

Chapter 8.8

Vive la Différence: The Cross–Culture Differences Within Us

David Gefen

Drexel University, USA

Nitza Geri

The Open University of Israel, Israel

Narasimha Paravastu

Central State University, USA

ABSTRACT

In the ITC cross-cultural literature, we often talk about the differences among peoples and how their respective culture and history may affect their adoption and preference usage patterns of ITC. However, do we really need to look that far to find such cross-cultural differences? Considering language is one of the major defining attributes of culture, this article takes a sociolinguistic approach to argue that there is also a cross-cultural aspect to ITC adoption within the same culture. Sociolinguists have claimed for years that, to a large extent, the communication between men and women, even within the supposedly same culture, has such characteristics because men and women communicate with different underlying social objectives and so their communication patterns are very different. This article examines

this sociolinguistic perspective in the context of online courses. A key finding is that although the stage is set to smother cultural and gender differences if participants wish to do so through ITC, gender based cultural patterns still emerge. These differences were actually strong enough to allow us to significantly identify the gender of the student, despite the gender neutral context of the course discussions. Implications for ITC, in general, in view of this *Vive la Différence*, are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

One of the major manifestations of culture is language and the way it affects communications: who we prefer to talk to and the sum of the underlying objectives of the communication.

Communication is not a mere exchange of words. It is a social process and, as such, it is imbued with a social meaning of inclusion, exclusion, and social hierarchy. These cultural aspects are a prime aspect of cross-cultural research, including in the context of ICT information technology and communications, adoption, and usage patterns. But one need not look that far to find cross-cultural differences. They are here among us all of the time—that, at least, is the basic premise of sociolinguistics.

Sociolinguistics deals, among other things, with the way culture affects and determines communication. Most important in the context of this study is that culture is not only a manifestation of language and national heritage. Culture is also a matter of gender. Men and women communicate differently, and do so with different underlying social objectives. This is part of our evolutionary past (Brizendine, 2006), which also affects online collaboration (Kock & Hantula, 2005). Gender is so much a part of communication that in many languages, there are distinct rules in the language about how men and women should conjure the sentences they speak and their expected speech patterns. It is much more than superimposed linguistic gender segregation though. It is, at least in the view of sociolinguists, a matter of a cultural difference between men and women.

In general terms, men, according to sociolinguistics, communicate more with the objective of creating and preserving their social status, while women communicate more with the objective of creating rapport and social inclusion. Not surprisingly, the result of this is that communication across genders is often an exercise in cultural miscommunication (Brizendine, 2006; Tannen, 1994; Tannen, 1995). Indeed, when men communicate with each other, it is often on a basis of exchanging information, or as Tannen calls it “report talk,” while women do so to exchange emotions, or as Tannen calls it “rapport talk” (Tannen, 1994). The consequence of this is often communication that are gender

segregated (Hannah & Murachver, 1999; Yates, 2001).¹ Looking at this distinction in the context of virtual communities and supporting it, Gefen and Ridings (2005) commented that when men joined virtual communities composed of mostly male members, they did so with the declared objective of sharing information, while when they joined mixed gender virtual communities, it was more for emotional support. In contrast, women who joined mixed virtual communities did so for information exchange, but when they looked for emotional support, they too joined mostly female ones. Indeed, even in what should be gender and emotion neutral settings, women perceive more social presence in e-mail (Gefen & Straub, 1997) and e-commerce websites (Gefen, 2003).

The objective of this study is to examine whether the expected gender-related cultural differences in oral communication, predicted by sociolinguists regarding oral communications, hold true also in the explicitly created gender-neutral ITC environment of online courses, where the nature of the controlled course conversations make social dominance and rapport rather irrelevant. If these gender communication patterns hold true also in this scenario, then how much more so that such cross-cultural differences should hold true in other ITC induced environments. This is a crucial question because if true, then cross-cultural research in ITC should look not only across the border, but also within.

The data support the basic *Vive la Différence* proposition of the study even in the stoic context of online course discussions. Male students did prefer to respond to other male students and female ones to females, and men did show a more domineering attitude in their postings. Cross-cultural studies in ITC should consider gender as another dimension of culture.

Theory

The tendency of society toward being masculine or feminine is a central aspect of the cultural di-

9 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/vive-différence-cross-culture-differences/22408

Related Content

Using an Ethical Framework to Examine Linkages Between “Going Green” in Research Practices and Information and Communication Technologies

Maliha Zaman, Claire A. Simmersand Murugan Anandarajan (2011). *International Journal of Social and Organizational Dynamics in IT* (pp. 26-45).

www.irma-international.org/article/using-ethical-framework-examine-linkages/53824

Engaged Scholars, Thoughtful Practitioners: The Interdependence of Academics and Practitioners in User-Centered Design and Usability

Susan M. Dray (2011). *Information and Communication Technologies, Society and Human Beings: Theory and Framework (Festschrift in honor of Gunilla Bradley)* (pp. 516-523).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/engaged-scholars-thoughtful-practitioners/45317

Assessment, Evaluation, and Revision of a Technology Plan

Debra L. Chapman, Melinda Bynogand Howard Yocom (2013). *Technology Integration and Foundations for Effective Leadership* (pp. 124-150).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/assessment-evaluation-revision-technology-plan/72605

A Model of Factors Explaining the Adoption and Use of Electronic Performance Support Systems in Portuguese Organizations

Piedade Carvalho (2019). *Human Performance Technology: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 1286-1301).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/a-model-of-factors-explaining-the-adoption-and-use-of-electronic-performance-support-systems-in-portuguese-organizations/226617

Developing Software in Bicultural Context: The Role of a SoDIS Inspection

Don Gotterbarn (2006). *International Journal of Technology and Human Interaction* (pp. 1-23).

www.irma-international.org/article/developing-software-bicultural-context/2880