech. The related analysis of Tenejapan culture showed that women and men markedly differ in the types of activities they perform, that women are considered indispensable to the order of things (not just for reproductive function but for maintaining the society), that men and women share responsibility for domestic decision-making, that only men make decisions about community affairs and hold public office, and that men are permitted to beat their wives and display other antagonistic
behaviors toward women. Brown claimed that linguistic and socio-political "connections" such as these make it possible to make predictions about when, where, and under what conditions women's speech will be positively polite (i.e., friendly, complimentary, jovial), negatively polite (i.e., formal, deferent, non-intrusive), or combinations of high and low negative or positive politeness. Thus, Brown theorized that deferent and formal speech (negative politeness) prevails if and where people are in a position of vulnerability or inferiority in a society. In contrast, friendly and supportive speech (polite speech) prevails if and when people have many-sided relationships with each person with whom they interact.

In this society, assumptions that there is a "women's speech" and beliefs that such speech is conceptually and socially separate from men's speech guarantees that "women's speech" will not be evaluated in the same way as men's (Kramer, Thorne, & Henley, 1978). Kramer (1975) stated that the belief in the reality of a women's language alters the behavior of people in ways which profoundly affect women. It was further suggested that if listeners have the preconceptions that the language of women is silly, trivial, childish, emotional, illogical, and inferior, they will inevitably listen to a woman's speech or read her writing with a negative attitude that constitutes a great disadvantage for the woman. For example, Siegler and Siegler (1976) found that statements most often attributed to males are strong, assertive statements, but statements most often attributed to females are statements with tag questions. Also, their study showed
that strong assertions associated with males were rated by subjects as reflecting the highest intelligence, while tag phrases associated with females were rated as reflecting the least intelligence.

Kramer (1974) suggested that it is easy to write statements which can be identified as either feminine or masculine, however, the sex-related cues in such statements "appear relatively infrequently in the language of either sex" (p. 84). Kramer's study was designed to investigate claims that women's language contains more words which precede and modify nouns ("handsome man") and more words ending in "ly" which precede and modify adjectives ("awfully pretty"), (Jespersen, 1922; Lakoff, 1975) and that women's language is less extensive (vocabulary-wise) than men's language (Jespersen, 1922). The results showed that male and female subjects who wrote descriptive paragraphs of photographs did not differ in their use of such modifiers nor did they differ in the number and variety of descriptive words. Furthermore, when a second group of subjects (female English majors) was asked to identify the sex of the writers based on stylistic variations of the paragraphs, the results showed that they were unable to differentiate between the statements of male and female authors. Kramer acknowledged that a greater number of the sex differences described by Lakoff (1975) and Jespersen (1922) may exist in spoken than in written language and suggested that in trying to identify such sex differences, other factors which may affect a woman's linguistic style, such as her age and socio-economic position and the sex of her addressee, must be taken into consideration. This is consistent with
Key's (1975) claim that when males and females are carrying out their professional or business roles, the style of language they both use is usually much the same. Key further claimed that the skillful use of occupational language in business settings is a different and more important requirement than maintenance of sex-role language.

The claim that both women and men are capable of using occupational language suggests that women are not always bound by stereotyped rules of language behavior. O'Barr and Atkins' (1980) study of court-room speech behavior examined male and female witnesses' testimonies for sex-related and/or power-related differences in the use of the women's language features described by Lakoff (1975) (i.e., hedges, intensifiers, questions, polite forms, and hesitant forms). They found that the key social factor correlating with the use of these syntactical features is not sex, but social status and further claimed that "women's language" appears to be, in large part, a language of powerlessness, a condition that can apply to men as well as to women. For example, O'Barr and Atkins reported that speakers of low social status, such as housewives, unemployed males, and males with subordinate, lower-status jobs, are higher in "women's language" usage, but speakers of middle-class background and well-educated (high social status) are low in these linguistic features. When subjects evaluated both audio-taped and written "mock" witnesses' testimonies, similar to those of witnesses in the actual court-room setting, they rated speakers using fewer "women's language" features as more convincing and believable than speakers using more of the weaker, hesitant forms of
speech. O'Barr and Atkins suggested that the concept of "women's language" ought to be renamed "powerless language" to reflect its close association with persons having low social power. Thus, women, by virtue of having a generally powerless position in this society, and men in powerless positions are more likely to use this powerless form of communication.

Eagly, Wood, and Fishbaugh (1981) stated that people typically do not enter groups on an equal footing but are pre-identified to each other in terms of visible attributes which convey information about social status. Sex informs group members about status because, in general, in our society, men have been accorded higher status than have women. Thus, any interactions between the sexes are affected by perceived status, simply because the status cues of sex lead people to have expectations about each other's performances and behaviors. High status people not only are expected to contribute more effectively to the group's task, but also are given more opportunities to participate (Eagly et al., 1981).

Sex Differences in Managerial Behavior

Equal opportunity for women in management has become a current social issue. The feminist movement, anti-sexual discrimination legislation, and predictions of shortages in managerial talent during the last decade have led to increased pressure for greater participation of women in leadership roles. The progress of integrating women into management positions has achieved limited success (Malabre, 1978).

One barrier to the integration of women into leadership positions
is the existence of pervasive and persistent sex-role stereotypes (Brown, 1979; Terborg, 1977). These commonly held attitudes perpetuate the belief that men are more independent, logical, active, aggressive, competitive, and better suited to handle managerial positions than are the typically gentle, sensitive, passive, and accommodative women (Stitt, Schmidt, & Kipnis, 1983; Terborg, 1977; Terborg & Ilgen, 1975). Previous research has indicated that the characteristics associated with successful managers are more congruent with the stereotypes of men than of women (Bartol & Butterfield, 1979; Schein, 1973). It has been suggested that two beliefs are generated by this stereotypic view of managers: that women are ineffective leaders (Brown, 1979; Terborg, 1977) and that women elicit lower levels of subordinate satisfaction than do men in leadership positions (Terborg, 1977). Recent reviews of empirical studies which investigated these beliefs produced conflicting results. Some investigations found male and female leadership behavioral differences and others found no sex-style differentiation (Brown, 1979; Terborg, 1977). For example, Terborg and Ilgen (1975) reported that stereotypes about women influence subordinates only when little or no information about the female leader is available. Women who have already demonstrated expertise or success are equally accepted by both male and female subordinates. A recent study by Stitt et al. (1983) revealed that male and female leaders display comparable leadership behaviors. Not only does leader sex have a relatively small influence on ratings of leaders' behavior, but also follower sex has almost no significant effect on ratings of leaders'
behavior. A second finding of their study was that male and female leaders elicit approximately equal affective responses from followers, such as satisfaction with the leader and satisfaction with the task. Female followers respond more extremely to different leadership styles than do male followers, with female followers showing a greater positive satisfaction with democratic leadership style than with autocratic leadership style than do male followers.

Feild and Caldwell's (1979) research which involved 155 paid employees working in the library of a large southeastern university found that expectations regarding women supervisors based on sex-role stereotypes are not reflected in the attitudes of subordinates who have had actual experience with female supervisors. In ratings of general supervisory satisfaction, Feild and Caldwell found that female subordinates are more satisfied with female supervisors than with male supervisors, but male subordinates are equally satisfied with either male or female supervisors. In addition, both male and female subordinates with female supervisors report more satisfaction with their work and with their coworkers than those with male supervisors.

In a study designed to assess the conditions under which competent females are denigrated relative to their male counterparts, Deutsch and Leong (1983) found that competent females were not devalued under any of the conditions or on any of the measures they employed. In fact, when cooperating with male and female partners on assigned tasks, male subjects (all male subjects) responded more favorably to competence in females than they did to competence in males, but when competing with
male and female partners on similar tasks, the male subjects did not differentiate between male and female partners. Furthermore, subjects with female partners showed a stronger preference than did those with male partners for working with the same partners again than for working alone. Deutsch and Leong speculated that male subjects may have viewed their female co-workers as real teammates and appreciated their contribution to the team's performance, but may have believed that their male co-workers wanted to outperform them and that such a desire would overshadow the need to be good teammates.

In a study which asked subjects to provide desirable leader characteristics rather than to respond to researcher-supplied traits, Graves and Powell (1982) reported that women show their socio-emotional concerns by selecting leaders who are cooperative, empathetic, supportive, and democratic, and men reflect a more instrumental orientation by selecting traits such as demanding, active, aggressive, rational, and decision-oriented. Both male and female subjects preferred leader behavior related to the structuring of work and consideration for employees as individuals. Graves and Powell concluded that it is reasonable to expect that female workers will perform better and be more satisfied when reporting to leaders who are more expressive than instrumental, whereas male employees will react more favorably to leaders who are more instrumental than expressive.

In the organizational setting, the strategies used by leaders to influence subordinates may be stereotyped by sex. Manipulative strategies, such as acting helpless or trying to be liked, are seen
as more typical of women than of men, whereas direct strategies based on concrete resources that are independent of relationships, such as wealth and access to power, are seen as more typical of men than of women. Furthermore, a wider range of influence strategies is seen as more appropriate for men than for women (Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972). Instone, Major, and Bunker (1983) investigated whether men and women in positions of equal power differ in the strategies they use to influence subordinates and found only marginally significant gender differences which were consistent with the general sex role stereotypes associated with the use of influence strategies. Even though their findings showed that men exhibit a wider range of influence behavior, use more rewarding strategies (pay increases), and less coercive strategies (pay deductions) than do women, Instone et al. (1983) concluded that men and women supervise others relatively similarly when they both have equal access to power resources.

In contrast, Jacobson, Antonelli, Winning, and Opeil (1977) reported that the sex of the subordinate affects the supervisor's decision to employ specific influence strategies. They suggested that social norms govern the perceived appropriateness and effectiveness of specific supervisory behaviors when performed by a male or female leader with either a male or female subordinate. Rosen and Jerdee's (1973) study showed that evaluations of certain supervisory styles are affected by the sex of the supervisor and the sex of the subordinate. The friendly-dependent supervisory style in which the supervisor asks
for help from a subordinate in a friendly, polite manner, is seen as more effective for supervisors of either sex when directed to subordinates of the opposite sex. That is, a supervisor will be seen positively when directing a polite, friendly request to a subordinate of the opposite sex, but will be seen negatively when directing the same request to a subordinate of the same sex. Inconsistent with Rosen and Jerdee's (1973) findings, Jacobsen et al. (1977) reported that even though it is preferred that both male and female authority figures act in a friendly manner toward subordinates of the opposite sex, such behavior is expected more of a woman than of a man. Their study showed that male authority figures are evaluated positively for being lenient or friendly toward both male and female subordinates, but female authority figures are evaluated positively for being lenient toward male subordinates and negatively for being lenient toward female subordinates. Jacobsen et al. reported that, in general, female authority figures are perceived in more negative terms than are male authority figures and concluded that evaluations of female authority figures are based both on behavior and sex of subordinate, but evaluations of male authority figures are based solely on the male supervisor's behavior.

These negative impressions of females are consistent with Wiley and Eskilson's (1982) study of influence behavior which showed that female influencers are seen more negatively than are male influencers. When 95 experienced male and female managers examined written dialogues between two colleagues in a corporate setting, the results
showed that female influencers are seen as less powerful, lower in corporate position, and colder (unfriendly) than are male influencers making identical influence attempts. Also, the results showed that influencers with female receivers are seen as less competent, less rational, less proper, and less active than influencers with male receivers. Wiley and Eskilson explained that their findings support the status effects explanation of sex differences in managerial evaluations (Meeker and Weitzel-O'Neill, 1977) which stated that sex differences in interaction styles are due to status processes, not to socialized roles. That is, people depend on diffuse status characteristics, such as sex, for predicting quality of performance when little or no information about performance is available. Thus, Wiley and Eskilson claimed that the differential expectations of men and women performing identical assertive roles result in less positive evaluations of women than of men. They further claimed that attempts to reduce bias by training women to use a "masculine" interaction style will not reduce unequal evaluations.

Since there are fewer women in top level managerial positions than men, people may expect all women to be less successful and behave accordingly. Kiesler (1975) identified this phenomenon as "actuarial prejudice," which is the expectation of inferior performance from subgroup members based on available information about that group. Goldberg (1967) claimed that even women tend to be biased against other women, both in traditional and non-traditional "feminine" fields. However, Kramer (1974) found no support for Goldberg's hypothesis and
Mischel (1974) found only limited support which was based on sex appropriateness of the field and education level of the subject. Lackey's (1976) study produced interesting results when female subjects evaluated identical written directives from male and female managers. The results showed no female prejudice against female managers in all but one directive which inadvertently had been written in an impolite style. Bass, Krusell, and Alexander (1971) claimed that negative attitudes toward women are based not on males' beliefs that women are less competent or qualified, but on the fact that having women as colleagues or bosses upsets the traditional patterns of deference (politeness) between men and women.

**Summary of Literature**

The literature defines polite speech as being more complicated and less straightforward than speech which is not concerned with the feelings of others (Brown, 1980; Lakoff, 1975). The rules of conversation (Grice, 1975) state that speech is to be clear, direct, and unencumbered by emotional messages. Lakoff (1975) suggested that the stereotyped view of women is that their speech is indirect, hesitant, questioning, and lengthy, while the speech of men is perceived to be direct, concise, and to the point. Some research has reported sex differences in linguistic behavior which resemble the stereotypes. For example, McMillan et al. (1977) found that women use more forms of speech which connote uncertainty, hesitancy, and concern for others in the presence of both sexes than do men. Additionally, men and women increase their usage of some of these polite forms of
speech in the presence of the opposite sex. It has been claimed that sex differences in linguistic behavior both reflect and reinforce the status quo (Whorf, 1958). Thus, sex differences in language not only set limitations on what is appropriate for men and women to say but also emphasize the status and power differences between the sexes.

Whether differences in linguistic behavior are based on social status, access to power, or social expectancies, may not be as important to women in management positions as how the use of such language affects evaluations of their performance and general managerial behavior. There is conflict among researchers as to whether women and men use different communication strategies and, in fact, receive differential evaluations in the workplace. The general perception that females are perceived as less competent than males has been refuted in recent studies (Son and Schmitt, 1983) and it has been shown that women are not evaluated more negatively than men if their competence and success are established (Terborg & Ilgen, 1975). In contrast, Wiley and Eskilson (1982) reported that women are evaluated more negatively than men when they performed identical tasks and were equally as competent as their male counterparts. Bass et al., (1971) state that women in supervisory roles upset the traditional patterns of deference (politeness) between the sexes, causing negative evaluations of their performance. There is evidence that women and men are differentially evaluated in the workplace because evaluations of women are based not only on behavior (as are males), but also on sex of their subordinates (Jacobson et al., 1977). Findings revealed that male and
female managers are expected to act in a friendly manner to subordinates of both sexes, however, the friendly, polite approach is expected more from a woman than from a man.

Key (1975) points out that males and females use similar language styles when carrying out their professional or business roles and that the skillful use of occupational language is a more important requirement than maintenance of sex-role language. Occupational language is traditionally in keeping with the rules of conversation (Grice, 1975) which insist on logical, concise, and informational speech—the stereotypical speech style of men. The literature suggested that occupational language, when used by men, may include both polite and impolite strategies, depending on situational factors (i.e., sex and status of listener, and topic of conversation), but women's use of occupational language does not permit the same flexibility of linguistic style (Jacobsen et al., 1977; Kemper, 1984; Lakoff, 1975). For women, the strength of the socialization process and sex-role expectations, when combined with the overwhelming power of the status differential of males and females, appears to place severe restrictions upon women's use of language. Thus, the flexibility experienced by men in their choices of linguistic strategies may not be available as an option to women in managerial roles. If this is the case, women may not want to adopt the male forms of speech as Lakoff (1975) suggested, but may want to recognize the reality of these language restrictions, the desirability of stereotypically female linguistic characteristics, and the possibility that effective communication can be, at the same time,
forceful, assertive, and self-revealing (Scott, 1984). Scott's (1984) study which showed that stereotypic characteristics assigned to women's language are rated more socially desirable than those associated with men's language refutes the notion that male speech is superior and also suggests that unequal power or perceptions of power between women and men are responsible for negative evaluations of "women's speech."

In summary, although there is general agreement among researchers that there is discrimination against women in management, the sources of this bias and possible ways to combat such discrimination are in question. One such question generated by the present literature review is based on Lakoff's (1975) claim that women's polite and hesitant speech is responsible for the lower evaluations of women's competence and interpersonal effectiveness as compared to that of men and asks if managers will be seen more positively when they use the impolite (direct) speech style associated with men than when they use the polite (indirect) speech style associated with women. A second question was generated by Wiley and Eskilson's (1982) claim that status differences between men and women are responsible for unequal evaluations of their competence and asks if male managers will be seen more positively than female managers. Other questions generated by the literature are based on claims that women are expected to be stereotypically polite at all times (Kemper, 1984; Lakoff, 1975), that people are expected to be more polite in the presence of females than with males (Lakoff, 1975), that people are expected to be more polite to opposite-sex listeners than to same-sex listeners (Lakoff,
Rosen & Jerdee, 1975), and that men are permitted more flexibility to be polite or impolite than are women (Jacobson et al., 1974; Lakoff, 1975). Generally, these questions ask if male and female managers will be differentially evaluated based on their use of polite or impolite speech to either a male or female subordinate. In conclusion, the purpose of the present study was to investigate differences in judgments about managers dependent on the use of polite or impolite speech, the sex of the manager, and the sex of the subordinate.

**Main Effects Hypotheses**

The expectation was that the status cue of sex would affect evaluations of managerial behavior, with male managers receiving significantly higher evaluations than female managers, regardless of the sex of the subordinate, on a cluster of instrumental qualities (power, respect, trust, effectiveness, and status), from male and female subjects. The instrumental qualities traditionally have been associated with male values in business and are in keeping with existing sex-role stereotypes of males (business-oriented, aggressive, technically-skilled, and logical) as compared to those of females (passive, irrational, and nonaggressive). It was expected that polite managers, regardless of the sex of the subordinate, would receive significantly higher evaluations than would impolite managers, on a cluster of expressive qualities (sensitivity, considerateness, friendliness, openness, and likability) from both male and female subjects. The expressive measures were expected to reflect the importance of politeness in the development of interpersonal relationships.
Hypothesis I. Male managers will receive significantly higher evaluations than will female managers on the instrumental scale.

Hypothesis II. Polite managers will receive significantly higher evaluations than will impolite managers on the expressive scale.

Additional Hypotheses

These additional predictions were partially based on actual findings that more polite speech forms are used by females than by males, that people are more polite to females than to males, and that people are more polite in the presence of females than with males (McMillan et al., 1977). It was also expected that the stereotype of cross-sex politeness in which males and females are expected to be polite to members of the opposite sex (Rosen & Jerdee, 1973) would affect subjects' evaluations of polite or impolite managers depending on specific manager/subordinate combinations. It was predicted that expectations of conformance to linguistic stereotypes and norms would be seen positively and counternormative actions would be seen negatively.

Hypothesis III. Polite managers will receive significantly higher evaluations on the expressive scale when making requests of female subordinates than will polite managers making requests of male subordinates.

Hypothesis IV. Polite female managers making requests of female subordinates will receive significantly higher evaluations on the expressive scale than will polite female managers making requests
of male subordinates.

Hypothesis V. Impolite male managers making requests of male subordinates will receive significantly higher evaluations on both the instrumental and expressive scales than will impolite male managers making requests of female subordinates.

Hypothesis VI. Impolite female managers making requests of male subordinates will receive the lowest evaluations overall on the instrumental and expressive scales.
METHOD

Subjects
Subjects were 129 female and 84 male undergraduate students enrolled in nine introductory psychology courses at two southern California community colleges. Ages of the subjects ranged from 15 to 53 years of age, with a mean age of 23.7 years. Each of the class instructors had been contacted by telephone to ask if his/her students could participate in a graduate student experiment during normal classtime hours in each of their respective classrooms. After permissions had been given by each instructor, the test was administered by the female experimenter and students were informed that participation in the study was not mandatory and could be terminated during the test procedure if desired. Debriefing took place in the classroom immediately following the test. Although subjects were predominantly female, the tests were randomly assigned to subjects by sex to insure that a minimum of 20 males would receive each condition of the study. Thus, the number of male subjects in each cell ranged from 20 to 22 and the number of female subjects in each cell ranged from 31 to 34.

Overview and Design
The experiment used a $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$ factorial design. There were three between-subjects variables: sex of subject, sex of manager, and
sex of subordinate. The one within-subjects variable was a repeated measure and was the speech style of the manager (politeness, impoliteness). Each subject was given a set of eight cartoons, four of which depicted a manager making a request of a subordinate employee in an office setting and four depicting a manager making a request of a subordinate in an artist workroom setting. Of the four cartoons in each setting, one-half were polite and one-half were impolite requests which had been randomly assigned. Each set of cartoons represented one combination of sex of manager and sex of subordinate which was varied to produce four dyad pairs (male/male, male/female, female/male, female/female). Thus, each subject was exposed to both polite and impolite communications and to both office and artist settings but to only one combination of gender of manager and gender of subordinate. Subjects were asked to evaluate the manager depicted in each cartoon by completing the questionnaire accompanying the cartoon. Five questionnaire items measured the instrumental qualities of the manager and five items measured the expressive qualities. The dependent measures were composed of the two clusters of items which formed the instrumental and expressive scales.

Procedure and Materials

Two cartoon work settings and four variations of polite and impolite speech were employed to measure subjects' judgments of managers' behavior (see Appendix A for sample cartoons). An office setting showed a manager seated at a desk with a subordinate employee
standing in the doorway. An artist's workroom setting showed a subordinate employee seated at a high table with the manager standing in the doorway. The two settings were developed so as to add to the generalizability of the study. Care was taken to insure similarity of facial expression, body construction, and attractiveness of the cartoon figures. Sex of manager and sex of subordinate were varied to produce four cartoons in each of the work settings (male/female, male/male, female/male, female/female). Four equivalent polite and impolite requests were developed based on Carrell and Konneker's (1981) hierarchy of politeness in which the two most polite forms of request are the past tense modal verb/interrogative construction ("Could you give me . . . ?") and present tense modal verb/interrogative construction ("Can you give me . . . ?"). The least polite syntactic structure is the imperative construction ("Give me . . . "). Each of the polite requests contained a "hedge" (Lakoff, 1975; Newcombe & Arnkoff, 1979) which further compounds the request, thus increasing politeness. The hedges used were "possibly," "around," "perhaps," and "sometime." The polite requests were:

1. Can you give me the report (designs) sometime this afternoon?
2. Could you take the letter (illustrations) downstairs to the printer around 3 p.m.?
3. Can you possibly make the changes in the brochure (pamphlet) now?
4. Could you perhaps meet with me at 5:30 today?
Four impolite requests using imperative constructions which corresponded with the polite requests in context were developed. The impolite requests were:

1. Give me the report (designs) at 2 p.m.
2. Take the letter (illustrations) upstairs to the mailroom at 2 p.m.
3. Make these changes in the brochure (pamphlet) now.
4. Meet with me at 5:30.

The order of presentation to the subjects was established by random assignment of a combination of two settings and four polite sentence constructions so as to insure that each subject received both setting conditions and two of the four polite sentence constructions within each setting. This random assignment was accomplished by assigning the four polite sentence constructions (in order from 1 through 4) to the columns of a 4 x 6 grid and the sex possible variations of the two settings (i.e., artist, office, artist, office; artist, artist, office, office; etc.) to the rows. Thus, each row of the grid represented one possible variation of the settings, and each of the four squares in the row was linked to one of the four polite sentence constructions. Polite sentence constructions, 1 and 2 were paired as were sentences 3 and 4 and each pair was assigned a number from 1 through 12 moving from the top of the grid to the bottom. A list of 22 numbers, randomly selected from numbers 1 through 12, was used to establish the order of presentation of the setting variations which were linked to the sentence constructions. Thus, if the random
number corresponded with sentence constructions 3 and 4 or a particular row, then sentences 3 and 4 would be presented first, followed by sentences 1 and 2 from the same row or the reverse. Impolite requests were assigned in the same manner. Two lists of the 22 random numbers, one for polite requests and one for impolite requests, then determined which of the setting variations would be presented and which of the sentence pairs would be presented first. Politeness was varied so that subjects saw two polite requests followed by two impolite requests or the reverse order. Thus, one-half of the subjects received two polite/two impolite, two polite/two impolite and the other half saw two impolite/two polite, two impolite/two polite. This order of presentation was randomly assigned to subjects within each of the sex dyad conditions and was held constant across all gender combinations.

Subjects were run in groups with random assignment of conditions and stimuli order within groups. The subjects were told that the experimenter was interested in the ways cartoons and captions affect impressions of managers and were instructed to assume the perspective of the target person (the subordinate employee). The subjects were asked to complete the demographic questionnaire first, indicating sex and age, and then proceed through the eight pages of cartoons, in order, answering all of the questions on each page before going on to the next cartoon (see Appendix B for instructions). Subjects were instructed to inspect the cartoon carefully and read the manager's statement thoroughly before answering the questions. Debriefing
took place following subjects' completion of the tests.

Dependent Measures

Five items were used to assess subjects' perceptions of the instrumental qualities of the managers (competence, prestige, power, success-orientation, and business-skill). Five items were used to assess subjects' perceptions of the expressive or interpersonal qualities of the managers (likability, consideration, friendliness, sensitivity, and democratic style). A 10-point Likert-type scale with the extremes anchored (1 = not at all and 10 = extremely) was used to measure subjects' judgments of managers' behavior. The questions were randomly ordered and the order was held constant across all conditions and sex dyads. The instrumental questions were:

1. How effective (that is, doing a good job) is the manager?
2. How much respect does the employee have for the manager?
3. How much power does the manager have over the employee?
4. How much status does the manager have in the company?
5. How much can the manager be trusted to make the right business decisions and keep things going smoothly?

The expressive questions were:

1. How likable is the manager?
2. How considerate is the manager?
3. How friendly is the manager?
4. How sensitive to the needs of others is the manager?
5. How open to suggestions and criticisms is the manager?

The five instrumental items composed the instrumental scale and
the five expressive items formed the expressive scale. A separate item "How polite or impolite is the manager's statement?" was included to establish the effectiveness of the politeness manipulation and used the same 10-point Likert scale as the instrumental and expressive items (1 = extremely impolite and 10 = extremely polite).
RESULTS

Manipulation Check

A multivariate analysis of variance performed on the question "How polite or impolite is the manager's statement?" showed that polite managers were seen as significantly more polite than impolite managers in both the office and artist settings, $F(2, 204) = 462.53, p < .001, \eta^2 = .82$. Univariate analyses showed that polite managers were seen as significantly more polite than impolite managers in the artist setting, $F(1, 205) = 669.77, p < .001$, and in the office setting, $F(1, 205) = 708.32, p < .001$. Thus, the strength of the difference in ratings on this one item suggests that subjects clearly perceived differences in politeness consistent with the speech constructions designed to convey politeness and impoliteness.

Reliability

Reliability analyses were performed on each of the two scales, instrumental and expressive. The first reliability analysis, which included polite and impolite instrumental items, produced an alpha of .82 and a median correlation of .33. A reliability analysis of expressive items produced an alpha of .86 with a median correlation of .38. When politeness and impoliteness were analyzed separately, polite instrumental items produced an alpha of .93 with a median correlation of .72 and impolite instrumental items produced an alpha
of .84 with a median correlation of .52. Polite expressive items produced an alpha of .94 with a median correlation of .77 and impolite expressive items produced an alpha of .96 with a median correlation of .82. Although two of the impolite instrumental items, prestige and power, did not correlate highly with each other (.21), both items correlated well with the other instrumental items on the scale and did not seriously affect the individual alpha scores (.84) if the items were to be deleted. Thus, the reliability estimates fall between .82 and .96.

Overview of Analysis

An overall 2 x 2 x 2 x 2 multivariate analysis of variance was performed on the combined instrumental and expressive scales to measure the effects of the independent variables: sex of subject, sex of speaker, sex of receiver, and politeness (within-subject) on the instrumental scale and the expressive scale. Subjects' scores on the instrumental and expressive scales were obtained by summing the responses on the five items of each scale for the two different but experimentally equivalent linguistic forms. Thus, the possible range of scores was 10 to 100.

When the multivariate analysis produced significant $F$ scores, univariate analyses were performed on the two scales. Initial analyses of the results revealed a strong main effect of politeness, $F(2, 204) = 401.48, p < .001, \eta^2 = .80$. Because there was a strong possibility that other effects were masked by the strength of the politeness main effect, further analyses were conducted. Separate 2 x 2 x 2
multivariate analyses of variance and consequent univariate analyses were performed for the polite conditions and impolite conditions on the scales. Because the data were based on subjects' observations of two work environments, a 2 x 2 x 2 x 2 multivariate analysis of variance was performed to measure the effects of the three between-subjects variables and the work-setting variable (within-subjects) on the instrumental and expressive scales. In this analysis, politeness was collapsed. A main effect of setting, $F(2, 204) = 6.60, p < .002, \eta^2 = .06$, indicated that work setting significantly affected subjects' ratings of managers and prompted further analyses which were performed on data from each of the settings and in the same order as the preceding analyses. All significant effects were tested by Tukey B method of post hoc analysis after computing harmonic means of the cells under analysis. The Tukey B method of analysis was used not only because it allows for unequal $n$, but also because its critical value is average for the corresponding critical values of Newman-Keuls and Tukey A tests. Thus, the Tukey B method of post hoc analysis is more conservative than Newman-Keuls and Duncan tests and less conservative than Tukey A and Scheffe tests (Winer, 1971). Only means which differed beyond .05 level of significance are reported.

Hypothesis I

Male managers will receive significantly higher evaluations than will female managers on the instrumental scale. The overall multivariate analysis of variance performed on the combined
instrumental and expressive scales showed no support for this hypothesis. However, when a MANOVA was performed to measure the effects of work setting on the combined instrumental and expressive scales, a significant interaction of sex of manager and work setting offered partial support for this hypothesis, $F(2, 204) = 4.67, p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .04$. Univariate analyses of the instrumental and expressive scales indicated the interaction was significant on the instrumental scale, $F(1, 205) = 4.07, p < .045$, and showed that, in the artist setting, subjects saw male managers as more instrumental than female managers ($M_{male managers} = 128.28, M_{female managers} = 125.03$). In the office setting, subjects did not differ in their ratings of the instrumental qualities of male or female managers. However, female managers, who received low ratings of instrumentality in the artist setting, were seen as significantly more instrumental in the office setting ($M_{female office} = 131.00, M_{female artist} = 125.03$).

**Hypothesis II**

Polite managers will receive significantly higher evaluations than impolite managers on the expressive scale. The overall multivariate analysis of variance performed on the combined instrumental and expressive scales showed a significant main effect of politeness, $F(2, 204) = 401.48, p < .001, \eta^2 = .80$. Univariate analyses of the instrumental and expressive scales showed main effects of politeness in which polite managers were seen as more instrumental, $F(1, 205) = 5.41, p < .021$, and more expressive, $F(1, 205) = 755.50, p < .001$, than impolite managers (instrumental: $M_{polite} = 131.48, M_{impolite} =$
When the work settings were analyzed separately, a multivariate analysis of variance performed on the combined instrumental and expressive scales in the office setting showed a main effect of politeness, $F(2, 204) = 336.24, p < .001, \eta^2 = .77$. Univariate analyses of the instrumental and expressive scales found the interaction significant on the expressive scale only, $F(1, 205) = 612.88, p < .001$, and showed that subjects saw polite managers as more expressive than impolite managers ($M_{polite} = 68.97, M_{impolite} = 34.34$), but made no differentiation between polite and impolite managers when rating instrumental qualities. The corresponding MANOVA performed on the instrumental and expressive scales in the artist setting produced a main effect of politeness, $F(2, 204) = 326.31, p < .001, \eta^2 = .76$. Univariate analyses of the scales showed main effects of politeness on both the instrumental, $F(1, 205) = 10.76, p < .001 (M_{polite} = 65.54, M_{impolite} = 61.09)$ and expressive scales, $F(1, 205) = 618.81, p < .001 (M_{polite} = 70.45, M_{impolite} = 33.32)$. Overall, politeness had a significant impact on ratings of both instrumentality and expressiveness. Analyses of the settings showed that expressiveness was affected by politeness in both settings.

The main effect of politeness in the overall MANOVA was modified by an interaction of sex of subject and politeness, $F(2, 204) = 4.17, p < .017, \eta^2 = .04$. Univariate analyses of the instrumental and expressive scales indicated that the interaction was significant on the expressive scale, $F(1, 205) = 8.34, p < .004$, and showed that
although male and female subjects differentiated managers' ratings of expressiveness on the basis of politeness, the effects of the politeness manipulation were stronger on female subjects than on male subjects. Female subjects saw polite managers as more expressive than did male subjects ($M$ female subjects = 142.97, $M$ male subjects = 133.97) and impolite managers as less expressive than did male subjects ($M$ female subjects = 65.17, $M$ male subjects = 71.59) When the two work settings were analyzed separately, MANOVAs performed on the combined instrumental and expressive scales of each setting showed interactions of sex of subject and politeness, office:

$$F(2, 204) = 3.95, p < .021, \eta^2 = .04$$;

artist: $$F(2, 204) = 3.02, p < .051, \eta^2 = .03.$$ In the office setting, univariate analyses of the instrumental and expressive scales found the interaction was significant on the expressive scale only, $$F(1, 205) = 7.77, p < .006,$$ and identical in form to that of the combined setting, with female subjects rating polite managers higher ($M$ female subjects = 70.69, $M$ male subjects = 66.32) and impolite managers lower ($M$ female subjects = 32.91, $M$ male subjects = 36.52) than did male subjects. In the artist setting, univariate analyses of the instrumental and expressive scales showed that female subjects rated polite managers higher in expressiveness than did male subjects, $$F(1, 205) = 5.99, p < .015$$ ($M$ female subjects = 71.26, $M$ male subjects = 65.28), but did not differ from male subjects in ratings of impolite managers' expressiveness. Thus, although both male and female subjects saw polite managers as more expressive than impolite managers in both
settings, female subjects were more affected by manipulation of
the politeness variable than were male subjects.

A multivariate analysis of variance performed on the combined
instrumental and expressive scales in the polite condition alone showed
a main effect of sex of subject, $F(2, 204) = 2.99, p < .052, \eta^2 = .03$.
Univariate analyses of the two scales indicated that the main effect
was significant on the expressive scale, $F(1, 205) = 5.26, p < .023$,
and showed that female subjects saw (polite) managers as more
expressive than did male subjects ($M_{\text{female subjects}} = 142.97$,
$M_{\text{male subjects}} = 133.98$). When the settings were analyzed separately
in the polite condition, multivariate analyses of variance performed
on the combined instrumental and expressive scales showed a main
effect of sex of subject in the artist setting, $F(2, 204) = 3.06$, $p < .049, \eta^2 = .03$,
but not in the office setting. Univariate
analyses of the instrumental and expressive scales showed a
significant main effect of sex of subject on the instrumental, $F(1, 205) = 3.88, p < .050$, and expressive scales, $F(1, 205) = 4.82, p < .029$,
indicating that only in the artist setting, female subjects saw
polite managers as more instrumental ($M_{\text{female subjects}} = 67.25$,
$M_{\text{male subjects}} = 62.90$) and more expressive ($M_{\text{female subjects}} = 72.28$,
$M_{\text{male subjects}} = 67.65$) than did male subjects.

Hypothesis III

Polite managers will receive significantly higher evaluations on
the expressive scale when making requests of female subordinates than
will polite managers making requests of male subordinates. The overall
multivariate analysis of variance performed on the combined instrumental and expressive scales showed no support for this hypothesis. However, when the settings were analyzed separately, a MANOVA performed on the combined scales in the artist setting offered minimal support in an interaction of sex of subject and sex of subordinate, $F(2, 204) = 3.05, p < .050, \eta^2 = .03$. Univariate analyses of the scales were significant on the expressive scale only, $F(1, 205) = 6.12, p < .014$, and showed that in the artist setting, female subjects rated managers as more expressive if the subordinate was female, regardless of politeness ($M$ female subordinate = 54.11, $M$ male subordinate = 50.27).

**Hypothesis IV**

Polite female managers making requests of female subordinates will receive significantly higher evaluations on the expressive scale than will polite female managers making requests of male subordinates. The overall multivariate analysis of variance of the instrumental and expressive scales showed no support for this hypothesis. Although a MANOVA performed on the combined instrumental and expressive scales in the polite condition alone did not support the hypothesis, univariate analyses of the scales indicated there was a significant interaction of sex of subject, sex of manager, and sex of subordinate on the expressive scale, $F(1, 205) = 3.84, p < .051$. Although female subjects alone did not differ in ratings of expressiveness of managers on the basis of sex of manager or sex of receiver, they saw female managers with female subordinates as more expressive than did
male subjects (M female subjects = 146.67, M male subjects = 124.40).
In contrast, male subjects rated female managers with female subordinates lower in expressiveness than female managers with male subordinates (female manager: M male subordinate = 140.00, M female subordinate = 124.41) and less expressive than male managers with either male or female subordinates (male manager: M male subordinate = 133.33, M female subordinate = 138.43). When the work settings were analyzed separately, a MANOVA performed on the polite condition alone of the combined instrumental and expressive scales produced a significant interaction of sex of subject, sex of manager, and sex of subordinate, F(2, 204) = 3.05, p < .050, η² = .03, in the artist setting only. Univariate analyses of the instrumental and expressive scales indicated that the interaction was significant on the expressive scale, F(1, 205) = 6.12, p < .014, and showed that, in the polite condition, female subjects saw female managers with female subordinates as more expressive than female managers with male subordinates (M female subordinates = 76.09, M male subordinates = 69.21). In contrast, male subjects saw female managers with female subordinates as less expressive than female managers with male subordinates (M male subordinates = 72.00, M female subordinates = 60.41). On the expressive scale, this hypothesis was supported by female subjects only.

Hypothesis V

Impolite male managers making requests of male subordinates will receive significantly higher evaluations on both the instrumental and expressive scales than will impolite male managers making requests
of female subordinates. Analysis of the impolite conditions showed no significant effects of sex of subordinate on either the instrumental of expressive scales.

**Hypothesis VI**

Impolite female managers making requests of subordinates will receive the lowest evaluations overall on the instrumental and expressive scales. Analysis of impolite conditions showed no significant effects of sex of manager and sex of subordinate on the instrumental or expressive scales.

**Work Setting Effects**

Work setting, when treated as a within-subjects variable, accounted for a larger proportion of the variance than any of the other variables except politeness. Therefore, analyses were performed on the instrumental and expressive scales to determine differences in subjects' ratings of managers on the basis of setting. Some of the work setting effects previously described in Hypotheses I through VI are repeated here for clarity.

A multivariate analysis of variance performed on the combined instrumental and expressive scales, across the politeness variable, to measure the effect of work setting resulted in a significant main effect of work setting, $F(2, 204) = 6.60, p < .002, \eta^2 = .06$. Univariate analyses of the instrumental scale only, $F(1, 205) = 9.54, p < .002$, showed that managers in the office setting were seen as more instrumental than managers in the artist setting ($M_{office} = 130.28, M_{artist} = 126.63$). This main effect was modified by an interaction of sex of
manager and setting, $F(2, 204) = 4.67, p < .010, \eta^2 = .04$, on the instrumental scale, $F(1, 205) = 4.07, p < .045$, and showed that subjects saw female managers higher in instrumentality in the office setting than in the artist setting ($M_{office} = 131.01, M_{artist} = 125.03$). When rating managers within the artist setting, subjects saw male managers as more instrumental than female managers ($M_{male managers} = 128.27, M_{female managers} = 125.03$).

When the settings were analyzed separately, an interaction of sex of subject and sex of receiver was significant in a MANOVA performed on the combined instrumental and expressive scales in the artist setting, $F(2, 204) = 3.05, p < .050, \eta^2 = .03$, but was not significant in the corresponding MANOVA performed on the combined scales in the office setting. Univariate analyses of the two scales in the artist setting showed the interaction was significant on the expressive scale, $F(1, 205) = 6.12, p < .014$, indicating that not only did female subjects rate managers with female subordinates higher in expressiveness than did male subjects ($M_{female subjects} = 54.11, M_{male subjects} = 50.83$), but also saw female managers with female subordinates as more expressive than female managers with male subordinates ($M_{female subordinates} = 54.11, M_{male subordinates} = 50.27$). A main effect of sex of subject was found in the artist setting only, $F(2, 204) = 2.55, p < .081, \eta^2 = .02$. Univariate analyses of the instrumental and expressive scales found the main effect of sex of subject to be significant on the instrumental scale, $F(1, 205) = 4.93, p < .027$, showing that female subjects saw managers
in the artist setting as more instrumental than did male subjects
(M female subjects = 64.69, M male subjects = 61.20). In the office
setting, male and female subjects did not differ in their ratings of
managers' instrumentality (M female subjects = 65.64, M male subjects = 64.37). Male subjects rated managers' instrumentality lower in the
artist setting than they did in the office setting but female subjects
did not.

A MANOVA performed on the polite condition in each of the two
settings found a main effect of sex of subject in the artist setting,
\( F(2, 204) = 3.06, p < .049, \eta^2 = .03 \), on both the instrumental,
\( F(1, 205) = 3.88, p < .050 \), and the expressive, \( F(1, 205) = 4.82,
\eta^2 = .029 \), scales. Female subjects rated (polite) managers higher in
instrumentality (M female subjects = 67.25, M male subjects = 62.90)
and expressiveness (M female subjects = 72.28, M male subjects = 67.65) than did male subjects. The corresponding analyses of the
office setting in the polite condition alone produced no significant
effects. A three-way interaction of sex of subject, sex of speaker,
and sex of receiver modified the main effect of sex of subject in the
polite condition of the artist setting, \( F(2, 204) = 3.52, p < .031,
\eta^2 = .03 \). Univariate analyses of the two scales showed the
interaction was significant on the expressive scale, \( F(1, 205) = 6.96,
p < .009 \), and found that male subjects, when rating managers on
expressiveness, saw female managers with female subordinates
significantly less expressive than the other dyad combinations
(M male managers: M male subordinates = 68.48, M female subordinates =
When female subjects rated managers, the female manager with female subordinate combination was seen as significantly more expressive than the female manager with male subordinate or the male manager with female subordinate combinations (female manager: $M_{female \, subordinate} = 76.09, M_{male \, subordinate} = 69.22$; male manager: $M_{female \, subordinate} = 70.81, M_{male \, subordinate} = 72.77$). Female subjects found female managers with female subordinates significantly more expressive than did male subjects ($M_{female \, subjects} = 76.09, M_{male \, subjects} = 60.41$). The way male subjects and female subjects rated the female manager with female subordinate combinations was responsible for the largest difference of means in the interaction and attributable to the low ratings male subjects gave to the female/female dyad, which were significantly lower than the seven other means in the analysis.
DISCUSSION

Limitations

Since the subjects of this study were undergraduate community college students with unknown experience working with managers in "real world" environments, the results of this study may not reflect the way the general population of employed people rates managers. Furthermore, the situations portrayed in the cartoons do not correspond to actual manager/subordinate interactions. The subjects were given cartoon characterizations of manager/subordinate interactions, each consisting of one out-of-context managerial statement with no other information about the encounter. The statements were limited to only four variations of the two extremes of polite and impolite speech. The cartoon format is a unique type of stimulus that cannot be compared to previous studies of managers, particularly because the cartoons create visual stimuli which may have inadvertently affected subjects' ratings of the other variables. Even though care was taken to create equivalent cartoons, there were subtle differences in the settings which reduced the generalizability of the study. Although the intent was to create two compatible settings which would increase generalizability, it is clear that the artist setting was different (stronger) from the office setting and elicited the most findings. Ad hoc interpretations of setting differences have been offered but as they are after the fact, they must be seen as speculative.
Discussion of the Results

The purpose of this study was to test hypotheses predicting differences in ratings of manager instrumentality and expressiveness, based not only on the speech style of the manager (polite or impolite), but also on the sex of the manager and/or the sex of the subordinate. It was predicted that male managers would receive higher ratings of instrumentality than would female managers, regardless of politeness or sex of subordinate. Instrumentality is based on qualities associated with male values in business, such as power, respect, trust, effectiveness, and status, and which are in keeping with sex-linked characteristics of males (aggressive, self-reliant, having leadership ability, direct, and well-informed) but not in keeping with the sex-linked characteristics of females (passive, emotional, dependent, illogical, and unskilled in business) (Broverman et al., 1972).

Although the overall analysis showed no sex of manager effect in ratings of instrumentality, partial support for this prediction was found when the settings were analyzed separately. Separate analyses of the settings were conducted because analysis of the data had shown a main effect for work setting indicating that setting significantly affected subjects' ratings of managers. The cartoon format used to test subjects' reactions to managers' speech styles employed two work settings or situations in which managers might normally make requests of subordinate employees. An office setting was depicted as a private office with the manager seated behind a
large desk talking to a subordinate who was standing in front of the desk. An artist setting depicted the manager standing in the doorway of an artist workroom talking to a subordinate who was seated at an artist's high worktable.

In the artist setting, but not in the office setting, subjects rated male managers significantly more instrumental than they rated female managers. The important-looking office with the manager sitting behind the desk may have served as a clear status cue of manager success, inferring high instrumentality, regardless of manager's sex. In contrast, the ambiguous artist setting with the manager standing in the doorway may have provided no cue to the status of the manager and may have influenced subjects to base judgments of managers' instrumentality on another status cue—the status cue of sex—thereby rating male managers higher than female managers. This explanation is in keeping with Kiesler's (1975) claim that unless there is information that changes the probabilities for an individual, judgments of performance will favor a man. Additionally, Wiley and Eskilson (1982) stated that people often rely on diffuse status characteristics such as sex for predicting performance quality when information about task relevant performance is absent and give more positive evaluations to behavior which is consistent with traditional sex-linked expectations. Finally, in support of the "ambiguous effect," Riger and Galligan (1980) stated that when success is ambiguous, women and men evoke different evaluations, but once independent verification of success is available, any discrimination disappears. Thus, in the more ambiguous artist
setting, male and female managers were rated differently whereas in the more traditional office setting male and female managers were rated the same.

The speech style of the manager was the focus of the prediction that polite managers would be seen as more expressive than impolite managers. Expressiveness is based on qualities such as likability, consideration, friendliness, sensitivity, and openness. The polite speech style, characterized by indirect, hesitant, and questioning qualities, has been associated with female linguistic behavior and is said to be inferior to the occupational speech style associated with male linguistic behavior, characterized by directness, succinctness, and accuracy (Lakoff, 1975). Even though Lakoff (1975) inferred that females should adopt the speech style of males, she conceded that when the rules of conversation (Grice, 1975) come into conflict with the rules of politeness, politeness wins out— it is better to be polite than rude. In contrast to Lakoff, Key (1975) claimed that males and females use similar language in their business roles and that the use of occupational language in business is a higher requirement than the maintenance of sex-role language. In the present study, it was expected and confirmed that the use of polite speech in occupational settings would not be stigmatizing as Lakoff (1975) suggested, but would be seen as a desirable communication tool for both male and female managers in the development of manager/subordinate relationships.

The overall results of the present study overwhelmingly show that subjects found polite managers significantly more expressive, as
predicted, and significantly more instrumental (not predicted) than impolite managers. The strength of the preference for polite speech accounts for 80% of the variance in subjects' responses. This strong main effect was modified slightly when separate analyses of the settings showed that only expressiveness was affected by politeness in both settings, while instrumentality was affected by politeness only in the artist setting.

These results show that although the speech style of the impolite managers is direct, concise, and to-the-point, according to the rules of conversation (Grice, 1975), subjects clearly preferred the meandering, questioning, and indirect style of the polite managers. These findings are consistent with those of Scott (1980) which showed that the stereotypic characteristics assigned to "women's language" are rated more socially desirable than those associated with "men's language." Rosen and Jerdee (1973) reported that subjects of both sexes rated male and female "helping" managers more positively than they rated either male or female "aggressive-threatenning" managers, even though such "helping" behavior is stereotypically associated with females and "aggressive-threatenning" behavior is stereotypically associated with males. Scott (1980) asserted that the value attached to the positive affiliative characteristics of the female speech style may be too often ignored in this society which is more concerned with competition and individual achievement than with cooperative endeavors. McMillan et al. (1977) suggested that Lakoff has overemphasized the negative connotations attached to women's speech and underemphasized
the value of such speech in conveying interpersonal sensitivity.

Although both male and female subjects rated polite male managers more expressive and instrumental than impolite managers, female subjects showed greater sensitivity to differences in speech styles than did male subjects by rating polite managers more expressive and impolite managers less expressive than did male subjects. This is consistent with Rosenthal, Archer, DiMatteo, Koivumaki, and Rogers' (1974) study which showed that females show a higher orientation to social stimuli, in general, than do males, and possess a greater social sensitivity to nonverbal communications as well. Henley (1977) described this greater social sensitivity as the "special gift"—or "burden"—of those who are subordinates, such as women in a male-dominated society. She also related this sensitivity to the ability of slaves to discriminate the character of others and claimed this quality refers to an aptitude for interpreting nonverbal signals, common to slaves and women alike. Whatever it is called, females seem to understand nonverbal signals and nuances of speech better and display more sensitivity to the parameters of human interactions than do males. These beliefs about females' sensitivity to social stimuli are consistent with Stitt, Schmidt, Price, and Kipnis' (1983) recent findings that although both male and female followers (subordinates) prefer democratic leadership style, female followers perceive greater differences between autocratic (order-giving, forceful speech, and controlling behavior) and democratic (mutual involvement, sharing of responsibility, and leader concern) leaders.
Predictions involving combinations of sex of manager and sex of subordinate in the polite condition were based on claims that females use more polite speech forms than do males, that people are more polite to females than to males, and that people are more polite in the presence of females than in the presence of males (Brown, 1976; McMillan et al., 1977; Lakoff, 1975). Thus, it was predicted that polite managers making requests of female subordinates would be seen as more expressive than polite managers making the same requests of male subordinates and that polite female managers using female sex-linked speech to make requests of female subordinates would be seen as more expressive and instrumental than polite female managers making the same requests of male subordinates.

The overall analysis showed no support for these two hypotheses, but separate analyses of the work settings showed that in the artist setting, female subjects found managers (regardless of politeness) with female subordinates significantly more expressive than managers with male subordinates. (Although not significant, male subjects tended to rate managers' expressiveness in the opposite direction, with higher ratings for managers with male subordinates than for managers with female subordinates.)

One explanation for these results may be that subjects simply feel more comfortable with managers speaking to subordinates of their own sex. Thus, the finding that female subjects, but not male subjects, significantly differed on ratings of managers' expressiveness based on sex of the subordinate is consistent with claims that females show
more sensitivity to social stimuli than do males (Rosenthal et al., 1974). Another explanation may be that the ambiguity of the artist setting stimulated different situational interpretations from male and female subjects. Although highly speculative, it is possible that female subjects were more sensitive to nonverbal cues or messages about the artist manager's special effort to visit subordinates' offices to make requests and saw such behavior as considerate, polite, and highly expressive—stereotypically more appropriate when directed toward females than toward males.

Although there is no overall support for the prediction that female managers would be seen as more instrumental and expressive when making polite requests of female subordinates than when making identical requests of male subordinates, analysis of the polite condition (alone) produced an interesting three-way interaction. Male subjects reacted in the opposite direction to the hypothesis by rating the female/female dyad significantly lower in expressiveness (but not in instrumentality) than the other manager/subordinate sex dyads. Also, male subjects rated the female/female dyad significantly lower in expressiveness than did female subjects.

Further analyses of the settings separately produced a similar and stronger three-way interaction when looking only at data in the artist setting. Again, male subjects rated the female/female dyad significantly less expressive than the other manager/subordinate dyad combinations, but here, female subjects supported the prediction that female managers would be seen as more expressive when speaking politely to female
rather than male subordinates. Female subjects rated the female/female dyad significantly more expressive than either of the cross-sex dyads (male/female, female/male) and more expressive (not significantly) than the other same-sex dyad (male/male). In addition, female subjects rated the female/female dyad higher in expressiveness than did male subjects. That is, while female subjects saw the all-female dyad as more expressive than did male subjects, the female subjects also saw the all-female dyad as more expressive than the other dyads, but male subjects saw the same all-female dyad as less expressive than the other dyads. Thus the hypothesis that female managers would be seen as more instrumental and more expressive when making polite requests of female subordinates than when making identical requests of male subordinates was supported for expressiveness by female subjects in the more ambiguous artist setting, whereas males in both settings responded opposite to the prediction.

Before offering an explanation for the tendency of male and female subjects to rate dyads in opposite directions to the female/female dyad, it might be helpful to first offer an explanation for subjects' similar reactions to the cross-sex and male/male dyad combinations. Because males and females are expected to be stereotypically polite in cross-sex interactions, male and female subjects appear to agree that the polite speech of managers in cross-sex dyads was appropriately correct when directed toward subordinates of the opposite sex. Such stereotypes depict male to female politeness as properly chivalrous
(Lakoff, 1975) and female to male politeness as properly subordinate
(Brown, 1980). Because males use polite speech in different ways,
for different reasons, and less frequently than do females (Brown,
1980; McMillan et al., 1977; Lakoff, 1975) and are allowed more
freedom to select speech strategies best suited to situations than
are females (Lakoff, 1975), male and female subjects may have found
the polite speech of the manager in the male/male dyad as surprisingly
considerate, expressive, and unexpected, particularly in an all-male
business transaction.

The disparity of male and female subjects' ratings of the female/
female dyad may result not only from the differential use of language
of males and females (Kramer, 1975; Lakoff, 1975), but also from
differential stereotyped beliefs about males and females (Broverman
et al., 1972). A simple explanation for male subjects' reactions may
be that their evaluations of the female/female dyad were based on the
negative stereotype of gossipy females, whereas female subjects may not
have suscribed to the stereotype. Josefowitz (1983) captures this
stereotype accurately and poetically when she writes, "HE is talking
with his co-workers. He must be discussing the latest deal. SHE IS
talking with her co-workers. She must be gossiping" (p. 6). From a
linguistic point of view, male subjects may have found the polite speech
of managers in the all-female dyad as unworthy of special attention
simply because it is expected that polite speech will be used by females,
to females, and in the presence of females (Lakoff, 1975) and therefore,
not particularly expressive.
In this study, male subjects, but not female subjects, are consistent with a study by Jacobson et al. (1977) in which subjects preferred male and female authority figures to act in a friendly and lenient manner toward members of the opposite sex, but expected such behavior more of a female than of a male. Jacobson et al. claimed that when the friendly-lenient approach is directed toward same-sex subordinates, only females, not males, are judged negatively. The responses of both male and female subjects in the present study are inconsistent with those of Rosen and Jerdee (1973) which showed that stereotypes of pair politeness are responsible for positive responses to cross-sex politeness and negative responses to same-sex politeness.

Clearly, female subjects did not see the stereotypically polite speech of the manager in the female/female dyad negatively as did male subjects, but reacted to this particular combination of speech and dyad in a positive manner. Brown (1980) suggested that females use more forms of polite speech which seek cooperation, avoid disagreement, stress reciprocity, and show that compliance is not coerced than do males. Female subjects in the present study may have seen the polite speech of the manager in the all-female dyad not only as similar to their own speech and that of their female cohorts but also as non-intrusive and rapport-stimulating. Thus, female subjects appear to have based their high ratings of expressiveness of the female/female dyad on what could be called an "inside" view of the egalitarian "give and take" of female interactions, not on an "outside" view of female-to-female speech behavior as male subjects may have done.
These "insider" evaluations of female behavior are consistent with findings of Feild and Caldwell (1979) which, contrary to traditional stereotypes of women as inferior supervisors, suggested that such stereotypes might not be important in long-term real-world situations and are not reflected in the attitudes of subordinates who have had experience with female supervisors. They reported that female subordinates with female managers expressed more satisfaction with managers, with work and with co-workers than do female subordinates with male managers. This is consistent with Terborg and Ilgen's (1975) claim that stereotypes about women influence subordinates only when little or no information about the female leader is available, and Stitt et al.'s (1983) report that male and female leaders are equally as liked by subordinates of both sexes. Additionally, female subordinates preferred the democratic leadership style associated with women as opposed to the autocratic leadership style associated with men.

These findings agree with the results of Brown's (1979) study which reported that differences in evaluations of female and male leaders were based on the frameworks used to analyze the studies, such as trait, style, or contingency theoretical approaches. Trait theory is centered around personal characteristics which determine good leadership and is exemplified by the male manager stereotype. Style theory concentrates on the best style of leader behavior and, in female leadership studies, focuses on differences between autocratic and democratic styles. Contingency theory centers on external variables
which control the appropriateness of any particular style and, in female leadership studies, the sex of the leader and/or follower are frequently the control variables. Brown reported that trait studies consistently support the traditional attitude that women lack adequate leadership characteristics. However, style and contingency studies show that although persons who have "real world" experience with female managers overwhelmingly feel there is no difference between male and female leadership styles, students in all-student studies generally hold the opposite to be true. The present study shows that female subjects, as compared to male subjects, are more in keeping with experienced business-people's positive evaluations of female managers, whereas male subjects, as compared to female subjects, are more in keeping with student populations' support of negative stereotypes about women in management.

A prediction about impoliteness was based on claims that managers are seen negatively if they are impolite to persons of the opposite sex (Rosen & Jerdee, 1973) and that male managers are not seen as negatively as are female managers if they are impolite to subordinates (Jacobson et al., 1977). The overall analysis offered no support for the prediction that impolite managers in the male/male dyad would be seen as more instrumental and expressive than impolite managers in the male/female dyad and shows that sex of manager and sex of subordinate make no significant impact on ratings of impolite managers. The finding that all of the significant differences in subjects' responses occurred in the polite condition is consistent with Schein's study (1973) in
which subjects (all male) found socially undesirable traits equally characteristic of men and women, but less characteristic of successful managers than of men and women. That is, the stereotyped expectation of successful managers is that they simply do not have as many socially undesirable traits in their repertoires of behavior as do non-occupationally defined men and women. The implication is that when managers exhibit undesirable behavior, no sex-biased effects are likely. Thus, as the present study shows, even though impolite managers were rated more negatively than polite managers, no differences were found between impolite male and impolite female managers.

The stereotyped belief that managers, regardless of sex, possess fewer undesirable traits than do men and women was further reflected in the present study when male and female subjects found impolite managers equally as instrumental as polite managers, but in the office setting only. One explanation for this finding is that managers in the two settings may have been seen differently due to the status cue effect of the settings, with those in the artist setting being seen as men and women and those in the office setting being seen as successful managers. Additionally, subjects may have characterized impoliteness as a successful manager's trait (i.e., directness, lack of uncertainty, and aggressiveness) (Schein, 1973) and rated impolite speech as less undesirable when used by either a male or female successful manager in a traditional office setting.

Just as the stereotyped view of successful managers suggests
specific sex-linked personality traits, there may be a stereotyped view of successful managers' workspaces. In the present study, two work settings were introduced to increase generalizability of the findings, but unexpectedly, the work settings differentially affected subjects' responses to the other variables. Although a main effect of setting showed that managers were seen significantly more instrumental in the office setting than in the artist setting, a setting x sex of manager interaction indicated that setting affected only female managers, not male managers. In the artist setting, instrumental ratings of female managers were significantly lower than those of male managers, but in the office setting, instrumental ratings of female managers were equal to those of male managers. These findings are in keeping with claims that when little or no information is available about an individual (artist setting), judgments of performance (instrumentality) will be based on traditional sex-linked expectations (Kiesler, 1975; Wiley & Eskilson, 1982) and that the more unstructured the stimulus situation, the greater the effectiveness of (external) social influences (Sherif & Sherif, 1969). Apparently the office setting, with its big desk, seated manager, and standing subordinate, is like a banner saluting success and competence, which, when contrasted with the artist setting, with its plain and simple manager standing in the doorway, left little doubt that the office manager was more instrumental than the artist manager.

Another setting difference found was that in the artist setting, but not in the office setting, female subjects rated managers
significantly more instrumental than did male subjects. It may be that female subjects were more socially sensitive (Rosenthal et al., 1974) to the equality and democratic appearance of the manager/subordinate interaction in the artist setting than were male subjects and reflected the claims of Stitt et al. (1983) that females show a stronger preference for democratic managerial style than do males. In contrast, male subjects rated managers' instrumentality lower in the artist setting than in the office setting, reflecting males' orientation to the instrumental qualities of success and status which are suggested by the office setting.

In summary, the results of the present study do not support the notion that polite speech, which is associated with female linguistic style, is stigmatizing to females in managerial positions as Lakoff (1975) claimed. Neither do the results show that the impolite (direct) speech, which is associated with male linguistic style, is beneficial for either male or female managers. Subjects showed their preference for polite speech by rating polite managers making requests of subordinates significantly higher in expressiveness in both settings and significantly higher in instrumentality in the artist setting than impolite managers.

Therefore, if managers work either in prestigious offices or ambiguous workspaces and want to be seen as friendly, open, considerate, sensitive, and likeable (expressive qualities), they need to be polite. If managers work in ambiguous settings and want to be seen as effective, trustworthy, powerful, respected, and of high status (instrumental
qualities), they also need to be polite. However, if managers work in high-status offices, they can get away with occasional gruffness or impoliteness and still be seen equally as instrumental as managers who are polite.

Although the settings affected ratings of instrumentality of managers, in general, with higher ratings in the office than in the artist settings, male subjects' ratings were responsible for the low ratings of the artist setting and only female managers were affected by these differences. Female managers were seen as less instrumental than male managers in the artist setting and equal to male managers in the office setting. Apparently, to establish instrumentality, the trappings of a successful-looking office are needed by female managers but not by male managers. In ratings of expressiveness, but only in the artist setting, findings not only showed that male and female subjects rated managers more expressive if the subordinate was the same sex as their own, but also showed that female subjects rated the female/female dyad as more expressive than the other dyads while male subjects rated the female/female dyad as less expressive than the other dyads. It may be that to establish expressiveness, a carefully selected combination of office trappings and subordinates (by sex) is needed more by female managers than by male managers. Additionally, in both the artist and office settings, female subjects showed a greater sensitivity to the expressiveness of speech styles of managers than did male subjects, suggesting that managers may need to be more polite to female subordinates than to male subordinates.
in order to be seen equally as expressive by both.

Thus, because visible status symbols seem to confer instrumentality and expressiveness, one suggestion for female managers who already have offices, is to get behind their desks and stay there until they have attained "successful manager" status. Female managers who work in non-status, ambiguous settings and who find it impossible to move to more formal offices may be advised to get a big desk, squeeze it into the existing workspace, pretend it is the executive suite, and be polite to male subordinates and especially polite to female subordinates. When having an office is out of the question, female managers who work in open or unstructured workspaces are more likely to be seen by male evaluators as highly expressive when they are polite and when their subordinates are male. In contrast, female managers in ambiguous settings are more likely to be seen by female evaluators as highly expressive when they are polite and when their subordinates are female. And finally, female managers who have both male and female evaluators are more likely to be seen as highly expressive when they have both male and female subordinates, are appropriately polite to both, and take special care that female-to-female interactions are seen by male evaluators as work-related and by female evaluators as considerate and friendly.

It is unfortunate that competent female managers might have to use such complicated strategies to counteract discrimination based on what Lakoff (1975) described as "speech patterns and listener expectations" which brand females as unfeminine and unlikeable if
they adopt the male speech style and vague and frivolous if they adopt the female speech style. Recent research indicated that these listener expectations are not as stable in business (Brown, 1979) as Lakoff claimed, and show that as females establish their competence on the job, discrimination based on stereotypes disappears. Furthermore, the present study suggests that as "successful manager" status is established, such as by environmental cues of success, discriminations based on speech style and listener expectations disappear. Thus, it may be that "occupational speech" which is said to supercede sex-role speech (Key, 1975) and "neutral" speech which is said to be used by males in business (Lakoff, 1975) actually contain an abundance of the polite elements associated with female speech, however, the discriminatory bias occurs more from expectations about the competence of the speaker than from the speech itself.

Thorne and Henley (1975) argue that the forms identified with females may represent positive values and that, rather than slavishly imitate masculine speech, women should strive for broader adoption of female forms of speech. Riger and Galligan (1980) assert that characteristics associated with traditional female sex roles, such as emphases on people as opposed to production, might actually produce better outcomes in certain work situations than characteristics associated with traditional male sex roles.

Suggestions for future research focus on the relationship of female and male interaction styles, male and female influence strategies, male and female sex-typed characteristics, and successful manager
characteristics as they relate to some very "bottom-line" business concerns such as worker productivity, employee satisfaction, employee absenteeism, and the ultimate business concern—corporate profit. By linking interaction styles and influence strategies to sex-role traits and successful manager characteristics, it may be found that certain male stereotyped characteristics such as aggressiveness, self-reliance, and controlling behavior are linked to interaction and influence styles which are not compatible to people-oriented managerial characteristics, while certain female stereotyped characteristics such as helpfulness, sensitivity, and egalitarian behavior are compatible and could be expected to affect employees in a positive way. Such findings might foster a climate of greater appreciation of the affiliative qualities associated with female speech and interaction style and, ultimately, greater receptivity to female managers. Thus, if females in managerial positions are perceived as uniquely valuable to corporate growth and profit, they could find themselves being boosted up the male corporate ladder by the very people who, in the past, were pushing them down.
APPENDIXES

A) Sample cartoons and test questions

B) Instructions and demographic questionnaire
Please circle the number on each scale which best fits your impression of the manager.

How much power does the manager have over the employees?
   No power at all  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10 A great deal of power

How sensitive is the manager to the needs of others?
   Not at all sensitive  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10 Extremely sensitive

How much respect does the employee have for the manager?
   No respect at all  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10 A great deal of respect

How much can the manager be trusted to make the right business decisions and keep things going smoothly?
   No trust at all  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10 A great deal of trust

How considerate is the manager?
   Not at all considerate  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10 Extremely considerate

How friendly is the manager?
   Not at all friendly  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10 Extremely friendly

How effective (that is, doing a good job) is the manager?
   Not at all effective  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10 Extremely effective

How much status does the manager have in the company?
   No status at all  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10 A great deal of status

How open to suggestions and criticisms is the manager?
   Not at all open  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10 Extremely open

How likable is the manager?
   Not at all likable  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10 Extremely likable

How polite or impolite is the manager's statement?
   Extremely impolite  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10 Extremely polite
Please circle the number on each scale which best fits your impression of the manager.

How much power does the manager have over the employee?
No power at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A great deal of power

How sensitive to the needs of others is the manager?
Not at all sensitive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely sensitive

How much respect does the employee have for the manager?
No respect at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A great deal of respect

How much can the manager be trusted to make the right business decisions and keep things going smoothly?
No trust at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A great deal of trust

How considerate is the manager?
Not at all considerate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely considerate

How friendly is the manager?
Not at all friendly 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely friendly

How effective (that is, doing a good job) is the manager?
Not at all effective 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely effective

How much status does the manager have in the company?
No status at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A great deal of status

How open to suggestions and criticisms is the manager?
Not at all open 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely open

How likable is the manager?
Not at all likable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely likable

How polite or impolite is the manager's statement?
Extremely impolite 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely polite
Please circle the number on each scale which best fits your impression of the manager.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much power does the manager have over the employee?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A great deal of power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How sensitive to the needs of others is the manager?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely sensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much respect does the employee have for the manager?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A great deal of respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much can the manager be trusted to make the right business decisions and keep things going smoothly?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A great deal of trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How considerate is the manager?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely considerate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How friendly is the manager?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effective (that is, doing a good job) is the manager?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much status does the manager have in the company?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A great deal of status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How open to suggestions and criticisms is the manager?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likeable is the manager?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely likable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How polite or impolite is the manager’s statement?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely polite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, you can be seen asking, "Can you give me the report sometime this afternoon?"
COULD YOU PERHAPS MEET WITH ME AT 5:30 TODAY?

Please circle the number on each scale which best fits your impression of the manager.

How much power does the manager have over the employee?
- No power at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A great deal of power

How sensitive to the needs of others is the manager?
- Not at all sensitive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely sensitive

How much respect does the employee have for the manager?
- No respect at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A great deal of respect

How much can the manager be trusted to make the right business decisions and keep things going smoothly?
- No trust at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A great deal of trust

How considerate is the manager?
- Not at all considerate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely considerate

How friendly is the manager?
- Not at all friendly 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely friendly

How effective (that is, doing a good job) is the manager?
- Not at all effective 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely effective

How much status does the manager have in the company?
- No status at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A great deal of status

How open to suggestions and criticisms is the manager?
- Not at all open 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely open

How likable is the manager?
- Not at all likable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely likable

How polite or impolite is the manager's statement?
- Extremely impolite 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely polite
Please circle the number on each scale which best fits your impression of the manager.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much power does the manager have over the employee?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No power at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How sensitive to the needs of others is the manager?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all sensitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much respect does the employee have for the manager?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No respect at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much can the manager be trusted to make the right business decisions and keep things going smoothly?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No trust at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How considerate is the manager?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all considerate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How friendly is the manager?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all friendly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How effective (that is, doing a good job) is the manager?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much status does the manager have in the company?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No status at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How open to suggestions and criticisms is the manager?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How likable is the manager?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all likable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How polite or impolite is the manager's statement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely impolite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please circle the number on each scale which best fits your impression of the manager.

How much power does the manager have over the employees?
   No power at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A great deal of power

How sensitive to the needs of others is the manager?
   Not at all sensitive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely sensitive

How much respect does the employees have for the manager?
   No respect at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A great deal of respect

How much can the manager be trusted to make the right business decisions and keep things going smoothly?
   No trust at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A great deal of trust

How considerate is the manager?
   Not at all considerate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely considerate

How friendly is the manager?
   Not at all friendly 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely friendly

How effective (that is, doing a good job) is the manager?
   Not at all effective 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely effective

How much status does the manager have in the company?
   No status at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A great deal of status

How open to suggestions and criticisms is the manager?
   Not at all open 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely open

How likable is the manager?
   Not at all likeable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely likeable

How polite or impolite is the manager's statement?
   Extremely impolite 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely polite
Please circle the number on each scale which best fits your impression of the manager.

How much power does the manager have over the employees?
- No power at all
- A great deal of power

How sensitive to the needs of others is the manager?
- Not at all sensitive
- Extremely sensitive

How much respect does the employee have for the manager?
- No respect at all
- A great deal of respect

How much can the manager be trusted to make the right business decisions and keep things going smoothly?
- No trust at all
- A great deal of trust

How considerate is the manager?
- Not at all considerate
- Extremely considerate

How friendly is the manager?
- Not at all friendly
- Extremely friendly

How effective (that is, doing a good job) is the manager?
- Not at all effective
- Extremely effective

How much status does the manager have in the company?
- No status at all
- A great deal of status

How open to suggestions and criticisms is the manager?
- Not at all open
- Extremely open

How likable is the manager?
- Not at all likable
- Extremely likable

How polite or impolite is the manager's statement?
- Extremely impolite
- Extremely polite
Please circle the number on each scale which best fits your impression of the manager.

How much power does the manager have over the employees?
No power at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A great deal of power

How sensitive to the needs of others is the manager?
Not at all sensitive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely sensitive

How much respect does the employee have for the manager?
No respect at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A great deal of respect

How much can the manager be trusted to make the right business decisions and keep things going smoothly?
No trust at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A great deal of trust

How considerate is the manager?
Not at all considerate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely considerate

How friendly is the manager?
Not at all friendly 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely friendly

How effective (that is, doing a good job) is the manager?
Not at all effective 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely effective

How much status does the manager have in the company?
No status at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 A great deal of status

How open to suggestions and criticisms is the manager?
Not at all open 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely open

How likable is the manager?
Not at all likable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely likable

How polite or impolite is the manager's statement?
Extremely impolite 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extremely polite
Thank you for taking the time to participate in this experimental study. We are interested in how cartoons and captions affect people's impressions of managerial behavior. We ask you to look at each cartoon, read the caption, and rate each manager on a set of scales following each cartoon.

When forming an impression of the manager, try to put yourself in the role of the other person in the cartoon. In other words, form an impression as if you were the target person of the manager's communication.

In rating the manager, you are asked to circle the number which best fits your impression. Please complete each page in order, answering each question, before going on to the next page. Your responses will be anonymous and confidential. If you want to know the results of this experiment, please put your name and address on the sign-up sheet which will be passed around. You are under no obligation to participate in this research. You may choose not to participate or you may withdraw at any time.

Before you turn to the first cartoon, please answer the following demographic questions.

What is your sex? Male Female (Circle one)

What is your age? _______

Thank you again, and remember, your responses are anonymous and confidential.
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