



**STRATEGY
RESEARCH
PROJECT**

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

**GENDER COMMUNICATION DIFFERENCES: THE IMPACT ON
STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP AND DECISIONMAKING**

BY

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

**COLONEL BARBARA J. SCHERB
United States Army**

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.**

19970623 021

USAWC CLASS OF 1997

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050



UNCLASSIFIED

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

**GENDER COMMUNICATION DIFFERENCES: THE IMPACT ON
STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP AND DECISIONMAKING**

by

COL Barbara J. Scherb
United States Army

COL Donna F. Barbisch
Project Advisor

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved
for public release. Distribution is unlimited.

U.S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Barbara J. Scherb (COL), USA

TITLE: Gender Communication Differences: The Impact on Strategic Leadership and Decisionmaking

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 17 March 1997

PAGES: 26

CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

Women and men grow up in different cultures, learn to speak different languages and communicate with different behaviors. In the traditional hierarchical world where men hold senior leadership and managerial positions and women work in lower-echelon jobs, preferred male and female communication styles pose few problems -- primarily because the leaders are all men. With the relatively recent emergence of women into the professional workforce, and particularly into the executive levels of leadership, these preferred gender communication styles often get in the way of effective and successful strategic decisionmaking. Women and men approach issues, problem solving and decisionmaking in different ways. By accepting and encouraging these cultural differences, we legitimize alternative strategies and creative thinking. The business world has learned a lot of lessons from its experiences in integrating women into these executive positions. The military establishment can learn from and apply these lessons to its own culture. As women enter strategic leadership positions in the military, it becomes increasingly important that both men and women acknowledge that communication style differences do exist and that they work to understand and to bridge these differences.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
THESIS STATEMENT.....	1
ASSUMPTIONS.....	2
DEFINITIONS.....	2
BACKGROUND.....	3
COMMUNICATION CULTURES.....	5
WOMEN'S CONTRIBUTION TO STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP.....	7
GENDER COMMUNICATION DIFFERENCES.....	11
WHY WE ARE WHERE WE ARE TODAY.....	17
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	18
ENDNOTES.....	21
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	25

Men and women grow up in different cultures, learn to speak different languages, and communicate with different behaviors. Because of these cultural differences, they learn different lessons as children, lessons designed to prepare them for their adult roles. One of the most important lessons that children learn is communication -- styles and patterns of speech and behavior that convey meaning to others.¹ In the traditional world where men hold senior managerial and leadership positions and women stay home or work in low-level service-oriented jobs, preferred male and female communication styles pose few problems at the strategic leadership level -- primarily because the leaders are all men. With the relatively recent emergence of women into the professional workforce, however, these preferred gender communication styles often get in the way of effective and successful strategic leadership and decisionmaking.

The purpose of this strategic research paper is to examine the impact of gender communication differences at the strategic leadership and decisionmaking level. The paper will also examine common gender communication differences that have been well-documented in the literature and that have posed or have the potential to pose difficulties for mixed gender groups.

Thesis Statement

Strategic leadership and decisionmaking is vulnerable to gender-specific communication differences and influences. The disenfranchisement of different cultures limits creative thinking, problem solving and decisionmaking. Ultimately, this limits the alternative strategies available to strategic leaders and decisionmakers.

Assumptions

- (1) The strategic leadership and decisionmaking process requires a great amount of communication.
- (2) Strategic decisionmaking skills are essential for both men and women in senior managerial and leadership positions.
- (3) The presence of women in senior managerial and leadership positions within the Department of Defense will not diminish in the foreseeable future.
- (4) Gender-specific cultures and communication styles are neither good nor bad, they are simply different.
- (5) Men and women incorporate varying degrees of opposite-gender communication patterns in their personal communication styles.
- (6) Lessons learned from the experiences of the business world regarding gender communication differences are applicable to the military establishment.

Definitions

Communication. Styles and patterns of speech and behavior that convey meaning to others.² Communication has at least two layers of meaning: the verbal (what we express with words) and the nonverbal (what we express without words). Nonverbal communication is often unconscious. When there is a disagreement between the verbal and nonverbal message, the nonverbal message is the one that is usually received.³

Gender versus Sex. Sex is biological; gender is cultural: our notion of how we expect men and women to behave. "Gender signifies an individual's personal, legal, and social status without reference to genetic sex; gender is a subjective cultural attitude while sex is an objective biological fact."⁴

Leadership. The "process of influencing others to willingly perform a task through providing purpose, direction, and motivation."⁵

Management. The "process of achieving optimum results through the efficient and effective allocation of resources." Management involves diverse activities such as "planning, controlling, decisionmaking, problem solving, and acquiring and disseminating resources."⁶

Strategic leadership/strategic management. The highest level of organizational responsibility, which includes the ability to influence organizational culture and build consensus. Except when indicated, leadership is intended to include both leadership and management.

Background

Words and phrases can have vastly different meanings depending on personal and cultural experiences. Consider the word "military". In the United States, where a long history of civilian control of the military and strict posse comitatus laws restrict the authority of the military over American citizens, the military enjoys a high degree of public respect, engendering little cause for fear. How different that word is viewed by people in nation-states that are run by military dictators propelled to power through the use of death-squads and

other terror tactics. While this is a fairly obvious example of the effect of cultural differences, less obvious, but no less important, is the effect of gender cultural differences.

Tannen⁷ contends that gender style miscommunication can actually be more troublesome and potentially damaging than other cultural miscommunications because they are more pervasive in our lives and we are less prepared for them. When dealing with people from different ethnic cultures and customs we are prepared for communication difficulties. But we don't expect colleagues who grew up in the same "culture" and who "speak the same language" to understand words differently.

Although communication has been the subject of considerable research for some time, research on gender communication differences is a relatively new area of interest dating back to the 1970s. The interest in gender communication differences probably grew out of the frustration of women attempting to break through the "glass ceiling", a term coined to represent the invisible barrier that seems to keep women out of the highest levels of management and leadership in corporate America. Efforts to understand the glass ceiling and, subsequently, how to assist women in conquering this barrier have achieved national interest. By the early 1990s, the problem was considered so pervasive and serious that the Secretary of Labor created the Glass Ceiling Commission as part of the Civil Rights Act of 1991.⁸ Today, many communication experts believe that much of the "glass ceiling" effect in America is actually a result of gender communication differences.

A review of the body of research and literature that exists relative to the rise of women to strategic management and leadership positions in the business world provides a relevant and valid comparison for the military establishment. So much research has been done on

gender communication differences in the business world that there can be little doubt that cross-gender differences constitute a significant factor in determining not only career progression, but also the effectiveness of leadership at all levels, and particularly at the strategic level. In some instances, the sheer number of replicated studies might be a result of the almost unbelievable data that is consistently obtained.⁹

Communication Cultures

Dr. Lillian Glass, one of the first and foremost researchers on gender communication differences, has identified 105 communication characteristics involving speech, voice, facial expressions, and body language that distinguish men from women. Of these, she identified 40 that if not understood and appropriately applied might have a “shattering affect” on women’s careers.¹⁰ These differences include, for example: (1) Men interrupt more than women in business, (2) Men are more direct, women are more indirect, (3) Men make more declarative statements, women make more tentative statements, (4) Men are more goal-oriented, women are more process-oriented, and (5) Men show their frustration by shouting, women by crying.¹¹ Specific communication differences will be discussed in greater detail later in this paper.

Dr. Pat Heim, president of Heim Associates, works extensively with businesses experiencing senior management and leadership problems related to cross-gender communication differences. She has also identified a number of gender differences, many of which can be explained by the types of games that children play, games that are designed to teach proper adult behavior. Specifically, boys play games that require team participation,

games in which there is a clear hierarchy of players with the coach and team captain at the top. Boys learn to be goal-oriented, to strategize and to take risks to achieve the goal, and to play with boys that they don't like. Boys learn to win -- and to take credit for winning -- and, more importantly, they learn to lose -- that when the game is over, the game is over. Boys learn that conflict is fun, that conflict is the way you win. Finally, boys learn to cheat, to do whatever they can get away with when the referees' back is turned.¹²

In contrast, girls learn to play one-on-one games, such as dolls and house, in which there is by design no winner and no loser. Thus, girls learn to avoid conflict, to play win-win games, to share and to negotiate because aggressive behavior is punished by the other player taking her toys and going home. Girls learn to play by the rules and to be open and forthright in their play. Consequently, girls don't learn to win and, more importantly, they don't learn to lose. They also don't learn risk-taking behavior. Finally, girls learn to read other people -- to not only recognize nonverbal behavior, but also to correctly interpret this behavior.¹³

It is certainly no coincidence that when girls exhibit male-pattern behavior, they are told to be nice and play fair. Conversely, the worst insult that one can give a boy is to tell him that he is playing like a girl. It is, therefore, little wonder that as adults men and women have different cultural and communication styles and rules. It is also little wonder that these differences can have an impact on how we interact with and are perceived by others in our work environments. The following two examples illustrate how cultural and communication differences can dramatically affect the best of intentions.

In her book, Hardball for Women, Dr. Heim¹⁴ described a speech by Dr. Warren Bennis to a group of executives that illustrates one gender cultural difference. Dr. Bennis, one

of most well-known corporate leadership consultants, asserted that President Carter made a grave error upon assuming the Presidency when he carried his own luggage into the White House. The men in the audience immediately began shaking their heads to indicate their agreement that this was indeed a terrible mistake. Dr. Bennis went on to explain that because of this one incident, President Carter never recovered his full power and authority and that it affected the success of his entire administration. Since this action seemed rather egalitarian to her, Dr. Heim was quite perplexed that anyone would see this as a problem. She later came to understand that in the male culture, a leader needs to continually display, or communicate, his position of authority or risk losing it. Failure to be aware of, and thus not comply with, these types of cultural rules immediately puts members of another culture at a disadvantage.

Misinterpreting the meanings of words is another problem created by gender cultural and communication differences. One of the most frequently used terms by members of the military of both genders is "team player". This apparently self-explanatory term is rarely defined because its definition appears obvious. But is it? While working with senior managers and executives, Dr. Heim discovered that although both women and men list "teamwork" as one of their most important responsibilities, these words can mean very different things.¹⁵ To men, who usually learned to play team sports as children, the term means "to follow orders" and "do what you're told" even when you don't agree. To women, who played house as children, being a team player means sharing ideas and listening to differing opinions with everyone working together for positive outcomes.¹⁶ When asked what they thought of the other's definition, one man said the woman's definition sounded manipulative while one woman said the man's definition sounded mindless. Although neither

definition is inherently right or wrong, failure to understand what is meant by such an innocuous term can result in confusion, frustration, and non-selection for tasks and assignments of increasing responsibilities.

Women's Contribution to Strategic Leadership

From a purely logical standpoint, it could be argued that the historically all-male leadership of America has done all right so why should anyone be concerned about the integration of women at strategic leadership levels. In other words, what is the value added of women in these positions? Just as a diverse group of men bring unique cultural experiences, women and men approach issues, problem solving, and decisionmaking in different ways. By accepting, and encouraging, these cultural differences, we legitimize alternative strategies and creative thinking.¹⁷

Another argument that seeks to dismiss the issue of women in strategic leadership and management positions is that alternative approaches can be obtained from the diversity within the lower echelons of the workforce and are not necessarily needed at the highest. The problem with this argument is that strategic leadership depends to a great extent on the power of the position in the hierarchy. Stated simply, "power is the ability to get things done."¹⁸ Without position, your power is nonexistent; without power, your ability to influence is greatly diminished; without influence, your diversity is of little consequence.

In his 1997 State of the Union address, President Clinton stated that "diversity is our greatest asset." In 1996, Senator Daniel Inouye, the first Japanese-American elected to the United States Congress, had this to say about diversity:

Our society is changing so rapidly that a diverse workforce is becoming the rule rather than the exception....Organizations that are looking to their future will have to evaluate the impact that diversity in our society will have on the marketing of their products or services. What better way for an organization to ensure innovation than through the cultivation of a diverse workforce. For example, in my own state of Hawaii, cultural diversity is the rule, not the exception. This diversity is not only accepted, but sought after by organizations seeking to compete in the international market.¹⁹

In her work as a consultant to Fortune 500 executives, Heim²⁰ has consistently found a number of leadership areas in which women generally perform better than men. For example, flatter organizational structures are rapidly growing in corporate America as organizations attempt to downsize and reorganize expensive, cumbersome hierarchical bureaucracies. These flatter organizations have the advantage of greater flexibility, better adaptability to external influences, and more empowerment of members at all levels. Women are very comfortable in these "flat hierarchies" and provide a ready source of leadership styles best suited for these organizations.

Unlike the traditional organizational hierarchies that encourage leaders to make the decisions and the others to "mindlessly" follow, women not only accept the involvement of everyone, but also expect them to contribute and to think. It took an automobile industry crisis to bring the concept of total quality management (TQM) and worker empowerment to America, while women have grown up in this type of culture. There is some anecdotal evidence that suggests that younger workers today mistrust traditional hierarchies and want to be part of the decisionmaking process. While "women often find these workers to be outstanding performers; men wonder what has happened to young people today."²¹

Another area in which women excel is the interpersonal world. Rather than avoiding emotional issues as a man might, women are more likely to address them. Thus, personal issues that have the potential to create adverse work environments can be resolved in their early stages rather than festering into bigger problems. Women's "ability to read nonverbal cues is one of the great strengths [they] bring to the business setting."²² This expertise gives women access to information men might not have and provides clues for inspiring workers to follow their leadership.

Men tend to be more goal oriented, women are more process oriented. This cultural difference alone explains a lot about why TQM took so long to be accepted in America. While TQM is about the process of continuous improvement, traditional business culture is about bottom lines and turning out more end products than your competitor, i.e. making more goals than your opponent. Because of their process orientation, women are more likely to become involved in the internal processes of an organization, to listen to concerns and suggestions from employees, and to be able to focus on many activities simultaneously. When confronted with process problems, women are more likely to seek an early resolution rather than waiting for the problems to effect the "bottom line."

A plethora of literature has been written about women's ability to negotiate win-win resolutions. The art of negotiating can be described as the ability to make all parties believe they won. This strategy not only allows everyone to feel good about the resolution of the current issue, but ensures that they will be willing to come "back to the table" in the future.

One of the biggest problems facing American business today might be internal competition.²³ Departments -- and the men who run them -- are so busy competing with their

colleagues that they often unconsciously sabotage the organization. Women's need to be "fair to everyone" and to "keep the power dead even" fits very well into a collaborative leadership style where competing and winning are less important than mentoring and working together for the good of the organization.

Historically, women who have made it through the "glass ceiling" have been encouraged to suppress their preferred leadership styles and adopt the men's style. The implication is that men are better leaders than women. In recent years, however, men are beginning to see the value in some of women's traditional strengths and have made a concerted effort to incorporate them into their own leadership styles. Fortunately, there is a multitude of women who can serve as leaders, mentors, and examples for the men who are expanding their own leadership styles.

Gender Communication Differences

Gender communication differences have been studied for more than 25 years. A number of them have consistently been documented, written about and talked about in a variety of formats. Books have been written on the subject (Tannen's You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation and Gray's Men Are from Mars, Women Are from Venus) and become best sellers and hot talk-show topics. While many of these books were written in a somewhat humorous way to point out communication differences in our personal lives, women and men have been experiencing the same sort of communication differences in our professional lives. Because so much of our time revolves around our work

environment and because we have less control over who we work with, “little” communication problems can lead to “big” work problems. Although men can’t change women’s interpretation of men-speak nor can women change men’s interpretation of woman-speak, we can be aware of how men-speak and woman-speak differ. The following examples are well-documented, consistently found gender communication differences that have a significant potential for impacting on work relationships.

(1) Topic control. Women introduce more topics of dialogue; men are more successful in getting their topics on the table.^{24, 25, 26} Selection of the topics of discussion reflects the relative dominant, or power, position of the participants. In mixed gender groups, men usually assume this position. When men bring up dialogue topics, women generally go along with them.²⁷ This is not true in the reverse. A common occurrence in mixed gender meetings is that when women bring up topics for discussion, they are ignored until or unless a man later brings up the same issue.

(2) Air time. Holding the floor can be measured in a number of ways: quantity of speech, use of filled pauses, loudness and silence breaking. In all areas, men exceed women as dominators of air time.²⁸ Contrary to the common perception that women talk more than men, the reality is much different. In one study, Spender²⁹ found that 88 percent of the women spoke from 8 to 35 percent of the time; the most time controlled by a woman was 42 percent. Some of the men who spoke for 58 to 75 percent of the time said they had not had a fair share of the conversation. In spite of the time inequities, both the men and women perceived that the time was either equitably shared or that the women spoke longer. In other words, women are perceived by both genders as speaking more than they actually do.

Another study in which subjects were given an unlimited time to describe paintings found that women talked for an average of 3.17 minutes while men talked for an average of 13.0 minutes, and several men actually ran out the clock.³⁰

Another aspect of time dominance is the willingness or lack of willingness to take turns. Again, research has shown that women are much more willing than men to equitably share turns. Eakins³¹ found that not only did men talk more than women, but that much of this dominance was accomplished by “interrupting women or answering questions that were not addressed to them. Many women have a difficult time getting and keeping attention in a group.” In another study, it was found that even when taking turns, men “without exception, spoke longer per turn.³² The longest average for a man was 17.07 seconds; the longest average for a woman was 10 seconds, shorter than the average shortest turn for a man. Since in the men’s culture the amount of air time is perceived to be indicative of the speaker’s level of commitment and confidence in his position, women who control less air time are perceived as being less committed and less confident about their stated position. They are also perceived as less powerful.

(3) Interruptions. Another area in which women and men communicate differently is in the use of interruptions, one of the most highly researched areas. Ground breaking studies in the 1970s and 1980s documented that men interrupt women far more than women interrupt men. Men interrupting women interactions were observed in some studies to be as high as 96 to 100 percent.^{33, 34, 35} Furthermore, women tend to use interruptions to indicate interest and to facilitate the conversation, while men tend to use interruptions to control the conversation. It should be noted, however, that much research continues in this area and researchers are

now attempting to better qualify the meanings of interruptions in addition to just documenting the quantity. It has been shown that women who are most successful at fending off interruptions are those who continue speaking without any acknowledgment of the interruption.

(4) Use of minimal and delayed response. Another more subtle form of communication control is the use of minimal and delayed response.³⁶ While men and women both use these techniques, they use them in different ways. Women tend to use minimal response to demonstrate active listening and support for the speaker; men's use of delayed and minimal response "signals a lack of interest" in what the speaker is saying.^{37, 38} This technique is often seen at meetings when a woman makes a suggestion which her male colleagues either ignore or change the subject.

(5) Use of questions, qualifiers, and disclaimers. Women use an assortment of techniques such as questions, qualifiers, and disclaimers to soften the impact of their statements and to demonstrate an evenness of power. Tag questions, in particular, are a tool of politeness in which the speaker's opinion is given indirectly to avoid imposing their views on someone else.³⁹ Tag questions, qualifiers, disclaimers and other hedges allow the speaker to minimize conflict and avoid unpleasant confrontations as the listener controls whether to agree or disagree with the stated "opinion".⁴⁰ The difficulty for women is that men frequently interpret these hedges as a sign of uncertainty and lack of conviction in the speaker's stated position, thus undermining women's credibility.⁴¹

(6) Use of statements and lecturing. Men tend to be more direct; women tend to be more indirect. One of the ways in which men demonstrate their "directness" is through the

use of statements and lecturing. Not only do men make more statements than women, but they almost always get a response, which is not true for women.⁴² Lecturing is part of the men's style of communication. "And women let them get away with it. Because women's style includes listening attentively and not interrupting...men assume that if their partner had anything to say, they would say it. These two styles interact to produce silent women who nod and smile although they are bored and talkative men who lecture at length though they themselves might be bored and frustrated by the lack of dialogue."⁴³

Conversely, women ask many more questions and use hedges as described above to avoid directness. The difficulty in decisionmaking is that statements make men appear confident and decisive and questions make women appear uncertain and wishy-washy. Additionally, men often interpret questions as a challenge to their authority, while women view the use of questions as a tool to better understand the discussion or directive.

(7) Reliance on nonverbal communication. As previously discussed, all communication consists of both verbal and nonverbal components. If there is one area of communication in which women excel, it is nonverbal communication.^{44, 45, 46} Not only are women more responsive to nonverbal stimuli, but they also interpret these nonverbal cues with greater accuracy.⁴⁷ As has been stated previously, in the business world, this is one of women's greatest strengths.⁴⁸

(8) Use and avoidance of conflict. Verbal aggressiveness, especially loud and aggressive argument and posturing, is a common feature of communication in all-male groups where it is viewed as a form of enjoyment rather than conflict.^{49, 50} In contrast, women "find such displays unpleasant and interpret them as meant personally", thus they try to avoid these

disruptive types of communication.^{51, 52} While studying the conversations of teenage boys and girls, Tannen⁵³ found that verbal “fights” were used by boys as a means of establishing a friendship or play relationship. On the other hand, girls defined friendship as being conflict-free and took pride in never having had a “fight” with their friends. In the adult world of business and leadership, women are at a disadvantage because they use “accommodative strategies” which seek to avoid conflict while men use “exploitive strategies” that are calculated to win arguments.⁵⁴ Although argument has been shown to positively effect learning, creativity, and decisionmaking, this strategy is successful only when all of the participants are “playing the same game.”^{55 56}

(9) Leadership style. Men grow up in hierarchies with everyone else either above or below them in power and status. Women grow up in flat organizations where the focus is on minimizing differences and keeping the power evenly distributed among the players. Consequently, men learn to communicate in a vertical, or hierarchical, manner while women learn to communicate in a horizontal manner. The relative difference of status within the male hierarchy lends itself to an authoritarian, directive type of leadership and decisionmaking, whereas the relative sameness of status within women’s flat organizations lends itself to more egalitarian, participative type of leadership and decisionmaking. Goodwin⁵⁷ found that even as children, boys organized their play into hierarchies where designated leaders directed activities through the use of commands and the exclusion of suggestions. In contrast, girls took turns being the leader and all players participated in contributing suggestions which were generally agreed to by the others.

As more women enter the strategic leadership and decisionmaking levels, these style differences often leave men frustrated as their traditional authoritative manner proves counterproductive and ineffective. Women likewise experience frustration at the lack of cooperation and participation allowed them by traditional command and control leaders.

In summary, women's communication style incorporates indirect, self-effacing speech patterns intended to avoid conflict and balance the power among the speakers. In contrast, men's communication style uses direct, aggressive speech that demonstrates and reinforces the relative status and power of the speakers. When these diverse styles interact, women are at a disadvantage in traditional hierarchical organizations, whereas men are uncomfortable in nontraditional flat organizational structures.

Why We Are Where We Are Today

Historically, the military establishment and corporate America have mirrored each other's organizational structure and leadership development.⁵⁸ The "glass ceiling" is just as prevalent, if not more so, within the military establishment as it is in the business world as evidenced by the disproportionately small number of women at the senior ranks of both the officer and enlisted corps. Although the pipeline argument has long been used as an explanation of this phenomenon, this explanation becomes less understandable as time passes but the representation of women at the top does not show significant increases.⁵⁹

Nevertheless, there are a number of women who have achieved strategic leadership positions, and given the political pressure on the military to increase their representation, this number can be expected to slowly increase as the next generation of military leaders rise to the top.

Affirmative action programs, intended to open access to corporate America for women and other groups previously without access, have proven to be a disappointment. One possible explanation is related to cultural communication differences. People from different backgrounds tend to talk and behave in different ways -- "ways that are incomprehensible to , incompatible with, or simply misunderstood" by people already in the organization.

Individuals caught in these cross-cultural differences tend to blame the other group: established members blame the newcomers for not being team players and adopting their cultural norms; newcomers blame the establishment for not treating them fairly.⁶⁰ The public policy wonks are genuinely confused about why these programs haven't worked out as they expected. Perhaps the problem is that cross-cultural communication differences, including gender style differences, have created an unrecognized, invisible barrier to these newcomers.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Men and women learn very different communication behaviors in childhood. For the most part, these behaviors continue to be reinforced throughout their lifetimes, particularly in work relationships. As long as like styles communicate with like styles, problems seldom arise. It is primarily when gender styles interact that communication problems occur. Given this reality, it might seem that the obvious solution would be to select one gender style for everyone to use. Unfortunately, this approach would not only virtually exclude one gender from the this level of leadership, it would also exclude talent and limit options.

The first and most basic step toward mitigating these problems is to acknowledge that differences do exist. The second step is to recognize the value that these different cultures

bring to the strategic leadership levels. Just as programs to integrate other diverse cultures into the leadership structure of the workforce have been implemented, American businesses are now addressing the issue of gender communication differences. In fact, these two seemingly different issues share many of the same basic challenges and goals.

The resolution of this issue does not necessarily require changing the preferred communication styles of women and men, but requires an awareness of these differences and their impact on leadership, and development of strategies to mitigate potential problems generated as a result of the interaction of these different styles. However, as men and women interact more openly with each other, there is a tendency for everyone to adopt at least some opposite-gender communication strategies. This creates a win-win situation in which mixed gender communication is enhanced and the repertoire of individual communication strategies expands. Books such as Hardball for Women by Dr. Heim can be very helpful to both men and women in understanding both their own as well as other gender preferred communication styles.

The business world has learned a lot of lessons from their experiences in integrating women into strategic leadership and management positions. Rather than reinventing the proverbial wheel, the military establishment can learn from and apply these lessons to its own culture. As women enter strategic leadership positions in the military, it becomes increasingly important that both men and women acknowledge that communication style differences do exist and that they work to understand and to bridge these differences. If this can be achieved, the winners will be all of us.

ENDNOTES

¹ Pat Heim, She Said/He Said, 86 min. (Chicago: American Organization of Nurse Executives, 1992), videocassette.

² Ibid.

³ Pat Heim and Susan K. Golant, Hardball for Women: Winning at the Game of Business (Los Angeles: Lowell House, 1992), 159.

⁴ Rosalie Maggio, The Dictionary of Bias-Free Usage: A Guide to Nondiscriminatory Language (Oryx Press, 1991), 115-116.

⁵ Marland J. Burckhardt, ed., "Army Organizational and Strategic Leadership Concepts," in Leading and Managing in the Strategic Arena: A Reference Text (Carlisle, PA: U.S. Army War College, Department of Command, Leadership, and Management, 1996), 275.

⁶ Ibid., 276.

⁷ Deborah Tannen, You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation (New York: Ballantine Books, 1990), 281-212.

⁸ _____, Talking from 9 to 5: Women and Men in the Workplace: Language, Sex and Power (New York: Avon Books, A Division of the Hearst Corporation, 1994), 133.

⁹ Heim, videocassette.

¹⁰ Lillian Glass, He Says, She Says: Closing the Communication Gap Between the Sexes (New York: Perigee Books, A Division of the Putnam Publishing Group, 1992), 183.

¹¹ Ibid, 183-186.

¹² Heim, videocassette.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Heim and Golant, 50.

¹⁵ Ibid., 71-75.

¹⁶ Ibid., 71-72.

¹⁷ Heim and Golant, 9.

¹⁸ Ibid., 124.

¹⁹ From a statement made on the floor of the United States Senate during the 104th Congressional debate on affirmative action.

²⁰ Heim and Golant, 263-273.

²¹ Ibid., 264.

²² Ibid., 266.

²³ Ibid., 268-272.

²⁴ Mary Crawford, Talking Difference: On Gender and Language (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 1995), 42.

²⁵ Nancy Hoar, "Genderlect, Powerlect, and Politeness", in Constructing and Reconstructing Gender: The Links Among Communication, Language, and Gender, eds. Linda A.M. Perry, Lynn H. Turner, and Helen M. Sterk (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), 129.

²⁶ Jennifer Coates, Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Sex Differences in Language (New York: Longman, 1986), 101, 116.

²⁷ Barrie Thorne, Chris Kramarae, and Nancy Henley, eds. Language, Gender and Society (New York: Newbury House Publishers, 1983), 96.

²⁸ Judi Beinstein Miller, "Sex Differences in Interaction Management and Goals," in Advances in Gender and Communication Research, eds. Lawrence B. Nadler, Marjorie Keeshan Nadler, and William R. Todd-Mancillas (New York: University Press of America, 1987), 110-111.

²⁹ D. Spender, The Writing or the Sex (New York: Pergamon Press, 1989), 9.

³⁰ Eakins, 27.

³¹ Ibid., 66.

³² Barbara Westbrook Eakins and R. Gene Eakins, Sex Differences in Human Communication (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1978), 26-27.

³³ Crawford, 41-42.

³⁴ Eakins, 69.

³⁵ Coates, 100-101.

³⁶ Robin Tolmach Lakoff, "Cries and Whispers: The Shattering of the Silence", in Gender Articulated : Language and the Socially Constructed Self, eds. Kira hall and Mary Bucholtz (New York: Routledge, 1995), 27-28.

³⁷ Thorne, 95-96.

³⁸ Coates, 100-101.

³⁹ Eakins, 41.

⁴⁰ Hoar, 129.

⁴¹ Crawford, 27-29.

⁴² Thorne, 96.

⁴³ Crawford, 99.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 61.

⁴⁵ Heim and Golant, 159.

⁴⁶ Hoar, 131.

⁴⁷ Eakins, 148-175.

⁴⁸ Heim and Golant, 92.

⁴⁹ Coates, 153.

⁵⁰ Heim and Golant, 133-134.

⁵¹ Coates, 153.

⁵² Steven Hartwell, Roger C. Pace, and Renata Hutak, "Women Negotiating: Assertiveness and Relatedness," in Constructing and Reconstructing Gender: The Links Among Communication, Language, and Gender, eds. Linda A.M. Perry, Lynn H. Turner, and Helen M. Sterk (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), 53-52, 56-57.

⁵³ Tannen, 1994, 40-43.

⁵⁴ Eakins, 51.

⁵⁵ Andrew S. Rancer and Robert A. Baukus, "Discriminating Males and Females on Belief Structures About Arguing", in Advances in Gender and Communication Research, eds. Lawrence B. Nadler, Marjorie Keeshan Nadler, and William R. Todd-Mancillas (New York: University Press of America, 1987), 155-158.

⁵⁶ Deborah Borisoff and Lisa Merrill, "Teaching the College Course on Gender Differences as Barriers to Conflict Resolution", in Advances in Gender and Communication Research, eds. Lawrence B. Nadler, Marjorie Keeshan Nadler, and William R. Todd-Mancillas (New York: University Press of America, 1987) 351-359.

⁵⁷ Marjorie Harness Goodwin, "Cooperation and Competition Across Girls' Play Activities", in Gender and Discourse: The Power of Talk. Volume XXX in the Series Advances in Discourse Processes, ed. Roy O. Freedle, 55-94 (Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1988), 56, 68-69, 73.

⁵⁸ Betty Lehan Harragan, Games Mother Never Taught You: Corporate Gamesmanship for Women (New York: Warner Books, 1977), 38-39.

⁵⁹ Tannen, 1994, 133.

⁶⁰ _____, 1986, 191-192.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Borisoff, Deborah and Lisa Merrill. "Teaching the College Course on Gender Differences as Barriers to Conflict Resolution". In Advances in Gender and Communication Research, eds. Lawrence B. Nadler, Marjorie Keeshan Nadler, and William R. Todd-Mancillas, 351-361. New York: University Press of America, 1987.
- Burckhardt, Marland J., ed. "Army Organizational and Strategic Leadership Concepts." In Leading and Managing in the Strategic Arena: A Reference Text. Carlisle, PA: U.S. Army War College, Department of Command, Leadership, and Management, 1996.
- Coates, Jennifer. Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Sex Differences in Language. New York: Longman, 1986.
- Crawford, Mary. Talking Difference: On Gender and Language. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 1995.
- Eakins, Barbara Westbrook and R. Gene Eakins. Sex Differences in Human Communication. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1978.
- Glass, Lillian. He Says, She Says: Closing the Communication Gap Between the Sexes. New York: Perigee Books, A Division of the Putnam Publishing Group, 1992.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness. "Cooperation and Competition Across Girls' Play Activities". In Gender and Discourse: The Power of Talk. Volume XXX in the Series Advances in Discourse Processes, ed. Roy O. Freedle, 55-94. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1988.
- Gray, John. Men Are from Mars, Women Are from Venus: A Practical Guide for Improving Communication and Getting What You Want in Your Relationships. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1992.
- Harragan, Betty Lehan. Games Mother Never Taught You: Corporate Gamesmanship for Women. New York: Warner Books, 1977.
- Hartwell, Steven, Roger C. Pace, and Renata Hutak. "Women Negotiating: Assertiveness and Relatedness". In Constructing and Reconstructing Gender: The Links Among Communication, Language, and Gender, eds. Linda A.M. Perry, Lynn H. Turner, and Helen M. Sterk, 53-59. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.
- Heim, Pat and Susan K. Golant. Hardball for Women: Winning at the Game of Business. Los Angeles: Lowell House, 1992.

- Heim, Pat. She Said/He Said. 86 min. Chicago: American Organization of Nurse Executives, 1992. Videocassette.
- Hoar, Nancy. "Genderlect, Powerlect, and Politeness." In Constructing and Reconstructing Gender: The Links Among Communication, Language, and Gender, eds. Linda A.M. Perry, Lynn H. Turner, and Helen M. Sterk, 127-136. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.
- Lakoff, Robin Tolmach. "Cries and Whispers: The Shattering of the Silence." In Gender Articulated : Language and the Socially Constructed Self, eds. Kira Hall and Mary Bucholtz, 25-50. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Maggio, Rosalie. The Dictionary of Bias-Free usage: A Guide to Nondiscriminatory Language. Oryx Press, 1991.
- Miller, Judi Beinstein. "Sex Differences in Interaction Management and Goals." In Advances in Gender and Communication Research, eds. Lawrence B. Nadler, Marjorie Keeshan Nadler, and William R. Todd-Mancillas, 109-126. New York: University Press of America, 1987.
- Rancer, Andrew S. and Robert A. Baukus. "Discriminating Males and Females on Belief Structures About Arguing". In Advances in Gender and Communication Research, eds. Lawrence B. Nadler, Marjorie Keeshan Nadler, and William R. Todd-Mancillas, 155-173. New York: University Press of America, 1987.
- Spender, Dale. The Writing or the Sex. New York: Pergamon Press, 1989.
- Tannen, Deborah. Gender and Discourse. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- _____. Talking from 9 to 5: Women and Men in the Workplace: Language, Sex and Power. New York: Avon Books, A Division of the Hearst Corporation, 1994.
- _____. That's Not What I Meant: How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Relationships. New York: Ballantine Books, 1986.
- _____. You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation. New York: Ballantine Books, 1990.
- Thorne, Barrie, Chris Kramarae, and Nancy Henley, eds. Language, Gender and Society. New York: Newbury House Publishers, 1983.