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#### Abstract

In 2016, Australia ranks 54th in the world for representation of women in Parliament, with women accounting for only $29 \%$ of the House of Representatives, and $39 \%$ of the Senate. This inevitably inspires discussion about women in parliament, quotas, and leadership styles. Given the wealth of research which suggests that equal representation does not necessarily guarantee equal treatment, this study focuses on Authoritative representation. That is, the space in between winning a seat and making a difference where components of communication and interaction affect the authority of a speaker.This study combines a Discourse Analysis of the official Hansard transcripts from the Senate Estimates Committee hearings, selected over a 10 year period between 2006 and 2015, with a linguistic ethnography of the Australian Senate to complement results with context. Results show that although female senators and witnesses are certainly in the room, they do not have the same capacity as their male counterparts. Both the access and effectiveness of women in the Senate is limited; not only are they given proportionally less time to speak, but interruption, gate keeping tactics, and the designation of questions significantly different in nature to those directed at men all work to limit female participation in the political domain. As witnesses, empirical measures showed that female testimony was often undermined by senators. Results also showed that female senators and witnesses occasionally adopted masculine styles of communication in an attempt to increase effectiveness in the Senate. That said, this was not enough to overcome the gendered expectations which limit female professionals in the political arena.
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## INTRODUCTION

Julia Gillard's tumultuous time in the top job led to a surge of interest in Australian female politicians. Academic literature relating to women at the top experienced a boom, with much being published on female leadership experience and styles. The treatment of female politicians by the Australian media also generated some academic interest, most likely due to the vilification of Gillard while she was in office. There was also a renewed interest in female candidacy and election. That said, little research has been conducted on the obstacles women face within the Australian parliament. Therefore, we have a greater understanding of the obstacles facing women trying to enter politics, and the obstacles facing women trying to progress in politics, but no real understanding of the problems facing female politicians simply trying to do their job. This is despite contemporaneous research existing in other cultures (James 2008; Wantchekon 2011; Humphreys, Masters, and Sandbu, 2006; Macedo et al. 2005; Karpowitz 2006; Walsh 2007; Devine et al. 2001; Gastil et al. 2010 Banand Rao). There is a strong body of international research which subverts the assumption that the election of a woman to a position of power will allow that person to influence on behalf of their group (Beckwith 2007; Childs and Krook 2006; Dahlerup 2006; Dolan, 1996; Franceschet \& Piscopo, 2008; Grey 2006; Htun and Power 2006; Mansbridge, 1999 \& 2005; Reingold 2000; Schwindt-Bayer 2006; Thomas, 1994; Tremblay and Pelletier 2000; Trimble, 2006; Vincent 2004; Weldon, 2002; Yoder, 1991). Even on the micro-level of discourse, social dynamics will subordinate the words and actions of women. This is of great significance for female politicians, who are elected to represent in a community of discourse. Australia's first female Prime Minister was a phenomenon that deserved significant academic attention, however it is important to also consider the gap in which other female members of the Australian parliament exist.

Women are, with little exception, underrepresented in the political arena. Lack of descriptive representation in government has been highly criticised by "critical mass" theory, in which Rosabeth Moss Kanter postulates that men's culture will dominate when women compose less than 15 percent, and that consequently women will be unable to function as little more than tokens. It goes on to suggest that women will have little agency, will be subjected to exclusionary and hostile behaviour by men, and will be perceived as less competent due to negative stereotypes relating to their gender (Kanter, 1977). Critical Mass theory also suggests that once women account for more than $35 \%$ they can begin to have some influence on the culture of the group, and experience more equal treatment. In 1995, the United Nations, motivated by this theory, set targets for all member states to increase female representation in government to $30 \%$, believing that this would allow women to make a visible impact on the style and content of political decision making. This led over one hundred countries to encourage or mandate gender quotas, with similar efforts being enacted in private enterprise, in Spain, Iceland, the Netherlands, Norway, and France (Pande and Ford 2011). While this effort was impressive, there has never been any clear evidence demonstrating a positive effect for substantive representation as a result of proper descriptive representation. Critical mass theory has been disputed as "both problematic and under-theorised" and has been criticised for minimising the contribution of small numbers of women (Beckwith and Cowell-Meyers 2007, 553). Surprisingly, consequent literature suggest that, at times, a small number of women can make a difference. At other times, women compromising $50 \%$ of a group can fail to make an impact. There is no solid explanation as to why this occurs. Literature suggests that more attention needs to be paid to authoritative representation, the area between winning a seat and making a difference (Carroll 2001; Franceschet, Krook, and Piscopo 2012; Reingold 2000; 2008, 132 and 140). It is in this area, that this research hopes to contribute, by seeking to further understand the behaviours within institutions that limit women's ability to contribute and succeed.

This thesis seeks to investigate whether or not women are at a linguistic disadvantage in Australian decision making bodies. This will be accomplished through an exploration of four hypotheses applied to Senate Estimates Hearings. By explaining women's ability to participate in policy making bodies, a snapshot of their current and potential impact in
government can be elucidated. The core objective of this study is to examine the differences in access to political discussion experienced by both men and women and subsequently, the effectiveness with which they are able to communicate their views. This will be achieved through the examination of hypotheses and measures used in existing international studies of gender participation in a political setting, in the hope of illustrating a faithful portrait of access and effectiveness in the Australian Senate during Estimates hearings.

The liberal ideology which forms the foundation for western politics is built on competition, individualism, and self-realisation. Through this ideological lens, it is understood that any woman who decides to participate in domains that have historically been exclusively male can contend with men and be successful (see Duerst-Lathi and Johnson, 1991 for wider discussion). It is this concept that purports we should be able to simply add women to any equation to achieve equality. That said, this point of view fails to address that rules which govern the exercise of power in society create a situation where some social groups work at a disadvantage; these rules benefit players who already occupy a preferred position. Political institutions are inherently gendered, with much political history authored and occupied by men (Sappiro, 19991; Kenney, 1996). Experience has illustrated to women that the government is not a neutral device that can be equally used to anyone's advantage. Power and effectiveness in the political world is directly influenced by access to resources, which is by no means equal across the genders. Masculinity infiltrates our cultural definition of leadership, and thus presents an obstacle to women's effectiveness in government (Kelly and Duerst-Lathi 1995, 16-20). When women enter politics it is made clear that they must "do so within ideological terms of masculine norms" and they are thus limited by the images of gender constructed by society.

There is a strong possibility that these "masculine norms" are the major catalyst behind the inequalities between males and females who hold formal positions of political power. Academics have noted that women are less likely to be leaders, partially because of existing male leaders, who use their position and resources to ensure the continuance of their control and women's status as outsiders (Constantini, 1990). The general imbalance in power within institutions can permeate into interpersonal relations; gender, for instance, will affect whose arguments are considered to be persuasive in debate or deliberation. Therefore, discourse can
be used, whether it be deliberately or unconsciously, by a dominant group as a tool to maintain control of an environment. As discourse is an integral component of political life, any imbalance or misuse of language will surely have significantly larger implications for women's ability to participate meaningfully in government (Fairclough, 1989).

Speech acts are an opportunity for actors to establish status and authority within a group setting. That said it is the reaction of the group to a speech act which affords a speaker this status (Ridgeway, Berger, and Smith 1985). Individuals convey their status and the status of those around them using communication cues. Speakers that are more dominant and confident in a group, identifiable through both the actions of the speaker and their reception by the group, use a combination of communication cues which signal a higher status; they speak more; they speak sooner; they negatively interrupt more; and positively interrupt (that is, to offer verbal support or encouragement for a speaker) less (Dovidio et al. 1988; Johnson 1994; Kollock, Blumstein, and Schwartz 1985; Ng, Brooke, and Dunne 1995). Interruptions are a key communication signal. Interruptions are inherently connected to volubility. That said, interruptions speak more to the agency of an individual than volubility, which can simply signify sociability (Ridgeway and Johnson 1990; Rudman and Glick 2001). Interruptions also have a significantly more negative and smothering effect on marginalised groups, as these groups are coming from a position where their authority is already fragile. Therefore any disagreement targeting higher status individuals in a group may be met with aggressive backlash. Recognisable patterns, or more specifically, recognisable differences in interruption patterns are indicative of inequalities in discourse. This can be seen clearly in mixed-gendered discourse. As men possess more authority in a larger societal sense, they are inclined to use speech acts that convey high status, and correspondingly women use speech acts that symbolise low status. In a meta-analysis of 43 studies, it was deduced that interruptions uphold the accepted societal gender hierarchy: men will interrupt negatively more than women, particularly in a group setting (Anderson and Leaper 1998). Furthermore, they will hold the speaking floor for a longer period of time. The lower status of women in talk based situations is compounded by the loss of influence women experience when they act too assertively. There is the possibility that this anomaly causes women to interpret negative interruptions as an attack on their authority more so than their male counterparts (Ridgeway 1982). A study conducted by Kristin Anderson and Campbell Leaper concluded that women
were three times more likely to surrender the floor when interrupted negatively in a group discussion on a gender-neutral topic than men (Anderson and Leaper 1998). Patterned difference in communication are amplified when discourse takes place in a domain considered to be masculine. Politics is one such domain, where women are seen, and often believe themselves, to be less knowledgeable about politics (Fox and Lawless 2011; Kanthak and Krause 2010; Mendez and Osborn 2010). This is irrespective of their genuine level of understanding. As women are presumably entering formal political discussions believing that they have less authority, it is likely that they will experience more interruptions, and that these interruptions will also affect them more (Beck 2001, 59).

The literature on gender, power, and communication, allows for the identification of four specific, testable hypothesis regarding the linguistic behaviours of Senators and witnesses in Senate Estimates Committee Hearings. These hypotheses can be separated into groups, with the first two relating to access, and the later relating to effectiveness.

First, it is hypothesised that male senators will hold the floor longer than any other group during a hearing. The fidelity shown to the formal time controls which exist in estimates hearings will inevitably influence the period for which each senator has the floor. Therefore, the committee chair has an amplified impact on the linguistic equity of these hearings. Past research regarding gendered patterns in discourse suggests that, by and large, male witnesses will speak for longer amounts of time than female witnesses. Given the adversarial nature of politics, winning and retaining the floor is of critical importance; the gendered preconceptions of power mean that women, although capable of participating, work at a noticeable disadvantage.

Second, it is expected that male senators will interrupt, both negatively and positively, more than all other groups; moreover, senators as a group are predicted to interrupt female witnesses more often than male witnesses, if they are attempting to maintain the masculinity of the domain. In regard to interruptions performed by witnesses, it is predicted that male witnesses will interrupt more than females. The most interruptions are expected to be from male chairs of committees.

Third, while any interruption attempt violates turn-taking norms, some interruptions may be more intrusive than others. Given the literature suggesting that men will attempt to
preserve the status and authority of other men, it is anticipated that men will interrupt in a negative fashion more often than a positive fashion, in order to obstruct the speakers interactional goals.

Fourth, it is hypothesised that female witnesses effectiveness, compared to male witnesses, will be restricted by senators attempts to destroy the credibility and authority of any testimony given by a woman. The influences of gender expectations as well as gatekeeping, will cause senators to see men as more credible and expert as witnesses, thus curbing the effectiveness of female testimony. Specific operationalisations are outlined below.

The essential objective of this study is to test a series of measures which indicate the differences in access men and women have to political discourse, and the differences in their ability to effectively argue their case. This will be done by amalgamating measures used in previous studies, most notably Laura Mattei's study of the judicial nomination hearings in the United States, to best present a fully formed image of access and effectiveness in the Australian Senate during Estimates hearings (Mattei, 1998). The exploration of these hypotheses will hopefully help to answer the larger question of whether women are at a linguistic disadvantage in Australian decision making bodies. Explaining women's participation in policy making provides a snapshot of their current and potential impact in government. An analysis of this approach, including clarification of the utilised measures and concepts, will follow a review of the diverse literature on language, gender, and representation.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Three main themes are connected to female representation: numbers, speech, and rules. The concept of numbers is likely to be the most familiar, as it includes critical mass theory and quotas. Research in this area generally refers to the effect that numerical or descriptive representation has on a woman's ability to make a substantive impact. Much research has also been done in relation to gender and speech (Aries, 1998; Butler, 1990; Cameron, 1996; Coates, 1994; Crawford, 1995; Holmes, 1992; Henley 1991; Lakoff, 1975; Shaw, 2006). Such research has examined the devaluing of female speech and the impact this has on women's ability to participate fully in deliberative bodies (Baxter, 2016; Cameron \& Shaw, 2016; Crewe, 2013; Ilie, 2013; Shaw, 2000; 2013; 2006; Toomey, 2015). Language and gender has experienced a rapid development in understanding since the 1970s which, in turn, has had a significant impact on the thinking surrounding mixed-gendered deliberation (Smith-Lovin \& Brody, 1989; Rudman \& Glick, 2001; Zimmerman \& West, 1975; Jacobs, Cook, \& Carpini, 2009). The impact of rules within institutions on female agency is also a key concept in female representation and participation. The affect that decision rules have on female contribution is significant, and while not the sole focus of much work, it has certainly been considered in most research conducted on women within institutions. As this thesis will examine data from Senate Estimates Committees, a highly regulated institution, an acknowledgement of the consequence of interactional rules is critical. This thesis will apply the synthesis of such themes proposed by Mendleberg, Karpowitz, and Oliphant (2012), to the Australian Senate. Specifically implementing the notion that "descriptive representation, in combination with a decision rule, shapes women's authority by affecting women's and men's relative experience of other members' engagement with their speech" (Karpowitz et. al. 2012: 19). Literature on descriptive representation, language and gender, and institutional rules will be examined in order to effectively comprehend the extent to which they influence female participation within deliberative bodies.

## SPEECH

Few professions rely as heavily on the act of speaking as the politician. The ability to participate and dominate in debate is integral for political success. To be able to assess linguistic and deliberative gender equity in parliament, the use of language and reception of female speech needs to be adequately examined. The way language is used in political discussion can reinforce the lower status of women in a group and create authority deficit for women in deliberation. Language can foster or undermine the standing of discussion partners, depending on how it is used. Speech is both indicative and constructive to authority in discussion.

There is an extensive body of literature on the relationship between language, gender, and power (Cameron, 1996; Childs, 2006; Kollock, Blumstein, \& Schwartz, 1985; Karpowitz \& Mendleberg, 2014). This research developed in two critical stages that can be categorised as essentialist and anti-essentialist. The literature produced during the essentialist period suggests that women have a unique language and a rigid and universal style of communication. The early essentialist stages comprised three major models: the deficit model, the dominance model, and the difference model. The deficit model is hallmarked by Robin Lakoff's 1975 work "Language and Woman's Place" which characterised the female language by its relative tentativeness and powerlessness compared to its male counterpart. It is referred to as the deficit model because it portrays women's communicative style as inferior to that of men (Uchida 1992: 549). According to Lakoff, women are socialised from a young age in a gendered style of communication that is heavily influenced by their subordinate position in society. This leads to more 'soft' linguistic cues such as polite forms of address, question tags, and other expressions which display a hesitation or insecurity. The discernment of a 'female language' has been criticised for numerous reasons. The most troubling of these objections is the recognition that Lakoff's assumptions are based on introspective observations of middle-class white women in the United States. Results from observation of a small subgroup cannot legitimately be applied to 'all women'. Whilst this analysis may have provided a meaningful foundation for research in this area, it was not substantial enough to assert claims regarding the use of language for an entire gender.

Moreover, some of the hypotheses purported by Lakoff regarding women's communication style have since been tested and have returned contradictory results (Crosby and Nyquist 1977; Dubois and Crouch 1975). It is worth noting that Lakoff herself suggested her work was not supposed to be received as a definitive account of language and sexism, but as a "goad to further research" (1975: 5).

Contemporaneously with Lakoff's study, other researchers were working on the dominance model. This model suggests that the gendered use of language directly correlates to larger societal power structures; namely, masculine dominance and feminine subordination. It builds on the proposition that men's societal power is also recognisable at the micro-level of interaction. Zimmerman and West's investigation of interruption and floor apportionment (West 1984; Zimmerman and West 1975) is the seminal work that utilises the dominance model. In their research, West and Zimmerman identify linguistic devices, such as interruptions, as tactics used primarily by men in a larger power play. The Dominance model was criticised for the extreme simplicity of viewing gender exclusively in relation to power. It attracted further criticism because of the a priori designation of 'powerful' and 'powerless' linguistic attributes (Tannen 1994). Some took issue with the depiction of women as powerless against their male oppressors, especially when facets of women's communicative style had been proven to be successful and strategic in negotiation (Coates 1994: 73). Moreover, some of the features identified by Zimmerman and West as oppressive, Tannen argues are multi-functional. For instance, interruption can also signify support or encourage solidarity with the speaker. The aversion to the seemingly rigid assumptions of the dominance model prompted academic thought in this area to focus primarily on the favourable and distinctive tenets of the female manner of communication (Cameron 1996: 41).

It also led to the development of the third essentialist model prominent in early understandings of language, gender, and power: the Difference model. The cultural difference approach (Maltz and Borker 1982; Tannen 1990) viewed men and women as members of separate and different cultural sub groups. Within these groups, men and women developed different but equally valuable communication styles. The approach used in this model was loosely based on a framework used by Gumperz (1982b) in his study of inter-ethnic
interaction. The framework implies that members of different cultures work under different rules and assumptions regarding the communication that they remain faithful to, even in cross-cultural encounters. This can lead to misunderstandings between the two parties. Maltz and Borker (1982) assert that similar misunderstandings can occur in mixed gendered interactions. They suggest that the largely single-sex socialisation that occurs during adolescence indoctrinates individuals into learned, gendered styles of communication. This leads to adult men and women interacting using two sets of distinctly different rules. This model was popularised by Deborah Tannen in her works That is not what I meant! (1986) and You just don't understand (1990). She furthered the cultural difference argument of Maltz and Borker by suggesting that misunderstanding could be avoided if a considered effort was made to comprehend the subcultural norms of the other. Part of the appeal of this work was its "equal but different" approach; linguistic differences were not the result of power imbalances, as suggested in the dominance and deficit models, but simply due to a difference in cultural socialisation (Cameron 1998a: 438). In spite of the popularity of Tannen's work, there was significant resistance to this apolitical position (Freed 1992; Troemel-Ploetz 1991; Uchida 1992) as it subverted much of the valuable work completed under the dominance model. The failure of the no-fault misunderstandings professed by the difference model to acknowledge undeniable realities in the power relations between men and women was, at the very least, compromising. Moreover, there was concern regarding Tannen's possible misappropriation of research conducted by Marjorie Goodwin (1980) and Maltz and Borker (1982). Generally, criticism was heavily linked to the over-simplifications and generalisations in Tannen's work.

All three models were continually debated for their individual strengths and shortcomings. While an agreement was reached that difference and dominance "should be seen as simultaneously composing the construct of gender" (Uchida1992: 563), all three models were ultimately discredited for their oversimplification of gender. Research in sociolinguistics shifted away from the essentialist static conception of gender, into an anti-essentialist phase influenced less by realism and more by constructivism.

Social constructivism supports the belief that language is a culturally constructed 'system of meaning' (Crawford 1995: 12) that is activated by social interaction. This approach is
highly critical of all essentialist research that has purported an internal and inherent link between gender and language. Susan Gal (1992) suggested that the concepts of 'feminine' and 'masculine' are constructed culturally and are therefore susceptible to change over time due to their intrinsic link to other areas of cultural discourse (1992: 154). The most significant theoretical development under the anti-essentialist school was the change from seeing gender as something that is 'done' to an inherent individual trait. Research spearheaded by Judith Butler (1990), which views gender as performative, falls under the anti-essentialist umbrella. Butler argues that gender is not essentially bound to sex, but that it is the product of social relations. Butler defines gender as 'the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a rigid regulatory frame which congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a 'natural' kind of being' (1990: 33). This view stresses the agency of the individual. It caused backlash from some feminists who believed that it ignored restrictions and oppressions that exist for women in power relations (Cameron 1997a: 30).

This research was followed by the 'ethnography of speaking' approach, which is the understanding of gender and language that will be adopted in this thesis. The advantage of this approach is that it supports the construction of gender through activities, but also recognises the reality of the unequal power relations that exist between the sexes and the 'normativeness of male dominance' (Shaw 2005: 23). It views gender as both flexible and fixed. Dorothy Smith's (1990) assessment of the "constant tension between women's freedom to make choices and the regulatory practices which function to limit these choices and determine how they are perceived" (Walsh 2000: 24) is essential to the analysis and discussion in this thesis.

## RULES

The constructivist view of gender and power is heavily dependent on situational and contextual realities. When looking at women in parliament, it is essential for institutional norms to be considered. Formal discussions and decisions take place within institutions, and a primary function of institutions is to impose rules on their members. Rules set 'norms' - a set
of tacit expectations that groups place on individuals behaviour - in motion. By cueing these expectations, norms shape the way people interact and, in the process, affect the status and authority of women in a decision making group. Rules may help or hinder the progress of social identity groups toward equal substantive and symbolic representation. Viewing the parliamentary floor as an economy where actors can participate at a profit or at a loss, is an extremely helpful way to assess the authority and access women have within parliament, and for this study, specifically within Senate Estimates.

Power is defined by Henley (1997) as 'the control of resources and their defense,' or as Fairclough (1995:1) proposes, 'asymmetries between participants in discourse events.' Control over the resources of the debate floor, demonstrated through linguistic interactions, significantly contributes to the power and authority of an actor. An actor's power is also dependent on a set of possessed attributes, one of which may be gender, that may impact their access and ownership of the debate floor. This thesis will view male and female participants as members of the same 'community of practice' (Eckhert and McConnell Ginet, 1992: 92-95), namely the Senate Estimate Hearings, and therefore expect them to act in accordance with the same rules and norms. However, membership to this community does not necessarily mean that all participate on the same terms. Actors can be members of multiple communities simultaneously. Communities based on gender, ethnicity, or occupation, ultimately affect an actor's ability to participate in deliberation and their effectiveness in deliberation. Regarding what characteristics have the most impact on participation and power on the debate floor, extensive scholarship suggests that gender is more remarkable than occupational status as a variable. To examine the influence of status and gender on interruption, Woods (1989) conducted a study of patterns in appointment to the floor using a group of three male and female colleagues of both high and low status. The results of this study supported the influence of gender over that of status in relation to interruption. Essentially, a man would interrupt a woman of higher status whereas a woman was less likely to interrupt a man regardless of his status. I am confident that these findings will be echoed in the Australian Senate. The predominance of gender as a variable could be a result of both historical and current lack of representation in the Senate. The consequence of this gender imbalance is a masculine norm of interaction (Kendall and Tannen, 1987: 86).

As outlined previously, parliament is historically a masculine domain, which gives male members of the community an advantage, particularly when it comes to discourse. Holmes (1992: 144) states 'there is no obvious incentive for adult males to give up highly valued talking time in public contexts'. Indeed, Walsh notes that increasing the numbers of women in some institutions can serve to 'strengthen fraternal networks' (2000:301) among men. This phenomenon has also been described by Yoder (1991) as the 'intrusiveness effect' whereby highly masculinised occupations become more, not less, resistant to rapidly increasing numbers of women. The concept that women engage in a more cooperative style of interaction, as opposed to the more competitive style of men, is integral in the context of parliament. In the highly masculinised environments of the House of Representatives and the Senate, where interaction is fundamentally adversarial, it is questionable whether there is scope for the incorporation of more consensual or co-operative styles of interaction. Therefore, if women and men do favour different interactional styles, the success of interaction will be predicated on a complex collusion of conditions. The naturalisation of male dominance within parliamentary discourse (Kotthoff and Wodak 1997: 4), means that men have a linguistic advantage that may not necessarily be demonstrated overtly. However, the subtle hierarchy of gender is important for reasons clearly articulated by Henley and Kramarae:

Hierarchies determine whose version of the communication situation will prevail; whose speech style will be normal; who will be required to learn the communication style, and interpret the meaning of the other; whose language style will be seen as deviant, irrational, and inferior; and who will be required to imitate the other's style in order to fit the society. Yet the situation of sex difference is not totally parallel: sex status intercuts and sometimes contrasts with other statuses; and no other two groups are so closely interwoven as women and men (1991: 19-20).

Because women and their communicative styles are viewed as abnormal within the context of parliamentary discourse, they enter interactions at a disadvantage. Traditional models for discourse analysis do not take these dynamics into account, despite the fact that
they are invaluable tools for identifying abnormalities in interaction. One of the simplest concepts in discourse analysis, turn taking, is also one of the most telling. Denny (1985: 43) defines turn taking as 'a jointly determined, socially constituted behaviour' . The seminal model for turn taking developed by Sacks, Schegloff \& Jefferson (1974), is fondly referred to as the 'no gap, no overlap' model. In this model conversation, one person speaks at a time; participants take turns at speaking to prevent dialogue from transforming into monologue (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974); and those speaking indicate when their turn is up with various cues. This is typically accomplished with few gaps or overlaps (Dabbs, Ruback, and Evans 1985). When a participant is speaking they have an opportunity to achieve an interactional goal or block the interactional goal of another (Kolloch et.al., 1985). This model of interaction is what Sacks et al. (1974) consider to be the 'ideal' form of debate as it has 'fixed the [...] parameters that conversations allow to vary' (Sacks et al.1974:731). Seven out of 14 facts pertaining to conversation differ in the context of debate: the order of turns is somewhat fixed; the length of turn is constrained; the length of debate is constrained; there is some predetermination of turn distribution; the topic is preset; and turns are verbally longer in that it is rare for a one word utterance to occur. As well as considering this 'perfect' model, some thought must be given to the event itself which is not perfect. While there are set rules, they can be violated, changing the nature of the event from one where there are no inequalities to 'an event in which prior inequalities (e.g. Gender, age, ethnicity) can be re-enacted' (Edelsky and Adams, 1990: 171). Indeed, speakers are likely to break these rules in order to promote their interactional goals and bar those of another.

Interruptions have been identified as a 'distinctive characteristic of all parliamentary discourse' (Ilie, 2006). Many find them to be the most enjoyable facet of parliamentary interaction, referring to them as the icing on the cake of debates (Buri 1992; Burkhardt 2004). Despite the apparent enthusiasm that surrounds interruption, there have been relatively few groundbreaking studies on patterns of interruption within a parliamentary setting (Kuhn 1983; Carbo 1992; Kipke 1995). Interest in the field of parliamentary discourse has increased (Carbó 1992, Slembrouck 1992, Biryukov et al 1995, Ilie 2000, 2001, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2003d, 2004, 2005, Ter Wal 2000a, Van der Valk 2000a, 2000b, Van Dijk 2000a, 2004, Wodak and Van Dijk 2000, Pérez de Ayala 2001, Wilson and Stapleton 2003, Bayley 2004) with a significant amount of academic attention being given to illegal interruptions in various
parliamentary communities (Van der Valk 2002; Burkart 2004; Shenhav 2008; Zima et. Al. 2008, 2009). Whilst the body of work on illegal interruptions, perhaps one of the most challenging concepts within parliamentary discourse, is growing, there is a significant gap regarding the consequence of interruption in relation to women's authoritative representation.

The rules of a deliberative situation are maintained and upheld by a chair. This is a particularly interesting component of parliamentary discourse when conducting research relating to gender, because men and women have shown to have significantly different leadership styles. There is a substantial amount of literature that suggests that women do not use or perceive positions of power in the same manner as their male counterparts (Blair and Stanley 1991; Dodson and Carroll 1991; Duerst-Lahti and Johnson 1990). Eagly and Johnson's (1990) meta-analyisis of organisational research on gender and leadership styles found that women are inclined to lead in a more democratic fashion, whereas men displayed a more autocratic style. These results were echoed in Kathlene's (1990) study of the Colorado legislative assembly, where female chairs used their positions to facilitate or moderate discussions within the committee, and men seemingly used their position as chair to control witness testimony, direct committee discussion, and participate in substantive debate (Kathlene, 1990, 1991). If the rules of debate are not being upheld consistently, or if there is any unconscious bias in the application of debate rules, this could put women at a further disadvantage.

Rules have a direct effect on female authority in deliberative environments because they provide an immediate affirmation or rejection, coming from other members of the group, while women speak. This is particularly true of interruptions and the consistency of the chair in enforcing rules and regulating deliberation. The number of women in a discussion is also influential. In groups where women are in a minority, the group may use majority rule to contain female influence and women experience a comparatively high number of negative interruptions. Conversely, in situations where the status of women is elevated by either numbers or rules, women experience a much higher level of positive interjection. Women's status can be positively affected by group interaction through the use of interjections that may enhance the speakers authority and suggest a rapport between other female member of the group.

## NUMBERS

For decades, critical mass theory has been the foundation concept guiding almost all research on gender and politics. Rosabeth Moss Kanter asserted that the status of women in a group or organisational setting is directly dependent on their relative number. If a group consists of only one or a very low number of women, then the women in this group will be largely marginalised. This is due to the attribution of stereotypical feminine traits to women by their male counterparts, causing them to be seen as less competent, capable, and astute. This results in the further subordination and harassment of minority women. This may, force them to conform to the gendered expectations of the environment, performing with stereotypically male behaviour. They are left in a situation where they will struggle to progress or make a contribution with little to no support and much hostility. However the theory also suggests that after women compose $30 \%$ of a group, the hostility which they were formerly subjected to will reduce significantly as will the negative stereotyping. Furthermore, once female membership reaches $50 \%$, there will be an equality in treatment and status. They will be free to act and pursue their will, regardless of whether they are seen as more masculine or feminine (Kanter 1977a, 1977b, 1997c).

This theory has not only been accepted academically, but has also been used to justify soft and hard requirements around the world for female representation (Baldez 2004; Beckwith 2003; Dahlerup 2006, 2012; Krook 2008, 2009; Norris 2004, 2006; Pande and Ford 2001). Such actions have been endorsed and accelerated by the United Nations, with exhortations issued to member states encouraging efforts to ensure women reach a "critical mass" in formal positions of power (United Nations Economic and Social Affairs 2005).

Despite all of this positive action, number-based representation has not produced the expected results in any consistent fashion. There is an inexplicable disconnect between the increase of women in formal positions of power and the legitimate influence of women. (Carroll 2001; Franceschet, Krook, and Poscopo 2012; Reingold 2000, 2008; Hannagan and Larimer 2010). This inconsistency is apparent at both ends of the continuum. In some situations, token women will have incredible success and women who make up $50 \%$ of a
group will find themselves with little agency (Beckwith and Cowell-Meyers 2007; Bratton 2005; Childs 2004; Childs and Krook 2006; Crowley 2004; Dahlerup 2006; Devlin and Elgie 2008; Grey 2002, 2006; Kanthak and Krause 2010; Kathlene 1994; Kittilson 2008; Lovenduski 2005; Rosenthal 1998). The inconsistency in results relating to the numerical representation of women leads many to consider this as less important than other variables. Such variables include the increase of female mobilisation within society (Htun and Weldon 2010, 2012; Weldon 2002, 2011), the ideological and political allegiance of the women in question (and that of their male counterparts), and the extent to which the women in question serve their purpose to male power brokers (Carroll 2001; Franceschet, Krook, and Piscopo 2012; Kathlene 2001; Reingold 1992, 2000, 2008). Moreover, the number of women has shown to have no impact on women's influence in civilian deliberation, such as a town meeting (Bryan 2004; Karpowitz and Medelberg 2014).

While the legitimacy of critical mass theory is questionable at best, some consequent work on gender representation has merit. Kanter's Critical Mass Theory is closely linked with Gender Role Theory, as gender roles have historically been used to explain the purported "critical mass" phenomenon. While this thesis is firm on the weakness of critical mass theory, some of the research relating to gender roles and gender congruity is compelling. The Gender Role hypothesis suggests that being in the numerical minority negatively affects the status of women, and that this is more significant for female minorities. This denigration of status has flow on consequences, such as a diminished sense of entitlement to take and keep the floor. The influence one is perceived to have is directly linked to how much they participate in deliberations (Fiske 2010). The fewer women in the group, the lower their status, the less they speak, and the lower their influence. Thus, the correlation between descriptive representation and entitlement may have some merit.

Secondly, historical gender stereotypes mean that men tend to be perceived as more competent, and studies have shown that men enjoy a higher status when discussing topics that are understood to be masculine in nature (Ridgeway and Smith-Lovin 1999). This is extremely consequential in the political context, as politics has long been viewed as a masculine domain. Burns, Schlozman, and Verba (2001) suggest that women will be less likely to contribute or attempt to persuade others in political discussion because of this
historic connotation. A wealth of research concludes that women will defer to the assumed expertise and displayed confidence of men in political deliberation (Aries 1998; Bowers, Steiner, and Sandys 2001; Croson and Gneezy 2009; Eagly 1987; Giles et al. 1987; Hastie, Penrod, and Pennington 1983; Huckfeldt and Sprague 1995; Ridgeway 1982; Strodt- beck, James, and Hawkins 1957).

Third, gendered norms in interaction may have a negative impact on women's participation in a deliberative setting. Linguistic research suggests that young boys and girls are socialised into different cultures of interaction, and that they carry these behaviours with them into adulthood (Maltz and Borker 1982; Tannen 1990). When a group is populated predominantly by men, the interaction will most likely be filled with stereotypically masculine behaviours such as individual assertion, agency, competition and dominance. Contrastingly, when women are in the majority, members tend to take on a more feminine style, one which puts emphasis cooperation, intimacy, and inclusivity (Aries 1976; Dindia and Allen 1992; Ellis 1982; McCarrick, Manderscheid, and Silbergeld 1981; Miller 1985; Smith-Lovin and Brody 1989; see Mendelberg and Karpowitz 2007).

Women thereby could potentially feel a greater sense of confidence in predominantly female settings due to the more feminine style of interaction, and conversely could feel more disenfranchised in predominantly male settings given the masculine norms for interaction. A study conducted by Kathlene (1994) identified that legislative committees in Colorado, which were predominantly male, displayed competitive and aggressive styles of communication, and that this hindered female participation.

Whilst comfortable with the suggestion that historically masculine domains will put women at a disadvantage, and that women may feel more confident to contribute in an environment with other women, it is problematic to subscribe to the belief that equal women will create a situation in which women have equal influence. The jump that is made between descriptive and substantive representation regarding critical mass theory is not only misleading, but dangerous to the understanding of what is needed to reach equality. While women may feel higher levels of confidence, and in turn, contribute more to deliberation in a setting with more women, that is not to say that they will have any more influence.

The flourishing and extensive literature on women and public office has so far focused on two central topics. The first, centres on descriptive representation, exploring the reasons why such a limited number of women are elected into office, systematic barriers, and the motivations and resources of women seeking political appointments. (see Darcy et al., 1994; Lovenduski and Norris, 1993, 1996; Norris and Lovenduski, 1995). The importance of descriptive representation should not be downplayed. For instance, Mansbridge (1999) deduces that the attainment of political representation has helped to increase democratic legitimacy and develop leadership abilities in disadvantaged groups such as African Americans and women. The second strand of research examines the potential impact of women in positions of political leadership. In other words, the kind of 'substantive' representation that women in positions of power will provide to their social group.

Previous research has suggested that women in political life not only exist as women but also act in the interest of women as a group (Phillips, 1995; Lovenduski, 1997). This argument relies on the assumption that the specific and different experiences of female politicians will inevitably have an impact on what issues they prioritise and what causes they value. It also presumes this will make them more sympathetic and passionate on issues directly relating to women such as childcare, education, and health. Moreover it assumes that women will aim for a less adversarial style in favour of collaboration.

## LOCATION

Authoritative representation is the missing link between descriptive and substantive representation and this thesis exists within that gap. The term authoritative representation, was coined by Mendelberg, Karpowitz and Oliphant (2000). Descriptive representation refers to the physical and numerical presence of women and substantive representation involves the actions of female representatives on behalf of the interests, values, and concerns of women as a group. Authoritative representation looks at components of communication and interaction which affect the authority of a speaker in a deliberative setting. Authority, in this sense, refers specifically to the expected and accepted influence of a speaker. Like symbolic representation
(the belief that someone can fulfil the requirements of a position effectively), authoritative representation relates to the perceived abilities of a speaker by the group. That said, authoritative representation is constructed during deliberation or interaction by decision makers, not preconceived purely on the perceived merits of an individual. Symbolic and substantive representation are both end product representation, just as descriptive representation is decided before a deliberative event begins. Therefore, descriptive representation will affect authoritative representation and, consequently, the level of authoritative representation in a deliberation will directly affect the level of symbolic and substantive representation achieved.

I propose that interaction and communication are the instruments which connect the numbers of descriptive representation to the outcomes of substantive and symbolic representation. Large numbers will fail to influence if not given power and authority by the institution within which they exist, just as small numbers will succeed if the institution allocates them value. The manner in which institutions can attribute this power is through discourse, which works to either construct or destroy authority. This understanding follows the synthesis of ideas initially presented by Karpowitz, Mendleberg and Oliphant (2012). The relevant ideas include the construction of women's speech as less authoritative due to gendered roles and expectations. Women are therefore at a disadvantage in any kind of discursive event as women do not exercise their voice equally to men. Furthermore, because women use a style seen as contextually abnormal, they are less likely to be listened to or regarded to as authoritative contributors to discussion. In addition, the use of language in political discourse can prolong the unequal status of women in a group as well as their authority deficit in discussion. This is both because of normative masculine forms of communication within parliament, and the ability to use interactional functions as tools to control discussion. Finally, this synthesis acknowledges the idea that it is both interactional rules as well as a group's gender composition that affect the elevation or depression of female authority.

This research attempts to discover where the barriers - and when the imbalances - occur in one important decision-making setting: the committee hearing. While it is possible that
men always dominate verbal interactions in mixed-sex groups, other research indicates that the dynamics of dominance are more complex. Such factors as the positional power of speakers plays an important role in gendered verbal behaviour, and it appears that there may be important power and influence differences depending on the topic (or issue) being discussed (Craig and Pitts 1990; Kathlene 1991). Documenting precisely whether and when women are effectively sidelined in committee hearing debates and under what circumstances women are successful, is vital to understanding how the status quo resists change despite numerical gains in elected women representatives.

## 3. METHODOLOGY

This research will take a dichotomous approach using both a flexible ethnographic design and a fixed discourse analysis to properly study the relationships between gender and discourse within the Australian Senate. This mixed methods approach has been chosen due to the complex nature of gender relations and the formal nature of parliamentary proceedings. Similar approaches have been used previously in analysis of the British, Irish, Swedish, and American Parliament. (Shaw, 2000; Christie, 2002; Catalano, 2009; Ilie, 2013 Shaw, 2013; Mattei, 1999). Moreover, much of the seminal work on the relationship between gender, power, and language is based on a Conversation Analysis and Ethnographic framework (Fishman 1983; Zimmerman and West 1975; West 1979; West and Zimmerman 1983).

The research will use an ethnographic understanding of the Senate based on the 'Ethnography of Speaking' approach (Scherzer, 1992) to aid the interpretation of the results from the discourse analysis. Linguistic Ethnography works from the base assumption that language and society are mutually shaping. Therefore, a thorough examination of both the context of the senate as well as the discourse patterns that occur within the senate are required in order to properly understand either (Rampton et. Al., 2004).

While the immersion seen in traditional ethnographic research is not a component of this research, the quantitative linguistic core of the study will be complemented with a comprehensive qualitative contextualisation of the Senate Estimates hearings. Context is rarely addressed in purely interactional analysis, and its presence will strengthen this study. Likewise, linguistics will provide a strong theoretical framework, which ethnography often lacks, and provide additional insight that can not be discovered through observation and field work alone.

This mixed-methods approach is much stronger than a single method approach, as ethnography provides flexibility where linguistics provides structure. The turn-taking model created by Sack's et. al. (1974) will be a particular focus of this research and will be used to
identify interactional norms in the Senate. There is an agreement in scholarship that gaining the floor is essentially a 'linguistic economy' (Cenoz, J and Gorter, D, 2009: 57) in which 'turns are valued, sought or avoided'. This is extremely relevant when analysing the strictly regulated floors of parliamentary discourse, where turns are highly contested in order to achieve political gain.

### 3.1 Materials Sampled

Senate Estimates Committee hearings are ideal material for discourse analysis as a variety of witnesses are summoned to testify and are then questioned by multiple senators. Apart from formalities, opening statements, and approved monological discourse, interaction within Senate hearings largely consists of dialogue. Senate Estimate hearings were chosen as the subject of study because of their largely dialogical nature, but also because of the formal rules relating to discourse. The rules include limits on the length of talk time for each member of the hearing, strict turn taking rules, clear expectations in regard to interaction and behaviour, and formalities surrounding floor ownership. Moreover, Senate Estimates hearings have a chairperson who is responsible for ensuring that these rules are adhered to correctly.

Senate Estimates hearings are significantly different in nature from normal Senate proceedings. Regular Senate proceedings involve Senators from different political parties participating in adversarial interactions with, or more aptly against, one another. In contrast, Senate Estimates hearings involves eight senators (four from government, four from opposition, and one either from a minority party or an independent minister) sitting alongside one another as a committee. While the political allegiance of senators is still noticeable, political adversity is not the main goal of these hearings. This makes estimates hearings more desirable for analysis as interruptions cannot simply be attributed to political opposition, as it benefits the committee to work together in unity. The presence of ministers and Senior Executive Staff from the Australian Public Service in Estimates hearings is an additional reason to analyse estimates hearings over general senate proceedings. The addition of senior executive level officials, who are in service to and report to the government, allows for the exploration of the effect of status on discourse. This is important, as the willingness of an official of lesser status to interrupt a senator of higher status and the nature of these interruptions will elucidate interesting power relationships.

The data corpus consists of ten sets of transcripts, namely the official transcripts of proceedings that have been selected from the Hansard records (detailings of the official transcripts of the Estimates hearings in the Australian Senate are attached in APPENDIX A ). Each analysed extract was approximately 3 hours long. These specific debates were selected for numerous reasons. The hearings took place over a long period of time, and were sourced from different portfolios. The hearings focused on different topics, and the gender of the speaker varied. By allowing the topic and date of the data to vary, we can ensure ethical results that are not restricted to any particular set of circumstances.

The following analysis is confined to the interactive components of estimates and does not include the opening statements of witnesses. The controls of this study are accomplished through the evaluation of the treatment of individual witnesses by multiple senators. A deliberate effort was made to include witnesses, senators, and chairs of both genders wherever possible. Moreover, a conscious attempt was to include senators from all parties in this analysis.

### 3.2 Transcribing Access

## Floor Apportionment

In order to measure the apportionment of the floor during the deliberative segments of Senate Estimates, the discourse between senators and witnesses was coded by the author manually. A code system constructed by the author, influenced by systems used in contemporaneous studies (Mattei, 1999), was used to analyse one sentence at a time. Each line of the code sheet records the number of words spoken in each sentence, and the time elapsed. To effectively code access, the number of words spoken was then juxtaposed by the number of interruptions experienced by each speaker. Percentages for the amount of time the floor is occupied by each speaker as well as the rate of interruption for each speaker will be provided.

## Interruptions

Interruptions do not have a uniform meaning. There are positive, negative, and neutral interruptions which consequently have a different impact on a speakers access to the floor. For this analysis the definitions of the different forms of interruption introduced by Jennifer

Stromer-Galley will be utilised. In consensus with other academics (Mendleberg \& Karpowitz, 2014; , Stromer-Galley (2007) defines positive interruptions as those which occur in support or agreement with the first speaker. Positive interruptions look to enhance the authority of the speaker's statement, and do not aim to co-opt the discourse floor. As such, a positive interruption will be coded when a second speaker overlaps with the first speaker to express solidarity, affection, or support. Moreover, if an interruption continues the line of thought of the first speaker without contradiction, it will also be coded as positive. Statements beginning with "yeah" or "I agree" usually signify a positive interruption.

In contrast, negative interrupts are distinct power plays. Negative interruptions represent an attempt by a secondary speaker to seize the floor in order to express disagreement or deprecation. They can disagree, object, or change the topic entirely. Often, negative interruptions can be identified through the use of phrases and words such as "well," "but," "I disagree," "I don't know," or "I'm not sure about that" to highlight a few. That said, it is important to note that negative interruptions do not have to contain a negative comment nor do they need to display explicit disagreement. If a speaker interrupts and changes the topic of discussion without acknowledging the content of the previous statement, whether it be through the use of an acknowledgement cue, or direct mention, than they will have executed a negative interruption. Therefore, ignoring the possession of the floor by another, or the arguments being made by another speaker prior to interruption, will also be coded as a negative interruption.

This study develops the understanding of interruption further, to include the category of defensive interruptions. Defensive interruptions occur when more powerful members of the particular community interrupt on behalf of less powerful members who are have their access or effectiveness negatively impacted by other members of the community. There are many instances in Senate Estimates hearings were senators call to the chair to restore order. Using the existing definitions, these would have normally been coded as negative interruptions which would have lead to a spurious results. In response, this category has been devised as a measure to combat the possible misinterpretation of data. Defensive interruptions can often be identified by an initial call to the chair, or phrases such as "point of order," or "let her finish."

Hearings will be analysed, with interruptions being categorised using the above understanding. The time of the interruption will be noted on the transcript, as will any relevant accompanying speech. Examples of interruptions within the transcript will be coded by their type, as well as the gender of the actors, the position of the actors, and the affect it has on the larger discourse. The frequency of interruptions will be noted and any emerging patterns will be recorded for further understanding. An interruption will be coded in any circumstance where two speakers overlap after the first speakers has spoken at least one word. To be clear, for an interruption to be recorded, one speaker must clearly hold the floor and another must make an attempt to take it (inadvertently or explicitly).

There is, of course, the possibility that an increase in interrupting behaviour will occur in tandem with an increase of the numerical representation of a gender, simply because there are more men or women who have the ability to interrupt. To guard against this possibility, of which misleading findings could be a consequence, measures have been implemented to ensure that the data is not misleading. Averages will be used rather than totals. That said, numerical gender inequality is a reality of Australian Senate Committee hearings, and as such, increased levels of interruption by particular genders are expected.

### 3.3 Transcribing Effectiveness

## Questions

Measuring the effectiveness of verbal interactions is a more nuanced process. In the case of Senate Estimates hearings, it is much easier to assess the effectiveness of witnesses, as their effectiveness is closely linked to their perceived credibility. There are many different empirical measures of the effectiveness and credibility of a legislative witness. One of the most assessable measures is question type. If a witness is asked a question by a senator that is difficult or requires analysis rather than a question based on fact or opinion, it can be seen as a test of authority. It is difficult to categorise questions into types in a purely objective fashion. Often the wording of a question is the most reliable indicator for question type. For instance, if a senator asks for evidence, or asks for an interpretation of evidence instead of
asking for an opinion or for purely factual information, then this kind of question could be coded as an authority test. This is important when viewed in context with the research regarding differences between ordinary and expert witnesses by Phillips (1993). It was found that valued witnesses (who were in this study, males) were only required to offer their opinion to be seen as effective and worthy. In contrast, women were often required to substantiate any claims made with evidence. In addition, senators may utilise factual questions to reinforce the status of certain witnesses who may be asked simply to confirm their qualifications or educational degrees (see Kathlene 1994b: 15 for a similar argument). Questions within the discourse of Senate Estimates hearings will be coded as factual, emotional accusations, or empirical.

Another method used for undermining a witness's effectiveness is the repetition of the same question. Previous studies have found that repeated questions are one way of challenging someone's authority or knowledge (Tannen 1994b: 183). Moreover, this can be compounded by the questioner's insistence that the witness failed to understand or answer the question previously. Deliberate use of this tactic can be used in order to elicit a particular answer or to demonstrate that the witness is incapable and should be sidelined. In congruence with other behaviours relating to credibility and authority, it is presumed that women will be asked more repeated questions than men.

As well as the variety of questions asked by senators, witnesses can offer a variety of responses. The fourth hypothesis notes that male witnesses will offer testimony that is substantiated more than female witnesses. If a response to a question makes references to any documents, studies, or statistics it will be coded as having offered empirical evidence.

## Disagreements

The final two measures of effectiveness are the frequency of direct disagreements and indirect challenges. These tactics are used by senators in order to establish themselves in a position of authority or as a method of gatekeeping. A statement will be considered a disagreement if the speaker explicitly asserts that another speaker is incorrect, wrong, or has made a mistake. A key indicator of a disagreement is the statement "I disagree". The indirect criticism of a speaker, without the use of words including "incorrect" or "wrong", will be
coded as a challenge. Direct hostility will also be coded as a challenge. Admittedly, this category, inclusive of both disagreements and challenges, is highly subjective.

This chapter has detailed the method of analysis that will be operationalised in this research. The combination of both a linguistic ethnography and discourse analysis was the most appealing way to navigate investigations of the complex concepts of gender and language. Senators and witnesses access to the domain will be measured by both their volubility and interruption rates. Effectiveness will be measured by analysing the type of questions received by witnesses dependent on gender. The following chapter will exclusively cover the hypotheses which relate to access, examining data for 10 Senate Estimates Committee hearings.

## 4. ACCESS

This chapter will analyse data relating to the access different groups have to the floor during senate estimates hearings. Groupings are made based on gender and status within the hearing. Specifically, comparisons will be made between female senators, male senators, female witnesses, male witnesses, and the chairperson. The analysis will look at two hypothesis: (1) that male senators will hold the floor for a longer period and that they will negatively interrupt more than any other group, and (2) that women will experience higher levels of hostility in hearings where they account for more than $30 \%$ of the participants.

Samples for analysis were taken from 10 separate estimates hearings between 2006 and 2015. In order to examine the access different groups have to the floor, each turn within the selected hearings was coded by the number of words and number of interruptions. Interruptions are coded under three classifications: negative, positive, and defensive. The word counts of each speaker were divided by the number of negative interruptions in order to calculate a rate of access.

Previous international studies have used similar methods to analyse gender representation in a legislative setting. In England, Sylvia Shaw's (2000) study combined transcript analysis with an ethnographic evaluation of the House of Commons. Lyn Kathlene's (1994) analysis of male and female communication patterns in Colorado legislative committees focused on turn taking to garner insight into the dynamics of gendered behavior in political institutions.

The most comprehensive study of gender and power in a legislative setting was carried out by Laura Winsky Mattei in 1998. Mattei conducted an in-depth analysis of female and male witnesses testifying before the all-male Senate Judiciary Committee on the nomination of David Souter to the Supreme Court. Evidence from Mattei's study found that compared to male witnesses women spoke less, were denied access to the floor at an increased rate, and experienced a disproportionate amount of hostile interruptions. In Mattei’s data, female witnesses did interrupt senators, but at a significantly lower rate than the interruptions they received. While women would interrupt once for every three interruptions they received, male witnesses would interrupt once for every one interruption they received. Furthermore, male witnesses who chose to interrupt senators were more often awarded the floor for their behaviour than female witnesses. The analysis conducted in Mattei's research provided a methodological basis for this study.

As no similar research has been conducted in Australia, the interactional patterns between men and women in a legislative setting are unknown. It is impossible to assume realities based on studies conducted in culturally similar countries; members of the English House of Commons appear to adhere more closely to formal codes of conduct than their Australian counterparts. The studies conducted in the United States look specifically at witnesses appearing before an all male panel. This work will uncover the Australian reality of gendered interaction in legislative bodies, looking at both women and men in all positions of power: Chair, senator, and witness.

## Hypothesis 1: It's a Man's World - Male senators will hold the floor longer and interrupt more than all other groups. Interruptions will be negative more often than positive in order to obstruct other speakers interactional goals.

The first hypothesis posits that male senators will dominate floor time. While it is not possible to measure the time a speaker utilises, word counts can be used as an indicator of floor control. By counting the number of words spoken by each participant in the hearings, floor apportionment by senators and witnesses can be compared. Data shows that male senators only dominated the floor in 2009 and 2011. Outside of these hearings, different groups primarily occupied the floor every hearing. Female witnesses primarily occupied the floor in 2006, 2013, and 2014. This result was not predicted, however the hearings in which female witnesses dominated were majoritively populated by women. Both the 2006 and 2013 hearings were $65 \%$ female; in 2014 , the hearing was $52 \%$ female. It is interesting to note that in all the hearings female witnesses spoke the most, female senators followed in volubility. Notwithstanding these results, male witnesses dominated in 2007, 2008, 2010, and 2012, meaning that men still controlled a majority of hearings.

While only evidence from 2009 and 2011 supports original expectations regarding gender and status, men as whole out-spoke their female counterparts. Overall, male witnesses spoke the most, totalling 112586 words over 10 hearings. This was 24031 more words than their female counterparts. That said, the overall evidence regarding floor apportionment was mixed; the average female witness across all hearings spoke 1884, the average male, 1705.

|  | 06 | 07 | 08 | 09 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | TOTA <br> L |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| M <br> SENATOR | 112 | - | 5119 | 16905 | 13105 | 14885 | 9829 | 1791 | 2196 | 4731 | 51768 |
| F <br> SENATOR | 10052 | 9763 | 6595 | - | 4470 | 716 | 4770 | 12438 | 10425 | 12835 | 70848 |
| M <br> WITNESS | 5439 | 13483 | 17235 | 1614 | 20666 | 7629 | 23007 | 7888 | 3856 | 11769 | 112586 |
| F <br> WITNESS | 11287 | 7819 | 7554 | 7561 | 323 | 10291 | 117 | 14507 | 17082 | 12014 | 88555 |
| CHAIR | 156 | 372 | 1993 | 641 | 2048 | 1124 | 781 | 1216 | 969 | 6213 | 15513 |

Although senators have a higher status, witnesses are required to provide testimony, and as such would most probably speak for longer periods. This provides a sound explanation for the unforeseen result. Given that witnesses must wait to be called on by senators, or appeal to be called on in order to speak during a hearing, senators have some control over how much witnesses get to speak.

While apportionment results would suggest that women are not at a significant disadvantage when it comes to access in hearings, it is critical to not base assumptions on word counts alone. Adding the additional element of interruption to measures of access illustrates the extent to which each group holds the floor with more clarity. While female and male witnesses may speak approximately the same number of words in a hearing, if one group is interrupted a multitude of times and another is not interrupted at all, their access and their ability to participate fully in the hearing is remarkably different.

The ideal rendition of a parliamentary debate is constructed so that interaction and participation is as fair as possible for all members. Meaning, all speakers can express themselves fully without intrusion, and that every participant will have the opportunity to contribute. In committee hearings, senators have pre-allocated questioning periods in which they are officially awarded the floor. A senator is required to ask the leave of the chair to take the floor out of order. Within these periods, senators may call on a witness to answer questions in regard to the relevant portfolios. The upholding of these rules
in the Australian senate is somewhat relaxed compared to international chambers, such as the House of Commons in England (Shaw, 2001).

As these rules are not strictly adhered to by members of the community, these debates, in which everyone should be given equal opportunity, is reduced to an 'event in which prior inequalities (e.g. gender, age, and ethnicity) can be re-enacted' (Edelsky and Adams 1990: 171). Violations to the ideal execution of parliamentary debate, such as interruptions, allow senators and witnesses to promote their own interactional goals or weaken the abilities of another speaker.

Over the 10 hearings, female senators interrupted more than any other group, interjecting 226 times. Female witnesses also interrupted more than male witnesses, with a 126 interjections compared to 113 carried out by men. This result contradicts the hypothesis which suggests that male senators will interrupt more than any other group. That said, only $37 \%$ of these interruptions were negative, meaning that they were an attempt to take the floor or corrupt the power of another speaker. Comparatively, out of the 133 male interjections, 100 were negative, meaning that $75 \%$ of interruptions by men were used to gain the floor or obstruct another speaker. This pattern was replicated in the witnesses; while female witnesses interrupted more than their male equivalents, only $17 \%$ of their interruptions were negative. Comparatively, interjections by male witnesses were $38 \%$ negative.

## INTERRUPTIONS GIVEN

|  | Total Interruptions | Negative Interruptions | Defensive <br> Interruptions | Positive Interruptions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female Senators | 226 | 85 | 67 | 74 |
| Male Senators | 133 | 100 | 1 | 32 |
| Female Witnesses | 126 | 22 | 16 | 47 |
| Male Witnesses | 113 | 48 |  | Figure 2 |

Previous research has demonstrated that men are more likely to interject in a confrontational or adversarial manner, and that women were more likely to intervene in a supportive manner (Coates 1989; Edelsky 1981). The results of this analysis support previous findings, with $70 \%$ of all interruptions being positive (this is inclusive of defensive interjections).

## INTERRUPTIONS RECEIVED

|  | Total Interruptions | Negative Interruptions | Defensive <br> Interruptions | Positive Interruptions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female Senators | 166 | 82 | 7 | 77 |
| Male Senators | 176 | 46 | 61 | 52 |
| Female Witnesses | 43 | 30 | 3 | 10 |
| Male Witnesses | 72 | 38 | 2 | 32 |

Figure 3

The analysis of interruptions 'received' across the 10 senate estimates hearings shows that out of a total of 457 interruptions between senators and witnesses, 176 were towards men. That said, female senators received the most negative interruptions, meaning they were obstructed more than any other group. Interruptions of female witnesses were $70 \%$ negative, whereas interruptions of male witnesses were only $52 \%$ negative. Despite women executing fewer negative interruptions than men, they also experience negative interruptions at a higher rate. While the results of this analysis are taken from a comparably small selection of hearings, if negative interruptions are a powerful resource, and if women are utilising them significantly less than men, women may be at a disadvantage because of this behaviour.

An explanation for this disparity could be the reception of interruptions based on gender. While male interruption is rarely policed, female interruption is met with disapproval and reprimandment. This is mostly due to behaviour being seen as incongruent with behavioural expectations of females (Edelsky, 1981; Ilie, 2012; Karpowitz \& Mendelberg, 2014). As masculine behaviour is viewed as inherently competitive and confrontational, it is compatible with interrupting behaviour. Even when men from a lower status position interrupt men in a higher status position they are rarely met with any hostility. The example below shows an interaction between a male senator and a male witness; while an interruption occurs it is received positively:

Senator BRANDIS: There may be other efficiencies and there may be other inefficiencies. There may be externalities and costs of a non-financial character as well. Let us not go there for the moment, Mr Wilkins. Perhaps we will come back to it. Now-

Mr Harriott: Sorry, Senator, if I could just interrupt-
Senator BRANDIS: Yes, Mr Harriott.
Mr Harriott: I do not think I had finished.
Senator BRANDIS: I am sorry. You were interrupted by Mr Wilkins.
Mr Harriott: I am sorry, but I just wanted to give you the complete answer that I was trying to propose. Senator BRANDIS: Yes.

Figure 4

## Defensive Interruptions

Interruptions performed in order to defend the speaking or procedural rights of a member of a hearing were coded as defensive. These interruptions are not wholly positive, in that the do not strengthen or support the interrupted speaker. That said, defensive interruptions are not essentially negative as their purpose is to protect not obstruct. These interruptions can occur in defense of oneself or on behalf of another. Defensive interruptions account for $32 \%$ of all female executed interruptions.

The highest incidences of defensive interruptions occur in hearings where females make up over 30\% of participants. The explanation for this could be twofold. The notable number of female members may have encouraged female participation, making women feel more comfortable to contribute and defend themselves and others. Alternatively, the higher levels of female representation could have resulted in an increase of hostility towards women, evidenced by the fact that $62 \%$ of negative interruptions took place in the hearing with close to equal representation of men and women.

An unexpected result was the frequency of interruptions by witnesses against senators. A study conducted in a work setting by Woods in 1989 on patterns of interruption in groups of men and women of different ranks focused on the relative influences of gender and status. It concluded that gender outweighed any variables relating to status or authority. The study observed interactions in an office setting, however evidence suggests that the results are also applicable to a legislative setting.

Another justification for status being less influential is the appearance of senators as witnesses. Given that senators on the committee and senators on the witness panel are of equal standing outside of the hearing, senatorial witnesses seemed more willing to interrupt members of the committee. These witnesses were also more likely to interrupt defensively on behalf of their colleagues. In the four hearings with near equal representations, three of the senators or officials of equivalent standing who appeared as witnesses were female, explaining the total of defensive interruptions of female
witnesses. Be that as it may, male witnesses were also willing to interrupt in order to protect their colleagues as the following example illustrates:

Ms Branson: I have with me some notes about it but I have certainly received an oral report-
Senator BARNETT: Who prepared the notes? When were they prepared?
Ms Branson: They were prepared to assist me in preparing for this attendance, on 5 May.
Senator BARNETT: May we have them-
Senator Ludwig: It might be better to ask a question and then listen to the response. It is unusual, I have to say, for you simply to request all briefing notes and documents of that kind. People come here with a whole range of information to assist in answering your questions, but my view would be that if you ask your question we will try to elicit a response for you.

Senator BARNETT: There is a document in front of Ms Branson, Minister.
Senator Ludwig: We all have documents in front of us, Senator, just like you have.

Female senators on the committee interrupted defensively on behalf of other senators and witnesses regularly. This was usually on behalf of other women as the most negative interruptions were perpetrated against women. It is important to note that of the 126 interruptions performed by female witnesses, 102 were coded as defensive. That means more than $80 \%$ of interruptions performed by female witnesses were in defense of their or others procedural rights.

Ms O'Brien: If I may, the document provided by the president and dated 10 December indicates that the president informally-
Senator O'SULLIVAN: I am sorry, Ms O'Brien, but this is the fifth time today.
Senator WONG: Chair, a point of order. The witness should not be interrupted and berated by the senator in this way. He should stop bullying people.
Senator O'SULLIVAN: Dear, oh dear, Penny.
Senator WONG: Stop bullying them.
Senator O'SULLIVAN: Settle down.
Senator WONG: I am not going to settle down; you ought to stop bullying them.

Defensive interruptions subvert the use of interruptions as a power play, allowing members of both the committee and the witness panel to refuse acquiescence. That says, not all defensive interruptions are effective in protecting or promoting a speaker's interactional goals.

## Hypothesis 2: Critical Myth - Women will experience higher levels of hostility when they make up more than $30 \%$ of a hearing

The second hypothesis posits that women will experience more hostility when they pass the critical mass threshold of $30 \%$. While the populist belief is that more descriptive representation will lead to the better treatment of women within a profession, much research has concluded the opposite (Beckwith and Cowell-Meyers 2007; Bratton 2005; Childs and Krook 2006; Crowley 2004; Dahlerup 2006; Devlin and Elgie 2008; Grey, 2006; Kanthak and Krause 2010; Kittilson 2008; Lovenduski 2005). Similar to studies previously conducted on parliamentary proceedings, the results of this analysis confirm that once women make up more than $30 \%$ membership of an interaction they will be treated with increasing hostility. For a clear exemplification of access across the 10 selected hearings, four rates were calculated. One rate conveys the average interruptions experienced by hearing participants, this is compared to the average interruptions experienced by women. The number of words spoken by each speaker was divided by the number of interruptions they received to calculate a volubility rate. This rate is compared to the exclusively female rate.

Data illustrates that in hearings populated majoritively by one sex, either male or female, women were interrupted less than the average rate of interruption and spoke more than the average volubility rate. Women experienced a notably higher rate of interruption in evenly populated hearings, where women represented more than $30 \%$ of the members. The 2015 hearing was an exception, where the increases were more subtle. Women experienced the highest levels of access in the male dominated hearings of 2008, 2010, 2011, and 2012. In predominantly female hearings, women experienced similar access to their male equivalents, as explicated in the table below.

|  | 2006 <br> $\mathrm{~F}^{*}$ | 2007 <br> F | 2008 <br> M | 2009 <br> E | 2010 <br> M | 2011 <br> M | 2012 <br> M | 2013 <br> E | 2014 <br> E | 2015 <br> E |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interruptions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average <br> Interruptions | 1.1 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 3.8 | 4.3 | 6.8 | 1.4 | 3.2 | 3.9 | 13.3 |
| Average Fem. <br> Interruptions | 1.5 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 6.6 | 1.8 | 4.6 | 1.2 | 5.2 | 6.4 | 14 |
| Apportionment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Average Rate** $^{*} 522$ | 863 | 728 | 668 | 441 | 250 | 729 | 344 | 347 | 182 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average F. Rate | 528 | 863 | 937 | 298 | 585 | 359 | 1002 | 303 | 396 | 147 |

[^0]This result can be explained using the phenomenon identified by Janice Yoder (1991) as the intrusiveness effect. This theory suggests that highly masculinised professional domains, such as politics, will become increasingly resistant to rapid increases in female membership. As tokens, women do not threaten the masculinity of the domain, and given their apparent harmlessness, are treated unremarkably. However, once women make up more than $30 \%$ of an environment, they are a threat against the culture of an institution, and are thus treated with hostility. Descriptive representation has a more negative than positive impact on women's ability to influence the culture of a domain. The realistic ability of women to affect cultural change within an institution is reliant on a combination of factors, including the commitment of women within the institution to create change and the strength of the fraternal networks that seek to oppose them.

Interestingly, Yoder's work suggests that token men, and men within the critical mass limits, do not experience the same negative treatment and consequences that women do. This suggests that the inequalities women experience have less to do with group size and more to do with sexism. Based on this evidence, Yoder theorised that the adverse behaviour of the majority against the introduction or inflation of a minority was the due to the reception of the minority as an intrusion. The majority feels threatened and as a result discriminates to limit any further gains by the minority.

Interruptions are a key tool for limiting access; in the case of female minorities, studies have shown that negative interruptions against men are not sexist in the way that interruptions against women often are (Shaw, 2013: 142). Interruptions not only obstruct women's interactional goals but also reinforce women as outsiders. By interrupting in a way that forces women to be conscious of their femininity in a masculine domain, men are able to establish their inherent suitability to the domain.

Senator Wong: If I could-
Senator BRANDIS: I am speaking! The coalition will be reasonable. We understand that he is very busy, but we have questions for him in this part of his estimates.

Senator Wong: I have a number of points. The first is that is a witness list which-

Senator BRANDIS: is prepared by Treasury.
Senator Wong: If I can finish now.
Senator BUSHBY: Miaow!
Senator Wong: Oh, yes. Why don't you miaow when a woman does that. That's a good idea. It is just extraordinary.

Senator CAMERON: Point of order, Chair.
Senator Wong: The blokes are allowed to yell, but if a woman stands her ground you want to make that kind of comment. It is sort of schoolyard politics, mate.

Figure 8

The treatment and capabilities of a minority cannot be solved or understood simply by looking at descriptive representation: 'It does not seem that scarcity alone can explain the reactions of men to women co-workers; nor is there any evidence to suggest that women's occupational problems can be alleviated by achieving numerical equality' (Zimmer 1988: 72).

Rather, the focus on gender quotas and tokenism distracts away from the genuine issue of unrelenting sexism and effectively restrict the discerning of factors that contribute to the negative reception of women.

## Positional Power - The Influence of the Chair

A gender neutral institution should theoretically provide an environment in which all committee chairs have the ability to facilitate discussions within the hearing and prescribe an agenda. However previous studies have demonstrated that female chairs do not garner the same levels of respect or exercise the same amount of influence in a committee hearing as male chairs. Moreover, other research has established that women regard and utilise positions of power differently to their male parallels (Blair and Stanley 1991; Dodson and Carroll 1991; Duerst-Lahti and Johnson 1990).

One of the seminal works in research on gendered leadership styles was a meta-analysis of experimental and organisational research performed by Eagly and Johnson (1990). It found that women were more likely to lead democratically, whereas men were more inclined to be autocratic. These results were mirrored in a legislative setting, where evidence was found that supported female chairs using their position to facilitate and moderate discussion, instead of controlling testimony, participating in discussion, and directing proceedings, like male chairs (Kathlene, 1900, 1991). Given that women use positions of power differently, it is unclear to what extent positions of power further women's pursuit of equal treatment and influence.

The chair of a committee have the most authority in a hearing because of their control over dynamics, speakers, and the reception of ideas. The chair has the power to encourage or silence discussion on any given topic. Research has previously uncovered that in exclusively female settings women interact in a supportive and cooperative fashion more than in a competitive manner (Coates 1988), and found that female hearing participants may also find it easier to contribute in a hearing with a female chair.

That said, other studies have found that even one male participant may cause group dynamics to change towards a more competitive interaction style (Smith-Lovin and Brody 1989), and as such a female chair may not be enough to make other female members feel comfortable. Furthermore, as female's leadership style is more democratic, it's essential inclusivity facilitates all voices, not just the voices of women, and therefore the aggressive discursive behaviour of men may be even more effective under a female chair (Eagly and Johnson 1990)

Data shows the female chairs interrupted less than their male counterparts. Out of the 105 interruptions performed 67 were from a male chair and 42 were from a female chair. While men only chaired 4 out of the 6 hearings sampled, they interrupted $50 \%$ more than the female chairs. $75 \%$ of the interruptions by male chairs were negative, demonstrating the tendency for male chairs to take a more peremptory approach to the position. This is further evidenced by the 40 defensive interruptions directed at male chairs, which is notable given that female chairs did not receive any defensive interruptions (see figure 10). Defensive interruptions directed at the chair indicate a willingness of male chairs to stray from procedural rules. Comparatively, female chairs almost exclusively used procedural or defensive turns, demonstrating their preference to act as facilitators.

## INTERRUPTIONS GIVEN

|  | Total Interruptions | Positive <br> Interruptions | Negative <br> Interruptions | Defensive <br> Interruptions |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male Chair | 63 | 15 | 47 | 1 |
| Female Chair | 42 | 6 | 12 | 24 |

## INTERRUPTIONS RECEIVED

|  | Total Interruptions | Positive <br> Interruptions | Negative <br> Interruptions | Defensive <br> Interruptions |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male Chair | 46 | 4 | 2 | 40 |
| Female Chair | 11 | 2 | 9 | 0 |

Figure 10

Throughout the sampled data, the chairs thwart less than $10 \%$ of illegal interruptions, meaning that members can interrupt at their will without the prospect of being censured. Furthermore, it signifies that the distance between what is considered to be the ideal structure of debate (where there are no interruptions or all interruptions are impeded by the Chair) and actual debate in a legislative setting is remarkable. While committee hearings are designed to facilitate equality amongst all members, the reality breeds extreme inequality, where members compete for the floor by intervening illegally. This inequality surges under a complacent chair.

Analysis of the data shows that breaches of rules are censured differently by the Chair dependent on the gender of the speaker. More analysis would be necessary to see how the gender of the Chair impacts this aspect of interaction. The difference in treatment and censures by the Chair means that female and male senators do not have the same capabilities in a hearing.

Evidence shows that men utilise positions of power in legislative hearings to exert control (Jones 1989). Analysis found that male chairs received an extraordinarily high level of defensive interruptions, which suggest they did not act in accordance with the formal rules governing the committee. Male chairs took turns outside of the turn taking model, by interrupting and speaking over other members of the hearing. That is, interruptions that did not fall within the limits of necessary procedural interventions. Not only does the chair moderate discussion, but the volition of the chair's choice to intervene defines what rule-breaking behaviour will be tolerated in each individual hearing. In the 2015 Constitutional and Legislative Affairs committee, the Chair's interpretation of procedural rules was irreverent and anomalous:

Senator WRIGHT: Chair, with respect, it seems to me that-
CHAIR: What is your point of order?

## Senator JACINTA COLLINS: Chair!

Senator WONG: You're rude.
Senator WRIGHT: I would put that there is a blurring of roles here-
CHAIR: What is the point of order? Which standing order are you concerned about?
Senator WONG: You're a bully.
Senator WRIGHT: The point of order is that, in this case, it would be appropriate, if you are going to be asking questions in this belligerent tone, that you allow the deputy chair to chair, allowing you to ask the questions.

CHAIR: There is no point of order. Please continue-
Senator WRIGHT: I think there is a serious question about your partiality in chairing, then.
CHAIR: Please continue, Professor Triggs.
Senator WRIGHT: There is a serious question about how-
CHAIR: There is no point of order-
Senator WRIGHT: this committee is being proceeded with.
CHAIR: and if you are going to keep interrupting I will suspend the-
Senator WONG: Chair, how about you stop shouting at people?
CHAIR: I will suspend the hearing.

As well as seizing the floor from other speakers, male chairs also influence hearings by contributing substantive comments to the discussion significantly more than their female counterparts. Of course, male chairs execute procedural turns, as is their duty, however they often offer personal opinions or overtly guide the question. In juxtaposition, female chairs are more likely to interject defensively on behalf of a witness or senator victim to negative interaction tactics. Out of the 42 interruptions performed by a female chair, $57 \%$ were defensive. Unlike their male counterparts, female chairs received no defensive interruptions, which suggests that they did not often engage in illegal or biased behaviour.

> Ms Branson: I have read carefully the review and in particular the outcomes document from the more recent review. Each of them deplores anti-Semitism. They stress that the Holocaust is not to be forgotten and-

Senator BRANDIS: Well, thank goodness for that, Ms Branson! The Holocaust is not to be forgotten. Thank goodness.

CHAIR: Senator Brandis, just let Ms Branson answer her question and then make some comments.

The influence of the chair is unclear. While it would seem that female chairs are more likely to intervene to defend the sanctity of the hearing or it's members, the more cooperative style may make them less effective against masculine styles of interaction. Male chairs only received one negative interruption for every 23 interrupts they performed. Female chairs, in comparison, received one negative interruption for approximately every one interruption they executed. While the gender of the chair may change the style of moderation, it is likely that under a female chair, the more aggressive verbal behaviour of male senators and witnesses is likely to be empowered not mitigated (Eagly and Johnson 1990).

This chapter has provided a clear examination of the access individuals of varying gender and status have to the debate floor in the Australian Senate. Using measures relating to volubility and interruption, a stronger understanding of realities within this domain was attained. While hypotheses were not fully corroborated, results were complex and not necessary conflicting with initial assumptions. Male senators did not speak the most, but male witnesses did. This is understandable given the format of the setting. Moreover, female senators were found to execute the highest number of interruptions. However an overwhelming number of these were in defense of others' speaking rights, and not attempts to seize the floor. The next chapter will follow on from these results, examining the effectiveness of senators and witnesses once they have gained the floor.

## 5. EFFECTIVENESS

This chapter will specifically analyse data relating to the effectiveness and credibility of female testimony. The testimony provided by a witness is heavily reliant on the questions they are asked. Senate Estimates Committees do not provide a forum where witnesses can offer their opinion; testimony must largely be based on facts. Senators may choose to ask questions which challenge the authority, ability or credibility of a witness, limiting their effectiveness in a hearing. It is expected that analysis will show female witnesses, compared to male witnesses, will be significantly more impeded by senators attempts to destroy their credibility or authority.

There are various empirical measures that test the authority of a witness in a legislative setting. One of these measures is the type of questions witnesses receive. A key way to challenge or test the authority of a witness is to ask more difficult questions rather than factual questions. These include empirical questions, repeated questions, as well as challenges or disagreements. The method for determining question type is quite objective. Word cues assist in the categorisation of questions. Requests for empirical evidence or interpretation of empirical evidence are linguistically quite clear. As are disagreements which consistently include phrases such as "I do not accept that," "I do not agree with that," or even in some cases "come on." A sentence is coded as a disagreement when a senator literally disagrees with a witness. These interjections work to both as a gatekeeping mechanism and also to further the authority of the interjecting senator.

Another key tactic used to undermine a witness is the repetition of the same question, either with consistent phrasing or using a slight variation. Linguistic research has determined that repeated questions can challenge or undermine the authority of a witness (Tannen, 1994). Repeated questions can be used to suggest two things; that the witness is being uncooperative and refusing to answer questions; or that the witness should not be seen as credible due to their inability to answer the question. It is expected that female witnesses will be subjected to more repeated questions as is the case with most behaviours relating to credibility.

Challenges and accusations of emotional/unreasonable behaviour are undoubtedly more difficult to categorise. This is partly because accusations of emotion are at their core also challenges. For the purpose of this study, questions or challenges that specifically refer to a witness' emotional state or ability to reason are coded as emotional challenges. All other statements or questions that challenge
the answers of a witness without explicitly disagreeing with them will be coded as a challenge. Often the phrase "With respect" signifies a challenge. Examples have been offered as part of the following analysis to demonstrate the types of questions that fall under each category.

It is expected that men will experience few difficult questions, and that their questions will largely be factual. Factual questions elicit short answers that require little argument. Previous studies have found male witnesses are often asked factual questions to establish their position as insiders. (Hurwitz, Miron, and Johnson 1992; Kathlene 1995).

## Hypothesis: Female witnesses effectiveness, compared to male witnesses, will be restricted by senators attempts to destroy the credibility and authority of any testimony given by a woman.

In a legislative setting, the reception of female witnesses is most easily understood using archetypes. Women are viewed as one, or a combination of multiple, of the following stereotypes: hysterical, deceptive, incompetent or recalcitrant. Each of these stereotypes are reinforced by the question types outlined above. This chapter will break down each of those assertions for more thorough exploration. It must be noted that party politics most certainly spurs more disagreements and challenges. A wealth of research has produced results which confirms that people show bias toward messages that align with their views, and against anything which contradicts or undermines those views (e.g. Lord, Ross, and Lepper 1979; Edwards and Smith 1996; Shapiro and Elkon 2008). However, as women and men exist on both sides of the aisle, this is not expected to affect the results in any considerable way.

|  | F Witness | M Witness | TOTAL | Female \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Easier Question Type |  |  |  |  |
| Factual Question | 2513 | 1598 |  |  |
| Difficult Question Type, Tests of Authority |  |  |  |  |
| Empirical Question | 31 | 45 | 76 | $93 \%$ |
| Repeated Question | 165 | 49 | 214 | $77 \%$ |
| Disagreement | 101 | 52 | 153 | $66 \%$ |
| Challenge | 213 | 98 | 311 | $68 \%$ |


| Emotional, Unreasonable | 163 | 65 | 228 | $72 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL | 705 | 269 | 974 | $72 \%$ |
| Negative Percentage | $30 \%$ | $10 \%$ |  |  |

One in three questions directed to women are tests of authority, which is a significantly higher rate than the one in ten tests of authority experienced by men. It is expected that these results will be replicated in every specific analysis. It is also expected that male senators will test authority at higher rates than female senators. This is because in a political setting, male senators will act as the gatekeepers of the masculine domain. In this domain, female witnesses are outsiders or interlopers, and must have their effectiveness curbed in order to maintain the masculinity of the environment (Shaw, 200).

Female senators also engaged in tests of authority, however these were usually in response to specific issues instead of towards a specific witness. A clear example of this is the behaviour of Senator McLucas in the 2007 Community Affairs Committee hearing. She begins with a long string of factual questioning eventually broken by the Chair, Senator Gary Humphries who apologetically states: "It seems an act of vandalism to interrupt your tour de force, Senator McLucas, but we will break now for some coffee." Later in the same hearing, Senator McLucas executes a burst of challenges and disagreements while questioning witnesses on a topic of interest. This topic based adversariality is keenly observed by the chair who comments: "We are continuing with outcome 4 . Have we got more on the exploding nursing homes issue to explore, Senator McLucas?"

## The Hysterical Woman - An overly sensitive, impressionable woman

Perhaps the most dogging of all female archetypes is that of the "hysterical" woman. Hysteria has been used for centuries to discredit and undermine female authority. Patricia Crawford $(2001,81)$ noted that 'learned men' of the eighteenth century definitively pronounced that the female body was 'subject to emotional disorders, such as hysteria, rendering them unfit for the duties of citizenship which required reason'. The legitimacy of the connection between hysteria and women was made possible by its classification as a medical disorder:

[^1]suddenly, dramatically, and seemingly for inconsequential reasons ... egocentric in the extreme ... essentially asexual and not uncommonly frigid.'
(Bordo, 2004, 169)

All of these characteristics were, at the time, seen as innately feminine. It follows that women, through their characterisation as irrational and hysterical, have a long history of exclusion from public realms. Moreover, given the historical associations between politics and reason, female politicians have struggled to overcome 'patriarchal constructions of women as hysterical'. This has made it almost impossible for female politicians to do their job, as women are understood as a group who are 'unreasonable, emotional and therefore unfit for the domains of science or public office' (Lafrance and McKenzie-Mohr 2014, 6)

Alluding to these historical misrepresentations is a power tactic that can be used to undermine the authority and credibility of female politicians or government officials rendering them less effective. By simply suggesting that a woman is powerless against her own emotions, her ability to reason is unfairly called into question. This tactic is particularly sexist in that it is almost assuredly used more against women than it is against men. For the purpose of this study, suggestions by a questioner that a witness is partisan have also been coded under this subsection.

|  | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F. Senator - F. Witness | 6 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 22 | 10 |  |
| M. Senator - F. Witness |  |  | 1 | 34 | 1 | 41 |  |  | 2 | 41 |
| F. Senator - M. Witness | 1 | 2 | 1 |  | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| M. Senator - M. Witness |  |  | 10 | 5 | 19 | 6 | 3 |  |  |  |

Analysis of data showed that female witness were called emotional, unreasonable, or words to that effect 163 times. Women received these kinds of comments 2.5 times more than their male counterparts. Consistent with expectations, these comments were majoritively issued by males, with 120 comments coming from male senators. Female senators also delivered accusations of unreasonability, totalling to 65 , however just like their male counterparts, most of these comments $(66 \%)$ were directed to female witnesses. Women experienced the highest proportion of these comments in the 2009, 2011, 2013, and 2015. Three of those four results were from panels where
women has surpassed a critical mass. This further demonstrates my conclusion that women will face more hostility when numerical representation passes $30 \%$.

Senator Wong: Do you want me to make a rude comment about you now, Senator
Bushby?
CHAIR: Senator Wong, please continue.
Senator BUSHBY: Go for it.
Senator Wong: Don't tempt me.
Senator BRANDIS: Being a bit sensitive this morning, Senator?
CHAIR: Senator Brandis!
Senator Wong: No, Senator, I just get irritated with the way in which moderates like you allow that kind of behaviour from blokes-

Senator BRANDIS: I want the Secretary of the Treasury to answer-
Senator Wong: No, that's not what I am annoyed about.
CHAIR: I repeat that if I am going to have constant interjections during this I will go back to a private meeting. Minister, would you continue your comments.
Senator BRANDIS: Minister, you are demeaning your office.

Female senators and witnesses are constructed as outsiders by sexist behaviour. Women are constantly alerted to their gender as a form of gatekeeping. The double bind theory, proposed by Robin Lakoff, establishes that women who work in politics and government exist in an impossible situation:

> When a woman is placed in a position in which being assertive and forceful is necessary, she is faced with a paradox; she can be a good woman but a bad professional, or vice versa. To do both is impossible (Lakoff 1990: 206).

When women assert their authority or engage in particular combative or aggressive behaviour, they are quickly reminded by gate-keepers, both male and female, of their gender and the behavioural expectations that come with it. For example, in the 2014 Education Committee hearing, Senator Lines made a cat sound at Senator Payne, a notorious slur used against women, and also previously used by Senator Bushby in 2011:

Senator Payne: I do not think Senator McKenzie interrupted Senator Lines, Chair. I might have but I do not think Senator McKenzie did.
Senator LINES: If you want to come over this side, Senator Payne-but you are there to respond to us. Senator McKENZIE: I have a question, Chair, to Ms Wilson.
Senator LINES: Meow.
CHAIR: Please carry on, Senator McKenzie.
Senator Payne: Remember Senator Bushby, Senator Lines? Is it a habit? Remember Senator Bushby who did that to Senator Wong? [...] Do you think that is appropriate behaviour?

## The Deceptive Woman - A woman who lies or talks in tongues

The female credibility impediment is neither new nor defunct; studies from across disciplines show the swiftness with which people are willing to accept a woman is lying. Depictions of women as liars can be traced from Ancient Greece's Cassandra, to America's Professor Anita Hill. The mythological depiction of Cassandra illustrates the seemingly impossible task of convincing a patriarchal society to hear or heed the message of a woman (Vagelatos 1995). Even today, this myth runs parallel to reality, where outdated laws and customs which see women as childlike and frivolous, and suggest that they are not to be believed or taken seriously still exist (Ronner, 1997, 130). These anchoring pieces of legislation and tradition feed ongoing stereotypes that women lack credibility (Jordan, 2004). Like children, women are perceived as fanciful storytellers, prone to dramatics and delusion (Quinn, 1988; Yates and Musty, 1988). Direct disagreements towards women, more often than not, also carry the suggestion that the witness is being deceptive or manipulative.

|  | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F. Senator - F. Witness | 3 | 7 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 7 | 9 | 2 |
| M. Senator - F. Witness |  |  | 4 | 23 |  | 22 |  | 1 | 1 | 21 |
| F. Senator - M. Witness | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 4 |  | 8 |
| M. Senator - M. Witness |  |  | 5 | 1 | 13 | 5 | 7 |  |  |  |

Analysis looking specifically at direct disagreements found that over the 10 hearings, 143 direct disagreements occurred. Of those disagreements, 101 were directed at female witness. These results
were congruent with expectations which predicted that female witnesses would encounter more direct disagreements than male witnesses. It was also predicted that male senators would directly disagree with witnesses more than female senators. Results show the male senators disagreed with witnesses 103 times, and that of those disagreements, 72 were directed at female witnesses. While men also faced disagreements, in most hearings the number of disagreements was negligible. These disagreements were rarely attached to any suggestion of deceitfulness, which was the case for a majority of the disagreements received by female witnesses. Moreover, female witnesses were also subjected to higher levels of consistent repeat disagreements, where they were not afforded the opportunity to reassert their position or further establish their evidence.

Senators can create traps for female witnesses in order to discredit them. Already having information from a source they consider more credible, often a male, a senator may ask a question and if the answer they receive is incongruous with the information they already have, they move forward to suggest the witness may be intentionally misleading them. Not only does this reinforce the elevation of authority of an outside source as well as the senator, but it diminishes the authority of the witness and undermines their credibility. Below is an example of such behaviour in the 2009 Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee Hearing:

Senator BRANDIS: Were there no telephone conversations or meetings with the minister or with advisers in the minister's office in relation to this?

Ms Branson: Not that I am aware of.
Senator BARNETT: Ms Branson, I cannot go into private discussions that I have had with Mr Calma, but if Mr Calma were here he would no doubt provide a more fulsome response. [...] Please be very careful in saying that there have been no further communications, or only informal ones, because I am led to believe that in fact there have been.

Ms Branson: I simply said there were none that I was aware of. I certainly did not assert that there were none.

2009 L\&C

As mentioned above, women and children are, in almost every aspect of life, seen as some of the least powerful people in society. This in turn makes them unusually perceptible to not being believed (Wheatcroft \& Walklate, 2014). In contrast to the perception of these weakened actors, Yarbrough and Bennett (2000) assert that individuals in positions of power, will not have their credibility questioned. It follows that credibility itself is indicative of power.

Moreover, misunderstandings involving female witnesses are likely to be characterised as malicious or intentional. This is exemplified in the sample below, where an unintentional misdirection by a government department is characterised as manipulative behaviour by a female witness:

Ms Quinn: The official specifically asked about whether that meant you wanted to look at general equilibrium impacts on the economy and the reply was, 'Yes'. That was why it was passed to estimates later in the day-so officials could be present to answers those questions. There was no intention to direct the committee in an inappropriate way. It was purely seeking clarification.

Senator CORMANN: But, Ms Quinn, I just want to know that we can trust the evidence that is given. We have had a pretty longstanding interaction on these issues, and I respect your knowledge in relation to all these matters. Let me just go-

Senator Wong: But Senator, you have made a bit of an imputation there- [...]
Senator CORMANN: It stands as its own statement of absolute proper fact that obviously it is important for Senate committees like this to be able to trust the advice from senior officials in the Treasury as we pursue our job, Minister, of scrutinising the activities of government. In that context, it is quite important to establish exactly what has happened.

Senator Wong: [...] Firstly, how you articulated what should occur, is correct. Officials have an obligation to answer correctly to the best of their ability before these estimates, and these people do. Any imputation that you may or may not have intended is firmly rejected. Ms Quinn has outlined the reasons why the answers were given in the previous estimates. You may disagree with those answers, Senator, but I think that that is a different issue to the issue of whether the evidence can be trusted.

## The Incompetent Woman - The Women Who Lacks Both Knowledge And Ability

It was predicted that female witnesses would encounter a higher level of empirical questioning. Empirically based questions require female witnesses to further establish their authority through the interpretation of evidence presented, or reinforce their arguments with secondary outside authority. Being asked to provide evidence outside of their own testimony is paramount to suggesting that their testimony alone is not enough for the questioner.

Research on expert credibility and the influence of gender in a judicial setting has produced mixed results. Female experts are often seen as more credible than their male counterparts, but exclusively in stereotypically female fields such as childcare, sexual abuse, and domestic violence. Given the historic masculinity of both politics and government, it is not expected that female witnesses will be afforded the same authority as males. In the context of Phillips (1993) distinction between ordinary and expert witness, the value of a witness can be distinguished by how much they are required to substantiate their claims. It follows that the more empirical questions a witness receives, the less authority they are perceived to have. Empirical evidence refers to both official documents (such as
letters, reports, statistics, or research) as well as the opinions of other experts. It is expected that women will also give high levels of empirically based answers.

Senator SMITH: Is there any international evidence, Secretary, that says that having an independent agency or a statutory authority provides better preventative health outcomes than the Department of Health being the single provider of those preventative health strategies?

Prof. Halton: I cannot say that I have reviewed that literature recently, so I will take that on notice - but not that I am aware of.

Senator SMITH: Thank you very much. Ms Sylvan, you have some evidence?
Ms Sylvan: It is an interesting question and, in a sense, it is question in my mind as well. I do not know that the evidence would be exactly what you are looking for. What is happening as far as we can see globally-New Zealand probably being the latest example, but Canada and a number of others - is that governments are setting up independent agencies in the prevention task. [...]

Empirical questions totalled to 76 across the 10 sampled hearings. A remarkable $93 \%$ of these questions were directed to female witnesses. Male witnesses were asked only 8 empirical questions, suggesting that their testimony alone was considered enough. Male senators issued just under $60 \%$ of these questions, which is a lower result than expected.

Empirical

|  | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F. Senator - F. Witness | 4 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| M. Senator - F. Witness |  | 1 |  | 25 |  | 6 |  | 5 |  | 5 |
| F. Senator - M. Witness |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 |  | 1 |
| M. Senator - M. Witness |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Empirical questions were also presented in the form of positing testimony from other experts in a field and requesting a response. Presenting an expert opinion which differs from that presented by the witness works to damage their credibility and diminish their authority by suggesting that their opinion is incongruent with someone more qualified, and therefore incorrect. This tactic was used by Senator Barnett in the 2009 Legal and Constitutional Legislation Committee hearing:

Senator BARNETT: Two High Court judges have expressed concern about constitutionality regarding, I think, the model that you have espoused. How do you overcome their concerns and the views that they have expressed?

Ms Branson: I am not sure to whom you refer, Senator Barnett, but if you are speaking of, for example, Mr Michael McHugh, who is a former High Court judge, or Sir Anthony Mason, a former Chief Justice of Australia, then they have both indicated their approval through a statement to which other prominent constitutional and human rights lawyers lent their names, saying that they do not believe a constitutional difficulty would attend a human rights act of the kind that we envisage.

Female witnesses are also painted as incompetent when they are challenged by a questioner. Challenging a witness establishes the questioners authority to the detriment of the witnesses credibility (Mattei, 1998). Take, for instance, Senator Trood's questioning of Ms Jennifer Rawson, the First Assistant Secretary of the International Security division within the Department of Defence. Senator Russell Trood is certainly learned in matters of International Security, with a distinguished career in the field. That said, it is Ms Rawson's professional responsibility to monitor the relevant policies of the Australian government and Trood's challenge of Ms Rawson's knowledge of policy undercut her authority and credibility:

Senator TROOD: Ms Rawson, I am just wondering whether or not you might be a bit behind the policy developments in this area, because I saw a report yesterday in the newspaper suggesting that the minister had softened his position on uranium sales. [...] I am speaking about the Minister for Foreign Affairs softening his position.
Ms Rawson: That is not a correct interpretation. The report yesterday was based on some Indian newspaper reports of comments made by Mr Smith in the margins of meetings with the commerce minister, who was here last week. My understanding is that the minister would have put the Australian government's position, which is that, as I said before, Australia will only allow the supply of uranium to those countries which are parties to the NPT. There is a separate issue of Australia's attitude towards those aspects of the US-India Civil Nuclear Initiative that I referred to before: what approach we would take in the IAEA and the NSG. The situation is that the government has not yet taken a decision on that and will do so if and when it is required to do so.

2008 FAD\&T

Challenges accounted for an overwhelming amount of the difficult questions. Over the 10 Senate Estimates hearings, 311 challenges are issued to witnesses. Out of those 311 challenges, 213 were directed at women. Male senators are responsible for 179 challenges. This is consistent with expected
results, given the adversarial nature of masculine communication, albeit a slightly lower proportion than expected. There was a remarkable number of challenges in all hearings, with the exception of 2006 and 2012. In the 2015, 2011, and 2009 hearings, more than 40 challenges are issued.

Challenges

|  | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F. Senator - F. Witness | 12 | 22 | 3 |  | 2 |  |  | 30 | 17 | 5 |
| M. Senator - F. Witness |  |  | 9 | 39 | 2 | 32 |  | 4 | 6 | 30 |
| F. Senator - M. Witness | 5 | 8 | 6 |  | 4 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 7 |
| M. Senator - M. Witness |  |  | 16 | 3 | 17 | 8 | 11 |  | 2 |  |

By challenging the expertise of a witness, the questioner is essentially elevating their own authority above that of a witness. It is presumable that it would be necessary for a questioner to have more authority on the topic of discussion in order to challenge the evidence given by a witness. Therefore, every time this gate keeping behaviour takes place, the authority of a witness is being eroded. A clear example of this is when Senator Brandis acknowledges the extraordinary reputation of the witness, Ms Branson, but then continues to tell her how to better do her job:

Ms Branson: In my view, what the president of one nation state says does not characterise the entire conference. It did bring great criticism on the president and alerted many people who might not otherwise be thinking of it to the evils of anti-Semitism. The rest of the conference was a very positive exercise in which the Australian Human Rights Commission, working with other national human rights institutions, found very valuable.

Senator BRANDIS: Ms Branson, I know of your background and I know of your illustrious reputation as a lawyer but, with respect, it seems to me that maybe-given what are plainly the international political sensitivities of this and given you were aware of them and discussed them, as is apparent from your own minutes-it would have been more prudent to leave judgments about international relations and politics and Australia's position in relation to those matters to the diplomats and the Minister for Foreign Affairs, who at least had an understanding of the nuances of international politics, rather than to characterise your decision to participate in a technical, lawyerly way, which shows scant respect for the foreign policy implications for Australia of the decision you were determined to make.

## The Recalcitrant Woman - The Woman who Refuses to Answer the Question

Women are painted as recalcitrant when they are asked the same question repeatedly. This implies an unwillingness or inability to provide an acceptable answer to the initial question. In actuality, the repetition of a question, in either the same words or slightly varied, is a tactic used to elicit a particular response or discredit a witness. Results from a wide variety of disciplines support this proposition. In a police interrogation setting, Eades (2002) found that police officers were able to elicit gratuitous concurrence, an empty yes, through the use of tactics such as double-barrelled questions, shouting, and repeated questions.

In the legislative setting, Tannen (1994: 183) found that repeated questions were commonly used to challenge someone's authority or their knowledge. This challenge can be intensified through insistence by the questioner that a witness has not or cannot understand the question being asked of them. By demonstrating that a witness is either incapable or averse to answering a question there is an increased chance that the witness and their testimony will be sidelined. The other possible result is that a witness will eventually provide the answer desired by the questioner. Similar to other functions relating to authority or credibility, it is expected that women will be asked more repeated questions than their male counterparts. It is also presumed that male senators will ask more repeated questions than female senators. Persistence in the pursuit of an "adequate" answer is adversarial in nature and more consistent with male behaviours.

Senator BRANDIS: If you had a witness in one of your courts in days gone by, Ms Branson, and they evaded a question as egregiously as you have just evaded mine, you would pull them up sharply. I want to know whether there was a written report prepared by Mr Calma or Ms Donaldson or Mr Shalbak.

Ms Branson: I am not yet in possession of a written report, other than-
Senator BRANDIS: So the answer to my question is no.
Ms Branson: I am trying to give you a comprehensive answer.
Senator BRANDIS: I do not want a comprehensive response. I want a specific response to a specific question.

2009 L\&C

Consistent with expectations, female witnesses were asked the most repeated questions, receiving 165 repeated questions. That equates to $77 \%$ of all repeated questions issued throughout the 10 Senate Estimates hearings. Female witnesses experienced an average of 8.25 repeated questions per hearing,
which was significantly higher than male witnesses who were only received 2.45 repeated questions per hearing on average.

Prior presumptions regarding male senators issuing higher levels of repeated questions were also found to be correct. Out of the 214 repeated questions coded from the sampled hearings, 144 came from male senators. Female senators asked an average of 3.5 repeated questions while their male parallels issued an average of 7.2.

|  | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F. Senator - F. Witness | 8 | 6 | 7 |  |  |  |  | 19 | 7 |  |
| M. Senator - F. Witness |  |  | 1 | 42 |  | 15 |  | 3 | 4 | 53 |
| F. Senator - M. Witness | 4 | 2 | 4 |  | 1 |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |
| M. Senator - M. Witness |  |  | 4 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 10 |  |  |  |

Examples of long lines of repeated questions in the sample hearings clearly illustrated the effectiveness of this tactic against female witnesses. The longer senators were able to stretch a line of repeated questions, the more successful the tool proved to be. As well as making the witness feel as though they had not answered the question adequately, slight variations of the phrasing of a question served to confuse witnesses, making them more likely to accidentally provide the answer desired by the senator, regardless of its factuality.

In the 2015 Legal and Constitutional Affairs hearing, Senator O'Sullivan in cohort with the Chair, Senator MacDonald, delivered an onslaught of 53 repeated questions. Male senators asked 190 questions in total during the 2015 hearing, meaning that over a quarter of these questions were repeated. A possible cause for the high propensity of repeated questions in this hearing could be the combination of the persistence of the male senators and the resolve of the female witness:

Senator O'SULLIVAN: I direct you to a statement-and I can lead you to it, if needs be-where I questioned you about a trigger for the inquiry. Your answer was that: There was no trigger.

Prof. Triggs: There was no one trigger.
Senator O'SULLIVAN: You said there was no trigger. I am happy for you to strike that down. That is the
purpose of this. You said that: "... I wanted to call an inquiry and I could not call that inquiry as we approached caretaker mode. It was simply inadvisable to do so." Do you accept that in your evidence today under examination by Senator Reynolds you have laid down a number of issues that triggered a transition from a review to an inquiry, using the commission's powers?

Senator BILYK: Asked and answered.
CHAIR: What is the question?
Senator O'SULLIVAN: The question is: do you accept that today you have given evidence that there were issues-I referred to them as 'triggers'-that caused it to transition from a review to an inquiry?

Prof. Triggs: My evidence has been given. It is in the documentation we have provided you with. It is in statements I have made. It is in answers that I have given for the last seven hours.

Senator O'SULLIVAN: I accept that.
Prof. Triggs: I have repeated and repeated the various factors that led to the final decision in December. I do not think I can add anything further to the record.

The results of this study have echoed that of Mattei's study in the United States. Female witnesses are consistently subjected to a harder line of questioning than their male counterpart. This reality, consistent with the expectations of this study and the results of the previous chapter, is only intensified when female numbers pass the critical mass threshold.

## 6. CONCLUSION

The key concern of this study is whether women are able to compete with men in a legislative setting, and if they are afforded equal access and opportunity to be effective. Access and effectiveness in a legislative environment are strongly influenced by the historical masculinity of political domains, the inherent differences in female and male communication, and the unproven impact of numerical representation. Empirically, this research concludes that while women are by no means silent (with female witnesses speaking slightly more than male witnesses on average) they are not privy to the same levels of access as their male counterparts. As apportionment is not tantamount to access, the high frequency of interruptions experienced by female senators and witnesses compared to male senators and witnesses, exposed the limitations to female access.

Moreover, the effectiveness of female witnesses is extremely limited by the difficult style of questions directed to them. Gatekeeping tactics which limit the effectiveness of female witnesses were utilised by both male and female senators from all political parties. While these tactics were used by almost every senator, they were almost exclusively targeted at female witnesses. Tactics included direct disagreements, challenges, empirical questions, repeated questions, and accusations of emotional or unreasonable behaviour. Results which showed the common adoption of a male communication style by female senators and witnesses were unexpected. The adaption of traditional masculine communication tactics were mostly defensive in motivation, however, in some situations female senators used adversarial behaviour in an aggressive capacity. It would be overly simplistic to suggest men alone execute gatekeeping behaviour, and that protection of patriarchal domains can only be conducted by men. In fact, the sexist behaviour of women witnessed in the Senate estimates committee hearings is congruent with previous research which has found that women do not always act on the behalf of women (Shaw, 2006; Kathlene, 1994; Mattei, 1999).

The findings of this study are limited by the scope of the data considered and additional legislative proceedings should be examined in order to further explore the agency of women in politics. That said, the available evidence is sufficient to arrive at some tentative conclusions. Firstly, that Senate Estimates Committee hearings are masculine in nature. The masculine style of communication is seen as inborn to the domain, and is more effective than feminine modes. This forces women to act from the position of outsider, due to their differences in expression, reception, and treatment (Kerber 1990).

Second, rules within this political community of practice were developed around masculine communication and as such benefit and complement the masculine voice. The men examined in this study were more likely to break the rules and, unlike their female counterparts, were less likely to be punished for rule-breaking behaviour. An interesting component of this examination was the influence of the chair, and any variation in moderation dependent on gender. When committees were chaired by women, a complex change could be witnessed in the hearings moderation. Female chairs were more likely to interrupt defensively, but less inclined to offer any guiding contributions. Furthermore, female chairs received practically no defensive interruptions, whereas a large majority of interruptions received by male chairs were defensive in motivation. However, male aggressiveness was often resistant to attempts at control by a female chair.

Finally, in relation to descriptive representation, female witnesses and senators will not experience better treatment in environments where genders are equally represented. Results from this study found that women experienced the best treatment in hearings numerically dominated by one gender, male or female. As tokens, women were not subject to hostility as a reactionary measure to preserve the masculinity of a domain, and as such, were more effective. Hearings that were close to equal in gender make-up demonstrated the highest levels of hostile and adversarial behaviour, with attacks coming from senators and witnesses of both genders.

Four hypotheses formed the basis of this research. This study found that male senators did not hold the floor longer than any other group during a hearing, but in fact male witnesses. Given the long form style of testimony often required of witnesses, this result is understandable. That said, there was no clear explanation for the difference in volubility of male and female witnesses. It was also hypothesised that male senators would interrupt, both negatively and positively, more than all other groups. In keeping with the first hypothesis, this was also not the cases in the examined data. Female senators were found to interrupt more than any other group, however an alarmingly high proportion of their interruptions were in defense of another members rights. Following this was the hypothesis which proposed that men would interrupt in a negative fashion more often than a positive fashion, in order to obstruct the speaker's interactional goals. Evidence found this to be true, with over 75\% of all male interruptions being negative attempts to take the floor, and only one defensive interruption being issued. Finally, this study found that the effectiveness of female witnesses, compared to male witnesses, was restricted by senators attempts to destroy their credibility and authority. Evidence was categorised through the use of archetypes often used to discredit women. All of the examined data corroborated the extreme discrepancy between the treatment of male and female witnesses.

This study has applied methods used in previous international legislative research to the Australian Senate. It confirms and expands on studies that suggests gender constitutes a significant barrier to effective representation within historically masculine domains. It would be useful for future discourse research to focus on other areas of Australian government, possibly in the general proceedings of the Senate or the House of Representatives, in order to provide a more comprehensive detailing of limitations faced by females. This research on linguistic behaviour opens a door to further gender studies that may have significant consequences in regard to understand democratic legislative process.

Based on the conclusions drawn from this research, the sexism that exists within the Australian Senate is a point of extreme concern. While numerical representation allows more space for female representatives to act without fear of creating negative stereotypes, focus on this issue should not be at the expense of exposing sexist behaviour. Bringing more women into politics will not translate directly into a proportionate amount of female power and influence. Given the inconclusive evidence surrounding the positive effects of a minority group achieving critical mass, social action to such ends might be more distracting than helpful. Bringing more women into politics will not translate directly into a proportionate amount of female power and influence. Instead, focus should be directed to cultural change in existing institutions as to ensure that when women enter, they do so with access and agency equal to their male counterparts.

## APPENDIX A

2006 - EMPLOYMENT AND EDUCATION LEGISLATION COMMITTEE<br>Thursday, 1 June 11:03-15:45 (4h42m)<br>Hansard: p 32-p 100<br>COMMITTEE LIST<br>Penny Wong (ALP)<br>Judith Troeth (LNP)<br>Corey Bernardi (LNP)<br>Ursula Stephens (ALP)<br>M: 1 - F: 3 CHAIR: $F$<br>WITNESS LIST<br>Senator Amanda Vanstone<br>Ms Lisa Paul<br>Mr Rod Manns<br>Ms Robyn Priddle<br>Mr Colin Walters<br>Ms Lois Sparkes<br>Mr Craig Storen<br>Mr Jim Davidson<br>Ms Linda White<br>Mr Neil McAuslan<br>Mr Craig Robertson<br>Ms Aurora Andruska<br>Ms Rebecca Cross<br>Ms Anne Baly<br>Ms Helen McLaren<br>Ms Margaret McKinnon<br>M: 6 - F: 10

## 2007 - COMMUNITY AFFAIRS LEGISLATION COMMITTEE Thursday, 31 May 09:03-14:53 (3h55m) <br> Hansard: p 06-p 75

COMMITTEE LIST
Jan McLucas (ALP)
Gary Humphries (ALP) CHAIR

M: 1-F: 1 CHAIR: M

WITNESS LIST
Ms Jane Halton
Ms Mary Murnane
Mr David Learmonth
Ms Fiona Nicholls
Ms Alison Killen
Ms Allison Rosevear
Mr Peter Broadhead
Mr Andrew Stuart
Ms Carolyn Smith
Ms Carolyn Scheetz
Mr Iain Scott
Ms Melinda Bromley
Mr Mark Brandon

```
M: \(5-F: 8\)
```

2008 - FOREIGN AFFAIRS, DEFENCE AND TRADE COMMITTEE<br>Monday, 2 June 14:22-21:53 (5h52m)<br>Hansard p 70-p 157

COMMITTEE LIST
Marise Payne (LNP)
Michael Forshaw (ALP)
Ian Macdonald (LNP)
Mathias Cormann (LNP)
Mark Bishop (ALP) CHAIR
Lyn Allison (DEM)
Russell Trood (LNP)
Kerry Nettle (GRNS)

M: 5-F: 3 CHAIR: M

## WITNESS LIST

Senator John Faulkner
Mr Doug Chester
Ms Ann Thorpe
Mr Peter Woolcott
Ms Penny Wensley
Ms Deborah Stokes
Mr Paul Robilliard
Mr Richard Rowe
Mr Michael Potts
Mr Adam McCarthy
Ms Jennifer Rawson
Mr John Carlson
Mr Sam Gerovich
Mr Peter Baxter
Mr Bassim Blazey
Mr Peter Tesch
Mr Bob Nash

M: $18-F: 4$

| 2009 - LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION COMMITTEE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Monday, $\mathbf{2 5}$ May 9:00-13:54 / 22:39-23:00 (3h55m) |  |
| Hansard: p 07-68/181-187 |  |
|  |  |
| COMMITTEE LIST | WITNESS LIST |
| Guy Barnett (LNP) | Senator Joe Ludwig |
| Trish Crossin (ALP) CHAIR | The Hon Catherine Branson QC |
| George Brandis (LNP) | Mr Roger Wilkins AO |
| David Feeney (ALP) | Mr Graeme Innes AM |
| Mary Jo Fisher (LNP) | Ms Susan Roberts |
|  | Emeritus Professor David Weisbrot AM |
| M: $3-$ F: 2 CHAIR: F | Ms Sabina Wynn |
|  | Ms Stephanie Fryer-Smith |
|  | Mr Franklin Gaffney |
|  | Mr Ian Govey |
|  | M: $6-F: 4$ |

2010 - FINANCE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION LEGISLATION COMMITTEE Tuesday, 25 May 09:04-15:45 (6h14m) Hansard: p 04 - p 95<br>COMMITTEE LIST<br>Michael Ronaldson (LNP)<br>Nick Xenophon (INDP)<br>Helen Kroger (LNP)<br>Michael Forshaw (ALP)<br>Jacinta Collins (ALP)<br>Scott Ryan (LNP)<br>Doug Cameron (ALP)<br>Brett Mason (LNP)<br>Marise Payne (LNP)<br>Helen Polley (ALP) CHAIR<br>M: 6-F: 4 CHAIR: F<br>WITNESS LIST<br>Senator Joe Ludwig<br>Mr Ian McPhee<br>Mr Peter White<br>Mr Steve Chapman<br>Mr Matt Cahill<br>Dr David Melville Rowlands<br>Dr Thomas (Tom) Edmund Clarke<br>Ms Glenys Beauchamp<br>Dr Paul Grimes<br>Ms Rebecca Cross<br>Mr Ben Rimmer<br>Mr Dominic English<br>Mr Ron Perry<br>M: $11-F: 2$

## 2011 - ECONOMICS LEGISLATION COMMITTEE <br> Wednesday, 1 June 09:18-14:57 (3h58m) <br> Hansard: p 07 -p 84

COMMITTEE LIST
Doug Cameron (ALP)
Annette Hurley (ALP) CHAIR
Louise Pratt (ALP)
Corey Bernardi (LNP)
Simon Birmingham (LNP)
George Brandis (LNP)
David Bushby (LNP)
Richard Colbeck (LNP)
Helen Coonan (LNP)
Mathias Cormann (LNP)
Alan Eggleston (LNP)
Bill Heffernan (LNP)
Barnaby Joyce (LNP)
Nick Xenophon (INDP)

M: 11 - F: 3 CHAIR: F

WITNESS LIST
Senator Penny Wong
Ms Meghan Quinn
Ms Deidre Gerathy
Dr Martin Parkinson
Dr David Gruen
Mr Frank Di Giorgio
Mr Nigel Ray
Mr Jim Murphy

M: 5 - F: 3

```
2012 - FOREIGN AFFAIRS, DEFENCE AND TRADE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE
Thursday, 31 May 09:03-14:17 (4h55m)
Hansard: p 10-p 83
COMMITTEE LIST WITNESS LIST
Senator Anne McEwen (ALP) CHAIR
Lisa Singh (ALP)
John Faulkner (ALP)
Ian Macdonald (LNP)
David Fawcett (LNP)
Helen Kroger (LNP)
Michael Ronaldson (LNP)
Alan Eggleston (LNP)
Nick Xenophon (INDP)
John Madigan (INDP)
Lee Rhiannon (GRNS)
Scott Ludlam (GRNS)
M: 8-F:4 CHAIR:F
```


## 2013 - COMMUNITY AFFAIRS LEGISLATION COMMITTEE Wednesday, 20 November 09:10-14:54 (5h29m) Hansard: p 08 -p 85

COMMITTEE LIST
Helen Polley (ALP)
Jan McLucas (ALP)
Carol Brown (ALP)
Claire Moore (ALP)
Zed Seselja (LNP)
Dean Smith (LNP)
Rachel Siewert (GRNS)
Nova Perris (ALP)
Bridget McKenzie (LNP)
Sue Boyce (LNP) CHAIR

M: 2 - F: 8 CHAIR: $F$

WITNESS LIST
Senator Fiona Nash
Professor Jane Halton
Mr Andrew Stuart
Mr Adam Davey
Ms Sharon Appleyard
Ms Megan Morris
Mr Nathan Smyth
Ms Colleen Krestensen
Ms Kathy Dennis
Professor John Skerritt
Mr Steve McCutcheon
Professor Warwick Anderson
Mr Tony Kingdon
Ms Jennie Roe
Ms Louise Sylvan
Ms Alice Creelman
Mr Jack Quinane
Professor Helen Zorbas

M: $8-F: 10$

# 2014 - EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT LEGISLATION COMMITTEE Wednesday, 4 June 09:03-14:17 (4h0m) <br> Hansard: p 09-p 83 

COMMITTEE LIST
Kim Carr (ALP)
Sue Lines (ALP)
Deborah O'Neill (ALP)
Mehmet Tillem (ALP)
Chris Back (LNP) CHAIR
Bridget McKenzie (LNP)
Penny Wright (GRNS)
Sarah Hanson-Young (GRNS)
Nick Xenophon (INDP)

M: 4-F: 5 CHAIR: M

## WITNESS LIST

Senator Marise Payne
Mr David De Silva
Ms Margaret Pearce
Mr Robert Griew
Mr Tony Cook PSM
Mr Matthew Hardy
Ms Jo Caldwell
Mr Jeff Willing
Mr George Kriz
Ms Michelle Cornish
Ms Jackie Wilson
Ms Lisa Paul

M: 6-F: 6

## 2015 - LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS LEGISLATION COMMITTEE Tuesday, 24 February 09:15-16:15 (5h38m) <br> Hansard: p $10-\mathrm{p} 119$

COMMITTEE LIST
Ian Macdonald (LNP) CHAIR
Linda Reynolds (LNP)
Barry O'Sullivan (LNP)
Jacinta Collins (ALP)
Catryna Bilyk (ALP)
Penny Wong (ALP)
Lisa Singh (ALP)
Sarah Hanson-Young (GRNS)
Penny Wright (GRNS)
Rachel Siewert (GRNS)

WITNESS LIST
Senator George Brandis
Professor Gillian Triggs
Mr Chris Moraitis
Mr David Fredericks
Mr John Reid
Ms Julie O'Brien
Ms Padma Raman

M: 4-F: 3

M: 2 - F: 8 CHAIR: M

## APPENDIX B

2006 Employment, Workplace Relations, And Education Committee

|  | WORDS SPOKEN | NEG INTERRUPTIONS | RATE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rebecca Cross | 2372 | 1 | 1186 |
| PENNY WONG | 9247 | 7 | 1156 |
| Jim Davidson | 2018 | 1 | 1009 |
| Linda White | 3010 | 2 | 1003 |
| Lisa Paul | 2803 | 2 | 934 |
| URSULA STEPHENS | 805 | 0 | 805 |
| Colin Walters | 1583 | 1 | 792 |
| Anne Baly | 1464 | 1 | 732 |
| Rod Manns | 953 | 1 | 477 |
| Amanda Vanstone | 732 | 3 | 244 |
| Helen McLaren | 241 | 0 | 241 |
| Aurora Andruska | 236 | 0 | 236 |
| Craig Robertson | 232 | 0 | 232 |
| Craig Storen | 436 | 1 | 218 |
| Neil McAuslan | 217 | 0 | 217 |
| Margaret McKinnon | 359 | 1 | 180 |
| COREY BERNARDI | 112 | 0 | 112 |
| JUDITH TROETH (CHAIR) | 156 | 1 | 78 |
| Lois Sparkes | 70 | 0 | 70 |

2007 Community Affairs Legislation Committee

|  | WORDS SPOKEN | NEG INTERRUPTIONS | RATE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mary Murnane | 1653 | 0 | 1653 |
| Mark Brandon | 1636 | 0 | 1636 |
| JAN MCLUCAS | 9763 | 5 | 1627 |
| Carolyn Scheetz | 1060 | 0 | 1060 |
| Andrew Stuart | 5212 | 4 | 1042 |
| Peter Broadhead | 5078 | 4 | 1016 |
| Allison Rosevear | 1685 | 1 | 843 |
| Carolyn Smith | 1668 | 1 | 834 |
| Jane Halton | 763 | 0 | 763 |
| Nicholls | 678 | 0 | 678 |
| Iain Scott | 659 | 0 | 659 |
| David Learmonth | 898 | 1 | 449 |
| GARY HUMPHRIES (CHAIR) | 372 | 0 | 372 |
| Alison Killen | 231 | 0 | 231 |
| Melinda Bromley | 81 | 0 | 81 |

2008 Foreign Affairs, Defence, and Trade Committee

|  | WORDS SPOKEN | NEG INTERRUPTIONS | RATE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Richard Rowe | 3532 | 0 | 3532 |
| Peter Woolcott | 2496 | 0 | 2496 |
| Deborah Stokes | 2736 | 0 | 1368 |
| LYN ALLISON | 1357 | 0 | 1357 |
| MARISE PAYNE | 5083 | 3 | 1271 |
| Penny Wensley | 1077 | 0 | 1077 |
| Jennifer Rawson | 3203 | 2 | 1068 |
| Peter Baxter | 1766 | 1 | 883 |
| Adam McCarthy | 872 | 0 | 872 |
| RUSSELL TROOD | 4357 | 4 | 871 |
| Michael Potts | 845 | 0 | 845 |
| Paul Robilliard | 858 | 0 | 858 |
| Bob Nash | 753 | 0 | 753 |
| John Faulkner | 2210 | 2 | 737 |
| Peter Tesch | 669 | 0 | 699 |
| MARK BISHOP (CHAIR) | 1993 | 2 | 664 |
| Doug Chester | 2335 | 3 | 584 |
| Bassim Blazey | 454 | 0 | 454 |
| John Carlson | 293 | 0 | 293 |
| Ann Thorpe | 538 | 1 | 269 |
| MICHAEL FORSHAW | 236 | 0 | 236 |
| MATHIAS CORMANN | 392 | 1 | 196 |
| KERRY NETTLE | 155 | 0 | 155 |
| Sam Gerovich | 152 | 0 | 152 |
| IAN MACDONALD | 134 | 1 | 67 |

## APPENDIX B

2009 Legal \& Constitutional Affairs Estimates Hearing

|  | WORDS SPOKEN | NEG INTERRUPTIONS | RATE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| BRANDIS | 9652 | 4 | 1930.4 |
| BARNETT | 7025 | 3 | 1756.25 |
| Ms Branson | 6896 | 16 | 405 |
| Senator Ludwig | 924 | 2 | 308 |
| Mr Innes | 690 | 1 | 230 |
| Ms Roberts | 663 | 3 | 331 |
| MADAM CHAIR | 641 | 0 | 160.25 |
| FEENEY | 228 |  | 228 |

2010 Finance and Public Administration Legislation Committee

|  | WORDS SPOKEN | NEG INTERRUPTIONS | RATE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MARISE PAYNE | 2732 | 0 | 2732 |
| Ian McPhee | 5636 | 5 | 939 |
| Tom Edmund Clarke | 2711 | 3 | 678 |
| NICK XENOPHON | 599 | 0 | 599 |
| Matt Cahill | 1159 | 1 | 580 |
| Paul Grimes | 2713 | 4 | 543 |
| DOUG CAMERON | 2453 | 4 | 491 |
| Ben Rimmer | 452 | 0 | 452 |
| Joe Ludwig | 6634 | 15 | 415 |
| BRETT MASON | 4039 | 9 | 404 |
| HELEN POLLEY (CHAIR) | 2048 | 5 | 341 |
| SCOTT RYAN | 2555 | 8 | 284 |
| Peter White | 560 | 1 | 280 |
| JACINTA COLLINS | 551 | 1 | 276 |
| HELEN KROGER | 1187 | 4 | 237 |
| Steven Chapman | 458 | 1 | 229 |
| MICHAEL RONALDSON | 5728 | 30 | 191 |
| Dominic English | 291 | 1 | 146 |
| Rebecca Cross | 243 | 1 | 122 |
| Glenys Beauchamp | 80 | 0 | 80 |
| MICHAEL FORSHAW | 286 | 3 | 72 |
| David Melville Rowlands | 52 | 0 | 52 |

## APPENDIX B

2011 Economic Legislation Committee

|  | WORDS SPOKEN | NEG INTERRUPTIONS | RATE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Meghan Quinn | 4604 | 3 | 1151 |
| Dr David Gruen | 1666 | 2 | 555 |
| SIMON BIRMINGHAM | 1416 | 2 | 472 |
| Dr Parkinson | 1526 | 3 | 382 |
| RICHARD COLBECK | 373 | 0 | 373 |
| LOUISE PRATT | 716 | 1 | 358 |
| Penny Wong | 5375 | 14 | 358 |
| Nigel Ray | 3073 | 8 | 341 |
| MATHIAS CORMANN | 8872 | 28 | 306 |
| Jim Murphy | 1364 | 5 | 227 |
| Annette HURLEY (CHAIR) | 1124 | 5 | 187 |
| BARNABY JOYCE | 453 | 2 | 151 |
| GEORGE BRANDIS | 276 | 1 | 138 |
| DOUG CAMERON | 675 | 4 | 135 |
| BILL HEFFERNAN | 644 | 4 | 129 |
| NICK XENOPHON | 2156 | 16 | 127 |
| Deidre Gerathy | 312 | 2 | 104 |
| COREY BERNARDI | 20 | 1 | 10 |

## APPENDIX B

2012 Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Legislation Committee

|  | WORDS SPOKEN | NEG INTERRUPTIONS | RATE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEE RHIANNON | 3045 | 0 | 3045 |
| Mr Baxter | 15799 | 5 | 2633 |
| Mr Brazier | 1323 | 0 | 1323 |
| Mr Carrasco | 975 | 0 | 975 |
| SCOTT LUDLAM | 832 | 0 | 832 |
| Anne MCEWEN (CHAIR) | 781 | 0 | 781 |
| DAVID FAWCETT | 1529 | 1 | 765 |
| HELEN KROGER | 4445 | 5 | 741 |
| ALAN EGGLESTON | 567 | 0 | 567 |
| Mr Wood | 551 | 0 | 551 |
| Mr Tranter | 491 | 0 | 491 |
| JOHN MADIGAN | 453 | 0 | 453 |
| Senator Bob Carr | 3041 | 6 | 435 |
| NICK XENOPHON | 686 | 1 | 343 |
| LISA SINGH | 325 | 0 | 325 |
| Mr McDonald | 639 | 1 | 320 |
| MICHAEL RONALDSON | 2429 | 9 | 243 |
| Mr Batley | 188 | 0 | 188 |
| Ms Wilson | 117 | 0 | 117 |
| IAN MACDONALD | 221 | 1 | 111 |
| JOHN FAULKNER | 67 | 0 | 67 |

2013 Community Affairs Legislation Committee

|  | WORDS SPOKEN | NEG INTERRUPTIONS | RATE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Louise Sylvan | 2573 | 1 | 1287 |
| Fiona Nash | 2437 | 2 | 812 |
| Prof Warwick Anderson | 788 | 0 | 788 |
| John Skerritt | 1442 | 1 | 721 |
| ZED SESELJA | 1222 | 1 | 611 |
| Andrew Stuart | 2011 | 3 | 502 |
| BROWN | 911 | 1 | 456 |
| Mr Jack Quinane | 447 | 0 | 447 |
| Nathan Smyth | 2066 | 4 | 413 |
| McLUCAS | 3876 | 10 | 352 |
| Colleen Krestensen | 344 | 0 | 344 |
| Prof Jane Halton | 7641 | 22 | 332 |
| Jennie Roe | 298 | 0 | 298 |
| DEAN SMITH | 569 | 1 | 285 |
| MOORE | 3254 | 12 | 250 |
| BOYCE | 1216 | 5 | 203 |
| Kathy Dennis | 590 | 2 | 197 |
| POLLEY | 1971 | 9 | 197 |
| Prof Helen Zorbas | 386 | 1 | 193 |
| Steve McCutcheon | 377 | 1 | 189 |
| Adam Davey | 693 | 3 | 173 |
| SIEWERT | 316 | 1 | 158 |
| Sharon Appleyard | 129 | 0 | 129 |
| McKENZIE | 714 | 7 | 102 |
| PERIS | 180 | 1 | 90 |
| Tony Kingdon | 64 | 0 | 64 |
| Alice Creelman | 109 | 1 | 55 |

## APPENDIX B

2014 Education and Employment Estimates Hearing

## APPORTIONMENT

|  | WORDS SPOKEN | NEG INTERRUPTIONS | RATE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BRIDGET MCKENZIE | 2188 | 1 | 1094 |
| KIM CARR | 1786 | 1 | 893 |
| HANSON YOUNG | 1423 | 2 | 474 |
| Marise Payne | 447 | 0 | 447 |
| Tony Cook PSM | 435 | 0 | 435 |
| DEB O'NEILL | 936 | 1 | 418 |
| David De Silva | 2245 | 5 | 374 |
| Margaret Pearce | 373 | 0 | 373 |
| Jackie Wilson | 8260 | 22 | 359 |
| Lisa Paul | 7487 | 23 | 326 |
| CHAIR (BACK) | 969 | 2 | 323 |
| PENNY WRIGHT | 830 | 2 | 277 |
| SUE LINES | 5048 | 19 | 252 |
| Robert Griew | 462 | 1 | 231 |
| XENOPHON | 228 | 0 | 228 |
| Jo Caldwell | 358 | 1 | 179 |
| Jeff Willing | 332 | 1 | 166 |
| Michelle Cornish | 157 | 0 | 157 |
| George Kriz | 123 | 0 | 123 |
| Matthew Hardy | 102 | 0 | 102 |
| MEHMET TILLEM | 182 | 2 | 61 |

## APPENDIX B

2015 Legal \& Constitutional Affairs Estimates Hearing

## APPORTIONMENT

|  | WORDS SPOKEN | NEG INTERRUPTIONS | RATE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Senator Brandis | 6504 | 11 | 542 |
| Mr Moraitis | 5164 | 9 | 516 |
| COLLINS | 3328 | 9 | 333 |
| O'SULLIVAN | 4731 | 22 | 206 |
| Ms O'Brien | 1550 | 7 | 194 |
| Prof Triggs | 10155 | 53 | 188 |
| BILYK | 165 | 0 | 165 |
| WONG | 4501 | 27 | 160 |
| Ms Raman | 309 | 1 | 155 |
| HANSON-YOUNG | 1910 | 13 | 137 |
| CHAIR (MACDONALD) | 6213 | 50 | 124 |
| WRIGHT | 1705 | 14 | 114 |
| REYNOLDS | 1086 | 9 | 109 |
| Mr Reid | 70 | 0 | 70 |
| SIEWERT | 111 | 1 | 56 |
| Mr Frederik | 31 | 0 | 31 |
| SINGH | 29 | 1 | 14.5 |

## APPENDIX C

|  | F <br> Witness | M <br> Witness | TOTAL | Female <br> $\%$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Easier Question Type |  |  |  |  |  |
| Factual Question | 2513 | 1598 |  | 76 |  |
| Difficult Question Type, Tests of Authority |  |  |  |  |  |
| Empirical Question | 31 | 45 | 76 | $93 \%$ |  |
| Repeated Question | 165 | 49 | 214 | $77 \%$ |  |
| Disagreement | 101 | 52 | 153 | $66 \%$ |  |
| Challenge | 213 | 98 | 311 | $68 \%$ |  |
| Emotional, Unreasonable | 163 | 65 | 228 | $72 \%$ |  |
| TOTAL | 705 | 269 | 974 | $72 \%$ |  |
| Negative Percentage | $30 \%$ | $10 \%$ |  |  |  |


|  | F <br> Senator | M <br> Senator | TOTAL | Female <br> $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Easier Question Type |  |  |  |  |
| Factual Question |  |  |  |  |
| Difficult Question Type, Tests of Authority |  |  |  |  |
| Empirical Question | 63 | 5 | 68 | $93 \%$ |
| Repeated Question | 70 | 144 | 214 | $33 \%$ |
| Disagreement | 55 | 98 | 153 | $36 \%$ |
| Challenge | 132 | 179 | 311 | $42 \%$ |
| Emotional, Unreasonable | 65 | 163 | 228 | $29 \%$ |
| TOTAL | 385 | 589 | 974 | $40 \%$ |

## APPENDIX C

## FEMALE WITNESS

Male senator $=$ left $/$ female senator $=$ right

|  | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Easier Question Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Factual Question | 2 \| 369 | 1\| 158 | 39 \|68 | 124 - | $6 \mid 2$ | $96 \mid 2$ | 1 \| | 24 \| 194 | 103\|331 | 40\|122 |
| Difficult Question Type, Tests of Authority |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Empirical Question | -14 | 1/9 | -12 | 251- | -1- | 61 - | - 1- | 5\|8 | - 12 | 5 \| 1 |
| Repeated Question | $-18$ | -16 | $1 \mid 7$ | 421- | -1- | 15 \| - | - 1- | 3\|19 | $4 \mid 7$ | $531-$ |
| Disagreement | -13 | $-17$ | $4 \mid 1$ | 231- | -1- | 22 \| - | - 1- | $1 / 7$ | $1 \mid 9$ | $21 \mid 2$ |
| Challenge | - 12 | - 122 | 9\|3 | 391- | $2 \mid 2$ | 32 \| - | - 1- | 4\|30 | $6 \mid 17$ | $30 \mid 5$ |
| Emotional, Unreasonable, OTA | -16 | -13 | $1 \mid 2$ | 34\|- | 11- | 41 \| - | - 1- | - 122 | 2\|10 | 41 \| - |

MALE WITNESS

|  | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Easier Question Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Factual Question | 7 \| 139 | 3 \| 175 | 513\|140 | 72 \| - | 221\|146 | 81\|42 | 230\| 155 | 3\|138 | 19 \| 69 | 13\|263 |
| Difficult Question Type, Tests of Authority |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Empirical Question | - 1- | - 1- | 31. | -1. | - $1 \cdot$ | -1- | 12 | 12 | - 1- | - 11 |
| Repeated Question | - 14 | - 12 | 4 \| 4 | 11. | 8\|1 | $31-$ | $10 \mid 4$ | \| | - 1- | -18 |
| Disagreement | - 13 | - 14 |  | 1\| - | 131- | 51 - | $7 \mid 2$ | 14 | - 1 - | -18 |
| Challenge | - 15 | - 18 | 16\|6 | 31. | 17 \| 4 | $8 \mid 1$ | 11 \| 5 | 14 | 2\|1 | $-17$ |
| Emotional, Unreasonable | - 11 | - 12 | 10 \| 1 | 51. | 19 \| 4 | 6 \|1 | 3 \| 3 | \|1 | - \| 1 | -18 |
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[^0]:    * Letter next to year of panel denotes the gender ratio of the hearing:
    $\mathrm{F}=$ female heavy hearing $-\mathrm{E}=$ equal hearing $-\mathrm{M}=$ male heavy hearing
    ** Rate is calculated by dividing the number of words spoken by the number of interruptions plus one

[^1]:    Doctors described what came to be known as the hysterical personality as 'impressionable, suggestible, and narcissistic; highly labile, their moods changing

