

human relations**Gender(ed) performances: Women's impression management in stand-up comedy**

Journal:	<i>Human Relations</i>
Manuscript ID	HR-2021-0839.R2
Manuscript Type:	Standard Manuscript
Keywords:	Impression Management, Comedy, Gender, Feminism, Comedians, Work Behavior

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Gender(ed) performances: Women's impression management in stand-up comedy

Clare Cook, Northumbria University, Newcastle, UK;

Jamie L. Callahan (contact), Durham University, UK;

Thomas V. Pollet, Northumbria University, Newcastle, UK;

Carole Elliott, Sheffield University Management School, UK

Corresponding author:

Jamie.callahan@durham.ac.uk

Durham University Business School

Millhill Lane, Durham

DH1 3LB

Abstract

How do women navigate and make space for themselves in workspaces where they are not perceived to fit? Women in male dominated careers often face perceptions of role misfit, leading them to engage in impression management. Using a mixed-methods design, we investigate if women stand-up comedians present as female gendered at work in two settings - one dominated by male performers (N = 257) and one featuring more gender diverse performers (N = 843). Women, as compared to men, presented more gendered in the more gender diverse performer setting and less gendered in the male performer dominated setting. Using Lorber's taxonomy of feminisms as a lens, assessment of how women presented their gender further implied greater constraint on women in the male dominated, compared to the diverse, setting. Our findings support Roberts' theory of social-identity based impression

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 management (SIM) in the novel context of stand-up comedy, refine the theory by presenting
4
5 a fifth SIM strategy and demonstrate how women are able to adapt their feminism to the
6
7 characteristics of the situation, thus helping secure their position in settings where they may
8
9 be unwelcomed. These findings have theoretical implications for impression management
10
11 and feminism, and practical implications for workplace equality initiatives.
12
13

14 *Keywords:* Impression management; work behavior; feminism; women comedians; gender;
15
16 comedy
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Peer Review Version

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 Occupational gender segregation is an enduring characteristic of the labor market
4
5 (Torre, 2017). Despite greater numbers of women gaining access to male dominated job
6
7 roles, high attrition rates ensure a largely stable gender ratio in these roles and that
8
9 entrenched, rather narrow, conceptions of the characteristics of a successful job incumbent
10
11 persist (England, 2010; Tasabehji, Harding, Lee and Dominguez-Pery, 2021; Torre, 2017).
12
13 Thus, women in male dominated occupations experience perceptions of misfit and a
14
15 consequent motivation to manage the image they present at work (Banks and Milestone,
16
17 2011; Faulkner, 2009; Kenny and Donnelly, 2020).
18
19
20

21
22 Due to its association with social acceptance and career success, presenting a viable
23
24 professional image is a key occupational concern (Banks and Milestone, 2011; Bourgoin and
25
26 Harvey, 2018; Roberts, 2005). Consequently, individuals invest a great deal of energy into
27
28 managing impressions, and those from marginalized groups – including women in male
29
30 dominated professions – face additional pressure to manage social as well as personal
31
32 characteristics (Bennett, Hennekam, Macarthur, Hope and Goh, 2017; He and Kang, 2019;
33
34 Heizmann and Liu, 2022; Roberts, 2005).
35
36
37

38 Investigation into women's impression management in male dominated professions is
39
40 necessary for understanding how women can function effectively and potentially challenge
41
42 constraints imposed upon them in spaces where they may be unwelcomed or subjugated
43
44 (Ahmed, 2017; Roberts, 2005). Furthermore, investigation of women's impression
45
46 management is helpful for better understanding the state of gender equality. Indeed, the
47
48 descriptive metrics (e.g., gender ratios, attrition rates, board level representation, pay gaps)
49
50 and investigation of women's lived experiences (e.g., discrimination, harassment, barriers to
51
52 entry and advancement) at work (e.g., Berdhal, 2007; England, 2010; Torre, 2017) commonly
53
54 used as markers of gender equality arguably have little meaning, if not considered alongside
55
56 an assessment of women's impression management within these contexts. Improved metrics
57
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 and the reduction of negative experiences may be achieved precisely because women *do*
4 manage their behavior (Mavin, 2008; Mavin and Grandy, 2012; Wright, 2016). Thus,
5
6 investigation into women's impression management is needed to understand how women can
7
8 navigate male power structures, and to gain a more comprehensive picture of the state of
9
10 gender equality.
11
12
13

14
15 Consequently, a rapidly growing literature has explored the ways in which women in
16
17 male dominated roles present themselves at work. However, there are some methodological
18
19 shortcomings within this research which preclude firm conclusions and knowledge gaps to
20
21 address. With one or two exceptions (e.g., Heizmann and Liu, 2022), studies have utilized
22
23 self-report methodologies. Yet, while self-report may uncover intention, since self-
24
25 presentation constitutes a performance for the observer (Roberts, 2005), we contend that
26
27 direct observation is required to confirm how individuals present. In addition, few studies
28
29 (e.g., He and Kang, 2019) have assessed women's presentation in male dominated roles
30
31 across situations with differing levels of male domination, which is helpful for confirming the
32
33 relationship between women's presentation and male domination. Furthermore, studies have
34
35 focused overwhelmingly on STEM and professional careers (e.g., Kenny and Donnelly,
36
37 2020; Koch, D'Mello and Sacket, 2014; Mavin and Grandy, 2012) and less is known about
38
39 women's presentation in male dominated careers outside these arenas. Roberts (2005) calls
40
41 for studies of impression management in a range of populations and professions.
42
43
44
45
46

47 Using a mixed methods design, we undertake observation of women stand-up
48
49 comedians' gendered presentation in two settings, one dominated by male performers and
50
51 one with a more gender diverse performer profile to enable comparison of gender
52
53 presentation under these varying levels of male domination. We focus on this sample not
54
55 only because of Roberts' call for investigation of unresearched professions and dearth of
56
57 empirical study of women in this and the wider arts (e.g., Bennett et al., 2017), but because
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 we argue that the performance arts represent an important area for study. Indeed, presenting a
4 role-fitting image requires performance skill. Therefore, study of those most likely to have
5 mastered this skill to the level of an art form should best enable assessment of its subtleties
6 and extremes thus allowing for more comprehensive assessment of existing theory and better
7 understanding of the strategies employed by women.
8
9

10
11
12 Furthermore, image cultivation is a long-standing, pervasive and reportedly inevitable
13 phenomenon in the performance arts, to the extent that some successful women report
14 challenges to their sense of authenticity and publicly reject their contrived images (e.g.,
15 Cameron, cited in Sherman, 2021). Thus, this arena should provide a fertile ground to further
16 study the extremes. More importantly, if we accept Bertolt Brecht's assertion that art serves
17 to shape reality, studying performance art can generate understanding of probable ways in
18 which women's impression management may develop in other careers.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 Stand-up comedy represents an appropriate corner of the performance arts for such
32 study. With the growth of stand-up, the late 1980s saw greater numbers of women entering
33 the profession. However, women still only represent 27.4% of UK comedy circuit comedians
34 and work against a backdrop of male norms and widespread belief that women are innately
35 unfunny (Chortle, 2020; Shouse and Opplinger, 2014). Hence, it would be expected that
36 presenting a viable professional image is a key concern for these women, particularly given
37 the precarious nature of many comedians' employment (Butler and Stoyanova Russell, 2018).
38 In addition, the public nature of comedians' work across a range of performance settings
39 makes the profession amenable for study in differing situations.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 To investigate women comedians' gendered presentation, we explore if these women
52 present gender differently in male dominated and diverse settings. To gain in-depth
53 understanding, we investigate both the levels and nature of gendered presentation which
54 underlies these levels. We ask:
55
56
57
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 R1: To what extent do women stand-up comedians present as female gendered¹ in a
4 male performer dominated versus a more gender balanced setting?
5
6

7 R2: How do women present their gender in the male performer dominated versus the
8 more gender balanced setting?
9
10

11
12 We find quantitative and qualitative differences in women's presentation in the male-
13 performer dominated compared to the more diverse setting and discover that by adjusting
14 their feminist stance in line with characteristics of the situation, women can adapt their
15 feminism to secure their position in male dominated professions (Lorber, 2005; Roberts).
16 Thus, a key contribution to the body of knowledge is that feminism is not monolithic: we find
17 individual practices of feminism can and, in order to achieve a desired goal, may necessarily
18 be situation dependent. We also extend Roberts' (2005) theory of social identify based
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 _____
33 ¹ We acknowledge the contested nature of gender identity and the problematics of using
34 gendered binaries of 'men' and 'women'; however, following Judith Butler (1993, as cited in
35 Lorber, 2005) we use the concept of 'womanhood' tactically to provide a stable analytic
36 category of one important identity that women comedians hold. Furthermore, we
37 acknowledge that identity content varies between those who identify as a given gender, for
38 example with regard to traditionalism (Becker and Wagner, 2009). Therefore, we define
39 female gendered as any attribute (e.g., experience, interest, value or concern) primarily
40 associated with womanhood. An example of one such experience is being a bride. While
41 female gendered is essentially synonymous with the term 'feminine', it encompasses but is
42 not limited to traditional femininity. We define gendered presentation as behavior or
43 performance that communicates an individual's gender, most likely through expression of
44 these attributes.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 impression management (SIM). By observing the public enactment of SIM by practiced
4
5 performers we not only demonstrate the applicability of the theory to a previously
6
7 unresearched group but also provide a deeper assessment of the theory resulting in
8
9 identification of an impression management strategy which is not discussed in the SIM
10
11 literature. In what follows, we describe the literature that supports our research, present the
12
13 tripartite study methods and findings, and discuss the contributions of our work.
14
15

Professional image construction

16
17
18 In an attempt to improve perceived fit, professional image construction research indicates that
19
20 individuals act to shape others' perceptions of them at work (Giacalone and Rosenfeld, 1991;
21
22 He and Kang; 2019; Robert, 2005). Broadly, the process involves impression monitoring
23
24 (assessment of alignment between how one believes they are viewed and the perceived ideal),
25
26 motivation (drive to increase alignment) and impression construction (constraining their
27
28 behavior to manage perceived misalignment and present a "desirable" image; Leary and
29
30 Kowalski, 1990; Roberts, 2005). Traditionally, professional image construction scholars
31
32 have focused on the management of personal attribute characteristics (Little, Major, Hinojosa
33
34 and Nelson, 2015). Roberts' (2005) broadening of the framework to include social identity-
35
36 based impression management (SIM) acknowledges the stigmatization that marginalized
37
38 groups, including women in male dominated roles, face at work as a result of unfavorable,
39
40 although reportedly improving, stereotypes and narrow conceptions of the ideal (e.g., Koch et
41
42 al., 2014). To avoid unhelpful categorization, individuals constrain their behavior and present
43
44 themselves such that they manage others' perceptions of their social identities in line with the
45
46 perceived characteristics of a competent job incumbent (Roberts, 2005).
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 SIM may be undertaken through either down-playing or maintaining the salience of
55
56 group affiliation, using four strategies (Roberts, 2005). Down-playing may involve
57
58 deemphasizing one's social identity and attempting to associate with a more accepted group,
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 for example through adopting the mannerisms or discussing topics of concern to the target
4
5 group (assimilation strategy), Alternatively, individuals who acknowledge their social
6
7 identities personally may avoid disclosing them to others, for example by avoiding personal
8
9 topics in conversations or using pseudonyms (deategorization strategy). Maintaining
10
11 salience is generally aimed at restoring positive distinction to the maligned group and, by
12
13 extension, the individual (Roberts, 2005). To this end, strategies include emphasizing the
14
15 positive characteristics of one's group (integration strategy), for example, by discussing these
16
17 openly with other others and capitalizing on accepted stereotypes (confirmation strategy).
18
19 Amongst women, confirmation may involve enacting a mothering or flirtatious style. Thus,
20
21 individuals could seek to dissociate from their group memberships and blend in or present
22
23 these and stand out (Lynch and Rodell, 2018; Roberts, 2005).
24
25
26
27

28
29 Characteristics of a given situation impact an individual's likelihood of engaging in
30
31 SIM and, if they do so, of downplaying or presenting their social identities. In situations with
32
33 no clear ideal or 'norm', individuals have little need to engage in impression management,
34
35 unless there is reward for doing so (Roberts, 2005). Thus, in gender diverse settings,
36
37 women's behavior is less likely to be constrained by SIM concerns. However, when maleness
38
39 is the usual or the ideal, women's behavior may be guided by their SIM strategy. In other
40
41 words, they may find themselves 'doing' gender differently to meet role expectations (Mavin
42
43 and Grandy, 2012). In such situations, the key determinants of whether women will
44
45 downplay or present their gender appears to be high demographic homogeneity, particularly
46
47 amongst those in power, and perception that divergence from the norm is unwelcomed, with
48
49 women more likely to disassociate in these conditions (Ely, 1995; Kaiser and Miller, 2001).
50
51
52
53

54
55 Thus, the literature provides examples of women both downplaying and presenting
56
57 gender. Indeed, Heizmann and Liu (2022) found that entrepreneurs presented idealized
58
59 feminine identities by leveraging the intersections of their privileged identities, while Harris
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 and Giuffre (2010) found chefs with understanding managers to be open about their
4
5 responsibilities as mothers; Kenny and Donnelly (2020) reported women using their agency
6
7 to assert notions of femininity into their IT careers. Yet, dissociation is most often reported.
8
9
10 Similar to members of maligned, invisible social identity groups, this may involve choosing
11
12 not to present as women when possible (Clair, Beatty and Maclean, 2005; Lynch and Rodell,
13
14 2018). For example, by avoiding disclosure of revealing information (e.g., incongruent
15
16 experiences and forenames) and fabricating a male identity (e.g., use of pseudonym) in
17
18 written communication (Bennett et al., 2017; He and Kang, 2019).
19
20

21
22 In face-to-face interactions, disassociation generally involves adopting stereotypically
23
24 male patterns of behavior and in-group distancing. Indeed, women seeking employment and
25
26 those who work in male dominated roles tend to present themselves as equally or more
27
28 masculine compared to men and display patterns of behavior generally perceived as “male”
29
30 as a strategy to navigate conflicting sex-role expectations (Mavin, 2008; Sasson-Levy, 2003).
31
32 Furthermore, internalized gender hierarchies, lead some women who operate within male-
33
34 dominated power structures to avoid interactions with women colleagues (Mavin, 2008;
35
36 Mavin and Grandy, 2018, Wright, 2016). Engaging in behaviors that can be seen as feminist
37
38 is one means that women may employ to reassert their power in situations where they
39
40 experience such behavioral constraint (Ahmed, 2017; Lorber, 1994).
41
42
43

44
45 Towards further increasing understanding of the ways in which women manage their
46
47 behavior in male dominated settings, we investigate whether women comedians’ gendered
48
49 presentation differs across comedy settings. Across three studies, we assess the extent to
50
51 which women present as female gendered and how they present their gender in a male
52
53 dominated versus a more gender diverse setting. Given the male norm implicit in male
54
55 dominated settings, we expect women’s presentation to be more constrained, more managed
56
57 in the male performer dominated, compared to the more gender diverse setting.
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

Methodology*Context*

Comedy originated in burlesque houses and working men's clubs, which did not provide an accepting audience for women comedy performers and hence were dominated by men (Bore, 2010; Sochen, 1991). Today, shows in dedicated comedy clubs and live performance venues are the main source of employment for most live comedians (Chortle, 2020). Such performances are dominated by men and often promote a male performer ideal. Indeed, comedy clubs have been described as 'unnecessarily androcentric', requiring a more aggressive style than is often associated with women's behavioral preferences (Shouse and Opplinger, 2014; Weisberg, DeYoung and Hirsh, 2011). Correspondingly, comedy centered on women's personal experience is criticized as not having broad enough appeal in these settings (Dickinson, Higgins, St. Pierre, Solomon and Zwagerman, 2013). However, there is evidence that these environments are becoming less male centric. At least two UK comedy clubs have instituted policies ensuring at a minimum of one woman is included on every bill (Healy, 2020) and research in a UK comedy club found that a less aggressive style of comedy was associated with effective comedic performance (Irwing et. al, 2020).

Comedians also perform live in alternative settings, including festivals and solo theatre shows, which are less centered around a male ideal and have greater gender diversity amongst performers (Chortle, 2020, EdFringe, 2019). Indeed, festivals celebrating women's comedy are being promoted in major cities (Healy, 2020) while arts festivals and theaters, provide opportunity for women to perform comedy in situations that are not male dominated. At the former, comedy often takes place alongside other performance art forms meaning that, while festival comedians are majority male, there is greater gender diversity amongst performers as a whole (Chortle, 2020, EdFringe, 2019). In these settings, women have performed female gendered comedy to great acclaim. For example, comedians Iliza

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 Shlesinger and Sarah Millican explicitly present a female identity and often deliver their
4
5 comedy from a feminist perspective.
6

Design

7
8
9
10 Towards increasing understanding of the ways in which women present their gender
11
12 in male dominated settings, we undertake observation of women comedians' gendered
13
14 presentation in a male performer dominated setting and compare this to women's behavior in
15
16 a more gender diverse performance setting. To gain the fullest picture of women's
17
18 presentation, our strategy was first to establish the descriptive metrics by quantifying the
19
20 genderedness of their presentation in the two settings, and then to investigate the nuanced
21
22 impression management behaviors which underlay the levels of gendered presentation
23
24 observed. To this end, we undertook three studies. Studies one and two establish the extent to
25
26 which women present as female gendered in a comedy setting with approximately equal
27
28 numbers of men and women performers (study one) versus a setting dominated by men
29
30 performers (study two). Next, study three, assessed and compared how women presented
31
32 their gender in the two settings, using qualitative methods.
33
34
35
36

37
38 The settings, an arts festival and a comedy club, were selected because while they
39
40 differ with regard to the level of gender diversity amongst performers, with diversity being
41
42 higher at the festival (Chortle, 2019; EdFringe, 2019), they are similar in other important
43
44 respects, facilitating comparison. Both attract comedians of varying expertise and offer career
45
46 enhancement opportunities; the festival is attended by industry scouts and critics while the
47
48 club provides performance footage which comedians can use for self-promotion and has an
49
50 unmatched online presence.
51
52

53
54 To assess the extent to which women present as female gendered, Study one
55
56 compared women's gendered presentation in their published show descriptions and Study
57
58 two compared their gendered presentation in comedy club performances to the industry norm
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

(male comedians). However, the different media used in each study necessitated varied methods for quantifying this presentation. The show descriptions, over 99% of which were in the third person, provide a brief show overview, were word limited and abided by standard grammatical rules. Consequently, they were most amenable to frequency counts. Conversely, the comedy performances represent a comedian's nuanced exploration of themselves and topics of interest to them, were delivered in the first person, grammatically complex, varied in length and challenging to parse into their component parts. Therefore, they required more holistic assessment.

In line with our focus on gender, irrespective of identity content (Becker and Wagner, 2009), both studies employed content neutral measures of gendered presentation.

Specifically, we applied He and Kang's (2019) findings, which identified two types of content neutral, gender revealing communication – self-describing language and gender-specific topics (experiences, hobbies and interests) - used in employment seeking situations. In Study one, raters recorded gendered self-describing language and gender-specific comedy topics. However, given the wide range of topics considered acceptable for discussion in comedy compared to the traditional workplace, the gender-specific topics recorded in Study one were not restricted to experiences, hobbies and interests but also included such topics as politics and social observations. In Study two, raters assessed gendered presentation using an adapted psychometric scale through consideration of the topics covered, how comedians self-described or, given the reduced need for self-description in face-to-face situations, how the rater would describe the comedian's on-stage persona.

To investigate how women presented their gender in the two settings, media from Studies one and two were qualitatively investigated (Study three). To facilitate methodological integration, one rater with both quantitative and qualitative expertise took part in all three studies (Bryman, 2007). The overviews below provide details of the methods

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 and results of each study. The quantitative data that support the findings of this study are
4
5 openly available in OSF at

6
7 https://osf.io/s6uby/?view_only=ef5356beab4c4455b1008faf6d602342. The quantitative
8
9 analyses were conducted in R 4.0.2 (R Development core team, 2008).
10
11

Study one

12
13
14 In Study one we focused our investigation at the 2019 Edinburgh Fringe Festival. The
15
16 Fringe usually runs annually for three weeks in August offering comedy, dance, theatre and
17
18 music shows. Performers from any of these areas can book to perform at the Fringe, without
19
20 requiring an invitation to do so. While Fringe comedy is dominated by male comedians,
21
22 approximately equal proportions of men and women perform at the Fringe, across
23
24 performance categories (EdFringe, 2019).
25
26
27

Procedure

28
29
30 Edinburgh Fringe performers are invited to provide a show description of up to 250
31
32 words to the Festival's official bookings website—edfringe.com. Show descriptions follow a
33
34 reasonably uniform format of introducing the comedian, outlining their comedy topics and,
35
36 sometimes, presenting previous reviews. The show descriptions depict how performers
37
38 choose to present themselves and, given the word limit, arguably what they consider the
39
40 defining, marketable characteristics of themselves and their show. We searched the 2019
41
42 Edinburgh Fringe Festival website for single performer comedy shows and identified 843
43
44 comedians' descriptions of their show for inclusion in Study one.
45
46
47

48
49 Gender was recorded by two raters based on the use of gendered language referring to
50
51 the comedian, registered name and profile photograph within each show listing. There was no
52
53 instance where any of these criteria were contradictory within a single show description.
54
55 Gender ratings were verified by consulting Chortle.com, the comedy industry's most
56
57 comprehensive database of comedians which listed 43.3% of those in our sample, exceeding
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 Tractenberg, Yumoto, Jin and Morris (2010) verification criteria. Raters achieved 100%
4 agreement on gender across the descriptions and 100% agreement with Chortle.com. To
5 assess gendered presentation, two raters worked independently to record gendered self-
6 description and gender-specific topics within the show descriptions.
7
8
9
10
11

Sample

12
13
14
15 There were 242 descriptions which featured comedians who we identified as women
16 (coded as 0) and 601 comedians who we identified as men (coded as 1). This represents a
17 very slight overrepresentation of women (28.7%) comedians compared to industry figures at
18 the time (27.4%; Chortle, 2019).
19
20
21
22
23

Measures

24
25
26 *Gendered self-description.* The number of same sex gendered nouns and pronouns
27 used to refer to the comedian were recorded. Inter-rater reliability was calculated via
28 Krippendorff's alpha with a 1,000 bootstraps (Hayes and Krippendorff, 2007). The measures
29 showed good reliabilities for gendered nouns ($\alpha = .750$) and pronouns ($\alpha = .933$).
30
31
32
33
34

35
36 *Gender specific topics.* Gender specific topics were defined as those which related to
37 the experience of a particular gender that would unlikely be experienced by individuals
38 outside of that gender and hence revealed gender. The number of same sex gendered topics
39 previewed in each show description was recorded. For example, experiencing male-pattern
40 baldness was coded as same sex gendered for men, while experiencing cervical screening
41 was coded as same sex gendered for women. Inter-rater reliability was good for coding of
42 same gender topics ($\alpha = .767$).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

Analytical strategy

51
52
53
54 We rely on ordinal association measures for most of our analyses as most values were
55 constrained between 0 and 6 (Somers' D) (Siegel and Castellan, 1988; Somers, 1962).
56
57
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

Somers' D can range between -1 and 1, like Pearson r . We plot our data where relevant via treemap figures (Wilke, 2019).

Results*Gender Differences in self-description: the use of gendered nouns and pronouns*

Men were less inclined to use gendered nouns to refer to themselves than were women (Somers' D = -.148, 95% CI: -.212 to -.084; Figure 1). However, there was no meaningful association between gender and use of gendered pronouns (Somers' D = -.034, 95% CI: -.074 to .006).

-----Insert Figure 1 here -----

Gendered topics: the discussion of same gender topics

Men were less inclined to discuss same gendered topics than women (Somers' D = -.357, 95% CI: -.260 to -.454; Figure 2).

-----Insert Figure 2 here -----

Discussion Study one.

Overall, women presented as more female gendered than men did male gendered at the 2019 Edinburgh Fringe Festival, thus indicating comparatively high levels of gendered presentation amongst this group of women. One explanation for this, consistent with the SIM model, is that due to the greater gender diversity amongst performers, women were not constrained by a male biased role ideal or norm in this setting. The increased level of gendered presentation amongst women, compared to men, is somewhat surprising and may imply reward for increased female genderedness (Roberts, 2005). Rewards might be psychological such as reactance related relief (Brehm, 1966). Alternatively, given the

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 commitment of television executives - who use the Fringe as a recruitment ground - to
4
5 increasing representation of women on television, rewards may be more tangible (Thorpe,
6
7 2014). It is possible, then, that women may use their show descriptions, and likely subsequent
8
9 shows, to advertise their womanhood in the hopes of attracting media interest.
10
11

Study two

12
13
14 Within Study two, we focused our investigation in one of the UK's most successful
15
16 comedy clubs and most prolific producer of weekly shows and online content. The comedy
17
18 club is open five nights a week, running multiple shows at the weekend. Typical of most UK
19
20 comedy clubs and reflective of the gender split in comedy, most performers are male.
21
22

Procedure

23
24
25 We identified 257 unedited recordings of comedians performing in front of a live
26
27 audience between 2018 and 2020 posted by the comedy club on their YouTube channel for
28
29 inclusion in our sample. Although publicly available, we sought permission from the club to
30
31 view the recordings for research purposes and confirmation that the footage had not been
32
33 altered or edited, which the club confirmed.
34
35
36

37
38 Two raters recorded gender based on the use of gendered language referring to the
39
40 comedian, registered name and appearance. There was no instance where any of these criteria
41
42 were contradictory within a single recording. Gender ratings were also verified by consulting
43
44 Chortle.com, which listed 48.6% of those in our sample, exceeding Tractenberg et al.'s
45
46 (2010) verification criteria. Raters achieved 100% agreement on gender identity across the
47
48 recordings and 100% agreement with Chortle.com. These two raters also viewed the
49
50 recordings and assessed gendered presentation within the performances.
51
52

Sample

53
54
55 There were 80 recordings that featured comedians who we identified as women
56
57 (coded as 0) and 177 featured comedians who we identified as men (coded as 1). The length
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 of the recordings for men and women (mean lengths were 9.20 and 8.99 minutes
4
5 respectively) were not significantly different ($t(256) = -.454, p = .650$).

6 7 *Measures*

8
9
10 *Gendered presentation.* As we were not able to identify an existing identity content
11
12 neutral measure (Becker and Wagner, 2009), we adapted the Traditional Masculinity-
13
14 Femininity (TMF; Kachel, Steffens and Niedlich, 2016) scale to assess the genderedness of
15
16 comedians' presentation as revealed through their comedy topics, self-description and
17
18 persona. The TMF comprises six items with a seven-point response scale (1= very masculine,
19
20 7= very feminine), demonstrates high internal consistency ($\alpha = .94$) and a clear factor
21
22 structure (Kachel et al., 2016). We made minor alterations to the items to make the scale
23
24 suitable for observer rating. In addition, the response scale anchors were replaced with 'very
25
26 female' and 'very male' thus enabling gendered but non-traditionally feminine/masculine
27
28 presentation (e.g., discussion of women's intimate health issues, feminism, being a 'new age'
29
30 man) to be rated towards the extreme ends of the rating scale. In the current study, the
31
32 internal consistency was high (both raters: $\alpha = .98$). Inter-rater reliability was excellent,
33
34 Krippendorff's alpha = .97. Since both raters were women, which could impact subjective
35
36 ratings of genderedness, as a means of ratification a man who is an industry expert (not
37
38 involved in any other aspect of the study) undertook the ratings of 25 men and 25 women
39
40 comedians (Tractenberg et al., 2010). Inter-reliability amongst the three raters was excellent,
41
42 Krippendorff's alpha = .98. Prior to analysis, ratings of the men comedians on the adapted
43
44 TMF were recoded so that a high score denoted high levels of same-sex gendered
45
46 presentation for both men and women. We plot our data where relevant via a box violin plot
47
48 (Wilke, 2019).
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 56 **Results**

57
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 Men comedians were rated as presenting themselves as male gendered ($M = 5.69$, SD
4 = .48, one sample t -test: $t(175) = 46.79$, $p < .0001$) and women comedians as female
5
6 gendered ($M = 5.40$, $SD = 0.55$, one sample t -test: $t(79) = 22.79$, $p < .0001$). Men comedians
7
8 were rated as presenting themselves more gendered than women comedians (Figure 3;
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
 $t(135.61) = 4.043$, $p < .0001$, Cohen's $d = 0.58$).

-----Insert Figure 3 here -----

Discussion Study two

Women presented themselves as female gendered on stage. However, in contrast to study one, they were significantly less female gendered in their presentation than men were male gendered indicating comparatively low levels of female gendered presentation. One explanation for this, consistent with the SIM model, is that the boundaries of the ideal and norm may not allow for very high levels of female gendered presentation, requiring women to engage in impression management and thus constrain their behavior (Robert, 2005). This explanation is in line with previous assertions that comedy clubs can be androcentric and less accepting of female-driven comedy (Dickinson et al., 2013; Shouse and Opplinger, 2014).

Study three

The qualitative portion for this project, Study three, proceeded after the quantitative analyses identified difference in the extent to which women comedians presented as gendered, compared to men, across the Fringe catalog entries and comedy club sets and sought to identify *how* women presented as female gendered. We applied an abductive post-coding strategy (Augustine, 2014) to tease out interpretation of patterns, as opposed to the identification and verification of patterns sought with the quantitative portion of this project.

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 The purpose of abductive qualitative work is not to find ‘the’ answer; rather, it is an ongoing
4 process in search of mystery (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007) that allows for multiple
5 possible interpretations. Our interpretation was that context, tone, and exposition (Roulston,
6 2001) of the performed sets were crucial to understanding how women present gender. The
7 common thread of *how*, was a clear feminist intent in the delivery of the material

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15 With this realization, two members of the project team analyzed the entire data set for
16 Study three using Alvesson and Kärreman’s (2007) method of mystery construction. This
17 approach uses existing theory as an analytic lens, analyzes empirical material through that
18 lens, and applies researcher experience as interpretive tool. Thus, the theoretical lens we
19 applied is Judith Lorber’s (1997) categories of the gendered social order feminisms.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26 There is no monolithic definition for feminism and there are many schools of feminist
27 thought (Mackay, 2015). Nevertheless, the unifying thread tying these schools together is a
28 recognition of a gender-unequal society with a broad commitment toward a society based on
29 gender equality (Lorber, 2010; Mackay, 2015). To provide analytic structure to this diverse
30 theoretical landscape, Lorber (1997/2010) clusters feminisms by their assumptions about
31 inequality (their theories of gender inequality) and their propositions to pursue equality (their
32 politics). Lorber argues that “[t]he social reproduction of gender in individuals reproduces the
33 gendered societal structure; as individuals act out gender norms and expectations in face-to-
34 face interaction, they are constructing gendered systems of dominance and power” (1994, p.
35 6). Feminism, she contends (Lorber, 1994), deconstructs these gendered systems. Because
36 Lorber’s classification system provides a framing structure for understanding how various
37 feminist theories operate, it is particularly useful as an exploratory analytic lens for the
38 individual presentations of women comedians. As a result, the qualitative component of our
39 study pinpoints the multiplicity of feminisms and how gender is presented.

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 Lorber offers three categories of feminisms: gender reform, gender resistant, and
4 gender rebellion. Gender reform feminisms capture ideas of equality and individual rights
5 promoted in first- and second-wave feminisms and include liberal, socialist, and postcolonial
6 feminisms (Lorber, 2010). These approaches to feminism generally accept gendered social
7 orders but seek to rid them of discrimination. They hold that men and women should have
8 equal freedom to live their lives as they choose with equal recognition and reward. Gender
9 resistance feminisms (such as standpoint) began to emerge in the 1980s and reject the
10 balancing and mainstreaming of reform feminisms. Resistant feminists expose and disrupt
11 patriarchy and contend that women's voices and perspectives should be privileged. Gender
12 rebellion feminisms—such as postmodern, intersectional, or social construction feminism—
13 critique and dismantle structures of domination by rebelling against unequal systems. Rebel
14 feminists deconstruct gender binaries and challenge the complicity of 'doing gender' in re-
15 creating systems of oppression.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33 Our analysis process was to have the two qualitative experts on the team
34 independently review samples from Study one and Study two to interpret the show
35 descriptions and comedy sets with respect to Lorber's three categories of the gendered social
36 order feminisms. Before beginning the assessment, they reviewed how Lorber interpreted
37 each category of feminism to ensure they understood the theoretical framing in the same way.
38 After assessing each description and comedy set according to gender reform, resistance, or
39 rebellion, the researchers talked through their analyses to reach a common interpretation of
40 the empirical material on the few data points where their independent evaluations differed
41 (less than 10% of the sample). Although counter-intuitive to epistemological foundations of
42 qualitative research, we did quantify our analyses to help provide a bridging mechanism to
43 the quantitative portions of our study.

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

Sample

We initially drew on women who appeared in the top quartile of ratings from Study one and two. For Study one, we ordered the 242 women by the number of female gendered topics included in their show description and alphabetically when the number of topics was equal; the top 25% was N=60. However, this did not represent a natural cut-off since 34 descriptions included more than one topic and 37 included one topic. One of those descriptions was no longer available for analysis. To achieve the natural cut-off, we opted to include 10 additional show descriptions in the sample for an updated total of 28.9% (N = 70). For Study two, we ordered the 80 women according to the adapted TMF scores and analyzed the top 25% (N = 20) comedy sets.

Findings*Performed presentation.*

In the comedy club sets, *all* of the women in our sample presented as feminist. However, they did not incorporate the full range of feminisms. Gender reform feminism was most common with 18 of the 20 employing this presentation strategy. Three women took a gender resistant approach (including one woman who employed both gender reform and gender resistant strategies in her performance), and no women used a gender rebellion approach. In this section, we present data from two of the comedians to highlight how gender reform and gender resistant strategies manifest in the comedy club. To capture the tone and nuance of the sets, we employ transcript conventions from conversation analysis (Roulston, 2001; see Appendix 1).

Gender resistance. Two of the three women who incorporated gender resistance used their ethnic or religious heritage as a foil to highlight gendered inequities such as comments about wearing a hijab or assumptions made about countries of origin. Two used interactions with their children and the experiences of motherhood as a source for encounters with micro-

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 aggressions (Sue, 2010). All three highlighted media presentations of women. One used such
4
5 representations as the centerpiece of her set, critiquing the way women artists are represented
6
7 as strong and empowered when the lyrics of their songs and the clothing they wear objectify
8
9 them. She suggested there was more exploitation than empowerment of women in the media.
10
11

12 In this performance, the comedian exposes and disrupts hegemonic norms about
13
14 women and sexuality; she directly challenges assumptions of what constitutes empowerment
15
16 for women. She begins the gender resistant portion of her set by reflecting on watching music
17
18 videos with her 11-year old daughter and the challenge it presents. “There’s a lot of arse in
19
20 music videos. A lot of arse. ... and, just watching this ↑bom::bardment of arse [gesturing
21
22 hands flashing toward her face, eyes widened] with my daughter [looks to side at imaginary
23
24 daughter, and gestures that direction] and, and, I’m not being, obviously (.) they’re not
25
26 wo::men [gestures hand down her body] with arses, because we never get to see their ↑faces.
27
28 ... ↑It wears you ↑down! We sit there watching, we never see a fuck::ing face. It’s just (.)
29
30 you get used to it.” In this portion of the set, the comedian is setting up the hegemony of
31
32 sexuality in entertainment and its influence on young girls.
33
34
35
36
37

38 She thought to counter this hegemonic effect, she would make an effort to show her
39
40 daughter some women artists because “they’ll be empowered”. Her chosen artist was the
41
42 group Little Mix; however, she questions their actual empowerment and the extent to which
43
44 they have any voice in their artistic production. She continues, “[vigorously gestures making
45
46 a ‘V’ below her waist and looking downward] All the time. So no matter what they’re
47
48 wear::ing (.) [sweeps hand over head] a little jumper, welder’s outfit [mocks putting on
49
50 clothing]. Always the [gestures making a ‘V’ below her waist and looking downward], (.)
51
52 always the little triangle of pleasure on ↓show [circles the area of her vagina and points at it].
53
54 That’s always gotta be ↑there. The Dairylea [circles the area of her vagina] of desire [bends
55
56 knees, hips forward, and gestures her palm forward toward audience just below waist level]
57
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 ... I know it's not ↑PC to criticize a woman's clothing, but I do not for one second believe
4
5 that Little Mix are choosing (.) to wear the clothes (.) that they wear." After describing the
6
7 inherent practical problems of several of the groups' costumes, she says, "I swear the next
8
9 video she's gonna be wearing a Mr. ↑Blobby outfit with just a hole [draws circle with hand
10
11 around vaginal area] (.) cut out here." In this section, she is setting up the myth of what
12
13 constitutes empowerment for women.
14
15

16
17 She lowers her voice register, shakes her body, and raises a fist. "We got the
18
19 pow::wah. It's the feminist. We got the pow::wah [she leans back in emphasis and pumps her
20
21 fist harder, maintaining the low register], feminist anthem. And if you listen to the ↓lyrics,
22
23 it's about women shagging on top, heh-heh. That's what this...[lean back and fist pump
24
25 again] fem (.) we got the pow (.)" She quotes the lyrics of the song to make her point and
26
27 then says, "that's like the whole fuckin', it's this (.), it's this myth we sell to young women
28
29 about sexuality [lowers register]. You're power (.) you're sexy. You're powerful, you're
30
31 sexy. Sexy's enjoy::able, but it's not power::ful, (.) right? This is her peak resistant moment
32
33 where she disrupts patriarchal constructions that women's power is manifested through
34
35 appearance and sex. Here, this comedian *integrates* (Roberts, 2005) by appealing to the
36
37 masculine audience by discussing sex, but resists assimilation by simultaneously critiquing
38
39 the way women are framed as sex objects.
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 *Gender reform*. The remaining videos, all of which incorporated a gender reform
47
48 approach, had a wide variety of topics. The gendered topics in their sets included sex and sex
49
50 acts, relationships, marriage and divorce, motherhood, menopause, genitalia, giving birth,
51
52 body hair, age, wage gaps, and more. The common thread in these sets was women
53
54 unapologetically asserting their individual rights to say what they wanted to say and how they
55
56 wanted to say it. This is the essence of gender reform theories of feminism. Included in this
57
58 group of comedians were women whose sets included raunchy sex jokes, as if they were
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 attempting to be accepted as ‘one of the boys’ to fit into the male-dominated scene. There
4
5 was no critique of the context, culture, or system with these sets; there simply appeared to be
6
7 an attempt to be ‘interchangeable’ with the type of ‘shock’ content many men delivered.
8
9

10 In one such set, the comedian challenges our ideas about women and sexuality, but
11 she does so in a manner to simply claim the right to talk about her sexuality. Asserting the
12 equal right to talk about topics typically reserved for men is a classic gender reform strategy.
13 Here, the comedian sets herself up as a motherly middle-aged figure – wearing a blouse with
14 a pussy-bow and saying she is retired and presenting the set on behalf of her son. Her
15 presenting style is blasé, with the occasional chuckle herself when a joke ‘hits’ with the
16 audience. Despite having opened the set with a description of a failed sex role play encounter
17 with her husband of 26 years, she sets up plausible deniability that it was her decision to
18 build a set around sex-talk by saying, “Now my son likes to talk about sex on stage.”
19
20 Nevertheless, she uses sex and her own experiences with sex as the crux for her set.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 She talked about how she was better at using sex for attracting a partner than she was
34 at employing other “traditionally female” strategies. She said: “Now I [hhh-], I think another
35 reason I didn’t have sex when I was a teenager was because my mother said to me, um [-
36 hhh], [changes tone of voice to represent an instructive tone] the way to a man’s ↑heart (.)
37 [eyes widen, looks directly at audience] is through his stomach [shakes hand affirmingly] (.)
38 [squints eyes and looks down] [hhh-] and I’m not too good in the ↓kit::chen. [looks up] ↑But
39 eventually I found out if you go [looks down and points toward floor] down about, uh, (.) six
40 (.) inches [very serious face]. (1.0) It’s a lot quick:er. (2.0) [shrugs] More effective, (.) and,
41 uh [hhh-], you don’t have to stand ↑up for so long. [looks down] (3.0).”
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 With her “son’s” notebook in hand, she opens the notebook looks down and says
55 [reading], “Now, um [hhh-], (.) uh, it says here [hhh-], [questioning tone] ↓B::J [hhh-]. And,
56 um, (2.0) when I [hhh-], when I first saw that and heard my son, I [hhh-], I thought it was
57
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 going to be about (.) Bor::is John::son or (.) or bun::gee jumping [hhh-] (.) and I was (.) I was
4
5 disappointed on both counts. (.) [-hhh] um, ↑Now, my husband, Roger, he (.) he does like the
6
7 B::J (3.0). Now I'm not too keen, but I will oblige occa::sionally [scrunches eyes] (2.)
8
9 because I find afterwards he's (.) he's much more willing to clean the ov::en [hhh-]. She then
10
11 does a short bit in which she "misinterprets" her son's annotations about the next topic of
12
13 "anal", followed by her closing joke. "And, um [looks at watch], oh my goodness, yes, it's
14
15 ten past ten. I think Roger's finished cleaning the oven by now. (2.) ↑Thank you very much,
16
17 you've been ↑lovely [bows and nods] ..."

18
19
20
21
22 The strength and tone of her voice in her closing 'thank you' to the audience reveals
23
24 that the soft, demure tone she used throughout the set was an act, likely designed to provide
25
26 more shock effect that a 'nice older woman' was so direct in talking about sex. She distances
27
28 herself from assumptions about the way (older) women should behave by shocking the
29
30 audience with her frankness that would be expected of a man (like her son); yet, the way she
31
32 framed women was as stereotypical within a "gendered" order—demure and helping (her
33
34 son), obliging (her husband), or manipulating (her early sexual partners and her husband)
35
36 men. Thus, we categorized her as engaging in gender reform feminism. We see this as
37
38 Roberts' (2005) *assimilation* because she adopts typically masculine orientation to topics
39
40 while still fulfilling other gendered expectations of women; she tests the waters of
41
42 recategorizing herself.
43
44
45

Written presentation.

46
47
48
49 The majority (N = 171) of the 242 show descriptions written by women for the 2019
50
51 Edinburgh Fringe Festival were topically gender-neutral. Of the 70 show descriptions women
52
53 wrote which were analyzed in Study three (all of which included a gendered topic), 66
54
55 covered the full range of Lorber's feminisms. Some explicitly incorporated more than one
56
57 type of feminism in their descriptions. We identified 46 comedians who employed gender
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 reform feminisms for their show descriptions; 15 who incorporated gender resistant
4
5 feminism; and 7 used gender rebellion feminism. Four of the women's descriptions were
6
7 feminine, but there was no discernible feminism.
8
9

10 An example of a feminine, but not feminist, show description would be:

11
12 Risette Adamson² presents [show name], a romp into femininity, idiocy, foxes and
13
14 omelettes. Risette Adamson is a Canadian-bred, [UK]-based comic who's winning
15
16 hearts across the country with her unique style of offbeat observations, and surreal
17
18 storytelling. Adamson is accessibly odd, memorable and not one to miss. [Award]
19
20 New Comedian finalist. [Award] regional finalist. 'Hugely watchable' (Review).
21
22 'Brilliantly offbeat' (Review).
23
24
25

26 This comedian and others who adopted a simply feminine approach conform to
27
28 stereotypes of being a woman, leveraging "femininity" to appeal to gendered expectations of
29
30 women (Roberts, 2005). This is consistent with the positive distinction strategy of impression
31
32 management associated with *confirmation*.
33
34

35 Another comedian employed a gender resistant approach. In this description, the
36
37 comedian raises the problem of verbal micro-aggressions against women's appearance:
38
39

40 Absolute powershed and regular host of [a popular podcast], Olivia Findley explores
41
42 her big strong strength. Have you ever watched a feminist try and take 'Buff' as a
43
44 compliment? It's like watching a snake eat but funny. In preview, Buff was
45
46 nominated for [Best Show Award]. You've seen Liv in BBC sitcoms ... and [an]
47
48 Award-winning drama She's also in forthcoming feature films She writes for
49
50
51
52
53

54 ² Although all of this data is in the public domain, we have used pseudonyms for comedians
55
56 and show names to give an added layer of confidentiality to the comedians who appear in
57
58 Study 3.
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

[a popular television show]. ‘Consistently hilarious’ (Review). ‘Smarts on her sleeve, great’ (Review).

Gender resistant comedians like this did not shy away from their identities as women and feminists. This comedian raises her feminism as a strength with a rather gruesome, and masculine, analogy of a snake eating. This juxtaposition of feminine and masculine with an educative orientation aligns well with Roberts’ (2005) positive distinction strategy of *integration*.

Gender reform, the most common strategy employed, is exemplified in the following show description:

Anne used to be fun. By fun, she means drunk. She’s been sober for 16 years but still misses the buzz of getting rat-arsed, slaughtered and shit-faced. Is it even possible for an uptight British woman to have fun without being drunk? Obsessed with High Spirits is a frank and funny show about anxiety, sex and booze – and nearly vomiting over Noddy Holder. In 2018, Anne reached the final of the semi-prestigious national competition of [an award]. ‘Comedy gold... She holds the room in the palm of her hand’ ***** (Review).

Like many other women performing gender reform feminism, this comedian uses a shock strategy approach by projecting a more stereotypically masculine delivery. This distances her from societal expectations of how a woman should behave, consistent with the recategorization strategy of *assimilation* (Roberts, 2005).

The 171 women whose show description content was not incorporated into the qualitative study are also important to highlight here. Their invisibility sheds light into the way that feminisms inform the operationalization of impression management. By submitting a show description devoid of topics that referenced their stigmatized social group, these women *decategorized* their gender (Roberts, 2005). Their shows were essentially genderless

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 and, therefore, could potentially provide insights into how to avoid reproducing gender
4
5 binaries.

6
7
8 Gender rebellion strategies were employed only in the Fringe descriptions. There
9
10 were only six comedians who used this strategy. Those who employed this strategy were
11
12 clear in taking on the underlying power structures that reinforced patriarchal privileges. In
13
14 her Fringe show description, one comedian said:

15
16
17 Person of interest on [three popular comedy television shows] squats and delivers a
18
19 show about the extreme sport of womanhood. Birthing her vision of the future before your
20
21 eyes, how she hopes it will be... free from class war, poverty and consent issues. Also
22
23 dragging the overdue spectre of what it is more likely to be: t-shirt feminism, Jordan Peterson
24
25 and corporate wokeness from her loins. All without an epidural. 'It's jaw-droppingly
26
27 remarkable how much ground she covers, how funny she is, how intelligent her attacks are'
28
29 ***** (Review).
30
31

32
33 The women who took a gender rebellion approach engaged in impression
34
35 management by challenging the patriarchal systems, which define the ideal—namely men.
36
37 Indeed, they defied the ideal and refused to accept categorization as a stigmatized 'other.'
38
39 This approach to impression management was distinctly different than the strategies offered
40
41 by Roberts (2005), which are dependent upon individuals acknowledging the boundaries of
42
43 their marginalized categories and managing them. Through their defiance, these women
44
45 rejected the categorization premise upon which SIM is based; they demanded to be what we
46
47 call *uncategorized*.
48
49

50
51 *Performed and Written Presentations*
52

53
54 Because our findings suggest that context plays a role in the ways women choose to
55
56 present gender in their comedy performances, we looked to see if there were women who
57
58 performed both at Fringe and at the comedy club. There were 15 women comedians who
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 appeared in both of our samples and 12 of the 15 used different feminist performance
4
5 strategies across the two contexts. Once again, all four forms of feminism (none, gender
6
7 reform, gender resistant, and gender rebellion) appeared amongst the 15 women's Fringe
8
9 Festival written presentations and only two forms appeared amongst the club sets (gender
10
11 reform and gender resistant). Of the 15, all of whom performed feminist comedy at the
12
13 comedy club, ten had no discernible feminism in their blurbs for Fringe Fest. This included
14
15 the three women who used gender resistant feminism at the comedy club. Only two of the 15
16
17 showed more 'radical' forms of feminism in the written blurb than they performed at the
18
19 comedy club.
20
21
22

23
24 That all forms of feminism were observed within our sample of 15 at the Fringe but
25
26 only two forms were apparent in their club sets indicates some constraints on women at the
27
28 comedy club, compared to at the Fringe, resulting in a narrowing of how they present gender
29
30 (to two out of four categories). This is in line with our contention that the greater range of
31
32 performers at the Fringe offers women the opportunity to perform and present without fear of
33
34 impunity. However, the male performer domination in the comedy club appears to trigger
35
36 impression management resulting in a narrowed approach to how gender is presented.
37
38
39

Summary

40
41
42 Our qualitative analysis revealed that the mystery worthy of exploration was the way
43
44 feminisms were (or were not) employed in operationalizing how women presented. In
45
46 presenting as gendered, or not, women comedians engaged in a full range of impression
47
48 management strategies as defined by Roberts (2005). These impression management
49
50 strategies were consistent with the forms of feminisms the women employed. As depicted in
51
52 Table 1, the comedians exhibited a form of impression management. When these comedians'
53
54 impression management was viewed through a lens of feminisms, however, the women
55
56 exhibited a form of impression management not previously identified by Roberts (2005).
57
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

-----Insert Table 1 here -----

General discussion

Our findings indicate that women comedians present as female gendered during the course of their work and that they do so by enacting different forms of feminism. However, the extent of their gendered presentation and the feminist form it takes appears to vary in line with the male performer domination in the situation. Thus, our approach of comparing two settings with differing levels of male domination serves to confirm findings from single setting research that a male norm impacts women's presentation (e.g., Kenny and Donnelly, 2020; Koch, D'Mello and Sacket, 2014; Mavin and Grandy, 2012). We find that constraint, likely stemming from attempts to manage impressions, is key to understanding women's behavior in male dominated settings. Women's behavior appeared more constrained, more managed, in the male performer dominated setting both in terms of the (lesser) extent to which they presented as female gendered and the (narrower) range of feminisms enacted, compared to the more gender diverse performer setting. Our findings therefore support Roberts' (2005) model, indicating a broader norm and likely similarly broad ideal, or lack of one, allows for less managed and hence greater freedom of behavior, while a narrow norm and likely ideal requires individuals to engage in impression management, which can constrain them.

Indeed, both the lower levels of gendered presentation and the categories of feminism displayed in the comedy club are indicative of impression management attempts. Specifically, presenting as less female gendered and performance of gender reform and resistant feminism which involve behavior that may be considered masculinized (Madison, Aasa, Walert and Woodley, 2014) appear well suited when there is male-biased ideal. By contrast, a feminine performance in the absence of feminism could indicate an acceptance of

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

women's lower status (van Breen et al., 2017) in environments where being a man is considered the ideal, likely resulting in the comedian failing to assert their right to perform and hence undermining their control over the room. Conversely, rebellion feminism would likely be seen as too threatening in a male-normed setting (Dickinson et al., 2013; Shouse and Opplinger, 2014) and thus serve as an obstacle to effective job performance.

These findings have implications for both feminist and SIM theory. They indicate that neither feminism nor social identity based professional image are monolithic. Rather, we find feminism can and, in order to achieve a desired goal (in this case securing a woman's position in a male dominated setting), may necessarily be situation dependent. Similarly, our findings indicate that professional image may require adaptability across situations. Indeed, consideration of the women who performed in both settings indicates they adapted their feminist style in line with what would be 'allowable'.

In addition, the parallel between our quantitative and qualitative findings, that constriction of both social identity (gender) and the primary associated political identity (feminism), occurs under the same conditions suggests that gender organizes behavior along broader lines than just gender identity itself. Indeed, to gain a fuller picture of women's professional image construction, our findings suggest that management of social identity should be considered alongside that of the associated political identity. Given the apparent appropriateness of the types of feminism used, particularly in the comedy club, this indicates the importance of political activism for ensuring maligned groups can function effectively in challenging situations.

Further, by using a feminist lens to interpret how comedians present their gender, our findings refine Roberts' (2005) theory by uncovering a fifth strategy for managing social identity—*uncategorization*. With this strategy, the women simply refused to accept the patriarchal system that established gendered binary categories and the impression

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 management driven by societal norms that attach to gendered binaries; they defied categories.

4
5 As they dealt “with norms that tighten the more we [women] fail to inhabit them” (Ahmed,
6
7 2017, p. 245), these women presented themselves as what Ahmed called ‘feminist killjoys.’

8
9
10 This new strategy is important for how we understand impression management because it
11
12 highlights a way that marginalized groups can simply reject the categorization constraints
13
14 that other forms of SIM demand.

**15
16
17 Limitations and future research**

18
19 Our mixed methods approach offers significant analytic strength by providing a fuller
20
21 picture of women’s presentation that would not be observable through a single method
22
23 design. The quantitative metrics provide the extent to which women’s presentation is
24
25 gendered while the qualitative approach provides nuance to the nature of that presentation
26
27 which is not captured by descriptive metrics alone.

28
29
30 We consider comedians in two situations; however, the crossover of comedians in the
31
32 two and differences between the stimuli observed meant that a more robust longitudinal
33
34 design was not possible with the quantitative data. Future research could attempt to
35
36 investigate the extent to which women adapt their presentation across multiple situations over
37
38 time. In addition, the show descriptions (Study one) encapsulate comedians’ marketing
39
40 strategy rather than their onstage behavior. Therefore, though the comparison of women to
41
42 the benchmark group of men allows us to deduce women’s relative level of gender related
43
44 impression management compared to the comedy majority group, we cannot be certain that
45
46 the level of disparity observed is similar to that displayed on stage at the Fringe. Further
47
48 research is needed to answer this question. Yet, we consider that the disparity observed in the
49
50 show descriptions is informative of how women present in its own right.

51
52 We also focused our research on the way women perform comedy in feminist ways as
53
54 they present their gender. Our findings suggest that women engage in a unique form of
55
56
57
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 impression management as they apply gender rebellion feminist strategies in their comedy.
4
5 However, men can perform in feminist ways as well; our present study did not explore how
6
7 this manifests amongst men comedians. We do suspect that men's performance of feminism
8
9 would likely be qualitatively different. Because the gendered societal structure is different for
10
11 men, the way feminism is presented would be different and toward different aims, such as
12
13 being an ally. We suggest this is a fruitful area for further exploration.
14
15

16
17 As is typical of observational studies, we rely on the available data. Therefore, since
18
19 we could only include comedians who had a recording or show description available in our
20
21 sample, selection bias may limit the generalizability of our research somewhat. That the
22
23 proportions of men and women comedians in both studies roughly approximated the industry
24
25 gender split implies that gender is less likely to impact inclusion in the sample and therefore
26
27 makes the impact of selection bias less concerning, given our focus. However, we did not
28
29 identify any nonbinary comedians in our sample, despite our knowledge of comedians who
30
31 identify as such working in the UK. This lack of available data reproduced the structure of
32
33 the gender binaries within our research. Yet, the comedians who employed what we have
34
35 termed *decategorization* essentially challenged the gender binary. Future studies might seek
36
37 to investigate how nonbinary performers represent gender and links between SIM and
38
39 nonbinary identification. Other non-random factors, such as caring responsibilities and
40
41 economic stability may impact the likelihood that individuals who live further from the
42
43 settings we studied would feature in our sample. In addition, comedians' satisfaction with
44
45 their performance could have impacted their willingness for it to appear on YouTube.
46
47
48
49

50
51 In addition, our observational method is limited in that it does not allow us to directly
52
53 question the reasons women make the presentation choices we have observed. Future,
54
55 interview-based, research might seek to investigate this question. Also, since gender was the
56
57 only identity which was verifiable in large enough proportions to study, and we could not
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 question those studied, we were neither able to provide further demographic details on the
4
5 sample or investigate the intersectional identities which are likely to shape the way
6
7 individuals present (Heizman and Liu, 2022). Future research might investigate the role of
8
9 intersectional identities in shaping performance.
10
11

Conclusion

12
13
14 Our research in the novel context of women in stand-up comedy answers Roberts'
15
16 (2005) call for investigation of SIM in unresearched professions and contributes to both the
17
18 body of knowledge associated with social identity based impression management, women in
19
20 male-dominated careers and feminism. This research provides a deeper understanding of the
21
22 ways in which women working in a novel public, male-dominated career present at work, in
23
24 line with varying male dominance. Our findings are explainable in line with Roberts' (2005)
25
26 assertion that social identity may be managed in line with an 'ideal' or norm. However, our
27
28 findings also extend the theory by demonstrating that professional image may be situation
29
30 dependent and by identifying a SIM strategy not currently included in Roberts' model. We
31
32 also uncover that social and associated political identities may be linked within impression
33
34 management strategies with the latter being expressed to gain acceptance for the former and
35
36 that by enacting a feminist stance suited to the situation, women can leverage their feminism
37
38 to secure their position in male dominated professions (Lorber, 2005; Roberts, 2005).
39
40
41
42
43

44 The result of our study is a feminist interpretation of Roberts' (2005) theory of social-
45
46 identity impression management (SIM) as it is operationalized in a novel, male-dominated
47
48 context. We hope that the findings from this study will inform future research that examines
49
50 how women manage their gender identities in different organizational and social contexts,
51
52 how feminism can be instrumental in securing women's position in situations where they
53
54 may be unwelcomed and raise awareness of how SIM is a relational process influenced by
55
56 dynamics of power.
57
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

Appendix

Transcription conventions used:

(.)	small untimed pause
(2.0)	pause timed in seconds
Th::en	prolonged sound
Heh heh	laughter
-hhh	in breath
hhh-	out breath
↑yes	rising intonation
↓gone	lowering intonation
<u>Underline</u>	emphasis

Acknowledgments

Clare Cook and Jamie L. Callahan are first authors, with equal contribution; Thomas V.

Pollet and Carole Elliott are second authors, with equal contribution.

We would like to thank the Associate Editor, Ajnesh Prasad, and our anonymous reviewers for their helpful and constructive comments.

Funding

There are no funders to report for this submission

References

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 Ahmed S (2017). *Living a Feminist Life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

4
5 Alvesson M and Kärreman D (2007). Unravelling HRM: Identity, ceremony, and control in a

6
7 management consulting firm. *Organization Science* 18: 711–723.

8
9 doi:10.1287/orsc.1070.0267

10
11 Augustine SM (2014). Living in a post-coding world: Analysis as assemblage. *Qualitative*

12
13 *Inquiry* 20(6): 747-753. doi: 10.1177/1077800414530258.qix.sagepub.com

14
15 Banks M and Milestone K (2011). Individualization, gender and cultural work. *Gender, Work*

16
17 *and Organization* 18(1): 73-89. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2010.00535.x

18
19
20
21 Becker JC and Wagner U (2009). Doing gender differently? The interplay of strength of

22
23 gender identification and content of gender identity in predicting wome's endorsement

24
25 of sexist beliefs. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 39: 487–508.

26
27
28
29 doi:10.1002/ejsp.551

30
31 Bennett D, Hennekam S, MacArthur S, Hope C and Goh T (2018) Hiding gender: how

32
33 female composers manage gender identity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 113: 20-32.

34
35
36
37 doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2018.07.003

38
39 Berdahl JL (2007) The sexual harassment of uppity women. *Journal of Applied Psychology*

40
41 92(2): 423-437. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.425

42
43 Bore IK (2010) (Un)funny women: TV comedy audiences and the gendering of humour.

44
45 *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 13: 139-154. doi:10.1177/1367549409352272

46
47 Bourgoin A and Harvey JF (2018) Professional image under threat: Dealing with learning–

48
49 credibility tension. *Human Relations* 71(12): 1611-1639.

50
51
52
53 doi:10.1177/0018726718756168

54
55 Brehm, JW (1966) *A theory of psychological reactance* (7th ed.). New York, NY: Academic

56
57
58
59
60 Press.

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 Butler N and Stoyanova Russell D (2018) No funny business: Precarious work and emotional
4 labour in stand-up comedy. *Human Relations* 71(12): 1666-1686. doi:

5
6
7
8 10.1177/0018726718758880

9
10 Chortle. (2020) 'Comedians'. [Online] Available at: <http://www.chortle.co.uk/comics>.

11
12 [Accessed 20 December, 2020]

13
14 Chortle. (2019) 'Comedians'. [Online] Available at: <http://www.chortle.co.uk/comics>.

15
16
17 [Accessed 2 April, 2019]

18
19 Clair JA, Beatty JE and MacLean TL (2005) Out of sight but not out of mind: Managing
20 invisible social identities in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review* 1:78 –

21
22
23 95. doi:10.5465/amr.2005.15281431

24
25
26 Dickinson P, Higgins A, St. Pierre PM, Solomon D, and Zwagerman S (2013) *Women and*
27
28 *Comedy: History, Theory, Practice*. Vancouver, BC: Farleigh Dickinson University
29
30 Press.

31
32
33 Ely RJ (1995) The power in demography: Women's social constructions of gender identity at
34 work. *Academy of Management Journal* 38:589– 634. doi:10.5465/256740

35
36
37 England P (2010) The Gender Revolution: Uneven and Stalled. *Gender and Society*
38
39 24(2):149–66. doi:10.1177/0891243210361475

40
41
42 Faulkner W (2009) Doing gender in engineering workplace cultures. II. Gender
43
44 in/authenticity and the in/visibility paradox. *Engineering Studies* 1(3): 169-
45
46 189, doi:10.1080/19378620903225059

47
48
49 Giacalone R and Rosenfeld P (1991) *Applied impression management: How image-making*
50
51 *affects managerial decisions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

52
53
54 Harris DA and Giuffre P (2010) The price you pay: How female professional chefs negotiate
55
56 work and family. *Gender Issues* 27: 27–52. doi:10.1007/s12147-010-9086-8.

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

- 1
2
3 He J and Kang S (2019) Covering in cover letters: Gender and self-presentation in job
4 applications. *Academy of Management Journal*. [doi:10.5465/AMBPP.2019.275](https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2019.275)
5
6
7
8 Healy R (2020) Sarcasm and sausages: Manchester's tough crowds make comedians sizzle,
9
10 *The Guardian*. Available at: [https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2020/mar/08/sarcasm-](https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2020/mar/08/sarcasm-and-sausages-manchester-comedians-mancunians-alternative-comedy)
11 [and-sausages-manchester-comedians-mancunians-alternative-comedy](https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2020/mar/08/sarcasm-and-sausages-manchester-comedians-mancunians-alternative-comedy). [Accessed 1
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Heizmann H and Liu H (2022). “Bloody Wonder Woman!”: Identity performances of elite women entrepreneurs on Instagram. *Human Relations* 75(3): 411-440. doi: 10.1177/0018726720979034.
- Irwing, P, Cook, C, Pollet, TV, & Hughes, DJ (2019). Comedians’ trait level and stage personalities: evidence for goal-directed personality adaptation, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 46(4): 590-602. doi:10.1177/0146167219867963
- Kachel S, Steffens MC and Niedlich C (2016) Traditional masculinity and femininity: Validation of a new scale assessing gender roles. *Frontiers in Psychology* 7: 1-19. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2016. 00956
- Kaiser CR and Miller CT (2001). Reacting to impending discrimination: Compensation for prejudice and attributions to discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 27(10): 254 –263. doi:10.1177/0146167201272010.
- Kenny EJ and Donnelly R (2020) Navigating the gender structure in information technology: How does this affect the experiences and behaviours of women?. *Human Relations* 73(3): 326-350. doi: 10.1177/0018726719828449
- Koch, AJ, D’Mello, SD and Sacket PR (2014) A Meta-Analysis of Gender Stereotypes and Bias in Experimental Simulations of Employment Decision Making, *Journal of Applied Psychology* 100(1): 128–161. doi:10.1037/a0036734

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 Leary, MR and Kowalski RM (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two-
4
5 component model. *Psychological Bulletin* 107(1): 34-47. doi:10.1037/0033-

6
7
8 2909.107.1.34
9

10 Little LM, Major VS, Hinojosa AS and Nelson DL (2015) Professional image maintenance:
11
12 How women navigate pregnancy in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*

13
14
15 58(1): 8-37. doi:10.5465/amj.2013.0599
16

17 Lorber J (1994) *Paradoxes of gender*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

18
19 Lorber J (1997/2010) *The variety of feminisms and their contributions to gender equality*.

20
21
22 Issue 97 of Oldenburger Universitätsreden. ISSN 0177-9133.
23

24 Lorber J (2005) *Gender inequality: Feminist theories and politics*. 3rd ed. Los Angeles, CA:

25
26
27 Roxbury Publishing Company.
28

29 Lynch JW and Rodell JB (2018) Blend In or Stand Out? Interpersonal Outcomes of

30
31 Managing Concealable Stigmas at Work. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 103(12):

32
33
34 1307–1323. doi:10.1037/apl0000342
35

36 Mavin S (2008) Queen bees, wannabees and afraid to bees: No more ‘best enemies’ for

37
38 women in management? *British Journal of Management* 19(1): S75-S84. doi:

39
40
41 10.1111/j.1467-8551.2008.00573.x
42

42 Mavin S and Grandy G (2012) Doing gender well and differently in management. *Gender in*

43
44
45 *Management* 27(4): 218-231. doi: 10.1108/17542411211244768
46

47 Mavin S and Grandy G (2018) How postfeminism plays out for women elite leaders. In P.

48
49
50 Lewis, Y. Benschop, and R. Simpson (Eds.). *Postfeminism and Organization* (pp. 161-

51
52
53 178). New York, NY: Routledge
54

54 R Development Core Team (2008) *R : A language and environment for statistical computing*.

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

- 1
2
3 Roberts, LM (2005) Changing Faces: Professional Image Construction in Diverse
4
5 Organizational Settings. *The Academy of Management Review* 30(4): 685-711.
6
7 doi:10.5465/amr.2005.18378873
8
9
- 10 Roulston K (2001). Data analysis and ‘theorizing as ideology’. *Qualitative Research* 1(3):
11
12 279-302. doi: [10.1177/146879410100100302](https://doi.org/10.1177/146879410100100302)
13
14
- 15 Sasson-Levy O (2003) Feminism and military practice: Israeli women soldiers in
16
17 “masculine” roles. *Sociological Inquiry* 73(3): 440–465. doi:10.1111/1475-682X.00064
18
19
- 20 Sherman M (2021) You think you know who Dove Cameron is but you actually have no idea.
21
22 *Refinery21*. Available at: [https://www.refinery29.com/en-ca/2021/07/10575036/who-](https://www.refinery29.com/en-ca/2021/07/10575036/who-is-dove-cameron-schmigadoon-disney)
23
24 [is-dove-cameron-schmigadoon-disney](https://www.refinery29.com/en-ca/2021/07/10575036/who-is-dove-cameron-schmigadoon-disney) [Accessed 25 July 2021].
25
- 26 Shouse E and Opplinger P (2014). Sarah is magic: The (post-gendered?) comedy of Sarah
27
28 Silverman. *Comedy Studies* 3(2): 201-216. doi:10.1386/cost.3.2.201_1
29
- 30 Siegel S and Castellan NJ (1988) *Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences*. (7th
31
32 ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-hill.
33
34
- 35 Sochen J (1991) *Women’s Comic Visions*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
36
37
- 38 Somers RH (1962) A New Asymmetric Measure of Association for Ordinal Variables.
39
40 *American Sociological Review* 27(6): 799–811. doi:10.2307/2090408
41
- 42 Sue DW (Ed.) (2010) *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and*
43
44 *impact*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
45
46
- 47 Tassabehji R, Harding N, Lee H, and Dominguez-Pery C (2021) From female computers to
48
49 male comput♂rs: Or why there are so few women writing algorithms and developing
50
51 software. *Human Relations* 74(8): 1296-1326. doi: 10.1177/0018726720914723
52
53
- 54 Thorpe V (2014) BBC chief: no more comedy shows with all-male panels. *The Observer*.
55
56 Available at: [https://www.theguardian.com/media/2014/feb/08/bbc-comedy-shows-](https://www.theguardian.com/media/2014/feb/08/bbc-comedy-shows-male-panels-female-presence)
57
58 [male-panels-female-presence](https://www.theguardian.com/media/2014/feb/08/bbc-comedy-shows-male-panels-female-presence). [Accessed 9 April, 2021]
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 Torre M (2017) Attrition from male-dominated occupations: Variation among occupations
4
5 and women. *Sociological Perspectives* 60(4): 665–684. doi:

6
7 10.1177/0731121416683160
8
9

10 Tractenberg RE, Yumoto F, Jin D and Morris JC (2010) Sample size requirements for
11
12 training to a kappa agreement criterion on Clinical Dementia Rating. *Alzheimer Disease*
13
14 & *Associated Disorders* 24(3): 264-268. doi:[10.1097/WAD.0b013e3181d489c6](https://doi.org/10.1097/WAD.0b013e3181d489c6)
15
16

17 Watson D and Clark LA (1994) *The PANAS-X: Manual for the Positive and Negative Affect*
18
19 *Schedule-Expanded Form*. Iowa City, Iowa: The University of Iowa.
20
21

22 Weisberg YJ, DeYoung CG and Hirsh JB (2011). Gender differences in personality across
23
24 the ten aspects of the Big Five. *Frontiers in Personality Science and Individual*
25
26 *Differences* 2, article 178. doi:[10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00178](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00178)
27
28

29 Wilke CO (2019) *Fundamentals of data visualization: a primer on making informative and*
30
31 *compelling figures*. Sebastopol, CA: O'Reilly Media.
32

33 Wright T (2016) Women's Experience of Workplace Interactions in Male-Dominated Work:
34
35 The Intersections of Gender, Sexuality and Occupational Group. *Gender, Work and*
36
37 *Organization* 23(3): 348-362. doi:[10.1111/gwao.12074](https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12074)
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

Biographies

Clare Cook is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Psychology at Northumbria University, Newcastle, UK. Her research interests include gender at work, untraditional career and personality. Prior research has been published in a range of journals including Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin and Journal of Managerial Psychology
[clare.cook@northumbria.ac.uk]

Jamie L. Callahan is Professor of Organisation and Ethics at Durham University, UK. Her research addresses issues of power and privilege in organized contexts, leading her to explore marginalized groups' experiences of leadership, learning, and organizational transformation. Her particular passion is championing gender equity. Her work has appeared in journals such as Academy of Management Learning and Education, Management Learning, Organization Studies, Journal of Consumer Culture, and Organization. She is Co-Editor in Chief of the International Journal of Management Reviews and formerly served as Editor in Chief of Human Resource Development Review.

Thomas V. Pollet is a Professor in Psychology at Northumbria University, Newcastle, UK. He has published broadly in the social and behavioural sciences. His research interests lie in individual differences and personal relationships, with a focus on social networks.
(thomas.pollet@northumbria.ac.uk)

Carole Elliott is Professor of Organisation Studies, and Associate Dean EDI and Development at Sheffield University Management School, UK. Her research interests include gender and leadership learning, and critical examinations of human resource development.

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Carole has published widely in international scholarly journals including Organization Studies, Academy of Management Learning and Education, Gender, Work and Organization, Management Learning, and the International Small Business Journal. She is an associate editor of Gender, Work and Organization, and former editor-in-chief of Human Resource Development International. Carole is a member of the BAM College of Fellows, and a Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts.

Peer Review Version

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

Figure 1

The relationship between gender and using gendered nouns to refer to oneself. The surface area corresponds to the frequency of a category.

Women: Gendered nouns (N=242)



Men: Gendered nouns (N=601)



Figure 2

The relationship between gender and same gender topics. The surface area corresponds to the frequency of a category.

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 3

Box violin plot comparing men and women comedians on genderedness of self-presentation.

This plot combines a box plot with a distribution

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES




Table 1

Social-Identity Impression Management Strategies (SIMs) and Feminisms

SIMs	Feminisms
Confirmation	Traditionally Feminine (not feminist)
Integration	Gender Resistant

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Assimilation	Gender Reform
Decategorization	Gender Neutral
<i>Uncategorization</i>	Gender Rebellion

Peer Review Version