

# Is Silence More Golden for Women than Men? Observers Derogate Effusive Women and their Quiet Partners

Jennifer Guinn Sellers · Mary Diltz Woolsey ·  
William B. Swann Jr.

Published online: 17 August 2007  
© Springer Science + Business Media, LLC 2007

**Abstract** Couples in which the woman is more verbally disinhibited than the man (man-more-inhibited couples) report lower satisfaction than couples in which the man is more verbally disinhibited (woman-more-inhibited couples). A violation of traditional gender roles is hypothesized to underlie this phenomenon. It was predicted that members of man-more-inhibited couples would be rated less likeable than woman-more-inhibited couples, and disinhibited men would be rated more competent than other males and females. To test these hypotheses, 95 undergraduate participants from a southwestern US university viewed a videotaped conflict between a man-more-inhibited or woman-more-inhibited couple. As predicted, members of man-more-inhibited couples were rated less likeable than members of woman-more-inhibited couples and disinhibited husbands were rated more competent than all other targets.

**Keywords** Gender roles · Verbal inhibition · Relationships · Social · Personality

## Introduction

Heterosexual couples in which the man is more verbally inhibited or submissive than the woman suffer both in terms

of relative lack of satisfaction (Swann et al. 2003, 2006, 2007) and inability to cope with stressors (Swann et al. 2007). Although this “man-more-inhibited” effect appears to be robust, its antecedents are poorly understood. In this report, we tested the notion that this phenomenon emerges because gender role expectations (Eagly 1987) lead people to expect men to verbally dominate women. That is, we reasoned that because men are expected to be in a position of power over women, couples in which the woman is verbally dominating the man (i.e., man-more-inhibited couples) ought to be rated more harshly than couples that adhere to the traditional role of men being in power over women (i.e., women-more-inhibited couples). To test this prediction, we had participants view a videotaped conflict of either a woman-more-inhibited or man-more-inhibited couple and rate each target’s likeability and competence.

This prediction is intriguing as it suggests that gender-based power imbalances may not be specific to workplace demands as past research has shown, but may also generalize to intimacy based relationships as well.

To put our predictions in context, we begin by discussing the nature of individual differences in verbal inhibition. We then consider how such differences may influence the dynamics of close relationships.

## Verbal Inhibition and Relationship Quality

In this report, verbal inhibition is understood in terms of Swann and Rentfrow’s (2001) research with the Brief Loquaciousness and Interpersonal Rapidity Test (BLIRT). High scorers (disinhibitors) tend to express themselves as soon as thoughts occur to them, endorsing items such as “If I have something to say, I don’t hesitate to say it,” and “I speak my mind as soon as a thought enters my head.” In contrast, low scorers (inhibitors) are relatively slow to respond to others, endorsing items such as “It often takes

---

J. G. Sellers (✉)  
Department of Behavioral and Social Sciences,  
Green Mountain College,  
1 College Circle,  
Poultney, VT 05764, USA  
e-mail: sellersj@greenmtn.edu

M. D. Woolsey · W. B. Swann Jr.  
Department of Psychology, University of Texas at Austin,  
Austin, TX 78712, USA

W. B. Swann Jr.  
e-mail: swann@mail.utexas.edu

me a while to figure out how to express myself,” and “If I disagree with someone, I tend to wait until later to say something.” As do all valid measures of personality, the BLIRT has desirable psychometric properties, such as internal consistency and temporal stability (Swann and Rentfrow 2001). BLIRT scores are also independent of intelligence, social desirability, and gender of the participant and uniquely predict behaviors related to communication that extraversion fails to predict.

Individual differences in verbal inhibition predict behavior in a wide range of settings. For example, scores on the BLIRT predict behavior in the classroom, on the telephone and in laboratory studies of reactions to personal insults. Specifically, those scoring high on this personality measure have been observed to speak longer and more rapidly during conversations. They are also more likely to speak out in difficult situations such as when confronting an aggressor or rule violator (for more evidence pertaining to the discriminant and predictive validity of the BLIRT, see Swann and Rentfrow 2001; and Swann et al. 2003). In each of these instances, verbal disinhibitors dominated the social situation by speaking quickly and effusively.

Of greatest interest here is evidence that gender specific configurations of inhibitors and disinhibitors in heterosexual relationships may degrade relationship quality. For example, Swann et al. (2003) proposed that couples in which the man is more verbally inhibited than the woman run an exceptionally high risk for experiencing relationship disharmony. In support of this reasoning, Swann and his colleagues reported seven studies that demonstrate a “man-more-inhibited” effect wherein couples in which the man was more verbally inhibited than the woman were less satisfied than all other couples in the sample (Swann et al. 2003, 2006, 2007). The difficulties of man-more-inhibited couples are not limited to established relationships but emerge after brief interactions with new acquaintances as well (Swann et al. 2006). The question that remains is why this gender specific configuration should be so problematic.

#### What Goes Wrong in Man-more-inhibited Couples?

There are at least two explanations for the relationship difficulties of man-more-inhibited couples. This first explanation emphasizes relationship dynamics; the second emphasizes gender expectations. The *relationship dynamics* explanation focuses on the nature of the interactions that unfold between the relationship partners. Logically, it seems obvious that some relationship configurations may be healthier than others. For example, if both partners are verbally disinhibited, both will respond rapidly and effusively to one another, fostering feelings of connection. Similarly, if both partners are inhibited, both will feel gratified that their partner offers them “space” to respond

thoughtfully. Indeed, past research has found that when members of heterosexual couples are similar in their levels of verbal inhibition, they report relatively high levels of relationship satisfaction (Swann et al. 2003). This finding is also consistent with other evidence that people tend to prefer others who act similarly to themselves (Chartrand and Bargh 1999). When partners differ in their level of verbal inhibition, however, difficulties may arise. Just as disinhibitors may think that the paucity of responses by inhibitors reflects lack of interest in the relationship, inhibitors may find disinhibitors overwhelming.

The relationship dynamics explanation, however, fails to explain the gender-specific nature of the man-more-inhibited effect. That is, although it explains why *man*-more-inhibited couples should experience difficulty, it cannot explain why *woman*-more-inhibited couples do not suffer similarly low levels of satisfaction (Swann et al. 2003). The *gender role expectation* explanation may solve this puzzle. This explanation is based on the well-documented finding that people who behave counter-stereotypically are often the recipients of penalties and negative evaluations (Appleton and Gurwitz 1976; Berndt and Heller 1986; Costrich et al. 1975; Lobel et al. 2000; Tilby and Kalin 1980). From this vantage point, the verbal submissiveness of inhibited men may violate the expectation that men are more powerful than women (Sidanius and Pratto 1999) and women have lower status than men (e.g., Pratto and Espinoza 2001). As a result, observers may derogate relatively inhibited men and impute relatively low levels of competence to them, in keeping with the perception that such men are not exerting the power that society has accorded to them (e.g., Sidanius and Pratto 1999; see also Fiske et al. 2002).

Inhibited men may not be the only ones to suffer negative evaluations from violating gender role expectations, however. Glick and Fiske’s (1999, 2001) theory of ambivalent sexism suggests that women will evoke hostility if they challenge the status quo by attempting to usurp power from men. This framework suggests that when disinhibited women verbally dominate inhibited men, as in man-more-inhibited couples, they violate the expectation that women will be deferent and verbally submissive to men and thus threaten traditional gender roles (Eagly 1987).

Support for the notion that men derogate women who speak rapidly and with few hesitations (i.e., verbally disinhibited women) comes from a series of studies by Carli and her associates (Carli 1990; Carli et al. 1995). In particular, when men were engaged in persuasive communications with loquacious women, the women were viewed harshly. A limitation of these studies, however, was their exclusive focus on men’s reactions to verbally dominant women. In such contexts, verbally dominant women may have evoked the ire of men for instrumental reasons, in that

their loquaciousness may have interfered with the efforts of men to assume leadership roles. It is unclear that these results would generalize to contexts in which instrumental concerns and leadership are less salient, such as the close relationship contexts that are the primary focus of this report.

To determine if gender role expectancies might play a role in the man-more-inhibited effect, we compared the impressions that outside observers formed of a couple who was reenacting actual conflicts reported by participants in previous research on the man-more-inhibited effect (Swann et al. 2003). In the condition that was designed to capture traditional gender roles, the man assumed the verbally dominant role during an argument (women-more-inhibited condition). Other observers witnessed reenactments of exactly the same conflicts, except that the gender of the verbally dominant actor was reversed. Specifically, in the condition designed to capture non-traditional gender roles, the woman assumed the verbally dominant role during the argument (man-more-inhibited condition). After viewing these conflicts, participants rated each actor's competence, likeability, and desirability as a friend.

We reasoned that if man-more-inhibited couples violate gender role expectations, outside observers should form more negative impressions of them than woman-more-inhibited couples. In particular, we hypothesized that observers would 1) rate actors in the man-more-inhibited couples as less likeable and would desire a friendship with them less than actors in the woman-more-inhibited couples. Furthermore, we hypothesized that 2) men in woman-more-inhibited couples would be viewed as more competent than their partners but that this would not be true for men in man-more-inhibited couples.

## Method

### Sample

Participants were 95 introductory psychology students (45 men and 50 women) at a large southwestern university in the USA who agreed to participate in exchange for partial fulfillment of an experimental research requirement. The age of participants ranged from 18 to 21 years. Participants took part in the study either individually or in pairs.

### Experimental Design and Procedure

We utilized a 2 (Target couple configuration: man-more-inhibited, woman-more-inhibited; a between subjects factor) × 2 (Target gender: male, female; a within subjects factor) repeated measures design. Each participant was escorted to a room equipped with a television and VCR and learned that they would be watching a brief video segment of a heterosexual

married couple being interviewed. They also learned that after the video, they would be rating both spouses on a series of scales. Participants then watched one of two videos.

### The Videos

The material from the videos was drawn from actual interviews of married couples conducted by Swann et al. (2003). One spouse in the interviews was verbally disinhibited while the other spouse was verbally inhibited. The interviewer asked spouses to describe two conflicts. The first conflict involved the spouse and someone other than their partner (e.g., a friend, coworker, family member, etc); the second conflict involved the spouse and partner. Spouses described the conflict, its cause, and how they dealt with it.

From the entire pool of conflicts, we selected four in an effort to rule out the possibility that our findings might be limited to one or two specific conflicts. We chose conflicts that met three conditions. First, it should be representative of the entire pool of conflicts. Second, one participant in the conflict should clearly be verbally dominant over the other. Third, there should be no cues that would make it implausible for the male and female participants to switch roles (i.e., we eliminated conflicts that included references to gender-specific activities, such as playing football or having a "girl's night out"). Transcripts of the four conflicts were made and recorded on one of two videos. Participants viewed one or the other video in its entirety.

#### *Verbally Disinhibited Video*

In the disinhibited video, the disinhibited target discussed a conflict between himself or herself and a family member in which the family member became insulted. The second conflict, between the individual and the individual's partner, consisted of an argument in which the disinhibiter's partner chose to balance the checkbook instead of getting ready to leave and, as a result, the couple was late for an engagement.

#### *Verbally Inhibited Video*

In the first inhibited video, the inhibitor discussed a conflict between himself or herself and a faculty member. The inhibitor described how the actions of the faculty member, whom the inhibitor knew well and felt close to, made the inhibitor very angry, but the inhibitor chose not to say anything or to address the conflict. The second inhibited conflict between the individual and the individual's partner, described an instance in which the couple was together in the kitchen. The inhibitor became frustrated and angry, but instead of saying anything, the inhibitor tossed down a dishtowel and left the room.

**Table 1** Participants' ratings of likeability based on the verbal configuration of the couple being rated.

Couple type	Mean	Standard Error
Man-more-inhibited <sup>a</sup>	2.54	.10
Woman-more-inhibited <sup>a</sup>	2.85	.10

Likeability ratings are based on the average ratings of likeability and desirability of friendship,  $\alpha=.7$ . Endpoints range from 1 (least descriptive) to 5 (most descriptive).

<sup>a</sup>Means are significantly different,  $p<0.05$ .

In the man-more-inhibited video, the female actor played the role of the disinhibited wife and the male actor played the role of the inhibited husband for all four conflicts. In the woman-more-inhibited video, the actors switched roles so that the female actor played the inhibited wife and the male confederate played the disinhibited husband for all four conflicts. After viewing the entire video, participants rated each actor's overall competence, likeability and desirability as a friend.

### Measure

On 5 point scales ranging from 1 (least descriptive) to 5 (most descriptive), participants rated both the husband's and the wife's: (a) competence; (b) likeability; and (c) desirability as a friend. Ratings of perceived likeability and desirability as friend measures were highly correlated ( $r=.70$ ), prompting us to combine them into a composite "perceived likeability" measure. This procedure therefore yielded two separate indices of each of the two fundamental dimensions of other interpersonal impressions, (1) perceived competence and (2) likeability (Fiske et al. 2002).

### Results

We anticipated that observers would rate the actors portraying a man-more-inhibited couple having a conflict more negatively than participants who viewed the same actors portraying a woman-more-inhibited couple having precisely the same conflict and saying precisely the same things. We also predicted that the male actor in man-more-inhibited relationships would be seen as less competent than men in woman-more-inhibited relationships. At the same time, because women are not expected to hold positions of dominance (e.g., Eagly 1987), we predicted that women in women more inhibited couples would not suffer lower ratings of competence than women in man-more-inhibited couples.

To test these predictions, we conducted a 2 (couple configuration, between subjects)  $\times$  2 (sex of spouse, a within subjects factor)  $\times$  2 (likeability, competence, a repeated measures factor) repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA). Consistent with our predictions, a significant

three-way interaction emerged,  $F(1, 93)=15.85$ ,  $p<.01$ ;  $\eta_p^2 = .146$ . A separate ANOVA was also conducted to test for observer sex effects. Contrary to concerns that observer sex may have interacted with perceptions of likeability or competence, there was neither a significant effect of observer sex ( $F(1, 91)=1.988$ ,  $p=.162$ ) nor a significant interaction between observer sex, couple configuration, sex of spouse and the likeability and competence measures ( $F(1, 91)=1.343$ ,  $p=.250$ ). To interpret the prior three-way interaction, we conducted the independent analyses of competence and likeability ratings discussed below.

### Perceived Likeability

It was predicted that members of the woman-more-inhibited couple would be rated as more likeable than members of the man-more-inhibited couple. The predicted main effect of couple configuration emerged, such that members of the man-more-inhibited couple ( $M=2.54$ ,  $SE=.10$ ) were rated as less likeable than members of the woman-more-inhibited couple ( $M=2.85$ ,  $SE=.10$ ). A 2 (couple configuration, between subjects)  $\times$  2 (sex of spouse, within subjects) ANOVA indicated that the main effect of couple configuration was significant,  $F(1, 93)=5.35$ ,  $p=.02$ ;  $\eta_p^2 = .054$ . No other main or interaction effects emerged in this analysis. See Table 1.

### Perceived Competence

It was predicted that the disinhibited husband would be rated as more competent than all other targets. Consistent with this prediction, a 2 (couple configuration, between subjects)  $\times$  2 (sex of spouse, a within subjects factor) ANOVA revealed the predicted interaction between couple configuration and sex of the spouse,  $F(1, 93)=6.68$ ,  $p=.01$ ;  $\eta_p^2 = .067$ . In the woman-more-inhibited condition, the disinhibited husband was rated as significantly more competent ( $M=3.70$ ,  $SE=.13$ ) than his inhibited wife ( $M=3.17$ ,  $SE=.14$ ),  $F(1, 93)=8.12$ ,  $p<.01$ . In addition, the disinhibited husband in the woman-more-inhibited condi-

**Table 2** Participants' ratings of competence based on the verbal inhibition of the spouses.

Couple type	Sex of target	Mean	Standard Error
Man-more-inhibited	Wife	3.35	.14
	Husband	3.21	.13
Woman-more-inhibited	Wife	3.17	.14
	Husband <sup>a</sup>	3.70	.13

Endpoints range from 1 (least descriptive) to 5 (most descriptive).

<sup>a</sup>The disinhibited husband was rated as significantly more competent than all other targets,  $p<.05$ . None of the other comparisons were significantly different.

tion was also seen as more competent than the inhibited husband ( $M=3.21$ ,  $SE=.13$ ),  $F(1, 93)=7.01$ ,  $p<.01$ , and the disinhibited wife ( $M=3.35$ ,  $SE=.14$ ),  $F(1, 93)=3.79$ ,  $p=.05$  in the man-more-inhibited condition. Furthermore, as predicted, in the man-more-inhibited condition, the inhibited husband and disinhibited wife were seen as equally competent,  $F(1, 93)=.57$ ,  $p=.45$ . See Table 2.

## Discussion

Our results show that silence is more golden for women than men. Participants in our research were relatively disparaging in their ratings toward actors when they portrayed members of man-more-inhibited couples as compared to women-more-inhibited couples. Even though participants witnessed the same actors engaging in the same behaviors, our findings suggest that participants' perceptions were based primarily on the fit between gender and the level of verbal dominance. That is, the gender role expectations of the participants seems to have lead observers to dislike members of couples whose behaviors appeared to challenge traditional gender roles—namely man-more-inhibited couples. In addition, participants imputed relatively low levels of competence to men in man-more-inhibited couples, comparable to the levels of competence imputed to the actor playing the wife and lower than the level of competence imputed to men in more traditional relationships.

Our evidence of the relatively low levels of competence imputed to men in man-more-inhibited relationships is reminiscent of Galinsky et al.'s (2003) evidence that participants placed in positions of power were more likely to act in a disinhibited manner and to direct their actions toward the attainment of some goal. This raises the possibility of a rival interpretation of our findings: perhaps verbally inhibited men in our study were perceived as less competent because inhibited men actually are less powerful and competent than their relatively disinhibited peers. If verbal disinhibition is routinely correlated with power and competence, however, then the verbally disinhibited wife who was angry at her husband for making them late to an engagement should have been perceived as more competent than the verbally inhibited wife who threw down a dishtowel in anger instead of talking to her husband. They were not, thus diminishing the plausibility of this rival explanation and buttressing the plausibility of our notion that inhibited men were perceived as less competent because their lack of verbal dominance violated gender role expectancies.

Looking more specifically to gender-driven expectations in intimate communication, Robey et al. (1998) have reported that men and women differ primarily in their perception of status and intimacy related cues in communication, with men being particularly attuned to non-explicit messages related to status. This raises the possibility that men

should be especially attuned to the role violation of verbally disinhibited female targets and thus particularly apt to derogate them. This gender difference did not emerge in our data, suggesting that prejudice against relatively disinhibited women may be shared by all members of our society.

The present findings have important implications for other types of relationships that violate conventional expectations. Lehmiller and Agnew (2006) have reported that members of marginalized relationships, such as interracial, same-sex and age-gap pairings, report lower levels of relationship commitment and perception of relationship alternatives. Such persons, however, do not suffer from the relatively low levels of relationships satisfaction reported by those involved in man-more-inhibited relationships (Swann et al. 2003). Although researchers have yet to address the commitment and perceptions of relationship alternatives held by members in man-more-inhibited relationships, it does seem a promising line of research to examine the dynamics within these two types of expectancy violating couples.

The results of the current study provide several additional directions for future research on intimate relationships. For instance, Burger and Milardo (1995) have theorized that couples may work to increase their number of friends as a way to maintain the amount of social support necessary to sustain their relationship. In support of this reasoning, Agnew et al. (2001) found that the number of joint friends a couple has is positively associated with measurements of commitment, satisfaction and investment in their relationship. Our evidence that participants were relatively uninterested in striking up a friendship with members of man-more-inhibited couples is therefore troubling, as it implies that members of man-more-inhibited couples may have fewer joint friends, and therefore a smaller social support network. If the social support network of members of man-more-inhibited couples is compromised, they may find that they have no one to turn to when they encounter difficulties, thus diminishing the resilience of the relationship.

## Limitations

To be sure, the present study leaves open many directions for future research, some of which undoubtedly follow from limitations, which we now turn to. First, participants in our study were making judgments of targets that they had never met. This is because we wanted to make certain that other confounding variables were not influencing the perceptions' of observers. For instance, because man-more-inhibited relationships have been documented as having poor relationship quality, individuals who rated members of these couples disparagingly could have been doing so because they perceived them as being less effectual at maintaining a satisfying relationship, not because they violated gender roles. Although this tighter level of control

allows us to be more certain that gender role violations are driving this effect, it is nonetheless unclear that these findings would generalize to friends of relationship partners. Future research should address whether or not this same pattern of findings is observed among friends of such pairings, and also if any effects of their disapproval are carried over into their friendships.

The second limitation stems from our lack of a comparison condition in which members of the target couple were similar in their levels of verbal inhibition. The lack of this comparison condition means that it is unclear whether participants were punishing members of the man-more-inhibited relationship for violating gender roles or if they were rewarding members of woman-more-inhibited relationships for adhering to gender roles. This is another question for future research to address.

Despite these limitations, the present study adds to our understanding of the role gender role expectancies may play in the realm of close relationships. As Lehmillier and Agnew (2006) note, "...we know virtually nothing about the implications of such negativity (e.g., prejudice) when directed at people's close relationships (p 40)." Such statements underscore the importance of the present research.

## Conclusions

The results of our investigation suggest that Frankie Valli's hit song, "Silence is Golden" might have been more appropriately sung by a woman. That is, across the board, members of man-more-inhibited couples were seen as both less likeable and less competent than verbally disinhibited men. These findings are especially troubling as both men and women gave negative ratings to gender role violators equally. It appears then, that in order to gain the approval of others, even within the confines of their own relationships, the advice we should be giving women is to be seen and not heard. Apparently, although Frankie Valli may be passé, the gender roles that colored people's perceptions then are still alive today.

**Acknowledgements** We thank Peter Glick, Alan Marwine and Richard Slatcher for helpful comments on an earlier version of this manuscript. This research was supported by a grant from the National Institutes of Mental Health MH57455 to William B. Swann, Jr.

## References

- Agnew, C. R., Loving, T. J., & Drigotas, S. M. (2001). Substituting the forest for the trees: Social networks and the prediction of romantic relationship state and fate. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 1042–1057.
- Appleton, H. L., & Gurwitz, S. B. (1976). Willingness to help as determined by sex-role appropriateness of the help-seeker's goals. *Sex Roles, 2*, 321–329.
- Berndt, T. J., & Heller, K. A. (1986). Gender stereotypes and social inferences: A developmental study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*, 889–898.
- Burger, E., & Milardo, R. M. (1995). Marital interdependence and social networks. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 12*, 403–415.
- Carli, L. L. (1990). Gender, language, & influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 941–951.
- Carli, L. L., LaFleur, S. J., & Loeber, C. C. (1995). Nonverbal behavior, gender, and influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 1030–1041.
- Chartrand, T. L., & Bargh, J. A. (1999). The chameleon effect: The perception-behavior link and social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*, 893–910.
- Costrich, N., Feinstein, J., Kidder, L., Maracek, J., & Pascale, L. (1975). When stereotypes hurt: Three studies of penalties for sex role reversals. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 11*, 520–530.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 878–902.
- Galinsky, A. D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Magee, J. C. (2003). From power to action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 453–466.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1999). Sexism and other 'isms': Interdependence, status, and the ambivalent content of stereotypes. In W. B. Swann, J. H. Langlois, & L. A. Gilbert (Eds.), *Sexism and stereotypes in modern society: The gender science of Janet Taylor Spence* (pp. 193–221). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist, 56*, 109–118.
- Lehmillier, J. J., & Agnew, C. R. (2006). Marginalized relationships: The impact of social disapproval on romantic relationship commitment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 40–51.
- Lobel, T. E., Mashraki\_Pedhazur, S., Mantzur, A., & Libby, S. (2000). Gender discrimination as a function of stereotypic and counter-stereotypic behavior: A cross-cultural study. *Sex Roles, 43*, 395–406.
- Pratto, F., & Espinoza, P. (2001). Gender, ethnicity, and power. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 763–780.
- Robey, E. B., Canary, D. J., & Burggraf, C. S. (1998). Marriage and conversational maintenance. In D. J. Canary and K. Dindia (Eds.), *Sex differences and similarities in communication: Critical essays and empirical investigations of sex and gender in interaction*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Swann, W. B. Jr., McClarty, K. L., & Rentfrow, P. J. (2007). Shelter from the storm? Stress-reduction impairments in precarious couples. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* (in press).
- Swann, W. B. Jr., & Rentfrow, P. J. (2001). Blirtatiousness: Cognitive, behavioral and physiological consequences of rapid responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 1160–1175.
- Swann, W. B. Jr., Rentfrow, J. R., & Gosling, S. G. (2003). The precarious couple effect: Verbally inhibited men + critical, disinhibited women = bad chemistry. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 1095–1106.
- Swann, W. B. Jr., Sellers, J. G., & McClarty, K. L. (2006). Tempting today, troubling tomorrow: The roots of the precarious couple effect. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 93–103.
- Tilby, P. J., & Kalin, R. (1980). Effects of sex-role deviant lifestyles in otherwise normal persons on the perception of maladjustment. *Sex Roles, 6*, 581–592.