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The Problem and Its Background

Sex differences in the use of instrumental language is the subject of this study. Differences between men and women in the degree of instrumentality of verbal behavior are here seen as the resultants of the power differential between the sex statuses. The study examines the written language of men and women in terms of its topical, formal, and functional variations. That is, it assesses instrumentality through the meaning conveyed by the inter-relation of language form and content.

This chapter will develop the following five arguments as background to this study:

1. Male-female relations are superordinate-subordinate relations that are similar to those in race and class.
2. Further, previous studies of the behavior and attitudes of men and women suggest that these differ along an instrumental-affective dimension, as may other power differentials.
3. Helping to buttress the sex power differential are cultural expectations that apply differentially to each sex status from early childhood.
4. The present investigation examines language as an indicator of the instrumental-affective dimension--thus of the differential power--of sex status.
5. To tap and emphasize the generality and pervasiveness of the instrumental-affective dimension in male and female language use, the data (verbal responses) have been collected in relatively situation-free settings.

**Male-Female Relations as Superordinate-Subordinate**

Sex status, one of two universal bases for social differentiation according to Linton (age is the other) places men and women in a superordinate-subordinate relationship (Linton, 1936:116). In almost all societies, women occupy a subordinate status. This is still true in the United States despite the greater freedom for women in many spheres of life.

Male-female differences are essentially differences in power and thus are comparable to race and class differences. Myrdal (1944: Appendix 5) pointed to the similarity of female inferiority to Negro inferiority in the United States and has traced their often overlapping histories. Proponents of Negro and female equality have sometimes supported, sometimes opposed, one another but the concern for race has always been stronger. Furthermore, a general concern with the inequities of social class, while more recent in America, has come to match the concern with race inequality. Female subordination, on the other hand, has been stressed far less than male-female differences that do not emphasize power distinctions.

A traditional explanation for power differences has been a biological, or bio-psychological, one. Biological explanations of race
dominated both professional and lay writings through the early decades of the present century. Similar explanations of class have existed (e.g., Galton, 1869) but they have been less numerous. Similar views of sex were held by some of the early sociologists. For example, Comte (1858:504-505) considered men to be inherently more intellectual and women more emotional; granting this, the education of boys was to be different, and to continue for a longer period, the future of girls to be concentrated in the family (Comte, 1896:226-239). Tönnies, characterizing gemeinschaft as feminine and gesellschaft masculine, assumed a biological basis for the behavior characteristics of each sex (1963:40, 154-155, 162-163). Ross (1908:70), following LeBon (1960:39, 46), classified women, together with children and animals, as highly suggestible.

Functionalist explanations for class and sex, though not necessarily race, hierarchies have been popular since World War II. Both Davis and Moore (1945) and Parsons (1953), have seen stratification as functionally necessary and useful, particularly in competitive industrial society. While race subordination has sometimes been seen as "eufunctional" for certain strata--and for social systems in particular situations--this is generally held to be undesirable for society as a whole. Sex differentiation and female subordination have also been held to be functional. Parsons argues that these features fulfill an integrative function within the family and play a consummatory role in society generally (1955; 1959); Pitts follows Parsons, and provides a Freudian explanation (1964); even Florence Kluckhohn sees male-female status distinctions as necessary (1950).
Cultural and interactional explanations of class, race, and sex differences—in contrast with functional approaches—have not emphasized the necessity or inevitability of these differences. For the most part, such explanations have emphasized that these differences are learned, and that they are mutable, as well as the social conditions for their origin, persistence, and change. Cultural anthropologists and sociologists have employed cross-cultural and sub-cultural processes, such as acculturation and enculturation in accounting for these differences. Interactionists have used language, role, and self to account for class, sex, and race differences, their more micro level of analysis stressing the circumstances under which socialization occurs.

Ameliorative efforts, however, have been far more strenuously directed toward race and class inequities than toward those of sex. For example, since the lot of the Negro and other minorities is granted to be miserable, studies of race prejudice and discrimination frequently are made with an eye toward changing attitudes and behavior so as to bring about greater equality. The attitude by sociologists and social scientists toward class subordination is more mixed, ranging from moral indictment, through resignation to its inevitability, to seeing it as functionally necessary. Yet, there is substantial agreement about the poorer lot of the lower classes and some emphasis upon the opportunities for some upward mobility as possible and, even, eufunctional.

No similar concern exists for male-female inequality, despite some successful suffragette movements and legislation that has gained women the vote and has increased their employment opportunities.
Sociologists have often supported the above reforms in their role as concerned citizens. As professionals, however, sociologists, and other social scientists, have given more emphasis to inequalities in race, class, and work relations. Perhaps that women are integrated into the family, and that male dominance is more benign than is the case with race or class, or that most sociologists are male (Davis, 1969) is responsible for this lack of emphasis. Even where sex inequality is admitted, its significance is often diluted by arguing that (1) women have indirect (behind-the-throne) power, that (2) female power, while lesser, is complementary to male power, and/or that (3) the differences are being eroded.

This study thus points to male-female relationships as power relationships; that is, the male status has more general power in American society than the female status. Further, this suggests similarities to other power relationships, e.g., black-white, middle class-lower class, employer-employee, leader-follower. Below, some of the evidence of the behavior and attitudes of men and women will be examined in this light.

Male-Female Behavior Differences as Instrumentality-Affectivity

Studies of men and women, and of other superordinate-subordinate relationships—not only race and class but also interpersonal relations in small groups—, suggest a similarity of behavior and attitude in a wide variety of power relationships. Below, following a
summary of findings in these areas, the argument will be made that an
instrumental-affective dimension exists in these power differentials and
that it has a long history in human experience and thought.

Studies of Men and Women

Sex differences in behavior, attitudes, values, self concept, style, and the like have been studied over the years. The contexts for these studies have varied, covering children at play and in school, adolescent behavior and problems, dating and courting behavior, marriage roles, relation of parents to children, and the like. Out of these have emerged a multitude of findings and implications relevant to the understanding of male and female role behavior.

Anastasi and Foley, in an early review of the literature, report as consistent general sex differences, aggressive and dominant behavior for males and social orientation (i.e., interest in people) for females (1949:671-672).

Similar conclusions are reached by Jerome Kagan in a more recent review. He states that one of the primary classes of sex-typed behaviors is the relation of masculinity to aggression; not only do males exhibit more aggression than females, but more is expected of them (1964:139). Additionally, Kagan finds that not only are females reported as less aggressive, they are also reported as less individualistic and active: "...there are more studies reporting greater dependency, conformity, and social passivity for females than for males at all ages" (1964:140). Females also show more affiliative and nurturant behaviors: "...a majority of investigations of overt behavior
or story telling responses reveal more frequent occurrence of affiliative and nurturant behavior among girls, and greater preoccupation with people and harmonious interpersonal relations among girls than among boys" (1964:139-140).

The sex difference in mode of social relations cited by Kagan is also reported by Douvan and Adelson. Their national survey of adolescents showed that the social relations of boys were dominated by the boys' needs for achievement and independence while girls, in their relations, were concerned with developing interpersonal skills and their need for love (1966:494-495).

Notwithstanding that many of the above conclusions about behavioral differences between the sexes are based upon studies of children and adolescents, data from adult subjects lend them weight. The results from an attitude survey of urban American adults lead Bennett and Cohen to report that "...masculine values are built more around a picture of the world as hostile and demanding...suggest[ing] high competition in an unpleasant environment" (1959:139). These masculine attitudes are related by Bennett and Cohen to men's greater independence and self-contained sociability:

Men are less willing to turn their lives over to what they consider to be a relatively hostile and dangerous social world. They prefer to build their own arsenal of weapons to tear success and reward from a restrictive environment. Their weapons are their competences, adequacies, skills, and effective behaviors (1959:148).

Bennett and Cohen also found men to desire success with greater intensity than do women and personal accomplishment is of greater importance to them than it is to women (1959:130-132).
The findings for women show them as feeling themselves to be helpless, timid, fearful, and the weaker of the two sexes, and that they see the world as relatively benevolent and as not demanding as much personal defensive and offensive activity (Bennett and Cohen, 1959:125, 148, 145). Their passive orientation to the environment is accompanied by a greater dependency and social gregariousness:

Women appear more willing to acknowledge that the outside world holds much control over their destiny. Apparently, they have learned to control their own hostility and to gain clearer and better established social attitudes and orientations. They probably consider their basic security as stemming largely from the kindness of others. This is their need for love (1959:148).

Women, who also feel themselves to be richer than men in social warmth and empathy (1959:125), "...have a greater need to gain their personal well-being without having to exert control or gain personal achievement. Through love and luck, success can come without independent effort" (1959:130).

The above, therefore, imply an active and instrumental attitude by the male related to his view of the world as something requiring conquest via use of competitive skills and resources. The female, in contrast, tends to a passive and affective attitude related to her view of the world as requiring placating and cultivation via nurturance and cooperative skills. In relations with each other, it is the male who initiates activity, is deferred to, has his interests as primary, and who can act directly to further them. The female, in contrast, keeps herself responsive to the male (Douvan and Gold, 1966:526),
is sensitive to the male's needs and wants, placates, puts her interests second, and uses more indirection.

Related Studies of Power Differences

The striking similarity between male-female findings and those of status differences in small groups lend support to the argument that many of these are characteristic of power relations in general. For example, small group studies in both laboratory and field situations have shown that higher status members tend to engage in task-oriented activities, to initiate activity for the lower status in direct fashion, to ignore the lower status, to disparage the latter, to resent their "intrusion" into interaction. The lower status, by contrast, tend to initiate interaction (e.g., requests for permission, information, or evaluation), use indirect methods, engage in task-irrelevant behavior (where upward mobility is impossible), try to communicate "up" the status system, seek favor of the higher status, exaggerate the degree to which the higher status members "like" them, and tend to have ambivalent feelings toward the higher status. Both statuses tend to overpredict the performance of the higher status, to underpredict that of the lower status, and to attribute in retrospect quality (e.g., good ideas and performance) to the higher status that was actually contributed by the lower status (cf., Whyte, 1943; Homans, 1950; Kelley, 1951; Riecken and Homans, 1954; Lippitt, et al., 1952; Berelson and Steiner, 1964:chaps. 8 and 9).

Similar findings exist for leader-follower and employer-employee relations. For example, both leaders and employers tend to be
more task-oriented, to initiate activity, use direct methods; whereas
followers and employees, engage in more task-irrelevant behavior, use
indirection, seek the favor of their superior, and never publicly give
orders to their superiors (Berelson and Steiner, 1964:374-380; Monane,

On the macro level, differences in class and race show many
similar findings that reflect differential power. For example, the
lower class and Negro use indirection, lack of dominance, low self-
esteem and morale, much expressive and tension-reducing activity, and
attribution to self of disparaging characteristics attributed to them by
the higher class and race. (For race: cf., Rose, 1948; 1949; Williams,
1947; 1958; Pettigrew, 1964:29-30, 39; Clark and Clark, 1947. For
class: cf., Berelson and Steiner, 1964:chap. 11; Knupfer, 1947; Warner,
et al., 1949; Kahl, 1957.)

The Dual Dimension in Social Life

The one dimension that is implied in the above sex, race,
class, and other power differences is the instrumental-affective
dimension. That is, the more "powerful" sex, race, class and the like
is engaging in more instrumental behavior and the less powerful in
behavior that is more affective.

In 1951, Talcott Parsons distinguished between instrumental
and expressive aspects of social action. The instrumental was seen as
"oriented to the achievement of a goal...[involving] evaluative
selection [that] gives primacy to cognitive considerations;" the
expressive was seen as "organization of the 'flow' of gratifications...
[and] the primacy is cathectic" (Parsons, 1951:48-49). Parsons later related this dimension to the four functional problems of social systems. Instrumentalism was related to adaptation and to pattern-maintenance whereas the consummatory (i.e., expressive or affective) was related to goal-attainment and to integration (Parsons, 1959:6-7). In the family, the husband's status was particularly related to the adaptation function (to exigencies outside the family, e.g., making a living) whereas the wife's status was specifically related to the integration function (to keeping the family coherent and efficiently run, i.e., the wife's role related to problems inside the family) (Parsons, 1964:48-49).

This emphasis on the duality of behaviors required by groups was developed early by Robert Bales. He saw groups as having to solve two kinds of problems, task and solidarity. The first problem dealt with efficiency and stressed "task-orientation:" it required logical thought, calculation, and planning to achieve the group goal(s) for which the group ostensibly exists. The second dealt with human relations and stressed a "social-emotional" orientation involving empathy, diplomacy, and tension-release. In time, informal problem-solving groups develop two kinds of leaders corresponding to the above two problems, a task leader and a social-emotional leader, respectively (Bales, 1953; 1958:437).

At about the same time that Parsons and Bales were studying these variables, George Homans developed a similar distinction between what he called the external system and the internal system of groups. The external system was concerned with the activity with which the group
was concerned. Homans' external system— as with Parsons' adaptation function and Bales' task-orientation— was oriented toward economic efficiency and problem solving of external task. The internal system was concerned with interpersonal adjustment (Homans emphasized sentiment), similar to Parsons' integration function and Bales' social-emotional dimension (Homans, 1950).

In 1964, Peter Blau described differentiation and solidarity as two aspects of groups which had to be balanced. The differentiating aspect distinguished group members from one another in terms of power or status, whereas the solidarity aspect, reflecting what was common to the group, accented equality and emotional rapport. Hence, a leader (or employer) must exert his authority to accomplish group tasks yet placate the followers (or employees) in order to acquire their cooperation and/or approval (Blau, 1964).

The polarities of behavior variously described above were linked to language behavior by Roger Brown. Seeing solidarity and status as opposing norms of social life, he describes how personal pronoun usage such as the German "du" or "Sie" and the French "tu" or "vous" indicate which of these norms is predominant in an interpersonal relation. For example, use of a familiar form such as the German "du" reflects solidarity when used between equals of long standing acquaintance. However, if only one member uses it, receiving the plural form ("Sie" or "vous") from the other, the superior status of the "du" user is reflected (Brown, 1965:62-65).

The instrumental-affective (expressive, consummatory) distinction has a long tradition in Western thought. It usually is a
distinction between objectivity, intellectuality, and/or rationality, on the one hand, and emotion, feeling, affect, or impulsiveness, on the other. Classical Greek thought had a three-fold classification of faculties: cognitive, conative, and affective. The history of subsequent thought generally chose one "faculty" to be emphasized from among these—such as emotion, passion, value, rationality, and thought. Schools of psychology and social psychology developed whose views of man and society varied accordingly, e.g., rationalism, hedonism, associationism, suggestion-imitation, Scottish Moralists, utilitarianism, instinctivism, folk psychology, sympathy, psychoanalysis, behaviorism, and cultural determinism (Allport, 1954:10-40; House, 1936:chaps. 15-17; Faris, 1937:chaps. 1, 2; Karpf, 1932).

A more recent, and more sophisticated, example is George H. Mead's emphasis upon rationality as a problem-solving process through which biological impulses become organized through social interaction. Mead's treatment of language as the organizer of, and link between, personal and social organization emphasized rationality at the expense of emotion (Mead, 1934:passim.). In fact, emotion was seen negatively as a non-symbolic, non-rational, factor that tended to disrupt organized, on-going, behavior (Mead, 1934:147-149).

The rise of industrialism, urbanism, and modernism in general has highlighted the distinction. Urbanism, by itself, has often been seen as a hostile and unnatural community. However, industrialism, by putting a premium upon rational calculation of means and ends, of resource and opportunities, added a further emphasis to this, if only
because larger proportions of the populations of Western Europe became involved and change became continuous (cf., Mumford, 1938:7).

It is perhaps unlikely that sociology would have emerged as a discipline had it not been for the industrial revolution. For, not only did the industrial revolution provide the secular atmosphere the field required, but also because many thinkers turned to examining the contrasts between modern and traditional society (cf., Nisbet, 1966:chaps. 1-3).

For example, Comte distinguished between domestic (i.e., the family, featuring socialization on the level of sentiment and value) and social (i.e., larger groups such as government, more intellectual than the family) association (Comte, 1858:Bk. 6, chap. 5). Tönnies' 
gemeinschaft-gesellschaft
distinction was a natural-will versus rational-will distinction, the former featuring emotion (integrated into family, neighborhood, and friendship) and the latter featuring thought of the calculating type found in modern contractual relations in economics, politics, and the city (Tönnies, 1963:Pts. 1 and 2). Durkheim's mechanical solidarity had community-wide sentiment integrated by a strong collective conscience whereas organic solidarity, only poorly integrated by a weakened collective conscience, featured a weakening of sentiments and values in favor of beliefs, ethics, and secularity (Durkheim, 1933). Simmel presented a dichotomy of organic commonness (i.e., concentric group membership) and mechanical simultaneousness (i.e., multiple-group membership); in the latter situation, diverse social experience increased the intellectual aspects of personality at the expense of the emotional (Simmel, 1955:138-157), as did
the metropolis (Simmel, 1950:409-424). Weber's distinction between rational and traditional organization, as well as his four types of social action (i.e., purposive-rational and value-rational versus affective and traditional), depicted a similar distinction (Weber, 1947:115-118). The field does not lack for distinctions such as the foregoing: Cooley, Ross, Park, Becker, Redfield, Sorokin are among a number of others who have made similar ones.

Running through the above is not only an emphasis upon thought-rationality-instrumentalism against emotion-impulse-affectivity, but also the circumstances under which they exist. Analyses by writers such as Ibn Khaldun, Tönnies, Durkheim, Simmel and Redfield have shown that the complex of insularity, homogeneity, tradition, and the emphasis upon family and local community make for the expressive-emotive tendency while trade and travel, heterogeneity, a money economy, and an urban setting make for the instrumental-thought tendency.

Thus, the instrumental-affective dimension appears to run through the findings of male-female differences. Second, it appears compatible with findings in other power relations. Third, support is given by current theory in community organization, small groups, and the like by writers as diverse as Parsons and Homans. In addition, this dichotomy has stood some kind of time test in the history of thought, not only Plato and Aristotle but also most of the major sociologists from Comte through Simmel.

Finally, the preceding discussion has emphasized the instrumentality-affectivity dimension of the differential power of sex status. This is an incomplete, and misleading, analysis if it implies
that power rests on resources, force, and fraud alone (Lenski, 1966). Power must also receive legitimation of some kind as well (cf., Weber, 1947:124-132; MacIver, 1947; Bierstedt, 1951; Buckley, 1967:176-205). Moreover, the occupants of sex statuses learn their typical behaviors from early childhood. The next section, therefore, examines the societal value-orientations that help to buttress the instrumental-affective behaviors of the differentially powerful sex statuses and that serve, as cultural expectations, to socialize their occupants.

Cultural Expectations for the Sex Statuses

Equality, achievement, and individualism have been seen as the predominant American values since colonial times (Lipset, 1963:101). Robin Williams has similarly described major American values as "centering around the concept of responsible individual personality" (1960:468) and "involving emphasis on active, instrumental mastery of the world in accordance with universalistic standards of performance" (1960:470). The presence of alternative themes to the major values in American society is also addressed by Williams in the course of an extensive discussion of major American value-orientations (1960:415-466). His listing of eight basic value-orientations of American society in which they are defined in relation to their opposites is summarized below:

1. Active mastery rather than passive acceptance.
2. Interest in manipulating the external world of things and events rather than contemplating the inner experience of meaning and affect.
3. A world view that is open rather than closed.
5. Orderliness rather than unsystematic acceptance of transitory experience.
6. Universalism rather than particularism.
7. Stress upon interpersonal relations that are equalitarian rather than hierarchial.

The alternative themes to the major value-orientations are described by Williams as containing a particularistic ethic with a closed world view which emphasizes group identity, traditionalism, contemplation, affect, and the passive acceptance of experience. They are organized around "categorical organic conceptions" and are "pervasive and powerful countercurrents" in opposition to the "rational-humane values in the received traditions of the society" (1960:466). Williams argues that the presence of alternative themes "...does not really concern basic value-orientations, but rather represents either deviance or, at least equally important, different restrictions of the value in different social roles and situations" (1960:439). Hence, the existence of a coherent set of alternate themes to the rational-humane
values does not indicate to Williams that different value systems exist within American society. Instead, they are seen as situational.

Florence Kluckhohn reaches a somewhat different interpretation than does Williams from a similar assessment of extant American values. She, as does Williams, describes dominant American culture as oriented toward the future, emphasizing autonomy, individualistic achievement externally evaluated, and an instrumental mode of behavior capable of overcoming obstacles (F. Kluckhohn, 1955:347-352). However, in contrast to Williams, Florence Kluckhohn does see the presence of several value systems within American society, and does not regard them all as deviance:

It has been a mistake, in the opinion of this writer, to seek for a picture of culture integration in one-dimensional terms, and then regard all variance as deviance...It seems better to differentiate between outright deviant behavior and the kind of variance in accord with alternative orientations... Clyde Kluckhohn would be closer to the idea of substitution when in his analysis of cultural patterns, he distinguishes between patterns which are preferred and those which are clearly alternative (1950:383).

1 A value orientation for Kluckhohn is a guiding principle behind the evaluation process for the choosing of solutions to problems which are common to all human groups (F. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961:9-10). For Williams, a value is "an affective conception of the desirable..." (1960:402). Values "concern goals and ends of action, and are, as well, components in the selection of adequate means" (1960:403). For both Kluckhohn and Williams, then, value-orientations are very generalized, abstracted, directives for behavior.

2 Kluckhohn's dominant (and male) value orientations for American society are individualism in social relations, doing mode for activity, future time orientation, and mastery-over-nature. Variant (and female) value orientations are collaterality in social relations, being-in-becoming activity mode, present time orientation and harmony-with-nature (F. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961:12).
Hence, in addition to the dominant system Kluckhohn finds variant value-orientations associated with ethnic, class, and role differences (1955:353). She describes these variant values as "a situational pattern wherein goals and welfare of the laterally extended group assume primacy for the individual and his roles are dependent upon his group" (1961:18-19) and there is "a great concern with what the human being is rather than with what he can accomplish" (1955:356). Furthermore, Kluckhohn considers it a mark of lower status to have a set of alternative values directing one's behavior (1950:376).

Parenthetically, it could be noted that Kluckhohn, at least in those of her writings under consideration here, does not state that American women have lower status than American men although this would follow from her statements about variant values. Rather, she asserts that the similar treatment given women and men results in role-conflict for women as evidenced by women's present demands for equal rights (1955:356-357).

The contrasts between Kluckhohn and Williams appear to stem from their somewhat differing approaches. Williams addresses himself to social change from the perspective of social organizations and institutions (1960:ix). His definition of social structure is normative, given by the sets of reciprocal behaviors expected between culturally designated types, i.e., by social (status) relationships (1960:31, 35-36). Thus, a cultural definition of others which elicits behavior toward them that is directed by an alternative theme is seen by Williams in its consequences for social organization (cf., 1960:441-443).
Kluckhohn, a functionalist, maintains that the dominant value-orientations of a society are related to which of its necessary activities the society most emphasizes (1961:29). Her statements that "...variation in value-orientation is the most important type of cultural variation and is, therefore, the central feature of the structure of culture" (1961:28) is most proper for her outlook.

Nevertheless, the conceptual differences between Williams and Kluckhohn do not negate the strong parallels between their respective descriptions of American values. What Williams has listed as basic value orientations can be aligned with Kluckhohn's dominant (and male) value orientations; Williams' alternative themes are encompassed by Kluckhohn's variant (and female) orientations.

This, then, completes the picture. On the structural level, men and women occupy different sex statuses. These determine or affect the sphere of life open to each. The male adult is directed toward occupational success with its accompanying attributes, e.g., type of house, neighborhood, organizational memberships, travel, and style of leisure. Further, his achievements are personal, i.e., they underscore and reward his individuality; also they are gained in the society at large, i.e., they are public. Finally, it is he (or his achievements) that gives ranking to his primary group.

The female adult, in contrast, is blocked or largely excluded from at least the higher reaches of the occupational structure; even when allowed into a higher-ranking job, this is seen as temporary and/or is rewarded less than in the case of the male. Therefore, she must seek satisfaction and recognition in primary relations (the family) and
the local community. She receives her social ranking from her father or husband, her rank thus being ascribed in that it is dependent upon the dominant male in her primary group. The male, therefore, receives gratification from the "status" or "differentiation" sphere whereas the woman gravitates toward the "solidarity" sphere.

On the cultural level, the rights and duties, the possibilities and limits, and the power differential of the sex statuses are institutionalized by the two sets of value-orientations of American society. Thus, the major (dominant) value-orientation emphasizes public achievement, active mastery, instrumentalism, and differentiation of self and gives legitimacy for appropriate behavior for the male sex status (and whites, middle classes, and the like). The alternative (variant) value-orientation, in turn, emphasizes human relations in the family and local community, passivity, affectivity, and self-abnegation and legitimizes appropriate behavior for the female sex status (and blacks and lower classes).

The cultural level is related to the person through socialization, particularly childhood and adolescent socialization. The major and the alternative value-orientations not only legitimize differentially appropriate behavior of adult sex statuses, but they supply differential cultural expectations for boys and girls. From early childhood, parents raise their children differentially for their future adult status. The fact of differential socialization thus means that not only are men and women responded to differently by the "structure," but that they themselves respond differently. Even where women have some opportunity to compete in the (upper reaches of the) occupational sphere, they are
often unequipped to do so--above and beyond structural barriers placed in their path. A preliminary delineation of the relationships of cultural (value-orientations) and structural (sex-statuses) variables to one another and to men and women is diagramatically presented below (Figure 1, page 23). It is incomplete in that it (1) omits other relevant variables such as biological and geographical, (2) presents only some of the possible relationships, and (3) suggests that only static relationships exist. However, it does demonstrate the interrelations among cultural, structural, and personal elements and that instrumental versus affective verbal behavior is the dependent variable of this study. That is, it shows that the focus is here upon language use as an indicator of the instrumental-affective dimension of sex statuses. The following section, therefore, will discuss the verbal behavior of men and women.
Cultural
(value-orientations)

Major (dominant) vs. Alternate (variant)
legitimizes power and domination

Structural
(sex statuses)

Male vs. Female
legitimizes powerlessness and dependence

Personal (personalities)

Man vs. Woman

in society at large
opens path to occupational success

restricts path to primary relations in family and local community

socializes to instrumental (verbal) behavior

socializes to affective (verbal) behavior

Figure 1.
The Relation of Value-orientation, Sex Status, and the Verbal Behavior of Men and Women.
Language as Indicator of the Instrumental-Affective Dimension of Sex Status

This study, then, is one of language as reflecting the differences in power and cultural expectations of male and female sex statuses. Language differences are studied as aspects of social rank differences. It distinguishes instrumental language from affective language and hypothesizes that the language of men is more instrumental and less affective than that of women.

Recognition of the importance of language in social life is as ancient as human civilization. Hertzler presents statements from the Egypt of 2000 B.C. which discuss the interpersonal effects of malicious speech (1965:3). Corinthians XIII, 11 is an early statement of the relation of language, thought and social status. While occasionally in the history of Western thought, language received scholarly consideration (e.g., Ockham, Hobbes, Locke, VonHerder), it was not until the nineteenth century that disciplined study of language can be said to have emerged.

A linguistic determinism had been encouraged by the new interest in language in the middle of the nineteenth century. August Schleicher, an eminent linguist, saw language as an organism, therefore as a biological (i.e., natural) science. The idea that most Europeans and West Asians spoke related languages fit the organic model. This led to exciting reconstruction of many phonetic and grammatic

---

3 When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things.
features of the Indo-European parent speech. It also encouraged linguistic determinism because language, as a biological phenomenon in a Darwinian era, obviously was cause rather than effect of cultural and psychological phenomena (Greenberg, 1963:chap. 11).

Some importance was accorded language by early sociologists. Durkheim gave it a central role in his later work, seeing "[c]onceptual thought as coeval with humanity" (1965:12); moreover, the vocabulary in which thought occurred was the collective product of the society and represented its whole experience (1965:480). Tönnies described language as "...the living understanding both in its content and its form;" its natural manifestation was the spontaneous outcome of deep feelings and prevailing thoughts although it could be used as a consensual system of symbols (1963:47-48). Cooley, seeing no sharp line between man and society (1922:36-37, 81), attributed the link to sympathy, symbols, and communication (1930:290-295; 1922:81, 136, 166). Mead (1934), more strongly, equated interaction itself with language as significant symbols. Even Marx, well before Cooley and Mead, called language "practical consciousness," seeing it as humanizing (Marx, 1956:70-71).

Anthropological studies of language in the twentieth century under the Boas influence attended to the intimate interrelation of language to the rest of culture (cf., Boas, 1917). A more extreme position was taken by Sapir, a culture-and-personality anthropologist, and Whorf, an engineer and student of Sapir. The so-called Sapir-Whorf school emphasized the determining effect of language upon perception, thought, and everything else (cf., Sapir, 1949; Whorf, 1956).
The study of language is presently looked upon as proper for a number of other disciplines outside of linguistics and semantics, which have traditionally been in the humanities. During the past half-century it has become of increasing concern to several of the social sciences, and even to natural science (viz., structural linguistics, information theory).

While some language determinism still continues to have adherents today, the recent tendency among language students has been toward moderation, seeing language as imbedded in other variables. Modern sociologists, particularly symbolic interactionists, see language as intertwined with social life, as being both cause and effect. Related earlier studies by geographer George K. Zipf (1935) that the length of terms is inversely correlated with their frequency of daily usage weakens the causal role of language even more. Further, the international studies of universals in language—which show not only commonalities in languages (Swadesh, 1955; Osgood, Archer, Miron, 1965) but that people are able to guess meanings of terms in radically different languages (Brown, Black, Horowitz, 1955)—suggest that languages, whatever their causal role, also reflect experience and even biological factors (Chomsky, 1957; 1968; Lamb, 1962; Lenneberg, 1964). Joseph Greenberg, an anthropologist, in referring to studies begun in 1954 of monolingual and multilingual speakers of Hopi, Navaho, Zuñi, Spanish, and English, sees their results as strongly weakening Whorfian linguistic relativism:

An examination of these data as well as the unpublished materials of the above projects points to the over-all conclusion that agreement in
fundamentals of human behavior among speakers of radically diverse languages far outweighs the idiosyncratic differences to be expected from a radical theory of linguistic relativity (Greenberg, 1963:138).

In a recent statement, Bill Harrell, a sociologist, saw language as playing a conservative role upon areas such as philosophy, religion, and art, but not in science and technology (1967:111-112). Perhaps Charles F. Hockett, linguist and student of idioms and proverbs, has stated the limitations of language most clearly and simply. He saw language as influential in non-empirical areas (e.g., some types of literature) but as relatively unimportant in practical contexts, e.g., logic and science. He writes that:

Languages differ not so much as to what can be said in them but rather as to what is relatively easy to say... [T]he history of Western logic and science, from Aristotle down, constitutes not so much the story of scholars hemmed in and misled by the nature of their specific languages as the story of a long and successful struggle against inherited linguistic limitations. From the time when science became observational and experimental this is easy to see: speech habits were revised to fit observed facts (Hockett, 1959:248).

Most social scientists, however, have not shown significant interest in language, not even in the latter's more moderate role. Despite Durkheim and Mead, sociologists and social psychologists have taken language for granted, confining themselves to theoretical lip-service. Language was like oxygen, necessary and vital but not particularly problematic. Simmel, for example, saw human sociation as possible only because of shared language (1950:315) but did not devote attention to the analysis of its variations. Language has usually been treated as carrier, conveyor, or transmitter of content, i.e., ideas,
values, moods. The conveyor or transmitter might be faulty and always less than perfect but it did not, in principle, need to affect the message it carried any more than a pipeline carrying liquids affected, or limited the variety of, the liquids that it could carry.

Except for observation of non-verbal behavior, language is obviously used in social and psychological research. The great variety of such studies use language as an indicator of such variables as attitudes, values, perceptions, personality, group membership, and behavior in other settings. Freud and Kurt Goldstein used language to study personality disorders (Lindesmith and Strauss, 1956:chap. 5). L. S. Vigotsky and Piaget and Inhelder did the same in developmental child psychology (Brown, 1965:chaps. 6 and 7). The cross-cultural comparisons by Malinowski, Clyde Kluckhohn, and others (Jones, 1958:441) are well-known. Content analysis makes use of a variety of written and published statements to indicate underlying values, themes, and orientations (McClelland and Friedman, 1952). Most studies and study summaries of male-female differences have used language thusly, as those already referred to above indicate (i.e., Anastasi and Foley, Kagan, Douvan and Adelson, Bennett and Cohen).

Even more direct studies of language, those emphasizing lexicon or vocabulary, have tended to focus on linguistic terms as indicators of other things. For example, the Eskimos have three words for snow whereas English has but one and the Aztec language only one term, with different endings for snow, ice, and cold (Whorf, 1947:215-216). The Masai of Africa have 17 words for conditions of the cow, the Hanunóo of the Philippines 92 for varieties of rice (Brown, 1965:317),
and Arabic over 6,000 terms for states of the camel (Thomas, 1937). The Hopi have one word for anything that flies (e.g., airplane, aviator, insect) except birds (Whorf, 1947:213). A final example, names for colors, show the Ashanti of Africa having but three terms (black for dark colors, red for bright ones, white for light colors), the Brassa of Liberia with one word for orange, red, and yellow and another for green, blue, and purple, and one New Guinea tribe combining yellow, olive-green, blue-green, gray, and lavender as variations of one color (Brown, 1965:315-316). The above presumably indicate the relative prevalence and/or importance of snow, cows, camels, rice, flying objects, and colors in different societies.

Sociological studies of vocabulary and lexicon have most often been the relating of special languages or language styles (e.g., argot, slang, jargon, dialect) to sub-groups or sub-cultures. The use of these special languages by an individual has most often been seen as indicating his membership (actual or anticipated) and/or identification with the particular sub-group or sub-culture. The special languages themselves, e.g., the argot of criminals, slang of youth, jargon of professions, class and regional dialects, have been seen as ensuing from the special needs, interests, and values of these various sub-groupings and/or indicative of their separation from the major thrust of American society. Hence, the special languages have usually been analyzed as to how their vocabularies reflect the socio-cultural differences (e.g., values, traditions, ideologies, normative systems) between the sub-groupings and the general society.
Recent symbolic interactionists, such as Herbert Blumer, Robert Faris, Alfred Lindesmith, Arnold Rose, Anselm Strauss, Manford Kuhn, Hugh Duncan, and their colleagues and students, have followed the Mead tradition of seeing language as intertwined, if not identical with, interaction, self, and thought—in fact, with all that is characteristically human. However, despite the central role given to language, their emphasis has been upon the meaning inferred from vocabulary while that contained in morphology has not been studied.

A different attitude toward vocabulary was exhibited by the General Semantics movement, which sought to purify language of ambiguity, somewhat in the tradition of Ockham, Hobbes, and Locke. Its founder, Count Alfred Korzybski, argued in favor of a concrete and specific language (i.e., extensional meaning) that would mirror the varied and ever-changing reality (1933). His noted dictum, "The word is not the thing; the map is not the territory," a duller version of Shakespeare, was influential. Like Ockham, Korzybski distrusted abstractions, deeming them a form of psychosis since they were removed from the real world. One of his foremost students, S. I. Hayakawa, in the first edition of *Language in Action* (1941), presented a table of levels of abstraction which began with the concrete "Bessie, the cow," and moved up through such increasingly abstract levels as cow, bovine, quadruped, animal, and organism. The aim of Korzybski and his followers was not to study parts of speech as indicators of anything else, much less to emphasize grammar or syntax, but to concretize language so as to solve human problems, e.g., prejudice, war, mental disease, alcoholism, and impotence.
In the work of the writers discussed above, one never comes to feel that language is anything more than an aggregation of terms (or words or symbols). One term bears no apparent relation to another term other than in its referent (or message or content). That is, language is implicitly conceptualized as a lexicon or word list, and not as a language system. Perhaps that the United States is a relatively homogeneous language community, strongly suspicious of verbal subterfuge, abets this tendency to see language as a collection of referents and to ignore the referents' interrelations or formal variations.

While empirical studies of morphology have been made in both primitive and Western society and some have examined the findings from a theoretical viewpoint, most have been descriptive. The few studies that have compared sex differences are of this latter sort.

Students of primitive languages have been more likely to point out the relations between the language structure and the modes of thought. Whorf, for example, describes how Hopi language is timeless, its distinctions emphasizing types of observational validity rather than tenses; words do exist for subjective time, distinguishing among momentary, continued, and repeated occurrences but the language does not deal with objective or mathematical time (1947:217). Trobriand language contains no relational terms such as causation, according to Dorothy Lee, metaphors being used rather than similes; events have attributes (rather than being related to use) and are seen, in the language and in the society as well, as separated, isolated, and sequential (Lee, 1949). The Nootka language of the Vancouver Islanders tends to verbs, featuring action and process; instead of "The leaf is
green" or "The house is there (standing)," the language tends to "The leaf greens," "A house occurs" (Greenberg, 1963:132).

Social Structure and the Differential Use of the Language System

Study of language as a system has tended to concentrate on whole societies. The concern here, however, is with variations in the use of a language system within a single society as they reflect other structural distinctions, specifically, the power differential between the sexes. An approach such as this is recent in social science, coming to the fore after midcentury in the work of the British sociologist, Basil Bernstein, although rooted in American anthropology.

Sapir in 1927 had described five levels for the analysis of speech: (1) voice, (2) voice dynamics, (3) pronunciation, (4) vocabulary, and (5) style. Part of the argument of this study is that most analyses have been at the level of vocabulary and that these could be applied to either the total culture or to particular individuals within it (cited in Hymes, 1961:320-321). The distinction between a society's language and the individual's speech goes back to Ferdinand de Saussure, "one of the main architects of linguistic science of Western society" (Hertzler, 1965:10-11), who distinguished between la langue, i.e., the culturally established, institutionalized, language code, and la parole, the every-day casual and innovative individual speech.

Dell Hymes, American anthropologist, introduced what he called "linguistic code" in 1961 and related it to role behavior in situational contexts. Part of Hymes' conception of code can be found in the
following statement, which follows de Saussure's distinction between speech and language:

Typically, one refers to the act or process or continuum of speech, but to the structure, pattern or system of language. Speech is message, language is code. Speech is observable behavior, language a set of habits (1961:315).

Hymes' article, from which the preceding is taken, apparently provided an impetus for Basil Bernstein's further development of the concept, linguistic code. Bernstein adapted Hymes' concept to his own work, distinguished two kinds of code (elaborated and restricted), but was more social structural in his explanation than Hymes. Bernstein related his codes to the more general societal status, in this case, middle class and working class. He has quoted the passage from Hymes cited above in recent statements about linguistic codes (Bernstein, 1966:254; 1965:150) and made his first use of the concept in the year that followed Hymes' publication. An article entitled "Linguistic Codes, Hesitation Phenomena and Intelligence" (1962a) seems to have been the first use of the concept for the organizing of his own previous observations of the social and social psychological functions and consequences of formal differences in speech (e.g., differences in grammar, syntax, lexicon) (cf., Bernstein, 1958; 1959; 1960).

Both Hymes and Bernstein trace their use of the concept in the work of the language determinists, although they modify the strict language determinism of Sapir and Whorf. Whorf, following Sapir, held that social behavior in a situation was determined by the pre-existing, culturally given, "linguistic formula" which was used to describe, analyze, and classify a situation (Whorf, 1941:88). However, for Hymes
and Bernstein, the social situation is the determiner of the code. Hymes' conceptualization of linguistic code displays a strong situational bias (specificity), although he does refer to other bases:

... in any society there is a congruence between speech and its setting, whether the setting be defined in terms of time, place, or personnel. Some differences in speech behavior seem constant across behavior settings, depending on the persons communicating. An Ainu husband uses his wife's personal name to her, but she may never address him by his. Sapir and Haas discuss phenomena of this sort, such as differences in the speech of men and women. Still, the persons involved communicated in certain behavior settings rather than others, so that particular usages become linked to particular situations (1961:340).

The emphasis placed upon the relation of code to the specific social situation is maintained within a later article wherein codes are seen as "speech patterns diagnostic or characteristic of particular roles... in relation to particular settings, channels, senders, and receivers" (1968:250-251).

Code, for Hymes, is thereby diagnostic or characteristic of the role played by an actor in a specific social situation rather than of aspects of actors, such as social status, which may transcend a variety of specific situations. With code thus seen as a concomitant of interaction, Hymes could allow it to be structurally determined only in so far as social structural considerations determined the nature of the interaction process, i.e., the types of "settings, channels, senders, receivers."

The preceding statement of Hymes' view appears to be basic to Basil Bernstein's conceptualization of linguistic code. Bernstein, similarly to Hymes, sees the social situation as determining the
linguistic code; unlike Hymes, Bernstein relates codes to the general type of social relations engaged in, rather than to very particular roles (1964b:64). In Bernstein's view, codes are a "function of the social structure" in that the individual's structural location, by controlling access to the types of social relations in which he can engage, thereby controls the speech models presented him (1962a:32-34).

Social relations requiring explicit verbal communication give rise to an elaborated linguistic code. When explicit verbal communication is not present, a restricted linguistic code is generated. Thus, for Bernstein, it is "the quality of the social relation" that determines which type of code is generated (1965:51). The social relations which generate a restricted linguistic code are described by Bernstein as ones in which the status relation of the actors is very salient and lines of authority are clear (1964a:56), the behavior required is clearly defined for all the participants (1964a:63) and/or based upon "an extensive net of closely shared identifications and expectations self-consciously held" (1964a:58), i.e., the dimensions of solidarity, affectivity, and/or power are emphasized in the relation (1964b:62, 64, 66). Furthermore, since occupants of all structural locations are seen by Bernstein as interacting in situations not requiring (or even proscribing) explicit verbal communication, the speech models for a restricted code are universally available. Hence, all individuals, regardless of their structural location, will possess a restricted code (1962b:233).

\(^4\) An elaborated linguistic code has a more complex sentence structure and wider vocabulary than a restricted code.
Less universally available are social relations that require explicit verbal communication and consequently generate an elaborated code—thus allowing a wide range of discretion in role performance. Participants share fewer expectations with one another and realize that they do not (1964b:64). Participation in this type of social relation, wherein the other's understanding is not taken for granted, is seen by Bernstein as limited mainly to the middle class and associated strata (1965:158). He describes their structural location as "a stratum seeking or already possessing access to the major decision-making areas of society" (1965:158). However, it is not structural location, per se, that is responsible for the production of an elaborated linguistic code, but rather, the orientation of the family role system and socialization procedures found in this stratum (1964b:66-67).

The use of status-oriented appeals based upon the power of the regulator is found in the lower class family. This type of socialization makes the immediate consequences of the act significant to the child. The middle class, presenting a subcultural contrast to the lower class, constrains the child's behavior through person-oriented appeals based upon the feelings of the regulator. As a result of this type of socialization, the act and its meaning become significant to the middle class child (1964a:60-62). Consequently, the middle class child "very early learns to orient towards the verbal channel" and "comes to perceive language as a set of theoretical possibilities for the presentation of his discrete experience to others" (1964b:65). However, the impersonal socialization undergone by the lower class child has elicited and progressively strengthened "... a relatively
undifferentiated adherence to the normative arrangements of a local social structure" (1964b:66).

The preceding discussion illustrated how Bernstein, like Hymes, sees linguistic code as originating in role behavior. Unlike Hymes, Bernstein's interest in more general types of linguistic code (i.e., elaborated and restricted) has him relate their origins to general types of social relations instead of to particular social situations. In following out Hymes' point of view, linguistic code would be a derivative of norms--of the specific behavioral prescriptions for the actors in particular situations. The nature of Bernstein's descriptions of the types of role relations which generate the two codes are much less specific and can be likened to statements of values--generalized or abstract directives or orientations for behavior.

It would be a distortion of Bernstein's viewpoint, however, to present him as saying that values associated with structural location are determinative of code. Bernstein's interests are social psychological and he is especially concerned with the problematic nature of formal education and psychotherapy for individuals who are limited to only the restricted code (cf., 1961; 1964a; 1964b). He accepts the association between types of social relations engaged in and social structural location as a given (cf., references to Bronfenbrenner and Neuson and Neuson in 1964b:60); hence, Bernstein's view of the determining effects

---

A statement by Lindesmith and Strauss (1956:674) could be noted:

One [problem] is to account for the origin of criminal groups. This is a historical and sociological problem and does not deal with the behavior of individuals. The other is to explain how a given individual comes to join a criminal group and to accept its way of life. This is of interest to the social psychologist.
of social structure is in its functions as a limiting or enabling factor.

Studies of Sex Differences in Language Use

Studies of sex differences in language use have tended to be elemental, descriptive, and often not significant. The frequent lack of significance supports Susan Ervin-Tripp's summary statement that there are relatively small formal differences in language use between the sexes (1966:89). Some examples of these studies are given below.

Loomis and Moran (1931) in a study of grammatical usage in eighty high school students found that girls use 4.9 per cent more modifiers and 5.3 per cent fewer articles than do boys. No significance tests were given. Chotlos, using essays collected from 1200 Iowa primary and secondary school students, found that only two of his twenty grammatical variables were significant for sex; girls used a greater number of adverbs and verbs than did boys (1944:93). Mary Bachman Mann, using samples of college freshman and of schizophrenic patients, found no significant differences between the sexes in either sample in relative frequencies of grammatical parts of speech (1944:72). Loban (1963), dividing a sample of sixth grade school children into superior and inferior writers of English, examined samples of their writing for the number of kinds of sentence structure. He found that while inferior boys were more limited in their repertoire of syntax than inferior girls, superior boys did better than superior girls.

Three investigations with greater analytic insight are relevant to the present study. Fischer (1958), in a sample of
twenty-four semi-rural New England children aged three to ten years, measured the rate of occurrence of the linguistic variant "-in" over "-ing" (e.g., "readin" versus "reading"). He found that markedly more girls used "-ing" more frequently and that boys used more "-in". Furthermore, for each sex, higher incidences of "-ing" were associated with compliant personality and higher incidences of "-in" with aggressive personality. Boder (1940) examined the ratio of qualitative descriptions (nouns and adjectives) to active descriptions (all verbs except auxiliary) in the work of male and female authors. This ratio, which is also called the adjective-verb quotient, is held to indicate the degree of concreteness, objectivity, and intellectuality (qualitative style) as against the degree of motility and emotionality (active style). The adjective-verb quotient was 35.8 for male authors and 34.7 for female authors, the difference not being statistically significant. Nunally and Flaugher (1963) gave college students forced choices to measure the semantic relation of words with their objects. Semantic relations were designated as (1) evaluative (e.g., good, bad, sweet), (2) denotative (e.g., green, long, sharp) and (3) categorical (the object is placed into a broad class; e.g., Republican, fruit, institution). The findings showed males to be more categorical and females more evaluative.

The first three studies are a selected sample of a descriptive and formal approach to language. They compare people on parts of speech, and even sentence structure, without regard to content, i.e., the message transmitted, the attitude expressed, the style, or any other implications. This is akin to examination of subcultural
differences in lexicon. Female superiority in verbal and linguistic functioning is unquestioned from infancy to adulthood (Anastasi and Foley, 1949:651), particularly in language development and verbal fluency (Gallagher, 1964:370). The weight of the above is that women use more verbs; verb usage is a sign of language development (McCarthy, 1943:124).

The last three studies are rare in that they interrelate form and content. That is, they pay attention to the message, attitude, style and other inferences and implications. For example, while Boder (1940) makes a rate analysis, he uses the results to measure behavioral style; his results were not statistically significant, however, and his samples, authors, are more atypical than most. Nunally and Flaugher (1963) studied semantic aspects of word choices (largely adjectives and nouns) but, like Boder, implied sex differences in behavioral style; the results cannot be compared with those of Boder since the latter relates the sum of nouns and adjectives to verbs. Finally, Fischer's (1968) study of verb endings used these examples of formal and informal speech to imply personality differences between the sexes.

The overall findings support the idea that women are more fluent in general, use language of a higher order, and have a predilection for verbs. These and other studies imply behavioral and personality differences already referred to above, e.g., compliance. Yet, Bernstein's (1962b) social class studies suggest a contradiction in the broader analysis of these relationships: He showed a higher order of language use by the middle class, which is more instrumental, and a lower order language use by the working class, which is more
expressive and affective. Yet women, having a higher order of language use than men, are less instrumental and more affective. Apparently, high order language may be used with different behavioral attitudes or styles, e.g., instrumentality and affectivity, Bernstein having overgeneralized from his class studies. As shall be indicated below, this study, interrelating language form and meaning, offers predictions (e.g., on the use of verbs) that appear to contradict the findings of the above studies.

"Situation-Free" Data Collection

The present study is focused on instrumental and affective language attached to sex status rather than to the more situationally specific role behavior. That is, it did not intend to measure speech in interaction with others (Hymes, 1961) but to see, instead, how one talks (i.e., writes) when more or less free from the exigencies of a particular social situation (Vigotsky, 1939). Such a setting, maximizing the language peculiarities of each subject and, presumably, reflecting his past experiences (Bernstein, 1958:60), was wanted.

Therefore, a reasonably anonymous setting was used, i.e., a university class in the first week of the academic year. Second, two fairly unstructured "tests" were administered, the Important Events Test or IET, devised by the investigator, and the Twenty Statements Test or TST (Kuhn and McPartland, 1954). The former asks the subject to write down all past events important to him, the latter to give
twenty different answers to the question, "Who Am I?" Further discussion of the instruments follows in Chapter II.

Apart from the test situation implying a degree of anonymity, the tests themselves provide two further advantages. First, their lack of structure enables language to be emitted more spontaneously, thus increasing its representativeness of language relevant to social status. Second, the questions to be answered detach the subject from the present role situation. The IET, depending on selective memory and conscious selection, is detached from concrete-reality; the TST, since it asks for self-concept, detaches the subject from any particular behavioral situation. Both tests, by transcending the testing situation, i.e., the university classroom, enable generalization—beyond the exigencies of particular role interactions—to social status.

A final advantage is the focus of the language analysis upon the interrelation of form and content. To the degree that language form is being measured, the subject will be less aware, or less certain, which attitude, value, behavior, or past circumstance is being studied—since people are less aware of, or knowledgeable about, the grammar and syntax of their statements.

This study, then, focuses on sex differences in use of instrumental language. It sees men and women as (1) occupants of different sex statuses (2) with differential power (3) supported by differing cultural expectations. It proposes that, as superordinate-subordinate status relations, men and women (as is true for race and class differences) behave in an instrumental and affective manner or style, respectively. This study measures the verbal (written) aspect
of this behavior, treating language as an interrelated form-content whole. Finally, it sees a relatively situation-free setting as most propitious for so doing. The following chapter (Chapter II) will discuss the measurement of the language variables and present the hypotheses for this study.
II

Instrumental versus Affective Language: Measurement, Variables, and Hypotheses

Although language use is traditionally separated into formal linguistics (syntax, grammar) and content (lexicon choice or semantics), in actual language use the meaning communicated is bound up with the grammatical form as well as with the word choice.

Franz Boas, while emphasizing that the vocabulary of a language was determined by the universe of experience (1938:127), also pointed to the functions of grammar in the transmission of experience. Grammar not only "...determines the relationships between the various words expressing different aspects of an experience...it determines those aspects of each experience that must be expressed...The aspects chosen in different groups of languages vary fundamentally" (1938:132-133). For Roman Jakobson, who follows Boas, any difference of grammatical categories is seen as carrying semantic information (1959:139). A similar statement has been made by George A. Miller:

Together the lexical and structural meanings comprise the linguistic meaning of the sentence. Of course, the total meaning of a sentence may include far more than just its linguistic meaning. For example, the boy hit the ball could, in the proper context, mean the boy was responsible for a broken window...The lexical meaning depends upon the categories that boy, ball, and hit designate, the structural meaning depends upon the relations among these lexical elements as they are combined to make a sentence, and the extra-linguistic depends upon the inferences that can be drawn when the sentence is embedded in a context of other information (1954:697).
A converse to the preceding is given by Lenneberg (1953). He maintains that since anything can be expressed in any language, the content of the message (the "What") does not give a clear idea of the language's communicative properties. Instead, the "How" of the communication (its encoding or codification) is the "...only pertinent linguistic data in this type of research..." (1953:467).

The variation in the coding of messages, i.e., the different ways of transmitting the same information, has been termed by Osgood and Sebeok "alternative representational mediators" (1954:72). They suggest that this be used as the unit of analysis of semantic studies which "...concern relations between the characteristic of messages and the characteristics of individuals who produce and receive them, including both their behavior and culture" (1954:3).

Dell Hymes comments that linguists have too long paid attention to only formal structural aspects of language (1961:315) and that "[d]ifferent semantic patterns must result from cumulative differences in the selective perceptions and cognitions..." (1961:331).

In the first studies of linguistic code, Basil Bernstein used only formal and quantitative measures. To demonstrate the existence of the restricted and the elaborated linguistic codes, Bernstein measured rates and means for such variables as grammatical parts of speech, syntax, and length of utterances (1962a; 1962b). In doing so, he was consistent with his definitions of the elaborated and the restricted linguistic codes as the ability of an outside observer to predict linguistic form (1965:153). Denis Lawton, following Bernstein's models, studied elaborated and restricted linguistic codes in written work, but
dealt with content as well. Lawton measured, in addition to syntax, grammar, and quantity of output, the degree of abstraction and of generalization present in the essays written by his subjects (1963).

Based on the foregoing recommendations and practices, the analysis of written language that was made in the present study used a variety of types of variables. That is, it measured formal categories, content (Lenneberg's "What" or meaning), and the intertwining of content and grammar (Lenneberg's "How" or codification).

The Instruments

Measurement of language use was made through two unstructured tests requiring written responses. The first, devised for this study, asks the subject to list all "important" past events; it was named the Important Events Test. The second, the Twenty Statements Test, is an instrument originally devised to measure self-concept (Kuhn and McPartland, 1954).

The two tests were chosen because of the following considerations:
1. They are a minimal stimulus to elicit behavior, requiring the least interference by the investigator. The question asked is broad; the answer is not limited by a fixed form or forced-choices. The respondent therefore structures his own replies, determines (consciously or unconsciously) the range and type of content—the lexicon, syntax, and grammar; and the volume of each response. The response thus approaches the ideal of "emitted behavior" rather than of "elicited" behavior—
consistent with the advice of Charles E. Osgood (1952:197) for the measurement of meaning. Spontaneity is of particular importance for the measuring of language form.

2. Written language is held to be more specific and explicit than speech because of the lack of (social) situational support (Vigotsky, quoted in Ervin-Tripp, 1966:82).

3. Further, the mere fact of writing in a presumably anonymous setting lessened the importance of the specific role situation with its more circumscribed interactional characteristics—in favor of more general verbal behavior, i.e., more reflective of the broader social status.

4. Finally, written language allows a more accurate estimate by the investigator. The separation of utterances (e.g., separate events), because of punctuation and word arrangement on the paper, should be more reliably made. Furthermore, given that the formal differences between the language of men and women are small (Ervin-Tripp, 1966:89), the collecting of a larger-sized sample is more feasible when using written responses than when using oral ones.

The Important Events Test (or IET) was specially designed for this study (sample in Appendix, page 110). It asks the subject to "write down all the events in the past that are important to you." Thus, the IET presents a broad stimulus and asks the subject to define it, e.g., what constitutes an "event," should it have been directly experienced, how many events, or what is "important?" Most subjects defined this in rather personal terms, i.e., few gave events outside of their direct experience and concern, e.g., "Kennedy's assassination" or "the invention of the wheel."
One limitation of the IET is that, by specifying events in the past, it inhibits the emission of future time orientation. This stricture is intended to deter the subjects' use of auxiliary verbs such as "may," "might," or "could;" the ambiguous meaning of such expressions, which are either wishes or predictions, makes it difficult to assess them correctly. Furthermore, the attempt here is to measure actual behavior mode, not what the subject would like to do if he could. Unfortunately, this limitation encouraged the incorrect prediction that females would be more (past) time-oriented than males (see variable 6 in chapters II and IV, below).

The Twenty Statements Test (or TST) asks the subject to give twenty different answers to the simple question, "Who am I?" (Sample in Appendix, page 111). Originally devised by Manford H. Kuhn about 1950, the TST now has a substantial body of research based upon it. For example, it has been used to measure degree of consensuality of an identity (Kuhn and McPartland, 1954), social class and psychiatric condition (McPartland and Cumming, 1958), identification with an occupation (Kuhn, 1960), ward behavior in a mental hospital (McPartland, Cumming, and Garretson, 1961), family role specialization (Couch, 1962), various background characteristics such as age, sex, religion, and education (Mulford and Salisbury, 1964), and alienation (Couch, 1966).

The test, designed to measure self-concept (or self-attitude) within the Mead tradition, is purposely unstructured so that the subject will present several selves, unfettered by questionnaire-type stimulation. It is somewhat free of specific situations, not only because
of its unstructured nature but because "self" transcends situations to a degree.

The present study has made use of an A-B-C-D coding scheme by McPartland (1965). A response to the TST is coded "A" if it is "concrete," giving physical attributes or I.D. card type information, e.g., "I have red hair" or "I live at 1247 Chestnut." A "B" statement refers to a "social" identify, e.g., "housewife," "Republican," or "I am a student." A "C" type is "stylistic," referring to personal trait, activity, or preference that transcends specific social contexts, e.g., "I am shy," "I like to go walking," or "I love rock 'n roll." Finally, a "D" statement is "global," being too vague, abstract, or improbable, e.g., "I love everybody when I feel like it," "Tomorrow will be forever," or "The governor gave me the franchise for the new supersonic airport." The TST lends itself particularly to the objective-subjective dimension and has so been used in the present study.

The Variables

The variables of this study are each related to neither a single elemental value-orientation (cultural expectations) nor addressed to an exclusive segment of the data. That is, in the first case, value-orientations tend to hang together, e.g., "active mastery" is found with "manipulating the external would" and "emphasis upon individual personality"—not with "passive acceptance," "contemplating the inner experience of meaning and affect," and "emphasis upon group identity and responsibility" (examples from Williams, 1960:469-470). Therefore,
there would not be a one-to-one correspondence between a given value-orientation and a given variable; the fact alone that value-orientations tend to "hang together" would preclude this.

In the second case, there is no one-to-one relation between a given variable and a specific segment or piece of datum. Instead, different aspects of a subject's "event" may be used for different variables; the fact that both the form and the content of the language of the events are used would make this inevitable. For example, a "when I met my fiance" event would be classified as "personal" on the second variable below, "Location of Event;" as "modified position" on the third variable, "Reference to 'Others;"" as "involved" in the fourth variable, "Involvement in Event;" as "event in the verb form" in the fifth variable, "Form of Reference to Event: Verb versus Noun;" as "vague" in the sixth variable below, "Time Reference."

Below are listed the seven variables of this study. The majority are based upon the Important Events Test:

1. Fluency
2. Location of Event
3. Reference to Others
4. Involvement in Event
5. Form of Reference to the Event: Verb versus Noun
6. Time Reference
7. Objective versus Subjective Self-Reference

Each variable will be discussed, its sub-categories listed, and a prediction offered. Finally, a summary listing of all the predictions will be presented as the hypotheses for this study.
Fluency

In 1938, Otto Jespersen, Dutch Professor of English language and literature, indicated an association between females and fluency, attributing this to a smaller vocabulary:

"It seems to be characteristic of the two sexes in their relation to language that women move in narrower circles of the vocabulary, in which they attain to perfect mastery so that the flow of words is always natural and, above all, never needs to stop, while men know more words and always want to be more precise in choosing the exact word with which to render their idea, the consequence being often less fluency and more hesitation (1938:16-17)."

Bernstein (1962a), using spoken language, and Lawton (1963), using written language, gave similar evidence for class, i.e., working class boys were more fluent than middle class boys and used a lower level of language. This would support Jespersen. As noted in chapter I, however, studies have shown women to have both higher fluency and a higher order of language than men (cf., LaBrant in Anastasi and Foley, 1949:652 and summary of twenty-five studies by Oetzel in Gallagher, 1964:370).

The above evidence present a contradictory relationship in that, in social class, high fluency is found with a lower order of language use (i.e., in the working class) whereas in sex status, high fluency is found with a higher order of language (that is, for women). The common factor in both class and sex--consistent with the argument of this study--is affectivity.

Prediction: Females are expected to write more events and more words than the males (on the Important Events Test) and more self-references (on the Twenty Statements Test).
Location of Event

This variable is addressed to what the event is about—the content of the message. Responses were classified as (1) Personal, (2) about the subject's Interacting Community, or (3) Removed from both the subject and his interacting community. Thus, the location of an important event in relation to the subject is a measure of his categorizing of his own experience, differences in the categorizing of experience distinguishing cultures or sub-cultures from one another (Clyde Kluckhohn, 1954:956).

**Personal:** what the respondent did, or those occurrences which directly concerned, involved, or happened to him: e.g., "winning the track meet," "when I was graduated," "my 17th birthday." A personal event is an expression of the subject's interest in himself and his own achievements, hence, individualistic (F. Kluckhohn, 1955:252).

**Interacting Community:** activities of and/or happenings to the subject's family, friends, work, school, church,—i.e., the others with whom he usually interacts. While the respondent may have been present at the event, his participation would have been as a spectator: e.g., "when my school won the track meet," "my sister's wedding." "When the collateral [rather than the individualistic] principle is dominant, the goals--or welfare--of the laterally extended group have primacy..." (F. Kluckhohn, 1955:352).

**Removed:** events which are generally known as matters of historical record or are otherwise available to all: e.g., "Kennedy's assassination," "a beautiful spring day."
Prediction: Males are expected to write more Personal events, females more Interacting Community events. No basis for prediction about Removed events.

Reference to "Others"

The number of others referred to as well as the mode of references should reflect whether individualism and instrumentality or collaterallity and affectivity is predominant. A collateral orientation, emphasizing group affiliations and goals, should dispose a subject to mention more others than the having of an individualistic orientation (with its respective emphasis upon personal achievement). Moreover, since collaterality emphasizes kin relations, ascribed roles (F. Kluckhohn, 1950:386), and hierarchial relations (Williams, 1960:469), others should be seen and verbally referred to in terms of their structural relations to the referrer, i.e., by their positional titles. Also, the positional title should be more often preceded by "my," reflecting the particularism and affectivity associated with the collateral orientation.

Possessors of an instrumental orientation with its emphasis upon universalistic standards and equality of peer relations (Williams, 1960:469) should tend to mention fewer others, and should refer to them in an individuating fashion rather than by position title. Additionally, and because of their individualism, fewer of their position references should be modified by the possessive pronoun.

Amount of Others: the number of others referenced in relation to the number of events and the number of words.
Types of Others:

**Individualized:** the other is described or named, the reference being not only one of position: e.g., "going to OSU," "went fishing with Jim."

**Positional:**

**Unmodified:** e.g., "graduation from high school," "sister's wedding."

**Modified:** e.g., "my sister's wedding," "seeing my friends."

Prediction: (1) Females are expected to reference a greater amount of "others;" (2) males are expected to have a higher proportion of individualized references to total "others;" and (3) females are expected to have higher proportions of modified to unmodified positional references.

"Involvement" in Event

One conclusion reached by Whorf from his Hopi studies is that, "...people act in situations in ways which are like the ways they talk about them" (1941:239). Thus, whether or not the respondent had linguistically signified that he was in some manner involved in the event would reflect his instrumental or passive relation to the event. The assessment of signification of involvement, however, should also take into account the location of the event (i.e., Personal, Interacting Community and Removed). On the one hand, to signify involvement when one was a spectator to the event or informed about it would indicate an orientation toward "inner experience of meaning and of affect"
Contrarily, not signifying involvement for a personal event would indicate passivity and the absence of instrumentality.

**Involvement Signified:** actual or implied use of "I" or "my," e.g., "(I) was graduated," "(My) being graduated," "sister's wedding was important (to me)," "When I heard of Kennedy's assassination."

**No involvement Signified:** nouns which are neither modified by "my" nor associated with a copulative verb; e.g., "graduation," "sister's wedding." The Important Events Test asks the subject to write events important to him; in English usage a pronoun is implied in association with a verb but not with a noun (cf., Boas, 1938:132-133 and Jakobson, 1959:139).

**Prediction:** Males are expected to signify involvement in more of their total events and in more of their Personal events; females are expected to signify involvement in more of their Interacting Community events.

**Form of Reference to Event:**

**Verb versus Noun**

An event, for users of English, means what their language classifies as a verb or something analogized therefrom (Whorf, 1947: 216), i.e., either verb forms or nouns. The behavioral attitudes associated with these two grammatical forms may be found in Morris' (1964) discussion of primary values and their signs. His description of the value dimensions of the stages of an act illustrates the linguistic change associated with moving from the manipulatory stage of action—having dominance as its value--, to the consummatory stage—which has dependence as its value. In this change, the dimension of
signifying changes from prescriptive to appraisive and the word use changes from verb to noun (Morris, 1964:23). The foregoing is outlined in Figure 2, below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Action:</th>
<th>Manipulatory</th>
<th>Consummatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension of Signifying:</td>
<td>Prescriptive</td>
<td>Appraisive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension of Value:</td>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>Dependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical Form:</td>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2

Stages of Action in Relation to Dimensions of Signifying, Value, and Grammatical Form

In value orientation terms, signifying an event by a verb would imply Williams' "active mastery" and Kluckhohn's "doing" orientation; by contrast, use of a noun would imply Williams' "passive acceptance" and Kluckhohn's "being" orientation (Williams, 1960:469; F. Kluckhohn and Strodtebeck, 1961:12).

**Verb:** e.g., "graduating," "was graduated."

**Noun:** e.g., "graduation."

Prediction: Males are expected to use verb forms to refer to events more than are females.

**Time References**

The dominant value system prescribed for American males associates with instrumentalism, a future time orientation and a

---

1Modified from Morris (1964:22; Table 2). The bottom row has been added and is based on Morris' discussion (1964:23).
concomitant de-emphasis upon the past (F. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961:13-15; Williams, 1960:469). This orientation should lead to a low frequency of time references in the mentioning of past events. Furthermore, the orientation toward accomplishment associated with the dominant value system should also lead to a lesser concern with past times and, hence, to a lesser interest in specifying clearly when an event occurred. Additionally, an instrumental orientation would be less inclined to see time as the event itself, i.e., to see a date as an event; viewing an event as time itself would emphasize "contemplation of inner experience and affect" (Williams, 1960:469).

**Total Time References**: all events with a time reference.

**Date**: the time is the event, e.g., "June 23, 1964," "17th birthday," "year in the army."

**Dated**: the event is specifically placed in time or its duration is clearly indicated, e.g., "June 23, 1964, the day I was married," "Living with a French family for six weeks."

**Vague**: a vague indication of time location or duration is given, e.g., "When I met Jim," "Every time my friends get together."

**Prediction**: (1) Females are expected to write proportionately more events with a time references than are males, (2) females are expected to write proportionately more of their "times" events as "Date" and "Dated," whereas males are expected to write proportionately more "Vague" time references.
Objective versus Subjective Self-Reference

Objective: a self-reference which implies "involvement in more or less explicitly structured social situations. This category contains references to statuses which are socially defined and can be socially validated:" (McPartland, 1965:10-11), e.g., "I am a student," "(I am) a tennis player," "father." An objective self-reference should indicate a "doing orientation whose...most distinguishing feature is its demand for action in the sense of accomplishment and in accord with standards which are conceived as being external to the individual...What does the individual do..." (F. Kluckhohn, 1955:350).

Subjective: self-references which "...describe styles of behavior which the respondent attributes to himself" (McPartland, 1965:11). A subjective self-reference should indicate a "being-in-becoming" orientation which "...emphasises a self-realization, self-development... and has a great concern with what the human being is rather than what he can accomplish..." (F. Kluckhohn, 1955:350).

Prediction: Males are expected to write a larger proportion of "Objective" self-references than females.

Hypotheses

The predictions listed at the end of the above seven variables will be repeated below as the hypotheses for this study.

1. Fluency: Females are expected to write more events and more words than males (on the Important Events Test) and more self-references (on the Twenty Statements Test).
2. **Location of Event.** Males are expected to write more Personal events, females more Interacting Community events.

3. **Reference to "Others."** (1) Females are expected to reference a greater amount of "others;" (2) males are expected to have a higher proportion of individualized references to total "others;" and (3) females are expected to have higher proportions of modified to unmodified positional references.

4. **"Involvement" in Event.** Males are expected to signify involvement in more of their total events and more of their Personal events; females are expected to signify involvement in more of their Interacting Community events.

5. **Form of Reference to Event: Verb versus Noun.** Males are expected to use verb forms to refer to events more than are females.

6. **Time References.** (1) Females are expected to write proportionately more events with a time reference than are males; (2) females are expected to write proportionately more of their "timed" events as "Date" and "Dated" whereas males are expected to write proportionately more "Vague" time references.

7. **Objective versus Subjective Self-Reference.** Males are expected to write a larger proportion of "objective" self-references than females.
III
Method

The central concern of this study revolved around the differential language style of men and women. This guided and also limited the methodological alternatives available and the decisions finally made. The study required (1) a sufficiently large sample of men and women with as little variation within each sex as possible, (2) a sample of their language that was representative, (3) a focus around which the subjects would present an organized (where relevant), rather than "choppy," language sample, (4) an instrument for collecting such language samples, and (5) a setting that would encourage the above.

College classes in the first week of the academic year were selected. While the strangeness of a new situation undoubtedly made for some tension, the presumed anonymity probably put students at ease about significant others knowing what they wrote. Further, having each subject perform by himself, outside of actual interaction with others, was intended to extend the generalizability of his language beyond specific role situations and to increase its relevance to his more general sex status. The relative homogeneity of the sample in age, social class, and the fact that they were all students increased the validity of the sex comparison. The homogeneity of the sample was subsequently increased further when the minority with a lower class background was eliminated and age variation controlled by dichotomization; it also narrowed the generalizability of the findings.
The instruments chosen for the collection of written language samples were the Important Events Test (IET) and the Twenty Statements Test (TST), both described and discussed in Chapters I and II, above. It was reasoned that use of relatively unstructured tests (i.e., tests that only minimally constricted the written answers) permitted more spontaneous language, therefore increasing its generalizability to ordinary life situations. Also, the fact that each test had a specific focus, i.e., important past events and self-concept, respectively, further increased the likelihood of a relatively organized answer where relevant, if only a sentence or phrase. That is important because this investigation studies language as an interrelation of form and content rather than as a frequency count of separate parts of speech.

Below, the sample and the more specific procedures and techniques will be described.

Source of Data

The data were gathered from students in nine sociology classes the first week of the autumn quarter, 1965, during the first part of one of the meeting times of these classes. The nine classes comprised both regular introductory sociology sections and courses open to both seniors and graduate students. The choice of which particular classes to use was made on "...the usual criteria of convenience, cooperation and captivity!" (Kuhn, 1960:44). In all, data from 357 respondents were gathered, although the number actually used was reduced to 263. Forty-three sets of data were discarded because they were incomplete or otherwise unusable (i.e., as lectures to the investigator, imitations
of very young children, drawings, etc.). Also eliminated were the fifty-one lower-class respondents, for reasons to be explained below.

Data Gathering: Materials and Procedures

The materials distributed to the subjects were the Important Events Test, the Twenty Statements Test, a background information sheet, and manilla envelopes large enough to accommodate the unfolded forms.

The Important Events Test was administered first and then the TST. Results from pre-testing showed that responses to the TST were not significantly affected by its being given subsequent to the Important Events Test.

The data gathering procedure was as follows:

1. Investigator introduced to class by instructor,
2. Distribution of Important Events Test,
3. Ten minutes after Step 2, distribution of envelopes, with the class directed to place the Test forms inside,
4. Distribution of TST forms,
5. Ten minutes after Step 4, class directed to place the TST forms inside the envelopes,
6. Distribution of background information sheet,
7. When it appeared that each student had completed the background information sheet, the class was again directed to place the completed form inside the envelope,
8. The envelopes, containing the materials, were collected and the students were thanked for their cooperation.
Frequency counts of each of the variables for each respondent were made and checked, once after the entire set of forms had been coded and again when the counts were transferred to forms for key-punching onto IBM cards.

Each of the variables for the Important Events Test was separately and consecutively coded, i.e., after all the Tests were evaluated upon one variable, such as Location of Event, before another variable, such as "Involvement" in Event, was coded. After the data were coded for the several variables, the coding process was repeated at least once. The same approach was used for the TST.

Analysis of the Data

The crucial status distinction in this study is sex; the data were thus so separated. Additionally, the data were separated by age (twenty years of age and older versus less than twenty). The age separation was felt to be necessary in that a respondent's age—his experience of the world—might influence the range of replies to the Important Events Test. Moreover, age is known to affect TST response (cf., Kuhn, 1960; Couch, 1962; Mulford and Salisbury, 1964). Further, examination of pre-test data showed the latter to be affected by age.

The data were confined to only middle-class respondents. Since sex differences have been demonstrated for social class (Bernstein, 1962a; 1962b; and Lawton, 1964), it was felt unwise to combine lower-class with middle-class respondents. Furthermore, lower-class college students should be unrepresentative of lower-class in
general. Finally, the number of lower-class respondents from whom data was collected was too small in that they were not only to be divided by sex, but by age as well.

The determination of social class was based upon the respondents' fathers' North-Hatt Scale scores. Scores of 67 and higher were considered middle class. The choice of cut-off point was based upon the work of Clarke (1956:302).

Statistical Procedure

Means, frequencies, and per cent of total sample for each variable within each of the four sex-age categories were computed. For those of the variables (and sub-types of variables) based upon a distribution of the total response of the subjects (e.g., Location of Event as Personal, or Interacting Community or Removed), per cent of each sub-type within each sex-age category was computed. Comparisons between the sexes were made separately for each of the two age groups. Significance tests were made with chi square and critical ratios.

Characteristics of the Sample

The sample used in this study thus contained 263 middle class respondents. These were separated by sex and age (twenty years and older and less than twenty) into four categories. The category means for age, year in college, and North-Hatt scale score of fathers' occupation, and number and per cent of sample are in Table 1, below.

---

1 An expanded form of the North-Hatt Scale was used; it was prepared by the following members of the OSU sociology department: Christen Jonassen, Robert Bullock, Jerome Folkman, William Kenkel, Alfred Clarke and Russell Dynes, and distributed in mimeographed form.
Table 1

Characteristics of the Sample by Sex-age Category: Number and Percentage of Total Sample, Mean Age, College Year, and Fathers' North-Hatt Scale Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Older Males (N=60)</th>
<th>Older Females (N=66)</th>
<th>Younger Males (N=32)</th>
<th>Younger Females (N=105)</th>
<th>Total Sample (N=263)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Year in College</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers' North-Hatt Scale Score (Mean)</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>75.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total Sample</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the sex-age categories for the sample are not equal in size; the younger females are overrepresented whereas the younger male category is underrepresented. However, the age break is fairly even—49 per cent older and 51 per cent younger—and there are similar proportions of older males and older females.

Average ages are identical in the younger sex categories (18.7) and differ only slightly for the older males and females (21.3 for males and 22.2 for females).

North-Hatt Scale scores are also very close for each of the age-sex categories: 105 of the respondents (39.5 per cent) had fathers whose scores were 76 or higher. The highest score was 93 (physicians).

The data for the hypotheses of this study, therefore, are varying frequencies of coded samples of written language on the
Important Events Test (IET) and the Twenty Statements Test (TST). These have been divided into four categories by sex and age. The division into sex follows from the general hypothesis of this study; the age dichotomy is for purposes of control. The four samples are: Older Males (OM), Older Females (OF), Younger Males (YM), and Younger Females (YF). The results will be examined in Chapter IV, below.
IV
Findings

Before examining the empirical findings, it may be well to recall a number of important aspects of this study. First, the original data were written responses to two unstructured tests, the Important Events Test (IET) and Twenty Statements Test (TST). Second, the subjects have been classified in terms of sex or, more relevantly, sex status. Third, the data have been collected, classified, and examined in terms of the underlying explanatory theme of this study, i.e., instrumental versus affective behavior style.

The seven variables, examined at length in Chapter II, above, are: (1) Fluency (2) Location of Event (3) Reference to "Others" (4) "Involvement" in Event (5) Form of the Reference to the Event: Verb versus Noun (6) Time Reference (7) Objective versus Subjective Self-Reference. The seven major hypotheses have all been listed at the end of Chapter II. For purposes of control, each sex has been divided into older and younger, resulting in four sub-samples in all: Older Males (OM), Older Females (OF), Younger Males (YM), and Younger Females (YF). The statistical significance level is p<.10, two-tailed.

The results will first be presented separately for each variable. They then will be analyzed and discussed in general. Finally, a short capsule, or "profile," will be presented of the male and female patterns.
Fluency

The women in the sample were more fluent than the men. On the Important Events Test (IET) both older females (OF) and younger females (YF) revealed significantly higher mean number of words and number of events than did the older males (OM) and younger males (YM), respectively. The means for number of words are: OM, 85.9; OF, 96.3; YM, 71.9; YF, 98.6. The means for number of events are: OM, 10.7; OF, 13.7; YM, 9.2; YF, 14.0 (Table 2, page 69). The sex differences, with age controlled (OM versus OF, and YM versus YF), in mean number of words and mean number of events are all below a probability level of .005.

The above findings are given greater weight by the fact that there was no significant difference in the mean length of events, i.e., the number of words per event per subject. Although the mean lengths are greater for the males than for the females, the probability values are above the 10 per cent level (Table 2). Given that the women wrote more events, one would have expected them to write fewer words per event; the lack of significant male-female difference in words per event thereby attests the more to the females' greater fluency.

Further support to the female's greater fluency is given by the Twenty Statements Test (TST) results. On this test, the mean number of self statements are: OM, 17.95; OF, 19.00; YM, 16.47; YF, 18.80. The sex differences, with age controlled, yield probability value of .06 for the difference between the older females and older males (OF versus OM) and a probability value of .002 for the younger females and younger males (YF versus YM) (Table 3, page 70).
Table 2

Amount of Words and Events and Rate of Response (words/events/subject) on Important Events Test: Numbers, Means, Variances, and Percentages by Sex-age Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Words</th>
<th></th>
<th>Events</th>
<th></th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>$\sigma^2$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Male</td>
<td>5,151</td>
<td>85.85</td>
<td>16.06</td>
<td>21.32</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Female</td>
<td>6,353</td>
<td>96.26</td>
<td>25.33</td>
<td>26.29</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger Male</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>71.86</td>
<td>20.56</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger Female</td>
<td>10,357</td>
<td>98.64</td>
<td>34.05</td>
<td>42.87</td>
<td>1,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24,161</td>
<td>272.43, p&lt;.005</td>
<td>42.87</td>
<td>44.28</td>
<td>3,311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$z$ values for the comparisons between the groups.
Table 3

Amount of Statements on Twenty Statements Test: Numbers, Means, Variances, and Percentages by Sex-age Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>$\sigma^2$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Older Male</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>14.13</td>
<td>22.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Female</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>25.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z = 1.597, p = .06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger Male</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>16.47</td>
<td>16.74</td>
<td>10.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger Female</td>
<td>1,974</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>40.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z = 2.985, p = .002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location of Event

The location of the event - whether it was (1) personal, (2) in the subject's interacting community, or (3) removed from the subject and his interacting community - deals with content. The basis for classification here was the referent of the event, i.e., in which of these three locations did the event occur?

Most of the events referred to by the sample were personal events; this type comprised 2914, or 88.01 per cent of the total 3311 events. The number of interacting community events is 297, or 8.97 per cent of the total. Only 100 removed events were written; these accounted for 3.02 per cent of the total. (Table 4, page 71).

The same order of frequency of events by location that is found for the total sample occurs in each of the four sex-age categories.
### Table 4
Personal, Interacting Community, and Removed Events: Number and Percentage by Sex-age Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Location of Event</th>
<th>Older Male</th>
<th>Older Female</th>
<th>Younger Male</th>
<th>Younger Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. (\bar{x})</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No. (\bar{x})</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No. (\bar{x})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal</strong></td>
<td>603 10.05 93.92</td>
<td>752 11.39 82.91</td>
<td>262 8.19 88.51</td>
<td>1,297 12.35 88.47</td>
<td>2,914 11.08 88.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interacting Community</strong></td>
<td>24 .40 3.74</td>
<td>114 1.73 12.57</td>
<td>20 .62 6.76</td>
<td>139 1.32 9.48</td>
<td>297 1.13 8.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Removed</strong></td>
<td>15 .25 2.34</td>
<td>41 .62 4.52</td>
<td>14 .44 4.73</td>
<td>30 .28 2.05</td>
<td>100 .38 3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Events</strong></td>
<td>642 10.70 9.74</td>
<td>907 13.74</td>
<td>296 9.25</td>
<td>1,466 13.96</td>
<td>3,311 12.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\chi^2 = 43.072, \text{ d.f.} = 2\)

\(p < .0005\)

\(\chi^2 = 9.097, \text{ d.f.} = 2\)

\(p < .0005\)
with personal events constituting the overwhelming majority in each of the categories. The distribution of the three types of locations substantially differs between the sexes in age controlled comparisons (p<.0005 for OM versus OF and for YM versus YF) (Table 4).

As predicted, the older males have the highest proportion of personal events to total events (93.92 per cent) and the older females the lowest (82.91 per cent). The chi square comparison between the older males and older females for personal versus all other events is significant (p<.0005, Table 5, page 73). However, the difference between younger males (88.51 per cent) and younger females (88.47 per cent) is not significant (p<.99, Table 5), contrary to expectation.

The older females have the highest proportion of interacting community events to total events (12.57 per cent) and the older males the lowest (3.74 per cent). The chi square comparison for interacting community versus all other events supported the prediction in the case of the older male-older female difference (p<.0005), but not for the difference between younger males and younger females: YM, 6.76 per cent; YF, 9.48 per cent; p<.20 (Table 5).

Removed events as a per cent of total events is highest for the younger males (4.73 per cent) and lowest for the younger females (2.05 per cent), this difference being significant (p<.01). In the case of the two older categories, the difference is also significant (p<.05), but in the opposite direction; here, the older males write proportionately fewer removed events than do the older females: OM, 2.34 per cent; OF, 4.52 per cent (See Tables 4 and 5).
Table 5
Summary of Chi Square Values and Their Levels of Significance for Each Type of Location versus All Other Events*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Older Male vs. Older Female</th>
<th>Younger Male vs. Younger Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal vs. All Other Events</td>
<td>$\chi^2=43.072, p&lt;.0005$</td>
<td>$\chi^2=9.097, p&lt;.0005$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting Community vs. All Other Events</td>
<td>$\chi^2=36.130, p&lt;.0005$</td>
<td>$\chi^2=2.221, p&lt;.20$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removed vs. All Other Events</td>
<td>$\chi^2=5.114, p&lt;.05$</td>
<td>$\chi^2=7.258, p&lt;.01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Events versus Interacting Community Events</td>
<td>$\chi^2=37.883, p&lt;.0005$</td>
<td>$\chi^2=1.880, p&lt;.20$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All d.f. = 1.
Since it was postulated in this study that males would write proportionately more personal events and females more interacting community events, these event types were directly compared. The results are significant for the older, but not for the younger, male-female comparisons: OM versus OF, p<.0005; YM versus YF, p<.20 (Table 5).

References to "Others"

An "other" has been defined here as a person, group, or organization. Only those references to others which used a common or proper noun were counted, e.g., "sister," "Mary," "my crowd;" excluded were personal pronouns standing in lieu of a noun.

Amount of Others Referenced

Females, as predicted, made more references to others than did males; the means are: OM, 5.78; OF, 8.41; YM 5.00; YF, 9.18. These sex differences in response rates are significant in comparisons based upon means: OM:OF, p<.0001; YM: YF, p<.00001 (Table 6, page 75).

The above comparison, by using the means, took into account the size of each sex-age category. Two other bases of comparison are number of events and number of words produced by each sex-age category. Therefore, the observed number of others was also compared to expected frequencies of others derived from (1) the proportionate number of events written by a sex-age category, and (2) the proportionate number of words written by a sex-age category. The expected frequencies and the results they yielded are presented in Table 7 (page 76). All the
Table 6

Amount of "Others" Referenced:
Number, Mean, Variance, and Percentage of Total by Sex-age Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Older Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Older Females</th>
<th></th>
<th>Younger Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Younger Females</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. ( \overline{X} ) ( \sigma^2 ) %</td>
<td></td>
<td>No. ( \overline{X} ) ( \sigma^2 ) %</td>
<td></td>
<td>No. ( \overline{X} ) ( \sigma^2 ) %</td>
<td></td>
<td>No. ( \overline{X} ) ( \sigma^2 ) %</td>
<td></td>
<td>No. ( \overline{X} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Males</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>17.13</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>20.54</td>
<td>27.39</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>z = 4.06, p &lt; .0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger Males</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>24.91</td>
<td>47.58</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>z = 6.22, p &lt; .00001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*sl*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Older Male No.</th>
<th>Older Female No.</th>
<th>Younger Male No.</th>
<th>Younger Female No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Derived from Events</td>
<td>373.8</td>
<td>528.2</td>
<td>188.8</td>
<td>935.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x^2$ = 3.281, d.f. = 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$x^2$ = 5.280, d.f. = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p&lt;.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Derived from Words</td>
<td>403.9</td>
<td>498.1</td>
<td>204.3</td>
<td>919.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x^2$ = 14.516, d.f. = 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$x^2$ = 11.740, d.f. = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p&lt;.0005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
comparisons showed females more likely to refer to others. The significance levels using events as the basis for the expected frequencies are: OM versus OF, p<.10; YM versus YF, p<.025. With words as the basis for expected frequencies, the significance levels are: OM versus OF, p<.0005; YM versus YF, p<.001 (Table 7).

Types of Others Referenced

References to others were categorized into individualized versus positional; the latter was further divided into unmodified versus modified. An individualized reference contained a proper noun (e.g., Mary) or an adjective qualifying a common noun (e.g., favorite sister). A positional reference uses a common noun alone, i.e., without any adjectival qualifiers, to indicate a sector or part of a social structure; it may be unmodified (e.g., sister, school, friends) or modified by a possessive personal pronoun (e.g., my sister, my school, my friends).

Males had, as expected, a higher proportion of individualized references: OM, 23.63 per cent; OF, 19.82 per cent; YM, 25.62 per cent; YF, 24.58 per cent. However, the chi square comparisons were not significant: OM versus OF, p<.20; YM versus YF, p<.40 (Table 8, page 78).

Comparing types of positional references, males, as expected, wrote proportionately more unmodified positional references than females: OM, 67.17 per cent; OF, 60.67 per cent; YM, 68.07 per cent; YF, 59.56 per cent. The comparisons are significant: OM versus OF, p<.10 and YM versus YF, p<.10 (Table 9, page 79).
Table 8

Type of Reference to "Others"—Individualized and Total Positional Preferences:
Number, Mean, and Percentage of Total by Sex-age Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Reference to &quot;Others&quot;</th>
<th>Older Male</th>
<th>Older Female</th>
<th>Younger Male</th>
<th>Younger Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>23.63%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Positional</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>76.37%</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total &quot;Others&quot; Referenced</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>555 8.41</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 1.834, d.f. = 1, p<.20
χ² = .076, d.f. = 1, p<.40
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Positional Reference</th>
<th>Older Male</th>
<th>Older Female</th>
<th>Younger Male</th>
<th>Younger Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmodified</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>67.17</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>60.67</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>32.83</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>39.33</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Positional</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
<td>445</td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 3.017, \ \text{d.f.} = 1, \ p < .10 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 3.104, \ \text{d.f.} = 1, \ p < .10 \]
Finally, a comparison simultaneously involving the three types of references to "others", i.e., individualized, unmodified position, and modified position, upheld the predictions that the males would have higher proportions of individualized and unmodified positional references, whereas the females would have higher proportions of modified positional references. For the older male versus older female comparison, the probability level was less than .005; for the younger, the probability level was less than .025 (Table 10, page 81).

"Involvement" in Event

In writing about an event, a subject may or may not "involve" himself in the event. That is, he may link himself to the event, e.g., "my graduation", "seeing my sister married", "being promoted", or even "graduated". "Non-involvement," on the other hand, means that the subject sets the event off from himself or stands apart from it, e.g., "graduation", "sister's wedding", "promotion". In the sample as a whole, involvement was indicated in 84.23 per cent of the events.

Males, as expected, indicated involvement in a greater proportion of their events than did females. However, the results were significant for the older male-older female comparison (OM, 90.97 per cent; OF, 80.82 per cent; p<.0005), but not for the younger (YM, 84.80 per cent; YF, 83.29 per cent, p<.50). (See Table 11, page 82.)

When events were distinguished by location - personal, interacting community, removed - the results went contrary to
Table 10

Individualized, Unmodified Positional, and Modified Positional References to "Others:"
Number, Mean, and Percentage of Total by Sex-age Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of &quot;Other&quot; Reference</th>
<th>Older Male</th>
<th>Older Female</th>
<th>Younger Male</th>
<th>Younger Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>178</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>51.30</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmodified Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>25.07</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>23.63</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total &quot;Other&quot; References</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>347</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 4.820, \text{ d.f.} = 1 \quad p < .005 \]

\[ \chi^2 = 3.154, \text{ d.f.} = 1 \quad p < .025 \]
Table 11

Indication of "Involvement" in Total Events:
Number, Mean, and Percentage of Total by Sex-age Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indication of &quot;Involvement&quot;</th>
<th>Older Male</th>
<th>Older Female</th>
<th>Younger Male</th>
<th>Younger Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Involvement&quot; Indicated</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>90.97</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Indication</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Events</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>93.74</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>13.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 40.480, \text{ d.f.} = 1, \quad p < .0005 \]

\[ \chi^2 = .404, \text{ d.f.} = 1, \quad p < .50 \]
expectation. It had been predicted that, whereas males would signify more involvement in personal events, females would signify more involvement in interacting community events. There was no significant difference in personal events for either the older males and females (OM, 95.19 per cent; OF, 93.48 per cent; p<.20) or the younger (YM, 94.28 per cent; YF, 92.06 per cent; p<.30) (Table 12, page 84). For interacting community events the results were opposite to the prediction in that older males showed significantly greater involvement (OM, 41.67 per cent; OF, 24.56 per cent; p<.10) and there was no significant difference for the younger (YM, 20.00 per cent; YF, 16.56 per cent; p<.80) (Table 13, page 85). Finally, for removed events, the results are not significant. There were only six removed events that indicated involvement, all written by the females - two by the older and four by the younger. Fisher's Exact Probability Test showed the following results: OM versus OF, p=.53; YM versus YF, p=.20.

Form of the Reference to the Event:
Verb versus Noun

The majority of the events references made by the total sample was in a verb form. That is, 64.06 per cent of the total events referenced were in the form of either a gerundial phrase or a predicate verb (e.g., graduating, graduated). The remaining 34.94 per cent (or 1157 events references) were nouns (e.g., graduation, sister's marriage) (Table 14, page 86).
Table 12

Indication of "Involvement" in Personal Events:
Number, Mean, and Percentage of Personal Events by Sex-age Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indication of &quot;Involvement&quot;</th>
<th>Older Male</th>
<th>Older Female</th>
<th>Younger Male</th>
<th>Younger Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Involvement&quot; Indicated</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>95.19</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>10.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Indication</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personal Events</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>1,297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\chi^2 = 1.790, \text{ d.f.} = 1\)  
P<.20

\(\chi^2 = 1.523, \text{ d.f.} = 1\)  
P<.30
Table 13

Indication of "Involvement" in Interacting Community Events:
Number, Mean, and Percentage of Total Interacting Community Events by Sex-age Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indication of &quot;Involvement&quot;</th>
<th>Older Male</th>
<th>Older Female</th>
<th>Younger Male</th>
<th>Younger Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Involvement&quot; Indicated</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Indication</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Interacting Community Events</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\chi^2 = 2.924, \text{ d.f.} = 1, p<.10\]  
\[\chi^2 = .146, \text{ d.f.} = 1, p<.80\]
Table 14

Form of Reference to the Event: Verb versus Noun:
Number, Mean, and Percentage of Total by Sex-age Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Reference</th>
<th>Older Male</th>
<th>Older Female</th>
<th>Younger Male</th>
<th>Younger Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>70.72</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>7.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>29.28</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Events</td>
<td>642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 31.183, d.f. = 1
p < .0005

χ² = 5.266, d.f. = 1
p < .025
Substantiating the prediction, males used significantly higher proportions of verb forms. The results for the older males and females are: OM, 70.72 per cent; OF, 56.78 per cent; p<.0005. For the younger males and females, the results are: YM, 72.97 per cent; YF, 66.10 per cent; p<.025.

Time Reference

Events were classified in terms of time reference, i.e., any reference to when they occurred or for how long. Three types of time reference were distinguished: (1) Date; the time reference was the event itself, e.g., "Christmas, 1964," "17th birthday," (2) Dated; explicit chronological location or duration, e.g., "Working at a settlement house during my junior year," "June 23, 1964, the day I was married," and (3) Vague; reference to time is vague, e.g., "the day I met Joe," "all the times my friends got together."

For the total sample, 784 (23.68 per cent) of events had a time reference, with the males writing higher proportions of these than the females: OM, 24.61 per cent; OF, 22.05 per cent; YM, 29.39 per cent, YF, 23.12 per cent. The comparisons, however, are significant only for the younger males and females (OM versus OF, p<.30; YM versus YF, p<.05) (See Table 15, page 88). The results were contrary to expectations.

The remaining analyses will be confined to comparisons among the measures of time reference, i.e., Date, Dated, and Vague. An analysis of the three simultaneously showed that males, as predicted,
Table 15

Amount of Events with a Time Reference:
Number, Mean, and Percentage of Total Events by Sex-age Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference to Time</th>
<th>Older Males</th>
<th>Older Females</th>
<th>Younger Males</th>
<th>Younger Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events with Time Reference</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>24.61</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Time Reference</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>75.39</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Events</td>
<td>642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 1.377, \text{ d.f.} = 1 \]
\[ \chi^2 = 4.487, \text{ d.f.} = 1 \]

p < .30
p < .05
write fewer "Date" statements (OM, 13.29 per cent; OF, 19.00 per cent; YM, 9.20 per cent; YF, 20.35 per cent) and, as expected, a greater proportion of "Vague" statements than the females (OM, 18.99 per cent; OF, 9.50 per cent; YM, 32.18; YF, 30.09). In the case of "Dated" statements, the older males write fewer than the older females whereas the younger males write more proportionately than the younger females (OM, 67.72 per cent; OF, 71.50 per cent; YM, 58.62 per cent; YF, 49.56 per cent). (Table 16, page 90.)

When "Date," alone was compared to the other time references (Dated plus Vague), only the comparisons between the younger samples were significant (OM versus OF, p<.20; YM versus YF, p<.025) (Table 17, page 91). No significant results were obtained when "Dated" was compared to the others (OM versus OF, p<.50, YM versus YF, p<.20) (Table 17). Finally, when "Vague" was compared with the other two, the results were significant only for the older samples (OM versus OF, p<.01; YM versus YF, p<.70) (Table 17).

**Objective versus Subjective Self-Reference**

An objective self-reference is the name of a status (i.e., a noun) which is socially defined and can be socially validated: e.g., "I am a student," "I am a tennis player." A subjective self-reference, on the other hand, is a description of behavioral style in social situations; in form, it is either a verb or a noun having an evaluative qualifier: e.g., "I like to study," "I am a reluctant student."
Table 16

Date, Dated, and Vague Time References:
Number, Mean, and Percentage of Total Time References by Sex-age Category

| Type of Time Reference | Older Males |  | Older Females |  | Younger Males |  | Younger Females |  | Total |  |
|------------------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---|
|                        | No. | X | %  | No. | X | %  | No. | X | %  | No. | X | %  |
| Date                   | 21  | .35| 13.29 | 38  | .58| 19.00 | 8  | .25| 9.20 | 69  | .66| 20.35 | 136 | .52| 17.35 |
| Dated                  | 107 | 1.78| 67.72 | 143 | 2.17| 71.50 | 51  | 1.59| 58.62 | 168 | 1.60| 49.56 | 469 | 1.78| 59.82 |
| Vague                  | 30  | .50| 18.99 | 19  | .29| 9.50  | 28  | .88| 32.18 | 102 | .97| 30.09 | 179 | .68| 22.83 |
| Total Time References  | 158 |       |         | 200 |       |         | 87  |       |         | 339 |       |         | 784 |       |         |

\[ \chi^2 = 7.737, \text{d.f.} = 2 \]
\[ \chi^2 = 5.966, \text{d.f.} = 2 \]
\[ p < .0005 \]
\[ p < .005 \]
Table 17

Summary of Chi Square Values and Their Levels of Significance for Each Type of Time Reference versus All Other Time References*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Reference</th>
<th>Older Males vs. Older Females</th>
<th>Younger Males vs. Younger Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date vs. All other</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 1.968, p&lt;.20$</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 5.789, p&lt;.025$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time References</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dated vs. All other</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = .586, p&lt;.50$</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 2.296, p&lt;.20$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time References</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vague vs. All other</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = 6.768, p&lt;.01$</td>
<td>$\chi^2 = .153, p&lt;.70$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time References</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All d.f. = 1.
Males, as predicted, had a higher proportion of objective to subjective self-statements: OM, 34.51 per cent; OF, 32.89 per cent; YM, 28.95 per cent; YF, 27.70 per cent. However, the differences between the sexes were not significant: OM versus OF, p<.50; YM versus YF, p<.70. (See Table 18, page 93.)

Discussion

The results that supported the predictions without exception came from two of the variables, Fluency (variable 1) and Form of Reference to the Event: Verb versus Noun (variable 5). Listed after these are two variables, at least half of whose predictions were borne out, with the remaining predictions not significant statistically but in the right direction: Location of Event (variable 2) and Reference to "Others" (variable 3). Next, variables 4 and 6, Involvement in Event and Time Reference, respectively, presented more mixed results, the former being borne out in its general prediction, the latter having its general prediction negated, and both having a variety of positive, negative, and neutral findings in their lesser predictions. Finally, variable 7, Objective versus Subjective Self-Reference, was not statistically significant, but in the right direction. Following this order, the results are examined and discussed below, concluding with a capsule picture, or "profile," of the male and female.

I. All Predictions Borne Out:

1. Fluency. All six predictions, four on the IET (for both number of words and number of events) and two on TST (number of
Table 18

Objective versus Subjective Self-References:
Number, Mean, and Percentage of Total by Sex-age Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Self-Reference</th>
<th>Older Males</th>
<th>Older Females</th>
<th>Younger Males</th>
<th>Younger Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>34.51</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>65.49</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>11.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Self-References</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>69.49</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>1,122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = .605$, d.f. = 1, $p<.50$

$\chi^2 = .271$, d.f. = 1, $p<.70$
statements) borne out and statistically significant. On all measures, and in both age controls, females were more fluent than males.

5. Form of Reference to Event: Verb versus Noun. Both predictions significant statistically. For both age categories, males tend to use a verb, and females a noun, form to signify the event.

II. At Least Half of Predictions Borne Out, with Remainder in Right Direction:

2. Location of Event. Both basic predictions for the older samples were statistically significant, with males locating the event in the Personal sphere and females in the Interacting Community sphere. For the younger samples, the results matched those of the older samples, but were not significant statistically. In the case of Removed events, no prediction had been made, the actual results showing the Older Females and Younger Males inclined toward this sphere at a statistically significant level.

3. Reference to "Others." All predictions referring to "amount" of reference to others were statistically significant, with females in both age controls more likely to mention others in the events than males; this also held true when amount of reference to others was made relative to total number of events and total number of words.

When "types" of reference to others was examined, males of both age categories were more likely to mention unmodified positions, e.g., "school," "friend," "brother," and females modified positions,

1The analysis of the six remaining variables took into account, i.e., controlled for, the greater fluency of the females.
e.g., "my school," "my friend." Individualized others, e.g., "OSU," "Jim," were more likely to be referenced by males, positions in general (Unmodified plus Modified) by females, in both age controls—but not at a statistically significant level.

III. In Right Direction, but not Statistically Significant:

7. Objective versus Subjective Self-Reference. The TST was used to measure objective ("B" type, i.e., "social" identity) and subjective ("C" type, i.e., "stylistic" or personal self-reference) (see TST discussion, above). The results, not statistically significant, leaned in the predicted direction, with males in both age categories tending to objective ("B" type), females to subjective ("C" type) self-reference.

IV. Mixed Results, General Prediction Borne Out:

4. "Involvement" in Event. The basic predictions, that males in both age controls would indicate greater "involvement" in the events, came out at a statistically significant level. However, when this was further categorized by type of location, i.e., Personal, Interacting Community, and Removed events (using the categories of variable 2, above), the results indicated several directions. Males had been predicted to be more involved in Personal, females in Interacting Community, events. This held for males of both age categories in the case of Personal events (though not at a statistically significant level); however, they were also more likely to be "involved" in Interacting Community events as well, the older males at a statistically significant level, the younger males not.
V. Mixed Results, General Prediction Negated:

6. Time Reference. The basic prediction, that reference to
time in general would be made more by females, was negated; males in
both age controls were more likely to make time references of all
kinds than females, though at a statistically significant level only
for younger males. Lesser predictions also had been made for type of
time reference, i.e., that females would lean more to "Date" references
(i.e., where the time reference was the event itself, e.g., "Christmas,
1964" or "17th birthday") and to "Dated" (where there is mention of a
specific time location or duration, e.g., "My first week at OSU") and
males to give more "Vague" (reference to time is inexact or vague,
e.g., "whenever I went home," "the day I met Joe") time references.
The predictions were substantiated for "Date" (statistically
significant for younger females, in right direction for older females)
and "Vague" time references (statistically significant for older males,
in right direction for younger males). In the case of "Dated" time
references, however, while older females were more likely to make such
references than older males, as predicted, it was males in the younger
age category who were the more likely, contrary to prediction; neither
finding was statistically significant.

In an overall look at the results, one might first look at
the more quantitative variables. In their written statements, females
in both age categories showed greater fluency (variable 1) in both
IET (number of words and number of events) and TST (number of state­
ments) and the greater tendency to refer to "others" (variable 3).
Males of both ages, in their written statements, were more likely to
"involve" themselves in the events (variable 4) and, in the case of
the younger, to indicate a time reference (variable 6).

In the more qualitative distinctions, males signified the
event more in a verb phrase of the sentence, females more in a noun
phrase (variable 5), this being true for both age categories for each
sex. Further, older males located the event in "personal" relations,
older females in the "interacting community," and both older females
and younger males in "removed" events (variable 2). Finally, there was
but a statistically non-significant inclination for males in both age
controls to write more objective self-references and females more
subjective self-references (variable 7).

Turning to qualitative distinctions made within the above
more quantitative variables, when the Personal-Interacting Community
distinction of variable 2 (Location of Event) was applied to variable 4
("Involvement" in Event), older males were more "involved" in "inter-
acting community" events than older females (despite the latter's
general predilection for the latter--see variable 2), though not in
the case of "personal" or "removed" events. Second, when Reference to
"Others" (variable 3) was divided into individualized and positional,
females in both age categories showed the greater tendency to use
"modified positions," the males "unmodified positions," and there was a
non-significant tendency for males to "individualize" their references
to "others" whereas females leaned toward "positional" references.
Finally, when time reference (variable 6) was divided into Date,
Dating, and Vague categories, younger females made more "date" time
references and older males more "vague" time references.
"Profile" of the Male and Female

In short, males tended to lesser fluency, to refer to the events in a verb phrase, to be time-oriented (in a particularly vague manner), to "involve" themselves more in their reference to the events, to locate the event in their personal sphere, to refer less to "others" but to individualize such reference and, where referring to position, not to modify it.

Females, in contrast, were more fluent, referred to events in a noun phrase, were less time-oriented (except where the date was the event), tended to be less "involved" in their event reference, to locate the event in the interacting community, to refer more to "others" but to do so by position, particularly modified position.
Summary and Concluding Statement

This study brought together two concerns, women and language. The first has been conceptualized as a social status that is at a power disadvantage relative to men, occupiers of the male status. Further, the power differential between men and women, similar to race and class power differences, was seen as buttressed from early childhood by cultural expectations: particular use was made of Robin Williams' and Florence Kluckhohn's distinctions between major (dominant) and alternate (variant) value-orientations of a society, the former applying to the male status, the second left to the female status.

Language, the second concern, was studied as the dependent variable. Relying on a traditional distinction that has also been theoretically developed in recent years, this study predicted that men are more likely to use instrumental language style and women affective language style. Further, emphasis was placed upon the interrelation of linguistic form and content, thus departing from the almost universal concentration by sociologists and social scientists on language vocabulary, i.e., content. The emphasis, therefore, upon language as a system follows the recent work on "linguistic code" of Dell Hymes and Basil Bernstein.

To test the basic hypothesis of male instrumental language use versus female affective language use, the writer collected language samples using two relatively unstructured tests, the Important Events
Test and the Twenty Statements Test. These tests permitted the emission of more spontaneous language than had more structured tests been used. Moreover, the setting, college classes in the first week of the academic year, not only implied anonymity, but, being removed from specific interaction situations, enabled a tapping of the status basis of language use.

Summary of Findings

The significant male-female differences will first be presented below briefly for each variable, then a general discussion will follow.

1. **Fluency.** Females were significantly more fluent than males, for both age categories, in both tests, and on all measures (number of words, events, and self-references).

2. **Location of Event.** Older males tended to locate events in the Personal sphere, older females in the Interacting Community sphere.

3. **Reference to "Others."** Females tended to refer more to "others" in the events, particularly in modified positional terms. Males showed the tendency, when referring to others, to do so in individualized and unmodified positional terms.

4. **"Involvement" in Event.** Males tended to be more "involved" in the events they referenced than females, even in the Interacting Community sphere (older samples only).
5. **Form of the Event: Verb versus Noun.** Males, in both age controls, tended to use a verb form to refer to the events, while females were more likely to use the noun form.

6. **Time Reference.** Males (younger) were more likely to present events with time references (contrary to prediction) and to refer to time in vague terms (older males); females (younger) were more likely to use a date itself as an event.

7. **Objective versus Subjective Self-Reference.** No significant results were obtained, with males leaning toward objective, females toward subjective, self-reference.

Most of the predictions were borne out, particularly those on Fluency (variable 1), Location of Event (variable 2), Reference to "Others" (variable 3), Form of the Reference to the Event: Verb versus Noun (variable 5), and, to a lesser degree, "Involvement" in the Event (variable 4). Variable 7, Objective versus Subjective Self-Reference, disappointed, although the results at least pointed in the predicted direction.

The data did not support variable 6, Time Reference. Had one followed the lead of Parsons, Williams, Kluckhohn, McClelland, and others, the prediction would have had the male, in this study, present the events with a time reference,--and the results indeed showed this to be the case. However, the instrument used to measure this variable was the Important Events Test, which referred to the past. Therefore, it was reasoned that the male, as future-oriented, would be less concerned with giving the time of past events, his tendency to "vague" time references in the study perhaps being consistent with this. The
only finding supporting the time prediction was the greater tendency of
younger females to events with "Date" references—but this variable
remains the one that yielded the poorest prediction.

The most rewarding correct prediction was variable 5, Form
of the Reference to the Event: Verb versus Noun. This study had
predicted greater use of the verb form by males, and of the noun form
by females, to refer to the event despite previous research by Boder,
Chotlos, and others (discussed in Chapter I, above) that associated
verbs with women. However, Boder's study used male and female authors,
subjects probably more atypical than most, the male authors probably
being more affective than the average male and the female authors more
instrumental—in order for the latter's work ever to see print. The
study by Chotlos, on the other hand, was typical of many such studies
in that it was atomistic and descriptive; that is, it made noun-verb
counts. The present study, in contrast, was not one of total noun-verb
usage but focused on the grammatical form in which the event was
signified. That is, the approach here dealt with the interrelation of
language form and content in focusing on the grammatical form that was
selected by the subject to convey the information, i.e., was the impor-
tant word of the utterance in verb or in noun form?

Critique and Suggestions
for the Future

In the broad sense, this study was somewhat limited in that it
(1) studied but one superordinate-subordinate relationship, i.e., sex
status, (2) confined the analysis to language, particularly written language, (3) used only two tests, the Important Events Test and the Twenty Statements Test, (4) used samples that were relatively circumscribed in culture (Western), subculture (largely urban middle-class), and age, and (5) studied these in direct interaction with each other. Given these limits, generalization to other superordinate-subordinate language (and behavior) styles must be cautious, extended only to the degree that other evidence and theory permit.

Following from the above, direct studies of the language style of blacks, lower class individuals, employees, followers, and other subordinates should be attempted. These can be studied in isolation, as in the present study, or in direct interaction with equals, superordinates, and subordinates. The disadvantage with the latter, that of too great a situational specificity, would be accompanied by the advantages of seeing language style in actual interaction. Given direct interaction, furthermore, one could then go beyond language to study other aspects of (overt) behavior.

The use of unstructured tests, moreover, has methodological limitations, as do projective tests in general. This required some trial-and-error experimentation with coding schemes. Among the imperfections was the inability to develop a more direct measure of the active-passive dimension. A second was the fact that the Important Events Test, since it referred to the past, was not a good way to measure futurism, though the results still showed males the more likely to refer to time in the events. Nevertheless, while there were several imperfections in the tests and in some of the uses to which they
were put, they were particularly appropriate for the study of spontaneous language emission, as indicated above.

The use of samples circumscribed in class, age, culture, and the like is always a matter of degree—but also a basis for cautious generalization. The least forgivable limitation is the use of convenient college classes—though the anonymity and familiarity of the subjects with test-taking was useful. It is clearly necessary to study subjects outside of college settings, vital to select a variety of racial and lower (and upper) class samples, and to vary the age range more widely. As it was, some control for age was necessary. The findings show some tendency for more statistically significant results in the older comparisons (OM versus OF, 16 statistically significant differences out of a possible total of 23; YM versus YF, 13 out of 23); the older samples gave better results particularly in variables 2 (Location of Event) and 4 ("Involvement" in Event) whereas the younger samples showed better results in variable 6 (Time Reference).

Moreover, replication would be valuable, first without any changes, then by introducing variations gradually for purposes of comparison. One important change would be another theoretical basis, that is, other than the emphasis on power differences, cultural expectations, instrumental and affective styles, and the like.

Concluding Statement

The findings appear to fit the instrumental-affective dimension, with their underlying value-orientations, as developed for
America by Robin Williams and Florence Kluckhohn. The picture, as presented, sees the male as time-oriented and active toward his environment, more sparing in words (resources), ego-involved in what he does and less concerned about others, except in peer-relations. He exemplifies the Williams, Kluckhohn, Parsons (and Tönnies and Simmel) analysis of the major or dominant values of Western industrial society, e.g., active mastery over nature, time-consciousness, individualism, universalism, and the like.

The picture presented of the female shows her to be more concerned with "being," more fluent, less ego-involved, and with greater concern for others, particularly hierarchial relations. She exemplifies the minor or variant Western industrial values, e.g., passive acceptance, harmony with her surroundings, collaterality, particularism, and so on.

The above supports the argument that men and women use language somewhat differently in both form and content; the differences fit the differences between instrumental and affective modes or styles of behavior. Second, they are compatible with the distinction, by Robin Williams, between major and alternative themes or value-orientations in American society--applied explicitly by Florence Kluckhohn to men and women as dominant versus variant value orientations. These, as cultural expectations, come to serve as models and guides for the socialization of the young and the daily behavior of the adult.

Further, as argued in Chapter I, sex status relations are superordinate-subordinate, therefore power, relations. The
instrumental-affective behavior style distinction is not only related to cultural expectations but also to differential power—therefore applicable to race, class, and other hierarchial relations. Nevertheless, cultural expectations are a necessary part of the picture, legitimizing power and domination of sex status occupants, on the one hand, and socializing these occupants from childhood (see Chapter I, Figure 1). One clue to this relationship arises out of the work of Bernstein and Lawton (referred to in Chapters I and II, above) and Hess and Shipman in socialization and is of direct relevance to the fluency findings of this study. This dimension shall now be developed.

Middle class boys, using the "elaborated" linguistic code, have high order language but low fluency whereas working class boys, using the "restricted" linguistic code, have low order language and high fluency, according to Bernstein and Lawton. A theoretical problem is presented in that the evidence shows women, with an affective language style (like the lower class), having both higher fluency and higher order language than men—who have an instrumental language style. A lead is provided by examining the Bernstein-Lawton socialization arguments and adapting the Hess-Shipman socialization studies to sex differences. Lower-class socialization uses inhibitory (naked-power) techniques, e.g., "If you do this, I will knock your block off." Middle class socialization uses internalizing techniques (Bernstein, 1964b:66), but in two ways (Hess and Shipman, 1967:416): (1) An appeal to logical considerations and objective consequences, e.g., "If you run out into the street, you may get hurt;" (2) an appeal to feeling states and subjective consequences, e.g., "If you do that, you
will be tired and Daddy will be angry." While the second type of (Hess and Shipman) internalizing technique is like the first in that it emphasizes awareness of alternatives and encourages the child to choose correctly or wisely, this nevertheless is a disguised appeal to power since it is an overt threat of withdrawal of love.

If one adapts the Hess-Shipman formulation to male versus female socialization, it is possible to resolve the contradiction between the Bernstein-Lawton findings on the language of classes and the substantial evidence about sex differences in language. That is, it may be that, at least in middle class homes, boys are raised with an internalizing approach stressing objective consequences whereas girls are raised with an internalizing approach stressing subjective consequences; the first makes for an instrumental language or behavior style ("elaborated code") emphasizing active mastery whereas the second leads to an affective style (also "elaborated code") exemplifying a concern with social relations. To summarize, the apparent contradictions among the languages of middle class males, lower class males, and (middle class) females may be resolved as follows: (1) inhibitory (naked power) socialization causes (lower class male) affective behavior style with low order language and high fluency; (2) internalizing (objective consequences) socialization makes for (middle class male) instrumental behavior with high order language and low fluency; finally, (3) internalizing (subjective consequences with disguised power appeal) socialization leads to affective behavior with an even higher order language and high fluency.
The woman is thus comparable to the lower class, the black, and other "subordinates" only in selected ways. Like them, she occupies a lower power rung, is socialized accordingly, and has high barriers to the cultural definition of success. Like them, also, her behavior (and language) style is affective. However, her language level not only is not comparable to the other "downtroddens," it is, in fact, higher than that of the more advantaged (and instrumental) male. This, then, offers a key to the state of the (middle class) woman in modern society. In a real sense, she is a pet in a gilded cage; she is of little consequence in the final analysis--what she does, anyone else can do. Her intimate, collateral, relationship to men in the family makes her situation more benign than that of other subordinates, which fact may account for the relative unconcern for her by sociologists and other social scientists. She, therefore, has exhibited less tendency to violence and organized revolt than workers and blacks--but there are recent rumblings.
APPENDIX A

Specimen Copy of Completed
Important Events Test

Please write down all the events in the past that are important to you. Do not worry about being logical or chronological.

taught Sunday School

[entire]
taught at camp for Mentally Retarded children

won confirmation essay award

won essay contest at graduation, won out of graduating class

was elected "Best Thespian" of year

homecoming court

on prom court

was on Senior Social Committee Senior year

acceptance to Ohio State

having great family & friends

made majorette during Soph. year at high school for secretary of class

[entire]
elected chosen to be in Miss Teenage America

[entire]
chosen to be in temple youth group camp

modeled for dept. store

[entire]
APPENDIX B

Specimen Copy of Completed
Twenty Statements Test

There are 20 numbered spaces on this sheet. Just write 20 different things about yourself in the spaces. Do not worry about how important they are or the order you put them in. Just write the first twenty answers you think of to the question "WHO AM I?"

1. Girl
2. Student at O.U.
3. Thoughtful
4. Kind to others
5. Considerate
6. Want to work with mentally retarded children
7. Helpful
8. Daughter of great parents
9. Daughter of doctor
10. Smoker
11. Outdoors type
12. Girl who likes to be with others & make others happy
13. Future teacher
14. Love to walk
15. Love to have fun & be happy
16. Like to go out to different & odd places
17. Like to climb trees
18.
19.
20.
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