



PERFORMING GENDERED BELONGING IN THE WORKPLACE: AN INTERACTIONAL FEMINIST ANALYSIS OF PIXAR'S PURL

Umm-e-Rooman Yaqoob
manooc93@gmail.com

PhD Scholar & Lecturer, Department of English, Fazaia
Bilquis College of Education for Women, PAF Nur Khan
Base, Rawalpindi, Pakistan.

Abstract

The analysis is based on the communicative mechanisms on a micro-level through which workplace inclusion and exclusion take place in an eight minutes Pixar animated short film Purl (2018) by relying on the dramaturgical sociology of Erving Goffman and the feminist discourse analysis of Sara Mills. The study, based on multimodal transcription and systematic discourse analysis of 14 interactional episodes, shows that gendered exclusion operates not by prevailing discrimination, but by the presence of latent interactional processes: systematic non-response, participation structure control, turn-taking marginalization, and negative assessment of feminine-coded interactional styles. The contribution of the study is theoretical, meaning that it proves that the frameworks of Goffman and Mills can be fruitfully combined, that exclusion has distinct interactional mechanisms, and that professional norms are naturalized. It methodologically lays the foundation of protocols of analysis of animated workplace stories and confirms intensive single case analysis. In practice, there is some evidence that meaningful inclusion in the workplace takes place when discourse norms are changed instead of having people trained to conform to norms that imply exclusion. The study contributes to the knowledge of the functioning of modern workplace inequality based on the daily communicative practice.

Keywords: *Feminist Discourse Analysis, Gender Performativity, Interactional Sociolinguistics, Workplace Inclusion and Exclusion, Workplace Interaction*

Corresponding Author: Umm-e-Rooman Yaqoob (PhD Scholar & Lecturer, Department of English, Fazaia Bilquis College of Education for Women, PAF Nur Khan Base, Rawalpindi, Pakistan.)

Email: manooc93@gmail.com

Co-Author: Fatima Iftikhar (PhD Scholar) (EST, Language Instructor, Federal Directorate of Education (FDE))

Email: fatimaktk.fi@gmail.com

1. Introduction

1.1. Context

The eight-minute clip of a short film by Pixar, titled Purl (2018), summarizes one of the core dynamics of gendered workplace exclusion, namely, how belonging is negotiated, not directly by discrimination, but indirectly, via micro-level interactions of daily interaction. Who is talking, who is listening, who has been recognized, and who has been disregarded are questions that are not answered by an organizational policy but rather by the talk, gesture, gaze and silence that are coordinated to occur at this moment in time. This research will discuss gendered workplace belonging as a performance of interaction and discursive norms in Purl. Based on dramaturgical sociology developed by Erving Goffman and feminist discourse analysis by Sarah Mills, the research finds how gender works on the border between individual performance and structural discursive regulation. The thesis here is that Purl is an embodiment of inclusion in the workplace, but on the conditions that one should adhere to implicitly gendered structures of interaction, which are displayed as neutral, professional, and universal, but systematically favor masculine-coded communicative behavior.

1.2. Research Problem and Rationale

Purl has received feminist media studies, organizational communication, and diversity education scholarly interest. Previous reviews have focused on visual symbolism in the film (Purl's changing to grey when he is excluded), plot (exclusion, assimilation, resistance), and ideology (criticism of masculine culture at the workplace). Nevertheless, the literature available on Purl is mostly using thematic, symbolic, or ideological approaches. These methods are concerned with the meaning or representation of the film, usually on the level of the storyline or visual metaphors. The only thing lacking is systematic, language-based studies that focus on the manner in which gender is constituted as a result of the interaction and discourse played out moment by moment. This lack is severe since it leaves unexplored the mechanisms through which the film portrays gendered workplace relations. In the absence of close considerations of the interactional performance and discursive norms, Purl analyses will not surpass the general interpretation level, but a strict depiction of how gendered exclusion is carried out communicatively will be absent.

1.3. Research Aim

To explore how workplace belonging is discursively and interactionally co-constructed as gendered via a multimodal analysis of Purl at Pixar, that shows how mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion are created through micro-level communicative acts that are independent of overt discrimination.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Gender as Performance: Theory underpinning

The theory related to gender as performance has its origins in sociological and feminist theory. His dramaturgical theory of presentation of self in everyday life uses the concept of dramaturgical framework by Goffman (1959) to conceptualize social interaction in a manner that social interaction is theatrical performance, with actors and actresses, who are people, handling impressions with strategic self-presentation. Although in his initial work, Goffman regarded gender as a context of interaction, in his subsequent essay *The Arrangement Between the Sexes* (Goffman, 1977), the author made known the notion of gender display, which implies that gender is acted through the use of stylized behavioral performances.

West and Zimmerman (1987) put a spin on the ideas of Goffman by suggesting that gender is not a discretionary presentation but is an all-purpose aspect of social interaction. Their influential article *Doing Gender* suggested that people are given responsibility in regard to normative ideas of masculinity and femininity in practically every social interaction. This responsibility implies that the interactive behavior is constantly judged based on the gender norms, and the outcomes are either subtle disapproval or the systematic social marginalization. An additional philosophical approach is the theory of gender performativity developed by Butler (1990), in *Gender Trouble*. Butler believes that gender is not a representation of an internal part of oneself but rather a performance that is created by the repetition and citational procedure of performative acts (Butler, 1990, p. 145). Gender only seems as natural, since these performances are constantly reproduced and controlled by means of social norms. To carry out the current study, the combination of these frameworks has defined that gender in workplaces is not a question of necessary differences between men and women, but rather arises through the continuous execution and assessment of communicative practices in comparison to culturally distinct standards of befitting gendered practices.

2.2. Gender and Discourse at the Workplace

2.2.1. Gendered Communication in the workplace

A workplace has been one of the most important places to study the gendered interaction. *The Power and Politeness in the Workplace* by Holmes and Stubbe (2003) offers a comprehensive record of the ways of how workers in New Zealand negotiate power and solidarity using gendered discourse strategies. They interpret the data provided in the *Language in the Workplace Project* and have found that workplace communication cannot be consumed by either the simple gender binaries, both women and men incorporate the repertoires of feminine and masculine communicative resources based on the institutional setting, position of hierarchy and purpose of interaction. *The Gendered Talk at Work* by Holmes (2006) is a synthesis of the studies concerning the gender dynamics in the workplace by showing that gender is utilized in communicative practices to be attached to certain social meanings. I would give the example of collaborative and

supportive communication styles, which can be coded as feminine, and assertive and competitive, which can be coded as masculine. In a critical manner, Holmes (2006) demonstrates that these associations are not natural but are ideological constructs and thus give preference to some forms of communicating at the expense of others. The analysis of workplace communication provided by Kendall and Tannen (1997) indicates the presence of gendered norms hidden in the seemingly gender-neutral professional communication. They record how the women in the world of work are in a double bind where the feminine-coded communication styles are perceived as unprofessional, and conversely, women who choose the masculine-coded styles are considered as inappropriately aggressive (Kendall and Tannen, 1997). This double bind is not a subjective perception but it is systematically generated by interactional assessment and institutional gate keeping.

2.2.2. Interactional Processes of Exclusion at the Workplace

Some interactional processes in which gendered workplace exclusion works have been found through research. The analysis of interruptions in cross-sex conversations by West and Zimmerman (1983) showed that men interrupt women in the disproportionate way, and that interruptions are bids to control conversations. Although this study was carried out outside the workplace, later studies have reported the same trends in the professional setting (Holmes and Stubbe, 2003). Another exclusion mechanism is conversational topic control. An analysis of domestic conversations by Fishman (1983) indicated women engaged in more interaction work (asking, supportive response, and introduction of topics) whereas the men determined the level of discussion to be given to a given topic. Holmes (2006) applies these results to working environments and demonstrates the way topic management leads to the marginalization of some voices and issues. Non-response and silence takes the form of exclusionary practices too. Jaworski (1993) believes in the silence, that it is not the lack of speech, but it carries with it communication concerning who is worthy of response, and whose input is safe to overlook. Systematic failure to acknowledge the contributions of women at workplace is a type of interactional silencing that contributes towards gendered hierarchies (Holmes & Stubbe, 2003).

2.2.3. The Professionalism of Becoming a Man

Of utmost importance to workplace gender processes is the fact that the concept of professionalism is gendered. Mills (2003) shows how there is no gender-neutrality of norms of professional communication but rather masculine-coded behavior is implicitly supported. Certain values are exalted as professional such as emotional restraint, competitive individualism, and aggressive self promotion whilst collaborative, emotionally expressive, and relational oriented communication is deemed unprofessional or even too soft to do business. Gendering professionalism has material implications. Studies have always proven that women with masculine-coded leadership behavior are

punished and those with feminine coded behavior are thought to be devoid of leadership abilities (Baxter, 2010). This means that there is a structural disadvantage to women in professional progress due not to a specific discrimination but to the general assessment of communicative performance. The notion of relational practice introduced by Fletcher (1999) sheds some light on how some types of valuable labour at work, such as mentoring, emotional support, conflict mediation, are both feminized and devalued. Such practices are culturally allocated to femininity and therefore remain invisible in performance appraisal in the workplace activity largely leading to the underrating of women despite their significant roles in the operation of the organization.

2.3. FDA: Feminist Discourse Analysis

2.3.1. Mills' Feminist Stylistics

The Feminist Stylistics of Sara Mills (1995) offers essential constructs in the analysis of the functioning of gender at the textual and discursive practice. Mills states that sexism can act in discourse not necessarily through an explicit derogatory rhetoric but through more subtle processes: the point of view, agency, metaphor and discursive positioning (Mills, 1995). Her method looks at the positioning of readers by texts and a gendered presentation of characters which tends to normalize hierarchical gender relations. The examples of communication provided by Mills (2003) on the issue of gender and politeness provide further evidence of how supposedly neutral communicative standards are implicitly gendered. She demonstrates that women are expected to meet higher standards of politeness than men and that actions that are considered to be well directed when done by men, are considered ill directed when done by women (Mills, 2003). This two-sided control works by the implicit regulation of conduct: there are no clear rules that women should be nicer, but those women who break the unwritten rules are subject to social punishment. In the current analysis, the frameworks by Mills allow assessing the manner in which Purl reflects gendered workplace relations on the discourse level. The fact that she focuses on the concept of indirect regulation, which is how norms are enforced by seemingly neutral expectations, is especially important in explaining how the protagonist is excluded and ultimately assimilated by the film.

2.3.2. Gender and Critical Discourse Analysis

Gender and Discourse by Wodak (1997) is a compilation that integrates critical discourse analysis (CDA) and feminist analysis, ushering in the contribution of discourse to reproduction of gender disparity in a variety of institutional dimensions. CDA theories are also based on the fact that discourse does not only mirror social reality, but constitutes it: language creates social relationships, identities, and power formations (Fairclough, 1989; van Dijk, 1993). Feminist critical discourse analysis developed by Lazar (2005) moves these views forward, claiming that gendered power relations need to be explicitly analyzed and confronted. Her model looks at the ways in which discourse naturalizes

gender hierarchies in that socially constructed arrangements seem natural or inevitable. This denaturalization is one of the key emancipatory objectives of the feminist linguistic scholarship.

Chapter 3: Conceptual Framework

3.1. Erving Goffman: Dramaturgical Sociology and Gender Display

The dramaturgical sociology of Erving Goffman, worked out in several publications, but the most methodically in *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959), theorizes the process of social interaction dramaturgically. Goffman (1959) suggests that people, similar to actors on stage, do strategic self-presentation to control the impressions being made of them by others. In this point of view social life is a performance in which people strive to define and preserve certain social identities. To conduct the current research, the dramaturgical model developed by Goffman (1959) allows examining how Purl enacts work-based identity, i.e. the ways of how she represents herself, what sorts of fronts she works with, and how she alters performances based on the evaluations of social actors. The study exposes the strategic aspects of the interaction at the workplace: the conscious and unconscious attempts to streamline oneself to the expectations regarding what is expected of a certain behavior in the workplace.

3.2. Sara Mills: Feminist Discourse Analysis

Feminist Stylistics by Sara Mills (1995) has laid out the frameworks of analyzing the way gender works in the textual and discursive practice level. In contrast to the previous feminist linguistics that mostly involved the sexist language at the lexical level (e.g. generic he, the derogatory language toward women), Mills (1995) is interested in how sexism functions through the less obvious textual processes: point of view, narrative structure, agency, and the location of readers and characters. According to Mills (1995), texts are not passive reflections of existing gender relations but rather construct and reproduce specific meanings of gender. The texts place readers in such a position that they assume some point of view, or identify with specific characters, and that they accept some gender set ups as natural or even unavoidable. These effects of positioning are mostly unconscious, as such, they are especially effective processes of reproducing gendered ideologies (Mills, 1995, pp. 3-5). The Purl analysis can be conducted through the lenses of Mills framework (1995) which will allow exploring the textual construction of gendered workplace relations in the movie. This involves examining the various viewpoints on which the narrative is seen, where characters are placed in relation to action at the workplace, and how the structure itself reveals the film challenges narrative conventions on gender.

Chapter 4: Methodology

4.1. Research Design

The study design is a single-case study design and the entire film Purl is considered a limited case where intensive analysis is to be conducted. The case study research design is specifically suitable where the study seeks to learn how phenomena behave in certain situations instead of developing how frequently they occur among people (Yin, 2009). The current work aims to show the ways in which gendered workplace belonging is created in both interactional and discursive ways as depicted in Purl without attempting to measure the prevalence of such patterns at workplaces or movies. The single-case design is long-standing in interactional sociolinguistics (Gumperz, 1982; Tannen, 1984) where the analysis of individual cases is valued over the coverage of a corpus. In the light of Tannen (1984), interaction patterns and communicative strategies may be identified by intensive study of a single case that would have remained unnoticed in the studies that focus on larger corpora but less in-depth analysis. This will be analytical generalization, making contributions to theoretical propositions regarding the functioning of gendered workplace dynamics, and not statistical generalization (Yin, 2009, p. 15).

4.2. Data: Pixar's Purl

Purl is an animated short film created by the Pixar Animation Studios as a series under the SparkShorts program and was released in 2018 and takes a duration of eight minutes. Kristen Lester directed the film, and she used her personal experience as a woman in a male-dominated industry (Pixar Animation Studios, 2019). Purl, a bright pink ball of yarn, starts her first day at B.R.O. Capital, a work office that is full of grey-suited men in the aggressive and competitive culture of the workplace. Purl is intentionally disregarded and not even allowed to interact with others despite her zeal and efforts to do so. Gradually, she changes herself, she puts on a grey suit, a low key, and masculine coded style of communication and is accepted. It then ends with Purl looking into a new worker another ball of yarn known as Lacy who was also being discriminated. Purl goes back to her original pink look and urges the inclusion of Lacy, which triggers more cultural transformation. The movie is 8 minutes and 42 seconds long, features dialogue and considerable amount of non-verbal communication, and features a stylistic use of animation that intensifies the gender relationship in the workplace by way of visual metaphor and exaggerated characterization.

4.3. Ethical Considerations

4.3.1. Publicly Available Text

Purl is a publicly traded cinematic film released by Pixar Animation Studios. Academic analysis does not need any special permission. The movie is also widely available on YouTube and other websites, and thus, readers can access the source text and assess analytical arguments.

4.3.2. Interpretive Ethics

The analysis establishes Purl as a cultural text which makes certain ideological positioning and projects workplace dynamics in certain forms. The research is going to critically examine these representations at the same time being objective to what the film has intended and achieved.

4.4. Limitations

4.4.1. Single-Text Focus

One eight-minute film is analyzed in the study. The results cannot be statistically applied to every workplace and every animated movie. Nevertheless, the analytical extension to theoretical hypotheses of gendered workplace interaction is acceptable (Yin, 2009). The difference between animated and naturalistic data is presented in question

4.4.2. Specific Pattern

The research looks at stylized, written animated interaction as opposed to naturalistic communication in the workplace. This is as taken care of by considering Purl as a cultural representation that narrow downs and renders visible interactional patterns working even more diffusively in real workplaces.

Chapter 5: Analysis Part 1 (Initial Exclusion)

5.1. Introduction

The analysis shows that exclusion does not work at the explicit discrimination level but rather via micro-level interactional processes: non-response, marginalization of conversation, controlling the subjects, and also assessing the communication style of Purl in comparison with implicitly masculine-coded rules of conduct in the workplace setting.

5.2. First Day Arrival: The Unresponded Greeting

5.2.1. Scene Description

Episode 1: Arrival at the office and welcome (00:00:45 -00:01:05)

The first day Purl comes to B.R.O. Capital. The office is physically identified as masculine: grey color prevails, the room is empty and thin, and four men in the same grey suits are reading newsreaders. The color, shape, and material of Purl, on the contrary, are coded as feminine: it is a bright pink color, rounded, and soft to touch.

5.2.2. Interactional Analysis Face-Threat Non-Response

Using the framework developed by Goffman (1967), the greeting of Purl is an opening move to an interaction ritual. Greetings are also access rituals that define social relationship and demand face which is positive social value a person wants of others (Goffman, 1967, p. 19). Purl thereby offers what Goffman (1959) refers to as impression management by welcoming them: by doing so, she demonstrates that she is a kind, colleague worker willing to engage in the community in the workplace. The silence that takes place after 1.5 seconds is not indifference but a deliberate face-threatening behavior (Goffman, 1967, p. 14). Greetings in normative interaction give a duty to respond- what conversation analysts refer to as adjacency pairs (Schegloff, 2007).

Face-loss occurs when greetings are not returned: the person who does the greeting loses the positive social value he/she asserted. More importantly, the non-response is not personal but shared. The four men are all in their reading positions, there is no eye contact, and nobody even speaks to acknowledge the existence of Purl. This mass ignoring does not signify unintentional but an organized exclusion. According to Goffman (1967), in an encounter, in case the others feel embarrassed he may feel embarrassed as well and the embarrassment of everyone grows at an accelerating pace (p. 103). In this case, the opposite happens, the lack of any embarrassment or repair effort is a pointer that Purl is not an exception, but a signifier of the existence of workplace norms which are not being broken, but rather being put in action.

5.2.3. Discourse Analysis: Making Professional Interaction Appropriate

This indirect form of sexism as explained by Mills (2008) sheds light on the functioning of this exclusion in a non-discriminatory manner. None of the characters say that women are not welcome here or any other sexist statement. Rather, exclusion works in the denying of interactional cooperation (Mills, 2008, p. 78). Gendered standards of professional behavior are also present in the scene. The way Purl welcomes the new visitor is active, loud, emotionally expressive- communicative modes which are usually coded as feminine (Holmes, 2006). In comparison, the behavior of men is marked with the masculine-coded professionalism: emotional control, emphasizing on working alone (reading), and not relating with each other. The film, therefore, confirms that proper professional conduct in this workplace is low-affect and physical space. Mills (2003) cites that women are more severely judged when their communication styles are too much, i.e., too emotional, too friendly, too eager. Purl is not enthusiastic in return and this makes it not suitable within this professional setting. This silence after her greeting serves as negative evaluation and this is not expressed in terms of criticism but rather through the non-discovery of ratifying (Mills, 2003, p. 265).

5.3. Water Cooler Interaction: Topic and Humor Control

5.3.1. Scene Description

Episode 2: Water Cooler Attempt (00:0140 -00: 02:10)

Later that day, three men are standing near the water cooler having loud and aggression filled conversation interrupted with laughter. Purl comes by, and tries to fit in.

5.3.2. Interactional Analysis: Participation Framework Omission

The concept of participation framework created by Goffman (1981) examines the people who take up what interactional roles: an addressee, speaker, ratified participant, or bystander. The three men in this scene form a ratified participation structure - they are gazing at each other, and body-positioned, as well as responsive towards one another, in terms of laughter. As Purl tries to join by asking the question Hey guys, what are we talking about? she requests to become a transformed as a bystander to a ratified participant

(Goffman, 1981). This bid fails. The waiting of 0.8 seconds and then resuming the discussion of the last discussion by Man 1 indicates the rejection of the bid by Purl. She is neither referred to nor recognized- abandoned to stand as unrecognized in-between even though she is physically close to the situation.

Goffman (1967) notes that, the scorned person can redeem some form of dignity by scurrying away in a prominent pout (p. 108). The gradual withdrawal by Purl can be attributed to this face-saving. She was unable to enter the sphere of interaction, and therefore, is forced to withdraw in order to lose her face even more. Importantly, this exclusion is achieved by the structure of interaction, but not by rejection. No one says "you can't join us." Rather, the denial to restructure the participation system conveys the message of exclusion rather indirectly but efficiently.

5.3.3 Discourse Analysis: Gendered Topic and Humor Norms

Mills (2008) points out that not only is it through discourse norms that one is controlled in what he or she says, he or she is also controlled in what he or she can say. The discussion that the men engage in is based on competitive narratives that are told in a boisterous manner with physically threatening embodiment- communicational pattern that is attributed to male homo-social bonding (Holmes, 2006). The male laughter that only ensues these stories is an indication of collective comprehension and ratification. Workplace laughter does not serve only as the appreciation of humor but as social bonding and in-group solidarity (Holmes, 2006, p. 117). The fact that Purl is not part of this laughing, her attempts to join the laughter do not even get attention, lets you know that she is not a member of the in-group at the workplace. In addition, the manner of communication reflects what Fletcher (1999) refers to as competitive individualism- loudness, interruption and one-upmanship, which is coded as masculine professional behavior. This aggressive style is contrasted with a more moderate tone of Purl (through her collaborative question of what we are talking about) who is implicitly considered as being out of step with the workplace norms.

5.4. Meeting Attendances: Insignificant Contributions

5.4.1. Scene Description

Episode 3: Meeting in the conference room (00:02:30 - 00:03:15)

Purl comes to her initial team meeting. It depicts her at the conference table with other male colleagues around her. Her contributions are systematically disregarded when she tries to give ideas.

5.4.2. Interactional Analysis: Face-Loss and Failed Turn-Taking

Gendered turn taking norms are revealed in this episode (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, 1974). Competitive turn-taking is used by the men, as they start simultaneously, use a high volume, and confident assertions. The boss approves such a style by using positive assessment (keep going, there is the energy I need). Purl, in her turn, relies on

collaborative turn-taking strategies: she raises her hand (seeking floor rights, not taking them), waits until she is noticed, uses signs of hesitation (um, maybe) as well, speaks moderately loudly (Holmes, 2006, p. 89). These measures are in agreement with the feminine coded communication but are systematically undermined in this interaction scenario. In case of the overlapping and forsaking of the turn by Purl, she feels the loss of face as defined by Goffman (1967): the group does not accept her claim to be taken seriously as a contributor. Most importantly, such a refusal works on the basis of interactional structure, it is not rejected but merely discussed and disregarded. The active reaction of the boss to the next contribution of the male, implicitly confirms aggressive turn-taking and undermines the team-working attitude of Purl.

5.4.3. Discourse Analysis: Gendered Professional Competence

According to Mills (2003), in many instances workplace discourse has equated assertiveness with competence against speakers who use more tentative or collaborative discourse strategies. In this scene, the style of delivery of ideas, which can be described as not content-based, is the loud, confident, aggressive style of delivery. The praise of the boss in the form of energy (there is the energy I need) directly appreciates performative aggression. The hedged and collaborative proposal of Purl (possibly we could work together) uses the signs of language that can also be related to the females politeness (Holmes, 2006; Mills, 2003). Although these qualities may be indicators of thoughtfulness and collaboration, in this masculine-coded working environment they are perceived as a sign of insecurity or inability. This is what Baxter (2010) calls the double bind of the women in the professional environments: feminine-coded language is not considered authoritative enough, and masculine-coded language is subject to ridicule as their gender norm is being broken. At this point of the story, Purl is yet to learn how to act in masculine-coded aggression, and her feminine-coded cooperation is made subordinate to a system.

5.5. Lunch Exclusion: The Face-Threat of Ultimate

5.5.1. Scene Description

Episode 4: Departure of the Group Lunch (00:03:20 - 00:03:50)

The men are about to go out to lunch, taking coats, and talking in a cheerful way. Purl finds this preparation, and undoubtedly he would have been glad to be a part of it.

5.5.2. Interactional Analysis: Systemic Face-Threat and Isolation

This scene is an indication of the accumulated face-threats. Workplace Lunch invitations serve the role of inclusion rituals (Goffman, 1967): they signify the members of the workplace community as well as non-members. The men express systematic exclusion by going to lunch without even notifying or even recognizing Purl. According to Goffman (1967), the rule of self-respect combined with the rule of considerateness makes an individual to behave in such a manner in an encounter that he will not only salvage his own face but also that of other parties who are involved in an encounter (p.

11). The departure by the men contravenes the principle of considerateness- the men do not even strive to retain the face of Purl by inviting her or even mentioning her existence. The two second silence following the closing of the door is a dramaturgical point of interest. Purl is the only person in the vacant office that lacks an audience in which to perform face-saving. Her stooped body is what Goffman (1959) termed back-stage behavior the performance front is dropped when the social audience is not present (pp. 112-113). It is this point that displays the emotional price of chronic face-threats and interactional exclusion.

5.5.3. Discourse Analysis: The Gendering of Sociability of the Workplace

Mills (2008) insists that exclusion takes place not solely in the framework of the formal way of work and undertaking but in the realms of informal sociability- very areas that women are usually relegated. The ritual of men lunch represents a male homo-social bonding: loud, competitive discussion of non-challenging subjects (two-for-one wings), and overtly apathetic embodiment (high-fiving). The words Alright BOYS lunch time! marks the social group explicitly with gender and linguistically as a male. Although Purl is not directly informed that she cannot participate, the gender address and leaving without a goodbye sends a message of indirect but overt exclusion (Mills, 2008, p. 85). This non-participation in non-formal sociability is not in vain. Scholarly studies have shown that employees in the work place tend to rise to higher positions in the workplace through networking and mentor-ship connections that are established on the outside of the work environment (Fletcher, 1999). The men deny Purl access to opportunities in social activities that can support her in terms of career advancement as they take place in informal settings.

5.6. Employee-of-the-Month Wall: Graphic Discourse of Nonacceptance

5.6.1. Analysis of Scenes and their description

Episode 5: Observing the Wall (00:03:55 - 00:04:10)

After the lunch exclusion Purl is alone in her desk. Her eyes shift to the wall where there are photographs of Employee of the Month. Her look is tracked by the camera to show a grid of distinctly similar pictures: white men in suits of middle age, all with the same faces and expression. Although it is not a direct interaction, this visual moment plays the role of discursive evidence of systemic exclusion.

5.6.2. Discourse of Silence

Mills (1995) notes that discourse does not only act on the basis of spoken language but behaves via their visual representation and the symbolism of the institution. The wall with the employee-of-the-month is a symbol of what is praised and rewarded in this working place: a masculine identity that is duplicated over and over. We have no visual diversity, and what Acker (1990) terms the "ideal worker" norm, the unmarked standard against which all the workers are judged, is represented. The perfect employee in B.R.O.

Capital is a male and this ideal is naturalized by the repetitive display of its image. The visual exclusion that Purl identifies with the help of her melancholic face is an indication that she realizes that she is not able to assume the idealized identity of a workplace.

5.7. Knitting Trial: Labor of Femininity Devalued

5.7.1. Scene Description

Episode 6: Knitting at Desk (00:04:15 - 00:04:35)

Purl is knitting at one point in the course of a work break, which is appropriate because it is a traditional activity associated with her role as a ball of yarn and with feminine-coded domestic craft. She is overtaken by a male co-worker.

5.7.2 Interactional Analysis: Gawking Stigmatization

Goffman (1963) examines how the stigmatized identities can be handled via interaction. Although this framework is not directly utilized in the analysis, the long stare of the male colleague is observed in the present analysis as a form of negative appraisal of the activity of Purl. The stare, which lasts 1.2 seconds, along with the eyebrows raised and, also, the head-shake, is a gesture of disapproval that does not require verbal expression. According to Goffman (1967), the expressive component of social life gains importance since it is through this that the definition of the situation is created (p. 105). The knitting is not a job situation, as the response embodied by the colleague indicates. The reaction of Purl, namely, by stopping the activity and pushing it aside, can be interpreted as an instance of defensive face-work: the efforts to avoid more face-loss by complying with the apparent norms. She understands that knitting identifies her as being different and in reaction to this, she denies it.

5.7.3. Discourse Analysis: Gendered Activity and Professional Identity

The dismissal of knitting is what Fletcher (1999) refers to as the invisibility of the so-called relational practice, which are activities that are coded feminine that are not comprehensible as possible assets in a workplace. Knitting may be a sign of creative problem-solving or stress relief, but it is specifically the cultural coding of femininity that makes knitting unprofessional. Mills (2008) posits that women in the work world are put under pressure to avoid identifying themselves with some form of feminine activities. Professionalism as constructed at the workplace is seen as incompatible with femininity at the domestic level in which women are forced to decide whether they want to be feminine or they are able to be recognized as professionally legitimate. The choice by Purl to quit knitting is that of her early acknowledgement of this incompatibility, but at this stage of the story she is not yet aware of how she will work this out.

Chapter 6: Analysis Part 2 (Transformation and Assimilation)

6.1. Introduction

The chapter is the analysis of the second step of Purl, which explores the strategic change of the main character and their inclusion into the workplace. After the established

exclusion that is recorded in Chapter 5, Purl changes her interactional performance to reflect the conventions of the masculine-coded discourse that underlies workplace belonging at B.R.O. Capital. The consequence of this transformation is that the assessment of her performances and her ability to participate in the workplace dramatically changes. The discussion shows that inclusion is not provided according to competence and merit but it depends on adherence to the rules of gendered interaction. Purl acquires masculine-coded behavior, aggressive humor, competitive communication, emotional restraint, and homo-social bonding practices, which provide the workplace acceptance that is systematically denied during the first phase. This shows the coercive aspect of so-called neutrality of professional standards as described by Mills (2008): they need to suppress feminine-coded behaviors and adopt masculine performances.

6.2. Strategic impression management: The Transformation

6.2.1. Scene Description

Episode 7: Transformation Montage (00:04:40 - 00:05:20)

The film portrays the metamorphosis of Purl in the form of the montage sequence in which she systematically altered her looks and her behavior. To a great extent, this sequence is non-verbal and uses visual representation and soundtrack to communicate the process of change.

6.2.2. The Front-Stage Preparation Interactional Analysis

This montage sequence is back-stage preparation of front-stage performance as described by Goffman (1959). Purl is alone in the office since the activities of the impression management that happen behind closed doors and where the audience to whom the performances are directed are not present (Goffman, 1959, pp. 112-113). The order unveils the tactical and labored gender acts. The process of becoming Purl is not natural or spontaneous but has to be practiced consciously: learning to act like a man, changing the voice, acquiring culture information that is more masculine (sports), and denying feminine indicators (removing pink coloring, dropping the knitting). This concurs with the explanation of gender as performative by Butler (1990) that is made through repetition and not this necessary identity. More importantly, the montage depicts Purl reading and imitating the actions of the men. She does not create a new way of interaction but just replicated the current masculine norm. According to Goffman (1959), whenever a person is present in the presence of others, he purposefully as well as inadvertently gives an impression of a situation definition (p. 242). The metamorphosis of Purl is a conscious projection of a new definition: the one that is in line with the masculine-coded professionalism.

6.2.3. Discourse Analysis: Adherence to Masculine Rules

Mills (2008) proposes that inclusion of women in the workplace usually demands what she refers to as gender neutralization the silencing of femininity and embracing

masculine language forms. This "neutralization, however, is not symmetrical: women have to alter their behavior in order to be closer to masculine standards, not the other way around. This asymmetry is reflected in the transformation montage in visual aspects.

6.3. Post-Transformational Inclusion: The same Context, the different Test

6.3.1. Morning Greeting Redux

Episode 8: Transformed Greeting (00:05:25 -00:05:40)

The movie shows a greeting of Purl following transformation, purposely a parallel to the previous greeting that was not answered (Episode 1, Chapter 5).

6.3.2 Comparative Interactional Analysis

The interactional analysis of the case under consideration will be performed comparatively. The juxtaposition between the 1st episode is vast. The content of the greeting is functionally the same, a morning greeting as one arrives, but the interactional result is dramatically changed. In the first episode, the excited Ruth cries Good MORNING! was not answered at all; in Episode 8 her low-key "Morning" is immediately recognized by three co-workers. Using the face-work framework by Goffman (1967), ratification is the critical difference. The face-claim of transgender Purl is given: her greeting is recognized, which makes her a valid member of the workplace. The reactions of the men, which can be seen as verbal, nodding, and gestures, are what Goffman (1967) refers to as supportive face-work: assisting in upholding the other person in their professed social value (p. 14). It is not the content of the greeting that is different but the style of performance. Post-transformation Purl uses the masculine-coded rules of greeting: the lack of emotion (flat intonation), lack of movement (no waving), and skim. These changes are an indication of her conformity to norms of discourse in the workplace and such conformity is rewarded by inclusion.

6.3.3. Discourse Analysis: Performance Conformity Rewarded

Mills (2003) holds that workplace evaluation is explicit by inputting an implicit comparison with masculine norms. The glee with which pre-transformation Purl received him broke rules of emotional control; the greeting of the post-transformation Purl is subdued. The instant recognition that she obtains is a good assessment of her effective conformity. More importantly, this shows that there was never a question as to whether Purl greeted colleagues- she did it in both episodes. The question is whether her greeting style was in the masculine-coded professional norms: did she perform it in the way men were expected to do the same. This shows the line of argument in the book of Mills (2008) which states that workplace exclusion works in terms of evaluating communicative style and not content or competence.

6.4. Water cooler inclusion: Homo-social bonding achieved

6.4.1. Scene Description

Episode 9: Water Cooler Success (00:05:45 - 00:06:15)

After transformation Purl also participates in the same water cooler talk that did not include her (Episode 2, Chapter 5).

6.4.2. Interactional Analysis: Framework of Transformation in participation

When the performance conformity is compared to the participation frameworks, the contrast with Episode 2 shows the response. Purl is not allowed to participate in episodes 2 (with her collaborative question, what are we talking about?), she is allowed to participate in episode 9 (with a forceful assessment, What a CHUMP), as the latter makes her the part of the ratified participation structure. The explanation of this transformation is given by Goffman (1981): in this case Purl uses the interaction ritual suitable in this situation. Instead of looking to gain access by asking polite questions, she gains access by using competitive, evaluative commentaries, which is the style that defines the masculine workplace humor (Holmes, 2006). The immediate reaction of the men turning to her, including her into laughter, high-fiving is what Goffman (1967) terms as interaction ritual success: as everyone has put the proper face and reinforced each other in their performance, the interaction proceeds in a smooth way. Purl has mastered the ritual requirements and her successful demonstration is paid off by being included.

6.4.3 Discourse Analysis: Masculine Humor Bonding Mechanism

According to Holmes (2006), workplace humor is known to have a variety of roles: it builds solidarity, power relations, and is used to mark in-group membership. The water cooler comedy in Purl performs all three roles, and, most notably, is gendered both in content and style. The humour is that of competitive losses, which is laughing at one another failing, and the use of violent terms (chump, loser), delivered with vocal energy. This code is the opposite of feminine-coded humor that is more likely to depreciate oneself and save a relationship instead of being aggressive (Holmes, 2006, p. 123). Purl has to not only grasp the humor but deliver it properly: playing it with aggression, using it dismissively, participating in group put-downs with excitement. This would be viewed as adherence to the rules of masculine discourses by Mills (2008) - rules that value competitive individualistically and undermine collaboratively relationality. The high-five at the end of the episode is especially important: it is a physical contact of acceptance, which was very lacking in the pre-transformation stage. This was in sign of inclusion that indicated that Purl had the successful entry into the masculine homo social bonding.

6.5. Meeting Attendance: Speech and Power.

6.5.1. Scene Description

Episode 10: Meeting Contribution Success (00:06:20 00:06:50)

Another team meeting is surveyed, which is organized after transformation Purl, similarly to the first meeting when her initiatives were disregarded (Episode 3, Chapter 5).

6.5.2. Interactional Analysis: Turn taking success and Face Gain

The turn taking evaluation is dramatic as demonstrated by the meeting participation. Purl used hedges (um, maybe), and was talked over in Episode 3. In the tenth episode, she cuts off and speaks in harsh terms, which are eagerly approved. This change is enlightened by the idea of face gain by Goffman (1967). Not only is the face of Purl preserved (her input is recognized), but she is accorded extra face when the boss is so excited and delegates the leadership task. This is what Goffman (1967) refers to as the ability to create a reputation (p. 9) - now, Purl is in a place of being competent and authoritative. Most importantly, the contents of the suggestion made by Purl do not differ significantly with her previous suggestions- both entail strategic approaches to commercial problems. The distinction is all in the way of delivery aggressive instead of collaborative, confident instead of hedged, interrupting instead of waiting to get floor rights.

6.5.3 The phenomenon of aggression as professional competence

According to Mills (2003, 2008), communicative style is the way professional competence is discursively constructed as much as it is substantively one. Competence, in the case of B.R.O. Capital, is marked by aggressive self-assertion, i.e., loud volume, confident tone, competitive language, and readiness to cut in. The response of the boss is (NOW we're talking! THATS what I want to hear!") is a direct praise of violence. The words that I want to hear imply that the past efforts, such as the earlier collaborative proposals by Purl were not ineffective but lacking in the style of communication as desired. This is what Baxter (2010) refers to as the male norm of leadership, which is the linking of power to aggressive and competitive forms of communication. In this situation, Purl becomes more authoritative not by proving different or better ideas but by enacting ideas in what can be described as masculinely-coded mode of authority that is considered authoritative in such situations.

6.6. Lunch Inclusion: The Final Ratification

6.6.1. Scene Description

Episode 11: Lunch Invitation (00:06:55 - 00:07:10)

The scene of departure of the lunch is shown in the film once more with a new Purl who is transformed as well.

6.6.2. Interactional Analysis: Full Participation Framework Inclusion

The difference between Episode 4 (Chapter 5) and the one discussed here is absolute. Purl is now actually invited in ("You in?"), affirms his/her participation and is literally integrated in the middle of the group instead of standing by himself. This is unveiled by Goffman (1967) interaction ritual paradigm where Purl is no longer a marginalized individual wishing to be involved but a full-scale legitimate applicant into the workplace sociability. The question "You in?" refers to what conversation analysts term a pre-invitation (Schegloff, 2007) - it presupposes the inclusion of Purl, but not the questioning. In addition to this, Purl now has the cultural capital needed to participate in

other words, knowledge of sports which allows her to add to the conversation topics that are masculine-coded. Her reaction (that last play was INSANE) indicates that she has competency in the discourse practices, which organize workplace bonding.

6.6.3. Discourse Analysis: Assimilation Full

According to Mills (2008), informal workplace sociability is an important location of inclusion and exclusion as they are performed. The fact that Purl is included in lunch gives her triumphant acculturation. She has also taken the communicative styles, cultural knowledge and interaction rituals that define her as a part of the masculine workplace community. Such inclusion however comes with the condition of continued conformity. Purl has to keep on doing the masculine-coded actions which made her acceptable. Any revert to feminine-coded communication, the collaborative language, the expressiveness of emotion, curiosity about inappropriate areas of interest, would put fresh exclusion under risk. This contingency unveils the coercive character of seemingly voluntary conformism, as, although nobody literally forces Purl to act in a masculine way, the systematic exclusion that she faced when acting in a femininely manner does not give her any viable choice when it comes to the desire to belong in the workplace.

6.7 The Costs of Assimilation: What Is Lost

Suppression of authentic communication refers to the process where a leader seeks to suppress others from expressing their authentic selves in order to maintain the established structure and order within an organization or group.

6.7.1. Scene Description

Episode 12: Purl Alone (00:07:15 - 00:07:30)

In the movie, there is a short shot of Purl sitting at her desk in the office when no one is present. She is physically worn-out, bent over her desk. The camera rests on her lost pink accessories lying in a drawer implying what has been lost. This scene reflects what Goffman (1959) is referring to as front and back stage selves tension. Post-transformation Purl presents well on stage during front communication and the back stage reality check shows the price: weariness of prolonged acting and repression of parts of the identity.

6.7.2. Attack on Collaborative Values

The communication style of pre-transformation Purl was focused on cooperation, motivation, and interpersonal relationship - the values correlated with feminine-coded communication (Holmes, 2006). After transformation, she uses competitive, aggressive, individualistic communication which is against these values. The movie itself fails to critically evaluate this change, although the critical prism makes it clear that what is being lost is what Foucault (1987) has termed the disappearance of relational practice: the useful qualities of collaborative and relational skills are instead undermined and eventually killed in an environment where workplace culture promotes competitive individualism. The

exclusionary norms can be reproduced, i.e., they are composed of other norms, which subsequently reproduce them.

6.7.3. Reproduction of Exclusionary Norms

The exclusionary norms can be reproduced, i.e., they are made of other norms, which in turn produce them. More importantly, the fact that Purl can successfully assimilate is not a threat to the gendered norms of the workplace, on the contrary, it is a recreation of these norms. By adhering to masculine-coded behaviors, Purl authenticates the behaviors as the norms of inclusion. The same pressure to fit in will be exerted on other women who will join the workplace and the cycle of being excluded and conforming begins. This is what Mills (2008) recognizes as the constraint of individual adaptation strategies: though they can ensure the inclusion of particular persons, they are not able to alter structural discourse norms that create the exclusion.

6.8. The Arrival of Lacy: Recognition and Resistance

6.8.1. Scene Description

Episode 13: Lacy's First Day (00:07:35 - 00:08:00)

One more ball of yarn comes into the world: Lacy is bright yellow and enthusiastic. The scene is comparable to the first arrival of Purl.

6.8.2 Interactional Analysis: Exclusionary Patterns Recognition

According to Goffman (1959), performance can be observed in other people, which may expose the performances that were constructed by an individual. Seeing Lacy subjected to the same kind of exclusion, Purl is able to see the systematic nature of it: it is not the failure of the individual woman, it is the structural exclusion at work that excludes her, no matter which woman this may be. This recognition is crucial. At this point, Purl is able to realize that she was not excluded because of any personal incompetence but because she was not compatible with the gendered workplace conventions. Lacy is also faced with the same systematic non-response, the same face-threats, that Purl has been receiving- not due to her incompetence, like Purl, but due to her feminine-coded communication style, which is against the masculine norms in the workplace.

6.8.3. Discourse Analysis: Witnessing Structural Inequality

Mills (2008) stresses that in order to effectively challenge workplace sexism, it is important to be aware of its structural and not individual character. The fact that Lacy was marginalized, as noted by Purl, gives this credit: it is not the communication style of individual women that has made the difference but the discourse norms in the workplace that systematically marginalize feminine-coded practices. This preconditions the ultimate metamorphosis of the film the choice of Purl, not to be absorbed and to promote the change, which is examined in the next section.

6.9. Resistance and Advocacy Transformation Redux

6.9.1. Scene Description

Episode 14: The Second Transformation of Purl (00:08:00 - 00:08:30)

In the last scene of the movie, Purl undergoes another transformation back to her original form and she defends the inclusion of Lacy.

6.9.2. Interactional Analysis: Other Performance Strategies

This rejection of full assimilation is expressed through Purl returning to her original look. Yet, her interactional style, in this scene, unites the traits of both her pre- and post-transformational behaviors warmth and cooperation (feminine-coded) and confidence and authority (masculine-coded). In the framework suggested by Goffman (1959), it would be examined as a novel performance strategy: Purl is no longer just re-enacting the existing masculine convention as he is trying to implement different rituals of interaction which would appreciate the emotion of collaboration and professionalism. Importantly, she defends Lacy by advocacy, which, according to Goffman (1967), is known as protective face-work: face-such acts aimed at preserving the face of other people. The way Purl welcomes Lacy and directly asks the men to be nice to her also gives Lacy the face-support that she honestly did not have initially.

6.9.3. Discourse Analysis: A Controversial Normative Structures

The challenge to the exclusionary norms is not an individual adaptation that Mills (2008) argues is needed to transform the workplace discourse. This challenge is embodied in the advocacy of Purl: instead of Lacy adapting (as Purl did), she wants the workplace to adjust to other communication styles. The reaction of the men at the beginning of the reaction, which was of surprise and then acceptance of the welcoming behavior, is that norms are arguable. Their obedience elucidates that the masculine-coded discourse standards are never imperative but they were created and reproduced in the course of daily interaction. They may be rebuilt when subjected to challenges.

Chapter 7: Discussion and Findings

7.1. Introduction

The analysis produced three significant findings. To begin with, the exclusion at workplace was not conducted by direct discrimination, but through indirect communicative processes, namely, non-response, a framework of participation control, marginalization of turn taking. Second, the inclusion at the workplace demanded broad adherence to the Masculine-coded discourse rules which meant that the adaptation burden was placed asymmetrically on the marginalized person. Third, one-to-one assimilation patterns resulted in personal inclusion but replicated and not changed structural workplace cultures. The findings shed light on how modern day gender inequality is perpetuated even in the context of legal measures on equality, acting through the day-to-day communicative and seemingly neutral communicative processes that continue to undermine feminine-coded practices systematically.

7.2. Invisibility of the Contemporary Workplace Exclusion

Probably the most remarkable result was the extent of exclusion that was carried out without the direct use of any discriminatory utterances. None of the characters in Purl commented that women should not be here or made overtly sexist comments. But gendered exclusion was widespread, organized and unambiguous. This invisibility sheds light on one of the major changes in the nature of workplace inequality in the modern times. These systematic silences of 1.5 seconds following the greetings of Purl, these closed participation structures at the water cooler, these overlapped contributions made during the meetings, all of these micro-levels practices theorized by Mills (2008) as indirect sexism. In contrast with the direct sexism that was prevalent in previous periods and is now illegal, indirect sexism operates in the form of seemingly neutral actions, which when systematically studied, show gendered trends. The men were not intentionally attempting to lock Purl out in any deliberate way; they were just adhering to the rules of interaction that happened to systematically discriminate her style of communication. This observation is significant as it reflects the way gender inequality remains strong despite the decades of legal safeguarding and diversity efforts. In cases where exclusion is done indirectly, it is so hard to determine, confront, or reverse. No discriminating statements to mention, no policies to dispute, no distinct impediments to eliminate. Rather, inequality is reproduced in thousands of micro-level interactions, who is recognized, whose work is developed, whose thoughts are attributed, whose style of communication is considered to be professional.

These micro-level mechanisms were found to act cumulatively as the analysis demonstrated. Any one of them, the unresponsive greeting, the contribution cut short, would be excusable as accidental or due to personal ill-manners. Still, the systemic trend in several episodes proved to exhibit structural, but not interpersonal exclusion. It is this systematic that makes individual interaction processes into inequality processes. Besides, the unreal nature of exclusion imposed unimaginable pressure on the excluded person. What do we do to dispute the fact that we are being overlooked and not paranoid or oversensitive? What is the challenge to the participation framework closure when nobody had clearly declined entry? Their invulnerability to being challenged by direct mechanisms safeguards them, and the result is that inequality is able to persist specifically because it is not explicitly recognized at all.

7.3. Gendering of the Neutral Professional Standards

The second significant result was related to the implicit masculine-coding of the seemingly neutral professional standards. The nature of communication in the company was characterized as professional communication, which at B.R.O. Capital was aggressive, competitive, and not to show emotions at all, and it is all culturally related to being a man. However these norms were never written as gendered; they were merely how things are done here, what competence would look like, what would be deemed as an

appropriate workplace behavior. This discovery builds on the theoretical effort by Mills (2008) because it illustrates with scientific accuracy how the process of naturalization takes place. The direct characteristics of aggression and energy praised by the boss in the episode 10 were not presented as masculine qualities but as professional skills. These behaviors were not found to be gendered by the systematic positive assessment of loud, confident, interruptive communication in meetings, but were attributes of leadership potential. Masculine communication lacked marking, it did not need any justification, explanation, or labelling. It was nothing more than professionalism.

On the other hand, collaboration, warmth, affective forms of communication by Purl was identified as deviant. Not feminized as being too feminine, but unspokenly judged as not professional enough, lacking in confidence, not authority enough. The binarization of masculine versus feminine as the unmarked-professional and the marked-unprofessional was a framework in which women were at a systematic disadvantage in spite of their true ability or even their input. The comparison of parallel episodes before and after transformation is especially interesting evidence. In episode 3 and episode 10, the contribution to the meeting was substantively similar, which consisted of strategic business suggestions. But, Episode 3 (pre-transformation) lead to discussing and neglecting Purl and proto-enthusiastic response and leadership appointment in Episode 10 (post-transformation). The point of difference was not content but style, not what was said but how it was done. This proves that the assessment was based on conformity to gendered discourse conventions instead of merit and competence. This observation contradicts meritocratic assumptions behind a lot of diversity talk. Individual organizations tend to define inclusion as a form of giving everyone an equal chance to prosper depending on their capabilities.

However, when only conformity to implicitly masculine norms of communication determines success, then there is not an equal opportunity. Women have a decision men have no: to silence the natural communication styles to manifest the masculine standards, or to uphold the natural forms and suffer systematic marginalization. In any case, the level of playing is not even. This also contributes to the low efficiency of most diversity interventions due to the naturalization of male standards as being neutral professionalism. Women-focused programs that teach women how to speak up, be more assertive or learn executive presence do not question the gendering of professional norms. They frame the issue as the lack of conformity in women instead of the exclusivity norms of organizations. Such interventions can assist individual women to manoeuvre in hostile environments, by not questioning the norms, which do not change the environments.

7.4 Cost, Asymmetry and the Limit of Individual Adaptation

The analysis of the transformation showed the radical imbalance of the workplace adaptation. Purl transformed each aspect of the communicative performance visual

display, vocal attributes, embodied behavior, linguistic expression, cultural competence, emotional expression. The men modified nothing. This entire one-sidedness uncovers the mythology of the diverse workplaces that was obtained through the hiring of women into the same masculine cultures that were not altered. The severity of the necessary change is impressive. Purl did not merely have to speak up more or be more confident she had to undergo radical change of communicative identity. The montage sequence revealed what is typically invisible the back-stage work involved in front-stage professional performance when one does not fit in with to hegemonic norms. This effort, what Hochschild (1983) has called emotional labor, is unequally burdened upon the marginalized individuals and is barely noticed by organizations. Besides, the analysis indicated expenditures on sustained assimilation. The personal cost of constant performance, as portrayed in episode 12 (when Purl is left alone after work, wearing pink accessories she hides in her desk) was the personal cost of a long-term performance.

The concept of front-stage and back-stage introduced by Goffman (1959) is quite eye-opening: the necessity to perform front-stage roles that conflict with real identities results in what organizational researchers call cover (Yoshino and Smith, 2013) the repression of the stigmatized parts of the self to align with the institutional expectations. In addition to the personal expenses, assimilation replicated the inequality in structure. This became most evident in Episode 13, when Lacy appeared to show that, despite Purl, the inclusion was successful, the norms in the workplace did not change. Lacy went through the same mechanisms of exclusion. Personal adaptation solutions, however effective in certain individuals, do not change the organizational cultures. They can even strengthen exclusionary rules through showing that it can be successful- only that women need to change. The end of the film was hinting at other possibilities.

The fact that Purl is back to pink looks and promotes Lacy was not accommodation but challenge. The norms may be challenged by her insistence that her colleagues should embrace Lacy and the fact that they did. Nonetheless, this was a short and vague conclusion. Would Purl be able to sustain her integrated performance forever? Do the organizational culture actually change or had she just gained enough status to make her difference acceptable? These queries concerning sustainability and change lead to underlying conflict in diversity work. There are cases where individual women can navigate the environments that are exclusionary by strategically adapting to it and develop adequate organizational capital that would one day enable them to lobby the other people. However, one can take this route only when one has resources to maintain long periods of exclusion and carry out long-term assimilation. Such resources are lacking in many women especially those subjected to intersection marginalization. Additionally, the fact that people have to demonstrate themselves by being a conformist in order to be accorded the right to be different only serve to reinforce inequality and not to confront inequality.

7.5. The Performance and Regulation Relationship

The compound analysis indicated how the interactional performance and discursive regulation work in dialectical relationship. These schemata provided by Goffman (1959, 1967) shed light on the way Purl skillfully employed impressions, performance changing, and face-work. The frameworks provided by Mills (2003, 2008) showed the existence of norms of discourse that were used as the yardstick against which performances were judged. The dynamics were not best represented by either of the frameworks. More importantly, the discussion showed that although people have an agency of changing performances, this agency is claimed to be structurally constrained. Purl could also alter her style of communication- this was real strategy. She was however not able to alter the communication styles that were appreciated. The discourse rules that regulated workplace engagement were created in a shared manner, which was reproduced in patterns of systematic evaluation and imposed by giving out or withholding face and belonging.

There was individual agency, but with limitations put in place by structural discursive power. This observation is part of the persistent theoretical discussions of structure and agency in the study of gender. The performativity theory by Butler (1990) focuses on the fact that gender is created through repetitive stylized acts. The "doing gender" framework by West and Zimmerman (1987) demonstrates that people are subject to gender expectations, and they are held responsible by way of interactional evaluation. The current discussion shows how both of these work mutually: people do gender strategically (agency), but in the framework of evaluations that limit the performance success (structure). Additionally, the discussion showed the way in which inequality is perpetuated via ostensibly free willful individual decisions. Purl decided to change the style of her communication. However, was this decision really voluntary when the other option was continued exclusion of involvement in the work place? The seeming presence of choice hides the force of the systems that put some groups at a disadvantage. When the organizational norms favor masculine communication, the decision of women to use masculine styles is determined by the structure of inequality although it is taken to seem as an individual decision.

Chapter 8: Conclusion

8.1. The Final Reflection

This research has explored the construction of gendered workplace belonging based on interactional performance and discursive regulation in an animated short film Purl in Pixar. Based on the erice sociology of dramaturgy introduced by Erving Goffman and the feminist discourse analysis by Sara Mills, the study examined communicative micro-processes that inclusivity and exclusion in the workplace take place. The analysis showed that gender is acted out in various dimensions of interaction which include:

greeting styles, contributions to conversations, turn-taking, participation in humor, embodied behavior, and paralinguistic. Pre-transformation Purl acted gender in terms of enthusiastic affect, co-operative communication, moderate tone, hedged language, and embodiment expressive of emotion, all forms of behavior which are culturally designated as feminine (Holmes, 2006).

These performances were evaluated in a systematic manner negatively by non response, conversational overlap, face threat and exclusion in workplace activities. Post-transformation Purl approached gender differently, following a lower demand of affect, competitive speech, aggressive volume, assertive language, and restrained embodiment, all of which were masculine-coded behaviors. These performances were considered as positive by way of recognition, inclusion and giving out of powers. Most importantly, the analysis showed that evaluation was related to the style of performance but not content or competence. Purl did not have any change in her professional skills, but rather an interactional alignment with the masculine coded discourse norms. The result confirms the theorization of Goffman (1977) that gender is a display of interaction that is subject to evaluation and the discussion by Mills (2003) that gendered evaluation is an implicitly comparative process to masculine standards.

8.2. Theoretical Contributions

The integration of Goffman and Mills aims at realizing the ideals of cultural diversity and multiculturalism within society (Hollis 234). The ideals of cultural diversity and multiculturalism in the society are to be achieved through the integration of Goffman and Mills (Hollis 234). The main conceptual input of the study was to show that interactional sociology of Goffman and feminist discourse analysis of Mills can work together effectively. Although both frameworks are well established on their own, their systematic combination towards a gendered workplaces dynamics analysis is a methodological step in the right direction. The combination of both allows studying the work of each separately (Goffman) and the constraint of the structure (Mills), showing that they work together. Purl is a strategic impression manager and performs adjustments (agency), but within the parameters that gendered discourse conventions set (structure). This dialectic cannot be described by either of the two frameworks separately. The research therefore adds methodology protocols in systematic integration: three-phase analysis using Goffman, then Mills, and then integrated interpretation.

References

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society*, 4(2), 139-158.
- Ashcraft, K. L. (2011). Knowing work through the communication of difference: A revised agenda for difference studies. In D. K. Mumby (Ed.), *Reframing difference in organizational communication studies* (pp. 3-30). SAGE Publications.

- Baxter, J. (2010). *The language of female leadership*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bergvall, V. L., Bing, J. M., & Freed, A. F. (Eds.). (1996). *Rethinking language and gender research: Theory and practice*. Longman.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). Greenwood Press.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. Routledge.
- Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. SAGE Publications.
- Cameron, D. (Ed.). (1997). *The feminist critique of language: A reader* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Cameron, D., McAlinden, F., & O'Leary, K. (1988). Lakoff in context: The social and linguistic functions of tag questions. In J. Coates & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Women in their speech communities* (pp. 74-93). Longman.
- Catalyst. (2022). *Women in the workforce: United States* (Quick Take). <https://www.catalyst.org/research/women-in-the-workforce-united-states/>
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241-1299.
- Do Rozario, R. (2004). The princess and the magic kingdom: Beyond nostalgia, the function of the Disney princess. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 27(1), 34-59.
- Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (1992). Think practically and look locally: Language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 21, 461-490. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.21.100192.002333>
- Erickson, F. (1985). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 119-161). Macmillan.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman.
- Fishman, P. M. (1983). Interaction: The work women do. In B. Thorne, C. Kramarae, & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language, gender and society* (pp. 89-101). Newbury House.
- Fletcher, J. K. (1999). *Disappearing acts: Gender, power, and relational practice at work*. MIT Press.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Prentice Hall.
- Gentry, R., & Harrison, L. (2020). Using film as a creative arts method to explore workplace sexism. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*, 15(3), 291-309.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Anchor Books.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Prentice Hall.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Anchor Books.
- Goffman, E. (1977). The arrangement between the sexes. *Theory and Society*, 4(3), 301-331. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00206983>
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Goodwin, C. (2000). Action and embodiment within situated human interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(10), 1489-1522. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(99\)00096-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00096-X)
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Harding, S. (1991). *Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives*. Cornell University Press.
- Hepburn, A., & Bolden, G. B. (2017). *Transcribing for social research*. SAGE Publications.
- Holmes, J. (2006). *Gendered talk at work: Constructing gender identity through workplace discourse*. Blackwell.
- Holmes, J., & Stubbe, M. (2003). *Power and politeness in the workplace: A sociolinguistic analysis of talk at work*. Pearson Education.
- Jaworski, A. (1993). *The power of silence: Social and pragmatic perspectives*. SAGE Publications.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13-31). John Benjamins.
- Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American Sociological Review*, 71(4), 589-617.
- Kendall, S., & Tannen, D. (1997). Gender and language in the workplace. In R. Wodak (Ed.), *Gender and discourse* (pp. 81-105). SAGE Publications.
- Labov, W. (1990). The intersection of sex and social class in the course of linguistic change. *Language Variation and Change*, 2(2), 205-254.
- Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and woman's place*. Harper & Row.
- Lauzen, M. M., Dozier, D. M., & Horan, N. (2008). Constructing gender stereotypes through social roles in prime-time television. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 52(2), 200-214.
- Lazar, M. M. (2005). *Feminist critical discourse analysis: Gender, power and ideology in discourse*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Martin, P. Y. (2003). "Said and done" versus "saying and doing": Gendering practices, practicing gender at work. *Gender & Society*, 17(3), 342-366.
- McKinsey & Company. (2023). *Women in the workplace 2023*. <https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/diversity-and-inclusion/women-in-the-workplace>
- Mills, S. (1995). *Feminist stylistics*. Routledge.
- Mills, S. (2003). Gender and politeness. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(2), 185-206.
- Mills, S. (2008). *Language and sexism*. Cambridge University Press.

- Mullany, L. (2011). Frontstage and backstage: Gordon Brown, the "bigoted woman" and (im)politeness in the 2010 UK general election. In Linguistic Politeness Research Group (Ed.), *Discursive approaches to politeness* (pp. 179-208). De Gruyter Mouton.
- Norris, S. (2004). *Analyzing multimodal interaction: A methodological framework*. Routledge.
- Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as theory. In E. Ochs & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Developmental pragmatics* (pp. 43-72). Academic Press.
- Pauwels, A. (1998). *Women changing language*. Longman.
- Pixar Animation Studios. (2019). *Purl* [Short film]. <https://www.pixar.com/purl>
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.
- Sanders, M. S. (2019). The gendered workplace: A study of Pixar's *Purl* as organizational communication pedagogy. *Communication Teacher*, 33(4), 286-291.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, S. L., Choueiti, M., Prescott, A., & Pieper, K. (2012). *Gender roles & occupations: A look at character attributes and job-related aspirations in film and television*. Geena Davis Institute on Gender in Media.
- Stivers, T., & Sidnell, J. (2005). Introduction: Multimodal interaction. *Semiotica*, 156, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.2005.2005.156.1>
- Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M. B., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist*, 62(4), 271-286.
- Tannen, D. (1984). *Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends*. Ablex.
- Tannen, D. (1994). *Talking from 9 to 5: Women and men at work*. William Morrow.
- Towbin, M. A., Haddock, S. A., Zimmerman, T. S., Lund, L. K., & Tanner, L. R. (2004). Images of gender, race, age, and sexual orientation in Disney feature-length animated films. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy*, 15(4), 19-44. https://doi.org/10.1300/J086v15n04_02
- Trudgill, P. (1974). *The social differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge University Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249-283.
- Wells, P. (2002). *Animation: Genre and authorship*. Wallflower Press.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1983). Small insults: A study of interruptions in cross-sex conversations between unacquainted persons. In B. Thorne, C. Kramarae, & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language, gender and society* (pp. 102-117). Newbury House.

- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, 1(2), 125-151.
- Wodak, R. (Ed.). (1997). *Gender and discourse*. SAGE Publications.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Zimmerman, D. H., & West, C. (1975). Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation. In B. Thorne & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language and sex: Difference and dominance* (pp. 105-129). Newbury House.