



The Gender Intelligence Chronicles™

Changing the Business Landscape

Gender Intelligence® Series | Volume 1, Issue 3

Resolving Gender Conflicts

By Barbara Annis

Men and women have different styles and approaches to most of the tasks we perform in an average working day. Once you understand those differences, you can easily turn them to your advantage. But when it comes to workplace conflicts, we tend to lose sight of this strength in being different.

Part of the problem is that when it comes to conflict, men and women literally come from two different worlds. Women see conflict as a breakdown. They view it as corrosive. One reason for this is that women internalize, and the conflict automatically becomes personal. For men, conflict is not so much a breakdown as a struggle. Men tend to react to conflict as if it was a challenge, a contest to be won. It's a call to battle.

Men and women don't deal with conflict the same way either. Women's first reaction to conflict is to personalize it. They wonder, "What did I do?" Men tend to treat conflict in an isolated, depersonalized manner. For women, it's about the relationship. That's one reason women tend to approach a conflict by treating it as an opportunity, a chance to have a clear-out, build rapport and get closer in the relationships. Women's instinct is to explore a conflict, figuring out how the conflict or its solution might affect other parties. Women ask others to get to the bottom of the problem by sharing their feelings. Men, on the other hand, tend to react to conflict by staking out a position – much the way they do when they negotiate. At work, they typically bark orders to others in a directive, here's-what-we're-going-to-do manner.

What do men and women in conflict have in common? Conflicts always start at the same source: unmet expectations. When our expectations are not met – for example, when someone hasn't done the job they promised to do or the one we expected – we are surprised. The impact of the unfulfilled promise hits us and we have a reaction: frustration, uncertainty, or anger. Men and women both go through this basic reaction to conflict. It's almost universal. But after that, men and women head off in different directions.

We all know what happens next. Men typically explode. They instinctively, instantly, look outside to someone or something else. They'll show anger and direct it at that something or someone. They'll slam their fist on a table or yell. It's the way they let their stress out. Women usually find this reaction perplexing, and even frightening. But that's because women's own way of reacting to conflict is almost the opposite. Women implode. When they find themselves in a conflict, the first question women tend to ask is, "What have I done wrong?" This doesn't mean they aren't angry. Women hold their reaction in while they try to make sense of it. They're working on their reaction, inside. They ponder,

mull it over – even if it's only briefly. Then they may have an emotional reaction, sometimes to the point of crying.

Men find this perplexing because they think tears are a sign of sadness. They often tell me tears make them feel helpless. But, as we've seen, tears, at work, are almost always an expression of frustration and anger. Many experts in different disciplines see these basic differences in different terms. Linguist Walter Ong points out in *Fighting for Life* that men's reaction to conflict is part of a set of ritualized behaviors that includes contests, competition, struggle, and contention. Paleopsychologist Howard Bloom, author of *The Global Brain*, writes that in organizations, men spend more time posturing, or in hierarchical displays or territorial competitions. When women deal with conflicts, he writes, they "dig in, find solutions and get back to work." So although women may be less purely results-oriented than men are in many aspects of working life, when it comes to conflict, Bloom says they are "more goal-oriented and less political."

*It's not that women are afraid of conflict.
They just don't like conflict for conflict's sake.*

Attacking versus Resolving

It's not that women are afraid of conflict. They just don't like conflict for conflict's sake. Working women often ask me, "Why do we have to have all this debate at the office all the time?" Women see debate and arguing as "attacking." Women also say they find men locked in their position or inflexible when they deal with conflicts. But that's because women assume, from the start, that the way to solve conflicts is through conciliation. For women, winning is not usually the real point. Linguist Deborah Tannen, in her book *The Argument Culture*, writes that women at work are frequently puzzled by how men can argue with each other and then continue as if nothing has happened.

Men at work are often surprised when women are deeply upset by a verbal attack. For men, it's simply part of getting the job done. But women often wonder, "Why does he have to jump all over me like that?" It's common for men to use ritual opposition even where there is no real conflict, such as teasing, playfully insulting each other, or exploring ideas by playing devil's advocate. This approach creates tension and conflict between women and men at work. Many women avoid overt disagreement when they really do disagree, because conflict for them signals a breakdown.

*It's common for men to use ritual opposition even where there is
no real conflict, such as teasing, playfully insulting each other,
or exploring ideas by playing devil's advocate.*

According to psychologists John Gottman and Robert Levenson at the University of Washington, you can see the differences in how men and women react to conflict by simply observing the physiological changes conflict provokes. The pair asked male and female patients to identify and discuss a major area of disagreement in their marriage. While the patients were doing this, they monitored factors like their heart rates, blood flow, and skin temperature and body movements. What did they find? Men literally get more "heated up" and physically stimulated by conflict. Women experienced less physical

change during sustained conflict. Their conclusion: men need to shut off or cool down during conflict or they get overwhelmed and lose control, while women can tolerate longer, escalating bouts of conflict without losing control.

So How Can We Resolve Conflicts?

Most of us know how to resolve conflicts. We get advice like “Explain your viewpoint” or “Be very clear, consistent and direct.” Most of us go through our careers assuming that this is all there is to do. And we think it’s probably enough. Of course, if we looked around and made a tally of the number of continuing conflicts we see or hear about in an average week at the office, we might start to wonder just how efficient those good old methods for solving conflicts really are.

I can tell you – from the number of conflicts I’m called in to deal with in an average week – that the good old methods don’t work. And they don’t work because we all overlook a few basic things about the nature of conflicts. Men and women each assume that the other sex thinks as they do. So they project their own reactions onto those of the other gender. In conflict, men and women do the same thing: they assume the other gender hears the same words and speaks the same language as they do.

But of course, men and women don’t speak the same language. Their words and actions don’t necessarily mean the same thing. So, unless you recognize how your actions appear to the other sex, your reaction will only make things worse. This syndrome of misunderstandings is as common at work as it is at home. One of my associates, Brenda, told me this story of a typical conflict she and her husband got into over cooking together. Their kitchen was small, so it wasn’t easy to cook together, but that day, things were going particularly smoothly.

Then, according to Brenda, “Jacques hit his head by accident on a cupboard door. And how did he react? He slammed it shut and cursed!” Brenda was mystified and hurt. To her, the reaction seemed completely out of proportion with the accident – which was just a result of Jacques’ own carelessness. “Why does he have to take out his anger on a cupboard door?”

Like most women Brenda took her husband’s expression of anger personally. It felt like a personal attack to her. The way she saw it, Jacques stole a good moment from her. They were cooking peacefully and he went and ruined it by over-reacting to what looked like a pretty minor incident to her. She told him what she thought. Jacques simply didn’t understand why Brenda was hurt and offended by his outburst. He told her it was just his way of letting off steam. “It’s got nothing to do with you,” he said. But to Brenda, it did have something to do with her. She persisted in resenting his reaction. Jacques was confused and frustrated. They both felt misunderstood. She was stuck in her position: “You over-reacted.” And he was stuck in his: “It had nothing to do with you.” And by this point, neither of them felt like being in the same room – let alone like cooking together in a tiny kitchen.

This is a classic dynamic between men and women in conflict. The more men explode, the more women implode. When women personalize situations, men’s frustration meter rises; they feel they’re being accused of something they didn’t intend. “It’s not about you.” When women hear this, they tend to shut down because they also feel they’re not being understood. It happens at work all the time.

*The challenge in conflicts — as in all your dealings
with the opposite sex — is to avoid becoming
a victim of your own faulty assumptions.*

One of my clients, Marylin, called me with a typical male-female work conflict situation. She was convinced that her boss, Ray, was being abusive towards her. By the time she called me, she was on the verge of hiring a lawyer to sue him. I asked her where this feeling came from. "In almost every e-mail he sends he clearly appears to me to be angry!" Marylin felt that the e-mails were attacks. I suspected she was misinterpreting Ray's style, so I asked her if I could read them myself. The style of the e-mails was clearly "directive." After a brief conversation with her boss, Marylin realized she had made a big assumption. Ray wasn't attacking her. His directive style just sounded that way to her. In just in one quick meeting, she and her boss resolved the misunderstanding.

E-mails can be a major cause of communication breakdown as our dependence on electronic conversations grows. Try to avoid having an argument this way – one that is meticulously documented, and that you may regret. Pick up the telephone before the situation can escalate. The challenge in conflicts – as in all your dealings with the opposite sex – is to avoid becoming a victim of your own faulty assumptions. To avoid this fate, the first thing you need is S.A.R.A.

S.A.R.A.

I learned a great lesson about how we react to conflict situations from a famous psychologist I once studied with, Virginia Satir. She said that people go through four stages when they are in a conflict: Surprise, Anger, Rejection, and Acceptance. Some people go through every stage. Others skip some stages. Some people are surprised, but go straight to Acceptance without passing through Anger. These are all normal human reactions, and nothing to be ashamed about. In fact, it's better to have these reactions and recognize them for what they are than to pretend you don't have them. You'll soon see why.

Without realizing it, most people get stuck in either Anger or Rejection. Where you get stuck partly depends on gender. Men tend to get stuck in Anger, projecting their reaction to conflict in an outward direction. Not surprisingly, women tend to get stuck in Rejection, because they project their reaction to conflict inwards. Women tend to internalize conflict. The problem is that when men are stuck in Anger and women are stuck in Rejection, their reactions reinforce one another. Perceptual filters kick in again. In Rejection, women say, "I feel hurt." This triggers men's anger because men feel they're being blamed. When men react defensively, they re-trigger women's feeling of Rejection. That makes women feel men don't want to listen to them, and feeds that feeling even more.

This syndrome where men and women's reactions reinforce each other doesn't help the ultimate problem both sexes face: getting to Acceptance. Why is this so important? When we are stuck in Surprise, Anger or Rejection, it is too early to act. You can't do anything productive to resolve a conflict. That's why it's good to recognize the stages. Then you need to take whatever time you need to get to Acceptance.

Our long-term intentions are the first thing we forget about when we're in a conflict. But they're usually more important than being "right."

Suffer in the Short Term

Getting to Acceptance is a matter of intentions. I often tell people, "It can take five minutes or it can take five years. You decide. But it has to be done." How do you get to Acceptance? The best way is to remind yourself of your long-term intentions. Our long-term intentions are the first thing we forget about when we're in a conflict. But they're usually more important than being "right." That means you have to accept some short-term suffering.

A young accountant, David, told me a story that perfectly illustrates why it's so important to get over Anger and Rejection before doing anything about a conflict. Many people will relate to this phone message scenario. David was head of a team of eighteen accountants working on a tax return for a large company. While he was on a business trip his team leader left him three messages warning him that they were probably not going to make the deadline. The team was having difficulty getting the information they needed from the client. On his way back from his trip David picked up one last message from his voice mail. This time it was from the client. The president accused David of being unprofessional because David's team was clearly behind schedule. "We are one of your largest clients," he said. "And this shows us we're not really that important to you."

"I was stunned," David recalled. "I knew it wasn't our fault and it certainly wasn't my fault! I remember I was on the pavement holding my mobile, pacing backwards and forwards. Then I just jabbed the callback button and unloaded on his voicemail. It was a knee-jerk reaction." As soon as David ended the call, he knew he had made a mistake. "I thought about it for a second and realized there was probably a misunderstanding. There was probably a communication problem somewhere. I wished so much I could get into the president's voicemail and delete my message." It turned out that a communication problem *was* at the root of the misunderstanding. David's team had been trying to get information from the company. The team leader had left repeated messages for the client but had not received any response.

As it turned out, the company had received the messages. They didn't answer them. They just acted on them. They were busy getting the information together. It was just taking longer than they expected. But David didn't know that. And the company's president didn't know it either. Each saw the delay and automatically assumed it was the other's fault. "It wasn't really anyone's fault," David said.

When you are in "Blame Frame," you are attached to your own opinion; you are attached to being right.

There are two ways of dealing with conflicts. Before we get to Acceptance we act in what I call “Blame Frame.” This is a win-lose mindset. When you are in Blame Frame, you are attached to your opinion; you are attached to being right. Your objective is to prove the other person wrong. When you are in the Outcome Frame, your goal is to find real resolution. Your objective is to find a win-win solution that will make everyone happy. Lots of people in conflict think it is unrealistic to have a win-win solution. They think somebody has to lose. That’s just because they are in the Blame Frame.

When you are in Surprise, Anger, or Rejection, you’re probably operating in the Blame Frame, and when you’re in the Blame Frame, it’s too early to act. Blaming is a normal human reaction. No one likes conflicts and when they happen, the first thing we think about is ourselves. We want to pin the fault on someone else. But that’s the problem with trying to resolve a conflict when you are in the Blame Frame. It’s about fault-finding, not solution-finding. It’s about “you or me.” It’s zero-sum, win or lose, “I’m right and you’re wrong.”

Most people assume you solve conflicts by talking. But talking won’t solve anything if you’re in the Blame Frame. It only digs you deeper. You’re still trying to decide who is at fault. David’s story is a perfect example. David was in Blame Frame when he made the snap decision to call the president and unload on him. When David felt attacked, he reacted by attacking back. He may have felt momentary relief after speaking his mind to the president’s voicemail, but that didn’t do much to solve the problem. He understood that pretty quickly.

After David left the first message, he cooled down a bit, got over his Anger, and decided to look for a win-win solution. David was in Acceptance. He was ready for the Outcome Frame. He started by checking his assumptions. He made a few calls to find out how the misunderstanding had occurred. He quickly realized that everyone was acting in good faith. So he called the president back and explained the situation. They agreed it was no one’s fault and extended the deadline for the tax return. Problem solved.

The Win-Win Way – Outcome Frame

The only way to resolve a conflict is to change from the Blame Frame to the Outcome Frame. This means switching your frame of reference from fault-finding to solution-finding. These five tips will help you:

1. Have a break. Remove yourself. Say, “I’ll get back to you on that.” Personally, I give myself five minutes to do this. I do it on my own. You can also go and see someone else, if you need to.
2. If you do choose to see someone else, make sure that person is a committed listener, not just an “ear.” Don’t just go to someone for sympathy or you’ll end up stuck back in the Blame Frame. It’s sensible to choose someone with a completely differently perspective from your own, maybe even someone you don’t know that well. Present that person with your challenge and explain what you’re looking for.
3. Get in touch with your long-term intentions. Are you committed to working with this client/colleague/partner? Do you want to make a partnership or collaboration work? If the answer is “Yes,” then you need to ask a few simple questions. How can we resolve this? What would be an ideal solution for you?

4. Forget about who's right and who's wrong and focus on the cost of the conflict. To do THAT you have to be in Acceptance. You have to get over thinking of "being right."
5. Detach yourself from your opinions, because the first step in resolving conflicts through the Outcome Frame is to find out what a "winning" solution would be for the other side.

When you follow these basic steps, your hostilities usually melt away and the solution will follow.

The only way to resolve a conflict is to switch your frame of reference from fault-finding to solution-finding.

The following story of a conflict at an engineering firm shows how you can move from the Blame Frame to the Outcome Frame – and how easy it is to find a solution once you're in the Outcome Frame. The story involved two colleagues, Gordon, a partner at the firm, and Sylvia, the accounts manager. Gordon had received a call from one of their most important clients who insisted they needed a contract finished for the next day. He was still feeling the shock of that when he went to talk to Sylvia at 3 p.m. "It absolutely has to be done for tomorrow," he said. "We don't have a choice."

That really put Sylvia on the spot. She had promised her husband she would pick up the children from a nursery that afternoon at 5 p.m. "I'll work on it for the next two hours, but I absolutely have to be away by 5 p.m.," she said. Gordon's reaction? "It absolutely has to be done by tomorrow." Sylvia was shocked but she tried a compromise.

"I'll try to get a babysitter, and if I can, I'll come back tonight and work on it. But I can't make any promises," she said. That just made Gordon angrier.

He blurted out in frustration, "Oh, not the children again! It's just impossible for it to wait. I promised it would be on the client's desk tomorrow morning."

The sarcastic comment about her children really hurt Sylvia. Gordon's words put her on the defensive. Conflicts like these are what I call the jugular variety. They get people by the throat by dragging up sensitive issues. They aren't easy to defuse. They bring out emotions we didn't know we had, and trigger things we're not even aware of. But even these kinds of conflict can be solved by switching from the Blame Frame to the Outcome Frame.

*Conflicts like these are what I call the jugular variety.
They get people by the throat by dragging up sensitive issues.*

Gordon was stuck in Anger and Sylvia was stuck in feeling Rejection. After they got over their reactions and got into Acceptance, they were able to move towards finding a solution. Gordon started by taking ownership of his request. He told Sylvia, "I am having a huge problem with this client. They absolutely insist on having this contract done by tomorrow morning and I promised they would have it. Is there a way we can meet this deadline?"

Sylvia dropped her defenses. Gordon's approach put her in a problem-solving, outcome mode. Sylvia knew the client. She knew they often made these kinds of last minute demands. And she knew that after they got their contracts, they let them sit for three weeks before they did anything with them. She explained this to Gordon. "I know this client makes a lot of demands. But I also know that if I push, they'll give a bit. It usually doesn't turn out to be a problem when we can't do things as quickly as they want." When Gordon heard this he understood something about his earlier reaction to the client's request.

He explained to Sylvia that he was from the old school, where the customer is king. Sylvia explained her point of view. She said that her team would do a better job if they had a reasonable amount of time. "The overall outcome will be better," she said. They agreed that if she worked a few hours from home over the weekend, then finished the rest early in the week, without rushing the job, the client would probably be happier. They were.

Team Conflicts

An office equipment company once approached me for advice on how to deal with another of these "jugular" conflicts between three of its sales representatives. The conflict started when the three—two women and one man—went to make a presentation to a potential client. The stakes were high. The contract was one of the biggest the company had ever seen. Greg made the presentation and they lost the contract. That's when the conflict started. The two women, June and Caroline, blamed Greg for blowing it.

Greg didn't think it was his fault. He said he gave it his best effort. This was Greg's version of events: he was making a presentation to the senior manager (a man) and three women who worked for him. And he just followed his instinct. Without even thinking about it, he zeroed in on the male manager. Later, Greg reported, "I just gave him the facts. I told him we had the best product at the best price and he was guaranteed satisfaction. And I did a great job."

Greg didn't have a clue what went wrong. But June and Caroline certainly did! They said Greg had gone downhill all the way from the minute he opened his mouth. "It was obviously the women who were making the decision," they explained. "And Greg didn't pay any attention to them." Their competitors took a much softer approach to the sale and June and Caroline could see it was working. "You blew it," they told Greg after the presentations.

*You can't resolve conflicts when you are focused
on having your own position understood.*

Greg wouldn't hear of it. "No. I did a terrific job!" The team lost the sale, but that wasn't the real problem. The real problem was that the incident had sparked a conflict between them that no one seemed able to resolve. That was when their sales director came to see me. The first thing I did was listen to everyone's version of events. June and Caroline said that right from the start they had seen Greg's approach wasn't working. "You came across as overbearing and condescending," they told him. "The women in the room could tell that the only one you thought you had to convince was their boss, and they were turned off."

Greg reacted defensively. "You can't blame *me*. I did a perfect job." He said that he thought everyone was plotting against him. June and Caroline said he refused to listen to them. They were in a deadlock. Greg, June, and Caroline's dispute shows how easy it is to fall into the Blame Frame.

"We saw that Greg was losing the client right away," they told me. "After that we just saw a checklist of what was going wrong, of the mistakes he was making." In other words, June and Caroline's Blame Frame shaped the way they saw Greg's whole presentation.

Greg was in the Blame Frame too. He said his only thoughts about the whole incident were that "June and Caroline are ganging up on me." He felt like a victim, as if they were gathering evidence against him. "It's not my fault. It's their fault." And what did he do? He stopped listening to them. He shut down. June and Caroline, meanwhile, assumed Greg just wasn't listening. Their reactions reinforced one another. There isn't much that can be done to avoid going through the Blame Frame. It's all part of the normal human reaction to conflict situations. The problem is that when you are in the Blame Frame, you aren't ready to do anything to really resolve a conflict. You can't resolve conflicts when you are focused on having your own position understood. What you have to be able to say is: "I want to understand the other person." Greg, June, and Caroline had to wait a few weeks before they were ready to move from the Blame Frame to the Outcome Frame.

How did they do this? They started by recalling what their long-term goals were. As I've said before, the first thing that goes out of the window when we are in a conflict is our long-term intention. As soon as Greg and June and Caroline were in a conflict situation, they just forgot they were a good team. I asked them, "What's the cost of being in the Blame Frame?"

It didn't take them long to come up with an answer. They lost trust in one another, they said. And they lost the special chemistry that had made them a good team. As they would later see, being in the Blame Frame was probably what lost them their client too. "What are you all committed to?" I asked them.

Again, it didn't take them long to come up with an answer. "Being a strong team. That's how we win clients," they answered. When they all heard themselves saying the same thing, the dispute suddenly went from "it's you against me" to "it's you *and* me." That's when Greg, June and Caroline switched from

the Blame Frame to the Outcome Frame. Then the past event took on a whole new meaning for them. Each saw what they could have done to save the situation.

"I have a confession to make," said Caroline. "I knew the women in the room would have the last word on the purchase. I could have jumped in and steered your attention to them. But instead, I just watched your presentation ticking like a time bomb." In the Blame Frame, Greg saw that he would have shut that kind of interruption out. But in the Outcome Frame he would have welcomed it. He would have realized Caroline had a reason for doing what she was doing.

Don't look for answers. Answers are things we use to solidify our own positions. Instead, look for insights.

Once we got to the Outcome Frame and resolved their conflict, Greg, June, and Caroline all had an insight about turning their differences into strengths. All three saw what they lost because they were stuck in the Blame Frame: not only the client, but also their trust in each other. Greg realized he could have had a lot of help from June and Caroline if he had been open to receive it. June and Caroline understood what they could do in similar situations in the future.

"Ah-hah" Moments

I tell all my workshop participants not to look for answers. Answers are things we use to solidify our own positions. Instead, look for insights. Insights mean we're learning something. Insights mean we're filling in that hole in our minds I like to call: "what we don't know, we don't know."

In the world we live and work in, it's easy to fall into Blame Frame. It's easy to react to a conflict by finger pointing. Shifting to Outcome Frame requires some self-discipline. Conflicts are very private. Many conflicts take place inside people's heads. Often there is no confrontation at all. So you have to shift to Outcome Frame on your own. It also requires a certain amount of determination. Here's what you can do to work out whether you're in Blame Frame or Outcome Frame: Think of a recent cross-gender conflict. Describe what you did. What frame of reference did you use? Blame or Outcome? And answer the following:

Did you:

- ▶ Decide the other person was wrong?
- ▶ Argue about who was right or wrong?
- ▶ Say, "I'm not responsible for this!"
- ▶ Walk away in anger or shock?
- ▶ Gossip?
- ▶ Keep mulling it over?
- ▶ Get defensive?
- ▶ Feel victimized, wrongly accused, misunderstood, or misinterpreted?
- ▶ Feel invalidated?

If you answered "Yes" to most of these questions, you're in the Blame Frame.

Or, did you:

- ▶ Stand back and reflect?
- ▶ Decide you were committed to this relationship?
- ▶ Take responsibility for dealing with the conflict?
- ▶ Take proactive steps towards finding a solution?
- ▶ Try to look for a win-win solution?

If you answered “Yes” to most of these questions, congratulations! You are in the Outcome Frame.

Seek to understand before being understood.

Here are three simple steps to help you get to a win-win solution:

1. Co-create a Win-Win Solution

Affirm your mutual understanding; make sure you both feel heard and understood. You could start by saying, “You may not have meant anything by this, but...” or, “I need to clarify something.” This is the hardest part both for men and for women: to stay with the conversation until it’s complete. Aim for a clean slate. Brainstorm together for multiple win-win solutions for the future. Concentrate on steps two and three, and keep your word.

2. Frame the Conversation

Identify the goal: “I have a conflict, and I’m here to see a win-win solution.” or, “There’s something I need to resolve with you.” Establish that your immediate goal is mutual understanding.

3. Check in

Ask for each other’s help towards this understanding. Do not defend or disagree, or you will fall back into the Blame Frame. Seek to understand before being understood. Repeat the other person’s position in your own words: “I may have made an assumption, but...” or, “I may have misinterpreted, but...”

Women, don’t forget: there’s nothing that frustrates men more than feeling like they *are* the problem instead of part of the solution. And men: there’s nothing that frustrates women more than “not being heard” and understood. Conflict resolution is a tool we can use once a misunderstanding has occurred. My hope and intention is that it is a tool we will require less frequently as our Gender Intelligence improves.

Whether it’s to talk about the challenges of working with the opposite sex, or about how you interpret words and actions differently, start investigating gender difference in a non-blaming way. Move from a denying to a tolerant attitude towards differences and you’ll discover how understanding gender differences can be beneficial to everyone.

About the Author

Barbara Annis, Founder and CEO of Barbara Annis & Associates, Inc. is a recognized global expert in Inclusive Leadership and Gender Initiatives. Her research and consultancy practice is dedicated to removing organizational and leadership barriers by bringing the latest research and thinking on Leadership, Gender Diversity, and Inclusiveness into the workplace, helping organizations turn gender diversity into a powerful technology of success. Her insights and achievements have pioneered a transformational shift in cultural attitudes on the importance of gender unity to organizational success.

Since its founding in 1980, Barbara Annis & Associates has interviewed tens of thousands of men and women, facilitated over 8,000 corporate workshops, and delivered keynotes and executive coaching sessions on Gender Intelligent Leadership across the globe. Barbara Annis first coined the term Gender Intelligence in the early 1990s and developed the concept in her first book *Same Words, Different Language* (2002) and second work, *Leadership and the Sexes*, co-authored with Michael Gurian (2006).

The Gender Intelligence Chronicles is a copyright protected publication by Barbara Annis & Associates, Inc. All rights reserved. Gender Intelligence® is the registered trademark of Barbara Annis & Associates, Inc. Any duplication of any issue of The Gender Intelligence Chronicles is forbidden without the written consent of Barbara Annis & Associates, Inc.

For more information on Gender Intelligence and Barbara Annis & Associates, or for a single or group subscription to The Gender Intelligence Chronicles, please visit: www.baainc.com.