"BUT THAT WAS IN ANOTHER COUNTRY, AND BESIDES, THE WENCH IS DEAD."

Edna Saffy
8 March 1974

(from The Jew of Malta)
A woman's place is in the home/Housewives are such dull people/ Women's talk is all chatter/Intelligent women are emasculating/ If you're so smart why aren't you married/Can you type?/If you want to make decisions in this family, go out and earn a paycheck yourself/Working women are unfeminine/A smart woman never shows her brains/It is a woman's duty to make herself attractive/All women think about are clothes/Women are always playing hard to get/No man likes an easy woman/Women should be struck regularly, like gongs/Women like to be raped/Women are always crying about something/Women don't understand the value of a dollar/Women executives are castrating bitches/Don't worry your pretty little head about it/Dumb broad/It is glorious to be the mother of all mankind/A woman's work is never done/All you do is cook and clean and sit around all day/Women are only interested in trapping some man/A woman who can't hold a man isn't much of a woman/Women hate to be with other women/Women are always off chattering with each other/Some of my best friends are women...1

Sexism is an all-pervasive force throughout that area of existence designated to "Communication." The language people speak, the actions they perform, the very ideas and assumptions that underlie those words and actions, all bear witness to its omnipresence. Yet rarely, if ever, have these aspects of communication been examined in the light of intercultural communication between women and men. Only recently has it even been suggested, much less acknowledged that the separate (but certainly not equal) roles assigned women and men are of enough significance to warrant their labeling as separate cultures. Presently, however, it is becoming evident not only that being a woman in America places one in a separate culture, which must use intercultural communications to interact with that other culture in which men exist, but also that there are various sub-cultures within women's culture between which various items govern attempts at communication.
Culture refers "to the cumulative deposit of knowledge, experience, meanings, beliefs, values, attitudes, religions, concepts of self, the universe, and self-universe relationships, hierarchies of status, role expectations, spatial relations, and time concepts acquired by a large group of people in the course of generations through individual and group strivings. Culture manifests itself both in patterns of language and thought and in forms of activity and behavior." The following statement, though perhaps obvious, is necessary for the understanding of this paper: the differences within cultures are less than the differences between cultures and though the various subcultures in America are differentiated by racial, ethnic, economic or social differences, members of these groups are similar in that they "may speak the same language, share the same religion, and inhabit the same geographical location." However there the similarities cease for these groups are culturally different in that their world views are dissimilar, their life styles vary, and neither their range of experiences nor their perceptions is alike.

For the purpose of this paper, the eight variables used are those of Richard E. Porter who states that the value of these eight variables in the communication process is determined in part by the culture which has the ability to influence our perceptions and to affect the meaning we assign to communicative acts. These variables are overlapping and are not to be dealt with in isolation. The variables are as follows: (1) attitudes
which includes ethnocentrism, world view, absolute values, stereotypes and prejudices; (2) social organization which includes geographic and role; (3) patterns of thought; (4) roles and role prescriptions; (5) language; (6) use and organization of space; (7) time conceptualization, and; (8) nonverbal expression.

It is the intent of this paper, using as a framework the eight variables of Porter, to support through research studies the contention that women are a separate cultural group from men and "to some extent they may speak the same language, share the same general religion, attend the same schools, and inhabit the same geographical area. Yet these groups of people are culturally different; they do not share the same experiences nor do they share the same perceptions. They do not see the world in the same way. Their life styles are vastly different, and their beliefs, values, and attitudes are far from being the same." It is also the intent of this paper that the examination of the eight major cultural variables that affect communication may lead to a better understanding of how intercultural communication operates.

Attitudes are the first of these variables and may be defined as "psychological states that predispose us to act in certain ways when we encounter various social events or objects in our environment. Attitudes that affect intercultural communication the most can be categorized as ethnocentrism, world view, absolute values, stereotypes, and prejudices." Ethnocentricity
denotes an individual's attempt to view her or his group as the center of all and to place the group as first and all other groups relative to it. Though in terms of numbers a majority (51 percent of the population) ethnocentrically, a woman tends to view her own group (of women) not at the center of the universe but to view man as first and rate herself accordingly. This view is often echoed in such statements from women as "Men make better friends than women," or "Women are so petty—not like men at all," or "I don't think I could ever vote for a woman for president."

As Nancy Chodor states: "One of the major issues of the Movement is to understand why it is that in almost every society women are physically, politically, and/or economically dominated by men and are thought to be (and think themselves to be) inferior to men." Women tend not to support those of their own group but to compete strongly against them and often to ally themselves with men against one of their own group.

Matina Horner states: "It seems there is nothing more distasteful than an "uppity" woman who opts to beat a man, especially at his own game—be it law, medicine, physics, or rational thought. She will evoke the wrath not only of men but also of other women."

Smith's findings indicate that girls' perceptions of themselves are so distorted that even though girls make consistently better grades than boys until late high school, their opinion of themselves grows progressively worse with age and their opinion of boys and boys' abilities grows better; however, boys have an
increasingly better opinion of themselves and worse opinion of girls as they grow older. This distortion of perception of themselves and group self-hate is an attribute of many minority groups for as Riesman points out, "Women, as with many minority groups, bitterly resent and envy those among them who break out of confinement and are frequently shrewish and vindictive toward them."9

Allegiance is another facet of ethnocentricism, for allegiance to one group restricts her/his ability to accept another or to view them favorably; however, the allegiance that women feel is not to other women but to men; yet, it is to other men that men feel allegiance. "Women have for so long in our culture been characterized as inconsistent, emotionally unstable, lacking in a strong conscience, weaker, nurturant rather than productive, and intuitive rather than intelligent that they have internalized this concept of themselves."10 Both men and women esteem masculine qualities and achievement, for women are taught the societally-imposed values and "too many women evaluate their bodies, personalities, and qualities as second-class."11 However only in the master/slave, dominate/submissive relationship is it usual for the allegiance to be toward some group other than self.

Even religion, another "and sometimes more potent source of ethnocentric attitude,"12 emphasizes the male supremacy. The Jewish male blesses his male god each day with the
following prayer:

Blessed art Thou, oh Lord our God, King of the Universe that I was not born a gentile.

Blessed art Thou, oh Lord our God, King of the Universe that I was not born a slave.

Blessed art Thou, oh Lord our God, King of the Universe that I was not born a woman.

The Koran, the sacred text of Islam states:

Men are superior to women on account of the qualities in which God has given them pre-eminence.

Even the Christian religions in emphasizing the rightness of their views from those of other religions) defines Women as a different entity from men by establishing their relationship (subjective) to men:

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth... and God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over...all the earth. And the rib which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman and brought her unto the man...And the Lord God said unto the woman, What is this that thou has done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat...Unto the woman He said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to they husband, and he shall rule over thee. (Gen. 1, 2, 3)

Further elaboration is provided by Saint Paul:

For a man...is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man. (1 Cor. 11)

Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the
woman, being deceived, was in the transgression. Notwithstanding, she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety. (1 Tim. 2)

On Sunday, October 21, 1973, in the Jacksonville Journal, the justification for the Episcopal Church refusal to permit the ordination of women to the ministry was on the grounds that "a priest is a god-symbol and women are not suited for the role because in the Bible, God is represented in male imagery." This ruling follows the lead of the seven major Protestant denominations in the United States which do not admit women to their ministries. The influence of the religious teachings on the attitudes of women and the attitudes about women is obvious.

World view is another variable and a direct quote from Richard Porter's article will serve as an example and should instill an awareness that the women's view of the world is different from that of the male. "The way we view our world is a function of our culture, and it affects our social perceptions: as Americans we tend to have a man-centered view."  

Absolute values, another consideration under attitudes, are culturally derived notions of right and wrong, good and bad, beautiful and ugly, true and false, positive and negative, etc. An absolute value or concept of right and wrong that is truth should be meaningful to us only in the relative sense of what is accepted or believed within a given culture. These values
differ from male to female, for even the notions of right and wrong, good and bad, etc., are relative to and dependent upon sex. The following terms when applied to a male are considered plaudits; when applied to a female, perjoratives: "independence, aggression, competitiveness, leadership, task-orientation, outward orientation, assertiveness, innovation, self-discipline, stoicism, activity, objectivity, analytic-mindedness, courage, unsentimentality, rationality, confidence, and emotional control."14 The following terms when applied to a woman are now considered plaudits, when applied to a male, perjoratives: "dependence, passivity, fragility, low pain tolerance, nonagression, inner-orientation, interpersonal orientation, empathy, sensitivity, nurturance, subjectivity, intuitiveness, yieldingness, receptivity, inability to risk, emotional liability, and supportiveness."15

The role requirements for women are a contradiction of the "dominant values of American culture--self-reliance, achievement, and independence;"16 therefore, a woman finds herself in the dichotomized position of either accepting those values of worth and being non-female or those values of non-worth and being female.

And finally, within the variable of attitudes is the attitudinal set of stereotypes and prejudices with which we assign attributes to another person solely on the basis of the class or category to which that person belongs. H. M. Hacker states that "women who are at all normal are suited to home and family for women know their place, which is in the home, and
they are really quite lovable, happy, childlike, loving creatures.\textsuperscript{17}

In short, the list adds up to a typical minority-group stereotype of inferiority.

The next variable which influences our perceptions is social organization, usually based on geographic societies and composed of a nation, nationality, tribe, caste or religious sect. The second social division is composed of role societies which act within or transcend geographic cultures; they are composed of members of professions, elite or ideological, racial, or religious co-fraternities. In colleges, women spend long years of apprenticeship in studying not their self-images or roles, but that of men and the masculine viewpoint. Women study such classics as \textit{Oedipus} and learn that as one critic states, "All of us want to murder our fathers and marry our mothers." And of course women will have read in college the classic of adolescent rebellion, \textit{Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man}. Since women "have no faith in the validity of their own perceptions and experience, rarely seeing them confirmed in literature or accepted in criticism, can one wonder that women students are so often timid, cautious and insecure when we exhort them to think for themselves.\textsuperscript{18} An added indication of women as a separate role society is a study run in 1968 in which female college students were asked to rate two sets of professional articles for value, competence, persuasiveness. One set of articles was supposedly authored by females and the second set, which was identical, was supposedly authored by males.
Goldberg found that "the identical article received significantly lower ratings when it was attributed to a female author than when it was attributed to a male author; also these students down-graded articles from the fields of dietetics and elementary school education when they were attributed to female authors. In other words, these students rated the male authors as better at everything." He concluded that "women are prejudiced against female professionals regardless of the actual accomplishments of these professionals, and will firmly refuse to recognize them as the equals of their male colleagues."19

Patterns of thought or the form of reasoning prevalent in a society is another of Porter's variables. Porter explains that the mode of reasoning in America is the Aristotelian system: "The Aristotelian system was developed by men presumed to be free and having the right to cast ballots; it views man as a rational being available to factual and sound reasoning."20 (It is not the intention of this paper to question by example the validity of Richard Porter's essay, it is, however the intention to use his article as one example of the rampant covert exclusion of one segment of our culture.) Women have long been told that their thinking is inferior to man's for subjectivity, empathy, intuitiveness, and emotionality have no place in the accepted male-oriented Aristotelian system. Aristotle also claimed that women never suffered from baldness because they never used the contents of their heads. At least Aristotle seems to have granted "contents" to women's heads.
Patterns of thought seem, in part, to be a function of socialization. According to Barry and Bacon, boys are encouraged to be aggressive, competitive, and independent, whereas girls are rewarded for being passive and dependent.21

Structured exposure to and participation in the mathematical and scientific function tend to improve skills in reasoning and logical abilities. However, note how often girls are given nurses' kits while boys are given doctor's bags, girls are given dolls and boys are given chemistry sets and microscopes. Children "quickly learn that mommy is proud to be a moron when it comes to mathematics and science, whereas, daddy knows all about these things."22 By the time a child reaches first grade the socialization practices have begun their effect; boys are already asking more questions about how and why things work.23 And that omnipresent nurses' kit... In the first two grades of grammar school, "when asked to suggest ways of improving various toys, boys do better on the fire truck and girls do better on the nurse's kit, but by the third grade, boys do better regardless of the toy presented."24 In the ninth grade only 3 per cent of the girls are considering careers in science or engineering; however, 25 per cent of the boys are.25 Boys tend to score significantly higher than girls on mathematical aptitude test--approximately 60 points higher.26 However, the saddest research of all is
that of Milton in 1958 who found that girls "improve their mathematical performance if problems are reworded so that they deal with cooking and gardening, even though the abstract reasoning required for their solutions remains the same."27 Clearly, not just ability, but motivation too, has been affected by the socialization process.

According to Maccoby, "this contextual mode of perception common to women is a distinct disadvantage for scientific production. Girls on the average develop a somewhat different way of handling incoming information, their thinking is less analytic, more global, and more preservative—and this kind of thinking may serve very well for many kinds of functioning, but it is not the kind of thinking most conducive to high-level productivity, especially in science."28 Research by Kagan and Moss found that "females who perform well on problems requiring analysis and complex reasoning tend to reject a traditional feminine identification."29 "Whereas men are unsexed by failure in this country"30 women seem to be unsexed by intellectual success.

Role and role expectation are another variable in inter-cultural communications. In America despite the equalitarian ideal, the male role is deemed more productive and of more value by both male and female, the female role is deemed second rate. "Since the sexes are different; women are viewed (and view
themselves) as not-men and that means not-good, inferior. It is important to understand that women in this culture as members of this culture, have internalized these self destructive values. Komarovsky studied the cultural contradictions and sex roles and found that women at an eastern college suffered uncertainty and insecurity because the norms for occupational and academic success conflicted with norms for the traditional feminine role.

Continuing this view of role expectation, Mannes held a symposium and discussed the dicotomy of the creative women and the fact she pays her dues for the approval of men and other women. "The point was made that nobody objects to a woman's being a good writer or sculptor or a good geneticist if, at the same time, she manages to be a good wife, a good mother, good-looking, good-tempered, well-dressed, well-groomed, and unaggressive." According to Horner: "Most American women faced with the conflict between maintaining their feminine image and developing their ability, compromise by disguising that ability and abdicating from competition in the outside world." Perhaps Rousseau may best summarize the role expectations of a woman: "A woman's dignity consists in being unknown to the world; her glory is in the esteem of her husband; her pleasures in the happiness of her family."

Language is thought to be a problem between cultures but not
within cultures; however, the sexisms prevalent in American society are more of a psychological problem than many realize. The difference between connotations and denotations are magnified on the sexual continuum. The American language abounds in negatively oriented female words. Try and think of a vituperation that is not female oriented; from mother-fucker to bastard to bitch. One of the few that is not female oriented is ass-hole. And the diminuative, how often is it used to designate the female sex. The entire first chapter of Otto Jespersen's book, *The Growth and Structure of the English Language* is devoted to proving his thesis that English is "the most positively and expressively masculine of all the languages and it is the language of the grown-up man, with very little childish or feminine about it." What of the masculine pronoun "he" and its changes and ending? Whose decision was it that "he" includes both male and female? "He" with different endings to show gender, was once the pronoun for all third persons, but men took over the root word; "she" was an afterthought. The pronoun is male inclusive and female exclusive and women are aware subtly or overtly of their exclusion. But the societal conditioning is accomplished and women will be heard saying, "I often feel that each of us is accustomed to his..." And finally one must cite as an example the revolutionary dictum of the Women's Liberation Movement that is a plea for equality: "Women Are Not Chicks."
Even the language of the law excludes women and places them in the category of lunatics and children. Note the Equal Protection clause of the 14th Amendment that was judged not to include women or lunatics or children and therefore, required the 19th Amendment to grant women the right to vote. Language dictates the sex of the position in American society i.e., salesman, chairman, first baseman, brakeman, serviceman, handyman, jack of all trades, master, etc. Language relegated woman to a position and man to a class: "I now pronounce you Man and Wife." "Men are male humans whereas women are human females."37

The use and organization of space is another cultural variable, for personal distances may be interpreted various ways. Lack of awareness may result in inadvertent intrusion into another's zone of personal space and such intrusions can disrupt interaction. "Depending on the social relationships involved, the intruder may be perceived as pushy, overbearing, disrespectful, sexually aggressive, homosexual, or even a boor."38 Space utilization differs from sex to sex; for example, F. N. Willis found that strangers seemed to begin conversations further away than did acquaintances; women stood closer to close friends than did males, but further away from 'just friends'."39

Time conceptualization is the seventh cultural variable and as time conceptualizations vary culturally, so will the norms concerning time sequences in communication. As Wilbert E. More
states in the Richard Porter article: "The fast talker may be regarded as foolish or with suspicion. The response that comes too fast may cause doubts about the consideration given to the stimulus, and the response that is too slow may raise doubt about the quality of the reception or the receiver's interest in the message." And the woman will talk, but slowly and hesitantly for there is much risk involved (note preceding) for her since "women notoriously lack the happy confidence, the exuberant sense of the value of their individual observations as a check upon the abstracts in the classroom, which enables men to risk making fools of themselves for the sake of an idea." Or, conversely, a woman will talk rapidly and often too rapidly and too often, for women are unaccustomed to being listened to and are accustomed to being ignored and often these women over compensate through verbal effusion. "It is extraordinarily difficult to understand what it means to be out of power when you are not there. It is very difficult for someone not under personal or social or physical threat to understand why somebody else is so nervous, so jumpy, so dumb, so slow moving, so dizzy, so careful with their speech, so careless about their speech." And finally, the nonverbal expression, another variable that is culturally determined since the amount of emotional expression differs widely from culture to culture and within cultures; for example, the imperturbability of the American
Indian, the inscrutability of the Oriental, the reserve of the Englishman, and at the other extreme, the expressiveness of the Negro or the Sicilian. There are differences within cultures as Freedman found, for in a study it was found that women experienced no negative effects on interpersonal behavior due to crowding. Women either in a group with other women or grouped with men found other members likable and friendlier; whereas men generally had negative reactions to crowded situations.43 There are great differences in body contact for according to Jourard, touching between father and son is considered less than masculine, however, in the same study it was also found that "females are considerably more accessible to touch by all persons than were males."44

Another difference between the sexes was found to be that females clearly make more use of visual information for feedback purposes and that they preferred to see the Other even when invisible themselves, i.e., behind a one-way screen. Males however did not: when invisible they preferred not to see the Other. It was also found in this study that when the Other is concealed "males talk more, females less; furthermore these shifts in quantity of speech were of the order of forty per cent in each direction. The explanation may be that females depend on visual cues giving permission to continue or to break in while males carry on until receiving visual signals that the other wants to speak."45 The differences continue for it
was found by Exline "that women will look at the Other more while speaking, if they like him, while men look more when listening, if the other is liked; however, women engage in more eye contact than men, especially when talking to other women."46 And finally, in another study, Exline found that women "have been shown to be higher in affiliative motivation (submission and dependence) and lower in dominative motivation (aggression and dominance) and this perhaps explains the greater eye contact of women.147 When the situation is a friendly or cooperative one. If the situation is competitive, these subjects look less, and subjects high in dominative needs look more."47

These cited studies should serve to illustrate that even the nonverbal adumbrations differ between these two groups. Naomi Weisstein addresses the differences within cultures: Women laugh a lot, laugh when they make mistakes, laugh when they don't make mistakes, laugh when they are unafraid, laugh when they are frightened. When I collided with puberty in the fifties the first thing I figured out was that, if I were to acquire personality--the key to popularity, dates, a steady boyfriend, a chance for me too, to run in slow motion with defocused lenses while whole choruses sang madrigals on my behalf--I'd better start smiling. Laugh as much as possible and when you cannot manage a laugh, do smile. So I smiled and I laughed maniacally
through high school, college, graduate school, and smiled warmly through all those years when all those chairmen of all those psychology departments explained that women were not suited for academic careers."[48]

The main intent of this paper has been to show that the major barriers to intercultural communication"come from errors in social perception resulting from cultural variations that affect the process of perception."[49] An awareness of possible barriers and an understanding of the similarities and differences may be the answer to the problem of communication, and this paper could be a first step toward awareness that women are from "Another Country" and that to be aware of the "Other Country" is to begin to be aware of what it is like to live in a world of constant danger, of total oppression, a world where one "is the object of ridicule and contempt, where one is ignored in conversations, patronized as a student, hello-babied by strangers, ogled on the streets, followed into buildings, fondled in public"[50] and attacked in parking lots. It is the author's hope that this knowledge can be applied to specific situations, and that, because of this awareness, barriers to communication could be removed and adjustments made "for understanding differences will help us know where problems lie."[51]
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