



This is a repository copy of *EXPRESS: Gender(ed) performances: women's impression management in stand-up comedy*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/193333/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Cook, C., Callahan, J.L., Pollet, T.V. et al. (1 more author) (2024) *EXPRESS: Gender(ed) performances: women's impression management in stand-up comedy*. *Human Relations*, 77 (4). pp. 533-559. ISSN 0018-7267

<https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267221137996>

Cook, C., Callahan, J. L., Pollet, T. V., & Elliott, C. (2022). *EXPRESS: Gender(ed) performances: Women's impression management in stand-up comedy*. *Human Relations*. Copyright © 2022 The Author(s). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267221137996> Article available under the terms of the CC-BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

human relations

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

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Journal: | <i>Human Relations</i> |
| Manuscript ID | Draft |
| Manuscript Type: | Standard Manuscript |
| Keywords: | Impression Management, work behavior, Comedy, Gender, Feminism |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

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

Women in male dominated careers often face perceptions of role misfit, leading them to engage in impression management. Using a mixed-methods, observational approach, we investigate if women stand-up comedians present as female gendered at work and the relationship between gendered presentation and observer response in two settings - one diverse (N=843) and one male dominated (N=257). Women, as compared to men, presented more female gendered in the diverse setting and less female gendered in the male dominated setting. A relationship between gendered presentation and observer response was evident in one setting for women but not men. Using Lorber's taxonomy of feminisms as a lens, assessment of women's gendered expression further implied greater constraint on women in the male dominated, compared to the diverse, setting. Our findings support and extend Roberts' theory of social-identity based impression management (SIM) in the novel context of stand-up comedy and refine the theory by presenting a fifth SIM strategy. These findings have implications for impression management research and theory as well as practice focused on promoting equality and diversity in the workplace.

Keywords: Impression management; work behavior; feminism; comedians; gender

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

Occupational gender segregation is an enduring characteristic of the labor market (Torre, 2017). Despite greater numbers of women gaining access to male dominated job roles, high attrition rates ensure a largely stable gender ratio in these roles and that entrenched, rather narrow, conceptions of the characteristics of a successful job incumbent persist (England, 2010; Hustad, Bandholtz, Hertlitz and Dekhtyar, 2020; Tasabehji, Harding, Lee and Dominguez-Pery, 2021; Torre, 2017). Thus, women in male dominated occupations experience perceptions of misfit and a consequent motivation to manage the image they present at work (Banks and Milestone, 2011; Faulkner, 2009; Kenny and Donnelly, 2020).

Due to its association with social acceptance and career success, presenting a viable professional image is a key occupational concern (Banks and Milestone, 2011; Berdahl, 2007; Bourgoin and Harvey, 2018; Ibarra, 1999; Faulkner, 2009; Robert, 2005; Schlenker, 2003). Consequently, individuals invest a great deal of energy into managing impressions, and those from marginalized groups – including women in male dominated professions – face additional pressure; to manage social as well as personal characteristics (Bennett, Hennekam, Macarthur, Hope and Goh, 2017; He and Kang, 2019; Heizmann and Liu, 2020; Roberts, 2005). A rapidly growing literature has explored the ways in which women in male dominated roles present themselves at work, towards constructing a role-fitting workplace image, usually in STEM and professional careers.

Despite well documented inequalities in the performance arts, there has been a notable dearth of empirical study of women in this arena, and little in the wider arts (e.g., Bennett et al., 2017). However, we argue that the performance arts represent an important area for study, not just because of the lack of existing research. Indeed, presenting a role fitting image requires performance skill. Therefore, study of those most likely to have mastered this skill to the level of an art form should best enable assessment of its subtleties

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 and extremes thus allowing for more comprehensive assessment of existing theory and better
4
5 understanding of the strategies employed by women.
6

7
8 Furthermore, image cultivation is a particularly long-standing, pervasive and
9
10 reportedly inevitable phenomenon in the performance arts, to the extent that some successful
11
12 women report challenges to their sense of authenticity and publicly reject their contrived
13
14 images (e.g. Cameron, cited in Sherman, 2021). Thus, this arena should provide a fertile
15
16 ground to further study the extremes. More importantly, if we accept Bertolt Brecht's
17
18 assertion that art serves to shape reality, studying performance art can also generate deeper
19
20 understanding of probable ways in which women's impression management may develop in
21
22 other careers.
23
24

25
26 Stand-up comedy represents an appropriate corner of the performance arts for such
27
28 study. With the growth of stand-up, the late 1980s saw greater numbers of women entering
29
30 the profession. However, women still only represent 27.4% of UK comedy circuit comedians
31
32 and work against a backdrop of male norms and widespread belief that women are innately
33
34 unfunny (Chortle, 2020; Shouse and Opplinger, 2014). Hence, it would be expected that
35
36 presenting a viable professional image is a key concern for these women, particularly given
37
38 the precarious nature of many comedians' employment (Butler and Russell, 2018). In
39
40 addition, the public nature of comedians' work enables assessment of much of their behavior
41
42 and observer responses, making the profession of comedy amenable for study.
43
44
45

46
47 Therefore, this study investigates the extent to which women stand-up comedians
48
49 present as female gendered¹ at work and the relationship between gendered presentation and
50
51

52
53 ¹ We acknowledge the contested nature of gender identity and the problematics of using gendered binaries of
54
55 'men' and 'women'; however, following Judith Butler (1993, as cited in Lorber, 2005) we use the concept of
56
57 'womanhood' tactically to provide a stable analytic category of one important identity that women comedians
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

observer response in two settings. We enhance our understanding by undertaking further exploration into how women comedians express their gender at work. Our work demonstrates how Roberts' (2005) strategies of social-identity based impression management (SIM) can be operationalized through categories of feminisms (Lorber, 2005). Our contribution to the body of knowledge is to both extend and refine Roberts' (2005) theory by demonstrating how the theory manifests at the level of a profession and by identifying a fifth impression management strategy that women use, which we call "un-categorization."

Professional image construction

In an attempt to improve perceived fit, professional image construction research indicates that individuals act to shape others' perceptions of them at work (Giacalone and Rosenfeld, 1991; He and Kang; 2019; Ibarra, 1999; Robert, 2005; Schlenker, 2003). Broadly, the process involves impression monitoring (assessment of alignment between how one believes they are viewed and the perceived ideal), motivation (drive to increase alignment) and impression construction (action to manage perceived misalignment and present a "desirable" image; Leary and Kowalski, 1990; Roberts, 2005). Consequently, in situations where the boundaries of what is considered ideal are not established, are unclear or are wide, misfit is less likely to be judged and individuals have little need to engage in image construction, unless there is a distinct reward for doing so (Roberts, 2005). However, when there is a clear ideal, or even an accepted usual, individuals are more mindful of how they present themselves.

Traditionally, professional image construction scholars have focused on the management of personal attribute characteristics including appearance, verbal and non-verbal

hold. Given the varying nature of gender identity content, we define female gendered as any expression of womanhood (Becker and Wagner, 2009).

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 indicators of role suitability (Little, Major, Hinojosa and Nelson, 2015). Roberts' (2005)
4
5 broadening of the framework to include social identity-based impression management (SIM)
6
7 acknowledges the challenges marginalized groups – including women in male dominated
8
9 roles - face in their working life as a result of unfavorable, although reportedly improving,
10
11 stereotypes and narrow conceptions of the ideal (e.g., Koch et al., 2014). To avoid unhelpful
12
13 categorization, individuals seek to present themselves such that they manage others'
14
15 perceptions of their social identity group affiliations in line with the perceived characteristics
16
17 of a competent job incumbent (Roberts, 2005).
18
19
20

21
22 SIM may be undertaken through either down-playing or maintaining the salience of
23
24 marginalized group affiliation, using four strategies (Roberts, 2005). Down-playing may
25
26 involve deemphasizing one's social identity and attempting to associate with a more accepted
27
28 group, for example through adopting the mannerisms or discussing topics of concern to the
29
30 target group (assimilation strategy). Alternatively, individuals who acknowledge their social
31
32 identities personally may seek to avoid disclosing them to others, for example by avoiding
33
34 personal topics in conversations or using pseudonyms (deategorization strategy)
35
36 Maintaining salience is generally aimed at restoring positive distinction to the maligned
37
38 group and, by extension, the individual (Roberts, 2005). To this end, strategies include
39
40 emphasizing the positive characteristics of one's group (integration strategy), for example, by
41
42 discussing these openly with other others and capitalizing on accepted stereotypes
43
44 (confirmation strategy). Amongst women, such confirmation may involve enacting a
45
46 mothering or flirtatious style when interacting with others. Thus, individuals could seek to
47
48 dissociate from their group memberships and blend in or openly present these and stand out
49
50 (Lynch and Rodell, 2018; Roberts, 2005).
51
52
53
54

55
56 There is well-established evidence of women openly presenting their gender identity
57
58 in male dominated contexts (e.g., Connell, 2009; Harris and Giuffre, 2010; Heizmann and
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 Liu, 2020; Kenny and Donnelly, 2020). However, disassociation through presentations of
4 maleness or gender neutrality and suppression of femaleness are nevertheless frequent and
5 are more likely when demographic homogeneity is apparent amongst those in power and
6 divergence from the norm is unwelcomed (Creed and Scully, 2000; Ely, 1995; Kaiser and
7 Miller, 2001). Similar to members of maligned, invisible social identity groups, those with
8 aspirations of success in male dominated careers often choose not to present themselves as
9 women when possible (Clair, Beatty and Maclean, 2005; Lynch and Rodell, 2018). In other
10 words, women may find themselves ‘doing’ gender differently to meet role expectations
11 (Mavin and Grandy, 2012). Tactics include avoiding disclosure of revealing information
12 (e.g., incongruent experiences, language cues and forenames) and fabricating a male identity
13 (e.g., use of pseudonym) in written communication (Bennett, Hennekam, Macarthur, Hope,
14 and Goh, 2017; He and Kang, 2019).

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

In face-to-face interactions, disassociation generally involves adopting stereotypically male patterns of behavior and in-group distancing. Indeed, women seeking employment and those who work in male dominated roles tend to present themselves as equally or more masculine compared to men and display patterns of behavior generally perceived as male as a strategy to navigate conflicting sex-role expectations (Mavin, 2008; Sasson-Levy, 2003). Furthermore, internalized gender hierarchies catalyze manufactured distinctions amongst women, leading some to avoid interactions with female colleagues (Mavin, 2008; Wright, 2016). These internalized gender hierarchies and conflicting sex-role expectations create double binds for women that constrain their behaviors within male-dominated power structures (Mavin, 2008; Mavin and Grandy, 2018). Feminist strategies are one means that women employ to manage this power inequality (Ahmed, 2017; Lorber, 1994).

Women and stand-up comedy

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

Historically, stand-up comedy developed in burlesque houses and working men's clubs, neither of which provided an accepting audience for female comedy performers (Bore, 2010; Sochen, 1991). Therefore, women were effectively excluded from the early shaping of live comedy, leaving men to determine stand-up norms. This heritage is evident in modern stand-up comedy clubs which have been described as 'unnecessarily androcentric', requiring comedians to present a less conversational, more aggressive style than is generally associated with female behavioral preferences (Shouse and Opplinger, 2014; Weisberg, DeYoung and Hirsh, 2011).

With regard to the focus of comedy, there are similar challenges. Perhaps unsurprisingly given the androcentric nature of many clubs, comedy centered on women's personal experience is frequently criticized as not having a broad enough audience appeal here (Dickinson, Higgins, St. Pierre, Solomon and Zwagerman, 2013).

While still male dominated, there is some evidence that the job of stand-up comedian is becoming less male centric and more welcoming of women. At least two national comedy clubs based in the UK have instituted policies ensuring a minimum of one woman be included on every bill and woman centered comedy is being promoted on major comedy circuits (Healy, 2020). In addition, recent research based in one of the UK's two preeminent comedy clubs, demonstrated that a less aggressive style of delivery was associated with effective performance (Authors, 2020). Indeed, while assertiveness was still judged to be important, comedians were expected to present as more easy-going than angry and only slightly more aggressive than meek to be effective. Furthermore, affirmative action initiatives provide wider opportunities for women who work as stand-up comedians outside of the comedy circuit (e.g., Thorpe, 2014).

In addition, the rise of arts festivals, solo theater shows, and television stand-up provides opportunities for women to perform comedy in situations that are not always male

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 dominated. At the former, comedy often takes place alongside other performance art forms
4 meaning that, while festival comedians are majority male, there is greater gender diversity
5 amongst performers as a whole and amongst audience members (Chortle, 2020, EdFringe,
6 2019). In these settings, women have performed female gendered comedy to great acclaim.
7
8 For example, comedians Iliza Shlesinger and Sarah Millican explicitly present a female
9 identity and openly center their comedy on stereotypical women's issues, frequently framing
10 those topics from a feminist perspective. However, it is unclear the extent to which
11 comedians at the grass roots, either on the comedy circuit or in less male dominated settings,
12 have followed suit.

Methodology

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 The three studies presented in this paper used a mixed method/methodology design to
27 investigate media from two comedy settings – an arts festival and a comedy club, selected for
28 both their similarity and difference. The settings are similar in that both attract comedians of
29 varying expertise and offer career enhancement opportunities: the festival is attended by
30 industry scouts and critics while the comedy club provides performance footage which
31 comedians can use for self-promotion and has an unmatched online presence. A key
32 difference between the two settings is the level of gender diversity amongst performers and
33 audience members, with diversity being higher at the festival (Chortle, 2019; EdFringe,
34 2019).

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 To assess the extent to which women present as female gendered, studies one and two
48 took a comparative approach. Study one compared gendered presentation amongst women in
49 published, one-person festival show descriptions and Study two compared gendered
50 presentation in comedy club performances to the industry standard (male comedians). In line
51 with our focus on gender, irrespective of gender identity content (Becker and Wagner, 2009),
52 both studies employed content neutral measures of gendered presentation. However, the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 different media used in each study, necessitated varied methods for quantifying gendered
4
5 presentation. The show descriptions, over 99% of which were written in the third person,
6
7 provide a brief show overview, were word limited and abided by standard grammatical rules.
8
9
10 Consequently, they were most amenable to frequency counts. To this end, we applied He and
11
12 Kang's (2019) findings, which identified two types of content neutral, gender revealing
13
14 communication – self-describing language and gender-specific topics (experiences, hobbies
15
16 and interests) - used in employment seeking situations. Therefore, raters recorded gendered
17
18 self-describing language and gender-specific comedy topics. However, given the wide range
19
20 of topics considered acceptable for discussion in comedy compared to the traditional
21
22 workplace, the gender-specific topics recorded in Study one were not restricted to
23
24 experiences, hobbies and interests.
25
26
27

28
29 Conversely, the comedy performances represent a comedian's nuanced exploration of
30
31 themselves and topics of interest to them, and were delivered in the first person,
32
33 grammatically complex, varied in length and challenging to parse into their component parts.
34
35 Therefore, we took a more wholistic approach. Through consideration of the topics covered,
36
37 how comedians self-described or, given the reduced need for self-description in face-to-face
38
39 situations, how the rater would describe the comedian's on-stage persona, raters assessed
40
41 gendered presentation using an adapted psychometric scale.
42
43
44

45
46 To assess response to gendered presentation, we utilized the available observer
47
48 responses (critics, club audiences and online viewers). Finally, to gain understanding of how
49
50 women expressed their gender, we selected the most strongly gendered performances from
51
52 Studies one and two for qualitative investigation (Study three). To facilitate methodological
53
54 integration, one rater with both quantitative and qualitative expertise took part in all three
55
56 studies (Bryman, 2007). The overviews below provide details of the methods and results of
57
58 each study. The data that support the findings of this study are openly available in OSF at
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

<http://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/S6UBY>. The quantitative analyses were conducted in R 4.0.2 (R Development core team, 2008).

Study one

Setting

In Study one we focused our investigation at the 2019 Edinburgh Fringe Festival. The Fringe Festival usually runs annually for three weeks in August offering comedy, dance, theater and music performances. While comedy at the Fringe is acknowledged to be male dominated, approximately equal proportion of men and women perform at the Fringe, across performance categories (EdFringe, 2019)

Procedure

Each year, Edinburgh Fringe performers are invited to provide a show description of up to 250 words to the Festival's official bookings website—edfringe.com. Show descriptions follow a reasonably uniform format of introducing the comedian, outlining their comedy topics and, sometimes, presenting previous reviews. The show descriptions depict how performers choose to present themselves and their work and, given the word limit, arguably what they consider the defining, marketable characteristics of themselves and their show. We searched the 2019 Edinburgh Fringe Festival website for single performer comedy shows and identified 843 comedians' descriptions of their show for inclusion in Study one.

Gender was recorded by two raters based on the use of gendered language referring to the comedian, registered name and profile photograph within each show listing. There was no instance where any of these criteria were contradictory, within a single show description. Gender ratings were verified by consulting Chortle.com, the comedy industry's most comprehensive database of comedians which listed 43.3% of those in our sample, exceeding Tractenberg, Yumoto, Jin and Morris (2010) verification criteria. Raters achieved 100% agreement on gender across the descriptions and 100% agreement with Chortle.com. To

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 assess gendered presentation, two raters worked independently to record gendered self-
4 description and gender-specific topics within the show descriptions.
5
6

7
8 Edinburgh shows are reviewed by specialist and national publications. Critics
9
10 commonly use a 1-5 star metric to quantify show quality. We identified seven prolific review
11 publications which used this common metric. Our search of the publications' websites
12 identified between 76 and 215 reviews per publication of the shows in our sample.
13
14
15

Sample

16
17
18 There were 242 descriptions which featured comedians who we identified as women
19 (coded as 0) and 601 comedians who we identified as men (coded as 1). This represents a
20 very slight overrepresentation of women (28.7%) compared to industry figures at the time
21 (27.4%; Chortle, 2019).
22
23
24
25
26
27

Measures

28
29
30
31 *Gendered self-description.* The number of same sex gendered nouns and pronouns
32 used to refer to the comedian were recorded. Inter-rater reliability was calculated via
33 Krippendorff's alpha with a 1,000 bootstraps (Hayes and Krippendorff, 2007). The measures
34 showed very good reliabilities for gendered nouns ($\alpha = .750$) and gendered pronouns ($\alpha =$
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42 .933) for referring to oneself.

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Gender specific topics. Gender specific topics were defined as those which related to
the experience of a particular gender that would unlikely be experienced by individuals
outside of that gender and hence revealed gender. The number of same sex gendered topics
previewed in each show description was recorded. For example, experiencing male-pattern
baldness was coded as same sex gendered for men, while experiencing cervical screening
was coded as same sex gendered for women. Inter-rater reliability was very good for coding
of same gender topics ($\alpha = .767$).

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

Observer response. We recorded the star ratings (minimum=1, maximum = 5) attributed by the seven identified publications, to each of the shows reviewed that was included in our sample.

Analytical strategy

We rely on ordinal association measures for most of our analyses as most values were constrained between 0 and 6 (Somers' D) (Siegel and Castellan, 1988; Somers, 1962).

Somers' D can range between -1 and 1, like Pearson r .

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 about 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 about here]

The impact of gendered self-description and topics on reviewer responses

We split the analyses by gender and by publication. For both men and women there were no meaningful associations between either gendered pronoun or gendered noun use for describing oneself and ratings given by publications (all CIs include 0).

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 For women, there was a negative association between the number of same gender
4 topics discussed and ratings in one publication; EdFestmag (Somers' $D = -.314$, 95% CI: -
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

For women, there was a negative association between the number of same gender topics discussed and ratings in one publication; EdFestmag (Somers' $D = -.314$, 95% CI: $-.556$ to $-.072$). Yet, for two other publications, there was a positive association between the number of same gender topics discussed and ratings for women (Three weeks: Somers' $D = .365$, 95% CI: $.007$ to $.724$; Skinny: Somers' $D = .237$, 95% CI: $.004$ to $.469$). The remaining four publications showed no meaningful associations (all CIs include 0). For men, there were no meaningful associations between the number of same gender topics discussed and ratings for any of the seven publications (all CIs include 0).

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

Since there was no relationship between any review score and gendered presentation amongst men, our data suggests that men were able to vary their genderedness without impact on their career. Thus, other factors, such as quality of their performance, were likely to be a greater determinant of review score amongst men. For women, however, mention of

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

female gendered topics was related to review success in three out of seven publications. That for two out of these three publications there was a positive relationship (and for four there was no relationship) with review score indicates increased female gendered presentation was more likely to contribute, rather than be an obstacle, to positive reception by observers. However, the negative relationship between number of topics and review score in the final publication and the inconsistency across publications suggests a mixed response to female gendered presentation.

Study two

Setting

Within Study two, we focused our investigation in one of the UK's most successful comedy clubs and most prolific producer of weekly shows and online content. The comedy club is usually open five nights a week, running multiple shows at the weekend. Typical of most UK comedy clubs and reflective of the gender split in comedy, the majority of performers are male.

Procedure

We identified 257 unedited recordings of comedians performing in front of a live audience between 2018 and 2020 posted by the comedy club on their YouTube channel for inclusion in our sample. Although publicly available, we sought permission from the club to view the recordings for research purposes and confirmation that the footage had not been altered or edited, which the club confirmed.

Two raters recorded gender based on the use of gendered language referring to the comedian, registered name and appearance. There was no instance where any of these criteria were contradictory within a single recording. Gender ratings were also verified by consulting Chortle.com, which listed 48.6% of those in our sample, exceeding Tractenberg et al.'s

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

(2010) verification criteria. Raters achieved 100% agreement on gender identity across the descriptions and 100% agreement with Chortle.com.

These two raters also viewed the recordings and assessed gendered presentation within the performances. In addition, two industry experts rated audience responses. The experts were experienced, award winning comedians who each had more than 15 years tenure in the comedy industry.

Sample

There were 80 recordings that featured comedians who we identified as women (coded as 0) and 177 featured comedians who we identified as men (coded as 1). The length of the recordings for men and women (mean lengths were 9.20 and 8.99 minutes respectively) were not significantly different ($t(256) = -.454, p = .650$).

Measures

Gendered presentation. As we were not able to identify an existing identity content neutral measure (Becker and Wagner, 2009), we adapted the Traditional Masculinity-Femininity (TMF; Kachel, Steffens and Niedlich, 2016) scale to assess the genderedness of comedians' presentation as revealed through their comedy topics, self-description and persona. The TMF comprises six items with a seven-point response scale (1= very masculine, 7= very feminine), demonstrates high internal consistency ($\alpha = .94$) and a clear factor structure (Kachel, Steffens and Niedlich, 2016). We made minor alterations to the items to make the scale suitable for observer rating. In addition, the response scale anchors were replaced with 'very female' and 'very male' thus enabling gendered but non-traditionally feminine/masculine presentation (e.g., discussion of women's intimate health issues, feminism, being a 'new age' man) to be rated towards the extreme ends of the rating scale. In the current study, the internal consistency was high (both raters: $\alpha = .98$). Inter-rater reliability was excellent, Krippendorff's alpha = .97. Since both raters were women, which could impact subjective

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 ratings of genderedness, as a means of ratification a male industry expert (not involved in any
4
5 other aspect of the study) undertook the ratings of 25 male and 25 female comedians
6
7 (Tractenberg et al., , 2010). Inter-reliability amongst the three raters was excellent,
8
9 Krippendorff's $\alpha = .98$. Prior to analysis, ratings of the male comedians on the adapted
10
11 TMF were recoded so that a high score denoted high levels of same-sex gendered
12
13 presentation for both men and women.
14
15

16
17 *Observer response.* We employed two measures to assess response. Firstly, for
18
19 audience response, the two industry experts rated the audience during each performance
20
21 using the PANAS-X Joviality scale (Watson and Clark, 1994). The scale comprises eight
22
23 descriptors paired with a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = very slightly or not at all, 5 =
24
25 extremely) and enables assessment of joviality associated positive emotion. The scale
26
27 structure has been replicated across samples and is the most the reliable of the PANAS-X
28
29 lower order scales showing a median internal consistency estimate of .93 (range = .88 to .94).
30
31 In the current study, the reliability was excellent (both raters: $\alpha = .98$). Inter-rater reliability
32
33 fell just outside Krippendorff's (2004) .667 recommendation (Krippendorff's $\alpha = .646$
34
35 but see [OSF document](#) for analyses by rater). Secondly, we recorded YouTube likes and
36
37 dislikes for each performance to give an indication of online response. One performance
38
39 recording became inactive before it could be rated. It is therefore excluded from analyses
40
41 except the associations between gender and the YouTube outcomes.
42
43
44
45
46

Results

Gender differences in presentation.

47
48
49
50
51 Male comedians were rated as presenting themselves as male gendered ($M = 5.69$, SD
52
53 = .48, one sample t -test: $t(175) = 46.79$, $p < .0001$) and female comedians as female gendered
54
55 ($M = 5.40$, $SD = 0.55$, one sample t -test: $t(79) = 22.79$, $p < .0001$). Male comedians were
56
57
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

rated as presenting themselves more gendered than female comedians (Figure X; $t(135.61) = 4.043, p < .0001, \text{Cohen's } d = 0.58$).

[insert Figure 3 about here]

The impact of gendered self-presentation on audience responses

Gender was not significantly related to the expert ratings (Somers' D = .05, 95% CI: -.02 to .11) or to the number of YouTube likes (Somers' D = -.03, 95% CI = -.09 to .04).

Gender was related to the number of dislikes, with men receiving fewer dislikes than women (Somers' D = -.19, 95% CI = -.26 to -.12). Closer inspection with a Zero-Altered Negative Binomial Regression model (Zuur et al., 2009) showed that this association was driven by women being more likely to receive at least one dislike than men did (details on [OSF](#)).

[insert Figure 4 about here]

Genderedness of presentation was not associated with expert ratings of the audience response (all Somers D's 95% confidence intervals overlap with 0) or with YouTube likes or dislikes (all Somers D's 95% confidence intervals overlap with 0) in men or women.

Discussion Study two

Women presented themselves as female gendered on stage. However, 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 may not allow for very high levels of female gendered presentation, requiring women to engage in impression management (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).

With regard to the relationship with observer response, gendered presentation did not impact audience response at the club or online, for either men or women. However, when

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 taken in conjunction with the finding that women present less gendered than men, it may
4
5 imply that women avoid a negative response by curtailing their gendered expression.
6
7
8 Consideration of how women present as female gendered would provide greater clarity on
9
10 this and is investigated in Study three.

Study three

14
15 The qualitative portion for this project, Study three, proceeded after the quantitative
16
17 analysis identified significant differences by gender across the Fringe catalog entries and
18
19 comedy club sets and sought to identify *how* women present as female gendered. The
20
21 qualitative analysis followed an abductive approach to tease out interpretation of patterns
22
23 (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007; Brinkmann, 2014), as opposed to the identification and
24
25 verification of patterns sought with the quantitative portion of this project. Using a post-
26
27 coding strategy (Brinkmann, 2014), two members of the project team first sought to make
28
29 sense of the empirical material. The purpose of abductive qualitative work is not to find ‘the’
30
31 answer; rather, it is an ongoing process in search of mystery (Alvesson and Kärreman, 2007)
32
33 with multiple possible interpretations.
34
35
36

37
38 We began the qualitative portion of the project by undertaking traditional coding for
39
40 thematic topics (Glesne, 2016) presented by women in the Fringe. However, we quickly
41
42 abandoned this approach after watching the videos of comedy club sets. We realized that
43
44 context, tone, and exposition of the performed sets were crucial to understanding how women
45
46 present gender and hence how gender organizes performance (Roulston, 2001). This
47
48 realization shifted us away from analyzing content by topic. Early in our data analysis, we
49
50 also discovered disconfirming cases for using impression management strategies as our
51
52 analytic lens. Thus, we sought a new avenue of inquiry to better understand how gender was
53
54 presented.
55
56
57
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 The common thread for the comedy club sets was a clear feminist intent in the
4 delivery of the material. This new ‘mystery’ that confronted us catalyzed a different analytic
5 approach. Thus, using a post-coding, abductive approach (Brinkmann, 2014), we reanalyzed
6 the entire data set for Study three using Alvesson and Kärreman’s (2007) method of mystery
7 construction which has three components: use of existing theory as an analytic lens, analysis
8 of empirical material through that lens, and application of researcher experience as
9 interpretive tool.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 The theoretical lens we applied is Judith Lorber’s (1997) categories of the gendered
20 social order feminisms. There is no monolithic definition for feminism and there are many
21 schools of feminist thought (Mackay, 2015). Nevertheless, the unifying thread tying these
22 schools together is a recognition of a gender-unequal society with a broad commitment
23 toward a society based on gender equality (Lorber, 2010; Mackay, 2015). To provide analytic
24 structure to this diverse theoretical landscape, Lorber (1997/2010) clusters feminisms by their
25 assumptions about inequality (their theories of gender inequality) and their propositions to
26 pursue equality (their politics). Because Lorber’s classification system provides a framing
27 structure for understanding how various feminist theories operate, it is particularly useful as
28 an exploratory analytic lens for the individual performances of women comedians. As a
29 result, the qualitative component of our study pinpoints the multiplicity of feminisms and
30 how gender is performed.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Lorber offers three categories of feminisms: gender reform, gender resistant, and
48 gender rebellion. Gender reform feminisms capture ideas of equality and individual rights
49 promoted in first- and second-wave feminisms and include liberal, socialist, and postcolonial
50 feminisms (Lorber, 2010). These approaches to feminism generally accept gendered social
51 orders but seek to rid them of discrimination. They hold that men and women should have
52 equal freedom to live their lives as they choose with equal recognition and reward. Gender
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 resistance feminisms (such as standpoint) began to emerge in the 1980s and reject the
4
5 balancing and mainstreaming of reform feminisms. Resistant feminists expose and disrupt
6
7 patriarchy and contend that women's voices and perspectives should be privileged. Gender
8
9 rebellion feminisms—such as postmodern, intersectional, or social construction feminism—
10
11 critique and dismantle structures of domination by rebelling against unequal systems. Rebel
12
13 feminists deconstruct gender binaries and challenge the complicity of 'doing gender' in re-
14
15 creating systems of oppression.
16
17

18
19 Our analysis process was to have the two qualitative experts on the team
20
21 independently review samples from Study one and Study two to interpret the show
22
23 descriptions and comedy sets with respect to Lorber's three categories of the gendered social
24
25 order feminisms. After assessing each description and comedy set according to gender
26
27 reform, resistance, or rebellion, the researchers talked through their analyses to reach a
28
29 common interpretation of the empirical material.
30
31

Sample

32
33
34
35 To qualitatively interpret how women present as female gendered, we drew on
36
37 women from each study. For Study one, we ordered the 242 women by the number of female
38
39 gendered topics included in their show description and alphabetically when the number of
40
41 topics was equal. Next, starting with descriptions including the most topics, analysis was
42
43 undertaken until saturation was achieved equating to 25% (N=60) of the women in the
44
45 sample. However, this did not represent a natural cut-off since 34 descriptions included more
46
47 than one topic and 37 included one topic. One description was no longer available for
48
49 analysis. In total 28.9% (N=70) from Study one were included in the sample for qualitative
50
51 analysis. Expecting to reach saturation at a similar level, we ordered the 80 comedy club
52
53 performances by women in Study two according to the adapted TMF scores. Starting with
54
55 the most female gendered, analysis was then undertaken. Saturation was reached at 18.8%
56
57
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

(N=15). However, to maintain consistency with our saturation level for Study one, we continued analysis until we reached 25% in Study two (N=20).

Findings*Performed presentation.*

In the comedy club sets, *all* of the women 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. There were three women who took a gender resistant approach, and no women used a gender rebellion approach. In the comedy club sets, one woman employed both gender reform and gender resistant strategies in her performance.

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

The remaining videos, all of which incorporated a gender reform approach, had a wide variety of topics. The gendered topics in their sets included sex and sex acts, relationships, marriage and divorce, motherhood, menopause, genitalia, giving birth, body hair, age, wage gaps, and more. The common thread in these sets was women unapologetically asserting their individual rights to say what they wanted to say and how they wanted to say it. This is the essence of gender reform theories of feminism. Included in this group of comedians were women whose sets included raunchy sex jokes, as if they were

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

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

Written presentation.

The majority (N = 171) of the 242 show descriptions written by women for the 2019 Edinburgh Fringe Festival were topically gender-neutral. Of the 70 show descriptions women wrote which were analyzed in Study three (all of which included a gendered topic), 66 covered the full range of Lorber’s feminisms. Some explicitly incorporated more than one type of feminism in their descriptions. We identified 46 comedians who employed gender reform feminisms for their show descriptions; 15 who incorporated gender resistant feminism; and 7 used gender rebellion feminism. Four of the women’s descriptions were feminine, but there was no discernible feminism.

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

[Full name] presents [show name], a romp into femininity, idiocy, foxes and omelettes. [Full name] is a [Nationality]-bred, [Residency]-based comic who's winning hearts across the country with her unique style of offbeat observations, and surreal storytelling. [Last name] is accessibly odd, memorable and not one to miss. [Award] New Comedian finalist. [Award] regional finalist. 'Hugely watchable' (VoiceMag.uk). 'Brilliantly offbeat' (FunnyWomen.com).

This comedian and others who adopted a simply feminine approach conform to stereotypes of being a woman, leveraging “femininity” to appeal to gendered expectations of women (Roberts, 2005). This is consistent with the positive distinction strategy of impression management associated with *confirmation*.

Another comedian employed a gender resistant approach. In this description, the comedian raises the problem of verbal micro-aggressions against women’s appearance:

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 Absolute powershed and regular host of [Podcast name], [Full name] explores her big
4 strong strength. Have you ever watched a feminist try and take '[Show name]' as a
5 compliment? It's like watching a snake eat but funny. In preview, [Show name] was
6 nominated for [Award]. You've seen [shorted forename] in BBC sitcoms [Television
7 show name] and [Television show name] and [Award] Award-winning drama
8 [Television show name]. She's also in forthcoming feature films: [Film name] and
9 [Film name]. She writes for [Television show name] Cats. 'Consistently hilarious'
10 (Fest). 'Smarts on her sleeve, great' (Guardian).

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 Gender resistant comedians like this did not shy away from their identities as women
23 and feminists. This comedian raises her feminism as a strength with a rather gruesome, and
24 masculine, analogy of a snake eating. This juxtaposition of feminine and masculine with an
25 educative orientation aligns well with Roberts' (2005) positive distinction strategy of
26 *integration*.
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

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

[Forename] 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 [Nationality] woman to have fun without being drunk? [Show
name] is a frank and funny show about anxiety, sex and booze – and nearly vomiting
over Noddy Holder. In 2018, [Forename] reached the final of the semi-prestigious
national competition of [Award]. 'Comedy gold... She holds the room in the palm of
her hand' ***** (One4Review.co.uk).

Like many other women performing gender reform feminism, this comedian uses a
shock strategy approach by projecting a more stereotypically masculine delivery. This

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 distances her from societal expectations of how a woman should behave, consistent with the
4
5 recategorization strategy of *assimilation* (Roberts, 2005).
6

7
8 The 171 women whose show description content was not incorporated into the
9
10 qualitative study are also important to highlight here. Their invisibility sheds light into the
11
12 way that feminisms inform the operationalization of impression management. By submitting
13
14 a show description devoid of topics that referenced their stigmatized social group, these
15
16 women *de-categorized* their gender (Roberts, 2005).
17

18
19 Gender rebellion strategies were employed only in the Fringe Fest descriptions. There
20
21 were only six comedians who used this strategy. Those who employed this strategy were
22
23 clear in taking on the underlying power structures that reinforced patriarchal privileges. In
24
25 her Fringe Fest show description, one comedian said:
26
27

28
29 Person of interest on [Television show name], [Television show name] and
30
31 [Television show name] squats and delivers a show about the extreme sport of womanhood.
32
33 Birthing her vision of the future before your eyes, how she hopes it will be... free from class
34
35 war, poverty and consent issues. Also dragging the overdue spectre of what it is more likely
36
37 to be: t-shirt feminism, Jordan Peterson and corporate wokeness from her loins. All without
38
39 an epidural. 'It's jaw-droppingly remarkable how much ground she covers, how funny she is,
40
41 how intelligent her attacks are' ***** (Sunday Herald).
42
43

44
45 The women who took a gender rebellion approach engaged in impression
46
47 management by challenging the patriarchal systems, which define the ideal—namely men.
48
49 Indeed, they defied the ideal and refused to accept categorization as a stigmatized 'other.'
50
51 This approach to impression management was distinctly different than the strategies offered
52
53 by Roberts (2005), which are dependent upon individuals acknowledging the boundaries of
54
55 their marginalized categories and managing them. Through their defiance, these women
56
57
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 rejected the categorization premise upon which SIM is based; they demanded to be what we
4
5 call *uncategorized*.

Summary

6
7
8
9
10 While the extent to which women comedians present as gendered was found to differ
11
12 to men in Study one and Study two, our qualitative analysis revealed that the mystery worthy
13
14 of exploration was the way feminisms were (or were not) employed in operationalizing how
15
16 women presented. In presenting as gendered, or not, women comedians engaged in a full
17
18 range of impression management strategies as defined by Roberts (2005). These impression
19
20 management strategies were consistent with the forms of feminisms the women employed.
21
22 As depicted in Table 1, the comedians exhibited a form of impression management. When
23
24 these comedians' impression management was viewed through a lens of feminisms, however,
25
26 the women exhibited a form of impression management not previously identified by Roberts.
27
28
29

30 [insert Table 1 about here]

General discussion

31
32
33
34
35 Our findings indicate that women comedians present as female gendered during the
36
37 course of their work and that they do so by enacting different forms of feminism. However,
38
39 the extent of their gendered presentation, compared to the industry standard, appears to vary:
40
41 at the 2019 Edinburgh Fringe women emphasized their gender through their show
42
43 descriptions to a greater extent and in the comedy club through their performance, to a lesser
44
45 extent than men. Within the comedy club environment there appears to be a line that might be
46
47 too female gendered for women to cross whilst on stage. At the Fringe no such line was
48
49 evident, although it cannot be ruled out that there is one for men. Thus, women at the comedy
50
51 club appear more constrained than women at the Fringe. From a professional image
52
53 construction perspective (Roberts, 2005), this would indicate the Fringe ideal, or lack of one,
54
55 allows for more highly female gendered presentation (compared to the industry standard) but
56
57
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 that the comedy club ideal may be more male biased requiring women to engage in
4
5 impression management.
6

7
8 The qualitative analysis suggests a similar trend. Comedians who we identified as
9
10 women displayed the full range of Lorber's feminisms within their Fringe show descriptions
11
12 and non-feminist approaches. However, a narrower range of approaches was evident at the
13
14 comedy club thus suggesting greater constraint. The categories of feminism displayed in the
15
16 comedy club appear well suited to a male ideal image. Specifically, performance of gender
17
18 reform and resistant feminism involves behavior that may be considered masculinized
19
20 (Madison, Aasa, Walert and Woodley, 2014). Indeed, a feminine performance in the absence
21
22 of feminism could indicate an acceptance of women's lower status (van Breen et al., 2017) in
23
24 a male-dominated environment, likely resulting in the comedian failing to assert their right to
25
26 perform and hence undermining their control over the room. Conversely, rebellion feminism
27
28 would likely be seen as too threatening in a male-idealized setting (Dickinson et al., 2013;
29
30 Shouse and Opplinger, 2014) and therefore serve as an obstacle to the comedian performing
31
32 their job effectively.
33
34
35
36

37
38 With regard to the potential career impact of observer responses, there do seem to be
39
40 some consequences for women. At the Fringe, a greater focus on gendered topics is related
41
42 to review ratings for women, but not men, in just under half the publications. While the
43
44 relationship between number of gendered topics and review score is for the most part
45
46 insignificant or positive, the inconsistency in this relationship across publications, and that
47
48 there is a relationship for any publication, demonstrates a level of judgement of women's
49
50 presentation that is not paralleled for men. Thus, even at the Fringe women appear somewhat
51
52 constrained in their work behavior. No such relationship between genderedness and any
53
54 measure of observer response was found in the comedy club or online. However, that women
55
56 do not present as gendered as men and frame their presentation within a narrower range of
57
58
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

feminist forms compared to women at the Fringe may indicate that they engage in a level of self-censorship to avoid a negative response (Roberts, 2005).

Across the studies, therefore, the indication is that women comedians present as female gendered in the course of their work. However, there appear to be some constraints on women: at the comedy club there seems to be limits to the level of femaleness presented compared to men, and at the Fringe gendered presentation is related to review score in some publications, for women, but not for men. Thus, it appears women may need to make strategic decisions regarding the appropriate level of genderedness and type of feminism to use to present it, considering the impact on observer response.

Limitations and future research

Our mixed methods, observational approach has significant analytic strengths. We consider comedians in two situations; however, the crossover of comedians across the two and differences between the stimuli observed meant that a more robust longitudinal design was not possible. Future research could attempt to investigate how women adapt their presentation across multiple situations over time. In addition, the show descriptions (Study one) encapsulate comedians' marketing strategy rather than their onstage behavior. Therefore, while the comparison of women to the benchmark group of men allows us to deduce women's relative level of gender related impression management compared to the comedy majority group, we cannot be certain that the level of disparity observed is similar to that displayed on stage at the Fringe. Further research is needed to answer this question. Yet, we consider that the disparity observed in the show descriptions is informative of how women present in its own right. Also, our observational method does not allow us to directly question the reasons women make the presentation choices we have observed. Future, interview-based, research might seek to investigate this question.

Conclusion

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

Our research in the novel context of women in stand-up comedy contributes to both the body of knowledge associated with impression management and women in male-dominated careers. This research provides a deeper understanding of the ways in which women working in a novel public, male-dominated career present at work, in line with varying male dominance. Our findings are explainable in line with Roberts' (2005) assertion that social identity may be managed in line with an 'ideal.'

Our findings also extend Roberts' (2005) theory by emphasizing that impression management should be considered at the profession as well as the organization level and that professional image may be situation dependent, requiring adaptability across situations. In addition, the parallel between our quantitative and qualitative findings regarding social identity (gender) and the primary associated political identity (feminism) suggests that gender organizes behavior along broader lines than just gender identity itself. Indeed, to gain a fuller picture of the professional image which women construct, our findings suggest that management of social identity should be considered in conjunction with that of the associated political identity.

Further, by using a feminist lens to interpret how comedians present their gender, our findings refine Roberts' (2005) theory of social-identity impression management 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 management driven by societal norms that attach to gendered binaries; they defied categories. As they dealt “with norms that tighten the more we [women] fail to inhabit them” (Ahmed, 2017, p. 245), these women performed their comedy by presenting themselves as what Ahmed called ‘feminist killjoys.’

The result of our study is a feminist interpretation of Roberts' (2005) theory of social-identity impression management (SIM) as it is operationalized in a novel, male-dominated

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

context. Identification of the new *uncategorized* strategy and its alignment with *gender rebellion* feminism points to the political nature of SIM. We hope that the findings from this study will inform future research that examines how women manage their gender identities in different organizational and social contexts, and raise awareness of how SIM is a relational process influenced by dynamics of power.

References

- Ahmed S (2017) *Living a Feminist Life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Alvesson M and Kärreman D (2007) Unraveling HRM: Identity, ceremony, and control in a management consulting firm. *Organization Science* 18: 711–723.
doi:10.1287/orsc.1070.0267
- Authors (2020).
- Banks M and Milestone K (2011) Individualization, gender and cultural work. *Gender, Work and Organization* 18(1): 73-89. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2010.00535.x
- Becker JC and Wagner U (2009). Doing gender differently? The interplay of strength of gender identification and content of gender identity in predicting women's endorsement of sexist beliefs. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 39: 487–508.
doi:10.1002/ejsp.551
- Bennett D, Hennekam S, MacArthur S, Hope C and Goh T (2018) Hiding gender: how female composers manage gender identity, *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 113: 20-32.
doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2018.07.003
- Berdahl JL (2007) The sexual harassment of uppity women, *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92(2): 423-437. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.425
- Bore IK (2010) (Un)funny women: TV comedy audiences and the gendering of humour. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 13: 139-154. doi:10.1177/1367549409352272

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

1
2
3 Bourgoin A and Harvey JF (2018) Professional image under threat: Dealing with learning–
4 credibility tension. *Human Relations*, 71(12): 1611-1639.

5
6
7 doi:10.1177/0018726718756168

8
9
10 Brehm, JW (1966) *A theory of psychological reactance* (7th ed.). New York, NY: Academic
11 Press.

12
13
14 Brinkmann S (2014) Doing Without Data. *Qualitative Inquiry* 20(6): 720-725.

15
16
17 doi:10.1177/1077800414530254

18
19 Butler N and Stoyanova RD (2018) No funny business: Precarious work and emotional labour in
20 stand-up comedy. *Human Relations*, 71(12): 1666-1686. doi: 10.1177/0018726718758880

21
22
23 Chortle. (2020) ‘Comedians’. [Online] Available at: <http://www.chortle.co.uk/comics>.

24
25
26 [Accessed 20 December, 2020]

27
28 Chortle. (2019) ‘Comedians’. [Online] Available at: <http://www.chortle.co.uk/comics>.

29
30
31 [Accessed 2 April, 2019]

32
33 Clair JA, Beatty JE and MacLean TL (2005) Out of sight but not out of mind: Managing
34 invisible social identities in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 1:78 –

35
36
37 95. doi:10.5465/amr.2005.15281431

38
39 Connell R (2009) *Short Introductions: Gender*. (2nd Ed.). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

40
41 Creed WED and Scully M (2000) Songs of ourselves: Employees' deployment of social
42 identity in work place encounters. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 9: 391-412.

43
44
45 doi:10.1177/10564926000900410

46
47
48 Dickinson P, Higgins A, St. Pierre PM, Solomon D, and Zwagerman S (2013) *Women and*
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Comedy: History, Theory, Practice. Vancouver, BC: Farleigh Dickinson University

Press.

Ellemers N, Rink F, Derks, B and Ryan MK (2012) Women in high places: When and why
promoting women into top positions can harm them individually or as a group (and

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

how to prevent this). *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, 32: 163-187.

doi:10.1016/j.riob.2012.10.003

Ely RJ (1995) The power in demography: Women's social constructions of gender identity at

work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38:589– 634. doi:10.5465/256740

England P (2010) The Gender Revolution: Uneven and Stalled. *Gender and Society*

24(2):149–66. doi:10.1177/0891243210361475

Faulkner W (2009) Doing gender in engineering workplace cultures. II. Gender

in/authenticity and the in/visibility paradox. *Engineering Studies*, 1(3): 169-

189, doi:10.1080/19378620903225059

Garcia-Retamero R and López-Zafra E (2006). Prejudice against women in male-congenial

environments: Perceptions of gender role congruity in leadership. *Sex Roles* 55: 51–61.

doi: 10.1007/s11199-006-9068-1

Giacalone R and Rosenfeld P (1991) *Applied impression management: How image-making*

affects managerial decisions. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gilbert J (2013) Lesbian Stand-Up Comics and the Politics of Laughter. In P Dickinson, PA

Higgins, PM St. Pierre, D Solomon and S Zwagerman (Eds.), *Women and comedy:*

History, theory, practice (pp. 185-215). Vancouver, BC: Farleigh Dickinson University

Press.

Glesne C (2016) *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. 5th ed. Boston, MA:

Pearson.

Harris DA and Giuffe P (2010) The price you pay: How female professional chefs negotiate

work and family. *Gender Issues*, 27: 27–52. doi:10.1007/s12147-010-9086-8.

He J and Kang S (2019) Covering in cover letters: Gender and self-presentation in job

applications. *Academy of Management Journal*. [doi:10.5465/AMBPP.2019.275](https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2019.275)

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

- 1
2
3 Healy R (2020) Sarcasm and sausages: Manchester's tough crowds make comedians sizzle,
4
5 *The Guardian*. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2020/mar/08/sarcasm->
6
7 and-sausages-manchester-comedians-mancunians-alternative-comedy. [Accessed 1
8
9 December, 2020]
10
11
- 12 Heizmann H and Liu H. (2020). “Bloody Wonder Woman!”: Identity performances of elite
13
14 women entrepreneurs on Instagram. *Human Relations*, 1-30. doi:
15
16 10.1177/0018726720979034.
17
18
- 19 Hustad IB, Bandholtz J, Herlitz, A and Dekhtyar S (2020) Occupational attributes and occupational
20
21 gender segregation in Sweden: Does it change over time. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11:1–8.
22
23 doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00554
24
25
- 26 Ibarra H (1999) Provisional selves: Experimenting with image and identity in professional
27
28 adaptation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44:764–791. doi:10.2307/2667055
29
30
- 31 Kachel S, Steffens MC and Niedlich C (2016) Traditional masculinity and femininity:
32
33 Validation of a new scale assessing gender roles. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7: 1-19.
34
35 doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2016. 00956
36
37
- 38 Kaiser CR and Miller CT (2001). Reacting to impending discrimination: Compensation for
39
40 prejudice and attributions to discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology*
41
42 *Bulletin*, 27: 254 –263. doi:10.1177/0146167201272010.
43
44
- 45 Kenny EJ and Donnelly R (2020) Navigating the gender structure in information technology:
46
47 How does this affect the experiences and behaviours of women?. *Human*
48
49 *Relations*, 73(3): 326-350. doi: 10.1177/0018726719828449
50
51
- 52 Kristof-Brown AL, Zimmerman RD and Johnson EC (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit
53
54 at work: a meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization, person– group, and
55
56 person–supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2): 281-342. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-
57
58 6570.2005.00672.x
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

- 1
2
3 Koch, AJ, D’Mello, SD and Sackett PR (2014) A Meta-Analysis of Gender Stereotypes and
4
5 Bias in Experimental Simulations of Employment Decision Making, *Journal of Applied*
6
7 *Psychology*, 100(1): 128–161. doi:10.1037/a0036734
8
9
- 10 Leary, MR and Kowalski RM (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two-
11
12 component model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107: 34-47. doi:10.1037/0033-
13
14 2909.107.1.34
15
16
- 17 Little LM, Major VS, Hinojosa AS and Nelson DL (2015) Professional image maintenance:
18
19 How women navigate pregnancy in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*,
20
21 58(1): 8-37. doi:10.5465/amj.2013.0599
22
23
- 24 Lorber J (1994) *Paradoxes of gender*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
25
- 26 Lorber J (1997/2010) *The variety of feminisms and their contributions to gender equality*.
27
28 Issue 97 of Oldenburger Universitätsreden. ISSN 0177-9133.
29
- 30 Lorber J (2005) *Gender inequality: Feminist theories and politics*. 3rd ed. Los Angeles, CA:
31
32 Roxbury Publishing Company.
33
34
- 35 Lynch JW and Rodell JB (2018). Blend In or Stand Out? Interpersonal Outcomes of
36
37 Managing Concealable Stigmas at Work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(12):
38
39 1307–1323. doi:10.1037/apl0000342
40
41
- 42 Mavin S (2008). Queen bees, wannabees and afraid to bees: No more ‘best enemies’ for
43
44 women in management? *British Journal of Management*, 19(1): S75-S84. doi:
45
46 10.1111/j.1467-8551.2008.00573.x
47
48
- 49 Mavin S and Grandy G (2012) Doing gender well and differently in management. *Gender in*
50
51 *Management*, 27(4), 218-231. doi: 10.1108/17542411211244768
52
53
- 54 Mavin S and Grandy G (2018) How postfeminism plays out for women elite leaders. In P.
55
56 Lewis, Y. Benschop, and R. Simpson (Eds.). *Postfeminism and Organization* (pp. 161-
57
58 178). New York, NY: Routledge
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

- 1
2
3 Mavin S, Grandy G, and Williams J (2014) Experiences of women elite leaders doing gender:
4
5 Intra-gender micro-violence between women. *British Journal of Management*, 25: 439-
6
7 455. doi: 10.1111/1467-8551.12057
8
9
- 10 R Development Core Team (2008) *R : A language and environment for statistical computing*.
11
12 Roberts, LM (2005) Changing Faces: Professional Image Construction in Diverse
13
14 Organizational Settings. *The Academy of Management Review*, 30(4): 685-711.
15
16 doi:10.5465/amr.2005.18378873
17
18
- 19 Roulston K (2001). Data analysis and ‘theorizing as ideology’. *Qualitative Research*, 1(3):
20
21 279-302. doi: [10.1177/146879410100100302](https://doi.org/10.1177/146879410100100302)
22
23
- 24 Sasson-Levy O (2003) Feminism and military practice: Israeli women soldiers in
25
26 “masculine” roles. *Sociological Inquiry*, 73(3): 440–465. doi:10.1111/1475-
27
28 682X.00064
29
- 30 Schlenker BR (2003) Self-presentation. In M Leary and J Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self*
31
32 *and identity* (pp. 492-518). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
33
34
- 35 Sherman M (2021) You think you know who Dove Cameron is but you actually have no
36
37 idea. *Refinery21*. Available at: [https://www.refinery29.com/en-](https://www.refinery29.com/en-ca/2021/07/10575036/who-is-dove-cameron-schmigadoon-disney)
38
39 [ca/2021/07/10575036/who-is-dove-cameron-schmigadoon-disney](https://www.refinery29.com/en-ca/2021/07/10575036/who-is-dove-cameron-schmigadoon-disney) [Accessed 25 July
40
41 2021].
42
43
- 44 Shouse E and Opplinger P (2014). Sarah is magic: The (post-gendered?) comedy of Sarah
45
46 Silverman, *Comedy Studies*, 3(2): 201-216. doi:10.1386/cost.3.2.201_1
47
48
- 49 Siegel S and Castellan NJ (1988). *Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences*. (7th
50
51 ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-hill.
52
53
- 54 Sochen J (1991) *Women’s Comic Visions*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
55
- 56 Somers RH (1962). A New Asymmetric Measure of Association for Ordinal Variables.
57
58 *American Sociological Review*, 27(6): 799–811. doi:10.2307/2090408
59
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

- 1
2
3 Sue DW (Ed.) (2010). *Microaggressions and marginality: Manifestation, dynamics, and*
4
5 *impact*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
6
7
8 Tassabehji R, Harding N, Lee H, and Dominguez-Pery C (2021) From female computers to
9
10 male computers: Or why there are so few women writing algorithms and developing
11
12 software. *Human Relations*, 74(8): 1296-1326. doi: 10.1177/0018726720914723
13
14
15 Thompson GL and Desrochers A (2009) Corroborating biased indicators: Global and local
16
17 agreement among objective and subjective estimates of printed word frequency.
18
19 *Behavior Research Methods*, 41(2): 452-471. doi:10.3758/BRM.41.2.452
20
21
22 Thorpe V (2014) BBC chief: no more comedy shows with all-male panels. *The Observer*.
23
24 Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/media/2014/feb/08/bbc-comedy-shows->
25
26 [male-panels-female-presence](https://www.theguardian.com/media/2014/feb/08/bbc-comedy-shows-male-panels-female-presence). [Accessed 9 April, 2021]
27
28
29 Torre M (2017) Attrition from male-dominated occupations: Variation among occupations
30
31 and women. *Sociological Perspectives*, 60(4): 665–684. doi:
32
33 10.1177/0731121416683160
34
35
36 Tractenberg RE, Yumoto F, Jin D and Morris JC (2010) Sample size requirements for
37
38 training to a kappa agreement criterion on Clinical Dementia Rating. *Alzheimer Disease*
39
40 *& Associated Disorders*, 24(3): 264-268. doi:[10.1097/WAD.0b013e3181d489c6](https://doi.org/10.1097/WAD.0b013e3181d489c6)
41
42
43 Watson, D and Clark LA (1994) *The PANAS-X: Manual for the Positive and Negative Affect*
44
45 *Schedule-Expanded Form*. Iowa City, Iowa: The University of Iowa.
46
47
48 Weisberg YJ, DeYoung CG and Hirsh JB (2011). Gender differences in personality across
49
50 the ten aspects of the Big Five. *Frontiers in Personality Science and Individual*
51
52 *Differences*, 2, article 178. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00178
53
54
55 Wright T (2016) Women's Experience of Workplace Interactions in Male-Dominated Work:
56
57 The Intersections of Gender, Sexuality and Occupational Group. *Gender, Work and*
58
59 *Organization*, 23: 348-362. doi:10.1111/gwao.12074
60

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

Zuur A, Ieno EN, Walker N, Saveliev AA and Smith GM (2009) *Mixed effects models and extensions in ecology with R*. New York, NY: Springer.

Table 1

Social-Identity Impression Management Strategies (SIMs) and Feminisms

| SIMs | Feminisms |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Confirmation | Feminine (not feminist) |
| Integration | Gender Resistant |
| Assimilation | Gender Reform |
| Decategorization | Gender Neutral |
| <i>Uncategorization</i> | Gender Rebellion |

Figure 1

The relationship between gender and using gendered nouns to refer to oneself.

Women: Gendered nouns (N=242)



Men: Gendered nouns (N=601)




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 2

The relationship between gender and same gender topics.



Version

GENDER(ED) PERFORMANCES

Figure 3

Violin plot comparing male and female comedians on genderedness of self-presentation.




Figure 4

The relationship between gender of the comedian and disliked YouTube videos ($n = 257$).

