Online Information Review

Sports reporters in the Twittersphere: Challenging and breaking down traditional conceptualizations of genderlect

Kent Kaiser

Sports reporters in the Twittersphere

Challenging and breaking down traditional conceptualizations of genderlect

Kent Kaiser
University of Northwestern Saint Paul, Roseville, Minnesota, USA

Received 1 February 2016
Revised 29 May 2016
Accepted 1 June 2016

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to investigate the impact of a dual medium/content context – the one offered by the online Twitter communication (medium-context) of reporting on elite sports (content-context) – on traditional conceptualizations of genderlect.

Design/methodology/approach – A quantitative content analysis, coding for a variety of traditional gendered language markers – was conducted on the tweets of male and female reporters who covered the men's and women's NCAA final four basketball tournaments.

Findings – Consistent with tenets of social role theory, the duel medium/content context of Twitter and sports produces several language patterns that frustrate attempts to categorize language markers according to traditional conceptualizations of genderlect and thus provides support for a redefinition of genderlect.

Research limitations/implications – This paper's findings suggest that people adapt their communication patterns to match the context in which they communicate. Whether adaptation takes place with conscious effort or as a natural byproduct of moving from one context to another remains to be discovered. Advice to female sports journalists on being vigilant against unwittingly undermining their credibility and perceived expertise is offered. This inquiry allows researchers to study sociology through sport.

Practical implications – This paper demonstrates that online environments can allow for traditional gender roles and expectations to be challenged and broken down, but some genderlect features appear tenacious and could undermine attempts to break down gender barriers.

Social implications – If sport mirrors society, then the same communication adaptations that appear in the online environmental context of reporters' tweets about sport should appear in other societal contexts.

Originality/value – Few studies have investigated differences in reporting by gender, and fewer have investigated differences in sports reporting by gender. Fewer, if any, have investigated differences in sports reporting by gender through Twitter.

Keywords Sports, Twitter, Reporting, Genderlect, Social role theory

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

Differences in the ways men and women communicate have long been a topic of research and have even prompted researchers to coin the term "genderlect" to describe the phenomenon and area of study. Consistent with a traditional concept of genderlect, the "gender-as-culture" or "two cultures" hypothesis asserts that, because of binary differences in communication patterns between the genders, males and females belong to two separate but overlapping cultures residing and interacting in the same physical space (Tannen, 1990; Mulac *et al.*, 2001). Yet in regard to genderlect studies, previous research suggests that genderlect may be moderated by any number of factors, including context (Canary and Hause, 1993; Motschenbacher, 2007). Therefore, Motschenbacher (2007) called for a postmodernist redefinition of the term genderlect to accommodate the fluid gender performativity that accompanies differing communication contexts.

Online Information Review
Vol. 40 No. 6, 2016
pp. 761-784

1468-4527
DOI 10.1108/OIR-02-2016-0040

The explosive growth in the popularity and widespread use of Twitter (see RiaNovosti, 2012) provide an opportunity to explore possible challenges to traditional gender communication expectations and the impact on the traditional conceptualization of genderlect in a new context – an online environment. As a microblog, Twitter may have equalizing properties like regular blogs, as Huffaker and Calvert (2005) found was the case with the personal blogs of teenagers. Beyond the medium-context of Twitter, the content-context of sports provides an opportunity to investigate communication patterns in a realm that has been characterized as a male preserve (Messner, 2012), with sports traditionally being more acceptable topics of storytelling for males than for females (Peterson, 2002). Consequently, the present research investigates the impact of a dual medium/content context – the one offered by the Twitter reporting (medium-context) about elite sports (content-context) – on traditional conceptualizations of genderlect. Thus, this paper investigates the potential for the online environment to challenge and break down traditional gender expectations and conventions.

Literature review

Language as gender performance

Gender is manifest in language, among many other phenomena (Alami, 2016). Indeed, a key aspect of gender performativity is learning how to use language in gender-distinctive or even gender-defining ways (Coates, 2011). There has been debate over exactly why men and women communicate differently. Some researchers have suggested that language differences by gender stem from biological differences (e.g. Bishop and Wahlsten, 1997; Baron-Cohen *et al.*, 2005). Others attribute the differences to nurture (e.g. Lakoff and Bucholtz, 2004; Cameron, 2007). The present study aligns with a third view – that differences in language use by gender are matter of free choice (e.g. Tannen, 1990) but that "although gender performances are available to everyone, with them comes constraints on who can perform which personae with impunity" (Alami, 2016, p. 249). Thus arises the premise that the traditional gendered binary in language can be challenged but that there are barriers to doing so.

Gendered communication features

Illustrating the gender-as-culture hypothesis and a traditional binary concept of genderlect, Mulac *et al.* (2001) reviewed previous empirical investigations of male/female differences in language use and found 16 features that had consistently indicated communicator gender. There is no reason to look at the individual studies for the purposes of the present study, but, to summarize, six "male" features identified in multiple studies were: references to quantity, judgmental adjectives, elliptical sentences, directives, locatives, and "I" references; ten "female" language features identified were: intensive adverbs, references to emotions, dependent clauses, sentence initial adverbials, relatively long sentences, uncertainty verbs, oppositions, negations, hedges, and questions. Consistent with the gender-as-culture hypothesis, these 16 language features were used by members of both genders but varied notably in extent used, thereby allowing prediction of communicator gender.

Researchers have found consistency in other communication features, as well, thus providing support for the gender-as-culture hypothesis. Mulac *et al.* (2000) confirmed prior research showing that men use more words overall, though women use longer sentences. Bischoping (1993) reviewed literature on the topics that men and women discuss to find generally that women were more likely than men to discuss

interpersonal relationships, fashion, and personal appearance, with men more likely to discuss work and leisure activity. Similarly, Dindia and Allen (1992) and Blum (1999) discovered that women disclose more information about themselves than men do. Timmers *et al.* (1998) reported that women are more likely to be concerned with relationships and less reluctant to express emotions, whereas men are motivated to be in control, including in regard to their emotions. Similarly, Duck and Wright (1993) found women more likely than men to express overtly and directly the socioemotional aspects of their friendships – e.g., caring, supportiveness, and encouragement. Moreover, Kashdan *et al.* (2009) reported that women were more likely to communicate gratitude. Guadagno and Cialdini (2007) explained that men are expected to be more assertive, controlling, and independent, while women are expected to be more communal and emotionally expressive. Their study's results suggest that men engage in more self-promotion and boasting, and women use more supportive language and give more compliments.

In spite of the consistency of these findings across studies, there is debate over whether the gender-as-culture hypothesis has merit (Metts, 1997; Vangelisti and Daly, 1997; Wood, 1997; Burleson, 1997; Vangelisti, 1997). Guadagno and Cialdini (2007) referenced social role theory in explaining gender differences in communication. Social role theory says that gender differences exist because of traditional expectations about the roles that males and females are supposed to occupy and because of how people are taught to communicate based on their gender. The tenets of social role theory suggest that the expectations of differing communication contexts could shape gender differences in communication, the consistency of the aforementioned gender differences notwithstanding. Indeed, social role theory supports the sort of redefinition of genderlect that Motschenbacher (2007) advocated. Moreover, even Mulac *et al.* (2001), in their attempt to identify language features to support the gender-as-culture hypothesis, reported that previous studies yielded inconsistent findings in regard to several language features; thus they provided some evidence for the merit of social role theory.

It should be noted that the aim of Mulac *et al.*'s (2001) investigation was to categorize language features into a male-female binary and to identify inconsistent past findings, not to pair language features with communication contexts. An investigation into language feature/communication-context pairings might have provided evidence to support a reconceptualization of genderlect. Indeed, findings relevant to several communication features have been inconsistent when observed in different contexts. Some studies, including Mulac *et al.*'s, 2000 study of professional/managerial communication by gender, have produced significantly contradictory results in the opposite direction of others already mentioned.

Newman *et al.* (2008) used a text analysis computer program to examine the use of a variety of specific words and to detect differences in word quantity and sentence length, by gender. They noted that "a frustration of studying natural language is that people use words in a variety of ways that changes as a function of context" (p. 214, emphasis added). They reviewed over 14,000 text files from 70 separate studies and found consistently greater use of swear words by males than by females. By contrast, Thelwall (2008) found gender differences in the use of swear words in the USA but not in the UK.

Online communication differences by gender

Other research has investigated the reasons for communication differences by gender and, more important for the present study, the impacts of medium-context on communication differences. Especially relevant to this study is research revealing a wide

range of differences by gender in online communications. It has long been believed that computer-mediated communication (CMC) has a status-leveling effect (Sproull and Kiesler, 1991). Wolf (2000) and Thomson *et al.*'s (2001) findings suggest a gender-leveling or gender-equalizing effect. Yet Fan (2011) asserted that males and females try to extend their roles in the real world to the virtual world, with males trying to further their influence online and females striving to nurture others and develop relationships online. Moreover, differences and inconsistencies abound. For example, adolescent females apparently are more likely than males to post photographs on a social networking website and adolescent males twice as likely to post videos on a social networking website (Pujazon-Zazik and Park, 2010). It appears that males tend to be more sexually explicit than females online (Wolak *et al.*, 2008; Blum, 1999). Yet aggressive communication apparently is not limited to males. According to Kowalski and Limber (2007), adolescent females outnumber males in the frequency of cyberbullying. In a study about e-mail, Rossetti (1998) reported traditional gender differences hold, with females being more often supportive and males being more often aggressive or sarcastic. Yet in another study of e-mail communication, Thomson *et al.* (2001) found men and women equally likely to communicate in ways that previous studies found to differ by gender, such as asking questions, offering compliments, apologizing, offering opinions, and insulting their e-mail recipients.

In a study of communication differences between male and female distance education students, Blum (1999) noted that males used more slang in CMC, which is similar to Sullivan and Feltz's (2003) and Sullivan and Short's (2011) findings that male team sport athletes communicate with more "distinctiveness" by using nicknames for and insider language with teammates. Consistent with traditional gender communication differences (Maltz and Borker, 1982; Cameron, 1992), Blum (1999) noted greater male use of "shouting," which is indicated by the use of all capital letters (CAPS) in CMC. Females reportedly use exclamation points significantly more in online communication than males do (Colley and Todd, 2002; Winn and Rubin, 2001). According to Witmer and Katzman (1997) and Bamman *et al.* (2014), females use more graphic accents (emoticons and articons) than males, but Huffaker and Calvert (2005) reported that males use emoticons more than females. Bamman *et al.* (2014) also confirmed prior research in finding that, in comparison to men, women use more expressive lengthening (e.g. "noooo waaaaay"), more ellipses, exclamation points, puzzled punctuation (i.e. combinations of "?" and "!"), and more backchannel-sound words like "hmmm," "grrrr," and "ugh." Contrary to prior research that found affirmation words to be used more commonly by men, Bamman *et al.* (2014) found affirmations to be used just as much by females as males.

Wolf (2000) found that when moving from same-gender to mixed-gender newsgroups, males increase emoticon use, which suggests contextual adaptation by males to communicate with an audience that includes females. Similarly, Thomson *et al.* (2001) found males and females both adapt their communication styles to the perceived gender of their audiences – that is, specifically, to the gender of their e-mail recipients. These studies echo Dindia and Allen's (1992) finding that both males and females alter their willingness to disclose information about themselves, depending on the audience gender.

Content-context: sport

The reason for looking at the context of sports reporting is that scholars have noted that sport is a male-dominated or masculine domain (e.g. Meân and Kassing, 2008; Clasen, 2001) and thus elicits more traditionally masculine communication features. For

example, in the context of intra-team communication in sports, Sullivan and Feltz (2003) and Sullivan and Short (2011) found male athletes to exhibit greater anger and engage in more conflict than females, consistent with other research noting aggressive language is characteristically masculine (e.g. Fehr *et al.*, 1999; Kinney *et al.*, 2001). Gregory (2010) noted that sports metaphors and trash talk used in professional business settings are primarily features of male networking and socializing. Yet Rainey (2012) reported mixed prevalence of trash talk by gender, with high school female soccer players engaging in more trash talk than male soccer players, female and male basketball players trash talking about equally, and male ice hockey players engaging in trash talk more than male and female athletes of any other sport (Rainey did not analyze women's ice hockey), which suggests the context of sport might provide a venue for challenging traditional gendered language norms.

Medium-context: Twitter

Twitter's signature 140-character-per-message format adds a layer of complexity to research on communication differences and adaptations by gender. For example, "male" features like using "I" references (Mulac *et al.*, 2001) become less prevalent in Twitter, where the "I" is often only implied in order to conserve character use; the same applies to the male tendency to use many words (Mulac *et al.*, 2000). "Female" features such as the penchant for including dependent clauses and sentence initial adverbials (Mulac *et al.*, 2001) and communicating in long sentences (Mulac *et al.*, 2000) are constrained by the 140-character limit. Other commonplace characteristics of Twitter, such as the need for usernames (a.k.a., handles) and the abbreviation of many words and phrases serve as equalizers, in terms of using nicknames, CMC initialisms, and slang. At the same time, Twitter does offer new features to investigate in terms of gender differences – or in terms of challenging traditional gender communication expectations – such as retweeting and the use of hashtags. Indeed, it has been noted that women are more likely than men to use expressive, or "commentary," hashtags (e.g. "#duh," "#blessed"), while men are more likely to stick to using traditional, or "tag," hashtags that allow searches of topics (Shapp, 2014, pp. 4-7).

Communication differences by reporter gender

Until recently, little research had been conducted on differences in reporting of any kind by gender (e.g. Danilewicz and Desmond, 2010; Devitt, 1999; Fico and Freedman, 2004; Freedman and Fico, 2005; Heldman *et al.*, 2005; Liebler and Smith, 1997; Nelson and Signorielli, 2007; Rodgers and Thorson, 2003; Sanders and Rock, 1988; Strong and Hannis, 2006), yet a few studies provide insight into the general findings of the past. In terms of the quantity of coverage, Strong and Hannis (2006) found male bylines to outnumber female bylines in Australian and New Zealand newspapers by a ratio of nearly 2:1. In terms of quality, style, and substance, Rodgers and Thorson (2003) found that female reporters used a greater diversity of sources, used fewer stereotypes, and wrote more positive stories than their male counterparts did. Danilewicz and Desmond (2010) found that female reporters were more likely than their male colleagues to present human interest and health-related stories.

Political reporting is especially relevant to this study because the field of politics resembles athletics: It is a traditionally male domain that features a competitive arena with contestants, strategies, and an ultimate event in which winners and losers are determined. In regard to differences in political reporting by journalist gender, some researchers found that in reporting on a political campaign featuring both a male candidate and a female

candidate, male reporters gave more space and prominence to the male candidate, while female reporters gave more space and prominence to the female candidate (Fico and Freedman, 2004; Freedman and Fico, 2005). The same researchers determined that female reporters, when reporting favorably on the QJ;female candidate, structured their stories to favor the female candidate much more strongly than when writing stories favoring the male candidate; no such imbalance existed among male reporters.

In terms of news and reporting, especially on breaking news and play-by-play events, Twitter is an important medium (Arceneaux and Weiss, 2010; Gibbs and Haynes, 2013; Hambrick and Sanderson, 2013) for professional journalists and citizen journalists alike (McEnnis, 2013). In the context of general news journalism on Twitter, Lasorsa (2012) found female journalists to be more transparent than males on Twitter – that is, to reveal more about their personal lives and jobs – but otherwise to be similar in their Twitter presence, in terms of topics and commentary presented. Artwick (2014) found both male and female reporters to engage more diverse audiences and to share conversations via retweets. Yet she also found that female reporters from large newspapers quoted fewer women on Twitter than female reporters from small newspapers did and posited that a social control mechanism might be at work, compelling large-newspaper female reporters to conform to a hegemonic male-dominated news environment, even on Twitter. This could be important inasmuch as Armstrong and Gao (2011) found a positive relationship between portrayals of men and women in tweets and in news content, with male mentions more likely than female mentions to appear in national news stories.

Sports reporting differences by reporter gender

Beyond the medium-context of Twitter and general reporters' use of Twitter, the content-context to be investigated in the present study is sports reporting. In line with Lasorsa's (2012) research, Weathers *et al.* (2014) found differences in the self-presentations of female sports reporter Erin Andrews and male sports reporter Kirk Herbstreit on Twitter, with Andrews discussing primarily personal items and Herbstreit providing sport commentary and analysis. Hull (2016) found that female sports broadcaster tweeted about women's sports less frequently than males did, which confirmed Kian *et al.*'s (2011) findings from a different medium, newspaper reporting on men's and women's tennis.

With these few studies examining the propensity of reporters of any kind, let alone sports reporters, to replicate traditional genderlect patterns in their reporting, and specifically in their tweets, a large gap in the research exists. In an attempt to begin filling this gap, this paper will address the following research question and test the following null hypothesis:

RQ1. In the context of Twitter and elite team sports reporting, combined, do traditional genderlect patterns hold, consistent with the gender-as-culture hypothesis, or is a more dynamic conceptualization of genderlect appropriate?

H0. No difference in language features will be found in the Twitter communication (tweets) of male and female elite team sport reporters.

A null hypothesis is used because of the mixed findings of previous studies, with significance sometimes shown in both gender directions for certain communication features, and because some features specific to the medium of Twitter have not previously been analyzed.

Methodology

The tweets of male and female sports reporters covering the 2015 NCAA Division I (D-I) men's and women's basketball final four championship games were collected because;

- basketball is a team sport with close men's and women's equivalents, with all but two of the D-I schools – the all-male-until-recently The Citadel and Virginia Military Institute – sponsoring both men's and women's teams (NCAA, 2016a), making basketball a model of Title IX success in terms of parity between men's and women's opportunities to play the sport (*The New York Times*, 2012);
- the championship series timeframe probably offers some of the most on-task communication in terms of being focussed on the sport activity;
- the men's and women's tournaments are held at roughly the same time;
- D-I basketball fits the definition of an "elite" sport in the USA in the sense that a D-I college basketball participant has the distinct potential for competing in the Olympics or as a professional athlete (Segen, 2006); and
- Collectively, the men's and women's final fours are among the top four tweeted about sports events (Eby, 2014).

To give some sense of the importance in American culture of the men's and women's final four tournaments: Men's final four attendance totaled nearly 150,000 in 2016, and women's totaled nearly 30,000; the men's national championship game generated 56 million impressions across social media, and the women's generated over 23 million (Durham, 2016; NCAA, 2016b). The percent of female fans of each is similar at about 40 percent (Paulsen, 2014).

In total, 30 male and 30 female sports reporters covering the men's and/or women's basketball final four games were identified by consulting major national sports news outlets, including *Sports Illustrated* magazine; ESPN, ABC, and NBC television; and the *Wall Street Journal* and *The New York Times* newspapers (see Appendix 1). In addition, MuckRack.com, which has been used in previous research to identify important reporters (Lasorsa, 2012), was consulted to ensure the best reporter choices were made. Because the tournaments took place at the same time, the reporters generally tweeted about either the men's tournament or the women's tournament. With the universe of major national sports reporters being so small, the research population's tweets were presumed to be representative of tweets about other sports covering major national sports; still, because the present study's research population was so specific, the tweets of reporters covering other non-sport beats could not be assumed to display similar characteristics.

By using TwimeMachine.com, the tweets of all 60 reporters were collected for April 3-8, 2015 – a period that included all men's and women's final four games. This process yielded a total of 3,329 tweets from the male sports reporters (1,984 about the final fours; 1,345 about other topics) and 1,806 tweets from the female sports reporters (889 about the final fours, 917 about other topics). To make coding more manageable, samples were drawn at the 99 percent confidence level at a five percent confidence interval, and ultimately included a total of 1,758 tweets: 500 male reporter tweets about the final fours, 445 male reporter tweets about other topics, 380 female reporter tweets about the final fours, and 383 female reporter tweets about other topics. All of each reporter's tweets were gathered into the data set, including retweets, with the idea that by retweeting others' tweets, reporters were appropriating the content of the others' tweets.

The decision to analyze retweets and tweets together was influenced by Boyd *et al.*'s (2010) research that noted ambiguity about whether retweeters mean to appropriate original content as their own and by Molyneux's (2015) findings that American journalists demonstrate a proclivity for retweeting messages about themselves to build their personal brands and for retweeting followers' messages to groom their own fan bases. Deprez *et al.* (2013) found the audience-interaction function of Twitter for Flemish sports reporters but to a lesser extent than Molyneux (2015) found it with American journalists, while McEnnis (2013) found more of a competitive relationship between British professional journalists and the public, or citizen journalists. The present study's decision to analyze retweets along with original reporter tweets differs from Frederick and Clavio's (2015) decision in a study about athlete-tweeters to include only retweets in which the retweeter had added commentary and to exclude push-button tweets – those that are simply redistributed without added commentary by the retweeter. Yet in preparing for data analysis in the present study, it was discovered that many push-button tweets seemed to fit Molyneux's (2015) description of personal brand-building and fan-grooming – indeed many fans tag a reporter (@reportername) in their original tweets as if to plead, "Reporter, retweet me – please," and the reporters often oblige. Moreover, Molyneux (2015) observed that journalists did not pass along strong opinions – that is, controversial stances – and thus apparently filtered original tweets and retweeted those that were in harmony with their personal brands. All of this said, retweets are also considered separately in the findings and discussion sections.

Using the individual tweet as the unit of analysis, each tweet was coded for whether it was about the men's final four, women's final four, or other. All tweets were also coded for several distinctive CMC features. These included use of specific CMC initialisms; existence of emoticon (e.g. ":)") and the use of traditional hashtags and expressive hashtags. Tweets that included a web link to a photograph and tweets that included a web link to a video were also recorded.

Several aggressive language markers considered masculine were coded, including existence of foul language (i.e. any commonly known swear word or its derivative or initialism, like "wtf" or "lmao," and any other word in its usage commonly considered to be foul in polite company, like "bitch," "crap," or "suck"); and the use of CAPS parts. Subjective masculine language features that were coded included trash talking, boasting, the use of sarcasm, and affirmations (see Appendix 2, e.g. of subjective features). Other traditionally masculine language features that were coded included the use of quantifiers, nicknames (only for people, not things or teams), and directives. Stereotypically masculine topics that were coded included sport history, athletes' physicality, and athletes' intelligence or leadership qualities. It should be noted that history, physicality, and intelligence are considered masculine topics in the present research, because the history involved would be, specifically, sports history, and sport has been a traditionally male domain (e.g. Meân and Kassing, 2008; Clasen, 2001), and athletes' physicality and intelligence/leadership topics have appeared in the narrative sports history, especially in regard to position "stacking," but are presumably diminished in more recent times (Lapchick *et al.*, 2014).

Traditionally feminine language markers that were coded included the existence of exclamation points, ellipses, and puzzled punctuation; the use of backchannel sounds; and the use of expressive lengthening. Subjective feminine language features that were coded included reference to one's own emotions and expression of gratitude. Two stereotypically feminine topics, fashion and "looks," were coded, as well.

A standard process and commonly accepted procedures were used to check the reliability of the coding scheme. Two coders were recruited for this procedure. The overall Cohen's (1960) κ coefficient, which was used to measure the intercoder reliability, was calculated at 0.856, well within the acceptable range.

The quantitative analysis here involves χ^2-tests, which are used for an analysis of goodness-of-fit, which is a standard test with no serious substitute and allows for testing whether there was a relationship between two categorical variables (Cochran, 1952). Specifically, goodness-of-fit tests the relationship between the responses of one participant group and the responses of another participant group. Because multiple independent statistical tests are being performed on a single data set, a Bonferroni correction ($p = 0.002$) is utilized to reduce the risk of Type I errors (Cabin and Mitchell, 2000).

Findings

Overall

Raw counts of tweets by gender-language marker can be found in Table AI.

Of the 500 sample male reporters' tweets about the final fours, 495 were about the men's final four, four about the women's, and one about both. The 380 sample female reporters' tweets about the final fours were more balanced, with 167 about the men's final four, 210 about the women's, and three about both. Of the 500 male reporters' tweets about the final fours, 122 (24.4 percent) were retweets; of the 380 female reporters' tweets about the final fours, 188 (49.5 percent) were retweets. The difference in the propensity to retweet was significant ($\chi^2(1, n = 310) = 18.2, p < 0.001$). Also, male reporters were fairly consistent with 23.8 percent of non-final four contents of their Twitter feeds consisting of retweets; only 31.1 percent of female sports reporters' tweets about other topics consisted of retweets. In addition, there was no significant difference in the likelihood of male and female reporters to respond to others' tweets ($\chi^2(1, n = 520) = 2.82, p = 0.093$).

Findings regarding specific language features were mixed and variously confirmed and contradicted prior research (see Table AII).

Language features characteristic of CMC

In terms of language features characteristic of CMC, there was a non-significant difference in overall use of CMC initialisms, with female reporters using more overall ($\chi^2(1, n = 47) = 7.31, p = 0.007$); this finding is the opposite of what Sullivan and Feltz's (2003) and Sullivan and Short's (2011) discovered. In the context of reporting on the final fours, the frequency of use of CMC initialisms was too small to be statistically reliable, but male and female reporters used them in statistically equal frequency, six and five times, respectively.

Female reporters used emoticons significantly more than male reporters did, overall ($\chi^2(1, n = 94) = 44.1, p < 0.001$), and nearly 12 times as often as male reporters did in the context of final four reporting, which is consistent with the findings of Witmer and Katzman (1997) and Bamman *et al.* (2014) but contradict Huffaker and Calvert's (2005) findings. Female reporters were significantly more likely than male reporters to use traditional hashtags, overall ($\chi^2(1, n = 258) = 43.0, p < 0.001$), and in the context of final four reporting ($\chi^2(1, n = 174) = 37.5, p < 0.001$), contrary to findings reported by Allison Shapp (2014). Female reporters were also significantly more likely to use expressive hashtags, overall ($\chi^2(1, n = 92) = 13.9, p < 0.001$), but not significantly so in the context of final four reporting ($\chi^2(1, n = 56) = 4.33, p = 0.037$), which is partly consistent with Shapp's (2014) research. Male and female sports reporters' propensity

to tweet web links to photographs found in the present study was consistent with Pujazon-Zazik and Park (2010) finding that females are more likely to post photographs on social networking websites, overall ($\chi^2(1,\ n=283)=11.3,\ p=0.001$), but not significantly so in the context of final four reporting ($\chi^2(1, n=162)=2.78, p=0.095$). In the present study, female reporters also demonstrated a non-significantly greater propensity to tweet web links to videos, overall ($\chi^2(1, n=56=3.58, p=0.059$) and in the context of final four reporting ($\chi^2(1,\ n=46)=3.54,\ p=0.060$); the findings nevertheless contrast with Pujazon-Zazik and Park (2010) research, which showed males to be twice as likely as females to post videos on social networking websites.

Aggressive language features

In looking at aggressive language features typically considered masculine language markers, no significant difference between male and female sports reporters was detected use of foul language, overall ($\chi^2(1,\ n=19)=0.452,\ p=0.501$), but the frequencies were very small – indeed, too small to be statistically reliable in the context of final four reporting. In any case, this contradicts traditional communication gender differences (Fehr *et al.*, 1999; Kinney *et al.*, 2001). Though the frequency of male and female reporters' use of trash talk was small, there was no significant difference between them, overall ($\chi^2(1,\ n=34)=0.553,\ p=0.457$) or in the context of final four reporting ($\chi^2(1,\ n=22)=0.09,\ p=0.761$); this adds ambiguity to Rainey's (2012) already varied findings. No significant difference was found between male and female reporters' use of CAPS parts of tweets, overall ($\chi^2(1, n=85)=1.11, p=0.292$) or in the context of final four reporting ($\chi^2(1,\ n=56)=2.29,\ p=0.131$), though the general direction was the opposite of the expected greater male use. No significant difference appeared in male and female reporters' use of boasting ($\chi^2(1, n=19)=1.105, p=0.305$), which contrasts with Guadagno and Cialdini's (2007) finding that men boast more than women, though the number of instances appearing in the present study was small. In the present study, male reporters demonstrated a non-significantly greater propensity to use sarcasm in their tweets, overall ($\chi^2(1, n=92)=3.36, p=0.067$) and in the context of final four reporting ($\chi^2(1,\ n=72)=6.13,\ p=0.013$), which aligns weakly with previous research showing sarcasm to be significantly a male language marker (Rossetti, 1998). Female reporters were non-significantly more likely to provide affirmation of others' remarks, overall ($\chi^2(1,\ n=182)=4.85,\ p=0.028$), or in the context of final four reporting ($\chi^2(1,\ n=82)=3.51,\ p=0.061$); this finding adds uncertainty to previous findings summarized by Bamman *et al.* (2014).

Other traditionally masculine language features

Looking at other language markers typically considered masculine, the present study's findings were inconsistent with past research presented by Mulac *et al.* (2001), Sullivan and Feltz (2003), and Sullivan and Short (2011). Specifically, female reporters were found to be just as likely as males to use quantifiers, overall ($\chi^2(1, n=285)=0.007, p=0.933$) and in the context of final four reporting ($\chi^2(1,\ n=192)=0.850,\ p=0.356$). Female reporters were also found to be just as likely as males to use nicknames overall ($\chi^2(1,\ n=43)=0.434,\ p=0.510$) and in the context of final four reporting ($\chi^2(1, n=36)=0.914, p=0.339$). Female reporters were found to non-significantly more likely to use directives, overall ($\chi^2(1, n=77)=5.10, p=0.024$), and in the context of final four reporting, male and female reporters were similar in their use of directives ($\chi^2(1, n=49)=0.04, p=0.839$). Male and female reporters were exactly as likely as one another to use sports history references in their tweets, overall, which contradicts the

expectation that males would do so more often. The frequency of mentioning physicality and intelligence/leadership of athletes was too small among female reporters to make statistical analysis relevant, with only four instances of each in female reporters' tweets, though 17 and ten in male reporters' tweets, respectively; nevertheless, the numbers align with the expectation that men would mention these historically racially charged traits more often than women would.

Traditionally feminine language features

Looking at language markers typically considered feminine, the present study's findings were consistent with past research in regard to females' greater use of exclamation points, overall ($\chi^2(1, n = 305) = 63.9, p < 0.001$) and in the context of final four reporting ($\chi^2(1, n = 124) = 25.4, p < 0.001$). Females' use of ellipses was non-significantly greater, overall ($\chi^2(1, n = 105) = 6.90, p = 0.009$), but significantly greater in the context of final four reporting ($\chi^2(1, n = 53) = 11.3, p = 0.001$). The frequency of puzzled punctuation was too small to be statistically relevant, with only two instances in male reporters' tweets and seven in female reporters' tweets, though the numbers align with the expectation that women would use the construction more often than men would. There was no significant difference in male and female reporters' use of backchannel sounds overall ($\chi^2(1, n = 26) = 1.23, p = 0.267$), and the frequencies were too small to be statistically reliable in the context of only final four reporting; the findings were, nevertheless, in the expected direction. The frequency of the use of expressive lengthening was too small to be statistically relevant, with only six instances in male reporters' tweets and three in female reporters' tweets.

In regard to subjective language features, the present study's findings were consistent with past research (e.g. Mulac *et al.*, 2001; Timmers *et al.*, 1998; Duck and Wright, 1993; Guadagno and Cialdini, 2007; Kashdan *et al.*, 2009) showing female reporters more likely to express emotions, overall ($\chi^2(1, n = 118) = 9.81, p = 0.002$), but only non-significantly so in the context of final four reporting ($\chi^2(1, n = 77) = 6.68, p = 0.010$). Similarly, female reporters were more likely to express gratitude, overall ($\chi^2(1, n = 109) = 20.5, p < 0.001$), but only non-significantly so in the context of final four reporting ($\chi^2(1, n = 29) = 5.84, p = 0.016$). The frequency of mentioning fashion and "looks" was too small to make statistical analysis relevant; nevertheless, the overall numbers align with the expectation (Bischoping, 1993) that women would mention fashion and looks more often than men would.

Retweets

The incidence of the various language features that appeared in the reporters' retweets generally aligned in close proportion with the incidence of those language features in the reporters' own original tweets; some were nonexistent or appeared so infrequently in the retweets that a statistical analysis would be unreliable (see Table AIII).

One notable exception appeared in the male reporters' retweets about the final four tournaments: The retweets included significantly more traditional hashtags than expected ($\chi^2(1, n = 122) = 12.4, p < 0.001$). The only other significant exception appeared in female reporters' retweets of non-final four material: These contained more photograph links than expected ($\chi^2(1, n = 119) = 11.5, p = 0.001$). The only other incidences where retweet language features even approached significance in their appearance compared to the expected rate were a greater-than-expected appearance of photograph links in the male reporters retweets of non-final four material ($\chi^2(1, n = 106) = 6.10, p = 0.013$); a greater-than-expected appearance of quantifiers in the female reporters' retweets about

the final fours ($\chi^2(1, n = 188) = 7.26$, $p = 0.007$) and other topics ($\chi^2(1, n = 119) = 4.98$, $p = 0.026$); a greater-than-expected appearance of exclamation points in male reporters' retweets of final four material ($\chi^2(1, n = 122) = 5.60$, $p = 0.018$); a greater-than-expected appearance of ellipses in the male reporters retweets about non-final four topics ($\chi^2(1, n = 106) = 3.98$, $p = 0.046$); and a scarcer-than-expected appearance of emotions in the females reporters' retweets about the final fours ($\chi^2(1, n = 188) = 5.25$, $p = 0.022$).

Discussion and notes for further research

The present study's findings support past research in regard to several traditionally female language markers, including the use of expressive hashtags; the posting of photograph links; the use of exclamation points, ellipses, and puzzled punctuation; the expression of emotions; the expression of gratitude; the discussion of fashion and looks; and, in the context of final four reporting, the expression of backchannel sounds. In addition, the present study's findings support the majority of past research that found females more likely to use emoticons. The present study's findings also support past research in regard to some traditionally male language markers, including the use of sarcasm and discussion of player physicality and player intelligence. More research is needed to discern the impact of these tenacious gendered language patterns on audience perceptions of the reporters. Female reporters, in particular, might be unwittingly allowing their credibility or perceived expertise to be undermined by displaying traditionally feminine communication patterns in the traditionally masculine content-context of sport.

At the same time, the present study's findings contrast with past research in finding no difference between males' and females' use of some aggressive language features, including foul language, trash talk, CAPS, and boasting. This could be due to male reporters using fewer of such aggressive language features in this professional context than they otherwise would. Indeed, the frequency of use of most of these features is small. Further research should be conducted to discern whether male reporters alter their language patterns to conform to professional conventions or the public's expectations.

In the present research, female reporters showed a greater propensity than expected to use traditional hashtags, to tweet video links, and to use directives. Because all three of these features encourage retweets and thus increase the reach of their users, it could be that female sports reporters are adapting to a competitive online media environment and employing professional sports reporting conventions to try to match the influence of their male counterparts. In the present study, females were found also to affirm others' messages more than males did, contrary to most past research; this might suggest female reporters were being intentional about grooming their audiences. This would be consistent with social role theory (Guadagno and Cialdini, 2007) and would support Motschenbacher's (2007) suggested need for a redefinition of genderlect based on context. More research – especially individual interviews – should be conducted with female sports reporters to discern the motivation behind the use of each of these features. In any case, it appears the online environment provides an opportunity for women to challenge and break down traditional gender expectations and conventions in a traditionally masculine context, sport.

In addition, some of the present research's other findings support the notion that reporters conform to the public's expectations specifically in the professional sports reporting context, rather than maintaining traditional gender-language patterns. To wit, the data show no difference between male and female sports reporters in regard to the use of quantifiers or nicknames or the propensity to discuss sport history – all of

which are traditionally male language markers. Both male and female reporters were found to use these features with relative regularity, especially in the context of final four reporting. This suggests that female sports reporters might have conformed to conventions in this context, again consistent with social role theory (Guadagno and Cialdini, 2007), considering that all three of these language markers are especially relevant in sports reporting. Additional research on other reporting contexts could shed light on whether this is the case.

Limitations

Ultimately, the small number of instances of some language features constituted a limitation of the present research. For example, the present study's suggestion that male reporters were more likely to use expressive lengthening is not a strong one, given the total number of instances being only six for males and only three for females. Future research should involve a more extensive data set. In addition, future research should include more reporters' tweets and involve reporting on more than just one set of sporting events and in more than one sport. Indeed, comparison among sports could be informative, especially inasmuch as sports vary substantively and culturally on a masculine-feminine continuum.

Another limitation of the present study was the focus on only sports reporters. Sports reporters are not representative of reporters in general on all of the language features analyzed here. Indeed, a different, more traditionally feminine reporting content-context might reveal very different language patterns between male and female reporters. Research in different content-contexts remains to be done. In addition, there are characteristics of reporters in general, as a study population, that probably temper the appearance of some language features, especially the aggressive ones, that other tweeters would not hesitate to use. After all, reporters are communication professionals whose livelihoods might be placed in jeopardy over an indiscrete or controversial language feature appearing in a tweet. This would help to explain the scarcity of some aggressive language features in the data set.

Retweets

The similarity in patterns of language features appearing in the reporters' tweets and retweets suggests retweets represent shared ideas or values, which is consistent with Molyneux's (2015) observation that journalists pass along subtle interpretation and analysis that complements their usual professional style.

The greater-than-expected appearance of traditional hashtags in the male reporters' retweets might signal greater attention paid by male reporters to the Twitter conversation about the final fours, but, again, female reporters used more traditional hashtags overall. More research should be done on this specific phenomenon, especially in light of Shapp's (2014) discussion about the use of traditional hashtags and asserting a place in a Twitter conversation. On a practical level, this might be an area in which female reporters could do even more to claim influence for themselves.

The greater-than-expected appearance of photograph links in the female reporters' non-final four retweets is interesting inasmuch as it helps to explain female reporters' overall greater use of photograph links, and it extends significantly a non-significant pattern obtained in all the other categories of retweets – female reporters' final four retweets and male reporters' final four and non-final four retweets. This across-the-board, greater-than-expected propensity to retweet tweets containing photograph links deserves greater investigation in future research, especially in light of McEnnis's (2013)

discussion about the tension expressed by professional journalists about citizen journalists. In the case of photograph links, professional journalists might find even citizen journalists' photographs to be worthy of retweeting in order to enhance the photojournalist value of their own Twitter feeds. Qualitative research involving interviews with individual reporters could help understand this phenomenon.

In addition, more research is needed specifically on photograph links and Twitter – whether original or retweet – because some photographs actually contain lines or blocks of text that allow a tweeter to circumvent Twitter's 140-character limit. Case in point is a 200-plus word statement with no words in the body of the tweet and only a photograph of words attached that Twitter CEO Jack Dorsey (2016) cleverly promulgated to affirm the medium's commitment to maintaining its 140-chacter limit. Whether differences exist between female and male tweeters in employing this communication tactic is unknown.

In all six of the retweet data set incidences of language features varying from the expected rate in ways that approach but do not hit significance, the differences could be attributed to the mixed-gender nature of the group whose messages were retweeted. Indeed, in each case, the direction of the difference from the expected aligns with the idea that the male reporters retweeted a substantial number of messages by women and vice versa.

Conclusion

In variously supporting and contradicting past research on several gender communication markers, the findings of the present research frustrate attempts to categorize language features according to traditional genderlect categories and thus provide support for Motschenbacher's (2007) call for a re-evaluation and redefinition of the term genderlect. Consistent with social role theory, this paper's findings suggest that people adapt their communication patterns to match the context in which they are communicating and to match the expectation of the people to whom they are communicating. Whether such adaptation takes place with conscious effort or as a natural byproduct of moving from one context or role to another remains to be discovered. In any case, the present study contributes to the social role theory literature by revealing that communication – a tangible indicator of one's social role – may change based on communication context. In this case, the online environment appears to allow female reporters, especially, to challenge traditional gender roles and communication patterns.

That said, the present study also reveals some tenacious genderlect patterns among female sports reporters that could, in subtle ways, undermine their perceived credibility or expertise among sports media consumers compared to their male counterparts – especially because some patterns like exclamation point and ellipses usage and expression of emotion are so over-represented in the female reporters' tweets. If a goal of communicating via Twitter for journalists is personal brand development, as Molyneux (2015) found, then female sports reporters would be wise to be deliberate in using Twitter to break down gender barriers. This could involve adjusting genderlect patterns for the content-context. Failure to do so could serve only to reinforce traditional sports media stereotypes (Weathers *et al.*, 2014) and to undermine the credibility and perceived expertise female sports reporters.

Finally, the present inquiry allows researchers to move toward an understanding of greater sociological issues. Specifically, the study provides an opportunity to study sociology *through* sport, which scholars have long encouraged (e.g. Ball, 1973; Coakley, 2010; Rasmussen, 1999). If sport mirrors society (Frey and Eitzen, 1991; Rasmussen,

1999), then one can reasonably assume the same online-environment communication complexities and adaptations appear in other societal contexts. This study provides support for research in this area by identifying and illustrating a dynamic genderlect phenomenon and revealing an online-environment context and a subject context that allows it.

References

Alami, M. (2016), "Approaches to gender studies: a review of literature", *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 247-256.

Arceneaux, N. and Weiss, A.S. (2010), "Seems stupid until you try it: press coverage of Twitter, 2006-9", *New Media & Society*, Vol. 12 No. 8, pp. 1262-1279.

Armstrong, C.L. and Gao, F. (2011), "Gender, Twitter, and news content: an examination across platforms and coverage areas", *Journalism Studies*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 490-505.

Artwick, C.G. (2014), "News sourcing and gender on Twitter", *Journalism*, Vol. 15 No. 8, pp. 1111-1127.

Ball, D.W. (1973), "Ascription and position: a comparative analysis of 'stacking' in professional football", *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 97-113.

Bamman, D., Eisenstein, J. and Schnoebelen, T. (2014), "Gender identity and lexical variation in social media", *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 135-160.

Baron-Cohen, S., Knickmeyer, R.C. and Belmonte, M.K. (2005), "Sex differences in the brain: implications for explaining autism", *Science*, Vol. 310 No. 5749, pp. 819-823.

Bischoping, K. (1993), "Gender differences in conversation topics, 1922-1990", *Sex Roles*, Vol. 28 Nos 1/2, pp. 1-18.

Bishop, K.M. and Wahlsten, D. (1997), "Sex differences in the human corpus callosum: myth or reality?", *Journal of Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Review*, Vol. 21 No. 5, pp. 581-601.

Blum, K.D. (1999), "Gender differences in asynchronous learning in higher education: learning styles, participation barriers and communication patterns", *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, Vol. 1 No. 3, pp. 46-66, available at: http://eec.edc.org/cwis_docs/NEWS_ARTICLES_JOURNALS/gender%20differences%20in%20asynchronous%20learning.htm (accessed July 7, 2012).

Boyd, D., Golder, S. and Lotan, G. (2010), "Tweet, tweet, retweet: conversational aspects of retweeting on Twitter", *43rd Hawaii International Conference on, System Sciences (HICSS), IEEE, January*, pp. 1-10.

Burleson, B.R. (1997), "A different voice on different cultures: illusion and reality in the study of sex differences in personal relationships", *Personal Relationships*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 229-241.

Cabin, R.J. and Mitchell, R.J. (2000), "To bonferroni or not to bonferroni: when and how are the questions", *Bulletin of the Ecological Society of America*, Vol. 81 No. 3, pp. 246-248.

Cameron, D. (1992), *Feminism and Linguistic Theory*, St. Martin's Press, New York, NY.

Cameron, D. (2007), *The myth of Mars and Venus*, Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

Canary, D.J. and Hause, K.S. (1993), "Is there any reason to research sex differences in communication?", *Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 41 No. 2, pp. 129-144.

Clasen, P.R.W. (2001), "The female athlete: dualisms and paradox in practice", *Women and Language*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 36-41.

Coakley, J. (2010), *Race and Ethnicity in the Sociology of Sport in the United States*, University of Colorado, Colorado Springs, CO.

Coates, J. (2011), *Language and Gender: A Reader*, 2nd ed., Wiley-Blackwell, Hoboken, NJ.

Cochran, W.G. (1952), "The χ^2 test of goodness of fit", *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 315-345.

Cohen, J. (1960), "A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales", *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 37-46.

Colley, A. and Todd, Z. (2002), "Gender-linked differences in the style and content of e-mails to friends", *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 380-392.

Danilewicz, A. and Desmond, R. (2010), "Women are on, but not in, the news: gender roles in local television news", *Sex Roles*, Vol. 62 Nos 11-12, pp 822-829.

Deprez, A., Mechant, P. and Hoebeke, T. (2013), "Social media and flemish sports reporters: a multimethod analysis of Twitter use as journalistic tool", *International Journal of Sport Communication*, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 107-119.

Devitt, J. (1999), *Framing Gender on the Campaign Trail: Women's Executive Leadership and the Press*, Women's Leadership Fund, New York, NY.

Dindia, K. and Allen, M. (1992), "Sex differences in self-disclosure: a meta-analysis", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 112 No. 1, pp. 106-124.

Dorsey, J. (2016), "At its core Twitter is public messaging", Twitter, January 5, available at: https://t.co/bc5RwqPcAX

Duck, S. and Wright, P.H. (1993), "Reexamining gender differences in same-gender friendships: a close look at two kinds of data", *Sex Roles*, Vol. 28 Nos 11-12, pp. 709-727.

Durham, M. (2016), "Houston, men's final four set attendance and viewing records", NCAA, Indianapolis, IN, April, available at: www.ncaa.com/news/basketball-men/article/2016-04-08/houston-mens-final-four-set-attendance-and-viewing-records

Eby, D. (2014), "2013 sports fan demographics", opendorse, Lincoln, NE, January 20, available at: http://opendorse.com/blog/2013-sports-fan-demographics/

Fan, L. (2011), "Gender differences in e-mail communication", *Advanced Materials Research*, Vols 225-226 No. 1, pp. 346-349.

Fehr, B., Baldwin, M., Collins, L., Patterson, S. and Benditt, R. (1999), "Anger in close relationships: an interpersonal script analysis", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 299-312.

Fico, F. and Freedman, E. (2004), "Bureau, wire reporters write more balanced stories", *Newspaper Research Journal*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 44-57.

Frederick, E.L. and Clavio, G. (2015), "Blurred lines: an examination of high school football recruits' self-presentation on Twitter", *International Journal of Sport Communication*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 330-344.

Freedman, E. and Fico, F. (2005), "Male and female sources in newspaper coverage of male and female candidates in open races for governor in 2002", *Mass Communication & Society*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 257-272.

Frey, J.H. and Eitzen, D.S. (1991), "Sport and society", *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 503-522.

Gibbs, C. and Haynes, R. (2013), "A phenomenological investigation into how Twitter has changed the nature of sport media relations", *International Journal of Sport Communication*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 394-408.

Gregory, M.R. (2010), "Slam dunk: strategic sport metaphors and the construction of masculine embodiment at work", *Advances in Gender Research*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 297-318.

Guadagno, R.E. and Cialdini, R.B. (2007), "Gender differences in impression management in organizations: a qualitative review", *Sex Roles*, Vol. 56 Nos 7-8, pp. 483-494.

Hambrick, M.E. and Sanderson, J. (2013), "Gaining primacy in the digital network: using social network analysis to examine sports journalists' coverage of the Penn State football scandal via Twitter", *Journal of Sports Media*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 1-18.

Heldman, C., Carroll, S.J. and Olson, S. (2005), "'She bought only a skirt': print media coverage of Elizabeth Dole's bid for the Republican presidential nomination", *Political Communication*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 315-335.

Huffaker, D.A. and Calvert, S.L. (2005), "Gender, identity, and language use in teenage blogs", *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, Vol. 10 No. 2.

Hull, K. (2016), "An examination of women's sports coverage on the Twitter accounts of local television sports broadcasters", *Communication & Sport*, doi: 2167479516632520 (forthcoming).

Kashdan, T.B., Mishra, A., Breen, W.E. and Froh, J.J. (2009), "Gender differences in gratitude: examining appraisals, narratives, the willingness to express emotions, and changes in psychological needs", *Journal of Personality*, Vol. 77 No. 3, pp. 691-730.

Kian, E.T.M., Fink, J.S. and Hardin, M. (2011), "Examining the impact of journalists' gender in online and newspaper tennis articles", *Women in Sport & Physical Activity Journal*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 3-21.

Kinney, T.A., Smith, B.A. and Donzella, B. (2001), "The influence of sex, gender, self-discrepancies, and self-awareness on anger and verbal aggressiveness among US college students", *The Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 141 No. 2, pp. 245-275.

Kowalski, R.M. and Limber, S.P. (2007), "Electronic bullying among middle school students", *Journal of Adolescent Health*, Vol. 41 No. 6, pp. S22-S30.

Lakoff, R.T. and Bucholtz, M. (2004), *Language and Woman's Place: Text and Commentaries*, Vol. 3, Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

Lapchick, R., Donovan, D., Rogers, S. and Johnson, A. (2014), *The 2014 Racial and Gender Report Card: National Football League*, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL.

Lasorsa, D. (2012), "Transparency and other journalistic norms on Twitter: the role of gender", *Journalism Studies*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 402-417.

Liebler, C.M. and Smith, S.J. (1997), "Tracking gender differences: a comparative analysis of network correspondents and their sources", *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, Vol. 41 No. 1, pp. 58-68.

McEnnis, S. (2013), "Raising our game: effects of citizen journalism on Twitter for professional identity and working practices of British sport journalists", *International Journal of Sport Communication*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 423-433.

Maltz, D.N. and Borker, R.A. (1982), "A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication", in Monaghan, L., Goodman, J.E. and Robinson, J.M. (Eds), *A Cultural Approach to Interpersonal Communication: Essential Readings*, Wiley, Malden, MA, pp. 168-185.

Meân, L.J. and Kassing, J.W. (2008), "'I would just like to be known as an athlete': managing hegemony, femininity, and heterosexuality in female sport", *Western Journal of Communication*, Vol. 72 No. 2, pp. 126-144.

Messner, M. (2012), "Reflections on communication and sport: on men and masculinities", *Communication & Sport*, Vol. 1 Nos 1-2, pp. 113-124.

Metts, S. (1997), "Reflections on the different cultures hypothesis: a scholars' symposium introduction", *Personal Relationships*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 201-202.

Molyneux, L. (2015), "What journalists retweet: opinion, humor, and brand development on Twitter", *Journalism*, Vol. 16 No. 7, pp. 920-935.

Motschenbacher, H. (2007), "Can the term 'genderlect' be saved? A postmodernist re-definition", *Gender and Language*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 255-278.

Mulac, A., Bradac, J.J. and Gibbons, P. (2001), "Empirical support for the gender-as-culture hypothesis: an intercultural analysis of male/female language differences", *Human Communication Research*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 121-152.

Mulac, A., Seibold, D.R. and Farris, J.L. (2000), "Female and male managers' and professionals' criticism giving: differences in language use and effects", *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, Vol. 19 No. 4, pp. 389-415.

NCAA (2016a), "Schools", NCAA, Indianapolis, IN, May 25, available at: www.ncaa.com/schools/a

NCAA (2016b), "Women's basketball makes history during final four", NCAA, Indianapolis, IN, April 8, available at: www.ncaa.com/news/basketball-women/article/2016-04-08/womens-basketball-makes-history-during-final-four

Nelson, D.E. and Signorielli, N. (2007), "Reporter sex and newspaper coverage of the adverse health effects of hormone therapy", *Women & Health*, Vol. 45 No. 1, pp. 1-15.

Newman, M.L., Groom, C.J., Handelman, L.D. and Pennebaker, J.W. (2008), "Gender differences in language use: an analysis of 14,000 text samples", *Discourse Processes*, Vol. 45 No. 3, pp. 211-236.

Paulsen (2014), "Demo reel, part 2: though outnumbered, women watch sports in big numbers", January 20, available at: www.sportsmediawatch.com/2014/01/demo-reel-part-2-though-outnumbered-women-watch-sports-in-big-numbers/ (accessed February 12, 2014).

Peterson, S. (2002), "Gender meanings in grade eight students' talk about classroom writing", *Gender and Education*, Vol. 14 No. 4, pp. 351-366.

Pujazon-Zazik, M. and Park, M.J. (2010), "To tweet, or not to tweet: gender differences and potential positive and negative health outcomes of adolescents' social internet use", *American Journal of Men's Health*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 77-85.

Rainey, D.W. (2012), "Sport's officials' reports of hearing trash talk and their responses to trash talk", *Journal of Sport Behavior*, Vol. 35 No. 1, pp. 78-93.

Rasmussen, K. (1999), "The changing sports scene", *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 57 No. 1, pp. 26-29.

RiaNovosti (2012), "Twitter: the world in 140 characters", available at: http://en.rian.ru/infographics/20120523/173579422.html (accessed July 7, 2012).

Rodgers, S. and Thorson, E. (2003), "A socialization perspective on male and female reporting", *Journal of Communication*, Vol. 53 No. 4, pp. 658-675.

Rossetti, P. (1998), "Gender differences in e-mail communication", *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. 4 No. 7, pp. 1-6, available at: http://iteslj.org/Articles/Rossetti-GenderDif.html (accessed July 7, 2012).

Sanders, M. and Rock, M. (1988), *Waiting for Prime Time: The Women of Television News*, University of Illinois Press, Chicago, IL.

Segen, J.C. (2006), *Concise Dictionary of Modern Medicine*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.

Shapp, A. (2014), "Variation in the use of Twitter hashtags", qualifying paper in sociolinguistics, New York University, New York, NY.

Sproull, L. and Kiesler, S. (1991), *Connections: New Ways of Working in the Networked Organization*, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Strong, C. and Hannis, G. (2006), "The visibility of female journalists at Australian and New Zealand newspapers: the good news and the bad news", *Australian Journalism Review*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 115-125.

Sullivan, P. and Feltz, D.L. (2003), "The preliminary development of the scale for effective communication in team sports (SECTS)", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 33 No. 8, pp. 1693-1715.

Sullivan, P.J. and Short, S. (2011), "Further operationalization of intra-team communication in sports: an updated version of the scale of effective communication in team sports (SECTS-2)", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 41 No. 2, pp. 471-487.

Tannen, D. (1990), *You Just Don't Understand. Women and Men in Conversation*, William Morrow, New York, NY.

The New York Times (2012), "Before and after Title IX: women in sports", *The New York Times*, June 16, p. SR5, available at www.nytimes.com/interactive/2012/06/17/opinion/sunday/sundayreview-titleix-timeline.html

Thelwall, M. (2008), "Fk yea I swear: cursing and gender in a corpus of MySpace pages", available at: www.scit.wlv.ac.uk/~cm1993/papers/MySpaceSwearing_extended_preprint.doc (accessed July 7, 2012).

Thomson, R., Murachver, T. and Green, J. (2001), "Where is the gender in gendered language?", *Psychological Science*, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 171-175.

Timmers, M., Fischer, A.H. and Manstead, A.S.R. (1998), "Gender differences in motives for regulating emotions", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 24 No. 9, pp. 974-985.

Vangelisti, A.L. (1997), "Gender differences, similarities, and interdependencies: some problems with the different cultures perspective", *Personal Relationships*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 243-253.

Vangelisti, A.L. and Daly, J.A. (1997), "Gender differences in standards for romantic relationships", *Personal Relationships*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 203-219.

Weathers, M., Sanderson, J., Matthey, P., Grevious, A., Warren, S. and Tehan, M. (2014), "The tweet life of Erin and Kirk: a gendered analysis of professional sports broadcasters' self-presentation on Twitter", *Journal of Sports Media*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 1-24.

Winn, L.L. and Rubin, D.L. (2001), "Enacting gender identity in written discourse: responding to gender role bidding in personal ads", *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, Vol. 20 No. 4, pp. 393-418.

Witmer, D.F. and Katzman, S.L. (1997), "On-line smiles: does gender make a difference in the use of graphic accents?", *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, Vol. 2 No. 4, doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.1997.tb00192.x.

Wolak, J., Finkelhor, D., Mitchell, K.J. and Ybarra, M.L. (2008), "Online 'predators' and their victims: myths, realities, and implications for prevention and treatment", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 63 No. 2, pp. 111-128.

Wolf, A. (2000), "Emotional expression online: gender differences in emoticon use", *CyberPsychology and Behavior*, Vol. 3 No. 5, pp. 827-833.

Wood, J.T. (1997), "Clarifying the issues", *Personal Relationships*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 221-228.

Appendix 1

Male reporters

David Aldridge: Reporter for Turner Broadcasting.
Jeff Borzello: Writer for ESPN.
Eamonn Brennan: Writer for ESPN.
C. L. Brown: Writer for ESPN.
Ben Cohen: Reporter for the *Wall Street Journal*.
Seth Davis: Basketball Analyst for CBS and Writer for *Sports illustrated*.
Michael Eaves: Anchor for ESPN.
Jason Gay: Writer for the *Wall Street Journal*.
Scott Gleeson: Journalist for *USA Today*.
Jeff Goodman: Reporter for ESPN.

Brian Hamilton: Writer for *Sports Illustrated*.
Chick Hernandez: Reporter for CSN.
Michael Jenkins: Reporter for CSN.
Andy Katz: Reporter for ESPN.
Peter King: Writer for *Sports Illustrated*.
Myron Medcalf: Writer for ESPN.
Matt Norlander: Writer for CBS.
Gary Parrish: Writer for CBS.
Andrew Perloff: Journalist for *Sports Illustrated*.
Eric Prisbell: Reporter for *USA Today*.
Brendan Prunty: Writer for *The New York Times*.
Michael Rosenberg: Writer for *Sports Illustrated*.
Jon Rothstein: Sideline Reporter for CBS.
Zach Schonbrun: Writer for *The New York Times*.
Chris Spatola: Sideline Reporter for CBS.
Pete Thamel: Writer for *Sports Illustrated*.
Sam Vecenie: Reporter for CBS.
Luke Winn: Writer for *Sports Illustrated*.
Brent Yarina: Writer and Editor for the Big Ten Network.
Adam Zucker: Reporter for CBS.

Female reporters

Debbie Antonelli: Commentator for ESPN.
Michelle Beadle: Reporter for ESPN.
Linda Cohn: Anchor for ESPN.
Melanie Collins: Reporter for CBS.
Jamie Erdahl: Reporter for CBS.
Lauren Gardner: Reporter for CBS Sports.
Rosalyn Gold-Onwude: Analyst for ESPN.
Maggie Gray: Journalist for *Sports Illustrated*.
Jemele Hill: Writer for ESPN.
Dana Jacobson: Anchor for CBS Sports.
Sally Jenkins: Writer for the *Washington Post*.
Andrea Joyce: Reporter for NBC.
Allie LaForce: Reporter for CBS.
Rebecca Lobo: Reporter for ESPN.
Carolyn Manno: Reporter for NBC.
Britt McHenry: Reporter for ESPN.
Elizabeth Newman: Writer for *Sports Illustrated*.
Rachel Nichols: Anchor for CNN.
Robin Roberts: Anchor for ESPN.
LaChina Robinson: Analyst for ESPN.
Lindsay Schnell: Writer for *Sports Illustrated*.
Shelley Smith: Reporter and Analyst for ESPN.
Holly Rowe: Reporter for ESPN.
Sage Steele: Anchor for ESPN.
Hannah Storm: Anchor for ESPN.
Charissa Thompson: Anchor for FOX Sports and NBC.
Brenda VanLengen: Play-by-play broadcaster for ESPN.
Allison Williams: Reporter for ESPN.
Christy Winters-Scott: Analyst for ESPN.
Tracy Wolfson: Anchor for CBS.

Appendix 2

Examples of subjective features in tweets

Trash Talk

- If Notre Dame wins tonight, I dress up in the leprechaun outfit and do the jig while the ND fight song plays. #PlusSizeLeprechaun
- Now you know why I didn't pick them to win. Not enough guys who can create RT @[reporter]: Can't win if you can't score. #FinalFour

Boasting

- When your employer gives you goosebumps 👈👈👈👈👈That open @[network] 💐 #NationalChampionship
- RT @[reporter]: @[reporter] I just made the bar I'm sitting in change it to TNT. #TeamStream

Sarcasm

- During the timeout, Kentucky band playing […] Uptown Funk. By my count, that's the 3,052 time for a school band this tournament.
- Just a couple of super clutch teams trying to out-clutch each other. Mixed with a lot of airballs.

Expression of Emotion

- Every year, every single time […] tears. One shining moment, you make me happy! one of best sporting events in the world. Just love it.
- The agony of defeat is SO tough to see. Can't truly appreciate the emotion if u have never felt it. #BeenOnBothSides #CantHave1WoutTheOther

Expression of Gratitude

- A heartfelt thank you to @[team] @[team] @[team] @[team] coaches players SID's for helping me at #ncaaWFF I am so very grateful 4 u!
- @[anchor] @[network] @[team] @[repoter] Thanks Tina! Hope that all is well! #KnicksWiz tonight! ✨

Affirmation

- "@[network]: Lehhhhhgo! #ncaaw [picture]" YES!!!! 😊🎉🙌🙌🙌🙌👌❤□💐
- @[fan] @[coach] @[league] Her explosiveness, body control, poise, and IQ make her an invaluable piece for sure! #NCAAW

Mention of looks

- RT @[reporter]: Caroline Wozniacki went from a very strange looking doll to J.J. Watt. Quite a change. [picture]
- Well, that's an interesting look. [picture]

Appendix 3

Table AI.
Male and female sports reporter tweets about the 2015 men's and women's final fours (F4) and about other topics, by gender-language markers

Feature	Male reporters' tweets ($n = 995$)		Female reporters' tweets ($n = 763$)	
	About F4 ($n = 500$)	Other ($n = 445$)	About F4 ($n = 380$)	Other ($n = 383$)
CMC initialism	6	8	5	28
Emoticon	3	7	35	49
Traditional hashtag	42	21	132	63
Expressive hashtag	21	6	35	30
Photograph link	77	43	85	78
Video link	17	5	29	5
Foul language	8	5	3	3
Trash talk	13	9	9	3
CAPS	24	7	32	22
Boasting	12	2	4	1
Sarcasm	55	9	17	11
Affirmation	34	48	48	52
Quantifier	100	60	92	33
Nickname	23	4	13	3
Directive	27	3	22	25
Sport history	35	7	29	4
Player physicality	8	9	1	3
Player intelligence	9	1	3	1
Exclamation point	31	45	93	136
Ellipses	13	27	40	25
Puzzled punctuation	2	0	3	4
Backchannel sound	1	10	8	7
Expressive lengthening	2	4	1	2
Emotion	28	15	49	26
Gratitude	7	22	22	58
Fashion	3	0	8	8
Looks	1	0	3	1

Appendix 4

Feature	Previous literature	Present findings, tweets about final four	Present findings, overall reporter tweets in timeframe
CMC initialism	F	n.d.	F*
Emoticon	Mixed	F**	F**
Traditional hashtag	M	F**	F**
Expressive hashtag	F	F**	F*
Photograph link	F	F	F**
Video link	M	F	F
Foul language	Mixed	n.d.	n.d.
Trash talk	Mixed	n.d.	n.d.
CAPS	M	n.d.	n.d.
Boasting	M	n.d.	n.d.
Sarcasm	M	M*	M
Affirmation	Mixed	F	F*
Quantifier	M	n.d.	n.d.
Nickname	M	n.d.	n.d.
Directive	M	n.d.	F*
Sport history	M	n.d.	n.d.
Player physicality	M	M	M
Player intelligence	M	M	M
Exclamation point	F	F**	F**
Ellipses	F	F**	F*
Puzzled punctuation	F	F	F
Backchannel sound	F	F	n.d.
Expressive lengthening	F	M	M
Emotion	F	F*	F**
Gratitude	F	F*	F**
Fashion	F	F	F
Looks	F	F	F

Notes: n.d., negligible difference; *$p = 0.05$; **Bonferroni-adjusted $p = 0.002$

Table AII. Comparison of gender-language markers with previous research

Appendix 5

Feature	Male reporters' retweets ($n = 228$) About F4 ($n = 122$)	Other ($n = 106$)	Female reporters' retweets ($n = 307$) About F4 ($n = 188$)	Other ($n = 119$)
CMC initialism	5	0	1	4
Emoticon	1	6	12	15
Traditional hashtag	26**	10	62	29
Expressive hashtag	10	3	13	12
Photograph link	24	21*	53	45**
Video link	4	3	15	4
Foul language	4	2	1	2
Trash talk	3	0	4	3
CAPS	5	1	18	10
Boasting	6	0	1	1
Sarcasm	13	1	6	3
Affirmation	16	13	29	12
Quantifier	21	12	63*	19*
Nickname	4	1	6	2
Directive	9	1	6	7
Sport history	9	1	18	4
Player Physicality	2	1	1	1
Player Intelligence	2	0	1	1
Exclamation point	16*	13	47	48
Ellipses	6	13*	15	6
Puzzled punctuation	2	0	0	0
Backchannel sound	0	2	3	0
Expressive lengthening	2	1	0	0
Emotion	10	5	13*	3
Gratitude	4	3	9	16
Fashion	1	0	1	2
Looks	1	0	0	0

Notes: *Approaching significant difference between expected incidence, based on non-retweet rate, and observed incidence among retweets (falling between $p = 0.002$ and $p = 0.05$ significance levels); **significant difference between expected incidence, based on non-retweet rate, and observed incidence among retweets at a Bonferroni-adjusted $p = 0.002$ significance level

Table AIII.
Male and female sports reporter retweets about the 2015 men's and women's final fours (F4) and about other topics, by gender-language markers

Corresponding author
Kent Kaiser can be contacted at: klkaiser@unwsp.edu