

Gretchen Gasteier
Research Essay
5/25/09

I decided to write my research paper on female public speech after I read an article in my sociology class by linguist, Deborah Tannen. She discussed that in public, women were the silent gender, declaring that men were out-speaking women in public by alarming amounts. After reading this, I asked my own UW class of seventeen girls in the Women's Leadership Program who among them had contributed to discussion in a co-ed class of forty or more students this year; half of them put down their hands. When I asked who had contributed more than once, only one hand remained. I was surprised that the girls whom I thought to be confident female leaders-in-the-making would be so apprehensive in contributing to class discussion. I immediately wanted to know if this really was the general trend and more importantly why this disproportion in public speech was occurring.

First I collected data, that included surveys and observations in a variety of public areas where men and women might speak, to see if there were studies that would confirm men do indeed speak more often than women in public. Most of this research came from online sources, such as journals, databases, and scholarly articles. I exhausted the words "gender" and "public speech" in every subject specific category from women's studies to linguistics to sociology to communications and beyond. The criteria I had to constitute a good source was overall relevance, relatively recent publication, written by a reliable scholar in the field, peer-reviewed, and whether or not the article had an esteemed publisher. After collecting data and sorting out the most reliable, representative studies for my paper, every study was consistent in claiming

that there was definitely a disproportion among genders when it came to public speech that favored the males.

I set out to find how and why this was occurring. My initial hypothesis was that societal norms and expectations were responsible for causing women to stay silent. This was research problem number one. I had already decided in my mind what I wanted to prove, and set out on a journey to find support for my hypothesis. The problem was it was not so easy to find sources that laid out society's expectations of females in public that I could clearly connect to why women would therefore not speak in public. Unfortunately for me society's gender norms and expectations are not clearly defined in a neat, little list. I wandered the linguistics and sociology sections of the library, and found some helpful books on the technical differences in gendered speech, but was still having trouble answering the question of "why?"

I felt like I had hit a dead end and knew I needed help. I met with a wonderful research librarian who, for the second time, helped me revamp my searches online. We brainstormed different words still related to "gender" and "speech," and he taught me to look for clues on the sidebars that might direct my research in the right path. I became more accustomed to using different databases, especially the science databases with which I was previously unfamiliar.

I also found some book titles online and ordered the books through the consortium. I hoped that they would be helpful, but all six books I was told (in a very sad email) were unavailable. I decided to have a fresh start and search through the GW library catalogue. Then I finally used a search combination that led me to a perfect book; and sitting on the shelf next to the book were about twenty more books that all

were relevant to my topic. I grabbed as many of the books I could carry and began reading. I read about five of the books from cover to cover, which only led me to more books and articles after perusing their reference lists. By this time I had about a dozen books and upwards of twenty articles, so I quickly learned how to skim each page for words and sections that were especially interesting or relevant to my research.

I didn't want my paper to be flooded with quotes, so I narrowed down what sources to use. I found there was a lot of overlap, so I decided which sources more clearly and concisely articulated each point, and those were the sources I used in my final paper. However, it was my research as a whole that led me to different ideas and angles of looking at my topic. Then, in turn, I was able to evaluate an argument that I thought was most plausible and develop a new thesis.

I learned a lot in the process of researching this paper. First, you are going to look at a lot of sources, and may not necessarily use all of them, but they are all helpful in some way. Second, there is going to be something out there about your topic. Even though I didn't find a neat list of societal norms, I found sources to support my own conclusions, which is ultimately the point of a research paper. Most importantly, I discovered letting my research guide me. I realized research is not black and white, there is a whole spectrum of possibilities and directions your research might take you; it is important to be open to those possibilities. If you predetermine what you want to prove or find, you may isolate yourself from an alternate, perhaps more interesting path. Finally, it is important to find a topic you are passionate about, or find something interesting in your topic. When you have the drive to find the answers, it makes the process more enjoyable and fulfilling.

Gretchen Gasteier

Professor Levine

UW 20

30 Apr 2009

Why Don't We Hear From the Women?: The Female Voice in Public Settings

It is a common complaint that women talk too much. They chatter on the phone, gossip over coffee, whisper during class, and nag their husbands. These notions about female communication conjure up a negative perception of women's voices, and perpetuate a misconception that women are always talking. However, women are not always the talkative sex we might perceive them to be. It seems that when women are placed in a public setting, they in fact become the silent gender. Why is it that this half of the population, the half that is perceived to be full of overzealous communicators no less, becomes tongue-tied when there is a wider audience? The reasons for the talkative man and the mute woman in the public setting are often attributed to biology and psychology, but we cannot ignore society's vast influence over women on what is desirable feminine communication. The socialization of the female gender can be attributed to this disproportion in public speaking by teaching females feminine styles of speech, while masculine styles of speech still dominate the world of public speaking.

Linguist Deborah Tannen discusses in her book, *Men and Women in Conversation*, the frustration many women feel when they find communication

effortless at home, but at the school PTA meeting or neighborhood council meeting become self-conscious and acutely aware of the negative reactions people might have to their words if they spoke. As an example of disproportionate gendered talk in public, Tannen cites an hour-long radio show where the discussion was about abortion, a topic expressly related to women, and all but two callers into the show were men (*Men* 87). Tannen's observation that women are not only keeping quiet in public, but about issues that concern women's own well being is disturbing.

After studying large amounts of data concerning gendered public speaking, it became more evident that there was a distinct pattern of men speaking more than women in public settings. I limited my studies to the United States, where participants were predominantly Caucasian and middle to upper class. I did this because many of the public areas I was looking at took place in areas of higher education where the Caucasian race is still in the majority. I also wanted to study the time period of post-second wave feminism in the United States. Finally, the norms and cultures outside of the United States differ greatly and would provide much different results. Each of the studies I researched consistently found that men out-talked the women, either in number of times spoken or in length of time talking.

The academic world is perhaps the most important space in which to study disproportionate public speech among men and women because it is often the most accessible arena for public speech. By studying speech from both faculty and students we find alarming results. Communications researchers Barbara and Gene Eakins studied university faculty meetings and found that men talk more than women and for longer periods of time. They write, "The men's turns ranged from

10.66 to 17.07 seconds, while the women's turns ranged from 3 to 10 seconds. In other words, the women's longest turns were still shorter than the men's shortest turns" (*Men* 100). We can find similar results at academic conferences. Linguist Marjorie Swacker studied question and answer sessions at academic conferences and found that women were well represented as speakers at the conference; they presented 40.7 percent of the papers and made up 42 percent of the audience. However, only 27.4 percent of the questions were asked by women, and when women did speak they took on average less than half the time of men to ask a question. She accounted for this time difference because "men tended to preface their questions with a statement, ask more than one question, and follow up the speaker's answer with another question or comment" (*Men* 100). In both instances we are observing faculty members and academics who have experience speaking to large groups, and yet the men are still holding the floor more often and for a longer period of time.

Given the results of disproportionate speech from faculty members, it is not surprising that we find similar results while observing students in the classroom. Jace Condrary, Esther Skirboll, and Rhoda Taylor are college professors of Communications who examined the impact of the classroom environment on women. In their study called "Faculty Perceptions of Classroom Gender Dynamics" they discuss the "chilly" classroom environment for women. They claim males are more likely than females to initiate response in class, especially when the class is taught by a male professor. When the professor is female the amount of female class participation rises, but is still outnumbered by the amount of male participation

(Skirboll 2). In all cases women never spoke as long as the men when given their turn to speak (Skirboll 3).

Rhodes, Taylor, and Skirboll's study on graduate classrooms explains there was no significant difference in the number of times males and females spoke. However, we must look at the proportion of males to females in the classroom. Male students comprised only 24 percent of student sample but accounted for 40 percent of speech frequency and for 51 percent of all interruptions (Skirboll 3). This shows even when the class's majority is female, the ratio of males' speech in comparison to class population far outweighs the females' ratio. In my own undergraduate class observations I noted that over a three-week span in a co-ed journalism class of 120 students, males consistently spoke more often than females in every class. In one particular class over the time period of seventy-five minutes, fifteen boys contributed to discussion, while only two girls contributed. Of those fifteen boys five of them spoke multiple times, one of who took five turns. I thought possibly these female students were just shy or they had nothing to say, so I decided to look in a different setting where both college-age girls and boys are granted the authority to speak: college debate tournaments.

Communications scholars, Irene Matz and Jon Bruschke, observed inadequate female representation in the college debate tournament. Not only are most of the teams predominantly male, but the female competitors are most likely to be on novice or junior varsity teams. In the National Debate Tournament, females comprise roughly one-fifth of all competitors. Only 26 percent of those women made it to the final elimination round. Females did much better in the novice divisions, but

when it came to the open divisions females lost 63 percent of the time to males (Matz 31). These findings show that even women who seemingly want to speak in public are still being outdone by their male competitors.

The media also provides good examples of gender bias in speech by showing the public audience more male speech than female speech. According to communications scholars, Elizabeth Natelle and Fritzi Bodenheimer, we are being fed gender-biased speech on television, probably without even realizing it. On Sunday morning political talk shows, like *Face the Nation* or *Meet the Press*, only 10 percent of the guests are women, and women make up only 6 percent of repeat guests (Natelle 2). Also in television advertisements, male voices accounted for 80-90 percent of the voiceovers. Advertisers claim the male voice is more reliable and that people are more willing to trust the product if its endorsed by a male (Natelle 15).

Radio talk shows also hold astonishingly gender-biased results in terms of guests who call in to talk. Diane Rehm, who hosts *The Diane Rehm Show*, reflects that while listeners to her show are equal parts male and female, “90 percent of callers to the show are men” (*Men* 103). It is here that Deborah Tannen made an important observation about her self as a public speaker. As a professor and linguistic expert she often speaks in public settings and has been a guest on many radio shows. However, she realized that she had never called into a radio show, even when she had an opinion or something to say on the topic. She states, “When I am in the role of invited guest, my position of authority is granted before I begin to speak. Were I to call in, I would be claiming that right on my own” (*Men* 88). Tannen would have to

establish credibility on her own or risk her comments being ignored or not valued. This is a common fear among women that their comments will not be valued, or worse ridiculed; as a result many women feel more apprehension towards speaking in public.

The data clearly suggests men speak more often in public settings than women, so the question is why do so many women feel apprehension, fear, and anxiety in regards to speaking in public? In other words why don't we hear from the women in public settings? I will discuss the possible explanations of physiological differences in male and female brain functions regarding language and psychological development, while arguing the socialization of gender can best explain this disproportionate phenomenon in public speech. Socialization, the way people learn how to behave in public and interact in social situations with other people, offers explanation as to how men and women learn public behavior regarding speech and why gendered speech exists.

Part of gender socialization is the reinforcement of stereotypes about men and women. Common female stereotypes are that women are nurturing, warm, kind, modest, cautious, and sensitive. Common male stereotypes are that men are assertive, dynamic, competitive, competent, aloof, task-oriented, domineering, and confident. According to linguistics professor Philip Smith, the danger in creating stereotypes is that they "can seriously misinterpret the nature of and extent of sex differences and can create preconceived notions about people that aren't true" (Smith 28).

By creating stereotypes we tend to pigeonhole men and women as having certain characteristics, and if people transcend these boundaries they may violate social norms. Feminist linguist, Deborah Cameron, states in her book, *The Feminist Critique of Language*, “Women are prevented from speaking, either by social taboos and restrictions or by the more genteel tyrannies of custom and practice” (Cameron 4). Cameron seems to suggest social norms about female behavior prevent women from speaking in public, because we have different expectations of women when it comes to communication.

It is usually uncontested that men and women communicate differently. Tannen explains, “More men feel more comfortable doing ‘public speaking,’ while more women feel more comfortable doing ‘private speaking’” (*Men* 100). She describes these differences by using the terms *report-talk* and *rappor-talk*. In general we believe women use rapport talk. Language for women is a way of establishing a connection with another person, finding similarities, and conferring on experiences. Women usually find these relationships with people in close settings where they feel comfortable, i.e. a more private setting (*Men*100). Men usually talk as a way to establish independence, status, social order, and relay information similar to giving a report. They do this by displaying their talents and knowledge and maintaining center stage by telling jokes or stories (*Men* 100).

It is important to remember there is no way to say all men speak this way and all women speak in another way. Some women are more aggressive and assertive in public, and some men would rather find themselves anywhere than behind a podium. Due to these gender exceptions, scholars have deemed there are

two different types of speech: the masculine form and the feminine form. Men and women can adopt certain aspects of both forms and vary in their degree of masculinity or femininity. However, it has been found that men generally adopt the masculine form and women generally adopt the feminine form of speech (Natelle 15). Throughout this paper when referring to men and women, it is in reference to the men who adopt masculine styles of speech and women who adopt feminine styles of speech since this represents the majority. It is this masculine style usually adopted by men that is seen as the style of strong public speech.

Society's view of what makes a good public speaker consists of someone who displays confidence, trustworthiness, competence, and assertiveness, and aggressiveness (Natelle 5). These are all characteristics that a good public speaker should obtain; however it is the fact that society views males as predominant seekers of these characteristics that is detrimental to the females. The masculine, combative style of communication has long been the socially valued form of public speech, and this unfortunately has only benefited masculine speakers, leaving little room for acceptance of feminine speakers.

According to Natelle and Bodenheimer, "The feminine style of speech favors building relationships and emphasizing personal stories to support ideas and the masculine style favors linear organization" (Natelle 15). In Tannen's book, *Gender and Discourse*, she explains masculine speakers are more likely to engage in conflict, such as arguing, issuing commands, or taking an opposing stance. Feminine speakers are more likely to agree, support, and make suggestions (*Gender* 42).

Certain patterns in female speech that represent their feminine tendencies are often plagued with negative connotations. Women's voices by nature have a higher pitch. As seen in the example of the television advertisement, lower pitch is associated with being more trustworthy and reliable. Women also use a greater variety of intonation patterns than men by using more rise and fall in their speech. Philip Smith explains in *Language, the Sexes, and Society* that men have a more deliberate, steady style of speech that is aggressive, decisive, and assertive, which is also seen as more reliable, while women's intonation variety is associated with emotional instability, not suited for positions of responsibility (Smith 69). Another major characteristic of female speech is the greater use of hedges, such as *sort of*, *maybe*, and *well* (Cameron 24). These words imply that the speaker is not confident in what they are saying and cannot speak with assurance, which detracts from the female's perceived authority on the subject.

Education professor Carmen Luke concludes in her article, "Politics of Speech and Silence," that women's voices are the product of women's "historical, socio-cultural, and economic locations in relation to men" (Luke, 213). To understand why men and women have adopted certain speech patterns it is impossible to ignore women's historical silence. Cameron defines this silence as women's "absence from high culture" such as religion, public ceremonies, politics, science, and poetry (Cameron 4). Historical examples of socialization can help us to understand today's gendered discourse.

In the past women were often more than encouraged to keep silent, they were sometimes physically punished if they spoke out of turn. In Tudor England

women had their head placed in a brank, resembling a helmet with spikes, if they spoke too freely or were found gossiping. Old myths frightened women into silence by claiming strenuous oratory efforts resulted in infertility. The Grimm fairy tales portray talkative women as witches and good women as silent and passive. Most girls have heard the common phrases “talk like a lady” or “silence is a virtue.” Even in today’s children’s movies we see silence is desirable in women. In Disney’s *The Little Mermaid*, Ariel must first lose her voice in order to receive the Prince’s love. These examples of appropriate, virtuous female behavior continue to influence women on what is expected of them in public. After all it has only been in recent times that women’s voices have been more accepted in the public sphere.

In the late 1960s, second wave feminism emerged in the U.S. with the intent to liberate women from the patriarchal constraints that had quelled their voices for so long. Finally a movement was asking to hear women’s speech; finally women were being encouraged to speak in public. Forty years have passed since this movement arose, and yet women are still less likely to speak up in the classroom, co-ed group discussions, on television interviews, and in other public settings. It is simply not enough to encourage women to speak in public, without considering the psychological consequences women have experienced throughout their centuries of silence. Communications professor at the University of Reading, Judith Baxter claims, “Feminism may have opened the door for female public speech, but did not teach women how to participate nor did it teach the public how to best respond to feminine styles of speech” (Baxter 8). Gender behavior cannot change overnight without guidance.

Beginning in early childhood girls play in smaller clusters of friends and often in pairs. Boys play in larger groups where they can assert authority. When asked if children have a best friend girls usually cite another female who they talk to most often; boys will most likely not have an answer or cite a fellow teammate or playmate. This reiterates that girls' speech is marked by intimacy and mutual support, while boys' speech is marked by establishing hierarchy (Cameron 26). Society teaches boys that the way to get attention is by being a dominant speaker; therefore we consider men as more comfortable speaking in public and to larger groups of people (*Men* 101).

The study of female silence in the classroom is especially important, as this is where much of a child's socialization takes place. More and more reports dictate that men and women's classroom participation is "both quantitatively and qualitatively different" (Skirboll 2). Starting as early as kindergarten children receive cues from their teachers that boys' speech is more valuable than the girls' speech. Boys are called on more often in classrooms. It is not that boys know more answers or find the answer more quickly, but girls tend to hesitate longer before raising their hand in order to form the most coherent thought. This is not to say boys do not also think of a coherent thought, but they tend to shout out or raise their hand as the thought pops into their head, whereas girls take longer to muster up the courage (*Men* 82).

In her book, *Gender in the Language Classroom*, scholar Allyson Jule found that teachers often ask more yes/no questions to girls and more open-ended questions to boys. Even nonverbal cues, such as making eye contact, were more

often directed at boys. She also found that boys were praised more often, and reprimanded less often than girls if they interrupted (Jule 26). Most teachers and professors are unaware that they even send such signals, and may subconsciously favor boys in the classroom due to cultural stereotypes that the boys will one day be the head of the household and the breadwinner (Jule 23).

This favoring of boys' speech in the classroom is dangerous for girls. Jule states, "Language is central to learning. If girls speak less will they learn less? Will their ability to think and communicate in complex ways be reduced? This may well be" (Jule 104). If boys dominate the discourse girls will inevitably miss out on learning opportunities to work through their ideas and experiment with public speech (Jule 26).

Some argue that girls in fact have the advantage in the classroom, as they emerge as the leaders in language from an early age. It is true that girls have been found to grasp language earlier and more quickly than boys. Language Science scholars, D. Burman, T. Bitan, and J. Booth, performed a study on sex differences in neural processing of language among elementary school aged children and younger. They found that even in children as young as two years old, better language performance can be seen among females. They write, "Girls begin talking earlier and show more spontaneous language" (Burman 1349).

To find out why girls may have a better grasp of language they decided to perform a series of tests on the brain activity of males and females during language processing. They found at young ages girls have a more developed frontal gyrus in the brain, which correlates to accuracy in spelling and rhyming, and girls have a

stronger right hemisphere, which correlates with language tasks and word identification. These tests consistently showed girls had a greater activation in linguistic areas of the brain (Burman 1357). However, these tests were conducted on children in elementary school and younger, and do not show that these developments continue through to adulthood. It is possible that men catch up to women in their teen years as their brain develops.

The argument that innate physiological differences between the sexes account for differences in communication does not help to explain why women speak less in public. If we cite brain functions for the communication disparity it would seem women should be more comfortable than men speaking in public; however the evidence shows this is not the case. Psychologists have studied how women's perceptions and anxieties interfere with their ability to speak in public. We can concur that psychology may help to explain female's reluctance toward public speech.

Public speaking is a source of stress and anxiety for many people. According to Ralph Behnke and Chris Sawyer, communications professors at the University of Texas, psychological factors determine each gender's response to stress. "Females are more sensitive to intense stimuli than men, and therefore perceived stressors suggest higher rates of trait anxiety levels for women than men" (Behnke 188). Females' higher anxiety levels may result in the adoption of more cautious styles of speech, where men adopt more confident styles.

When college students were asked what six variables, including confidence, interest in subject, gender, class size, student/student interactions, graded

participation, and emotional climate, had the strongest correlation with their public participation, confidence was ranked as the number one determinant. Accordingly the males in the class reported to having higher levels of confidence than the females and therefore felt more comfortable speaking in class (Skirboll 4). Women often view confidence as something they either have or do not have, but confidence is not something you are born with; it is a “positive evaluation of self” (Smith 67). If faced with a negative evaluation, women are more likely to experience decreased levels of confidence and will be reluctant to speak in public again.

It is difficult to claim that females shy away from public speaking because they are inherently more anxious and less confident than men. It is more likely that females’ anxiety and decreased levels of confidence emerge from the social consequences they fear they may endure from speaking in public. Society tends to have certain expectations of women public speakers. Women are expected to smile more and maintain eye contact, because they need to be well liked in order to influence an audience (Natelle 67). These expectations create a double-edged sword for female public speakers who grapple with coming off too tentative and seeming incompetent or coming off too aggressive and being less likeable. For women in business and politics this is an especially difficult dichotomy to balance. Presidential nominee, Hilary Rodham Clinton, was criticized in the public for being cold, unlikeable and unfeminine, as well as for being too emotional when she showed signs of tears in public.

A study done in *Business Week* claimed “42 percent of women felt high apprehension toward speaking in their professional setting compared to only 15

percent of men” (Natelle 4). In business women are more likely to be evaluated on how well they cooperate with others, while men are evaluated on their competence (Baxter 68). Women do not want to be seen as uncooperative if they voice their opinion to readily or too aggressively. Leadership is associated with talk, though, and if women’s voices continue to be quelled in school, business, politics, and other public spaces women will have a difficult time in breaking the glass ceiling in these areas.

With so much at stake on women’s ability to speak in public, it is important to understand patterns in human behavior, so we can better encourage women in the public speaking environment (*Gender* 13). According to Cameron, feminist critique “has accepted that the stereotypes about feminine speech may contain a measure of truth” (Cameron 23). Therefore feminists have opted to create two different models that reinterpret what the stereotypical behaviors mean. The first model is the Dominance Model, which is “a negative evaluation of women’s language in cultural terms, where women are forced to learn a weak, deferential style [of speech] as part of their socialization” (Cameron 23). The second model is the Difference Model, which states “women use language differently from men perhaps as the stereotypes suggest, but the language needs to be reinterpreted in a positive light” (Cameron 24). Both models are important in understanding feminine speech and what can be done to make this style of speech accepted in the public. The question is should women appropriate masculine styles of speech in the public sphere and risk being looked at in a negative light, or should society change its views on what constitutes a valid public speaker?

Unfortunately, these are not easy solutions to implement. Cultural patterns are resistant to change and it is almost impossible to undo socialization of gender roles if society's norms stay the same. However, by increasing awareness of different styles of speech, and by recognizing one style is not better than the other we can start to make changes in how we view public speakers.

The audience, from the academic to the social atmosphere, needs to be more cognizant of who the speaker is and what style of speech the speaker adopts. Judith Baxter notes a conversation she had with a woman on public speaking. The woman, who was a scholar and expert in her field, was asked to give a presentation at a conference. At the end of her presentation she was bombarded by questions and comments, mostly from men. She felt the comments were made in such a derogatory and aggressive manner, that the audience's sole purpose was to debase her argument and make her feel inferior. She was so distraught at the end of her presentation she claimed she never wanted to speak in public again (Baxter 35). It might not have been the audience's intention to disgrace the speaker, but that is how she felt after her presentation. Jule points out, "Females tend to need some acknowledgment of positive feedback from an audience or it will cause them to hesitate, feel unsure, or cease talking altogether" (Jule 34). This acknowledgment needs to only be eye contact or a nod of the head, but it can make a difference in making the speaker feel comfortable.

Women need to be taught that public speaking is actually a skill that can be built in a systematic way; it is not just a skill born in men and not in women (Natelle 4). In the classroom, teachers need to be aware of gender differences in order to

alter classroom activities to best meet all students' needs. They should look at girls and boys in equal numbers after asking a question, ensure they give equal amounts of praise to each gender, or pause a moment longer in order to give girls a better opportunity to formulate the thought and decide to raise their hand.

Some people argue that the remedy for women's silence in public lies in expanding women's repertoires to encompass the more assertive, masculine style of public authority and speech, since the masculine style of speech is still dominant in today's public speaking world. It would appear that presently women must adopt masculine styles of speech to get ahead in their careers or to make their voices heard in public, and then bear the possible consequences of being labeled unfeminine or overbearing. Ultimately however, it is not women's alleged deficiencies, but the cultural devaluing of feminine styles of speech that need to change. We need to re-label words like deferential, chattery, and trivial in describing feminine speech to words like supportive, women-centered, and thoughtful. Instead of looking at emotion as a negative attribute in public speaking we can look at it as a way for women to better connect with their audience.

Girls have been socialized that feminine styles of speech are more appropriate, yet society continues to favor masculine styles of public speech. This has led to a continued disproportion in terms of gendered public speech even after the women's movement began in the 1960s. Second wave feminism made great strides in liberating women's voices, but the same stereotypes and societal expectations about appropriate female behavior still influence women today. However, more and more people are starting to recognize that women's voices do warrant a place in the

public world and can offer new perspectives. Hopefully when we start to acknowledge and become aware of different styles of public speaking we can include all voices in the public speaking world. The door to the public realm has been opened; we just need to do a better job of coaxing women through it.

Works Cited

- Baxter, Judith. *Speaking Out: The Female Voice in Public Contexts*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Behnke, Ralph, and Chris Sawyer. "Anticipatory Anxiety Patterns for Male and Female Public Speakers." *Communication Education* 49.2 (2000): 187-196.
- Burman, Douglas, Tali Bitan, and James R. Booth. "Sex Differences in Neural Processing of Language Among Children." *Neuropsychologia* 46 (2008): 1349-1362.
- Cameron, Deborah. *The Feminist Critique of Language*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Jule, Allyson. *Gender, Participation and Silence in the Language Classroom: Sh-shushing the Girls*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Luke, Carmen. "Women in the Academy: The Politics of Speech and Silence." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 15.2 (1994): 211-226.
- Matz, Irene, and John Brushke. "Gender Inequality in Debate, Legal and Business Professions." *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate* 26 (2006): 29-45.
- Natelle, Elizabeth, and Fritzi R. Bodenheimer. *The Woman's Public Speaking Handbook*. Belmont: Wadsworth, 2004.
- Skirboll, Esther, Jace Condravy, and Rhoda Taylor. "Faculty Perceptions of Classroom Gender Dynamics." *Women and Language* 21.1 (1998): 18-27.
- Smith, Philip. *Language, The Sexes and Society*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985.
- Tannen, Deborah. *Gender and Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Tannen, Deborah. *You Just Don't Understand: Men and Women in Conversation*. New York: Random House, 1990.