

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

- 1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.**
- 2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.**
- 3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.**
- 4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.**
- 5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.**

**University
Microfilms
International**

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

7913158

**RICH-SIEBZEHNER, MARCIA MYRA
SEX DIFFERENCES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF VERBAL
SOCIAL RESPONSES.**

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, PH.D., 1979

University
Microfilms
International 300 N ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

© 1979

MARCIA MYRA RICH-SIEBZEHNER

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Sex Differences In The
Development of
Verbal Social Responses

by

MARCIA RICH-SIEBZEHNER

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate
Faculty in Speech and Hearing Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the require-
ments for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
The City University of New York.

1979

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Speech and Hearing Sciences in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Jan 22, 1979
date

Arnold Braust
Chairman of Examining Committee

Jan 24, 1979
date

Jimmy Hobbey
Executive Officer

Florence L. Denmark

Edward H. Gendron
Louis J. Serstman
Supervisory Committee

Abstract**SEX DIFFERENCES IN THE
DEVELOPMENT OF
VERBAL SOCIAL RESPONSES**

by

Marcia Rich-Siebzechner**Advisers: Professor Arthur J. Bronstein
Professor Louis J. Gerstman**

This study is concerned specifically with linguistic distinctions as manifested in vocabulary, particularly sex differences in word choice and language style. Contemporary studies have shown that there are some differences in the ways that males and females use language, particularly in regard to expletive use.

The purpose of the present investigations was to determine whether pre- and post-puberty females as opposed to pre- and post-puberty males, when tested with written tasks, would: 1) use more words on the basis of total words used; 2) use fewer sentences; 3) use fewer expletives.

A questionnaire was utilized in order to obtain samples of written language from 225 subjects, both males and females, from three separate age groups (fifth graders, tenth graders and college students), from both public and private schools. The subjects' task was to respond to eight scenarios incorporating actions by both male and female actors for a total of 1800 performances. Beyond responding to the

scenarios, each subject completed a questionnaire designed to elicit information regarding parental education and employment so that inferences regarding social class might be made. Each of these performances generated five dependent variables which were coded for computer analysis. Each response was also evaluated for affect by two independent judges.

Regarding overall sex differences, two predictions made were confirmed but a third prediction was reversed. Females did indeed use more words and fewer expletives. Additionally, females exhibited significantly greater variability than males in number of words used, but significantly less variability in number of expletives. The reversed finding was that females used more, rather than fewer, sentences than males.

Altogether 69 different expletives were elicited in the study, only 16 of which were contributed by both sexes, the remainder being far more often due to male subjects than to female subjects. Most of these were produced in response to hostile behavior in the scenarios, few in response to queries.

According to the results of this study, it would seem that although women are less variable in their use of expletives, they are using more and stronger expletives than heretofore. This finding might indicate that women, as they become more and more involved in the mainstream of our culture, as they emerge professionally and otherwise, might be outgrowing some of their old linguistic habits.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am most grateful to a number of people who helped make this study possible. My chairman, Professor Arthur J. Bronstein, a "Renaissance Man," first encouraged me to believe in my course of investigation, to pursue it, and was instrumental in metamorphosing an idea into reality. Professor Louis J. Gerstman, my co-chairman, was an indefatigable mentor, an invaluable researcher, and possessed of such a generous spirit as to be truly remarkable. Professor Edward H. Bendix has had a great impact on my way of thinking, has always been available, always patient, and has provided many insights when it was sometimes difficult to see. Professor Florence L. Denmark was at all times graciously cooperative and has served as an inspiration with her work in Women's Studies.

I am both indebted and everlastingly grateful to my husband, Hirsch, without whose support and encouragement this study might not have been undertaken. I am truly grateful to my daughters, Judith and Ruth, for being forbearing and supportive throughout.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Conclusion	18
II. THE PRESENT STUDY	19
III. METHODS	31
Task Construction	32
Subjects.	34
Procedure	37
IV. RESULTS	38
Dependent Variables	38
Analysis of Scenario Effect	41
Analysis of Demographic Effects	46
Analysis of Expletive Use	50
V. DISCUSSION	54
Scenario Effect	54
Demographic Effects	55
On The Use of Aggressive Responses.	57
On The Use of Expletives.	59
APPENDIX A: Questionnaire Used In This Study.	68
APPENDIX B: Fifteen Illustrative Responses.	80
APPENDIX C: Analyses of Variance of Scenario Effects.	83
APPENDIX D: Alphabetical List of Elicited Expletives.	96
REFERENCES	100

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Four Provocative Scenarios	33
2. Sources of Subjects For This Study	35
3. Subject Characteristics For Each Age Group . .	36
4. Five Measures of Performance For Each Sex and Age Group	39
5. Examples of Responses of Varying Affect. . . .	42
6. Social Status Variations In Performances By Fifth Graders.	48
7. Expletives Elicited Three or More Times In This Study	51
8. Expletives Shared With Bailey and Timm	53

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Although linguists have traditionally dealt with dimensions of variety such as age, socio-economic differences, and literary differences they have not traditionally discussed linguistic distinctions between the sexes. In recent years, however, there has been much research in the area of "Women's Language". Much of the current research in the area of sex distinctions has been done from the point of view of the researcher as informant and as a result may not be as objective as it should be from the point of view of scholarly research. However, the area of "Women's Language" is a fairly new one and therefore is open to different approaches, all of which may prove important to a more complete understanding of certain linguistic universals. This study is concerned specifically with linguistic distinctions as manifested in vocabulary, particularly sex differences in word choice and language style.

The question, of course, is whether or not these differences can be described as rule governed rather than anecdotal. Is it possible to identify certain linguistic features of current English usage that are associated typically with females rather than with males within specific age and social groups? Also, do the linguistic differences narrow as males and females become more closely

matched with respect to such characteristics as education, social class and age? An even more significant matching would be in regard to Hymes' (1972) parameters, e.g., setting/context, purposes, events, etc. Hymes states:

In a sociolinguistic description, then, it is necessary to deal with activities which are in some recognizable way bounded or integral. From the standpoint of general social description they may be registered as ceremonies, fishing trips, and the like; from particular standpoints they may be regarded as political, esthetic, etc., situations, which serve as contexts for the manifestation of political, esthetic, etc., activity. From the sociolinguistic standpoint they may be regarded as speech situations (p. 56).

Hymes further states "that the same type of speech act may recur in different types of speech events, and the same type of speech event in different contexts of situation" (ibid).

These are some of the questions that this study will attempt to answer in an effort to substantiate Hymes' (1972) concept that research into sex differences in speech must take account of the varied components of speech events. It is the hypothesis of this study that women speak differently in the same situations from the ways that men do. However, in relation to this hypothesis it is necessary to define the speech community with which one is working. Hymes defines the speech community as one which shares rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech and rules for the interpretation of at least one linguistic variety. He considers both conditions essential aspects of any single speech community.

Key (1972) states that "language which might be labelled 'coarse language' (therefore 'unladylike') by one group of people might be used acceptably by women in a higher socio-economic group, or used by a sub-culture such as the Hollywood group, or the 'tough' business world.

In reference to context of situation, Key says that the role which one is assuming at the moment may blur or highlight male/female differences. The linguistic behavior of men and women in an office or at work might be almost identical but the same persons may exhibit other linguistic patterns when in other roles (e.g. in a sexual role). Key's statement does not preclude any possibilities of various mixes of language variety.

There is a growing body of literature about male/female language distinctions in non-Western societies. Around the turn of the century and shortly thereafter interest in women's languages ran high and was perhaps triggered by the exotic accounts brought back by travellers who reported these phenomena. The ethnographic literature has descriptions of tribes in which men and women speak different languages or distinct dialects. These include differences in vocabulary, word taboos, and certain grammatical forms unique to each sex.

Jespersen (1922) discussed the use of different dialects by men and women. He cited reports dating back to 1664 that among the Caribs of the Small Antilles, each sex had expressions which the other sex "understands but never

uses". As Jespersen stated: "the men have a great many expressions peculiar to them, which the women understand but never pronounce themselves. On the other hand, the women have words and phrases which the men never use, or they would be laughed to scorn. Thus it happens that in their conversations it often seems as if the women had another language than the men. . . . But though the boys understand the speech of their mothers and sisters, they nevertheless follow their fathers and brothers and conform to their speech from the age of five or six. . . . (p. 237)."

Jespersen explained that the special words accounted for only about one tenth of the vocabulary, and the sexes shared the same grammar; hence, there are not really "two distinct languages in the proper sense of the word." Verbal taboos distinguished the sexes in various societies; e.g. among the Caribs, men on the war-path used words forbidden to women, and among the Zulu in Africa, a wife was not allowed to mention the name of her father-in-law and his brothers. There were grammatical differences between the sexes among the Chiquitos in Bolivia. Jespersen variously attributed these sex differences in language to the social separation of the sexes, to different activities and interests, and to differences of rank and male domination.

Sapir (1924) discussed the distinction between male and female forms in Yana, a language of northern California which was spoken in four distinct dialects - Northern, Central, Southern, and Yahi. Sapir indicated the lack of

gender in Yana but said that there were a number of verb stems which applied exclusively to activity carried on by a male or by a female; e.g., /ni-/, /ni-/ "a male goes" but /a-/ "a female goes". He went on to say that:

The male forms are used only by males in speaking to males, while the female forms are used by females in speaking to males or females and by males in speaking to females. In other words, the female forms are used about three times as frequently as the male forms. There is apparently no question of the male forms being tabooed to the females, for a female uses the male forms without hesitation when she quotes the words of a male speaking to a male, as in relating a myth in which one male character speaks to another (p. 206).

Another interesting ethnographic discussion was Furfey's (1944) report regarding phonetic differences between men and women among the Chukchi, a Mongoloid tribe who inhabited the extreme northeast corner of Siberia. In Chukchi, the women tended to substitute /ts/ for /ch/ and /r/ and /tsts/ for /rk/ and /chh/. Thus where the men would say /ramichhin/, "people," women would say /tsankitstsin/. Furfey also commented upon the grammatical differences between men's and women's language among the Chiquito of Bolivia. Contrary to Sapir's account of Yana, here "in the men's language two genders are distinguished". "Nouns designating gods, demons, and men are masculine, while those designating women, the lower animals regardless of sex, and all other concepts are feminine. There is an elaborate system of gender inflections involving, not only nouns, but all the words of the language except a few invariable particles." Furfey pointed out that this system resulted in a sharp distinction between

constructions containing masculine nouns and those containing feminine nouns. However, in the women's language the gender distinctions did not exist. Men, therefore used masculine constructions when speaking of masculine nouns and feminine constructions when speaking of feminine nouns, while the women used the feminine constructions in all cases regardless of gender. Thus men say, /n-ipoostii nqui tupas/, "the house of God," while women say, /n-ipoos n-tupas/ with the same meaning (p. 210).

Haas (1964) cited the differences in men's and women's speech in Koasati which is a Muskogean language now spoken in southwestern Louisiana. Haas found that other Muskogean languages, such as Muskogee and Kitchiti, also had such differences formerly. Sometimes the differences in these languages affect vocabulary items, and sometimes the pronunciation of particular words. Haas noted an interesting point in her discussion of the language differences when she said: "It is of interest to note that at the present time only middle-aged and elderly women use the women's forms, while younger women are now using the forms characteristic of men's speech (p. 229)." Here also, as in the previous accounts, we find that "members of each sex are quite familiar with both types of speech and can use either as occasion demands. Thus if a man is telling a tale he will use women's forms when quoting a female character; similarly, if a woman is telling a tale she will use men's forms when quoting a male character. Also, as Jespersen pointed out in his account of the Caribe,

the Muskogean parents were formerly accustomed to correct the speech of children of either sex, since each child was trained to use forms appropriate to his or her sex.

The ethnographic accounts then would aid in the realization that male/female differences in language are not so rare as might be supposed. However, until recently, Jespersen's Language: Its Nature, Development and Origin (1922) had the only extensive discussion of sex differences in the English language and contained one of the few published discussions of the topic. Jespersen devoted an entire chapter to "The Woman" in which he made many claims about women's speech some of which we cite here:

1. Word Choice - Women are euphemistic, exercising a great and universal influence on linguistic development through their instinctive shrinking from coarse and gross expressions and their preference for refined and (in certain spheres) veiled and indirect expressions (p. 246). While men swear, women use euphemistic substitutes (e.g. men: "hell"; women: "the other place"). Through the invention and use of slang, men are the "chief renovators of language." This is not invalidated by the fact that quite recently, with the rise of the feminist movement, many young ladies have begun to imitate their brothers in that as well as in other respects (p. 248).

2. Vocabulary - Women's vocabulary is less extensive, and more in the central field of language (avoiding the bizaare) than is that of men, and "men take greater interest in words as such and in their acoustic properties" (pp. 248-249).

3. Adverbs - Women are fond of hyperbole, using more adverbs of intensity ("awfully," "pretty," "terribly nice," "quite," "so") (p. 250).

4. Sentence Construction - Women much more often than men break off without finishing their sen-

tences, because they start talking without having thought out what they are going to say (p. 250). The sexes have different ways of building sentences: men use more intricate structures, with clause within clause (like a set of Chinese boxes); women add on clauses (building sentences like stringing pearls), the gradation between ideas marked not grammatically, but "emotionally," by stress and intonation.

Jespersen gathered most of his information from his own experience and from the literature of his day. It is interesting to note that although, for the most part, he found that women's language was "inferior" to that of men, from an intellectual point of view, he conceded that the differences were attributable to "thousands of years of male supremacy". Men had the kind of work, "war and hunting," that did not give them much occasion to talk because most situations were "fraught with danger". Women, on the other hand, were occupied with domestic chores which did not demand such bursts of intense energy and were, "until quite recently her almost exclusive concern - - things which for the most part demanded no deep thought, which were performed in company and could well be accompanied with a lively chatter." Jespersen concluded his investigation with the comment that although "lingering effects of this state of things are seen still, great social changes are going on in our times which may eventually modify even the linguistic relations of the two sexes (p. 254).

With the emergence of the Women's Liberation Movement some social scientists and linguists have begun to speculate about how language has helped to maintain rigid sex role

barriers. Lakoff (1973) has served as a catalyst for other investigators with her study, Language and Woman's Place. She endeavored to indicate how "women experience linguistic discrimination in two ways: in the way they are taught to use language, and in the way general language use treats them." Lakoff has stated succinctly that women are relegated "to certain subservient functions: that of sex-object or servant; and that therefore certain lexical items mean one thing applied to man, another to woman, a difference that cannot be predicted except with reference to the different roles the sexes play in society (p. 46)."

Lakoff's discussion parallels that of Jespersen and seems to draw the same inferences about male/female language differences. However, Lakoff goes further in her discussion by presenting a strong rationale for the manner in which women might conceivably change their mode of speech so as to be more assertive and change their image from "weak" to "strong". Also, Lakoff's study has emerged at a time when there is much concern with male/female differences and she has succeeded in prompting language researchers, in particular, to enter the fray, if only to test her various hypotheses.

Lakoff explains that women have a distinctive style of speech which avoids strong statements and has connotations of uncertainty and triviality. A woman who wants to be taken seriously learns to adopt male ("neutral") vocabulary and style of speech. She discusses the difference between the

sexes in choice and frequency of lexical items as indicated by women's "more precise discriminations in naming colors than men . . .," routinely using terms like "beige, ecru, aquamarine, and lavender" which most men do not have in their active vocabularies (p. 49). Lakoff explains why this is so:

Men tend to relegate to women things that are not of concern to them, or do not involve their egos. Among these are problems of fine color discrimination . . . since women are not expected to make decisions on important matters, like what kind of job to hold, they are relegated the non-crucial decisions as a sop. Deciding whether to name a color 'lavender' or 'mauve' is one such sop (p. 49).

Lakoff also states that women use weaker expletives than men: "Women are more likely to say "oh dear," "goodness," or "fudge," while men use stronger expletives like shit and damn and hell, for example. Thus, given the following two sentences, Lakoff argues (p. 50), most listeners would identify the latter as "men's language";

1. Oh dear, you've put the peanut butter in the refrigerator again.
2. Shit, you've put the peanut butter in the refrigerator again.

Hence, according to Lakoff, men are allowed "stronger" means of expression than are now open to women, which further reinforces men's position of strength in the real world. Further, "if someone is allowed to show emotions, and consequently does, others may well be able to view him as a real individual in his own right, as they could not if he never showed emotion." From this we learn that, contrary to Anglo-

American stereotypes, men are the emotional sex, and that their unchecked tongues and tempers have helped them achieve psychological, social and economic happiness.

Lakoff explains that women are more likely to use adjectives like "adorable," "charming," "lovely," "divine" while males use "neutral" adjectives such as "great," "terrific," "neat." She claims that the women's words suggest that the referent is frivolous, trivial and unimportant to the world at large. (This researcher has very rarely heard women use the words "adorable" and "divine" but has heard many women use the words "great" and "terrific".)

In regard to syntax, Lakoff says that women more often use tag-questions ("John is here, isn't he?" as opposed to the direct question form, "Is John here?"). The tag form is used when the speaker is stating a claim but lacks full confidence in the truth of that claim; it gives the addressee leeway, not forcing him to go along with the views of the speaker which is another way in which women's speech patterns avoid making strong statements. Lakoff notes that women are more likely to couch wishes in the form of requests rather than commands, (the male province), so as to avoid imposing views or claims on the addressee, seeming to be more polite.

Lakoff does not indicate whether or not a certain group of women ever use strong expletives, or if a certain group of men ever refrain from using strong expletives. This is just one of Lakoff's unsupported assertions about women's

language that could be reformulated as an hypothesis, then tested in a controlled experiment or checked for validity against data gathered in natural speech situations. Lakoff's is a subjective view rather than an objective one even though she is apparently writing as an observer. Lakoff herself states that the data on which she based her claims "have been gathered mainly by introspection: I have examined my own speech and that of my acquaintances, and have used my own intuitions in analyzing it. I have also made use of the media . . . (p. 46)." However, in defense of her method, Lakoff says that: "If we are to have a good sample of data to analyze, this will have to be elicited artificially from someone; I submit I am as good an artificial source of data as anyone (p. 47)."

Although Lakoff (1973) refers to "women's language," she seems to be using the term language in a loose sense since no one claims that women and men use mutually unintelligible codes in English or in any other language. Ervin-Tripp's (1972) term "style," which suggests the co-occurrence of linguistic features, seems to be a more appropriate designation for the speech patterns associated with men and with women. Another relevant term is "variety," (Fishman, 1972), which refers to "a kind of language," and includes, for example, dialects (both social and regional), distinctive forms associated with ethnic or religious groups, and the specialized language of occupational groups. In Fishman's terminology, "variety" designates "a member of a verbal

repertoire." However, since the term "women's language" is so prevalent in the literature and has come to be known as a particular area of investigation we will continue its use in this study.

It is a sociolinguistic tenet that sex differences in language may vary with group situation and role and Key (1972) stresses the sociolinguistic concept in the examination of male/female language. She explains that "many of the differences which are attributed to male and female behavior are mixed in complex ways with other dimensions of behavior. Differences between the male and female are probably not as great as 'what everyone knows' them to be (p. 16)." Research does indeed show that "there are differences" in males' and females' linguistic behavior "as well as in references made to male and female but these differences may not occur when speakers are in roles other than the sex role" (p. 29).

Key agrees with Lakoff about the area of so-called "coarse language". However, Key amplifies the concept that men are permitted stronger language than women by stating that women believe and have believed that they are perpetuating femininity by accepting the lower status that has been imposed on them by the "limitations" in the female's linguistic habits. She says that women have also been kept out of the running by the use of religious instruction to the effect that it is right and the natural order of things for the woman to be limited in her linguistic habits in order to

maintain the womanly image. Key states that these are powerful beliefs in the minds of females who want to be 'real ladies' and in the minds of males who treasure and revere their 'true ladies' (p. 102).

To stretch a point, Trudgill (1974) comments on this area of limitations in the female's linguistic habits when he states that WC (working class) speech has connotations of masculinity because it is associated with roughness and toughness which are, to an extent, desirable masculine attributes. They are not, on the other hand, considered to be desirable feminine characteristics. On the contrary, refinement and sophistication are much preferred (p. 94).

Many studies seem content to suggest or document one more type of difference between women and men. However, difference is only one part of the picture and the fact of male dominance which is built into the economic, family, political, and legal structures of society is also central to language and speech. It is the language which aids in the enactment and transmission of every type of inequality, including that between the sexes. As Henley (1974) says: "It is part of the 'micropolitical structure' that helps maintain the larger political-economic structure."

Terms applied to women are narrower in reference than those applied to men, and they are more likely to assume derogatory sexual connotations which overshadow other meaning (Schulz, 1975; Saporta, 1974; Lakoff, 1973). This derogation and overgeneralization is related to the process of

stereotyping and is also present in other situations of dominance, e.g., racial and ethnic situations.

Schulz (1975) explains that:

An analysis of the language used by men to discuss and describe women reveals something about male attitudes, fears, and prejudices concerning the female sex. Again and again in the history of the language, one finds that a perfectly innocent term designating a girl or woman may begin with totally neutral or even positive connotations, but that gradually it acquires negative implications, at first perhaps only slightly disparaging, but after a period of time becoming abusive and ending as a sexual slur (p. 65).

Schulz (ibid) gives examples indicating that disparagement gravitates more toward terms for women than for men. She compares, for example, the connotations of bachelor with those of spinster or old maid or the innocuousness of warlock with the insinuations of witch. Also, when a term designating a man is used to denote a woman, there is usually no affront. However, when a term generally applied to a woman is used to designate a man there is probably an insult implied (op. cit.).

Saporta (1974) also comments upon the evidence in the language connoting the female stereotype and discusses the asymmetries that are common in the lexicon and cites the following examples: "although man and boy may correspond to woman and girl, there is no equivalent for guy. The words for males seem to provide for a general ageless category not available for females (p. 3)."

Suardiez (1973), in a Master's Thesis concerning sexism in the Spanish language, also discusses asymmetry in that she

says that "one of my principal guidelines for deciding when a lexical item or expression is significant for an analysis of sexism in the language has been asymmetry: asymmetry in meaning, where the feminine form of a word has a meaning different from that of the masculine, (e.g., innocente only means "not guilty" when said of a man, but may mean "virgin" when applied to a woman) (p. 6).

Reik (1953) mentions what he thinks are differences in the ways that men and women use the same words. A word such as "sex," "love," or "home" might have different connotations for the two sexes.

Clark (1977) also comments about sexism in language and states that "the problem with sexism in language is that it reflects and helps perpetuate sexism in society. It is simplistic to believe that by changing a few vocabulary items we can change society; but it is not simplistic to hope that increased awareness of the ways in which language reflects underlying prejudices will be part of the climate necessarily preceding change (p. 4)."

It has been found that women use linguistic forms associated with the prestige norm more frequently than do men. Labov (1966) found that in careful speech women use fewer stigmatized forms than men or feel freer to acknowledge them; lower middle class women show the most extreme form of this behavior. There are implications for the role of women in furthering linguistic change (p. 288). Recent studies in New York, Detroit, and Chicago also show that women use more

exact word forms in their casual speech, and correct more sharply to the other extreme in their formal speech. Labov (1970) states that "the pattern is particularly marked in lower middle-class women, who show the most extreme form of this behavior." However, he also indicates that "there is some question as to whether lower class women are also more sensitive to social norms of speech (p. 197)."

Women do not, however always lead in the course of linguistic change; Labov's study of the speech of Martha's Vineyard (1963) found male speakers carried some new forms; Trudgill (1972) suggests that in Norwich men lead in the use of new vernacular forms in casual speech. Trudgill says that the social position of women in our society is less secure than that of men, and generally speaking, subordinate to that of men. It is therefore more necessary for women to secure and signal their social status linguistically . . . , and they are more aware of the importance of this type of signal (p. 94). One could say then, that it is not that women lead in linguistic change, but rather that the sexual differentiation of speech often plays a major role in the mechanism of linguistic evolution.

CONCLUSION

It is the aim of this study to contribute to the growing body of research in the area of Women's Language. The particular interest of this researcher is in the development of attitudes via the linguistic environment since language exists not in a social vacuum but at the very core of human interaction.

The question of whether or not language affects the thought and culture of the people who use it remains to be answered. Even if we were to agree that it does, we would have difficulty calculating the extent to which the language we use influences our society. There is no doubt, on the other hand, that a language reflects the thoughts, attitudes, and culture of the people who make it and use it.

A distinction in the speech of men and women, sometimes quite extensive and sometimes confined to only a few expressions, is a not uncommon linguistic phenomenon. It would also appear that there is linguistic evidence in scattered instances, that the existence of these distinctions is associated with an assertion of masculine superiority.

CHAPTER II

THE PRESENT STUDY

This study will attempt to determine whether, in actuality, there is a linguistic dichotomy which is governed by our social environment and our general attitude toward the male and female and their roles in society.

This study will examine the hypothesis that pre- and post-puberty females as opposed to pre- and post-puberty males, when tested with written tasks, will:

1. Use more words on the basis of total words used.
2. Use fewer sentences.
3. Use fewer expletives.

The study will also attempt to determine whether or not, with development, there is any change in the "female stereotype." A number of queries need to be posited. Does the socio-economic and educational background of parents have anything to do with the development of a female stereotype? Will females from an upper middle class background be less typical than those of a lower middle class background? The assumption is that linguistic change as a result of change in the social background or environment will manifest itself first in the upper classes. Labov (1971) states that "lower middle class speakers tend to adopt the formal speech patterns of the younger, upper middle class speakers. This tendency provides feedback mechanism which is potentially capable of accelerating the introduction of any prestige

feature (p. 101)."

Warshay (1971) in her study, "Sex Differences in Language Style," also employed the written response and was able to determine that "the male is more active, more ego-involved in what he does, and is less concerned about others. The female adult "exhibits concern with 'being' (pp. 8-9)."

The study will attempt to determine whether females use more words than males based on the total words used.

Meredith, Hobby and Craik (1969) state that "women attained a higher mean word count than men in eight of nine descriptions in a given kind of social situation." One third of the comparisons of the sex differences were statistically significant.

However, Wood (1966) states that "men tend to use more words per utterance in a given verbal task than do women (p. 139)." These researchers have had conflicting results with oral tasks. It is the contention here that written tasks might provide yet another dimension to the problem of determining whether females (as opposed to males) use more words on the basis of total words used.

It would be interesting to note whether the written responses vary greatly from those responses derived from oral testing and what those differences, if any, mean in terms of this particular research project.

Hiatt (1977) in reference to sentence length states that "an examination of one aspect of writing style - sentence length - offers no support for the stereotypes, that

women acquire and use words more easily than do men, for in general, the women in Hiatt's study phrased their thoughts in shorter rather than longer units than did the men. In written style, the women are more terse than the men (p. 21). In this study we will try to determine whether females use fewer sentences than do males and thus demonstrate terseness as Hiatt found female writers to be comparatively terse and the men to be comparatively long-winded and wordy (p. 121). In fact, Hiatt claims that as far as sentence length is concerned, there is no justification whatsoever for believing that the "masculine" style is terse and the "feminine" style is verbose. If anything, the opposite is true (p. 38).

Whether or not women use as many expletives as men has been investigated from various points of view. Flexner (1960) writes, in the preface to the Dictionary of American Slang:

In my work in this dictionary, I was constantly aware that most American slang is created and used by males. Many types of slang words -- including the taboo and strongly derogatory ones, those referring to sex, women, work, money, whiskey, politics, transportation, sports, and the like -- refer primarily to male endeavor and interest. The majority of entries in this dictionary could be labelled "primarily masculine use...." Men also tend to avoid words that sound feminine or weak. Thus there are sexual differences in the standard vocabularies of men and women.

Lakoff (1973) notes that while expletives are used by both men and women in American society, "the 'stronger' expletives are reserved for men, and the 'weaker' ones for women." Lakoff, in contending that women use weaker exple-

tives than men is probably referring to her own age group (approximately in the thirties). Thus, language behavior is variable and dependent upon domain, mood, identity and other interactional features. There is evidence that females of different age groups act differently in their language behavior vis a vis expletives: younger women seeming to use strong expletives more freely, while older women (those over 55) seem to fit the model Lakoff suggests, that is, negating the use of these 'stronger' expletives even in more intimate situations.

Conklin (1973) in responding to Labov's (1968) statement that "males are the chief exemplars of the vernacular culture" says that there is "no conclusive evidence that females do not participate fully in the vernacular culture. Sociolinguistic data do not show that women are less non-standard in casual, relaxed, natural speech, only that they are less likely to exhibit their most relaxed speech styles in front of a linguistic investigator, especially a male investigator (p. 11)." And, as she further remarks, the female-only group has rarely been investigated and male speech has simply been studied more than female speech; not only that, it has been reported as if it is the speech of both sexes.

Oliver and Rubin (1975) took exception to Lakoff's conclusions about expletives and administered a written questionnaire to a group of Oliver's friends and acquaintances. They felt that, within the group, two variables might affect the

results:

1. whether the women were married or not.
2. whether the women said they felt they were liberated or not.

Oliver and Rubin found that:

1. there really are some clearcut differences between so called strong and weak expletives as Lakoff suggested in her article.
2. that all women vary their usage depending on the formality of the situation, the degree of intimacy and the need to put forth their identity.
3. that married and single women both share and differ in their use of these expletives (though single women generally use them more frequently).
4. that women who said they are working on being liberated tend to use the expletives more frequently than either those who said they feel completely liberated or those who said they feel not at all liberated (p. 196).

The authors conclude that if their study had been done with women in the 20 - 40 age group, they might have found that the use of strong expletives was far greater. Also, they did not examine the responses of men in the same age group and social class.

Bailey and Timm (1976), in a follow-up of the Oliver and Rubin study, were also interested in testing the Lakoff (1973) assertion that, in the United States at least, women do not in general use strong expletives such as "Shit," "Damn," "Fuck," etc., these being reserved in the main for male speakers of American English, who, accordingly, are thought (by Lakoff) to enjoy the psychological advantages of

possessing a more vigorous and effective means of self-expression than do women.

The purpose of Bailey and Timm's work was to see if, in a self-report questionnaire, differences in the use of strong expletives would emerge across sex and age lines. Their study, to some extent, complements that of Oliver and Rubin who did not survey men or younger women. It is interesting to note that according to their results there is a high incidence of strong expletives among the women aged 31 to 34. They state that a possible factor involved in this increased tendency to use 'strong language' may well be, as Oliver and Rubin report, the result of affiliation to or sympathy with the women's liberation movement; or, it may be the fruit of a more open and relaxed set of attitudes about sex rules which the women's movement has, to a considerable extent, helped promulgate (p. 442).

Bailey and Timm conclude that the youngest women seem to view strong expletives more as stylistic devices than as expressions of emotion or attitude. They state that for the youngest group the expletives seem to be relatively free of moral or ethical overtones; however, for the older women (and especially for the women in the oldest group), strong expletives appear still to pack some profane or obscene punch, so their deployment may better reflect the speaker's emotional state or mood. It was immediately apparent that the men, overall, responded with a far wider range of strong expletives than the women did. The women's expletives

cluster around Damn (and its variants), Shit, Oh (my) God and Fuck (p. 443). They found that men did, overall, use more expletives than women but this finding masks the significance of the factor of age.

These findings suggest that influence of age on female speech patterns must not be overlooked. Moreover, it is doubtless the case that numerous additional factors - such as regional, socioeconomic and educational background - are of considerable importance in shaping women's verbal behavior. It is of interest to determine whether Bailey and Timm's findings will hold among the current elementary, high school and college populations, among which the females have been more affected by the "onslaught" of women's Liberation. We are interested in the outcome of a written exercise, which does not require the use of one's name, which would elicit multi-word citations in a grammatical context and would measure the use or non-use of expletives by both males and females in the written form.

Sagarin (1969) has indicated that from "ungrammatical constructions to forbidden words, a shadow language, an outlawed language, thrives. It takes on many shapes and forms, serves many purposes, and seems to be classifiable into categories that overlap only slightly. From these categories one can readily assume that the term 'expletives' covers a broad range of so-called dirty words and the speech of blasphemy and its corruption into non-profane slang." He further says that:

Shocking and tabooed, these words are nevertheless employed with the greatest of frequency. If one focuses attention particularly on the nonbiological uses of these words and phrases, perhaps one can utilize this aspect of our language (and hence our culture) to demonstrate how, as Sapir stated, language 'powerfully conditions all our thinking about social problems and processes' (p. 28).

It would seem that most of the existing literature on women's language refers to limited populations, those of college age or older, or nursery school children. This study is concerned with testing the groups in between as representative of contemporary mores. It has also been difficult for most researchers to avoid generalizations. It is hoped that this study will avoid generalizing by specifically answering certain questions regarding one particular domain. Further, a study analyzing written responses might provide insights about perceived sex role differences and stereotypes.

According to Lakoff (1973) children are ostracized, scolded, or made fun of by adults and peers for not speaking the "correct" language for their sex. But if a little girl learns her lesson well, her "women's language" will later be an excuse for others to keep her in a demeaning position and/or to refuse to take her seriously. Further, as they mature, boys go through a state of rough talk normally discouraged in girls; at around 10, when they split up into same-sex peer groups, both languages seem to be present. Boys have unlearned their original language and adopted new forms, while girls retain their old speech.

Mead (1949) says that in order to establish male identity, males go through what she calls 'the second weaning'; at some point, often around five or six, they break a close bond with the mother, begin to identify with the father and male culture, and at the same time, switch speech patterns. She says that males have the need to prove their masculinity

and to assert themselves as not feminine and that this is, or seems to be, central to male identity (p. 160).

Labov (1972) states that ". . . women play an important part in the mechanism of linguistic change. To the extent that parents influence children's early language, women (parents) do so even more; certainly women talk to young children more than men do, and have a more direct influence during the years when children are forming linguistic rules with greatest speed and efficiency (p. 243)."

Gleason and Berko (1971) did an observational study of a child's emerging control of different language styles, made on natural conversations in families with several children, ranging in age from infancy to 8 years. In adult-to-child communication, they found distinctions between the manner of address used with boy and girl children. Boy babies tended to be addressed in a "Hail-Baby-Well-Met style," especially by fathers, while being played with heartily. "Girl babies were dealt with more gently, both physically and verbally." There is no mention here of differences between the sexes of adults in their address to children (except for the mention of father), nor of differences in children's address to different-sex adults or children.

Mead (ibid) had also discussed this roughhousing with boys and stated that "with enormous variations in class and region, there is still a tendency for little boys to learn about maleness by a vis-a-vis rough-house with their fathers and older brothers that is carried over later into

the approved rough-housing, jocose insult, and endless hearty banter of male groups (p. 276)."

McCarthy (1953) argues along related, although somewhat different lines, suggesting that girls have the edge in early language development partly because they can identify with and imitate the mother's speech. The mother is at home more and talks more than the father and so boys, who need to identify with the father, have less possibility for echo-reaction with the deeper adult male voice.

Labov (1972) observes that since women talk to young children more than men do, they have special influence on the rate and direction of special change.

Cherry (1975) found that there are differences in the speech styles of boys and girls which may be accounted for by differences in the quality and quantity of the children's verbal interactions with their caretakers. From the moment of birth, females and males are talked to differently by the adults in their environments.

These are some of the obvious ways that male/female language differences manifest themselves. The question is, will these and other supposed differences continue to obtain when the sexes are tested with controls for age, education and socioeconomic background? Does there exist an actual dichotomy which is governed by our social environment and our general attitude toward the male and female?

Thus this study will procure verbal responses from males and females of differing ages and varying socioeconomic status in an effort to assess the influences of these variables on word quantity, sentence length and use of expletives.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

To answer the questions posed in the previous chapter, samples of language behavior had to be gathered from males and females of varying age and social class. The first design issue was whether the responses should be oral or written. Although free speech might be more spontaneous than written responses, two factors governed our eventual choice of the latter: (1) the need for large sample sizes to overcome the literature tendency to make assertions on too few cases and (2) concern that interpersonal factors, such as sex of experimenter, might influence the nature of the material gathered in a face-to-face recording situation.

Task Construction

Given that written responses would be employed, it was felt that the best opportunity to retrieve naturalistic language would be provided by scenarios containing provocations by an actor to which subjects would be invited to make anonymous replies. The activity would thus be somewhat akin to the invitation a wall presents to a graffiti artist. It was, of course, essential that the scenarios appear equally plausible to a ten-year old or a college student, and that none of the provocations be more appropriate to one sex than the other.

Beyond these general desiderata, it was necessary that the scenarios vary in respect of our research questions, i.e., the sex and age of the actor. Additionally, it seemed reasonable to determine whether it mattered if the actor spoke to the subject or acted on the subject, particularly as this might influence the use of expletives in responses.

Accordingly, after much trial and error, four scenarios were devised which met these criteria, and which could be presented with either a male or female actor. Table I displays the final stimuli, coded according to their roles in the design, with parentheses denoting the two sex variants of each protagonist.

TABLE 1
FOUR PROVOCATIVE SCENARIOS

<u>Scenario</u>	<u>Role</u>	<u>Text</u>
1	Child Speaking	You are standing on the corner holding two ice cream cones when a (boy/girl) on roller skates stops in front of you and says: "Why are you holding two ice cream cones?" What do you say?
2	Child Acting	You are standing on a corner and a (boy/girl) on a tricycle runs over your toe, what do you say?
3	Adult Speaking	A teenaged (boy/girl) meets you on the street and says: "Seeing as it's not Halloween, tell me why you're wearing a Halloween mask." What do you say?
4	Adult acting	A teenaged (boy/girl) shoves you in order to get ahead of you in line, what do you say?

Subjects

A total of 225 individuals from three separate age groups responded to the four scenarios. The age groups were defined educationally as fifth graders, tenth graders and college students. The choice of these particular groups was dictated by our desire to assess sex differences in verbal aggressiveness and obscenity on a developmental basis, wherein the groups were presumed to represent pre-pubescence, post-pubescence, and sexual maturity, respectively.

To insure some variation in social class, subjects were recruited both from private and public schools, the latter groups accessed only after overcoming severe resistance by the New York City Board of Education. In the final sample, 11 schools contributed subjects in varying quantities as indicated in Table 2.

Beyond responding to the four scenarios, each subject completed a questionnaire designed to elicit information regarding parental education and employment so that inferences regarding social class might be made according to a well established system pioneered by Labov (1966). Additionally, each subject was invited to indicate his or her own social class aspirations and birth order, in case variation in these measures might be relevant to task performance. The actual questionnaire is shown in Appendix A while the statistics gleaned from it are summarized in Table 3.

TABLE 2
SOURCES OF SUBJECTS FOR THIS STUDY

<u>AGE GROUP</u>	<u>SAMPLE SIZE</u>
Fifth Graders	95
Public School 114	27
Public School 288	30
Birch Wathen School (Private)	38
Tenth Graders	52
Music and Art H.S.	21
Edward R. Murrow H.S.	19
Bentley School (Private)	12
College Students	78
City College, CUNY	19
Hunter College, CUNY	15
Brooklyn College, CUNY	25
St. Francis College (private)	5
Fordham University (private)	14
Total Sample	225

TABLE 3
SUBJECT CHARACTERISTICS FOR EACH AGE GROUP

<u>Age Group</u>	Fifth Grade	Tenth Grade	College
<u>Sample Size</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>78</u>
<u>Sex</u> Males	46	24	32
Females	49	28	46
<u>Age</u> Mean	10.19	15.38	20.19
S.D.	0.42	0.77	2.23
<u>Social Class Level</u> ¹			
Lower	8	5	21
Working	31	9	20
Middle	20	17	17
Upper Middle	36	21	20
<u>Birth Order</u>			
First	57	27	30
Second	31	16	24
Third	4	7	13
Fourth or More	3	2	11

¹Social Class Level determined by parental education and employment according to Labov (1966).

Procedure

The subjects were tested in their classroom during regular school sessions. After being introduced by the teacher, the experimenter introduced the task as an interlude in the day's activities during which she hoped to get a better idea of the language people currently use. Without exception, the students were cooperative and retrospectively reported having enjoyed the activity.

Subjects required between 30 and 40 minutes to complete the task, during which each subject responded to the eight scenarios indicated in Table 1. There were, however, four different orders of scenario presentation in which sex roles and action-speaking sequences were permuted in all possible combinations subject only to the constraint that both sex versions of any scenario were adjacent, and that Scenarios 1 and 2 (child agents) always preceded Scenarios 3 and 4 (adult agents).

A total of 255 subjects performed the task, but upon analysis of their responses, 30 cases were discarded because of failure to make response to one or more scenarios. The bulk of these failures occurred in the P.S.288 and the St. Francis College samples. Tables 2 and 3 describe the final data base after the failures were discarded.

CHAPTER IV

Results

The data base for this study consisted of the responses of 225 subjects to 8 scenarios for a total of 1800 performances. Each of these generated five dependent variables which were coded for computer analysis as described below and summarized for each sex and age group in Table 4.

Dependent Variables

Number of Sentences. The vast majority of responses were single sentences so that the modal sum over the eight scenarios was 8. The range, however, extended to 21, whence a sentence sum was posted for each subject.

Number of Words. The majority of subjects wrote between 8 and 12 words for each scenario, but the range was very great. One fifth grade boy produced only 27 words over the whole task, while one tenth grade girl wrote 299 words!

Words per Sentence. Since there is an obvious correlation between number of words and number of sentences, an average was computed for each scenario. For the majority this varied from 8 to 11 words per sentence, but one fifth grade boy averaged less than 4 and another verbose girl averaged 22 words per sentence. The latter child also began every response with "I would say," thereby repeating the question posed with each scenario. This form of indirect response was fairly rare, 163 subjects never employing it at all. The remainder used it infrequently except for 13 fifth

TABLE 4

FIVE MEASURES OF PERFORMANCE FOR EACH SEX AND AGE GROUP

Age Group	Fifth Grade		Tenth Grade		College	
Sex	M	F	M	F	M	F
Number of Cases	46	49	24	28	32	46
1. Number of Sentences Over 8 Scenarios						
Mean	8.98	10.08	8.87	9.82	8.72	8.87
S.D.	2.46	3.17	1.36	2.96	1.37	1.53
2. Number of Words						
Mean	10.17	12.63	11.16	12.30	9.23	8.98
S.D.	3.60	4.49	3.51	7.50	3.45	3.81
3. Words Per Sentence						
Mean	9.32	10.81	10.28	9.90	8.65	8.11
S.D.	3.08	4.13	3.40	3.77	3.16	2.95
4. Number of Expletives						
Mean	0.13	0.05	0.30	0.25	0.12	0.10
S.D.	0.27	0.18	0.32	0.23	0.18	0.20
5. Affect Rating 1 - Cordial 5 - Hostile						
Mean	1.92	1.76	2.19	2.03	1.65	1.58
S.D.	0.89	0.66	0.73	0.62	0.53	0.57

graders and 5 college students, divided equally between the sexes. That sample was too small to permit further consideration of the matter.

Number of Expletives. Our quest to procure expletives must be considered only moderately successful since only 247 of them occurred in 1800 performances. Indeed, 147 subjects produced none at all, presumably because the demand for written responses was too forbidding. This constraint, however, varied with age, tenth graders being the least inhibited.

Out of 95 fifth graders, 16 children produced at least one expletive, one boy achieving a sum of 8. Out of 52 tenth graders, there were 37 producers, one male sum reaching 10. Out of 78 college students, there were 25 producers, the peak for one male reaching 7.

Despite these asymmetries of occurrence, an expletive sum was posted for each scenario and the words transcribed for later analysis.

Affect Rating. Two volunteer judges evaluated each response for affective tone. One was a male law student, the other a female college senior. Both would be categorized as upper middle class according to Labov's system (1966), and presumably employed the social reference system of that class in performing their task. The judges worked independently but thereafter conferenced to achieve consensus on any disparities.

Affect was judged on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being very cordial and 5 very hostile. Two examples of each scale

rating are presented in Table 5 to permit a reader to observe the vast range of affect elicited. It should be noted that the categories of the scale were employed very asymmetrically, the steps from 1 to 5 garnering 51, 27, 14, 6 and 2 percent of the judges' votes respectively. We thus see that the modal response was a cordial one, but nonetheless there was a sufficient range of ratings to permit posting one for each scenario.

Beyond affect ratings, some of the responses were considered sufficiently interesting to warrant special scrutiny. These are gathered in Appendix B and will be discussed in the next chapter.

Analysis of Scenario Effects

The four dependent variables with separate scenario scores were subjected to repeated measures analyses of variance in order to assess the effects of actor sex (male or female), actor age (prepubescent or postpubescent), and nature of action (asking or doing). These analyses were performed separately for each age group, with sex of subject as the independent variable.

Significant findings are presented below, while the 24 summary tables may be found in Appendix C.

Number of Words. In the college sample the only significant effect was that of actor sex, the female scenarios provoking more words than the male scenarios (9.51 vs. 8.70), $F(1, 76)=10.20, p<.01$. In the tenth grade sample, the only significant effect was an interaction between actor age and

TABLE 5

EXAMPLES OF RESPONSES OF VARYING AFFECT

<u>Affect Rating</u>	<u>Subject Grade</u>	<u>Subject Sex</u>	<u>Scenario</u>	<u>Actor Sex</u>	<u>Response</u>
1	5	F	4	F	"Please ask your friend if you can go in front of him or her but please don't go in front of me."
1	5	M	2	M	"Please watch where you're going next time. Please be careful, excuse me, but that hurt."
2	5	F	1	M	"It's none of your business, you jerk!"
2	5	M	3	M	"Leave us alone! The same to you!"
3	10	F	4	F	"Hey get your damn ass in back of me!"
3	10	M	4	M	"Hey, what's the big idea, you big faggot?"
4	10	F	2	M	"You stupid asshole, get the fuck out of here."
4	College	M	4	F	"Hey, you gay son of a bitch, get the hell out of the way!"
5	College	F	4	F	"Who the fuck do you think you are you fucking bitch, next time you better watch your ass."
5	10	M	2	M	"Oh son of a bitch, oh shit. Get the hell out of here or I'm going to put it up your ass."

action, $F(1, 50)=7.05$, $p<.05$. A subsequent Tukey Test established that this was due to subjects using 2.4 fewer words in response to a prepubescent doer (Scenario 2). In the fifth grade sample there were several effects. Girls wrote more words than boys (12.63 vs. 10.17), $F(1, 93)=8.63$, $p<.01$. In the scenarios, there was a highly significant effect of actor age, prepubescent actors provoking more words than postpubescent actors (12.33 vs. 10.47), $F(1, 93)=31.46$, $p<.001$. Additionally, there was the same interaction between actor age and action as was observed with the tenth graders, $F(1, 93)=5.46$, $p<.05$. Here, however, the interaction inhered in subjects using 1.87 fewer words in response to an adult questioner. (Scenario 3).

Words per Sentence. In the college sample there was a significant effect of actor sex, male actors provoking shorter sentences than female actors (8.07 vs. 8.68), $F(1, 76)=9.44$, $p<.01$. There was also an actor age vs. action interaction, $F(1, 76)=5.63$, $p<.05$. This was found to inhere in subjects making no discrimination between young and old actors doing (Scenarios 2 and 4) but answering a child questioner with 1.4 more words per sentence (Scenario 1) than an adult questioner (Scenario 3). In the tenth grade sample shorter sentences were provoked by doers than askers (9.44 vs. 10.74), $F(1, 50)=9.84$, $p<.01$. Again, there was an age by action interaction, $F(1, 50)=6.21$, $p<.05$. Here the effect inhered in subjects using 2.3 fewer words per sentence in response to a prepubescent doer

Scenario 2) than to the other three scenarios. In the fifth grade sample there is a significant effect of actor age, shorter sentences being produced in response to adult actors than to child actors (10.71 vs. 9.42), $F(1, 93)=12.07$, $p<.001$, identical to that described for the college sample. Here, Scenario 1 provoked 2.4 more words per sentence than Scenario 3.

Number of Expletives. Considering the small pool of responses available for analysis, 65, 112 and 70 in the college, tenth grade and fifth grade samples, it was deemed wise to consider only main effects and ignore interactions. In this connection, the college sample produced an effect for actor sex and actor age. Male actors provoked more expletives than female actors (42 vs. 23), $F(1, 76)=7.06$, $p<.01$. Child actors provoked fewer expletives than adult actors (21 vs. 44), $F(1, 76)=5.55$, $p<.05$. In the tenth grade sample, only actor age was significant, child actors provoking far fewer expletives than adult actors (36 vs. 76), $F(1, 50)=12.40$, $p<.001$. In the fifth grade sample, actor age and sex were both significant, with young actors provoking fewer expletives than older actors (24 vs. 46), $F(1, 93)=4.02$, $p<.05$, but paradoxically, female actors provoking more expletives than male actors (39 vs. 32), $F(1, 93)=3.96$, $p<.05$. Additionally, since it was predicted that male subjects would produce more expletives than female subjects, which indeed was the case (50 vs. 20) the difference is minimally significant, $F(1, 93)=2.92$, $p<.05$, one-tailed.

Affect Scale. The affect rating scale generated more scenario effects than any other dependent variable. In the college sample there was a significant effect of actor sex. Male actors provoked more hostility than female actors (1.74 vs. 1.49), $F(1, 76)=26.23$, $p<.001$. Additionally, there was a significant interaction with sex of subject, $F(1, 76)=11.18$, $p<.01$, which inhered in females being slightly, but not significantly, more hostile to males than to females, (1.63 vs. 1.54), whilst males were much more hostile to their own sex than to females (1.86 vs. 1.44). Likewise, there was much more hostility directed to adult actors than to child actors (1.87 vs. 1.36), $F(1, 76)=43.34$, $p<.001$. Again there was a mildly significant interaction with subject sex, $F(1, 76)=4.23$, $p<.05$, which inhered in males being less hostile than females to children (1.32 vs. 1.41) but more hostile to adults (1.98 vs 1.76). There were two scenario interactions, age with sex $F(1, 76)=8.22$, $p<.01$, and age with action, $F(1, 76)=10.64$, $p<.01$. The former inhered in adult males provoking more hostility than would be expected on the basis of sex and age operating additively. The latter interaction inhered in there being a small difference in hostility between young and old doers (1.50 vs. 1.72) but a large difference in hostility toward young and old questioners (1.23 vs. 2.02)!

In the high school sample there were main effects for actor sex and age. Males provoked more hostility than females (2.26 vs. 1.95), $F(1, 50)=10.79$, $p<.01$, and children

provoked less hostility than adults (1.78 vs. 2.44), $F(1, 50)=46.99$, $p<.001$. Additionally, subject sex interacted with actor sex, $F(1, 50)=13.41$, $p<.001$. This interaction matched the college one with a minimal difference in female hostility (2.00 vs. 2.05) but a great difference in male hostility (2.52 vs. 1.85). In addition there were two modest scenario interactions, sex with action, $F(1, 50)=5.12$, $p<.05$, and age with action, $F(1, 50)=5.06$, $p<.05$. The former inhered in there being no discrimination between male and female doers (2.21 vs. 1.98). The latter interaction matched the college sample finding, in that there was a small difference between young and old doers (1.88 vs. 2.31) but a large difference between young and old questioners (1.67 vs. 2.57).

In the fifth grade sample, there were main effects for actor sex, age, and action. Males provoked more hostility than females (1.88 vs. 1.80), $F(1, 93)=5.68$, $p<.05$. Young actors provoked less hostility than adult actors (1.66 vs. 2.02), $F(1, 93)=40.50$, $p<.001$. Questioners provoked less hostility than doers (1.74 vs. 1.94), $F(1, 93)=13.46$, $p<.001$. In the last respect, the youngest age group differs from the two older age groups who only discriminated action in the context of other parameters, age in the case of college students, and age and sex in the case of tenth graders.

Analysis of Demographic Effects

Each of the dependent variables was next reexamined

to determine any overall influence of sex, social class and birth order. (No use was made of the data on subjects' class aspirations since these differed minimally from the class of their parents) For the purpose, a mean value was computed for each dependent variable over all eight scenarios. These were then subjected to separate analyses of variance for each age group in which only main effects could be considered owing to the asymmetric distributions of social class and birth order within each sex.

In the college and tenth grade samples no significant effects were found. In the fifth grade sample, conversely, all three demographic factors had some influence. For simplicity of description these will be summarized according to factors.

Sex differences emerged in number of sentences written and number of words used. Boys used fewer sentences (8.98 vs. 10.08), $F(1, 74)=5.12$, $p<.05$, and fewer words per scenario (10.17 vs. 12.63), $F(1, 74)=10.63$, $p<.01$. Social status proved significant in four variables as summarized in Table 6. Post hoc Scheffe tests revealed that the upper class children produced fewer words ($p<.05$) and fewer words per sentence ($p<.01$) than the other three classes. Regarding both expletives and affect ratings the lower and upper middle class children were indistinguishable and separate from the working and middle class children, who in turn were indistinguishable from each other. The latter group produced significantly more expletives ($p<.05$) and were significantly

TABLE 6

SOCIAL STATUS VARIATIONS IN PERFORMANCES BY FIFTH GRADERS

	<u>Social Status</u>				<u>F(3,74)</u>
	<u>Lower</u>	<u>Working</u>	<u>Middle</u>	<u>Upper Middle</u>	
	N 8	N 31	N 21	N 35	
<u>Variable</u>					
Number of Words					
Mean	13.38	12.48	12.02	9.71	3.96*
S.D.	4.55	3.69	4.85	3.81	
Words Per Sentence					
Mean	11.29	11.17	11.01	8.30	4.13**
S.D.	2.44	3.27	4.69	3.06	
Number of Expletives					
Mean	0.25	1.16	1.33	0.11	3.51*
S.D.	0.71	2.37	2.24	0.68	
Affect Rating					
Mean	1.44	2.18	2.04	1.50	7.27***
S.D.	0.49	0.85	0.94	0.42	

*p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

more hostile ($p .01$). Birth order effects were observed only in the affect ratings, $F(2, 74)=3.17$, $p<.05$, and inhered in the 7 third-or-later-born children (mean=2.54) being more hostile than the 57 first-born or 30 second-born children (means of 1.80 and 1.73, respectively). Because of the asymmetric sample sizes, a final comparison was made between the 7 later-born children and the other two groups combined. The result was $t = 2.54$, $p<.02$, two-tailed, thus affirming this finding.

A final set of analyses were performed to determine whether there were any overall differences among the three age groups or between the two sexes. One way analyses of variance revealed four age group differences. Both with regard to number of words used, $F(2, 222)=7.71$, $p<.001$ and words per sentence, $F(2, 222)=6.54$, $p<.01$, college students were discriminably lower than the other two groups. Regarding expletives, $F(2, 222)=11.40$, $p<.001$, tenth graders used more expletives than the other two groups. Regarding affect level, $F(2, 222)=8.11$, $p<.001$, the tenth graders were significantly more hostile than the college students ($p<.01$) but the fifth graders were not distinguishable from either group.

Regarding overall sex differences, two predictions made at the start of Chapter II were confirmed but a third prediction was reversed. Females did indeed use more words ($t=1.81$) and fewer expletives ($t=1.66$), both findings significant at the .05 level, one-tailed. Additionally,

females exhibited significantly greater variability than males in number of words used, $F(122, 101)=2.25$, $p<.001$, but significantly less variability in number of expletives $F(101, 122)=1.62$, $p<.05$. The reversed finding was that females used more, rather than fewer, sentences than males, $t=2.27$, $p .05$. Here females exhibited more variability than males, $F(122, 101)=1.90$, $p<.001$.

Analysis of Expletive Use

Each of the 247 expletive words or phrases were transcribed and are presented in alphabetic order in Appendix D, wherein male and female usage are separately noted. Altogether 69 distinguishably different words or phrases were elicited, of which 38 occurred only once, and 11 twice. The remaining 20 words are listed in descending rank order in Table 7 together with their male and female frequencies of occurrence. Additionally, 11 words are asterisked which also appeared on Bailey and Timm's list (1976).

Although males produce more expletives than females, there are four conspicuous entries where female usage exceeds male usage: "Bitch," "Fuck You," "Damn," and "Ass". Attempts were made to establish age group differences in choice of particular expletives but no disparities were significant. Finally, it should be noted that males used a more diverse range of expletives than females almost permitting the assertion that the two sexes have differing vocabularies for cursing. Of the 69 words or phrases tabulated, only 16 were contributed by both sexes, 15 of the

TABLE 7

EXPLETIVES ELICITED THREE OR MORE TIMES IN THIS STUDY

<u>Expletive</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
Bitch	5	16	21
Fuck*	11	10	21
Hell*	13	6	19
Son of a Bitch*	13	5	18
Fuck You*	2	15	17
Shit*	5	8	13
Asshole*	5	6	11
Bastard*	8	3	11
God Damn*	6	3	9
Damn*	-	8	8
Ass	-	6	6
Fucking Bitch	3	2	5
Sucker	5	-	5
Fucking	4	-	4
Goddamn It	2	2	4
Damn It*	3	-	3
Faggot	3	-	3
Fuck Off*	3	-	3
Fuck Yourself	2	1	3
Kick Your Ass	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
Totals	94	93	187

*Expletives also occurring in Bailey and Timm (1976)

remainder contributed by females, 38 by males!

Altogether 15 expletives appeared both on our list and that of Bailey and Timm (1976). Table 8 presents them in their order of occurrence in that study, together with their frequencies in the present study. We observe that there are substantial disparities in ranking, confirmed by a non-significant Spearman rank difference correlation ($r_s=.38$). The disparities inhere in the greater frequency on our list of expletives normally directed to a recipient, such as "Fuck You," "Asshole," and "Bastard," and a greater frequency on their list of curse words not requiring a listener such as "Shit" and "Damn".

TABLE 8
EXPLETIVES SHARED WITH BAILEY AND TIMM

<u>Expletives</u>	<u>Bailey and Timm</u>	<u>Present Study</u>
Shit	71	13
Damn	54	8
Damn It	16	3
Fuck	14	21
Son of a Bitch	8	18
Goddamn	7	9
Hell	4	19
Jesus Christ	4	1
Fuck You	2	17
Asshole	1	11
Bastard	1	11
Fuck Off	1	3
Fucked Up	1	2
Stupid Ass	1	1
What The Hell	1	1

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The results will be discussed in the same order in which they were described, first examining scenario effects and then demographic effects. Thereafter we shall examine the use of aggression and expletives.

Scenario Effects

The factors governing the construction of the scenarios influenced the three age groups in differing ways. College students differentiated between male and female actors in all four measures; using more words, longer sentences, fewer expletives and less hostility when responding to females. The role of sex was less prominent in the tenth graders, the age of the actor looming larger in their discrimination especially as it interacted with the actor's behavior. In this group, the child asking a question provoked the longest answers, the least hostility and the fewest expletives. The fifth graders took cognizance of both sex and age. One might infer from this that children learn sex role and age role discrimination very early in life, but during adolescence focus on age more than sex and by college reverse that focus.

We thus see a developmental component to hostility reaction. In the fifth grader it is unalloyedly greater cordiality toward the questioner than the doer. By tenth grade, the children take cognizance of both age and sex, while by college the respondents take cognizance only of age.

From another point of view, we note that all three scenario factors were somewhere relevant in each age group's responses, thereby indicating a shared social covenant regarding the factors: one speaks more words to children than to hostile actors.

Demographic Effects

In the light of the foregoing, it is intriguing to note that the subjects of the study behaved according to the same covenant. Females used more words than males and adults used fewer words than children.

The findings in the fifth grade sample in regard to the demographic factors of sex, social class and birth order were more significant than in either the college or tenth grade samples. In the fifth grade sample, boys used fewer sentences and fewer words than girls and upper class children went to the extreme in this area using the fewest words and the fewest words per sentence than the other three classes. This finding might arise if it were the case that upper middle class children were more confident in the verbal-writing role than their classmates.

The lower class and upper middle class children used fewer expletives and were considered less hostile in their reactions to the scenario actors than the working and middle class children who were alike in their responses. This finding would seem to indicate that in the case of the lower class children it might be their desire for prestige that would inhibit the production of expletives. Conversely, in

the case of the upper class children, the result might stem from a negation of so-called "low class behavior". The use of expletives by the working class and middle class children could relate in some way to their desire to perform in a manner considered to be "macho".

Birth order effects were interesting in that 7 third-or-later-born children were more hostile than the first born or second born children in the sample. This finding might indicate that those children who belong to large families and are younger would have to be more aggressive in order to be heard or to get any attention.

There was a final complicated scenario effect which we have saved for discussion here. We refer to a 3-way interaction between subject-sex, actor-sex and action in the affect scale. Cutting through the complexities, the interaction inheres in fifth grade boys being very hostile to males acting against them while fifth grade girls are very cordial to females asking questions. In one way this complex interaction epitomizes the overall sense of the scenario factors. What seems most interesting to us is that it required the youngest subjects to reveal this interaction.

On The Use of Aggressive Responses

One cannot read the illustrative examples in Appendix B or note the male-only expletives in Appendix D without observing a sex difference in the function of aggression: unlike most female responses, many male responses have an anal focus. This orientation corresponds to that found by Dundes, Leach and Özkök (1972) in discussing verbal dueling by Turkish boys. Although a distinctly different culture, the function may serve similar purposes. The authors' comment that "the same obscenity which keeps the tradition (verbal dueling) out of the reach of most Turkish women has tended to keep it out of the province of scholarship" (p. 135).

Although Dundes, et al are discussing a tradition, the general aim of the anally aggressive taunts and insults is to force one's opponent into a female, passive role. This may be done by defining the opponent or his mother or sister as a wanton sexual receptacle. If the male opponent is thus defined, it is usually by means of casting him as a submissive anus, an anus which must accept the brunt of the verbal duelist's attacking phallus (op cit). Dundes indicates that it is important to play the active role in a homosexual relationship; it is shameful and demeaning to be forced to take the passive role (op cit). The authors state that the distinction between homosexual roles in which only the passive female role brings discredit is not limited to the Turkish culture (p. 147).

It is this aspect of male aggression that permits the repudiation of the female world with its passive sexual role and affirms the male world with its active sexual role. It is a sign of fraternity whereby males recognize one another as part and parcel of a particular group which of course necessitates the exclusion of females.

To the extent that some females employ this anal aspect of the male in-language, they would seem to be engaged in a quest for equality or retaliation. Common sense principles of mental health suggest that women ought to invent their own in-language instead. This male language is derogatory of women and when used by women is self-abusive.

On The Use of Expletives

The roles of men and women in our rapidly changing society are undergoing re-evaluation by such diverse groups as women's liberation, gay liberation, psychological, sociological, and anthropological organizations. Certainly, the changes are bound to affect the social structure and in so doing are bound to affect the linguistic structure of the community. Women have always been described as being more conservative in their speech, and is illustrated by Genet's community of homosexuals:

As for slang, Divine did not use it, any more than did her cronies, the other Nellys . . . Slang was for men. It was the male tongue. Like the language of men among the Caribees, it became a secondary sexual attribute. It was like the colored plumage of male birds, like the multi-colored silk garments which are the prerogatives of the warriors of the tribe. It was a crest and spurs. Everyone could understand it, but the only ones who could speak it were the men who at birth received as a gift the gestures, the carriage of the hips, legs and arms, the eyes, the chest, with which one can speak it. One day at one of our bars, when Mimosa ventured the following words in the course of a sentence . . . "his screwy stories . . .", the men frowned. Someone said with a threat in his voice: "Broad acting tough."

Genet thus agrees with Lakoff (1973) who declares that women do not use strong expletives. Nonetheless this study, as well as Bailey and Timm's (1976), reveal that women do indeed use them. The difference inheres, of course, in the meaning of "usage," wherein the latter studies called for written responses in non social contexts. Goffman (1964) defines the social situation "as an environment of mutual monitoring possibilities, anywhere within which an individual

will find himself accessible to the naked senses of all others who are present, and similarly find them accessible to him" (p. 63).

Clearly, when Bailey and Timm (1976) explicitly ask subjects to write down what expletives they would use in response to common annoyances, or I ask subjects to imagine their replies to scenarios, neither of us are retrieving social language. Rather, we are assessing subjects' competencies without the constraints that govern spoken utterances.

Age does seem to be important for specifying the use of expletives. My findings suggest that the use of strong expletives peaks at the high school age and Bailey and Timm who had older groups suggest that the youngest women in their study (19-25) seemed to view strong expletives more as stylistic devices than as expressions of emotion or attitude and that for older women "strong expletives appear still to pack some profane or obscene punch" (p. 443).

In both studies, the women's expletives cluster around Damn (and its variants), Shit and Fuck. In my study, the males used fuck more often than the females in communicative situations as opposed to the females using the word fuck more than the male in non-communicative swearing. I do not know why the word fuck should be used in such different ways by the males and females. Fuck is an everyday "cussword" for many adolescent males actually having no meaning. For the female, it has been a taboo word and as such is difficult

to articulate in a public situation unless the female has a so-called "tough" image or has achieved a certain level of maturity and sophistication. The female is more likely to rebel against the taboo in private which will then give her the courage to eventually use the taboo word in public but only in certain domains.

Legman (1975) states that "when the word 'fuck' is used as an expletive or curse-word alone, or as 'fuck it!' or 'fuck you!' it has no real erotic meaning, and is being used sadistically or scatologically with an intention of verbal dirtying. Legman (ibid) also discusses the participial form which use he illustrates with an anecdote:

A man in court is explaining why he has been arrested. "I went into this fuckin' one-arm joint and asked for a fuckin' hamburger, and the fuckin' manager went and called a fuckin' cop. I still can't figure out why they arrested me." The arresting policeman cuffs him and says, "Shut up, you! That's no way to talk in court." The judge bangs with his gavel, and shouts, "Officer, who's trying this fuckin' case, you or me?"
(p. 694)

Read (1977) suggests a solution for the problem of obscenity. He states that obscenity must be met by frank, open-minded discussion since it is the product of secrecy and suppression. "A word is obscene not because the thing named is obscene, but because the speaker or hearer regards it, owing to the interference of a taboo, with a sneaking, shame-faced, psychopathic attitude. Surely it is not a wise policy to leave an area of our language in a diseased condition, without attempting to cleanse it. When one refrains from

using the stigmatized words, one is not ignoring the taboo but is actively abetting it (p. 14)." Read asserts that the solution to the problem lies in the adjustment to the use of these words without the reaction of shame and that they should be used unostentatiously.

Language does not exist in a vacuum and does relate to all that is happening around us at any given moment in time. The use of expletives, to my way of thinking, is a form of verbal rebellion and as such is quite harmless. The fact that women are using more expletives now than heretofore would seem to indicate that they are expressing themselves more freely in a rebellious manner that has been quite usual for men but not permissible for women. If we were to deny the possibilities for rebelliousness in language by watering everything down and making the terms unostentatious how indeed might that rebellion be expressed? Also, there may be no logical connection between the use of expletives and rebellion but simply a general tendency to go along with the newest thing.

Reik (1975) states:

The frequent and casual use of four-letter words by some women, especially of expressions denoting sexual and excretory functions, is rarely characteristic of a low level of upbringing and education. In most cases it is an unconscious travesty or parody of men and their manners, and reveals a concealed and often repressed hostility to the male. As such it is comparable to the unconscious mockery contained in the manner in which homosexual men imitate and parody women's speech (p. 697).

Well, perhaps Reik is right in stating that such usage is an unconscious parody of men's usage but with continued usage by women it is probable that the use of expletives will not be an exclusively male tool of aggression and once that happens then we may be able to eradicate the use of obscenities. However, it would be interesting to note whether or not women will create a new set of expletives that indicate aggression towards men as most of the expletives and obscenities now in common use are expressive of aggression towards women and are explicitly derogatory of them.

The respondents in this study who used strong expletives did seem to use them as both stylistic devices and as expressions of emotion or attitude. I concur with Key that the differences between the male and female are not that great and probably the greatest differences occur when males and females are in a sexual role. As stated by Key, research does indeed show that "there are differences" in males' and females' behavior . . . but these differences may not occur when speakers are in roles other than the sex role" (p. 29). In that most of the expletives used in my study were used in provocative male and female situations or in female-to-female situations when angered it occurs to me that both stylistic and emotional devices were utilized.

I do not know if the young women in this study who used strong expletives would use them in more formal situations or, for that matter, as they get older and experience more social restraint. Certainly, since they evidence more

assertiveness in certain areas of speech at this age I dare say they will be more assertive in general than perhaps the generation before them. Also, it is the current fashion for young females to more closely emulate the styles and manners of young males. However, this fashion does not extend to all areas of society, since increasing resistance can be observed in some conservative communities.

Nevertheless, more and more women are entering the business arena as witnessed by a recent series of articles in The Wall Street Journal titled Women at Work (1978) and resistance is lessening or at least seems to be going underground. Perhaps, as men become more accustomed to working with women who are as successful as they, there will be a lessening of anxiety and therefore a change in the language. According to The Wall Street Journal, "Once a small minority, American women who hold a paying job soon may outnumber those who stay at home." They state that the nation's working women are "41 million strong and growing." The interesting point here is that this steady flow of women out of the home and into the labor force has become, to many economists and sociologists, nothing short of a major event, one that is altering our society in ways still not fully understood.

My sense of the importance of the differences in the ways that men and women express themselves has changed. If, it is true, as evidenced from the data in this study, that females, of a particular age, and social background, do use strong expletives then perhaps women have considered and are

considering "outgrowing" all of our old linguistic habits - - e.g., asking questions, speaking politely, as we grow more professional and powerful. I do not think that in the effort to change our status we need to carelessly lose some of the qualities and competencies that contribute to our language, that is, the language that should be shared mutually by men and women, and appreciated as such.

I do believe that there is more overlap between males and females than there are differences between them. Since what constitutes male vs. female traits is determined by our culture and that culture is both overtly and covertly anti-feminist, the masculine traits are those that are highly valued. It would seem that feminine attributes are comprised of nonattributes, in other words, the absence of those traits attributed to males.

There is a great overlap in masculine and feminine speech characteristics and when we attempt to dichotomize behavior into male vs. female traits there is a tendency to obscure the correlational nature of a great deal of the data. It would seem that females who score high in a particular trait are much more similar to males who score high than to females who score low in that characteristic. There is no set pattern. Some women do use expletives and some men use expletives and perhaps that is where the similarity lies. There is an indication here for future research from the point of view of what kind of people use expletives in what segment of society and under what sort of conditions?

Read (1977) states that "stigmatized words are known to all social classes, and the principal early records of the worst of them are from the writings of members of the British peerage (p. 12)."

What is termed "masculine" or "feminine" differs from one society to another, according to the way in which a culture defines the respective roles of men and women. There exists in our society, especially in the media, a stereotype of women as chiefly interested in domestic affairs, the rearing of children, longing for romance and eternal youth, and rather than measuring their success or failure by a career they measure in terms of marriage and popularity with men. One should be able to make choices which are not based on misconceptions of the truth. Also, in many cases we artificially dichotomize masculine and feminine traits. Perhaps now, as more and more women are involved in the professions, business and the sports, there will be a completely new group of solidarities which may contribute to a lessening of the kind of in-group feelings among members of each sex and naturally affect the use of language.

In regard to women using more prestige forms than men, women as proper rhetoricians, can be seen to be able to reach out to others in language and life and to listen to others in turn. The ways that women are able to reach out are largely unfamiliar to men and which unfamiliarity for men is costly. This, also, it stands to reason, has the possibility for change as contact between the sexes

becomes more fraternal.

Society will be changed before language is changed. However, it is hoped that as society becomes more aware of the underlying prejudices evidenced by our language perhaps there will be a change in the ways that it denigrates women.

APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN THIS STUDY

"WHAT WOULD YOU SAY"

YOUR AGE _____

YOUR SEX _____

YOUR SCHOOL _____

YOUR GRADE IN SCHOOL _____

On the following pages you will read about situations that could happen to you. We are interested in what you would say in every situation.

On each page there are lines for your answer. Please use a separate space for each of your words, up to five words on a line. Use as many lines as you need.

You can begin whenever you are ready. Please be sure to respond to all eight situations.

THANKS FOR YOUR HELP

You are standing on the corner holding two ice cream cones when a boy on roller skates stops in front of you and says: "Why are you holding two ice cream cones?"

What do you say?

PLEASE TURN TO NEXT PAGE

You are standing on the corner holding two ice cream cones when a girl on roller skates stops in front of you and says: "Why are you holding two ice cream cones?"

What do you say?

PLEASE TURN TO NEXT PAGE

You are standing on a corner and a boy on a tricycle runs over your toe, what do you say?

PLEASE TURN TO NEXT PAGE

You are standing on a corner and a girl on a tricycle runs over your toe, what do you say?

PLEASE TURN TO NEXT PAGE

A teenaged boy meets you on the street and says:
"Seeing as it's not Halloween, tell me why you're wearing
a Halloween mask." What do you say?

PLEASE TURN TO NEXT PAGE

A teenaged girl meets you on the street and says:
"Seeing as it's not Halloween, tell me why you're wearing
a Halloween mask." What do you say?

PLEASE TURN TO NEXT PAGE

A teenaged boy shoves you in order to get ahead of you
in line, what do you say?

PLEASE TURN TO NEXT PAGE

A teenaged girl shoves you in order to get ahead of you
in line, what do you say?

PLEASE TURN TO NEXT PAGE

APPENDIX B
FIFTEEN ILLUSTRATIVE RESPONSES

FIFTEEN ILLUSTRATIVE RESPONSES

Examples of Extreme Courtesy

1. Scenario 3, Female Actor Male College Student
 "Well, because I'm me and you're you and we are both individuals of different character."

2. Scenario 2, Female Actor Female College Student
 "I might say it's none of your business first, then I might tell her why because she's a female."

Examples of Aggression

3. Scenario 3, Male Actor Male 10th Grader
 "What the fuck are you saying? Why don't you look at yourself? By the way, is that a crease in the middle of your face or is that your asshole?"

4. Scenario 3, Female Actor Female College Student
 "Eat shit bitch, what's your problem?"

Example of Rhymed Aggression

5. Scenario 4, Male Actor Male 5th Grader
 "Hey you two ball sucker, mother fucker, I was in front of you."

Examples of Sexual Aggression

6. Scenario 4, Female Actor Male 10th Grader
 "You keep shoving me, the next time I'm going to take my dick and shove it in your mouth."

7. Scenario 3, Male Actor Female College Student
 "Fuck you, I hope your balls fall off."

Example of Sexism

8. Scenario 1, Female Actor Female 5th Grader
 "Little girl, you are a little lady and ladies don't go bumping into people, do they?"

FIFTEEN ILLUSTRATIVE RESPONSES - CONTINUED

Example of Creative Proposition

9. Scenario 2, Female Male 10th Grader

"Do you want to go 50-50 on a baby?"

Examples of Sex Role Differentiation Within The Same ScenarioFrom a male college student

10. Scenario 2, Male Actor

"I'm waiting for my friend Simon to come and eat them both."

11. Scenario 2, Female Actor

"Hi there! Would you like an ice cream cone? I bought it for you because I thought you would say yes."

From a female 5th grader

12. Scenario 4, Female Actor

"Nothing, I'd smack her."

13. Scenario 4, Male Actor

"Nothing, I'd punch him." (underscoring added)

From a female 10th grader

14. Scenario 4, Female Actor

"Who are you, the Queen of England, get your ass back in line."

15. Scenario 4, Male Actor

"If he is much bigger than I am I would say, 'Excuse me, I was in front of you'."

APPENDIX C
ANALYSES OF VARIANCE OF SCENARIO EFFECTS

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR NUMBER OF WORDS (COLLEGE SAMPLE)

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>
Sex	9.903	1	9.903	0.092
Sex x Subjects	8190.551	76	107.770	
Actor Sex (A)	99.334	1	99.334	10.197**
Sex x A	2.411	1	2.411	0.247
A x Subjects	740.358	76	9.742	
Actor Age (B)	29.620	1	29.620	1.176
Sex x B	5.004	1	5.004	0.199
B x Subjects	1913.488	76	25.177	
Actor Action (C)	1.557	1	1.557	0.046
Sex x C	23.968	1	23.968	0.711
C x Subjects	2562.109	76	33.712	
A x B	6.739	1	6.739	0.646
Sex x A x B	0.739	1	0.739	0.071
A x B x Subjects	792.850	76	10.432	
A x C	8.463	1	8.463	0.811
Sex x A x C	9.257	1	9.257	0.888
A x C x Subjects	792.723	76	10.431	
B x C	109.306	1	109.306	3.141
Sex x B x C	20.280	1	20.280	0.583
B x C x Subjects	2644.385	76	34.795	
A x B x C	6.250	1	6.250	0.653
Sex x A x B x C	28.942	1	28.942	3.024
A x B x C x Subjects	727.396	76	9.571	
TOTAL	18725.605	623	30.057	

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR WORDS PER SENTENCE (COLLEGE SAMPLE)

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>
Sex	43.142	1	43.142	0.447
Sex x Subjects	5609.785	76	73.813	
Actor Sex (A)	56.265	1	56.265	9.439**
Sex x A	2.406	1	2.406	0.404
A x Subjects	453.013	76	5.961	
Actor Age (B)	31.346	1	31.346	1.325
Sex x B	4.470	1	4.470	0.189
B x Subjects	1798.147	76	23.660	
Actor Action (C)	4.190	1	4.190	0.182
Sex x C	3.919	1	3.919	0.170
C x Subjects	1747.264	76	22.990	
A x B	1.495	1	1.495	0.220
Sex x A x B	2.528	1	2.528	0.371
A x B x Subjects	517.561	76	6.810	
A x C	8.292	1	8.292	1.069
Sex x A x C	77.489	1	77.489	9.993**
A x C x Subjects	589.313	76	7.754	
B x C	121.620	1	121.620	5.630*
Sex x B x C	1.602	1	1.602	0.074
B x C x Subjects	1641.868	76	21.604	
A x B x C	0.173	1	0.173	0.027
Sex x A x B x C	25.848	1	25.848	3.997*
A x B x C x Subjects	491.419	76	6.466	
TOTAL	13233.121	623	21.241	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR EXPLETIVES (COLLEGE SAMPLE)

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>
Sex	0.074	1	0.074	0.251
Sex x Subjects	22.281	76	0.293	
Actor Sex (A)	0.498	1	0.498	7.059**
Sex x A	0.408	1	0.408	5.785*
A x Subjects	5.357	76	0.070	
Actor Age (B)	0.820	1	0.820	5.553*
Sex x B	0.192	1	0.192	1.300
B x Subjects	11.226	76	0.148	
Actor Action (C)	0.004	1	0.004	0.022
Sex x C	0.017	1	0.017	0.094
C x Subjects	13.607	76	0.179	
A x B	0.327	1	0.327	7.451**
Sex x A x B	0.596	1	0.596	13.586***
A x B x Subjects	3.335	76	0.044	
A x C	0.038	1	0.038	0.638
Sex x A x C	0.000	1	0.000	
A x C x Subjects	4.585	76	0.060	
B x C	2.476	1	2.476	11.148**
Sex x B x C	0.053	1	0.053	0.237
B x C x Subjects	16.878	76	0.222	
A x B x C	0.017	1	0.017	0.353
Sex x A x B x C	0.004	1	0.004	0.083
A x B x C x Subjects	3.607	76	0.047	
TOTAL	86.397	623	0.139	

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR AFFECT RATING SCALE
(COLLEGE SAMPLE)

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>
Sex	0.757	1	0.757	0.310
Sex x Subjects	185.739	76	2.444	
Actor Sex (A)	9.474	1	9.474	26.225***
Sex x A	4.039	1	4.039	11.179**
A x Subjects	27.457	76	0.361	
Actor Age (B)	38.646	1	38.646	43.338***
Sex x B	3.775	1	3.775	4.233*
B x Subjects	67.772	76	0.892	
Actor Action (C)	0.024	1	0.024	0.039
Sex x C	1.191	1	1.191	1.909
C x Subjects	47.432	76	0.624	
A x B	2.417	1	2.417	8.215**
Sex x A x B	2.020	1	2.020	6.864*
A x B x Subjects	22.360	76	0.294	
A x C	0.033	1	0.033	0.161
Sex x A x C	0.007	1	0.007	0.036
A x C x Subjects	15.578	76	0.205	
B x C	12.189	1	12.189	10.637**
Sex x B x C	0.266	1	0.266	0.232
B x C x Subjects	87.088	76	1.146	
A x B x C	0.950	1	0.950	4.194*
Sex x A x B x C	0.245	1	0.245	1.080
A x B x C x Subjects	17.212	76	0.226	
TOTAL	546.669	623	0.877	

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR NUMBER OF WORDS (TENTH GRADE SAMPLE)

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>
Sex	135.032	1	135.032	0.468
Sex x Subjects	14419.754	50	288.395	
Actor Sex (A)	0.265	1	0.265	0.012
Sex x A	29.015	1	29.015	1.338
A x Subjects	1084.492	50	21.690	
Actor Age (B)	118.353	1	118.353	1.121
Sex x B	97.622	1	97.622	0.924
B x Subjects	5280.246	50	105.605	
Actor Action (C)	192.932	1	192.932	3.569
Sex x C	66.759	1	66.759	1.235
C x Subjects	2703.074	50	54.061	
A x B	29.178	1	29.178	1.311
Sex x A x B	2.524	1	2.524	0.113
A x B x Subjects	1112.656	50	22.253	
A x C	34.111	1	34.111	1.051
Sex x A x C	53.630	1	53.630	1.652
A x C x Subjects	1622.991	50	32.460	
B x C	180.935	1	180.935	7.047*
Sex x B x C	13.742	1	13.742	0.535
B x C x Subjects	1283.822	50	25.676	
A x B x C	3.028	1	3.028	0.127
Sex x A x B x C	8.528	1	8.528	0.359
A x B x C x Subjects	1187.535	50	23.751	
TOTAL	29660.199	415	71.470	

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR WORDS PER SENTENCE (TENTH GRADE SAMPLE)

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>
Sex	15.500	1	15.500	0.149
Sex x Subjects	5203.531	50	104.071	
Actor Sex (A)	1.333	1	1.333	0.052
Sex x A	1.333	1	1.333	0.052
A x Subjects	1282.812	50	25.656	
Actor Age (B)	85.634	1	85.634	1.973
Sex x B	34.965	1	34.965	0.806
B x Subjects	2170.304	50	43.406	
Actor Action (C)	173.644	1	173.644	9.840**
Sex x C	19.991	1	19.991	1.133
C x Subjects	882.376	50	17.648	
A x B	17.579	1	17.579	1.075
Sex x A x B	2.267	1	2.267	0.139
A x B x Subjects	817.500	50	16.350	
A x C	3.905	1	3.905	0.152
Sex x A x C	40.193	1	40.193	1.566
A x C x Subjects	1282.958	50	25.659	
B x C	148.100	1	148.100	6.213*
Sex x B x C	16.801	1	16.801	0.705
B x C x Subjects	1191.877	50	23.838	
A x B x C	0.231	1	0.231	0.015
Sex x A x B x C	3.739	1	3.739	0.250
A x B x C x Subjects	748.259	50	14.965	
TOTAL	14144.801	415	34.084	

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR EXPLETIVES (TENTH GRADE SAMPLE)

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>
Sex	0.272	1	0.272	0.453
Sex x Subjects	30.074	50	0.601	
Actor Sex (A)	0.257	1	0.257	0.881
Sex x A	2.267	1	2.267	7.773**
A x Subjects	14.580	50	0.292	
Actor Age (B)	4.142	1	4.142	12.396***
Sex x B	0.055	1	0.055	0.165
B x Subjects	16.705	50	0.334	
Actor Action (C)	0.000	1	0.000	
Sex x C	0.010	1	0.010	0.029
C x Subjects	16.490	50	0.330	
A x B	0.078	1	0.078	0.316
Sex x A x B	0.030	1	0.030	0.122
A x B x Subjects	12.383	50	0.248	
A x C	0.048	1	0.048	0.244
Sex x A x C	0.096	1	0.096	0.488
A x C x Subjects	9.865	50	0.197	
B x C	1.043	1	1.043	2.697
Sex x B x C	0.495	1	0.495	1.280
B x C x Subjects	19.342	50	0.387	
A x B x C	0.017	1	0.017	0.089
Sex x A x B x C	0.161	1	0.161	0.862
A x B x C x Subjects	9.330	50	0.187	
TOTAL	137.738	415	0.332	

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR AFFECT RATING SCALE
(TENTH GRADE SAMPLE)

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>
Sex	2.670	1	2.670	0.741
Sex x Subjects	180.091	50	3.602	
Actor Sex (A)	9.715	1	9.715	10.793**
Sex x A	13.408	1	13.408	14.895***
A x Subjects	45.006	50	0.900	
Actor Age (B)	45.744	1	45.744	46.994***
Sex x B	0.052	1	0.052	0.053
B x Subjects	48.670	50	0.973	
Actor Action (C)	0.059	1	0.059	0.064
Sex x C	0.443	1	0.443	0.487
C x Subjects	45.470	50	0.909	
A x B	0.909	1	0.909	1.869
Sex x A x B	0.909	1	0.909	1.869
A x B x Subjects	24.313	50	0.486	
A x C	2.975	1	2.975	5.120*
Sex x A x C	0.668	1	0.668	1.149
A x C x Subjects	29.054	50	0.581	
B x C	5.788	1	5.788	5.056*
Sex x B x C	0.249	1	0.249	0.218
B x C x Subjects	57.241	50	1.145	
A x B x C	1.154	1	1.154	2.001
Sex x A x B x C	0.000	1	0.000	
A x B x C x Subjects	28.836	50	0.577	
TOTAL	543.420	415	1.309	

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR NUMBER OF WORDS (5thGRADE SAMPLE)

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>
Sex	1150.323	1	1150.323	8.631**
Sex x Subjects	12394.813	93	233.278	
Actor Sex (A)	8.513	1	8.513	1.067
Sex x A	0.356	1	0.356	0.045
A x Subjects	742.136	93	7.980	
Actor Age (B)	657.514	1	657.514	31.456***
Sex x B	6.689	1	6.689	0.320
B x Subjects	1943.952	93	20.903	
Actor Action (C)	3.582	1	3.582	0.157
Sex x C	35.635	1	35.635	1.562
C x Subjects	2121.582	93	22.813	
A x B	0.020	1	0.020	0.002
Sex x A x B	0.967	1	0.967	0.102
A x B x Subjects	883.646	93	9.502	
A x C	0.405	1	0.405	0.032
Sex x A x C	56.626	1	56.626	4.447*
A x C x Subjects	1184.338	93	12.735	
B x C	123.261	1	123.261	5.458*
Sex x B x C	30.103	1	30.103	1.333
B x C x Subjects	2100.256	93	22.583	
A x B x C	26.338	1	26.338	2.122
Sex x A x B x C	0.401	1	0.401	0.032
A x B x C x Subjects	1154.063	93	12.409	
TOTAL	24625.480	759	32.445	

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR WORDS PER SENTENCE (5th GRADE SAMPLE)

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>
Sex	418.093	1	418.093	3.897
Sex x Subjects	9976.488	93	107.274	
Actor Sex (A)	7.281	1	7.281	0.817
Sex x A	1.671	1	1.671	0.188
A x Subjects	828.633	93	8.910	
Actor Age (B)	319.555	1	319.555	16.408***
Sex x B	0.410	1	0.410	0.021
B x Subjects	1811.193	93	19.475	
Actor Action (C)	0.318	1	0.318	0.017
Sex x C	34.843	1	34.843	1.881
C x Subjects	1722.301	93	18.519	
A x B	2.857	1	2.857	0.383
Sex x A x B	0.102	1	0.102	0.014
A x B x Subjects	694.142	93	7.464	
A x C	0.559	1	0.559	0.051
Sex x A x C	28.812	1	28.812	2.632
A x C x Subjects	1017.902	93	10.945	
B x C	210.713	1	210.713	12.072***
Sex x B x C	20.295	1	20.295	1.163
B x C x Subjects	1623.232	93	17.454	
A x B x C	5.628	1	5.628	0.655
Sex x A x B x C	0.005	1	0.005	
A x B x C x Subjects	799.630	93	8.598	
TOTAL	19524.629	759	25.724	

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR EXPLETIVES (5th GRADE SAMPLE)

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>
Sex	1.202	1	1.202	2.915
Sex x Subjects	38.351	93	0.412	
Actor Sex (A)	0.051	1	0.051	1.239
Sex x A	0.088	1	0.088	2.126
A x Subjects	3.864	93	0.042	
Actor Age (B)	0.537	1	0.537	4.021*
Sex x B	0.058	1	0.058	0.434
B x Subjects	12.416	93	0.134	
Actor Action (C)	0.345	1	0.345	3.960*
Sex x C	0.056	1	0.056	0.639
C x Subjects	8.107	93	0.087	
A x B	0.023	1	0.023	0.436
Sex x A x B	0.049	1	0.049	0.933
A x B x Subjects	4.930	93	0.053	
A x C	0.025	1	0.025	0.525
Sex x A x C	0.135	1	0.135	2.892
A x C x Subjects	4.344	93	0.047	
B x C	0.145	1	0.145	1.198
Sex x B x C	0.351	1	0.351	4.067*
B x C x Subjects	8.018	93	0.086	
A x B x C	0.051	1	0.051	0.752
Sex x A x B x C	0.088	1	0.088	1.291
A x B x C x Subjects	6.364	93	0.068	
TOTAL	89.599	759	0.118	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR AFFECT RATING SCALE
(5th GRADE SAMPLE)

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>
Sex	4.909	1	4.909	1.010
Sex x Subjects	451.910	93	4.859	
Actor Sex (A)	1.258	1	1.258	5.678*
Sex x A	0.005	1	0.005	0.024
A x Subjects	20.605	93	0.222	
Actor Age (B)	24.436	1	24.436	40.498***
Sex x B	0.563	1	0.563	0.933
B x Subjects	56.116	93	0.603	
Actor Action (C)	7.440	1	7.440	13.461***
Sex x C	0.072	1	0.072	0.129
C x Subjects	51.402	93	0.553	
A x B	0.244	1	0.244	1.071
Sex x A x B	0.496	1	0.496	2.181
A x B x Subjects	21.156	93	0.227	
A x C	0.794	1	0.794	3.446
Sex x A x C	3.257	1	3.257	14.139***
A x C x Subjects	21.422	93	0.230	
B x C	2.468	1	2.468	3.514
Sex x B x C	0.141	1	0.141	0.201
B x C x Subjects	65.301	93	0.702	
A x B x C	0.001	1	0.001	0.004
Sex x A x B x C	0.033	1	0.033	0.149
A x B x C x Subjects	20.341	93	0.219	
TOTAL	754.367	759	0.994	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

APPENDIX D
ALPHABETICAL LIST OF ELICITED EXPLETIVES

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF ELICITED EXPLETIVES

<u>Expletive</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Total</u>
ass	6	-	6
asshole	6	5	11
assy	-	1	1
bastard	3	8	11
bend over, I'll drive you home	-	1	1
bitch	16	5	21
cat shit	1	-	1
cunt	-	1	1
cute ass	-	1	1
damn	8	-	8
damn ass	-	2	2
damn bastard	1	-	1
damn it	-	3	3
damn you	1	-	1
dick	-	1	1
dog shit	1	-	1
faggot	-	3	3
fag's day	-	1	1
50-50 on a baby	-	1	1
freak you bitch	-	1	1
frigging	-	2	2
fuck	10	11	21
fuck off	-	3	3
fuck up	-	1	1

ELICITED EXPLETIVES CONTINUED

<u>Expletive</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Total</u>
fuck you	15	2	17
fuck you up	1	-	1
fuck yourself	1	2	3
fucked up	1	1	2
fucking	-	4	4
fucking ass	-	1	1
fucking asshole	1	-	1
fucking bastard	-	2	2
fucking bitch	2	3	5
fucking douchebag	-	1	1
fucko	-	1	1
gay lord	-	1	1
gay son of a bitch	-	1	1
go to hell	1	-	1
goddamn	3	6	9
goddamn it	2	2	4
hard on	-	1	1
hell	6	13	19
I'll shove something in you	-	1	1
Jesus Christ	1	-	1
kick your ass	2	1	3
mèrde	-	2	2
motherfucker	-	2	2
piss on you	-	1	1
prick	-	1	1

ELICITED EXPLETIVES CONTINUED

<u>Expletive</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Total</u>
put it up your ass	-	1	1
schmuck	2	-	2
schmucky	-	1	1
screw	-	1	1
shit	8	5	13
shithead	-	2	2
shove it	1	-	1
shove it up my ass	-	1	1
son of a bitch	5	13	18
stupid ass	1	-	1
sucker	-	5	5
two ball sucker	-	1	1
up your ass	-	2	2
up yours	1	-	1
what the fuck	1	-	1
what the hell	1	-	1
whore	-	1	1
you fuck	-	2	2
you sucker	-	2	2
your mother	-	1	1
<hr/>			
TOTALS	109	138	247

REFERENCES

- Bailey, Lee Ann and Timm, Leonora, A., More on women's - and men's - expletives. Anthropological Linguistics, 18, 438-448 (1976).
- Cherry, Louise, Teacher-child verbal interaction: an approach to the study of sex differences. In Barrie Thorne and Nancy Henley (Eds.), Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance, Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, 172-183 (1975).
- Clark, Virginia P., Women and language: some current research. Paper presented at meeting of American Dialect Society at Northeast MLA Conference at Penn. State (1978).
- Conklin, N. F., Perspectives on the dialects of women. Paper presented at meeting of American Dialect Society (1973).
- Dundes, Alan, Leach, J. W., and Özkök, B., The strategy of Turkish boys' verbal dueling rhymes. In Gumperz and Hymes (Eds.), Directions In Sociolinguistics, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 130-160 (1972).
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan, On sociolinguistic rules: alternation and co-occurrence. In Gumperz and Hymes (Eds.), Directions In Sociolinguistics, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 213-250 (1972).
- Fishman, Joshua A., The Sociology of Language. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers (1972).
- Flexner, Stuart Berg, Dictionary of American Slang. New York: Crowell Publishing (1960).
- Furfey, Paul Hanley, Men's and women's language. The American Catholic Sociological Review, 5, 218-223 (1944).
- Genet, Jean, Our Lady of the Flowers (Notre-Dame-des-Fleurs). New York: Bantam Books (1964).
- Gleason, J. B. and Berko, Jean, Code switching in children's language. Paper presented at Conference on Developmental Psycholinguistics, State University of New York at Buffalo (1971).
- Goffman, Erving, The neglected situation. In Pier Paolo Giglioli (Ed.), Language and Social Context, Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, Inc., 61-66 (1972).

Haas, Mary R., Men's and women's speech in Koasati. In Dell Hymes (Ed.), Language In Culture And Society, New York: Harper & Row, 228-233 (1964).

Henley, Nancy, Power, sex, and non-verbal communication. In Thorne and Henley (Eds.), Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, 184-203 (1975).

Hiatt, Mary, The Way Women Write. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University (1977).

Hymes, Dell, Models of the interaction of language and social life. In Gumperz and Hymes (Eds.), Directions In Sociolinguistics, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 35-71 (1972a).

_____, Toward ethnographies of communication: the analysis of communicative events. In Pier Paolo Giglioli (Ed.), Language and Social Context, Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, 21-44 (1972b).

Jespersen, Otto, Language, Its Nature, Development and Origin. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 237-254 (1922).

Key, Mary Ritchie, Linguistic behavior of male and female. Linguistics, 88, 15-31 (1972).

_____, Male/Female Language. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc. (1975).

Labov, William, The social motivation of a sound change. Word, 19, 273-309 (1963).

_____, The Social Stratification of English In New York City. Washington, D. C.: Center For Applied Linguistics (1966).

_____, The study of language in its social context. In Joshua A. Fishman (Ed.), Advances In The Sociology of Language, Volume I, The Hague: Mouton Press, 152-216 (1971).

_____, Hypercorrection as a factor in linguistic change. In William Bright (Ed.), Sociolinguistics, The Hague: Mouton Press, 84-113 (1971).

_____, Sociolinguistic Patterns. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press (1972).

Lakoff, Robin, Language and woman's place. Language In Society, Vol. 2:1, 45-79 (1973).

Legman, Gershon, No Laughing Matter: Rationale of the Dirty Joke, Second Series. New York: Bell Publishing Co. (1975).

McCarthy, Dorothea A., Some possible explanations of sex differences in language development and disorders. Journal of Psychology, 35, 155-160 (1953).

Mead, Margaret, Male and Female. New York: William Morrow and Company (1949).

Meredith, Hobby and Craik, Non-linguistic factors in oral language productivity. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 29, 871-874 (1969).

Oliver, Marion M. and Rubin, Joan, The use of expletives by some American women. Anthropological Linguistics, 17:5, 191-197 (1975).

Read, Allen Walker, Classic American Graffiti. Waukesha, Wisconsin: Maledicta Press (1977).

Reik, Theodor, Men and women speak different languages. Psychoanalysis, V. 1-2, 3-15 (1953).

_____, The need to be loved. In Legman, G., No Laughing Matter: Rationale of The Dirty Joke, Second Series, New York: Bell Publishing, 697 (1975).

Sagarin, Edward, The Anatomy of Dirty Words. New York: Paperback Library (1969).

Sapir, Edward, Male and female forms of speech in Yana. In D. Mandelbaum (Ed.), Selected Writings of Edward Sapir. Colorado: University of Colorado Press, 206-212 (1963).

Saporta, Sal, Language in a sexist society. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Modern Language Association of America. New York, December (1974).

Schulz, Muriel R., The semantic derogation of woman. In Thorne and Henley (Eds.), Language and Sex. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, Inc., 64-75 (1975).

Suardiez, Delia E., Sexism in the Spanish language. Studies In Linguistics And Language Learning, Seattle: University of Washington, Vol. 2 (1973).

Trudgill, Peter, The Social Differentiation of English In Norwich. London: Cambridge University Press (1974).

Wall Street Journal, Women At Work. Series of articles reprinted from The Wall Street Journal, August 28, September 5, 8, 13, 19, 21 (1978).

Warshay, Diana W., Sex differences in language style. In Constantina Safilios-Rothschild (Ed.), Toward A Sociology Of Women. Lexington, Massachusetts: Xerox College Publishing, 3-9 (1972).

Wood, Marion M., The influence of sex and knowledge of communication effectiveness on spontaneous speech. Word, 22, 112-137 (1966).