

Joan C. Chrisler . Donald R. McCreary
Editors

Handbook of Gender Research in Psychology

Volume 1: Gender Research in General
and Experimental Psychology



ie 23/17/11

A-5156191

 Springer

KATALOG

Chapter 20

Gender, Power, and Nonverbal Behavior

Marianne Schmid Mast and Sabine Sczesny

Relatively stable and pronounced gender differences in nonverbal behavior have been well documented in the literature (Hall, 1984; Hall, Carter, & Horgan, 2000; LaFrance, Hecht, & Paluck, 2003; McClure, 2000; Vrugt & Kerkstra, 1984). Moreover, women are traditionally found in less powerful positions than men in most societies, a difference reflected in the unequal number of women and men who occupy top leadership positions (Carli, 2001; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eagly & Karau, 1991; Eagly & Sczesny, 2008). These two facts have inspired much theorizing about the nature of these nonverbal gender differences and the role that status or power plays in it. The most famous theory is Henley's (1977) subordination hypothesis, which posits that the nonverbal behaviors exhibited more by women than by men are indicative of women's lower power. This theory has encouraged valuable and much needed research, and today we have an impressive body of research on power, gender, and nonverbal behavior to consider.

In the present chapter we review relevant empirical findings to gain more insights into the interaction of gender, power, and nonverbal behavior, that is, whether observed gender differences in nonverbal behavior correspond to power differences. We start with a definition of nonverbal behavior and highlight its importance for social interactions, especially the role of nonverbal behavior in accurate person perception. We then give an overview of existing empirical findings on gender differences in expressed and perceived nonverbal behavior; gender differences in nonverbal behavior are very well documented, and they are largely in line with existing gender stereotypes. We address the relation of power and nonverbal behavior. It is interesting that, although people use many different indicators of nonverbal behavior when judging the power or status of an interaction partner, only a few of these behaviors are systematically expressed by people who possess actual high or low power. Finally, we tackle the question of whether and for which nonverbal behaviors the aforementioned subordination hypothesis holds by comparing the gender differences in nonverbal behavior with the power differences in nonverbal behavior, and we discuss research that included measures of all three variables (i.e., gender, power, and nonverbal behavior) to examine their interplay. We illustrate how gender and power might interact in their relation to nonverbal behavior (i.e., how gender can moderate the relation between power and nonverbal behavior). Our review indicates the importance of treating gender and power as two distinct variables in empirical studies and of conducting the appropriate statistical analyses to examine whether power differences can explain gender differences in nonverbal behavior.

M.S. Mast (✉)
University of Neuchâtel, Neuchâtel, Switzerland

Definition and Importance of Nonverbal Behavior

Nonverbal behavior is defined as communication without words (Knapp & Hall, 2002). The distinction between verbal and nonverbal communication, however, is not clear cut. Sign language, for instance, does not use words, yet the gestures stand for specific words. In verbal communication, each word has a specific meaning, and people can be held accountable for what they say. By contrast, most nonverbal communication is ambiguous with respect to meaning. Contextual and situational aspects such as the relationship between the conversation partners or the topic of discussion can influence the meaning of specific nonverbal cues. For instance, touching an interaction partner with whom we are friends conveys intimacy (Mehrabian, 1972), and thus is perceived as something positive. However, when a low status person touches a high status person, this behavior is usually seen in a negative light, as a role violation (Henley, 1977).

Nonverbal behaviors that are typically investigated include facial expressions (e.g., smiling), eye gaze, body movements (e.g., gestures), posture, touching behavior, and vocal behavior (e.g., tone of voice, speech modulation, speech duration). A useful distinction can be drawn between speech-related nonverbal behavior such as tone of voice or speaking time and speech-unrelated nonverbal behavior such as posture, gestures, or facial expression (Knapp & Hall, 2002).

Nonverbal behavior per se is equivocal; we can, for instance, smile at another person because we like him or her, because we want to ingratiate, or because we are happy and the other just happened to be nearby. Whether verbal or nonverbal behavior matters more as a source of information depends on the situation. In an ambiguous communication situation, nonverbal cues are often consulted as a source of information. People often turn to the nonverbal channel for information especially when the nonverbal cues contradict the words being spoken or when people doubt the honesty of a verbal communication. This is indeed a good strategy because lie detection seems to be more successful when people rely on nonverbal (and especially paralinguistic cues such as laughing or vocal pitch) as opposed to verbal cues (Anderson, DePaulo, Anfield, Tickle, & Green, 1999).

Nonverbal cues are also important in the expression of emotions (Ekman, 1993), but their function should not be reduced solely to emotion expression. Nonverbal behavior is also used to signal attention, reflect physical states such as pain, coordinate turn-taking in conversations, reveal personality characteristics, and signal interpersonal orientations such as friendliness or dominance (Knapp & Hall, 2002).

Correctly reading and interpreting nonverbal cues emitted by our social interaction partners to infer motives and intentions underlying their actions is an important aspect of successful social interactions. In so called zero-acquaintance situations, when strangers meet for the first time, the impression they form about each other is mostly based on verbal, nonverbal, and appearance cues (Ambady, Hallahan, & Rosenthal, 1995; Borkenau & Liebler, 1992; Costanzo & Archer, 1989; Gifford, 1994; Hyde, 2005). Regardless of whether the formed impressions are correct or not, they affect what we think about our social interaction partners and how we behave toward them.

In sum, nonverbal behavior is not only used to express different states or traits but also in the interpretation of other people's behavior in social interactions and the assessment of others' states and traits. This latter aspect is detailed in the following section.

The Role of Nonverbal Behavior for Accurate Person Perception

Within a brief window of time we draw inferences about a person based on behavior, both verbal and nonverbal, and on the person's general appearance. Although we make some mistakes, we are quite good (and often at better than chance level) at decoding other people's states and traits (Ambady

et al., 1995; Borkenau & Liebler, 1992; Costanzo & Archer, 1989; Rosenthal, Hall, DiMatteo, Rogers, & Archer, 1979; Mast & Hall, 2004a). The ability to assess other people correctly is called interpersonal sensitivity or accuracy (Hall & Bernieri, 2001). The assessment we make of others encompasses a variety of different domains: person and personality characteristics, social relations, emotions, motives and intentions, cognition, behavior, and physical appearance (Mast, Murphy, & Hall, 2006).

Nonverbal behavior plays a key role for such social judgments because, in the absence of any knowledge about the social interaction partner, nonverbal cues become an important source of information. In a world characterized by increasing social and geographical mobility, we find ourselves very often in a situation where we meet a person for the first time. In order to decide how to interact with this person (e.g., whether to trust him/her), we heavily rely on the person's nonverbal behavior.

There are very pronounced individual differences in how well a person is able to assess different aspects of the social interaction or the social interaction partner, but, on average, people are very skilled in those assessments. When it comes, for instance, to judging personality traits such as extraversion or intelligence, people can be judged quite accurately on the basis of observations of slim slices of behavior (e.g., 30s of videotaped interaction) (Borkenau & Liebler, 1992; Murphy, Hall, & Colvin, 2003). These findings typically are based on asking people to watch different excerpts of short interpersonal interactions and to judge the targets' personality traits. These judgments are then compared to a criterion in order to gain information about the degree of accuracy of the judgment. The criterion for personality traits such as extraversion, usually consists of the scores on a self-report personality questionnaire concerning the specific trait and/or expert and/or peer judgments of that specific trait for each of the targets. When participants are asked to assess intelligence, for instance, the criterion can be measured objectively by an intelligence test score. The more the judgment corresponds to the criterion, the more accurate it is.

Nonverbal behavior not only allows us to infer others' personality traits but also provides information about the nature of social relationships. In general, people are able to assess correctly the social relations among interaction partners. For instance, who is the boss and who is the subordinate can be judged correctly from photographs featuring people of different power positions within a hierarchy (Mast & Hall, 2004a; Sternberg & Smith, 1985). Correctly reading nonverbal cues is important for emotion recognition, another aspect of interpersonal sensitivity. In general, women do a better job at reading others' emotions correctly than men do (Hall, 2006a), a finding that we discuss in more detail below. In social interactions, we also try to assess others' motives, intentions, and thoughts. People usually are better than chance in such assessments (Ickes, 1993; Rosenthal et al., 1979), except for lie detection, in which case the detection rate is basically at guessing level (DePaulo, Charlton, Cooper, Lindsay, & Muhlenbruck, 1997; Malone & DePaulo, 2001). Also, people are able to remember accurately another's verbal and nonverbal behavior exhibited during a social interaction as well as other people's features such as their style or clothes (Hall, Murphy, & Mast, 2006; Horgan, Mast, Hall, & Carter, 2004; Mast & Hall, 2006).

All of these skills heavily draw on the nonverbal behavior of our social interaction partners that we use to interpret or infer their actions, thoughts, intentions, and emotions or to gain information about the nature of the social interaction we observe or in which we are involved. Nonverbal behavior thus plays an important role – and often a more important role than verbal behavior – for accurate person perception. For example, Murphy et al. (2003) showed that participants who read transcripts of social interactions did not accurately perceive intelligence in targets, whereas those participants who viewed videotapes of the same interactions with auditory information present (but without being able to understand the words) were accurate at better than chance levels. It must be noted, however, that for some interpersonal sensitivity tasks, relying on verbal information rather than nonverbal

information is beneficial (Hall & Mast, 2007). For instance, when asked to infer the thoughts and feelings of a videotaped target person (empathic accuracy paradigm) (Ickes, 1993, 2001, 2003), verbal information contributed the most to accuracy (transcript condition), followed by vocal nonverbal cues (audio only condition). Visual nonverbal cues (silent video condition) contributed the least. Moreover, when asked to infer other people's feelings, perceivers appeared to shift attention toward visual nonverbal cues and away from verbal cues, and the reverse occurred when they were asked to infer thoughts.

Gender and Nonverbal Behavior

Based on several meta-analytic reviews (Hall, 1984, 2006b; Hall et al., 2000), we can summarize gender differences concerning nonverbal behavior in the following way: Women smile more than men, they gaze more at their interaction partners, show more nodding and forward lean, approach others at a closer distance, use more gestures, self-touch more often, have more expressive faces, and are more accurate at expressing their own emotions. Men, on the other hand, show more restless body movements (e.g., fidgeting) and more bodily expansiveness, have louder voices, and make more speech errors (e.g., repetitions, omissions, slips of the tongue, sentence corrections, sentence incompletions, stutters) and filled pauses (e.g., "ehm"). In terms of speaking time, a recent meta-analysis indicates that men are more talkative than women (Leaper & Ayres, 2007). Moreover, men are more likely than women to interrupt others' speech (Anderson & Leaper, 1998). Also, in cross-gender interactions, men show more visual dominance than women do (Dovidio, Ellyson, Keating, Heltman, & Brown, 1988). A high visual dominance ratio means that a person engages in relatively more looking at others while speaking to them than looking at others while listening to them.

Women are more accurate than men at judging others and especially so when inferring others' emotions (Hall, 1984, 2006b; Hall et al., 2000). Moreover, women are more accurate at remembering others' nonverbal behavior than men are (Hall et al., 2006). And, female perceivers are more accurate at recalling targets' appearance than male perceivers are (also, female targets' appearance is recalled better than male targets' appearance) (Horgan et al., 2004; Mast & Hall, 2006). Taken together, these findings indicate that women, in general, do a better job than men do at reading other people correctly (interpersonal accuracy). Nevertheless, the type of task also plays a role. For instance, women's advantage in interpersonal accuracy was smaller in masculine-stereotypic domains (e.g., performance recall) than in feminine-stereotypic domains (e.g., appearance recall) (Hall & Mast, 2008).

Gender differences in nonverbal expressions and in reading nonverbal cues of others are not only present in adults but also in adolescents and in children (Hall, 1984). For instance, gender differences in gazing, smiling, and backchannels (i.e., short responses like "uh-huh" uttered while the other is speaking, which indicate that the listener is attentive and serve to reassure the speaker to continue) became more frequent with increasing age in two samples of 9–15 year olds and a sample of 12–17 year olds (van Beek, van Dolderen, & Dubas, 2006).

Although decoding skills generally improve from childhood to adulthood (Nowicki & Duke, 1994), the gender gap remains stable at all ages: Girls outperform boys in the same way as women outperform men (Hall, 1984; McClure, 2000). McClure's meta-analysis shows that gender differences in nonverbal decoding are present in infants (effect size $d = 0.70$) and in children and adolescents (effect size $d = 0.18$). From infancy, the effect sizes decrease with age until the preschool years (about 4 years of age), then rise again slightly, and then level out, which means that the effect sizes remain fairly stable throughout childhood and adolescence.

Gender differences in nonverbal behavior are not only very well documented, they are also important in magnitude compared to gender differences found in other areas of psychology (Hall, 2006a). This conclusion was reached by meta-analytically comparing the magnitude of the nonverbal gender effects for smiling ($d = 0.66$) and nonverbal sensitivity ($d = 0.44$), as well as a wide array of other nonverbal behaviors (median effect size $d = 0.71$), to the magnitude of the gender differences found in meta-analyses of other psychological gender differences (e.g., median effect size of gender differences in the cognitive domain including, for example, verbal ability and math confidence: $d = 0.35$; median effect size of gender differences in personality traits: $d = 0.16$, median effect size of gender differences concerning behaviors and attitudes in small groups: $d = 0.20$) (Hall, 2006a).

Note also that people have, in general, very accurate knowledge about existing gender differences in various domains including nonverbal gender differences. Hall and Carter (1999) asked participants to rate gender differences on 77 behaviors and traits. Their ratings were correlated with the actual gender differences based on the results of meta-analyses. Results indicated that women were more accurate than men in their knowledge about nonverbal gender differences (e.g., that women smile more than men do).

The above-mentioned gender differences in nonverbal behavior are summarized in Table 20.1. As can be observed, these gender differences are largely in line with existing gender role stereotypes of women as more socially oriented and caring (i.e., communion) and men as more oriented toward power and self-promotion (i.e., agency) (Bakan, 1966; Eagly & Wood, 1999). To illustrate, women show more supportive interpersonal behavior (e.g., nodding, smiling) and more behavior that manifests other orientation, such as interest in and concern about the social interaction partner (e.g., facial expressiveness, interpersonal sensitivity, closer interpersonal distance). Men, on the other hand, show more behavior that is self-promoting, such as speaking and interrupting more, using a louder voice, and taking up more interpersonal space (i.e., body expansiveness). Whether these nonverbal gender differences correspond to power differences is a question that we address in more detail below.

Table 20.1 Gender and power differences in nonverbal behavior

| Nonverbal behavior | Gender difference | Power difference |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Smiling | F > M | Hi = Lo |
| Gazing | F > M | Hi = Lo |
| Nodding | F > M | Hi = Lo |
| Forward lean/facing orientation | F > M | Hi = Lo |
| Approach at close distance | F > M | Hi > Lo |
| Gesturing | F > M | Hi = Lo |
| Self-touch | F > M | Hi = Lo |
| Expressiveness (face) | F > M | Hi > Lo |
| Accurate emotion expression | F > M | Hi > Lo |
| Interpersonal accuracy | F > M | Hi > Lo |
| Body movements (e.g., fidgeting) | M > F | Hi = Lo |
| Bodily expansiveness | M > F | Hi > Lo |
| Loud voice | M > F | Hi > Lo |
| Speech errors | M > F | Hi = Lo |
| Filled pauses | M > F | Hi = Lo |
| Speaking time | M > F | Hi > Lo |
| Interruptions | M > F | Hi > Lo |
| Visual dominance | M > F | Hi > Lo |

Note. F = women. M = men. The power differences are based on differences in actual power and not differences in perceived power. Hi = people with high power. Lo = people with low power.

Power and Nonverbal Behavior

Power has been defined in many different ways (Ellyson & Dovidio, 1985) and is used in the present chapter as an umbrella term synonymously with status, dominance, and “verticality” (the latter term was introduced by Hall, Coats, & LeBeau, 2005). We understand power as having or striving for privileged access to restricted resources (e.g., money, time) or as having or striving for influence or control over others.

How power is attained and expressed can vary quite a bit. French and Raven (1959) distinguished among referent power, expert power, reward power, coercive power, and legitimate power. Referent power means that a person identifies with a leader or high status individual and gains power by the mere association with the powerful person. Expert power describes a person’s specific competence or expertise in a given domain and entails admiration or respect from the others. Reward power is the power to allocate rewards to others, whereas coercive power is the power to punish others. Legitimate power refers to the fact that the power holder has a legitimate right to his or her high dominance position.

Depending on what kind of power an individual possesses, the expression of it and the perception of it might differ. For instance, a dictator can exert coercive power by torturing regime critics to maintain her or his high status, whereas a leader with legitimate power usually seeks approval from voters to secure her or his high status position. Moreover, there is an array of different operationalizations of power. Thus, contextual influences make it difficult to obtain a simple picture of behavioral – including nonverbal – correlates of actual power.

To study the link between power and nonverbal behavior, the Brunswikian lens model approach (Brunswik, 1956) represents a very useful framework for analyzing the expression of power in nonverbal behavior as well as the perception of power based on nonverbal behavior. From a Brunswikian lens model perspective, a target’s nonverbal behavior (together with the verbal behavior and appearance cues) forms the basis of perceivers’ judgments about the targets’ power. So if, for instance, a high-power person talks more than a low-power person, speaking time can be considered an indicator of *actual power*. A perceiver observes the exhibited behavior, for instance that one person talks more than another, and infers that the person who talks more has more power than the person who talks less. Thus, speaking time is used as a cue of elevated *perceived power*. If perceived power corresponds to actual power, the assessment is considered accurate.

Nonverbal Expression of Power

Studies of actual (as opposed to perceived) power as expressed in nonverbal behavior have used different definitions and operationalizations of power: personality dominance (e.g., assessed with a questionnaire), structural status (e.g., rank in an organization, socioeconomic status, emergent leadership within a group), or assigned status (e.g., in a laboratory experiment). A recent meta-analysis on the expression of power in nonverbal behavior showed that only a few cues were related to actual status (Hall et al., 2005). High-power people show more bodily openness (arms and legs), interact at a closer interpersonal distance, have louder voices, and interrupt others more often than do low-power individuals. Also, high-power people have more expressive faces and are better able to express emotions through nonverbal cues than low-power people are. In addition, high-power people talk more than low-power people (Mast, 2002), and high-power people have higher visual dominance than low-power people (Dovidio et al., 1988). All of these power differences are reported in Table 20.1.

Perception of Power Through Nonverbal Behavior

It is interesting that, although only relatively few nonverbal cues are actually indicative of high-power people, people hold clear expectations as to how specific nonverbal cues are related to power. For example, Carney, Hall, and LeBeau (2005) found that people believed there to be a difference between high and low-power individuals in 35 of 70 measured nonverbal behaviors. The perception of power has been measured with different research paradigms. For instance, target stimuli have been schematic faces, photographs of posed facial cues (e.g., smiling versus non-smiling, lowered versus raised eyebrows), candid photographs of naturalistic interactions, short video clips of people interacting, or face-to-face interactions. Meta-analytic results (Hall et al., 2005) show that perceivers rated targets higher in power if they showed more gazing, lowered eyebrows, a more expressive face, more nodding, less self-touch, more other-touch, more gestures, more bodily openness, more erect or tense posture, more body or leg shifts, smaller interpersonal distance, a more variable voice, a louder voice, more interruptions, less pausing, a faster speech rate, a lower voice pitch, and more vocal relaxation. Moreover, there is a strong positive relation between speaking time and perceived status (Mast, 2002), and observers use the visual dominance ratio defined above as an indicator of high status (Dovidio et al., 1988).

There are clearly fewer nonverbal behaviors that are characteristic of people with an actual high or low status than there are nonverbal behaviors perceived as indicators of status. In sum, all behaviors indicative of actual power are used by observers to assess power, but the list of power indicators assumed by observers is much longer than the data can support. As a consequence, the assessment of power in others might simply be a product of people's stereotypical beliefs about the relation between certain behaviors and power. For instance, if people believe that smiling often is related to low power, this can only result in an accurate power assessment if actual power is conveyed by low levels of smiling (which it is not) (Hall et al., 2005). Thus, perceivers seem to use nonverbal cues that are not necessarily diagnostic of the status dimension. If this is the case, are people accurate in judging another person's status?

Power and Interpersonal Accuracy

Although the findings are not unequivocal, it seems that status can be assessed at better than chance level. For instance, Barnes and Sternberg (1989) found better than chance accuracy when perceivers judged which of the two target people in a photograph was the other's boss. Other research has shown that people could assess the status of university employees based on photographs (Mast & Hall, 2004a), and observers were able to assess targets' assertiveness in videotaped interaction at better than chance level (Mast, Hall, Murphy, & Colvin, 2003).

It is surprising that, although people seem to use non-diagnostic cues to infer power, they are still able to infer correctly the power hierarchy among two individuals. Although this could be due to a methodological weakness, namely that any given study only measures a certain number of nonverbal cues, whereas the list of potentially diagnostic nonverbal indicators of power is endless. Perhaps the researchers have not measured the nonverbal cue – or the combination of specific nonverbal cues (e.g., frowning in combination with leaning forward) – that people rely on when assessing power. Moreover, people might change their strategy when assessing how powerful a person is depending on the nonverbal cues that seem most salient in a given situation. For example, in a work setting, perceivers might rely more on how formally somebody is dressed to assess his or her status, whereas in a peer group discussion, indicators such as speaking time or loud voice might be used to find out who is the most influential person in the group. Furthermore, the choice of the nonverbal behavior to assess, might also depend on gender, and we discuss examples of this below.

Note that the correct assessment of individuals' power might be made based on a combination of different cues, rather than on reliance on one specific cue, and is thus a Gestalt-like impression formation process. There is evidence to support this claim in that the relative importance accorded to each of the nonverbal cues used to assess another person's power corresponds to the relative diagnostic value of the cues to indicate actual power. To explain, neither erect posture nor self-touch were indicators of the actual status of male targets if considered individually (Mast & Hall, 2004a) but actual high status was expressed relatively more through erect posture than through self-touch (i.e., the effect size of the relation between erect posture and status was more pronounced than the effect size of the relation between self-touch and status), and this is also the relative weight perceivers attributed to these two behaviors when they assessed target status; they relied more on erect posture than on self-touch. In other words, there was a profile match between the actual and perceived power-nonverbal behavior relations (Hall et al., 2005), which can explain that, although each of the single cues might not be diagnostic of power, the correct weighting of all the nonverbal cues available might still result in accuracy.

One also should not forget that situational factors can greatly influence the assessment of another person's power. Imagine, for instance, a job candidate in an interview situation. We have seen that high-power people tend to talk more than low-power people and that people who talk more are perceived as more powerful (Mast, 2002). Although the job candidate speaks much more than the interviewer, the former is not the powerful one in the interaction, and an outside observer could reach an erroneous conclusion based on the simple heuristic of dominance as equal to speaking time.

In sum, people are accurate in assessing the power of others. However, another question in the realm of interpersonal accuracy and power is whether high or low-power people are better at accurate person perception (in general, not necessarily with respect to detecting interpersonal power). Some authors have posited that low-power people have more interpersonal accuracy than high-power people because high-power people can afford not to take an interest in their subordinates, whereas low-power people are motivated to be interpersonally sensitive to (e.g., detect signs of approval or disapproval) their superiors (Fiske & Dépret, 1996; Goodwin, Gubin, Fiske, & Yzerbyt, 2000). Another reason why low- more than high-power individuals should be interpersonally sensitive is that interpersonal accuracy (the opposite of stereotyping) requires a deliberate (as opposed to an automatic) information processing style (Devine, 1989; Fiske & Neuberg, 1990), and high-power people tend to use automatic processing (Smith, Wigboldus, & Dijksterhuis, 2008; Smith & Yrope, 2006). However, one can also argue that, for successful leadership, it is important to allocate the right task to the right person at the right time, and, to do so, a superior needs to be interpersonally sensitive. This is in line with research that points to the importance of individual consideration (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003) and emotional intelligence (Caruso & Salovey, 2004) as aspects of successful leadership. Moreover, there is accumulating evidence that high-power people are more accurate at detecting others' emotions and thoughts than low-power people are (Mast, Jonas, & Hall, 2009). More research is needed to address this question.

Disentangling Gender and Power with Respect to Nonverbal Behavior

Henley (1977) claimed that gender differences in nonverbal behavior can be explained and understood by gender differences in power. Although there is certainly a kernel of truth to this subordination hypothesis, it needs empirical testing because the relation of power to nonverbal behavior is not necessarily a logical consequence of the above. To illustrate, consider the following: We observe that more men than women like boxing. We also observe that men are, on average,

taller than women. To conclude that more taller people than smaller ones like boxing is not a necessary logical consequence. It is possible that this relation exists, but it needs to be examined and cannot be assumed a priori.

To gain a refined understanding of whether differences in nonverbal communication between high and low-power individuals parallel gender differences and to account for some of the variance in those differences, we first need to compare the empirical findings we have reviewed in the preceding sections. As we have seen, there is a broad literature that documents gender differences in nonverbal behavior (Hall, 2006a; Hall et al., 2000; LaFrance et al., 2003; McClure, 2000; Vrugt & Kerkstra, 1984). Moreover, literature that shows that women have less power than men is also abundant (Carli, 2001; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eagly & Karau, 1991; Eagly & Sczesny, 2008). Only relatively recently have we begun to get a clearer picture of the relation between power and nonverbal behavior (Hall et al., 2005; Mast, 2002). These latter results show that, for some nonverbal cues, the parallelism with gender differences holds, whereas, for others, it does not (see Table 20.1; see Hall, 2006b).

Behaviors that confirm the parallelism, that is, behaviors that men show more than women and that high-power individuals show more than low-power individuals, are bodily expansiveness, loud voice, speaking time, interruptions, and visual dominance (Hall, 2006b). However, there are a number of nonverbal behaviors for which the parallelism does not hold. Some nonverbal behaviors are indicative of high power but are expressed more by women than by men: closer interpersonal distance, facial expressiveness, emotion expression through nonverbal cues, and interpersonal accuracy. Also, for some nonverbal behaviors, high- and low-power individuals do not differ, whereas there is a gender difference associated with those behaviors. For instance, women smile more, nod more, gaze more, self-touch more, show more forward lean, and gesture more than men do, but these nonverbal cues do not differ between individuals of different levels of power (Hall, 2006b).

Moreover, even if parallelism exists (and it does for certain behaviors, as we have seen), we cannot conclude that there is a link between power and nonverbal gender differences. To prove such a connection, one would have to demonstrate that the gender difference is reduced or absent when power is controlled. To be able to perform the necessary analysis, one would have to include power, gender, and nonverbal behavior into one and the same study. We thus need to disentangle the effects of power on nonverbal behavior from gender differences in nonverbal behavior. This can be accomplished by research on the relation between power and nonverbal behavior separately for women and men. For example, Mast and Hall (2004b) found that smiling was elevated in women when they were in a low-power position and wanted to be there (as opposed to wanting to be in a high-power position), whereas this effect was not found among men. In the following section, we review studies that have followed this approach and have treated gender as a moderator of the power-nonverbal behavior relation.

Gender as a Moderator of the Relation Between Power and Nonverbal Behavior

As in the aforementioned example, we need to assess the relation between power and nonverbal behavior separately for women and men to gain a deeper understanding of how power, gender, and nonverbal behavior interplay. Moreover, there are many more potential moderators of the power-nonverbal behavior relation that we should not forget (e.g., personality dominance, the motivation for a high- or low-power position within a hierarchy). In other words, researchers should not only look at main effects of gender and nonverbal behavior or power and nonverbal behavior; instead the study of interactions among the three (or even more) variables has the potential to deepen our insight much more.

Moreover, the same nonverbal behavior exhibited by a woman or a man might be perceived and judged differently in terms of how powerful or influential he or she is. To illustrate, in a recent study, participants were asked to rate the status of each of two people in a photograph for a total of 47 target dyads (Mast & Hall, 2004a). Based on the photographs, the targets' nonverbal behavior and appearance were assessed, and each cue was correlated with perceived status for female and male targets separately. Results showed that perceivers relied on different nonverbal and appearance cues when they judged male or female targets' status. For instance, to assess female targets' status, perceivers used downward head tilt and lowered eyebrows significantly more than they did to assess male targets' status, whereas to assess male targets' status they relied significantly more on how formally dressed the male targets were. In the same vein, when asked to judge the assertiveness of male and female videotaped targets, the nonverbal cues used by participants differed (Mast et al., 2003). Results showed, for instance, that a *high* level of fidgeting was used as a sign of assertiveness in female targets, whereas, in male targets, a *low* level of fidgeting was used as an indicator of assertiveness. This example shows that gender can influence the meaning of specific nonverbal cues. Fidgeting, for example, is generally considered to be an indicator of social anxiety (Heerey & Kring, 2007). So maybe fidgeting is perceived as a sign of social anxiety in men and thus related to low perceived assertiveness, whereas in women fidgeting might be seen as a sign of agitation or effortful involvement in the interaction and thus related to high perceived assertiveness.

Gender role expectations also play an important role when it comes to evaluating the behavior of women and men in high-power or influential positions. For instance, women in leadership positions are generally evaluated more negatively than men in comparable positions and even more so if they adopt a masculine (e.g., directive) as compared to a feminine (e.g., democratic) leadership style (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Role congruity theory posits that this effect is due to the incongruity between the feminine gender role and the role of leader that exerts cross-pressures on the expected behavior for women but less so for men (Eagly & Karau, 2002). As a consequence, women who show behavior that is atypical for their gender might be evaluated less positively than when they show nonverbal gender role congruent behavior. There is some evidence that this assumption does not hold only for verbal (see above) but also for nonverbal behavior: Mast, Hall, Klöckner, and Choi (2008) examined which nonverbal behaviors of a female and a male physician were related to patient satisfaction. Patients were most satisfied with female physicians who behaved in line with the feminine gender role (e.g., more gazing, more forward lean, softer voice), whereas for male physicians, satisfaction was high for a broader range of behaviors only partly related to their gender role (e.g., louder voice, more distance from patient).

Moreover, Rudman (1998) identified self-promotion as a risk factor for women. In simulated job interviews, self-promoting targets spoke in a direct, self-confident manner, highlighted their past accomplishments, and also used more powerful nonverbal status cues such as direct eye contact than did the self-effacing targets. The results indicated that women, but not men, rated self-promoting women as less competent, less socially attractive, and, subsequently, less hireable than self-promoting men. Nevertheless, it remains an open question to what extent nonverbal behavior in relation to verbal behavior contributed to this finding.

All in all, these examples illustrate that there is much to be gained from future research aimed at disentangling gender and power in their relation to nonverbal behavior.

Summary and Future Directions

Women and men differ in their nonverbal behavior (Hall, 2006a; Hall et al., 2000; LaFrance et al., 2003; McClure, 2000; Vrugt & Kerkstra, 1984). This difference, however, cannot (or at least not fully) be explained by existing power differences between women and men because only some

of the gender differences in nonverbal behavior parallel differences in nonverbal behavior between high- and low-power individuals (Halberstadt & Saitta, 1987; Hall, 2006b). As can be seen, the list of nonverbal behaviors that show a gender difference only partially matches the list that show a power difference (see Table 20.1). To illustrate, many of the typically feminine nonverbal behaviors (e.g., smiling, gazing, nodding) are not behaviors that distinguish between high- and low-power individuals. Thus, the conclusion that women's nonverbal behaviors are indicative of submissiveness or low status does not hold true; rather women's nonverbal behaviors are indicative of sociability and caring. That interpersonal orientation is not simply the opposite of power but a dimension orthogonal to it has been demonstrated abundantly (e.g., Bakan, 1966; Bem, 1974; Helgeson, 1994; Moskowitz, 1993). However, it is interesting that many of men's typical nonverbal behaviors (e.g., speaking time, loud voice, interruptions) are indeed related to high power. Thus nonverbal behaviors exhibited more by men than by women are the ones characteristic for high-power individuals. In other words, the parallelism suggested by Henley (1977) seems to hold for some nonverbal behaviors, namely those predominantly exhibited by men, but not for others, namely those predominantly exhibited by women. This pattern of results is reminiscent of results reported by Coats and Feldman (1996), who showed that women were better at expressing happiness (e.g., smiling often) and that men were better at conveying anger (e.g., speaking in a loud voice) and that women's ability to display happiness and men's ability to display anger were both correlated with their respective sociometric status. As a consequence, feminine typical nonverbal behaviors are not expressions of low status but of sociability which, in women, is related to high status. Social role theory (Eagly, 1987; Eagly & Wood, 1999; Eagly, Wood, & Diekmann, 2000) offers an explanatory framework for understanding this difference. Following this approach, the contents of gender stereotypes are derived from observations of men and women in gender-typical domestic and occupational roles (e.g., bread-winner, homemaker). Due to this segregation by gender and the different requirements of women's and men's typical social roles, inferences of men as assertive and agentic and of women as nurturing and communal are favored (Bosak, Sczesny, & Eagly, 2008; Eagly & Steffen, 1984). Moreover, these stereotypical expectancies affect men's and women's self-perceptions and behavior (for an overview, see Sczesny, Bosak, Diekmann, & Twenge, 2007). Thus, nonverbal behaviors shown more by men than by women are related to the fact that men's social roles require the expression of agentic behavior, and nonverbal behaviors shown more by women than by men are related to women's social roles that require the expression of communal behavior.

Moreover, the parallelism that some nonverbal behaviors are shown more by men and high-power individuals than by women and low-power individuals is not enough to prove that men show them more often *because* men have relatively more power in our society. As we have discussed, this would only be a correct assumption if the gender difference diminishes or disappears when researchers control for power. To clarify the relations between power, gender, and nonverbal behavior, one needs to look at how power and gender – separately or jointly – affect nonverbal behavior. Thus, researchers should avoid equating gender with power at the outset of a study. By avoiding the confounding of gender and power, one opens avenues for much needed insight into the complex relations between power, gender, and nonverbal behavior. The advantages of investigating the relation between certain nonverbal behaviors and power for women and men separately are multifaceted. If we know, for instance, how different nonverbal behaviors of male leaders and female leaders are perceived and evaluated by others (e.g., the media or the subordinates) we can develop specific leadership training. As suggested by the role congruity theory of prejudice against female leaders (Eagly & Karau, 2002), female leaders who adopt a more stereotypically feminine interpersonal interaction style will be evaluated more positively than when they adopt a more stereotypically masculine interaction style. As a consequence, one would expect that female leaders who show feminine nonverbal behavior (e.g., smiling, gazing, reduced interpersonal distance) will be particularly successful in building trust with stockholders and especially efficient in leading teams and in motivating subordinates. As a matter of

fact, female leaders seem to adopt a more transformational leadership style, characterized by inspiring motivation in subordinates and intellectually stimulating them, as well as showing individual consideration for them (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003). And all of these leadership aspects have been found to be related to better leadership effectiveness. Maybe the nonverbal channel is particularly suited to adherence to gender congruent behavior for female leaders. To illustrate, negative performance feedback communicated by a female leader using feminine nonverbal behavior might be easier to accept and thus bring about the desired attitude change in the employee than it would if the feedback were accompanied by masculine nonverbal behavior.

Of course, feminine nonverbal behavior might also undermine the power aspirations of women and result in women being overlooked when it comes to promotions or to climbing the corporate ladder especially when we consider that the stereotypes people have about low-power individuals include many of the feminine nonverbal behaviors. Whether these assumptions withstand empirical testing remains to be seen. However, these examples illustrate the potentially crucial role of nonverbal behavior for male and female leaders.

Moreover, additional factors, such as personality dominance, power motivation, gender role orientation, and self-esteem, have to be taken into consideration in future research in terms of possible mediators or moderators in the interplay of gender, power, and nonverbal behavior. There is a lot of work to be done in this area, and results of studies of gender, power, and nonverbal behavior can have a practical impact on future leaders' success.

References

- Ambady, N., Hallahan, M., & Rosenthal, R. (1995). On judging and being judged accurately in zero-acquaintance situations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 518–529.
- Anderson, D. E., DePaulo, B. M., Ansfield, M. E., Tickle, J. J., & Green, E. (1999). Beliefs about cues to deception: Mindless stereotypes or untapped wisdom? *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 23*, 67–88.
- Anderson, K. J., & Leaper, C. (1998). Meta-analyses of gender effects on conversational interruption: Who, what, when, where, and how. *Sex Roles, 39*, 225–252.
- Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Barnes, M. L., & Sternberg, R. J. (1989). Social intelligence and decoding of nonverbal cues. *Intelligence, 13*, 263–287.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 207–218.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*, 155–162.
- Borkenau, P., & Liebler, A. (1992). Trait inferences: Sources of validity at zero acquaintance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*, 645–657.
- Bosak, J., Sczesny, S., & Eagly, A. H. (2008). Communion and agency judgments of women and men as a function of role information and response format. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 38*, 1148–1155.
- Brunswik, E. (1956). *Perception and the representative design of psychological experiments*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Carli, L. L. (2001). Gender and social influence. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 725–741.
- Carney, D. R., Hall, J. A., & LeBeau, L. S. (2005). Beliefs about the nonverbal expression of social power. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 29*, 105–123.
- Caruso, D. R., & Salovey, P. (2004). *The emotionally intelligent manager*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Coats, E. J., & Feldman, R. S. (1996). Gender differences in nonverbal correlates of social status. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*, 1014–1022.
- Costanzo, M., & Archer, D. (1989). Interpreting the expressive behavior of others: The Interpersonal Perception Task. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 13*, 225–245.
- DePaulo, B. M., Charlton, K., Cooper, H., Lindsay, J. J., & Muhlenbruck, L. (1997). The accuracy-confidence correlation in the detection of deception. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 1*, 346–357.

- Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *56*, 5–18.
- Dovidio, J. F., Ellyson, S. L., Keating, C. F., Heltman, K., & Brown, C. E. (1988). The relationship of social power to visual displays of dominance between men and women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*, 233–242.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*, 569–591.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (1991). Gender and the emergence of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*, 685–710.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, *109*, 573–598.
- Eagly, A. H., & Sczesny, S. (2008). Stereotypes about woman, men, and leaders: Have times changed? In M. Barreto, M. Ryan, & M. Schmitt (Eds.), *Barriers to diversity: The glass ceiling in the 21st century* (pp. 21–47). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1984). Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of women and men into social roles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *46*, 735–754.
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behavior. *American Psychologist*, *54*, 408–423.
- Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Diekmann, A. B. (2000). Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal. In T. Eckes & H. M. Trautner (Eds.), *The developmental social psychology of gender* (pp. 123–174). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ekman, P. (1993). Facial expression and emotion. *American Psychologist*, *48*, 384–392.
- Ellyson, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1985). Power, dominance, and nonverbal behavior: Basic concepts and issues. In S. L. Ellyson & J. F. Dovidio (Eds.), *Power, dominance, and nonverbal behavior* (pp. 1–27). New York: Springer.
- Fiske, S. T., & Dépret, E. (1996). Control, interdependence and power: Understanding social cognition in its social context. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *7*, 31–61.
- Fiske, S. T., & Neuberg, S. L. (1990). A continuum of impression formation, from category-based to individuating processes: Influences of information and motivation on attention and interpretation. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 1–74). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- French, J. R. P., Jr., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150–167). Oxford: University of Michigan Press.
- Gifford, R. (1994). A lens-mapping framework for understanding the encoding and decoding of interpersonal dispositions in nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *66*, 398–412.
- Goodwin, S. A., Gubin, A., Fiske, S. T., & Yzerbyt, V. Y. (2000). Power can bias impression processes: Stereotyping subordinates by default and by design. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *3*, 227–256.
- Halberstadt, A. G., & Saitta, M. B. (1987). Gender, nonverbal behavior, and perceived dominance: A test of the theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *53*, 257–272.
- Hall, J. A. (1984). *Nonverbal sex differences: Communication accuracy and expressive style*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hall, J. A. (2006a). How big are nonverbal sex differences? The case of smiling and nonverbal sensitivity. In K. Dindia & D. J. Canary (Eds.), *Sex differences and similarities in communication* (pp. 59–81). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hall, J. A. (2006b). Nonverbal behavior, status, and gender: How do we understand their relations? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *30*, 384–391.
- Hall, J. A., & Bernieri, F. J. (Eds.). (2001). *Interpersonal sensitivity: Theory and measurement*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hall, J. A., & Carter, J. D. (1999). Gender-stereotype accuracy as an individual difference. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*, 350–359.
- Hall, J. A., Carter, J. D., & Horgan, T. G. (2000). Gender differences in nonverbal communication of emotion. In A. H. Fischer (Ed.), *Gender and emotion: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 97–117). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, J. A., Coats, E. J., & LeBeau, L. S. (2005). Nonverbal behavior and the vertical dimension of social relations: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *131*, 898–924.
- Hall, J. A., & Mast, M. S. (2007). Sources of accuracy in the empathic accuracy paradigm. *Emotion*, *7*, 438–446.
- Hall, J. A., & Mast, M. S. (2008). Are women always more interpersonally sensitive than men? Impact of goals and content domain. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *34*, 144–155.

- Hall, J. A., Murphy, N. A., & Mast, M. S. (2006). Recall of nonverbal cues: Exploring a new definition of interpersonal sensitivity. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 30*, 141–155.
- Heerey, E. A., & Kring, A. M. (2007). Interpersonal consequences of social anxiety. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 116*, 125–134.
- Helgeson, V. S. (1994). Relation of agency and communion to well-being: Evidence and potential explanations. *Psychological Bulletin, 116*, 412–428.
- Henley, N. M. (1977). *Body politics: Power, sex, and nonverbal communication*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Horgan, T. G., Mast, M. S., Hall, J. A., & Carter, J. D. (2004). Gender differences in memory for the appearance of others. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 185–196.
- Hyde, J. S. (2005). The gender similarities hypothesis. *American Psychologist, 60*, 581–592.
- Ickes, W. (1993). Empathic accuracy. *Journal of Personality, 61*, 587–610.
- Ickes, W. (2001). Measuring empathic accuracy. In J. A. Hall & F. J. Bernieri (Eds.), *Interpersonal sensitivity: Theory and measurement* (pp. 219–241). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ickes, W. (2003). *Everyday mind reading: Understanding what other people think and feel*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Knapp, M. L., & Hall, J. A. (2002). *Nonverbal communication in human interaction*. Fort Worth, TX: Thomson Learning.
- LaFrance, M., Hecht, M. A., & Paluck, E. L. (2003). The contingent smile: A meta-analysis of sex differences in smiling. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 305–334.
- Leeper, C., & Ayres, M. M. (2007). A meta-analytic review of gender variations in adults' language use: Talkativeness, affiliative speech, and assertive speech. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 11*, 328–363.
- Malone, B. E., & DePaulo, B. M. (2001). Measuring sensitivity to deception. In J. A. Hall & F. J. Bernieri (Eds.), *Interpersonal sensitivity: Theory and measurement* (pp. 103–124). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Mast, M. S. (2002). Dominance as expressed and inferred through speaking time: A meta-analysis. *Human Communication Research, 28*, 420–450.
- Mast, M. S., & Hall, J. A. (2004a). Who is the boss and who is not? Accuracy of judging status. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 28*, 145–165.
- Mast, M. S., & Hall, J. A. (2004b). When is dominance related to smiling? Assigned dominance, dominance preference, trait dominance, and gender as moderators. *Sex Roles, 50*, 387–399.
- Mast, M. S., & Hall, J. A. (2006). Women's advantage at remembering others' appearance: A systematic look at the why and when of a gender difference. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 353–364.
- Mast, M. S., Hall, J. A., Klöckner, C., & Choi, E. (2008). Physician gender affects how physician nonverbal behavior is related to patient satisfaction. *Medical Care, 46*, 1212–1218.
- Mast, M. S., Hall, J. A., Murphy, N. A., & Colvin, C. R. (2003). Judging assertiveness in female and male targets. *Facta Universitatis, 2*, 731–743.
- Mast, M. S., Jonas, K., & Hall, J. A. (2009). Give a person power and he or she will show interpersonal sensitivity: The phenomenon and its why and when. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 97*, 835–850.
- Mast, M. S., Murphy, N. A., & Hall, J. A. (2006). Brief review of interpersonal sensitivity: Measuring accuracy in perceiving others. In D. Chadee & J. A. Young (Eds.), *Current themes in social psychology* (pp. 163–185). Trinidad, CO: University of the West Indies Press.
- McClure, E. B. (2000). A meta-analytic review of sex differences in facial expression processing and their development in infants, children, and adolescents. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*, 424–453.
- Mehrabian, A. (1972). *Nonverbal communication*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Moskowitz, D. S. (1993). Dominance and friendliness: On the interaction of gender and situation. *Journal of Personality, 61*, 387–409.
- Murphy, N. A., Hall, J. A., & Colvin, C. R. (2003). Accurate intelligence assessments in social interactions: Mediators and gender effects. *Journal of Personality, 71*, 465–493.
- Nowicki, S., Jr., & Duke, M. P. (1994). Individual differences in the nonverbal communication of affect: The Diagnostic Analysis of Nonverbal Accuracy Scale. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 18*, 9–35.
- Rosenthal, R., Hall, J. A., DiMatteo, M. R., Rogers, P. L., & Archer, D. (1979). *Sensitivity to nonverbal communication: The PONS test*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Rudman, L. A. (1998). Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: The costs and benefits of counterstereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 629–645.
- Sczesny, S., Bosak, J., Diekmann, A. B., & Twenge, J. M. (2007). Dynamics of sex-role stereotypes. In Y. Kashima, K. Fiedler, & P. Freytag (Eds.), *Stereotype dynamics: Language-based approaches to the formation, maintenance, and transformation of stereotypes* (pp. 135–161). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Smith, P. K., Wigboldus, D. H. J., & Dijksterhuis, A. (2008). Abstract thinking increases one's sense of power. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44*, 378–385.
- Smith, P. K., & Yrope, Y. (2006). You focus on the forest when you're in charge of the trees: Power priming and abstract information procession. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 578–596.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Smith, C. (1985). Social intelligence and decoding skills in nonverbal communication. *Social Cognition, 3*, 168–192.
- van Beek, Y., van Dolderen, M. S. M., & Dubas, J. J. S. D. (2006). Gender-specific development of nonverbal behaviours and mild depression in adolescence. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 47*, 1272–1283.
- Vrugt, A., & Kerkstra, A. (1984). Sex differences in nonverbal communication. *Semiotica, 50*, 1–41.