

Speaking Like a Lady:
COLLEGE STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS ON THE
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN IN PUBLIC SPEAKING

By
KAITLYN MACAULAY

A Thesis Submitted to The Honors College
In Partial Fulfillment of the Bachelors degree
With Honors in
Communication

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

M A Y 2 0 1 5

Approved by:



Dr. Michael Dues
Department of Communication

ABSTRACT:

The purpose of this study is to determine how the attire of male and female public speakers affects college students' perception of their credibility. This study was conducted by having a sample of currently enrolled undergraduate students watch a video recording of a male speaker and a female speaker give an identical speech and then evaluate each of them based on ten sets of criteria. The male and female speaker each had three possible videos for the speakers to watch where they were either dressed casually, professionally, or night-out attire. After assessing the two speakers in the random appearance selection, each participant filled out a demographics questionnaire to provide information about their gender, age, ethnicity, and political affiliation. Unfortunately the results proved to have little to no significance with the difference scales based on credibility of each speaker. This is mainly due to the lack of sample size for the participants, indicating that although the topic of this study is of interest, it needs a larger sample size for future investigations in order to yield significant results.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.....	2
STATEMENT OF RELEVANCE.....	2
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	3
METHODS.....	9
RESULTS.....	12
DISCUSSION.....	13
CONCLUSIONS.....	17
FUTURE DIRECTION.....	19
REFERENCES	21
APPENDICES.....	23

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE:

This honors thesis will examine how college students perceive the credibility of male and female speakers based on their appearance through a lens of the college student's gender, age, ethnicity, and political affiliation.

STATEMENT OF RELEVANCE:

In a world where women have fought long and hard in order to gain equality in education, athletics, work, and more, a common question is if our cultural perception of women has changed. Although women may be able to have the same job as men, and have the same education as men, are they still seen as less credible? Often this perception is viewed as old fashioned and dated. However even subconscious comparisons between men and women are made which often evaluate women as not as credible, intelligent, and sophisticated, as men. This thesis looks into this possible perception in the facet of appearance to see how college students evaluate a female public speaker credibility in comparison to a male public speaker, with the focus on what they are wearing. The results of this thesis help open the door to discussing whether perceptions of educated, often young adults are still viewing women as less credible than men, or whether our views are finally becoming equalized in viewing both sexes.

LITERATURE REVIEW:

Inspiration for this project began with a commercial for a hair care product that showed a man taking control of a meeting and called him a “boss”. Then it depicted a woman doing the same thing and called her “bossy”. The commercial next showed a man giving a speech and labeled him as “persuasive” but labeled the women doing the same thing as “pushy”. Continuing with this pattern, the commercial illustrated how when women do exactly what men do in the world, they are often seen in a negative light. This portrayal stimulated me to investigate what published research had to say about this aspect of gender inequality. Many sources agree that men and women, especially in the context of speaking publically, are viewed differently. In addition, “it is often difficult...to separate actual sex difference in communication from stereotypical beliefs, expectations, and perceptions of the communication behaviors of males and females” (Wilcox, 1980). It is also hard to find a study that is a “one-size-fits-all” since the “differences in male/female language are often dependent on the situation” (Goldshmidt & Weller, 2000).

In Western culture, males are typically more encouraged from childhood to be outspoken and to learn how to speak in front of an audience in a more competitive and challenging way (Galvin, Dolly & Pula, 2013). Even though studies have not shown that females participated less in public speaking opportunities than males, they do show how males often dominate in these settings (Galvin, Dolly & Pula, 2013). In addition to this heavier presence of male voices, males are encouraged during their formative years to be more dominant (Galvin, Dolly & Pula, 2013). Even when males were outnumbered by females, they still participated more in a classroom setting, showing more confidence and more assertiveness (Galvin, Dolly & Pula, 2013). Despite young women growing up in a setting where their male peers are taking more charge in speech, many females still go on to be great public speakers. Yet the challenges to women do not decrease after adulthood.

“Culturally, every United States women who broke the sound barrier confronted similar conflicts and struggles” (Campbell, 2003). The challenge for women to have their voice be heard is an issue women of all ages face.

Beyond women and men being raised differently in order to be successful in public speaking, an audience also perceives public speakers differently based on the speaker’s gender. An audience member’s perspective “of another’s gender identity is the master key that immediately unlocks a...vast array of beliefs and stereotypes about that person’s nature” (Berscheid, 1993). One major difference between men’s and women’s voices is the sound they produce. When examining female candidates for elections, voters tended to prefer females who had lower-pitched voices, seeming to emulate their male counterparts (Klofstad, Anderson & Susan, 2012). These lower-pitched voices were perceived “as competent, strong and trustworthy” for both genders (Klofstad, Anderson & Susan, 2012). However from the results of this study, men seemed to prefer lower-pitched male voices, judging them as more competent and stronger (Klofstad, Anderson & Susan, 2012).

Audience’s perception of speakers expands to a speaker’s speech style based on gender. In general, consistent studies have shown there is a “gender-linked language effect” in which respondents react differently to samples of speech of men and women” (Zahn, 2009). As found in a study examining the evaluations of male and female speech, “raters consistently identify speaker’s sex with the respective language features and also give less positive evaluations of female language (Zahn, 2009). Women did receive some positive reviews when their speech was evaluated based on “aesthetic quality” but male speakers were evaluated “as more dynamic than female speakers” (Zahn, 2009). This difference in evaluation may be rooted in “stereotypes about social roles” along with “other cues as to the sex of the speaker (voice qualities, appearance)” (Zahn, 2009). Gender-based language

qualities among the many indicators which can begin to shape an audience's evaluation of a speaker before the content of the speech crosses the audience's mind.

In addition to gendered sound and style being related to an audience's perception of a speaker, the gender of a speaker also affects the speaker's perceived persuasiveness. In a study by Zambaka, Goolkasian, and Hodges (2006), "male participants were more persuaded by the male speakers than the female speakers, and the female participants were more persuaded by the male speakers than the female speakers" (Zambaka, Goolkasian & Hodges, 2006). These results showed how there is indeed a "significant interaction between the gender of speakers and gender of the participants" which "replicates gender stereotypes that are common in social interaction studies" (Zambaka, Goolkasian & Hodges, 2006). Even "male subjects low in generalized self-confidence are generally more persuasible," showing that someone's perceived gender can take them further than anything the speaker actually says (Bauer 1964). Furthermore, even if a male's speech performance is "at fair or poor levels" it may still be evaluated more positively than that of a woman at those same levels" (Zahn, 2009). This issue is not just men identifying and being more supportive of other male speakers. Even women, according to the Zambaka, Goolkasian, and Hodges (2006) study, perceived male speakers to be more persuasive than female speakers. This suggests that gender identity may not be a driving force in how an audience sees speakers, but that men are seen as more favorable simply because of their perceived gender, regardless of the audience's gender.

Based on the Kloth, Anderson, and Susan (2012) study and a study by Kawakami, White, and Langer (2000), it might be suggested that women simply need to lower the pitch of their voice and they may be evaluated equally because "female leaders need to possess masculine traits to be perceived as an effective leader" (Kawakami, White & Langer, 2000). In fact, in an experiment with college students, more "feminine appearing women may be

more persuasive communicators of feminist ideology than ‘masculine’ appearing women” (Bullock & Fernald, 2003). Yet women are placed in a double bind since “effective leadership has been associated with masculine characteristics, but women acting outside of the feminine gender role have been evaluated unfavorably” (Kawakami, White & Langer, 2000). In light of these studies one wonders questions when, or even if, women can ever get out of this circular pattern of being evaluated as less competent, persuasive, or positive than male speakers.

Interestingly, this gender to speaker perception evaluation issue is also present in the political sphere. Women still fight for their voice to be heard in this realm of society as well. In the course of voting, voters “will perceive the choice of female leaders as risky and continue to favor male leaders, causing biased perceptions about women’s effectiveness as leaders to persist” (Beaman, 2009). One study suggests that a tactic to help combat women’s struggles in politics “lies simply in time and numbers; the longer women are collectively part of the political elite, the more their presence will redefine, rather than sit in opposition to, the norm” (Thomas, 2008). Even if change may happen over time, it is still important to examine what might be holding women back. What aspects of them as candidates in the political sphere contribute to their negative evaluations in comparison to men? One major aspect is appearance. “Longer faces, longer hair, and a more youthful appearance increased [women’s] physical attractiveness, but detracted from [their] political image” (Rosenberg, Kahn, Tran & Le, 1991). In fact, by manipulating a women’s political image, subjects who had “clear information on the candidate’s political affiliation and their positions on more significant” issues were still swayed significantly by the image of the female candidate (Rosenberg, Kahn, Tran & Le, 1991).

This issue of appearance expands beyond just the political sphere to everyday life. In general “dress involves aesthetic presentation that cannot be verbalized readily” which the

perceiver then organizes in order to attribute meaning and make judgements (Damhorst, 1990). Since appearance gives many clues to an audience about who someone is, there are also expectations about what roles fit what perceptions. For example, one study found that men viewed women in business dress as less fashionable, less physically attractive, and overall less exciting than if they were wearing a type of party dress (DeLong, Salusso-Deonier & Larniz, 1983). In this scenario, perhaps the male participants had a preconceived notion that women were meant to be beautiful figures of pleasure, so seeing them in work or business attire took them out of the ideal image of women they had already created. Beyond just men's perceived roles of women through dress, all types of articles of clothing show stereotypes people perceive. A person wearing glasses may be perceived as "intelligent, religious, conventional, and unimaginative" by both men and women (Hamid, 1968). A woman wearing "makeup, bright colored dresses and high hemlines" was seen by both sexes as "sophisticated, immoral and physically attractive" (Hamid, 1968). Therefore, these preconceived judgements based on one's appearance are not owned by a single gender, but by both males and females.

Even though many of these sources do discuss how males and females perceive each other over time, many do not address the current perspective of our population today; in particular, current college students. Since college students are going to be the future leaders of our country, companies, organizations, etc. it is important to know how they view men and women in public speaking. Furthermore, little research has isolated the variable of gender, separating it from other variables such as political stance. Who exactly are the ones who find certain speakers of a certain gender more appealing or more respectable? According to Chang and Hitchon (1997) in their study on the mass media's impact on voter responses to women candidates, "no firm conclusions could be drawn about the effects of candidate gender", offering no answer to whether political ideas influence perceptions. Some sources were able

to find ratings on the issues women discussed in their candidacy, but not on their actual speaking style outside of their platform (Thomas, 2008). In addition, research could also focus on comparisons of different appearances between men and women. Although we know men are generally viewed as more credible, what if they wear casual clothes and a woman dresses in business attire? Do women then have the upper hand or does it depend on the gender of the audience? The questions of comparing different speakers' appearances in contrast to the audience's own gender and political affiliation are all aspects this thesis will engage in.

METHODS:

Questions:

The question is who judges women speakers more negatively? Other women or men? And of those people who do rate these women speakers lower (or higher) than men, are they more conservative or liberal in their personal political affiliations?

Hypotheses:

My first hypothesis is that women will, on average rate women speakers less than they rate male speakers to a more significant degree than men rating the same two speakers. My second hypothesis is that more conservative participants will, on average, rate women speakers lower than they rate male speakers to a more significant degree than liberal participants rating the two speakers.

Variables:

The independent variables I manipulated were the different clothing in which female and male speakers were shown during their speeches. The three manipulated appearances were casually dressed, professionally dressed, and “night-out” clothing. For each of these appearances, the female and male speakers wore commonly accepted gendered versions of that specific appearance. This generated a total of six conditions: female casually dressed, female professionally dressed, female in night-out dress, male casually dressed, male professionally dressed, and male in night-out dress. The dependent variable in this experiment was the evaluation of credibility. After watching the speakers give the speech participants were asked to evaluate them based on ten different traits that had to do with how credible they perceived the speaker to be, over all. All speakers used the same speech. Each

speaker presented it in the same memorized fashion with minimal expression, gestures, or inflection in order to make the speeches as equal as possible from a presentation perspective.

Materials:

For the study, I created six separate video recordings of each manipulated appearance variable for the female speaker and the male speaker. I then inputted these videos into a survey which prompted the participant with a single, random female video. After watching the female speech video, the participant evaluated the speaker's credibility on a five-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree with ten attributes which they then evaluated on a scale for credibility after watching the video of the speech (Appendix C). This same procedure was then prompted for the male speaker. After the two speeches had been evaluated, the survey ended with asking basic demographic questions (gender, ethnicity, age, and political affiliation) (Appendix D). After the data was gathered, the IBM SPSS Statistics software was used in order to calculate relevant statistical tests.

Participants and Protocol:

The participants were typically college aged, between the ages of 18 to 24 years old ($N = 85$, 98%; 25 to 34 years old: $N = 1$, 1%; 35 to 44 year old: $N = 1$, 1%). In addition, participants typically identified as politically moderate ($N = 35$, 40.23%; Liberal: $N = 33$, 38%; Conservative: $N = 19$, 22%). All participants were sent an email including a link for a Qualtrics survey. The survey first asked the participants if they were eligible for the survey, then if they consented to participating. The survey then showed the participant a video of a female giving a speech about a basic communication theory. The speech they watched could have been one of three possible videos. Each video was of the same women giving the same speech, but dressed in either casual, professional, or night out attire. The video presented to

the participant was random. After watching the female speech video, the participant was then prompted with ten criteria in order to evaluate the speaker. These asked the extent to which they found the speaker credible, trustworthy, knowledgeable, agreeable, likeable, professional, understandable, clear, intelligent, and attractive (Appendix C). Participants rated each of these attributes were on a 5 point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree (Appendix C). After evaluating the female speaker, the participants then watched a male give the same speech. This video had the same appearance options as the female video and one of the three possible videos was randomly presented to the participant. After watching the male video, the participant then answered the same evaluative questions on the same scale for the male speaker (Appendix C). Lastly, each participant answered demographic questions about their gender, age, ethnicity, and political affiliation (Appendix D).

RESULTS:

First, the credibility scale created for both the female and male speaker was tested for reliability. It was found to be reliable, $r > .70$. To determine whether participants found the female speaker or male speaker credible based on the credibility scale, an ANOVA of the credibility scales for female and male videos was conducted (Appendix A). The female credibility scale ANOVA test indicated that there was no significance between any of the three female appearances and the credibility scale (Appendix A). The male credibility scale ANOVA test indicated that there was a marginal significance between the three male appearances, $F(87) = .08, p < .05$ (Appendix A). After conducting a Post HOC Tukey test on the male credibility scale results, the marginal significance was found between the casual and professional appearances, $F(87) = .03, p < .05$ (Appendix B). When examining correlations between the gender and political affiliation of the participants and the credibility scale for the female and male speaker, only trivial to no correlations were found.

DISCUSSION:

None of the results from this study provided statistically significant findings. The data did, however, suggest several ideas. For one, it is possible that the lack of statistically significant variance, may simply result from less judgement based on gender in the college demographic. Perhaps our newer generation is finally learning that you cannot use a person's perceived gender as a source to qualify them as good or bad at a particular task, such as public speaking. This could reflect the fact that the sampled population is in higher education. University education tends to encourage students to think in newer and more accepting ways where someone's credibility is based on abilities, not on gender or other unchangeable traits. Furthermore, it is also possible that perhaps the participants, being mostly 18 years old to 24 years old are becoming more aware of society's sexist tendencies through more exposure to gender rights advocacy. This expanded view point could be influencing their thought processes when they are prompted to evaluate speakers, making them more conscious to not discriminating based on gender. In addition, all of the students involved as participants were taking at least one class within the University of Arizona Undergraduate Communication Department. Some of the courses offered in this department teach students public speaking, argumentation, and other forms of examining public speakers. Having this exposure to these classes could have also helped making participants more adjusted to judging speakers by their abilities to speak, and less on their gender.

Having participants be possibly educated in speaker evaluation could also have caused some issues in their ability to properly score the male and female speakers. After each evaluation, participants were given the option to write comments to explain their scores or thoughts process. Several participants commented about how they felt they did not have enough information to properly evaluate the credibility of the speakers since they didn't

know anything about them. Given that these participants from the Communication Department may have had training in what traits to look for in credible speakers, this educational background could have inhibited their confidence in evaluating the speakers. Actually it is encouraging to note that if this were an inhibitor for some participants, it shows that gender is not a main tool used for evaluating the speaker's credibility and that audience members may be paying more attention to speaker's education, professional background, and other qualities that make them skilled or knowledgeable in public speaking.

Although the results did not prove any significant results, it is useful to discuss the marginal difference between the male speaker's casual and professional dress. One reason to explain this possible difference in scores could be how a male's dress often insinuates a specific role. When a males are wearing suits, it is easy to envision them as a CEO, politician, or another position of power. Society sees men on television, in pictures, and online in these roles wearing suits every day, making this role association applicable and plausible. However women are not seen in these positions of power as often as men are, making the logical jump from women in a suit to CEO not as easy to process through past exposure. Therefore, participants in the study, when viewing the professionally dressed male speaker, may have been able to associate him as someone who had a position of power, in comparison to the casually dressed male which did not invoke that same perception. If the participants had this perception in mind, it might also explain why the female speaker's scores did not reflect this significance, since there is less of an association with females in suits equally power positions.

An additional explanation for the marginal statistical significance between casual and professional male speaking scores could be the type of clothing the male speaker wore. His casual appearance consisted of a plain t-shirt and cargo shorts. The professional appearance consisted of a full suit, buttoned, and with a tie. The "night-out" clothing was actually very

similar to the professional, excluding the jacket and tie, and had the button up shirt a bit more open in the chest area of the speaker. Since the jump from casual to professional and “night-out” is such a stark difference in clothing choices for males, it can show why there was a significant difference in credibility scoring. This more drastic difference between the two clothing choices could have influenced the scoring between the different male appearances. In comparison, the female’s different clothing choices could have easily been seen as casual, more professional, or appropriate for a “night-out” by simply adding a pair of heels, adding a blazer, or unbuttoning a top. Since male’s situational dress is much more rigid while female’s has more fashion-based flexibility, it may explain why the female speaker appearance scores yielded no significance while the male’s casual and professional dress did.

Another interesting lack of findings within the results was the lack of correlations between the scores the participants gave for each speaker and the participants’ political affiliation. A possible reason to explain this is because a plurality of the participants identified as politically moderate. This identification then lowered the number of participants who could contribute to any correlations, positive or negative to the scoring of each speaker’s credibility. This high number of moderate participants was not unexpected. Since most of the participants are between the ages of 18 to 24, and all were actively enrolled at the University of Arizona at the time of the study, they may be in a transitional time in their lives politically. While attending classes at the University, these students may be encouraged or prompted to think outside of the perspectives with which they were raised. The educational environment could have been contributing to these participants’ personal political stances, putting them in a transitional and questioning time as to where they may stand on certain issues. This transitional period may result in many more students identifying as moderate, because they are still in the process of formulating their own political opinions. Since there

was a higher concentration of politically moderate participants, this lack of correlation between speaker's credulity scores and participants' political affiliation is not unexpected.

In addition to the amount of participants being decreased for political affiliation correlation analysis, the total sample size made finding any statistical significant results challenging. In order to find power in my sample size, it was estimated that around 350 participants would be needed. However the study ended up with only 87 final participants. Since there were three different conditions based on appearance, even the minimal $N = 30$ was not reached. Therefore, unless there was a very large difference in credulity scores between the two speakers or three types of appearances, it was unlikely that statistical evidence would be found. Although this does make the results of the study fairly inconclusive, it still raises questions that the study attempted to answer which may inspire future studies and experiments to try and find more conclusive or at least statistically significant answers.

CONCLUSION:

Although this study produced no statistically significant data, the questions posed by the literature review and actual experiment itself are still valid for future experimentation. Hopefully this study will be able to be re-examined with a larger participant sample in order to yield larger statistical power and find significant data. If the results still find themselves to be the same as this study, then perhaps that shows that our newer generations of college-aged students are examining the world without letting a person's presumed gender guide their judgements of that person's abilities. And this would be very good news.

Through this study, I was able to conduct my own research and literature review to help refine my questions and discover the world of data and experiments already conducted on the subject of audience's perceptions of speakers. I then filed a request to do research through the University of Arizona's Institutional Research Board (IRB). In addition, I also created my own credibility scale, made a survey from Qualtrics, analyzed the data through Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), and compiled all my findings and information in a senior thesis. Through this project, I was able to build upon the traditions of Communication-based research evaluation. I organized my research, data, and final thesis based on the traditions and standards of the University of Arizona Communication Department and the IRB. These traditions helped inform me about making sure my research is ethical and safe along with properly conducted so that I keep my findings accurate and in proper format.

Although, statistically speaking, the project might be viewed as less than successful, my view is the opposite. So many studies find that the null hypothesis is the only findings for their entire project. For my lack of statistically significant data is not unusual. The project

was more than finding interesting or profound results. It was about allowing me, an undergraduate researcher, test my personal ideas, skills, and see how far I could go as an individual with directional guidance from my advisor. I quickly found that conducting a thesis was much more than dreaming up an idea and writing about it. Filling out the forms for IRB, making an actual scale from scratch, compiling dozens of articles, and actually doing the statistical tests was really a huge challenge in itself. Some students may complain that they do not see the point in taking research methods classes because they do not see how they will ever need to use it in the future. Even though I found I was a bit rusty in this subject, I was able to find my old research methods materials and piece together the concepts I had learned back in the fall semester of my sophomore year. Although I certainly wouldn't call myself a statistical master, I did find that the programs I used (Qualtrics and SPSS) to be so fascinating and useful in other aspects of my life. I know if I ever need to create a personalized survey or compile a large amount of data for any future projects, I have tested my abilities to be able to conduct those kinds of tasks.

Besides using new tools for my research, I also learned how to present my information in a thesis. It is one thing to research articles, do an experiment, and find some data. It is another to actually present the information in a concise yet fully explained way. Although my future is in law, this skill is still useful in my future briefing. Sadly, many attorneys have the reputation for being very poor writers, even in a field that involves writing and compiling hundreds of pages of briefs, affidavits, depositions, motions, etc. Having this experience to write about my entire research process and findings has allowed me to take my skills learned in University and prove that I can apply them in a meaningful and successful way. With all of these exercises of my abilities being enacted through my thesis, I would judge my project to be a success. It was not the outcome of my project that ended up being the most meaningful to me, but the process of creating, doing, and refining.

FUTURE DIRECTION:

To adequately test this study's hypotheses, a future study with a larger sample size would be necessary. It would also be interesting to expand this study beyond college students as the subjects. If significant results were discovered, it would be helpful to compare them to other generations in order to measure the extent to which audiences' perceptions have changed over time. Furthermore, comparing different cultural groups' perceptions on speakers could help expand this study to see if one's ethnic or cultural background impacts their evaluation of a speaker. By expanding the parameters of the audience for this study, more can be learned about what variables subconsciously or consciously influence how we evaluate another person.

Besides adjusting the participants, it would also be helpful to change the speakers in this study. By having multiple men or women speakers give the speech, there could be more accurate evaluations of the audiences' perceptions. This would help make sure the audience member is not just judging a single female or male a certain way, and to see if groups of female and male speakers have a trend in how they score based on credibility. Beyond more speakers, changing the race and ethnicity of the speakers could help illuminate how a speaker's race and ethnicity plays a role in his/her perceived credibility. Other factors such as age, sexual orientation, and disability status could be other factors incorporated into this study to examine factors that influence an audiences' perception of a public speaker.

This thesis is only the starting point toward helping us understand how public speakers are truly seen. These results can affect politicians, business men and women, attorneys, lobbyists, educators, and so many more professions and individuals. Because of the broad nature of the questions this study posed, many different lenses can be filtered through

the basic design of this study. Hopefully more insights can be gained, helping us understand the biases we walk in with and teaching us to examine the actual merits of individual people.

REFERENCES:

- Bullock, H. E., & Fernald, J. L. (2003). "Feminism Lite?" Feminist Identification, Speaker Appearance, and Perceptions of Feminist and Antifeminist Messengers. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 27(4), 291-299.
- Campbell, K.K. (1995). Gender and Genre: Loci and invention and contradiction in the earliest speeches by U.S. women. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 81, 479-495.
- Chang, C., & Hitchon, J. (1997). Mass Media Impact on Voter Response to Women Candidates: Theoretical Development. *Communication Theory*, 7(1), 29-52.
- Damhorst, M. L. (1990). In Search of a Common Thread: Classification of Information Communicated Through Dress. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 8(2), 1-12.
- DeLong, M. R., Salusso-Deonier, C., & Larniz, K. (1983). Use of Perceptions of Female Dress as an Indicator of Role Definition. *Home Economics Research Journal*, 11(4), 327-336.
- Galvin, S. M., Dolly, M. R., & Pula, J. J. (2013). Genderlect and Participation in the College English Classroom. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 79(1), 22-30.
- Goldschmidt, T. G., & Weller, L. (2000). "Talking Emotions": Gender Differences in a Variety of Conversational Contexts. *Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction*, 23(2), 117-134.
- Hamid, P. N. (1968). Style of Dress as a Perceptual Cue in Impression Formation. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 26(3), 904-906.
- Kawakami, C., White, J. B., & Langer, E. J. (2000). Mindful and Masculine: Freeing Women Leaders From the Constraints of Gender Roles. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56(1), 49-63.
- Klofstad, C. A., Anderson, R. C., & Peters, S. (2012). Sounds like a Winner: Voice Pitch Influences Perception of Leadership Capacity in both Men and Women. *Proceedings of the Royal Society*, 279(1738), 1-7.

- Beaman, L. et. Al. (2009). Powerful Women: Does Exposure Reduce Bias? *MIT Press*, 124(4), 1497-1540.
- Rosenberg, S. W., Kahn, S., Tran, T., & Le, M. T. (1991). Creating a Political Image: Shaping Appearance and Manipulating the Vote. *Political Behavior*, 13(4), 345-367.
- Strand, E. A. (1999). Uncovering the Role of Gender Stereotypes in Speech Perception. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 18(1), 86-99.
- Thomas, S. (2008). Why Gender Matters, Women and Politics. *The Haworth Press*, 17(1) 27-53.
- Zahn, C. J. (2009). The Base for Differing Evaluations of Male and Female Speech: Evidence from Ratings of Transcribed Conversation. *Communication Monographs*, 56(1), 59-74.
- Zanbaka, C., Goolkasian, P., & Hodges, L. F. (2006). Can a Virtual Cat Persuade you? The Role of Gender and Realism in Speaker Persuasiveness. *Beliefs and Affects*, 1153-1162.

APPENDICES:

Appendix A: Table 1

Credibility of the male and female speakers for the three appearances

	Casual Dress	Professional Dress	“Night-Out” Dress
Female Videos	3.60 (.46)	3.47 (.62)	3.35 (.57)
Male Videos	3.25 (.64)	3.58 (.58)	3.32 (.52)

Note: Means and Standard Deviation are reflected based on an ANOVA ($p < .05$).

Appendix B: Table 2

Credibility differences between male speaker appearances

	Mean Difference	Significance
Casual Dress Professional Dress	-.33	.08
Professional Dress "Night Out" Dress	.26	.22
Casual Dress "Night Out" Dress	-.07	.90

Note: Means are all based off a Post Hoc test ($p < .05$, Tukey comparison).

Appendix C: Credibility Questionnaire

I found the speaker...					
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Credible					
Trustworthy					
Knowledgeable					
Agreeable					
Likeable					
Professional					
Understandable					
Clear					
Intelligent					
Attractive					

Appendix D: Demographics Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions about yourself:

What gender do you identify as?

- Male
 - Female
 - Other
-

What is your age?

- 18 – 24 years old
- 25 – 34 years old
- 35 – 44 years old
- 45 – 54 years old
- 55 + years old

What is your ethnicity?

- White
 - Hispanic or Latino
 - Black or African American
 - Native American
 - Asian
 - Pacific Islander
 - Other
-

What political affiliation do you most closely identify with?

- Very Liberal
- Liberal
- Moderate
- Conservative
- Very Conservative