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CHAPTER ONE

The Problem

This study is designed to examine the relationships between the structure of language, the use of certain linguistic forms, and the assumption of "politeness" as a definition by gender\(^1\) of speaking styles. The language used by two women and two men in televised interviews with public figures is analyzed in order to 1) discover what syntactical rules govern their linguistic behavior and 2) document how different levels of linguistic structure relate to the rules which have been imputed to female and male\(^2\) speakers.

Perspectives

Lakoff (1973) argues that women and men can be identified reliably from their particular uses of language. She observes that linguistic differences are sex-preferential.\(^3\) Particular grammatical forms are not used exclusively by women or men. Rather, they vary in frequency of occurrence in women's and men's speech. She (Lakoff, 1975) hypothesizes that different rules guide women and men in their choice of grammatical forms. Women tend to speak with reference to the rules of politeness\(^4\) whereas men tend to speak with reference to the rules of
conversation both women and men, "when the crunch comes, the rules of politeness will supersede the rules of conversation as guidelines: better be unclear than rude" (p. 74). Lakoff (1977) suggests that inappropriate use of the rules of politeness results in unclear expression ("tentativeness") and that both women and men can be tentative depending on their degree of self-assurance rather than on their gender (p. 10).

However, Lakoff (1975 and 1977) claims that women are polite too often. Women's speech reflects an overuse of the deference rule of politeness: they organize their speech in ways that indicate the provisions of options. Men, on the other hand, depend on the formality rule to express politeness: they tend to become aloof when they are tentative. This implies that formality, or distancing, is men's style the linguistic manifestations of which Lakoff (1975) discusses only briefly (p. 74).

When deference characterizes an individual's style, tentativeness is the impression s/he conveys. Using deference means leaving decisions to one's addressee (Lakoff, 1977, p. 26). In a discussion of women and polite language, Lakoff (1975) describes two deferent constructions:

**tag questions**
A statement "tagged" by the addition of a question, such as "It's a nice day, isn't it?" (Lakoff, 1975, p. 15)

**compound requests:**
A demand phrased as a suggestion or request by the addition of particles. "Close the door" is a direct order. Adding "Please..." makes it a simple request. Adding "Will you please..." to the original order compounds the request (Lakoff, 1975, p. 18-19).
In a later discussion of deference as women's style of politeness, Lakoff (1977) describes three additional forms as feminine:

- **Modal constructions of verb phrases**: Verbs modified by an auxiliary which indicates manner, as in "She may have a point." The construction indicates hesitancy.

- **Qualifiers**: Lexical items such as qualifying adverbs and adverbial clauses (e.g., sort of, presumably, and I think) and habitual phrases that act as fillers (e.g., well, okay, you know). These forms are direct hedges which "convert declaratives into expressions of thought" (p. 13) as in "Like, Jane is sorta tall."

- **Mitigated performative**: Verbs such as think, guess, wonder which "syntactically and pragmatically combine the illocutionary force of say or ask with a mitigating effect" (p. 15). The use of these forms is an indirect hedge, as in "I guess it's getting late."

Lakoff claims that all of these constructions are qualifications.

Erickson, Lind, Johnson, and O'Barr (1978), who investigate Lakoff's claims in a study of the language used by courtroom witnesses, define qualifications as forms "which modify the force of an assertion" (p. 214). These constructions may indicate true indecision or lack of knowledge, as in "Sue's home, isn't she?" when the speaker has just arrived. However, using qualifications violates the rules of conversation (see Note 5) which implies that something else may be at stake for a speaker; notably, the participants' relationship. Using the constructions inappropriately or overusing them minimizes the speaker's effectiveness by "attributing responsibility for the message to the listener" (1977, p. 36).
Lakoff believes that from birth humans learn to use the grammatical constructions appropriate for their sex and to avoid using the forms appropriate for the opposite sex. As part of sex-role (or gender) socialization in this culture, a female learns to "talk like a lady" and a male learns to "talk like a man." Berger and Luckmann (1966) discuss a similar proposition for the development of language skills: that the use of language is socially as well as physiologically determined. Sachs (Sachs, 1975; Sachs, Lieberman, & Erickson, 1973) provides some empirical evidence that the proposition holds.

In a series of experiments, female and male children were matched carefully for physical size and weight since there is no average difference in the size of voice mechanisms before puberty. Judges accurately identified the sex of the subjects from their taped voices "without having any intuitions about the basis for their judgments" (Sachs 1975, p. 153). Sachs (1975) suggests that at least part of the reason that female and male subjects sounded different to the judges is that girls and boys learn to use the voice and speech style generally considered appropriate for their sex (p. 168). Discussing her findings, Sachs (1975) speculates that style in voice and speech function to make the gender of the individual clearly and sometimes in exaggerated ways (p. 169).

Sachs' (1973, 1975) findings indicate that the cues which prompt identification of gender are not physiological and that style -- the way one communicates -- is part of the speaker's message (Chafe, 1970). Choice and order of words are structural elements of language, and style refers to an individual's own systematic arrangements of those
elements (Olson, 1977). Style is the use of a principle to organize the content of a message into some meaning to be communicated (Nonaghan, 1977).

To summarize Lakoff's (1977) argument, deference is the organizing principle for "talking like a lady." Women use deference as a criterion for choosing tentative expressions unnecessarily "because we have been socialized to believe that a hesitant style will win us acceptance" (p. 11). Deference can be inferred from the occurrence of an identifiable set of linguistic forms (Lakoff, 1975, p. 8-19) which characterizes women's speaking style and constitutes a separate language for women in American culture.

Lakoff's conclusion has generated much literature. Kramer (1974a) considers the evidence for a system of "genderlects" (p. 14) and stresses that women as speakers have been ignored in communication research. Key (1975) details a more extensive list of the features identified with women's language and describes their associations with stereotypes about women. Bodine (1975) relates the history of documenting gender-based differentiation in other languages, and suggests that the social meaning of such differentiation has not been explored (p. 149). Feminist scholars like Daly (1973) discuss language as a symbolic system closely tied to the larger social structure. Kramer, Thorne and Henley (1978), in reviewing several feminist analyses of sexism and language, state that such discussions "demonstrate the importance of language in establishing, reflecting, and maintaining an asymmetrical relationship between women and men" (p. 646). However, Kramer et al. (1978) state that few expected differences have been
established firmly by empirical studies of actual speech (p. 640). They describe Lakoff's claims as anecdotal, stating that researchers who tested the claims have reported both positive and negative results.

Some researchers who initially hypothesized gender differences did not find them. In a study of perceptions of female and male speech, Kramer (1974) found no differences in choice of adjectives and adverbs used by students in her experiment to describe what characterizes female and male speech. She reported (Kramer, 1975) that both female and male subjects possess stereotyped concepts of how women and men actually talk. In a study of language in conversation, Hirschman (1974) found no differences between female and male subjects in the proportion of qualifiers (adverbs) or hesitations (fillers) they use in same-sex and mixed-sex interactions. Kramer, Thorne and Henley (1978) comment that stereotypes about personality characteristics may be related to the belief that women and men speak differently despite evidence to the contrary.

Kramer et al.'s (1978) review of developments in theory and the results of research on gender-related differences in the use of language indicates questions that remain to be answered: Is Lakoff's claim warranted? Do women tend to use the same set of linguistic forms no matter what the situation, the circumstances, or the audience? Do men tend not to use these forms, or not to use them as a set? Cues that allow us to discern differences in women's and men's speech have not been studied exhaustively (Wallum, 1977, p. 26). The concept of "rule" may provide a way of checking out Lakoff's assumptions.
Pepinsky (in press) suggests that conventional approaches to communication seem inadequate to explain what happens when people converse. The Shannon-Weaver model of humans as information-processing systems is an example of conventional approaches. Recently, scholars from several disciplines have developed methods to analyze human conversation. They assume the organization of talk to be a form of social action (Cicourel, 1970; Labov & Fanshell, 1977; Pepinsky, in press; Rush, Pepinsky, Landry, Meara, Strong, Valley & Young, 1974; Searle, 1969).

Communication researchers use a concept of rule to explain the role of language in conversation. They propose that people in the process of recognizing and interpreting social behavior, including language, act as if they were using rules (Cushman & Pearce, 1977; Cushman & Whiting, 1972; Frenz & Farrell, 1976; Hawes 1973a and 1973b; Pearce, 1973 and 1976). Cronen and Davis (1978) state that the mechanism of rule is a useful way to describe what an individual infers from observing and participating in social interaction (p. 123). They cite Toulmin (1964), a philosopher, who defines a rule as a shorthand summary of social expectations developed through an individual's experience (Cronen & Davis, 1978, p. 123).

Toulmin (1969 and 1974) asserted human behavior to be rule-conforming. In his view, people learn the range of behaviors appropriate to various situations and their conventional uses and meanings by watching others and imitating them (1969, p. 89). Language, according to Toulmin (1974), is the means by which people learn to recognize and correct their mistakes (p. 209). Investigators
may invoke rules to explain human behavior or impute them to users as the rational grounds upon which action is based:

... Regularities in human behavior may be ordered along a continuum from lawful physiological explanations at one extreme to the conscious critique of rules at the other. (Cronen & Davis, 1978, p. 126).

Using the concept of rule to explain communicative phenomena means shifting the unit of analysis from the individual to the speech act, more explicitly, the interact: at least a pair of contiguous statements made by at least two people (Hawes, 1973a, p. 13). Communication, the, becomes a process that requires the formulation, transmission, and interpretation of information by more than one person.

Hawes (1973a) discusses theories of meaning (cf. Brodbeck, 1968, and Schutz, 1965) as the basis of a model for communication:

In the process of becoming socialized, we learn to identify patterns of interaction that define various symbol systems and the appropriate verbal and nonverbal actions so that we might engage in rather than disrupt these systems (p. 16).

Hawes (1973b) differentiates between the "meaning" that one person conveys to another and the other person's "understanding" of what is conveyed. Pepinsky (in press) makes no such distinction. Like Hawes, he contends that people are likely to improvise as well as to be guided by rules in their use of spoken language. However, Pepinsky's construction of the formulative dimension, phi, encompasses both
the productive and interpretive aspects of language in communication.

The phi phenomenon defines talk as rule-engendering human behavior. People use grammatical rules both conventionally to make their utterances sensible and creatively to enhance their messages and to make them relevant. They collaborate in conversation to display what they know to be their common culture (Pepinsky, in press). Olson (1977) describes the same phenomenon when he observes that people in interaction negotiate the meanings of sentences in terms of the specific context, their social relationship, and their prior world knowledge (p. 10).

Pepinsky (in press) regards talk as the most conspicuous medium through which participants in a conversation signal to one another their interpretations of what is taking place. Pepinsky and Patton (1971), have identified such signals as "informative display." This is a concept in a theory of meaning which presumes that language can be analyzed structurally and partitioned into units of informative display (Patton, Fuhriman, & Bieber, 1977; Pepinsky, 1974 and in press; Rush, et al., 1974).

Language has a structure that can be isolated and displayed. Language is formed from a set of elements according to a system of rules for combining those elements serially into meaningful utterances. The system of rules which governs the production and reception of language, permitting some sequences and excluding others, is called its "grammar." Grammar as a system of ideas is postulated to consist of three sets of rules: of morphology (the construction of words), of syntax (the combination of words into phrases and clauses),
and of semiotics (the construction of meaning apart from sequential order).

Cummings and Renshaw (1976) stated that the structure of language -- the selection and arrangement of words -- is rule-governed in that it includes a set of criterial rules by which speech behavior may be judged grammatical or ungrammatical (p. 11). Fries (1952) believed that individuals signal interpretable meaning to each other through the grammatical structuring of their messages (p. 430). Cook (1972a) argued that the above-mentioned levels of grammar are not mutually exclusive: the syntactical structure of language has a type of meaning apart from the referential meaning of individual words. These positions suggest that structural analysis of samples of talk will reveal information about (1) both the language used and the language-user and (2) the relationship between social rules and their grammatical construction.

There is a disadvantage in choosing to analyse only the verbal behavior in conversation: the information provided by nonverbal and paralinguistic signals is ignored. The advantage is that texts of spoken language can be read and interpreted directly by computer, without recourse to intermediate procedures.

Preliminary work in computer-assisted structural language analysis has focused on the analysis of communication in therapy. Patton et al. (1977) discuss the refinements of a model for language as informative display in counselor-client interaction. Rush et al. (1974) originally developed the model in conjunction with a metalanguage in the form of a series of computer programs called CALAS. Both the model and CALAS
have promising implications for research on the process of communication in other contexts (see figure 1).

To elaborate on the model, "prior knowledge" of both familiar speaking practices and the ways in which social relationships occur in the culture is a methodological assumption. The circles represent space for the physical presence of the participants in the dialogue. The "informative displays" of either participant are observed as natural language: what Pepinsky (in press) defines as "any language employed without self-consciousness and routinely by a group of persons to communicate with each other..." Informative displays are recognized and comprehended by means of "interpretive activity": inferred sequences of behavior which Pearce (1976) called "episodes" which are impled in figure 1. Coordinated speaking practices in continuing interaction are evidence of "concerted actions" (Garfinkle, 1963). Unsuccessful recognition or understanding of informative displays may be inferred from silence or other interruptions in the discourse. Concerted actions effect a "change in the participants' relationship." That change, in turn, is assumed to be reflected in subsequent informative displays.

The model depicts both the formulative and interpretive dimensions of the process of communication. Using this model, a researcher begins to examine conversation at any point or combination of points. For the present research, informative displays are examined in order to make inferences about the relationship between what exists as prior knowledge for each participant and what each displays as information to the other in discourse.
Figure 1 Model of Two-Person Interaction
Several empirical studies have made use of this conceptualization and the computer-assisted language analysis system (CALAS) related to it. Hurndon, Meara, and Pepinsky's (1978) research suggest that a person's "conceptual level" may be reflected in the language s/he employs. By implication, it might be useful to match counselor and client on the basis of the stylistic complexity of their language. Meara, Shannon, and Pepinsky (1978) used similar measures of stylistic complexity to investigate dimensions of interpersonal influences in counseling. Bieber, Patton, and Fuhriman (1977) found evidence for concerted action between counselor and client in therapeutic interviews over time. They used verb types and case roles as dependent measures of convergence and tracking phenomena. These authors (Bieber et al., 1977; Patton et al., 1977) suggested that structural analysis of language may be useful in predicting counseling outcomes.

In this study, I have drawn upon the above model and attendant research to determine whether speakers' use of language is affected by gender definitions of the styles assumed to be appropriate for female and male speakers and/or to same-sex or mixed-sex conversations.

Interviewing is a highly verbal enterprise that usually requires participants to create spontaneous discourse.

The use of language in conversation is conceptualized as rule-creating as well as rule-created social behavior and talk -- natural language -- is treated as informative display.

Televised interviews were used in this study for the following reasons: (1) Interviewers on television are working people. They
depend for their livelihood on making conversation. (2) Interviews on television approximate conversations that occur naturally within most organizations. Interviewers share an objective with other workers who interview: to elicit information from a client for a particular purpose in a specific context.

Whether the speaking practices of interviewers on television are representative of the language used by the general population remains an issue. Lakoff (1975) argues that "the speech heard on television mirrors the speech of the television-watching community; if it did not, it would not succeed. Moreover, televised conversations have potential impact on more than just the participants because they are broadcast for an audience. With regard to stereotypes in particular, television images have been shown to influence sex-role values (Frueh, 1975). Whether women's speech actually differs from that of men is a question separate from but related to the question of whether women, no matter what their speaking style, are judged by different criteria than are men. Both questions reflect pertinent, current concerns about differential and/or discriminatory behavior in work situations.

Women at work are a unique minority. Nancy Herman, director of the Women's Bureau at the Department of Labor, recently cited statistics on women in the work force. To a wire service reporter, she stated that 49 per cent of women in America over the age of 18 are working or looking for work and that the number is growing. Fourteen million women have joined the work force since 1965; the increase for men during the same period has been only nine million. The Census
Bureau lists 441 occupations in American industry, but Department of Labor statistics indicate that almost all working women are concentrated into 20 of these (UPI, Columbus Citizen-Journal, August 29, 1978, p. 7). A woman's situations continue to change, stereotyped definitions of women and men must give way to non-discriminatory criteria for choosing work roles and behaviors. Analysis of the language used by working people permits some measurement to determine what kernels of truth are represented in the stereotypes.

Additional reasons for using televised interviews were related to the situation of research. (1) As a conversation, the televised interview takes place in the public domain. Thus, it is available for research. (2) The value of using the televised interview is that it is programmed: it would take place whether or not it was recorded for research. Hence, data collection procedures do not alter the "social reality under scrutiny" (Cherry, 1975, p. 174).

This Study

This study was designed to test the hypothesis that women speak in a deferent manner more often than do men; in particular, that women use linguistic forms categorized as deferent (Lakoff, 1975 and 1977) more frequently and more regularly than men. This manner of speaking is associated with a definition by gender of deference as the social rule for women's style of politeness. Specifically, this research investigates how deference is displayed in the language used by female and male interviewers on television. It is hypothesized that female interviewers will be more deferent than male interviewers in their use of language.
The hypothesis rests on two assumptions: (1) Deference is a rule of politeness that can be inferred from an individual's use of a specified set of linguistic forms and from the extent to which s/he compounds requests. (2) Deference as a style can be measured by the occurrence of these forms in speech and by the structural complexity of questions. The ability to measure these things rests on a prior assumption that the language used by interviewers on television can be analyzed explicitly to provide indices of deference.

The method for arriving at these indices is based on a meta-language incorporated into a computer-assisted language analysis system (CALAS). The meta-language is derived from a theory of meaning which includes a case grammar analysis of language (Patton et al., 1977; Pepinsky, 1974 and in press; Rush et al., 1974). The results are intended to provide a check upon Lakoff's generalizations regarding women's language.
FOOTNOTES

1 "Gender" refers to psychological, social, and cultural definitions of attitudes and behaviors which individuals learn are appropriate to persons of each sex. "Masculine" and "feminine" are terms which indicate gender. (Wallum, 1977, p. 5).

2 "Female" and "male" are biological assignments of sex to individuals based on chromosomal and anatomical structures and on hormonal composition. Assignments of sex usually are made at birth (Wallum, 1977, p. 5).

3 Scholars have created some confusion by referring to both "sex" and "gender" in their discussions of differences between women and men in their uses of language. In no recent case does anyone argue that such differences are "innate" or biologically determined. The argument, as in Lakoff's case, is that biological sex can be predicted from patterns in the use of language.

4 The rules of politeness developed by Lakoff (1975) are: formality ("keep aloof"); deference ("provide options"); and camaraderie ("show sympathy") (p. 65).

5 The rules of conversation were developed by Grice (1975) to explain how factual information is conveyed in dialogue. As presented by Lakoff (1975), they are: quality ("say only what is true"); quantity ("say only as much as is necessary"); relevance ("speak to the subject"); and manner ("don't be ambiguous; don't be obscure") (p. 71).
6 In this case, "stereotypes" are commonly-held over-generalizations regarding the personalities, attitudes and behaviors of women and men (Eakins & Eakins, 1978, p. 6).


8 "CALAS" is an acronym for a Computer-Assisted Language Analysis System. For details on CALAS programs and procedures, see Appendix C.
The present research employs a concept of informative display, a model for two-person interaction, and a computer-assisted language analysis system (CALAS) in an investigation of linguistic behavior. I want to understand how informative displays function to make known participants' formulative activity in carrying on conversation. The grammatical evidence of deference as a speaking style is examined by structural analysis of the talk of female and male interviewers in eight randomly-selected conversations. Differences in interviewers' speech that varied by sex would imply gender-related differences in the interviewers' use of language.

Design and Variables

A 2(networks) x 2(interviewers) x 2/respondents design was employed (see figure 2) to draw a sample of interviews for analysis and to make comparisons on the research measures.
**INTERVIEWERS**

**NETWORKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ABC</th>
<th>NBC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESPONDENTS**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(F) = Female  
(M) = Male

Figure 2. Research Design for Sampling and Comparing the Talk of Interviewers on Measures of Deference

The independent variable was the sex of participants in the sampled conversations. By design the sex of respondents was specified and varied systematically for each interviewer. Lakoff (1975) suggests that both women and men are more polite in mixed company than either are with members of the same sex (p. 75). Consequently, two interviews were recorded for each subject: one with a person of the same sex and one with a person of the opposite sex.

The dependent variable in this study was language usage. Structural analysis of interviewers' talk in the course of entire conversations was employed to isolate the constituent features of their verbal behavior. From computerized displays of the grammatical
elements of the sampled language, outcomes were calculated on two sets of dependent measures: (a) rates at which interviewers use different linguistic forms and (b) the structural complexity of interviewers' questions.

Units of Analysis

The unit of analysis for calculating rate measures was the turn. Cherry (1975) commented that to avoid the problems inherent in previous research on gender differences in dyadic interaction, methodologies must include units of analysis that measure "the nature or quality of the verbal interaction itself, as well as the characteristics of the speech of individual speakers" (p. 174). Thus, a definition of "turn" was constructed from the research described by Cherry (1975) and Putnam and Skerchock (1978). The turn is a speech act which begins when a person verbally obtains the attention of the person addressed and ends when the speaker relinquishes that attention. Overlaps (speakers talking over one another) and backchannels (phrases of no more than two words which indicate continued listening) were interruptions not included in this category. Refer to Appendix A for a complete description of the system developed for categorizing turns and for illustrations of the employment of the system in the transcripts.

The unit of analysis for determining the structural complexity of questions was the clause. Cook (1972a; 1972b; and 1975) identified the clause as the structural unit of discourse. Cook (1975) maintained that sentences are made up of clauses arranged in information blocks, which are the sets of dependent clauses clustered around a main clause. Average sentence length, average block length and
average clause depth are measures devised by Cook (1975) to determine the stylistic complexity of samples of written and spoken language. When applied to the texts of questions, these measures constituted a syntactic index of the use of a deferent construction: I assumed that the more complex that questions were on the average, the more deferent the speaker's questioning style.

Subjects

Co-hosts of two network morning news programs were the subjects for this study. Jane Pauley and Tom Brokaw co-host "The Today Show" (TTS), produced by the National Broadcasting Corporation (NBC) from seven to nine a.m., Monday through Friday. Sandy Hill and David Hartman co-host "Good Morning, America" (GMA), produced by the American Broadcasting Corporation (ABC) at the same hours on the same days.

These two programs were selected for study because they are alike and compete for a share of the same audience. Each program has a similar format presenting news, weather, sports and features in four half-hour segments. Both programs regularly include face-to-face interviews with public figures such as politicians, authors, and other newsmakers. Each interview of approximately five minutes is conducted under the same or similar circumstances. Consequently, the situational constraints are similar for each interview. Interviewers and respondents seated in close proximity to one another carry on conversation in front of the camera. Each co-host conducts interviews regularly. TTS co-hosts share interviewing responsibilities equally. GMA co-hosts share differently: Sandy Hill usually is responsible for one interview a
week while David Hartman usually conducts one interview per half-hour segment.

Sample

Monitoring the programs during the month of December, 1977 revealed variations in the circumstances of interviews conducted on each of these programs. For example, GMA interviewers sometimes made use of a second "expert" interviewer. TTS interviewers regularly conducted interviews which included questions from viewers. Thus, additional criteria were developed to select a common set of circumstances for all interviews in the sample. The criteria required that an interview be:

- two-way (between one interviewer and one respondent)
- face-to-face (in the presence of one another)
- unscripted (using only the words of participants)
- talk (without the inclusion of audio-visual illustrations such as film clips).

A "composite week" for each program was constructed by drawing a random sample of five program dates from the twenty dates available in a four-week period. The specific procedure, described in Appendix B, was adopted from Stemple's (1952) experiment to determine adequate sample size for classification of subject matter published in a daily newspaper. The procedure does not entail strict randomness, although Stemple maintains it makes use of a random principle which stratifies for day of the week (p. 333). The first interviews which met the design requirements and selection criteria were audiotaped for analysis. Two samples of programs were drawn in order to complete the sample of
interviews. Results of the program sampling procedure are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1. Program Dates for First Eligible Interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NETWORK</th>
<th>ABC</th>
<th>NBC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERVIEWER</td>
<td>(F)\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>(M)\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}(F) = female  
\textsuperscript{b}(M) = male  
\textsuperscript{c}# = number used in subsequent references to interviews
The data submitted to computerized analysis were verbatim transcriptions (see Appendix A) of the interviews numbered in Table 1. The participants and topics are described in Table 2.

Table 2. Participants and Topics in Eight Randomly-Sampled Televised Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>INTERVIEWER</th>
<th># RESPONDENT</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Sandy Hill</td>
<td>1. Matina Horner, president, Radcliffe College</td>
<td>&quot;Fear of success&quot; research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Charles &quot;Tex&quot; Watson, prisoner-author</td>
<td>Recently-released autobiography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Betty Ann Weaver, juvenile court judge</td>
<td>Juvenile offender program in Lelanaw County, Michigan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Jane Pauley</td>
<td>5. Melissa Ludtke, sports reporter, Sports Illustrated</td>
<td>Sex discrimination suit filed against the Commissioner of Baseball.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. V. Paul Donnelly, attorney, Detroit, Michigan</td>
<td>Legal options available to employees threatened with dismissal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analysis

Analysis of the data was accomplished in three phases: (1) structural analysis of the natural language used in eight randomly-selected interviews using a computer-assisted language analysis system (CALAS); (2) descriptive analysis of interviewers' speech using seven dependent measures of deferent language usage; and (3) statistical comparisons of interviewers on measures of deference using chi square analyses of several sets of contingency tables.

1. Case Grammar and CALAS

CALAS includes a metalanguage: a computerized structural language developed for use in the rapid, reliable, and accurate analysis of discourse. The use of it yields various units of measurement such as clauses, phrases, types for verb phrases and case role assignments for noun phrases. These measures are based on assumptions about the structural properties of language identified by linguists in terms of case grammar (Chafe, 1970; Cook, 1972a and 1972b; Fillmore, 1968).

Structurally, language is postulated to consist of names and relators (Pepinsky, in press). It is assumed that sense is organized in an utterance and made recognizable to a listener when the speaker uses normative syntactic structures (Patton et al., 1977). Semantically, the grammatical structure of a sample of language consists of "non-linearly ordered case-marked noun phrases associated with a verb phrase" (Meara, 1976, p. 2).

The verb phrase is the pivotal word class -- the essential relator -- since it specifies how noun phrases -- names -- are to be put together by the listener (Chafe, 1970; Cook, 1972a and 1972b). Thus
the basic structure of language is inferred to be semantic not syntactic (Bieber, 1978b). The clause functions as the unit of analysis in the name-relator-name conception of language and is further identified as the unit of informative display (Patton et al., 1977; Pepinsky, in press). It is an utterance which contains one and only one verb phrase as predicate (Cook, 1972a).

According to Chafe (1970) and Cook (1972b), verbs can be typed via case grammar. By definition (see the glossary of case grammar provided in Appendix B), verb types categorize the state or activity described in verb phrases. The basic verb types are: stative (S), process (P), agentive (A), and agentive-process (AP). The verb type controls the assignments and number of case roles available for the noun phrases in the clause. The verb type/case frame matrix presented in Table 3 depicts the relationship between types of verb phrases and the case roles of noun phrases. For example, stative verbs imply intrapersonal activity and so take only object cases in the basic case frame.

Case roles specify the noun phrase's relationship to the verb. Case roles are: agent (Agt) and/or object (Obj) in the "basic" case frame; experiencer (Exp), agent and/or object in the "experience" frame; and beneficiary (Bene), agent, and/or object in the "benefactive" frame. For example, the noun phrase associated with an agentive-process (AP) verb may be the "agent" or "object" of the action described by the verb, as in:

"The girl broke a window when she hit a homerun."

Agt (AP) Obj Agt(AP) Obj
Table 3. Verb Types in a Case Frame Matrix (adapted from Cook, 1976b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASIC</th>
<th>EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>REFLEXIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>requires</td>
<td>requires</td>
<td>requires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S</strong></td>
<td><strong>N-0bj</strong></td>
<td><strong>SA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g.</td>
<td>e.g. broken</td>
<td>e.g. like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object</td>
<td>sight</td>
<td>work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SP</strong></td>
<td><strong>N-0bj</strong></td>
<td><strong>SP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. has been</td>
<td>e.g. known</td>
<td>Exp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finished</td>
<td>thing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>N-0bj</strong></td>
<td><strong>PE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. break</td>
<td>e.g.</td>
<td>Exp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[iv]</td>
<td>hear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>die</td>
<td><strong>SB</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ben</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AP</strong></td>
<td><strong>Agent</strong></td>
<td><strong>AP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. break</td>
<td>e.g.</td>
<td>e.g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[iv]</td>
<td>ask</td>
<td>talk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where ( ) indicates "optional."

iv means "intransitive," or "cannot take a direct object."

tv means "transitive," or "must take a direct object."

Upper case abbreviations represent verb types.

Capitalized abbreviations represent case roles.
In the example above, the subordinator "when" specifies a peripheral case relation of time (see definitions of peripheral cases provided in Appendix C). Adverbs, prepositions, and conjunctions or subordinators belong to a word class that marks peripheral relations of time, place, manner, committation, cause, and purpose. Phrases in this class are peripheral because their case assignment is not governed by verb type.

In summary, verb phrases are the essential relators and are classified lexically by types and structurally by case role environment. Every other noun or phrase in a clause is a name or part of a complex name. Case role assignments for noun phrases designate an essential or peripheral relationship given the verb phrase and its type.

CALAS is both a syntactic and semantic analyzer of the texts it ingests (Pepinsky, 1978). That is, CALAS initially makes a linear translation of the discourse into its grammatical elements by reference to a dictionary and to sequential order. Then, without necessary regard for word order, CALAS identifies the relationships which exist within meaningful clusters of words: clauses are separated and arranged to display their relationships to one another; verb phrases are typed according to the Chafe-Cook classification scheme as it has been modified by others (Meara, 1976; Pepinsky et al., 1977; Table 2); and noun phrases are assigned case roles according to their function within the clause.

CALAS consists of a series of four language analysis programs and an algorithm (explicit sets of rules for implementing the program instructions) which make use of two programming languages, SPITBALL.
and PL/1, and are run on an IBM System 370/Model 168 computer. CALAS isolates and displays the speech patterns found in conversation, currently using machine-readable texts in the English language as its data source. The programs take word elements in the text and relates them to their structural counterparts as parts of speech, analyzed in units of words, phrases, and clauses. The result is that the original text is analyzed and recombined to reveal the specific arrangement of a set of structurally-identifiable features (Rush et al., 1974).

Computer analysis by means of CALAS is accomplished in three stages. The first stage called EYEBALL catalogues each word in sequence and identifies it by its grammatical label: noun (N), pronoun (U); verb (V); auxiliary verb (X); adverb (A); intensifier adverb (I); adjective (J); determiner adjective (D); preposition (P); conjunction (C); subordinator (S). An example of EYEBALL output is:

PRIVATELY, FRENCH OFFICIALS SAY THEY WOULD BE VERY HAPPY IF PAKISTAN...
A J N V U X X I J S N
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

The second stage called PHRASER aggregates the individual words into appropriate phrases and marks them: nominal (N); verbal (V); adverbial (A); adjectival (J); prepositional (P); conjunctive (C); and subordinative (S) phrases. An example of PHRASER output is:

PRIVATELY, FRENCH OFFICIALS SAY THEY WOULD BE VERY HAPPY IF PAKISTAN...
A N V N V J S N
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

The third and final stage, CLAUSE/CASE, accomplishes (a) clause separation, marking them to indicate their independent (lettered "A")
or specifically dependent status ("B" is dependent on "A" for its meaning; "C" is dependent on "B", and so on) as displayed in column one below; (b) the reprinting of the numbers for each phrase in the clause (column two); (c) the reprinting of the text phrase-by-phrase using indentation as an additional display of clause status (column three); (d) assignment of case roles and verb types for the appropriate noun and verb phrases (column four); and (e) the reprinting of grammatical phrase labels (column five). An example of CLAUSE/CASE output is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>PRIVATELY,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADVERB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
<td>FRENCH OFFICIALS</td>
<td>AGT</td>
<td>NOUN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03</td>
<td>SAY</td>
<td>APE</td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>THEY</td>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>NOUN</td>
<td>VERB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05</td>
<td>WOULD BE</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>ADJECTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>VERY HAPPY</td>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
<td>SUBORDINATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08</td>
<td>PAKISTAN</td>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>NOUN</td>
<td>VERB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09</td>
<td>WOULD WITHDRAW</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>BUT</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONJUNCTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
<td>THEY.</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>NOUN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At each stage, one or more human raters well-versed in case grammar reviews the program's decisions, correcting the evident errors made by the program in order to improve the accuracy of the results. In this study, changes in the program's decisions were the result of concensus of at least two raters, including this investigator. Independent corrections by at least three raters formed the basis for decision-making.
The use of the computer to make the majority decisions satisfies the condition of reliability in coding since any computer using the same programs would produce the same decisions when run on the same samples of language. Williams (1970) estimates that computerized routines using adequate classification schemata can be expected to be between 90 to 95% accurate. The accuracy approaches 100% with the addition of human editing to code ambiguous items such as one-word comments by consistently applying rules developed to handle such cases (Williams, 1970, p. 248). CALAS programs, the procedures used in preparation of data and in the processing and editing of texts are described in Appendix C.

Each of the program stages relies upon the preceding stage for its input: grammatical assignments made by the first program become input for the second which puts words together in phrases. Phrase output then becomes input for the third set of programs. The results of the third and final stage (phrases, clauses, verb types and case roles) are the data available for further analysis.

2. Dependent Measures and Description

Descriptive analysis established a systematic basis for comparing interviewers on measures of deference. Two sets of measures were selected to describe each interviewer's speaking style. Both sets of measures were developed from a definition of politeness as deference. Deference was conceptualized as a social rule inferred from the use of these constructions.
Deferent speakers qualify their statements in order to provide options to the person(s) addressed (Lakoff, 1977). Deferent speakers accomplish this syntactically by employing at least one, some or all of the following linguistic forms: (a) qualifications, (b) modal constructions of verb phrases, (c) hesitations, and (d) mitigated performative verbs. Deferent speakers also lengthen their requests (Lakoff, 1977, p. 18), this implies that their questions will be more complex structurally.

Definitions of seven dependent measures of deferent language usage are provided in the paragraphs which follow. The paragraphs are numbered by set, or category, of measure: R1, R2, R3 and R4 are rate measures; Q1, Q2 and Q3 are question measures. These set numbers are direct references to the formulae presented in Table 4. Frequencies in each category of measures were transformed into proportions, using the turn as the unit of analysis for rate measures and the clause as the unit of analysis for question measures.

(R1) "Qualifications" are a category of adverbs or adverbial clause hedges (Hirschman, 1974). They are forms which modify the force of an assertion by emphasizing it such as very, definitely, surely, or by allowing for exceptions or avoiding rigid commitments, such as kind of, probably, or I'd guess (Erickson et al., 1978, p. 241). When these forms were labeled "adverb" by CALAS, they could be sorted out from all other adverbs, categorized as qualifications, and counted for each speaker. Qualifications rates were calculated by taking the frequency of qualifications in an interview's speech and dividing it by her/his total number of turns in the conversation. (See Table 4).
Table 4. Dependent Measures of Deferent Language Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFERENT FORMS: RATES&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1 Qualifications Rate</td>
<td>adverbial constructions</td>
<td>turns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 Modals Rate</td>
<td>modal constructions of verb phrases</td>
<td>turns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3 Hesitations Rate</td>
<td>expletives</td>
<td>turns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4 Mitigated Verbs Rate</td>
<td>SEC verb types</td>
<td>turns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRUCTURAL COMPLEXITY: QUESTIONS&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 Average Sentence Length</td>
<td>clauses</td>
<td>questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 Average Block Length</td>
<td>clauses</td>
<td>main clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 Average Clause Depth</td>
<td>value of clauses</td>
<td>clauses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The numerators of rations represent frequencies.

<sup>a</sup> The grammatical units of description for rate measures are expletives, adverbs or adverbial clauses, and verb phrases. The unit of analysis is the turn.

<sup>b</sup> The syntactical units of description for question measures are questions containing at least one clause and information blocks. The unit of analysis is the clause.
"Modals" is a term which refers to modal constructions of verb phrases: compound verbs which make use of the modal auxiliaries can, could, shall, should, will, would, may, might, have, and forms of the verb to be as in "I might just do that!" (Key, 1975, p. 31). Modals are forms of indirect hedging which "convert certainty into judgment of mere likelihood" (Lakoff, 1977, p. 13). All auxiliary verbs were marked (X) by the EYEBALL program. Subsequently, these particular auxiliaries were sorted out and counted for each speaker in each conversation. Interviewer "modals rates" were determined by dividing the frequency of modals in an interviewer's speech by her/his total number of turns. (See Table 4.)

"Hesitations" are habitual filler words or phrases such as well, you know, oh, okay and like (Putnam & Skerchock, 1978). They are not essential to the meaning of a clause (Erickson, et al., 1978). CALAS marks these phrases "expletive," making them available for sorting and counting by speaker. The dependent measure "hesitations rate" is calculated by dividing the total number of hesitation forms by the total number of turns for each speaker. (See Table 4.)

"Mitigated performative verbs" are of the type, stative experiencer cognitive. According to Pepinsky et al. (1977) after Cook (1972b), SEC verbs define an experiencer's cognitive state or activity. (Refer to definitions in Appendix C.) Lakoff (1977) cites know, think and wonder as examples of verbs which indirectly hedge the speaker's grammatical construction of an assertion by interposing the speaker's judgment between the proposition itself and the listener's freedom to determine agreement; e.g., "I wonder if you're right." Lakoff's
sample verbs would be typed "SEC" by CLAUSE/CASE. Hence, all SEC verbs were counted and sorted by speaker to determine the frequency with which mitigated performatives might occur in the speech of interviewers sampled in this study. The "mitigated performatives rate" for each interviewer was calculated in the same way as other deference rates. (See Table 4.)

The least deferent speaking style for an interviewer is represented by the number "1" or less on these four measures combined. The value cannot be zero since some of the forms categorized as deferent have other legitimate meanings (Key, 1975; Lakoff, 1975 and 1977). The use of only one deference form per interviewer turn reflects the value on these measures for low frequencies.

The texts of questions were analyzed to test Lakoff's claim regarding the compounding of requests as a deference form characteristic of women's speech.

Williams' (1970) caveat regarding statistics that depend on sentence measurements of spoken language (p. 260) affected the decision to use only the text of questions rather than the entire text of an interviewer's talk in a conversation. Paralinguistic signals such as the rising intonation which accompanies a speaker's phrasing of questions may provide a clearer criterion of identifying question forms from audiotapes. One-word or phrase-only question forms such as "No?" or "At what point?" are not included in totals. Therefore, stylistic complexity measures use the number of questions which include at least one clause.
(Q1) Average sentence length (ASL) provides a way to compare the length of questions asked by the four interviewers. The total number of questions is divided into the total number of clauses in questions. (See Table 4.)

(Q2) The directness or indirectness of a sample of questions can be determined by figuring average block length (ABL), a quantitative measure of the amount of information to be processed in each cluster of clauses in the sample of interviewer questions. It is calculated by dividing the total number of clauses in questions by the total number of main clauses in questions for each interviewer. (See Table 4).

(Q3) Average clause depth (ACD) is a qualitative measure of stylistic complexity. It provides a rough index of the ease or difficulty with which a given sample of questions can be processed by a respondent. As with ABL, the measure depends on the assumptions of current transformational grammar that: information blocks containing subordinate clause are processed one at a time; and subordinate clauses are processed from most embedded clause up through the main clause by "cycling up" (Cook, 1975). Thus, determing ACD is the result of a procedure whereby independent clauses are marked A and given a value of one since no cycling up is necessary. Subordinate clauses are marked B and given a value of two \((A + 1)\) since the cycle must apply once. C-clauses are valued at three \((B + 1)\) because the cycle must apply once again, and so on. ACD is computed by dividing the total value of the clauses in a speaker's questions by the total number of clauses in questions.
The simplest questioning style is represented by the number "1" which indicates that the interviewer asked questions having one main clause each.

In summary, the dependent measures of deference are of two kinds. Outcomes on rate measures establish the proportion of deferent forms which occur in an interviewer's talk. Outcomes on question measures reflect the complexity or simplicity of an interviewer's questions. Outcomes for measures in both categories which have a value greater than one indicate the interviewer tends to use the deferent form or construction being investigated.

Descriptive analysis using the two sets of dependent measures was accomplished in separate stages. Forms were counted and proportions were determined on rate measures for each interviewer in each conversation. The purpose was to assess whether any of the forms were used characteristically by any interviewer.

Additionally, the texts of questions were isolated for each interviewer in each conversation. One-word or phrase-only questioning forms were dropped from the texts. Frequencies of clauses, their independent or relatively dependent status, and verb types were established for questions which contained at least one clause. The formulae for Cook's three measures of stylistic complexity were applied to the texts of questions in order to assess the compounding of interviewers' requests for information from each respondent.

The calculation of proportions from frequency data for each interviewer in each conversation corrected for differences in the
length of interviews. The proportions resulting from the descriptive analysis became the basis for testing the hypothesis that women use deferent forms and constructions more frequently than men do.

3. **Tables and Chi Square Tests**

Outcomes on dependent measures were treated as frequency data in chi square tests for differences among interviewers. Statistical analysis was conducted first by transforming the data to base 100. In the preliminary analysis, chi squares were computed across two conversations for each interviewer on each of the dependent measures. The resulting set of values provided the basis for discussing each interviewer's speaking style. This initial use of the statistic is described by Williams (1968) as a one-sample case of chi square. It establishes a sampling distribution among interviewers in categories of deferent language usage.

The second use of the chi square statistic was for comparisons of interviewers using four sets of contingency tables:

1. **networks x measures** (rates/questions): across four conversations for each network to determine whether program policy had any differential effect on either rate or question measures.

2. **interviewer sex x measures** (rates/questions): across four conversations for female interviewers and four for male interviewers to assess the influence of gender definitions of speaking style.

3. **same/opposite sex pairs x measures** (rates/questions): across four conversations for same-sex and four for mixed-sex pairs to
determine whether gender identification with the person addressed is associated with particular patterns in the interviewers' speaking styles.

(4) conversation x measures (rates/questions): for each interviewer in the two conversations in which s/he participated to determine whether s/he uses language in the same way with both female and male respondents.

Alpha was set at the .05 level. Comparisons among interviewers on either set of measure which yielded a chi square significant at less than the .05 level were taken to mean that observed differences between them did not happen by chance.
FOOTNOTES

1 The talk of respondents in these conversations has been processed through CALAS. Results will be reported in a second study which centers on interaction (Piehowicz, Pepinsky & McCarthy, in progress).

2 Patterns of language usage are learned behaviors (Berger & Luckman, 1966; Sachs, 1973 and 1975; Toulmin, 1974). They are indicative of gender or gender identity, a sociological term referring to an individual's internalization of socio-cultural definitions of gender (Wallum, 1977, p. 6). It is assumed that gender is what is inferred from identification of sex.

3 The successful adaptation of the programs to a recent change in equipment at the Ohio State University Instruction and Research Computer Center from an IBM to an Amadahl system indicates the ease with which CALAS can be transferred from one kind of computer system to another.
CHAPTER THREE

Results

It has been argued that people who frequently use qualifications (adverbs and adverbial clause hedges), modals (modal constructions of verb phrases), hesitations (expletive fillers) and mitigated performative verbs (stative experiencer cognitive verbs as these have been typed by Pepinsky et al., 1977, after Cook, 1972b) have a more deferent speaking style than people who use these forms less frequently or not at all. It was also argued that questions can be constructed deferentially. Requests are compounded by the addition of words, phrases, and clauses to direct orders or simple questions. These four forms and the complex structuring of questions have been identified by Lakoff (1975 and 1977) among others (Eakins & Eakins, 1978; Key 1973 and 1975) as part of a speaking style characteristic of women.

This research examined the natural language used by four interviewers in eight randomly-sampled televised interviews which for the sake of clarity are called "conversations" in this report. Two sets
of dependent measures of deferent language usage were selected to assess the influence of gender on female and male speaking styles. Rate measures of the four forms listed above depend on "interviewer turns" (a total for each conversation) as the unit of analysis. Question measures of structural complexity (average sentence length, average block length, and average clause depth) describe each interviewer's questioning style and depend on the clause as the unit of analysis. Outcomes on these measures also are represented as ratios. Proportions from both sets of measures provide the data used to compare interviewers' language usage by means of chi square tests for difference.

Results are presented in three sections: (1) outcomes on each dependent measure; (2) comparisons among interviewers by network, by sex of interviewer, and combination-of-sex pairs; and finally (3) comparisons of each interviewer's use of deference language between two conversations.

1. Outcomes on Dependent Measure

Descriptive statistics on each of the five dependent measures of deferent language usage are displayed in Table 5. Means and standard deviations were calculated on each measure for interviewers' speech in eight conversations.
Table 5. Means and Standard Deviations for Five Dependent Measures of Different Language Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT MEASURE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STANDARD DEVIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(R1) Qualifications Rate</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R2) Modals Rate</td>
<td>1.147</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q1) Average Sentence Length</td>
<td>1.896</td>
<td>.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q2) Average Block Length</td>
<td>1.772</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q3) Average Clause Depth</td>
<td>2.050</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Observations for each measure = 8

The relative independence of each set of measures (rate measures and question measures) was tested by recourse to the Pearson correlation coefficient. The correlation coefficients for the three question measures are presented in Table 6. The coefficient obtained for the two rate measures (.67) was not statistically significant, suggesting the measures to be independent of one another.
Table 6. Correlation Coefficients of Three Measures of Stylistic Complexity for Interviewer Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(Q1)</th>
<th>(Q2)</th>
<th>(Q3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Q1) Average Sentence Length</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q2) Average Block Length</td>
<td></td>
<td>.889*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q3) Average Clause Depth</td>
<td>.872*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p less than .01
N = 8

The correlations between Average Sentence Length (ASL) and the two other question measures are statistically significant. The coefficients themselves are high enough to indicate that ASL does not measure the stylistic complexity of interviewer questions independently of average block length (ABL) and (ACD). However, Cook (1975) argues that it provides unique information. The nonsignificant correlation between ACD and ABL indicates these two measures to be independent of one another. Undue reliance on these inferences is unwise because of the limited sample.

Rate Measures

Rate measures of hesitations and mitigated performative verbs were dropped from the analyses because the forms simply do not occur often enough in the speech of any of the four interviewers. The frequencies for each of these forms are presented in Table 7.
Table 7. Frequency Distribution of Hesitations and Mitigated Performative Verbs in the Speech of Four Interviewers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEWER (SEX)</th>
<th>DEFERENCE FORM</th>
<th>RESPONDENT (SEX)</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hesitations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>Hill(F)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>Hartman(M)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigated Perfor-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mative Verbs</td>
<td>Pauley(F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>Brokaw(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 8 conversations

Interviewers do not use either of these deferent forms with sufficient frequency to warrant further analysis. Qualifications and modals are the two remaining forms which were included. The frequencies with which they appear in the speech of each interviewer across two conversations are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Frequency Distribution of Qualifications and Modals in Interviewer's Speech Across Two Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEWER</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEERENCE FORM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modals</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FREQUENCY</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TURNS</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of observations = 8
Rates were devised for qualifications (R1) and modals (R2) by calculating the ratio of the total frequency of the form over the total number of turns taken by the interviewer. Outcomes on R1 and R2 are displayed in Table 9.

Table 9. Rate Measures of Qualifications and Modals in Interviewers' Speech Across Two Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>INTERVIEWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R1) Qualifications Rate</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R2) Modals Rate</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEERENCE RATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total frequency of 2 forms</td>
<td>1.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total turns in 2 conversations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All interviewers used these forms at a rate greater than one of the forms per turn. "Good Morning, America" interviewers Hill (A) and Hartman (B) appear to have used qualifiers and modals at a rate somewhat less than "The Today Show" interviewers Pauley (C) and Brokaw (D). Brokaw used qualifiers at a rate greater than the other three. Hill used the fewest deference forms per turn.

Differences between interviewers across rate measures was tested by using chi square on a 4(interviewers) by 2(measures) table. The purpose was to determine whether deference rates were significantly different among interviewers. They were not: \( \chi^2 = 4.74, \text{ d.f.} = 3 \). Across conversations, these four interviewers seem to use both qualifications and modals at comparable rates.
The sampling distribution of interviewers in two categories of deference rates between conversations was examined by means of a 4 (interviewers) by 2 (conversations) table constructed for each measure. Interviewers used qualifications at a significantly different rate between the conversations sampled for each of them ($x^2 = 51.79$, d.f. = 3, $p$ less than .001). They also used modals at a significantly different rate in the two conversations ($x^2 = 64.54$, d.f. = 3, $p$ less than .001). It appears that there were individual differences between these interviewers in their use of two deferent forms.

Question Measures

Question measures which assess the structural complexity of the texts of questions depend on the clause as the unit of analysis. Frequencies were calculated for: total numbers of questions containing at least one clause, total number of clauses, total number of main clauses, and total value of clauses. An information block, the construct employed in "average block length," consists of the cluster of dependent clauses with each main clause. Values on three dependent measures of the stylistic complexity (Cook, 1975) of interviewers' questions were computed according to the following formulae:

\[
\begin{align*}
(Q1) \quad & \text{Average Sentence Length} = \frac{\text{total clauses}}{\text{total questions}} \\
(Q2) \quad & \text{Average Block Length} = \frac{\text{total clauses}}{\text{total main clauses}} \\
(Q3) \quad & \text{Average Clause Depth} = \frac{\text{total value of clauses}}{\text{total clauses}}
\end{align*}
\]
The outcomes for each interviewer across two conversations on question measures are presented in Table 10.

Table 10. Measures for Stylistic Complexity of Interviewers' Questions Across Two Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>INTERVIEWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q1) Average Sentence Length ASL</td>
<td>1.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q2) Average Block Length ABL</td>
<td>1.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q3) Average Clause Depth ACD</td>
<td>1.375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 8

A rough "amount of talk" index for questions was calculated in order to consider the information available from all questions including those which were single words or phrases. For each interviewer over two conversations, the number of words in questions was divided by the total number of questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEWER</th>
<th>Average Number of Words per Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hill (A)</td>
<td>7.7 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartman (B)</td>
<td>8.6 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauley (C)</td>
<td>14.2 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brokaw (D)</td>
<td>16.6 words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No interviewer has the simplest questioning style represented by a value of "1" on any of the three question measures. The questions asked by Pauley (Interviewer C) appear to be more consistently complex than those of any other interviewer although on the average, Brokaw (D), used more words per question than Pauley does. Hill's (A) questions appear to be simpler than any other interviewer's questions across the three measures. She also used, on the average, fewer words per question than the other three interviewers.

Differences between interviewers across measures of the complexity of their questions was tested by using the chi square statistic on a 4(interviewers) by 3(measures) contingency table. Differences among them across conversations were significant ($x^2 = 12.933$, d.f. = 6, $p$ less than .05). These four interviewers seem to have had unique questioning styles on the dimension of stylistic complexity.

When outcomes on three question measures were compared conversation by conversation for each measure, again, the differences are significant. Chi square analysis was based on a 4(interviewers) by 2(conversations) sample with three degrees of freedom: ASL ($x^2 = 52.58$; $p$ less than .001), ABL ($x^2 = 105.37$; $p$ less than .001), and ACD ($x^2 = 26.98$; $p$ less than .001). It seems that interviewers' questioning styles differed, one from the other, in the conversations sampled. Also, each interviewer asked questions at a level of complexity which appears to have been responsive to each interviewing situation.
In summary, these interviewers compared with each other do not seem to have used qualifications and modals at significantly different rates. They did use each of these forms differently when dealing with different respondents, but the differences do not vary by sex. Each of the interviewers used hesitations and mitigated performatives so infrequently that no interviewer’s speaking style could be described as deferent from their use of these two forms. Interviewers differed significantly from one another in the complexity of the questions they asked across conversations. Further their questioning styles appear to have been different in the conversations sampled for each of them.

Independent Comparisons of Interviewers

The question remains whether differences among interviewers can be accounted for by program policy (different networks), by interviewer's sex (gender definitions of the speaking style appropriate for women or men), or by respondent's sex (interviewer's display of identification with social rules appropriate for talk with a person of the same or opposite sex).

Two-by-two contingency tables were constructed to compare outcomes for interviewers on two rate measures by network, interviewer's sex, and same/opposite sex participants in the conversation. Chi-square tests revealed no significant differences among them on their rates of use of two deferent linguistic forms.

Two-by-three contingency tables were constructed to compare outcomes for interviewers on three question measures, again by network, interviewer's sex, and same/opposite sex pairs. Chi square values
were not significant for three question measures: by two networks \( (x^2 = 0.6262, \text{d.f.} = 2) \); by female/male interviewers \( (x^2 = 1.492, \text{d.f.} = 2) \), and by same/opposite sex participants \( (x^2 = 4.308, \text{d.f.} = 2) \).

In summary, it appears that differences among interviewers across conversations cannot be explained by comparing these factors systematically.

Each Interviewer's Speech in Two Conversations

One final set of comparisons was made. Outcomes for each interviewer on each set of measures were compared to determine whether s/he used the deferent language form being investigated in significantly different ways with two respondents.

For each interviewer on rate measures, two-by-two contingency tables presented the data for qualifications rates and modals rates with a respondent of the same sex and a respondent of the opposite sex. For question measures, two-by-three tables were constructed to array the data for each interviewer in a "same/opposite sex of the respondent" by "three measures of question complexity" fashion. The results of chi square analyses are presented in Table 11.

Table 11. Chi Square Tests for Interviewer Differences with Respondents of the Same/Opposite Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEWER</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Rate Measures</td>
<td>21.895***</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>6.186*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Question Measures</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>15.209**</td>
<td>17.146***</td>
<td>3.413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p less than .05
** p less than .01
*** p less than .001
N = 8
Each interviewer used deferent language in significantly different ways, between conversations. Hill used qualifications at a significantly greater rate with a respondent of the same sex ($R_1 = 1.12$) than she did with a respondent of the opposite sex ($R_1 = .33$). The rate at which she used modals is approximately the same with a respondent of the same or opposite sex ($R_2 = .50$, same sex; .53, opposite sex).

For Brokaw, the greatest difference on rates was opposite. He used more modals per turn than qualifiers per turn with a person of the same sex: modals ($R_2 = 1.85$, same; .62 opposite) compared with qualifications ($R_1 = 1.69$, same; .92 opposite).

On question measures, Hartman and Pauley used questions which were structurally different in some way when each interviewed a respondent of the same or opposite sex. For Hartman, average clause depth (ACD) was approximately the same in both interviews ($Q_3 = 2.00$, same; 2.08 opposite). However, the lengths of Hartman's average question (ASL) and average block (ABL), or cluster of clauses, was much shorter when he addressed a respondent of the same sex than when he addressed a person of the opposite sex:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>With Male Respondent</th>
<th>With Female Respondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Q1) ASL</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q2) ABL</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pauley's questions were more simply constructed when addressing a respondent of the opposite sex as her scores on questions asked in that conversation for all three measures indicate: with an opposite sex respondent (ASL = 2.20; ABL = 2.20; ACD = 2.21). In contrast with a
respondent of the same sex, she asks much longer questions \( (\text{ASL} = 3.27) \) and questions which take more time for the respondent to process \( (\text{Cook, 1975, p. 118}) \) because the clauses are more deeply embedded \( (\text{ACD} = 3.78) \).

In summary, each interviewer uses at least one different linguistic form in a significantly different way with a respondent of the same or opposite sex.
CHAPTER FOUR

Discussion

This research analyzed the talk of four interviewers in eight randomly-sampled televised conversations. It was argued that the speech used by interviewers on television is analogous to the language used by other working women and men who interview. It was also argued that the language used by television interviewers could be analyzed explicitly to provide indices of deference.

The study was undertaken to test the hypothesis that a gender-related definition of deference as women's speaking style would hold for two female interviewers -- women at work on television. The sex of interviewees (who are called respondents in this report) was varied systematically as a relevant context factor for sampling conversations. Consequently, descriptive and statistical analyses were made of each interviewer's use of language in two conversations: one with a person of the same sex and one with a person of the opposite sex. Observed differences between female and male interviewers on dependent measures of deference were taken to imply gender-related differences in speaking style.
Descriptive and statistical analyses of interviewers' speaking styles were made possible by an initial structural analysis of the language used in the eight conversations sampled. Interviewers' talk was treated as "informative display" (Pepinsky & Patton, 1971) and analyzed to identify units of informative display which mark grammatical constructions of deference (Lakoff, 1975 and 1977). The Computer-Assisted Language Analysis System (CALAS) programs were employed to identify grammatical elements and their arrangements in each interviewer's speech. CALAS is part of a metalanguage which was developed in conjunction with a model for talk as informative display in two-person interaction in therapy (Rush, et al., 1974).

Descriptions of each interviewer's style and outcomes for the sample were drawn from comparisons of results on two sets of dependent measures of deference. Rate measures assessed an interviewer's use of four deferent linguistic forms. Qualifications, modal, auxillary verbs, hesitations, and mitigated performative verbs are four of the linguistic forms Lakoff (1975 and 1977) describes as deferent and characteristically feminine. Rate measures were proportions calculated according to formulae described and presented in the Method Chapter. The formulae employ the number of turns an interviewer took in the conversation as the common denominator.

A compounded request is a grammatical construction Lakoff (1973 and 1975) and others (Eakins & Eakins, 1978) described as deferent and characteristic of women's speaking style. Question measures assessed the simplicity or complexity of interviewers' requests for information.
using the clause as the unit of analysis. Three measures of stylistic complexity (Cook, 1975) were applied to the texts of questions asked by each interviewer. Average sentence length (ASL-Q), average block length (ABL-Q), and average clause depth (ACD-Q) provide both quantitative and qualitative measures of the compounding of interviewers' questions.

Neither hesitations nor mitigated performative verbs occurred with sufficient frequency to warrant their inclusion in further analyses. Statistical analysis was conducted using outcomes on the remaining five dependent measures of deferent language usage. Comparisons of interviewers were made by applying the chi square statistical test of association to several sets of contingency tables.

For discussion purposes, the hypothesis (that female interviewers would be more deferent than male interviewers in their use of language to display politeness) is evaluated in light of two sets of questions related to gender differences in speaking style:

1. Do female interviewers use proportionately more deference forms per turn than male interviewers? Are the questions of female interviewers structurally more complex than those of male interviewers?

2. Do interviewers (female and male) use proportionately more deference forms and constructions in opposite-sex conversations than they do in same-sex conversations?

In answer to questions regarding female interviewers' differential use of deference forms, all four interviewers were found to use similar proportions of the deference forms investigated. There were individual differences between interviewers on measures of the structural complexity of their questions, but those differences
followed no pattern by sex. These results are most similar to those reported by Hirschman (1973 and 1974). She found no differences in the proportion of qualifiers (adverbs) or fillers (expletives) used by women and men in same-sex and mixed-sex conversations.

In answer to the question of whether interviewers spoke differently in mixed company, individual differences between interviewers were found. However, the differences displayed by interviewers in same-sex and mixed-sex conversations followed no pattern determined by the sex of participants in the conversation. Individually, interviewers did use language differently in the two conversations sampled for each. Sandy Hill and Tom Brokaw used deferent linguistic forms at significantly different rates in the conversations analyzed for each of them. Jane Pauley and David Hartman asked questions in significantly different ways in each of their conversations.

In sum, on these measures, the use of deferent language does not appear to vary by sex. Deference did not seem to characterize the speech of these female interviewers nor of these interviewers in mixed company. Key (1975) noted that occupational language takes precedence over sex-role (or gender-appropriate) language when women and men perform the same tasks. It appears that her observation is more descriptive of the speaking styles of these interviewers than is Lakoff's.

Several explanations for these findings are possible. Where there were differences on outcomes for each conversation, sex was the only contextual factor noted for the respondents. It is possible
that other variables, such as the socioeconomic status of the respondent may have accounted for some of the differences in an interviewer's use of language. For example, the finding that Sandy Hill used more deferent language with a respondent of the same sex is somewhat clearer when occupational status is noted: her female respondent was the president of a college while her male respondent was a federal prisoner. Kramer et al. (1978) suggested that the interaction of sex with other status variable provides a more complete explanation of apparent differences in language behavior.

The finding of no difference with respect to the variable sex can be interpreted in several ways: (1) The forms chosen do not represent deference; (2) The televised interview does not lend itself to differences in female and male displays of deferent language behavior; (3) The hypothesis may be incorrect: females and males may be equally deferent in their use of language to display politeness. Variations in interviewers' displays of deference may be explained better by factors other than gender or by some combination of gender with other factors.

Summary

The results for these four interviewers were consistent across seven dependent measures of deferent language usage. Female interviewers were not significantly different from male interviewers in their use of four deferent linguistic forms and one deferent construction. On these measures, interviewers were different one from the other. Also, each interviewer used deferent forms and
constructions differently in the two conversations sampled for each one. These interviewers addressed the female and male respondents in the sample differently; to some extent, their language seemed to be uniquely responsive to each situation and respondent.

The weight of interpretation of these data was on the results of the descriptive analysis. Small sample size made it unwise to draw conclusions from the results of statistical analysis. Significant differences, or the lack thereof, among interviewers on measures of deferent language usage point to necessary refinements in the design of future studies and to directions for further research.

Further Research

The results of this study must be placed in the context of the interaction in each of the sampled conversations. Descriptive and statistical analyses of respondents' talk is currently underway (Piehowicz & Pepinsky, in progress). Also, a plan is being developed for submitting these data to some form of interaction analysis (McCarthy, Pepinsky & Piehowicz, in progress). In the latter study, some use will be made of the concept of interact (Hawes, 1972a) or double interact (Frenz & Farrell, 1976). It is expected that some variation in interviewers' use of deference forms and constructions can be explained in terms of the responsiveness of interviewer to respondent and vice versa.

Whether deference is characteristic of women's speaking style is a question which remains to be answered unequivocally. These
findings indicate there is some reason to believe Lakoff's claims do not hold. For these interviewers, larger samples of talk would be required to determine whether the lack of pattern by sex holds true for them more generally. For interviewers' speaking styles, I believe that analyzing the text of questions along would yield interesting data on measures of deference.

Definitions of the grammatical construction of deference need to be both expanded and refined for testing. The interutterance connective (such as HILL: "She had a baby." HORNER: "And it's a very interesting kind of coping strategy.") is an example of another form identified as deferent which could be tracked by means of CALAS. An operational definition of deference as a speaking style or, more generally, of the display of politeness in spoken language needs to be both comprehensive and clear in order to be tested in other contexts by other researchers.

A less-biased method of testing for gender-related differences in speaking styles may be to analyze the results of large samples of conversation processed by CALAS to determine whether any systematic differences exist in the use of various verb types and/or of stylistic complexity. The results of a number of studies which make use of these concepts indicate their viability (Bieber, et al., 1977; Hurndon, et al., 1978; Meara, et al., 1978; Murray, 1977; Patton, et al., 1977; Shannon, 1977).

What is clear from this study is the viability of using the Computer-Assisted Language Analysis System (CALAS) to study verbal behavior in conversations in a context different from therapy. The
employment of these computertized programs to process natural language makes it possible to collect larger samples of conversation than have been possible previously. Also, the concept of informative display is one that may prove useful in explaining other phenomena in communication made evident through natural language.
APPENDIX A

Interview Transcriptions
In the following pages, the texts for the eight interviews used in this study are provided. The transcriptions make use of the following symbols:

\[ \] = false start, repetition, incomplete word or nonsense hesitation (um, er, ah) which was removed from the text by the REMFALSE program and catalogued on a file separate from the dialogue submitted to CALAS analysis.

( ) = extra-linguistic comment not amenable to language analysis; e.g., (chuckle).

... = overlap; i.e., words spoken simultaneously by two speakers.

In addition to the texts of conversations, the speaking turns taken by interviewers have been marked and numbered according to the following system. Each interviewer's turn is marked behind the speaker's name. The turn is either given a number in parenthesis which indicates its place in sequence or, if it is part of a turn overlap, it is given one of the following symbols in parenthesis:

(*) = backchannel: a one- or two-word comment such as umhumm, right, okay which is emitted by an interviewer while the respondent is talking (Putnam & Skerchuck, 1978, list 1, p. 2). Eakins and Eakins (1978) argue that backchannels indicate continued listening behavior rather than a separate turn (p. 66-67). On the other hand, Yeah, yes, or nope is a single-word turn unit, because it is a reaction or comment.

(+) = interruption: a contribution made by the interviewer while the respondent is still talking. In these conversations, the plus or minus symbol usually marks the interviewer's attempt to finish a respondent's thought. A change-of-topic interruption that elicits no comment from the respondent is given a turn sequence number. There are two types:

(+) = successful: indicates that the overlap results in the interviewer getting the floor with minimum (one word) comment by the respondent.
(-) = unsuccessful: indicates that the interviewer's overlap does not result in an immediate change in speakers. In these dialogues, the respondent talks over the interruption and continues her/his turn.

(!) = turn continuation: marks the interviewer's talk following an unsuccessful interruption by a respondent. It also indicates short comments made in response to a respondent's request for clarification.

Admittedly, these are fine and difficult distinctions to make when transcribing actual conversations. This investigator has attempted to implement her conception of these distinctions with consistency.
INTERVIEW #1

Good Morning, America
April 20, 1978

INTERVIEWER: Sandy Hill

RESPONDENT: Matina Horner, President, Radcliffe College

SUBJECT: "Fear of success" research

HILL (1): More and more talented women are entering the job market than ever before, and most of us would expect that these women are interested in earning as much money as possible and rising as high in their chosen fields as they can. Well, according to Matina Horner -- she is the president of Radcliffe College -- that is not the case. Mrs. Horner is an experimental psychologist. She has done studies that show many gifted women are actually afraid of success. Good morning and welcome.

HORNER: Good morning.

HILL (2): It's such a curious paradox, isn't it?

HORNER: It is, indeed. It's one of the ironies and contradictions of our times.

HILL (3): [How do you] How do you define success?

HORNER: Well, it's really a very personal definition for me, but [I think] if [uh] one were to talk about success as leading an enriched and full and satisfying life, I think it involves being able to come to a happy integration of a personal and professional life, one that is a balance [uh] consitstant with our innermost drums, rather than an externally-imposed definition [uh] of success.

HILL (4): Our innermost drums. That's a lovely way to put it. You say that that's a personal opinion. How do most people define success?
HORNER: I think most people in the traditional [uh] American ethic of success have said to succeed competitively in terms of status, in terms of money [uh].

HILL (5): Umhummm. And that's prestige, power, and money, period.

HORNER: And that's prestige, power, and money, yes indeed. And I think people have struggled for a long time to see if they can really achieve a balance in personal growth, occupationally.

HILL (6): You know, as we started to talk, I guess that's one of the great ironies. And indeed it is because most people associate very positive things with success. So why [why] are women afraid of it, some women?

HORNER: Fear of success is really simply a reflection, I think, of the kind of expectations we've developed about ourselves and [and] others in the process of growing up and observing the consequences of pursuing a certain course of action or achieving a certain kind of accomplishment and developing a sense of self-esteem [uh] really in the process of growing up in a particular environment and seeing what happens to men and women and we tend to make normative assumptions . . .

HILL (*): . . . Uhhuh . . .

HORNER: . . . about what's happening [uh] to us. And it's very interesting to think, what is the boundary of femininity? What is the boundary of masculinity? And we tend to develop it by watching what happens to those who cross the expected boundaries.
HILL (7): [what] What you're saying is that [is that] some women are afraid they will lose their femininity by becoming successful. [eh] You know, to put it very simply, is that one of their fears?

HORNER: Femininity is [one of the] only one of the consequences. There are those who are afraid that the quality of their life as a whole [uh] may fall apart.

HILL (8): Uhmhm. Is it friends, or something?

HORNER: As a consequence of working, there's [time, there's] no time for friends. There may not be [uh] time for some valued extracurricular activities. If you love music and you're involved in one kind of action and you see very busy women unable to enjoy that aspect of [uh, of] their life.

HILL (9): What do [what do] women do when they're afraid of success? I mean, how does it [how does it] show up in their professional life, let's say?

HORNER: Well, interestingly enough [enough], the women that fear success are precisely those women that most want and are most able to achieve success. I mean, that's where the irony and the contradiction comes. They've developed very positive motivation and very deep interest in certain courses of action [uh] but they've also developed [uh] some expectation that there may be great costs entailed . . .

HILL (*): . . . Uhmhm . . .
HORNER: . . . In pursuing and achieving that particular goal and then their efforts and their persistence toward that goal are [are] dampened . . .

HILL (*): . . . Umhmm . . .

HORNER: . . . and their enthusiasm for it, so it's precisely those people most directed to it that will tend to hold back. Others develop coping strategies. It depends on what they're afraid of.

HILL (10): What do they do to cope?

HORNER: One of the most interesting studies [uh] that came out was following the original sample in which the idea first developed in the 1960's nine or ten years later, and those women that were most fearful of success [uh] in the preceding nine years tended at a point in which a significant gap between themselves and [uh] a significant man in their life . . .

HILL (-): . . . Husband and lover . . .

HORNER: . . . or boyfriend or whatever, began to close, either he had a setback or she had a major advance, tended to have what [somebody] Lois Hoffman at Michigan called success anticipatory pregnancies . . .

HILL (-): . . . She had a baby.

HORNER: And it is a very interesting kind of copying strategy because there's another study that followed a group fifteen years later that Abigail Stewart did and those very women who, you would think, had the
most [constraints for] practical constraints -- had children, husbands, households to take care of -- were the ones who persisted in their careers. So you can wonder whether those people nine years out had developed a strategy that will allow them fifteen years out to pursue that other professional goal and it's [it's] a struggle with balance and bringing to [to] bear your autonomy and your commitment and self-assertion.

HILL (11): Yeah. There are two other things I would really like to ask you but we're [we're] running so tight. Do most women know that they're afraid of success?

HORNER: I don't think it's a conscious thing that you would reckon with. People will talk much more consciously about being afraid of failure [uh] . . .

HILL (*): . . . Uhhuh . . .

HORNER: . . . But it's [something, it's] just there. We're uncomfortable. There's a real gap in both men and women between our newly-adopted attitudes and values and our behaviors and how we feel about our new behaviors.

HILL (12): I must ask you. I mean, you are obviously a successful woman -- [uh] president of a college, married, three children. [Uh] By anyone's definition, that definitely is success. Were you afraid of it?

HORNER: It's very hard to say whether I was or wasn't afraid of it.
HILL (13): You don't know?

HORNER: [uh] I really don't know. [uh]

HILL (14): Huh. And that's [uh, that's] where we all are.

HORNER: I think that's where we all are.

HILL (15): At least in your assessment. Well, it's fascinating. It really is, Ms. Horner, and thank you so much . . .

HORNER: . . . Well, I'm glad to be here . . .

HILL (!): . . . For being with us and talking about it.

HORNER: Things have changed. It's so interesting.

HILL (16): It is. It's an on-going thing, forever. Only permanence is change.
INTERVIEW #2

Good Morning, America
April 13, 1978

INTERVIEWER: Sandy Hill
RESPONDENT: Charles "Tex" Watson
Prisoner-Author
SUBJECT: Recently released autobiography

HILL (1): Charles "Tex" Watson is the assistant pastor of the chapel at the men's colony, which means most of his prison life revolves around the church. He conducts bible study classes, gives sermons, administers holy communion and even counsels his fellow inmates, discussing both personal and theological questions. He hopes one day to become an ordained minister. How and when did you find Christ?

WATSON: I found Christ about [two years ago] two and a half years ago, [uh] at a revival here in this very chapel. [um] I'd just come to a point in my life to where I felt [uh] I needed something [uh] other than what I had.

HILL (2): How did the man who once called himself the devil and was out to do the devil's business make that transition? It would seem the ultimate paradox.

WATSON: The commitment [it] itself I made to the devil. At the time, I feel that was part of my personality to completely give, to completely submit [uh] to [uh] something to have control over me. [uh] Just like now, I've completely submitted myself [uh] to the Lord Jesus Christ. [um] I feel that it's just taken [uh] a complete hundered-and-eighty-degree turn [uh] in that, as I did, you know, submit myself totally
to the devil at that time, now I've completely given myself to the Lord Jesus . . .

HILL (3): . . . But how did you make the transition?

WATSON: [um] I didn't make it. I feel like the Lord made it through me.

HILL (4): You found Christ in 1975 and, less than three years after that, you now have a book on the market. What's the purpose?

WATSON: [uh] I think to tell others about Jesus Christ and what He can do for a man's life in that [uh] all things are possible with God and He don't just save [uh] good people, but He saves the very worst of people, too.

HILL (5): What do you get out of it?

WATSON: Tex Watson gets nothing. It all goes back to God: Now, in the way of prison ministry, and also I'd like to see even the families of the victims of the crime get part of [that] money, if that can ever be arranged.

HILL (6): Will you use your conversion as a [a] key to the prison door, in effect?

WATSON: I think it's pretty well-known now [that, uh] that you don't get shorter sentences just because [uh] you ask the Lord to come into
your life. [uh] I think [uh, it would] it paves my freedom, yes, in that I'm now free in Jesus Christ and that I gave my life to Him and I'm free from the bondage of [of] Satan [uh] in this world.

HILL (7): Are you using your religion to get out of prison on parole?

WATSON: [uh] it's not important at all. I'm here to do the will of God and to be used by Him. [uh] If He wants me here [uh] I'll be here doing His work and if He would like to see me outside, I'll be there to do His work.

HILL (8): When you [uh] converted in effect, in 1975. Well, prior to that point, your all-consuming passion was to get out.

WATSON: That's right.

HILL (9): You wrote copious letters to your former lawyer, or to your lawyer, and saying, "Get me out. What can we do? How can I change this? How can I appeal? How can I move?" Then all of a sudden, (finger snap) it stops?

WATSON: It just stops, yeah (chuckle). He gives you a freedom. What else can I say? The Lord Jesus Christ is freedom, and your concern becomes not to get out anymore because you are out. You're free.

HILL (10): Do you believe in justice?

WATSON: Yes, I believe in justice.
HILL (11): What does that mean to you?

WATSON: Justice depends [uh] on how long you have to stay in prison to actually pay for what you [uh] have committed. But when you get it into the spiritual realm, justice is the Lord Jesus Christ in that he paid for the crime upon the cross of Calvary, and I am washed clean but I don't . . .

HILL (12): . . . Clean enough to be paroled in seven years?

WATSON: No, I'm not saying that. I'm saying . . .

HILL (13): . . . Do you believe you deserve to be paroled?

WATSON: No, I don't really feel that I deserve to be paroled. I think that would be utterly ridiculous to say, because there's seven counts of first-degree murder.

HILL (14): There are those who will say that what has happened to you smacks of jailhouse religion. You even see that.

WATSON: Mmmmm.

HILL (!): What do you say to them?

WATSON: I believe that jailhouse religion is very easily to be seen [uh] when a man comes into this chapel here and, if he is coming in under a pretense that is not real, we'll immediately be able to see it. You [uh] can't fake being a Christian. You just can't do that.
HILL (15): What about your life with the Manson family before the murders? What was it like?

WATSON: At that time, it was good, but now I look back upon it and it's garbage. [uh] It was the pits of hell.

HILL (16): How did you spend your time?

WATSON: Well, I spent my time [uh] doing drugs and smoking grass and just in a family setting, just living kind of a natural life.

HILL (17): Charles Manson was natural?

WATSON: Well, he was a natural man, yes. He didn't have anything spiritual about him. [Uh] . . .

HILL (18): What did he mean to you?

WATSON: Well, at that particular time he was, I guess, my idol [or] or my God and [uh, um] a man that was over me that [uh, um] fulfilled my life with his thoughts and his knowledge that I believed him to have at that particular time.

HILL (19): Why were you so willing to kill for Charles Manson?

WATSON: I think because I'd been totally [uh] uncompeted of everything that I'd been taught in my life previous to that time.

HILL (20): There were other family members who were as intoxicated by Charles Manson as you were, who looked at him as a kind of deity, and
yet they refused to kill for him. Brooks Poston, for example. What was in it Charles "Tex" Watson that made him more susceptible to Charles Manson?

WATSON: I was the one that was asked to do it, you know, for him and I did it. The others weren't [wasn't] asked at that particular time and all before . . .

HILL (21): . . . Brooks Poston was asked, at one point, to kill for Charles Manson.

WATSON: Oh, [I wasn't] I didn't know about that. Mmmmm.

HILL (22): And he refused.

WATSON: Oh, I was sold out completely. What can I say? I was sold out to the devil completely and I was completely brainwashed [um] of what I had been taught to believe so therefore I did it without question and [uh] the girls did, too. We all went together and [uh] if he'da told us to jump off a bridge, we'da jumped off a bridge, you know.

HILL (23): Susan Atkins is another family member who also was convicted of murder. She now claims to be a born-again Christian. Do you believe her?

WATSON: Yes, I believe she is. I believe that she's had a true experience with the Lord Jesus Christ.

HILL (24): In her book she claims she never killed anyone in the Tate-LaBianca.
WATSON: That's true. She did not.

HILL (25): She did not kill anyone?

WATSON: No, she did not kill anyone.

HILL (26): And yet she testified that she did in the trial.

WATSON: Yes [I] She lied at the trial. [um] I believe she's retracted that statement since then but [um, um] she didn't kill anyone.

HILL (27): Did you do it all?

WATSON: Yes, I did it all.

HILL (28): Everyone?

WATSON: [uh] Yes, everyone.

HILL (29): Can Charlie Manson be saved?

WATSON: At this present time, I'm praying for him and hope that he can but the thing that is in him right now -- the evil that is present in his life, the satanic way of his life right now -- is exhausting himself above God and for you to be saved, you have to humble yourself before God instead of up above God saying, "I don't need no God," you know. "I am God."

HILL (30): Would you reach out to Charles Manson?

WATSON: I would reach out to [God, to to] Charles Manson because God reaches out to Charles Manson. I think [uh] God calls [uh] us to forgive people just as He forgives people, and I would reach out to Charles Manson, if he would reach out to God.
INTERVIEW #3
Good Morning, America
January 17, 1978

INTERVIEWER: David Hartman
RESPONDENT: James Earl Jones, Actor
SUBJECT: Role in Paul Robeson
a new Broadway play

HARTMAN (1): Paul Robeson was the son of a runaway slave. He was an All-American college football player back in 1917, 1918. He was Phi Beta Kappa in undergraduate school. He then graduated from law school. He was a giant [uh] figure as an actor and singer. [he] He talked publicly and controversially about racism and about his attraction to the Soviet Union. [uh] During the years of the cold war, he was blacklisted and when he died two years ago at the age of seventy-eight, most people were no longer aware of who this man was. A play, simply called Paul Robeson, is opening on Broadway this Thursday with James Earl Jones playing the title role and it's a pleasure, James, to have you with us this morning. Good morning.

JONES: My pleasure.

HARTMAN (2): And happy birthday.

JONES: Thank you.

HARTMAN (3): [Heh] Are you a birthday fan, a big birthday fan?

JONES: I think one's birthday is the most important day of the year.

HARTMAN (4): Why?

JONES: Well, it's because that's the day that life was invested into each of us.

JONES: It's more important than Christmas or Independence Day or anything.

HARTMAN (6): Paul Robeson was an extraordinary man...

JONES: ... Yes ...

HARTMAN (!): ... As I just said. What was he to you?

JONES: [uh] That extraordinary [uh] man. [What, What I] I met him through my father [um] but [what I] what impresses me about Paul was that, as total as he was, so was his view total. [He] He never saw [uh] racism as something separate. He saw it as connected with a lot of things that go on around the world [uh] that tend to dehumanize life. He saw racism connected to facism, connected to colonialism. [He saw all] He saw the problems as global problems. And that's why [he] during the cold war, he thought that the [the] rift between the USA and Russia was so ridiculous.

HARTMAN (7): Did you know him? Did you meet him?

JONES: I met him three times in my life, the first time through my father.

HARTMAN (8): And what was he like?

JONES: [Umm] (chuckle) Well. Enormous and [and uh] enormously. [Um] I'll tell you this. I stood twenty feet aware from him when he was singing and I felt literally rocked in the cradle. It wasn't just the musicianship but the magnetism that came through that voice and
probably he'll be remembered mostly through his singing, through his records.

HARTMAN (9): [You] Your dad was blacklisted as well, was he not?

JONES: Yes.

HARTMAN (10): What effect did [did] your dad's blacklisting have? What influence did that have on your judgment about Paul Robeson if you've made any [yeah, if you've made any]?

JONES: No, I have no judgments on [him, on] Paul Robeson.

HARTMAN (11): Did [did] your father's blacklisting affect you in any way?

JONES: I don't think so.

HARTMAN (+): No?

JONES: I [I] don't think so.

HARTMAN (12): Robeson's influence, [uh] perhaps . . .

JONES: . . . [Uh] affect me in terms of my [of my] career, or personally?

HARTMAN (+): No, just personally.

JONES: Oh, yes. I mean, I [I] had to look at life [uh] with wider eyes [uh], look at the whole issue of [of] justice with wider eyes . . .

HARTMAN (*): . . . Umhmm . . .
JONES: ... See the larger scope of what was going on in that.

HARTMAN (13): What does the play deal with? There's no way that one play can deal with the entire life of Paul Robeson. What do you deal with in the play?

JONES: We deal with his life at the age of nineteen to the age of seventy-five.

HARTMAN (+): Which is most of his life.

JONES: [Um] Yes. [Yes]

HARTMAN (14): And in what way? In what manner? How is he presented?

JONES: In one-man form. [Um] We go from event to event. [It] It's as if [uh] the two hours of this play is an evening where [uh] Paul Robeson [uh] hosts his own life. The audience is the guest and Paul is the host and he [he] tells the audience of his guests some significant things about his life, some events that happen . . .

HARTMAN (*): . . . Right . . .

JONES: . . . to his life.

HARTMAN (15): There's been criticism by a number of black leaders, performers, politicians, et cetera: Coretta King, James Baldwin, Julian Bond, Paul Robeson, Jr., as a matter of fact. And they have denounced the play [as], and I'm quoting here, as being "a perversion of the essence of Paul Robeson." Why?
JONES: Why? [Uh] I can't account for [uh] all the things that they feel or that they need. [Uh] I will say this about Paul Robeson, Jr. I respect him greatly. [Um] There's a potential that I've always felt that I had with him, [uh] we having similar backgrounds and so on. But [uh, uh] I can't counter him really, because that was his father, you see.

HARTMAN (*): Umhmm.

JONES: At the same time, Paul Robeson was more than Junior's father. He was something to everybody, to the whole world. And I think that gives me a right, as an actor, to [uh to] try to present an essence of his life . . .

HARTMAN (*): . . . Right . . .

JONES: . . . on stage. [Uh the] the people who come to see the play, I can't encounter them either because they have a right to their opinion and the right to protest but I think [what goes] along with that right to protest goes with it a responsibility and that is to see the play, at least. Those who have, okay.

HARTMAN (*): Fine.

JONES: But those who have not, I have to say that there's something very dangerous going on there, [uh] and I think people who have lived with a great deal of pain as black people do still in this country and around the world, probably. [Uh, there's always without] When there is not effective leadership, there's always a tendency for the people who
are intellectually-oriented to look at the areas of high visibility -- and the arts of courses are always high visibility -- and try to use those areas to set priorities. And it puts a great burden on the art and I think that [uh, uh] there's a great danger of us losing freedom and [uh and of] of us paralyzing ourselves.

HARTMAN (-): Which can be devastating.

JONES: Devastating, yes. I mean, so [so] if the ad hoc committee that says it want to end the crimes . . .

HARTMAN (-) . . . Excuse me, James . . .

JONES: . . . against Paul Robeson really contribute to the silencing of [uh, uh, of] that man's essence, I think.

HARTMAN (+): And also of the freedom that we talked about.

JONES: Oh, yes.

HARTMAN (16): James, best to you.

JONES: Thank you.

HARTMAN (17): Everything you've done is so excellent. It's nice seeing you . . .

JONES: Thank you.

HARTMAN (!): Thank you.
HARTMAN (1): There's a common perception that juvenile courts [uh] go very soft on teenage offenders, [uh] that the court's compassion and understanding or willingness to give second changes often gives the wrong message to youngsters in trouble with the law. Betty Ann Weaver is a juvenile court judge for Lelanaw County, Michigan. She sees things a little differently, and she's attracted [uh] quite a bit of attention for her policy of tough sentencing. Good morning, Judge, and welcome.

WEAVER: Hi, David.

HARTMAN (2): What's [uh, what's] good about putting young people in jail?

WEAVER: Well, I think it can change their lives positively.

HARTMAN (3): How?

WEAVER: [Uh] A little while in jail -- a couple of days or a couple of weeks -- has turned around young people's lives and kept them from going into serious crime.

HARTMAN (4): That's a very hard statement to just come out and say, "Just throw them in jail;" "It'll do them good." Give me some examples, if you would, of the kind of crimes and sentencing. What were you really saying?
WEAVER: Well, usually we're handling crimes before they go to the felony level, the assailant level, the [uh] violent level. And yet, [uh] we will generally give the person probation, but if they violate their probation then they're going to spend some time in jail. While they're there, my staff is going to talk with them, see them, and they'll require them to write essays. They're going to do work. They're not going to watch television. They're not going to anything wrong, although they'll do some thinking and changing dramatically. They've gone from [um, um] reading at second grade level, to [uh] increasing seven grade levels while they're sitting in jail, reading.

HARTMAN (5): What kind of response have you gotten from the community?

WEAVER: Very positive. I think [uh] the general [uh] community [uh] is very supportive of the courts taking their role which is to stand for authority, stand for accountability and responsibility for their actions, and that's what we're talking about.

HARTMAN (6): [Is there] Is there a danger that [this could be, that] going to jail for a youngster 15, 16, 17 years old, could be so traumatic that it could bring about the opposite reaction from that which you were talking about?

WEAVER: I really don't think so. I think that, when it's handled in the right way -- and we're talking about putting [uh] people in jails where it is humane -- [uh] that [uh] they [uh] see that they are accountable for their actions and that [uh] it is an opportunity to learn and to change before it's too late.
HARTMAN (7): There are many people who feel that these youngsters will continue to commit crimes of one sort or another -- and sometimes serious crime -- because they, one, don't have any respect for the law. Well, that's the keypoint: that they don't respect the law. Do you agree with that, or (pause)?

WEAVER: Well, [uh] that's too general. I think that obviously that those that don't respect the law [that they will only] come to respect the law if the law demands their respect, and shows them that they in fact are accountable.

HARTMAN (8): You're talking about a [a community] a small community where you have a very [untold] controlled jail situation. It's clean. It's terrific [uh] by comparison. It's still a lock-up, but it's still very good. Do you think you could take your small community experience and transpose it into a city like New York, or Chicago, or Detroit or Los Angeles where conditions are not that good, and you know that?

WEAVER: Well, I think it could be done if the cities want to get back to community government and to neighborhoods. [Uh] You could do it if there was better resources. My contention is that it would be most important and very vaulable to society in the cities if we would spend the money by [uh] handling crime at that level, taking what I'm doing and bringing it back to the cities, get back to neighborhood courts where the kinds [uh] can be [uh] caught up with and held accountable.

HARTMAN (9): Have you talked with people in the big cities about doing just what you're talking about?
WEAVER: I have to a degree . . .

HARTMAN (10): . . . What do they say?

WEAVER: . . . and, well, they seem to think that it's financially impossible. But what I think we're doing is we're feeding [uh] the program by ignoring crime at a very early level [the line of crime] and saying when a child shoplifts or something like that, [uh] "don't do it again." We already know that child will go on to something else, and before you know, we're handling a higher level of crime, felony crime, and we're spending more money in the end.

HARTMAN (11): I was surprised at this statistic: that over half of the serious crimes in the United States is committed by youngsters between the age of ten and seventeen. Is that a valid statistic to you?

WEAVER: My understanding is that [that] it's true.

HARTMAN (12): Do you agree? I know it is concerning New York state. [the uh] I don't whether it's true in Michigan or not, but the juvenile [records] court records are thrown away once a youngster reaches the age of 21. Do you agree . . .

WEAVER: . . . I think it's too early [uh] particularly if it's a felony crime. I think that [uh] you just cannot throw away [uh] what you've done. [Uh You have to have a little bit longer time, I would say, before you throw away, ten years from now.
HARTMAN (13): How optimistic are you that if your programs were to go into effect in more communities than just yours, that you could really have an impact on the level of crime?

WEAVER: I'm very optimistic because we've had an impact in our community.

HARTMAN (14): What kind of percentage?

WEAVER: We've had about an 18% decrease in criminal activity at the juvenile level since I took office which has been about three years ago.

HARTMAN (15): And [uh] you are going to be re-elected next time around?

WEAVER: I was just re-elected last year, so I've got five years to go.

HARTMAN (16): Five more years to try to improve things in your community.

WEAVER: That's right.

HARTMAN (17): Judge, it's a pleasure meeting you.

WEAVER: Well, thank you David, I've really enjoyed being with you.

HARTMAN (18): Thank you, and if you'd like to learn a little bit more about [uh] the judge's experiences and her programs and plans in Lenlanaw Michigan, you can read about her in People magazine this week.
INTERVIEW #5

Today Show
January 4, 1978

INTERVIEWER: Jane Pauley

RESPONDENT: Melissa Ludtke
sports reporter
Sports Illustrated

SUBJECT: Sex discrimination
suit filed against
the Commissioner of
Baseball

PAULEY (1): Melissa Ludtke is a sports writer and she writes sports
for a living. She is a reporter for Sports Illustrated who has filed
a sex discrimination suit to force major league baseball to grant
women journalists access to the players' locker rooms. Time, Inc.,
Ms. Ludtke's [importer, reh] employer is joining in that suit which
was filed last week. The commissioner of baseball, Bowie Kuhn, has
said he would allow women sports writers into baseball locker rooms
for post-game interviews, quote, "if they could satisfy us that we
have violated any law." With the present policy he is satisfied.
He says he considers the [uh] present practice of providing female
reporters with, quote, "interview facilities adjacent to the team's
dressing quarters appropriate and in the best interest of all con-
cerned." When did writers start invading locker rooms, [meb] male
or female, to get the story after the game? When did that practice
get started anyway?

LUDTKE: That's a good question. I'm not actually sure when it started
but by now it's such a tradition that it seems like it's been around as
long as the game's been around.
PAULEY (2): As a sports writer, I think you probably would know as well as anybody how modest, by reputation, are baseball players?

LUDTKE: I think that they're probably fairly modest, in the sense that they've never been presented with the problem of a woman. Now they're presumably not very modest in the presence of the men reporters because I understand that that's part of the problem, that the men feel that they'd like to be able to be comfortable in whatever outfit or lack of outfit they care to walk around in. So my presumption is that they're not very modest in their own quarters which is their locker room.

PAULEY (3): As you see it, should modesty be the issue anyway?

LUDTKE: I don't think so, not from my point of view and probably not from any reporter's point of view. We're not in there for a beauty contest. We're in there to do a job. We're in there to get any interview and once we get that interview, presumably, we'll leave.

PAULEY (4): We had occasion to talk to at least one well-known sports writer who I will leave unmentioned who said jokingly, leeringly, that he wouldn't mind being allowed into the girls' dressing room to interview Chrissie Evert in the ladies' room, for instance. Are men at this point allowed in women's locker rooms after, say, a tennis match or a women's basketball game, or do they even care?

LUDTKE: Well, what we're talking about here is a question of equal access. After Virginia Slims tournaments, per se, which is the women's tennis tour,
the two women who are involved in the match are brought into an inter-
view room and that's the tradition in women's tennis, that the ladies
are brought into an interview room where everyone is present and then
after that interview is over, they go back and they shower and presumably, if someone has a follow-up question at that point, they can get them after that. So my point is that that's the tradition that's evolved in the women's tennis game. [Um] On the golf circuit, it's a question, I think, of the same kind of thing. You don't have the same kind of locker room situation. Maybe they change their shoes. [Um] so really you're talking about a tradition in baseball that [does] is not yet established on the women's tennis tour.

PAULEY (5): I think Bowie Kuhn makes [uh, uh], an interesting point in that [um] when you're covering sports, [the] the game is not played in the locker room. In which case, why doesn't he just throw the whole lot of you out of the locker room and let you and all the fellows who are sports writers sit together in that adjacent room and wait [till] for Reggie [who] -- this is Reggie, by the way, Reggie Jackson -- till everybody's all showered and shaved and dressed and everyone can come out and sit down and talk to you. Why doesn't he kick everybody out?

LUDTKE: The game's not played in the locker room but more and more sports writing is done in, say, a sidebar kind of situation. People want to know the personalities that play. They want to know what Reggie Jackson is like. They don't want to know, "why did you swing at the second pitch." They want to know, "what did you think about something
that went on tonight. What's your reaction?" And sometimes visually, you can see a reaction much better with someone to explain it. You could see when Reggie Jackson hit his third homerun -- at least I could see on the TV monitor that I might have run around the corner to see -- that he was elated, that there was something [that was something] special about that evening to him and he went on and talked about it for an hour and forty-five minutes. I didn't hear one word of that hour and forty-five minutes. (overlap)

PAULEY (6): You were in that room adjacent to the locker room?

LUDTKE: I wasn't in the room adjacent. I was standing outside the clubhouse crushed against the wall. I was watching people go in and out of the locker room with no credentials. I had a credential. It said "she can go into the clubhouse." I was standing out there and the guard said, "you can't go into the clubhouse. I have orders from the commissioner's office. You're not allowed." I missed an hour and forty-five minutes of Reggie Jackson talking about hitting the three home runs. By the time he was ready to come out and say hello to me, you can imagine there were twenty people outside yelling, "Reggie, Reggie, Reggie," you know, "we're number one." I couldn't get a word.

PAULEY (7): So what do you do? You get on the phone and call your boss and you say, "well listen boss, I was there and I saw the game and wasn't it a good one and they wouldn't let me in and I didn't get the story?"

LUDTKE: He knew that. He knew that before I went into the sixth game. This had come up in the first and second games of the series. There had
already been talks with the commissioner's office about it. He knew the position I was in. He understood the position I was in and that's really why this came about.

PAULEY (8): When you first walked out here (cleared throat) and you sort of looked at the picture and you said, "Who is that?" And I said, "Reggie Jackson" and you said, "that's Reggie's chest?" Now why did [why did] you say that, lest we create the impression that you are after all leering at [uh] athletic [uh] bodies? (overlap)

LUDTKE: No, I was trying to get loose because I was sitting here thinking what am I going to say and I was thinking, well, you know, I was just trying to get loose. And really it is a situation where I almost thought when I walked in here and [and] saw that I thought, "I missed that." I never saw that part of Reggie Jackson's evening. I never saw that that's Gabe Paul pouring champagne over his head or watch Reggie Jackson drink that champagne.

PAULEY (9): I would like to know, if I could ask a [ah] rhetorical question, the sex of the camera that was allowed into the locker room to take that photograph when you weren't allowed there, and I don't know that anybody can answer that question. Melissa Ludtke, thank you for being with us. We will be following your case.
PAULEY (1): Well, suppose it looks like you're about to be fired, and we sometimes get advance clues, or maybe you've already been fired. Well, most people accept the situation, bitterly maybe, but then they go about looking for another job or go into a deep depression. Well, not V. Paul Donnelly. He says you should fight back. Donnelly is a Detroit attorney who says most firings aren't based on faulty job performance but on other factors, and the person being fired may have some rights, legal, that he doesn't know about. (That's) especially true for people in middle management who often find themselves squeezed out in large company maneuverings of one kind or another. Donnelly has dozens of such clients he has represented, and has kind of a reputation for fighting back on behalf of people who were fired. At what point, and for what cause, can I sue the boss?

DONNELLY: Well, I think the most logical point is while you're on the job. [um] The majority of my clients are on the job. I have lawsuits involving well over fifty-five corporations from General Motors on down.

PAULEY (2): But on the job, they haven't been fired yet. What do you sue them for?

DONNELLY: Well, what usually happens is [a man, and] it usually involves either sex discrimination or age discrimination. [Uh] A person gets a performance review that starts going down. For instance, in the sense
of an excellent performance review becomes satisfactory plus. That person at that time can see that something might happen in the future. He can then either go [uh] through a Civil Rights Commission, U.S. Department of Labor, or through a lawyer and sue them for discrimination on his job.

PAULEY (3): Well, [uh] why? [uh] Maybe his performance is in fact declining or, on the other hand, maybe the company has a motive for (pause)

DONNELLY: Well, yes. [Uh] The easiest way to eliminate a person would be to claim that they have poor performance and once that they have poor performance, then they have a reason for demotion or termination. They've got to have an excuse.

PAULEY (4): If that would happen to you?

DONNELLY: In what sense, me?

PAULEY (!): [Um] Were you fired or eased out, or . . .

DONNELLY: . . . Oh, no. No, no. I was with Chrysler as a lawyer, Chrysler Corporation, and [uh] I was termed a non-conformist and [uh] I left and went into the ghetto for five years and came out and I'm back.

PAULEY (5): Did you sue them?

DONNELLY: No, I didn't sue them. [Uh] I have enough clients suing them now. [uh] I've vindicated myself.
PAULEY (6): How many suits do you have pending, say against [uh] I understand Chrysler and some against Ford Motor Company?

DONNELLY: Oh, with Ford, I have well over 55 managers [uh] that I represent. Chrysler, I have many. In fact, Mr. Galloway who is in Esquire is one of my clients and we expect to get fifty-one percent of the vote [eh] at the next stockholders meeting on proxie statements we have.

PAULEY (7): [When um] When you are in fact fired, however, you say that's the time to negotiate a big [uh] settlement -- before you clean out your desk, as I said.

DONNELLY: Well, I think you should negotiate for as much severance pay, et cetera, as you can. I . . .

PAULEY (8): . . . It's negotiable?

DONNELLY: I think it's negotiable. I think that you should threaten to go to a lawyer and get as much as you can.

PAULEY (9): What's the most money -- severance pay -- you've ever won for a client?

DONNELLY: I've won, in terms of settlement, full pay from sixty to sixty-five and full pension sixty-five to seventy. The man was president of a corporation and I would say it's close to a million dollars.

PAULEY (10): We did get [uh] in touch with [um] both Chrysler Corporation and Ford Motor Company. Chrysler didn't want to talk about it because these things were under litigation, but Ford gave us a statement that said that, since '71, they had worked either with you or with
the company, or rather had been sued by, ninety-two times and [eh],
essentially they say you haven't won a single court verdict against
them . . .

DONNELLY: . . . They don't count . . .

PAULEY (!): . . . Though the number of cases they have . . .

DONNELLY: [They] They don't go that far. The first client I had [uh]
was [uh] threatened with forced retirement and we made an issue out of
it and [uh] they said "we never intended to do that anyway" and the
man is on the job at fifty-nine and just got a promotion. I can name
many, many people. The head of security at the Glass House, the world
headquarters of Ford Motor, is a client of mine. They tried to [uh]
transfer him from the Glass House to the Rouge, which is a bad area
and [he's] I sent him home, full pay. As far as I'm concerned, he's
going to stay home, full pay.

PAULEY. (11): That, in your opinion then, is just the threat of the
lawsuit, and Ford would say no action Ford has ever taken was taken on
the basis of a lawsuit filed by Paul Donnelly. But what do you think
is the motive for a company, say, changing its mind about demoting
someone or firing someone? What is the motive for keeping them?

DONNELLY: [The mo] the motive for keeping them would be that, if they
fired them after a complaint has been filed, the could be accused of
recrimination. It's against the law to recriminate, for instance,
for a person who is [accused] accusing of age discrimination or sex
discrimination. Recrimination is a problem.
PAULEY (12): A company is [um] pretty much damned if they do and damned if they don't, though. [Um] If they don't give a job to a qualified minority member, a woman, perhaps, and [they, they, they] they want to fire a man, [uh] give him early retirement or whatnot, they're going to be sued either way they go, aren't they?

DONNELLY: [Uh] Probably, but I think it's about time middle-clase whites do a little suing.

PAULEY (13): Oh, yeah?

DONNELLY: Yes, I think so . . .

PAULEY (!): . . . You speak like a bitter man.

DONNELLY: I'm not bitter at all. [I was raised in the depression and grew up in the war and I've got my eight kids and [uh, uh, uh] we reach a point when we want to be successful and [want] want to say we've done a good job and then, boom, you're done. Well, it kills the pride of the middle-class man. [He's, it'll] it kills them. I've had at least six clients die of heart attacks. It's a terribly serious thing, you know, and when this law represents [seventy percent] over seventy percent of the workers in the United States, I'm thankful that I have five minutes here to talk about it because we are talking about seventy percent. Non-union workers are seventy percent of this country.

PAULEY (14): These are middle-management executive . . .

DONNELLY: . . . Right.
PAULEY (!): Well, [what if um] what if you lose, and [they have been
fired] they have [uh] sued the company? Who's going to hire a man who
has sued [his] his boss?

DONNELLY: Well, (chuckle) [that] that's not a real problem, because, if
they badmouthed him in the first place with a bad performance review,
they can say anything. With the lawsuit, I think at least you can say,
"I've got the courage to sue and I want the truth out," and I don't
think a company'd dare [uh black] blackball a man for having filed a
lawsuit. I think he is safer by suing or going through a Civil Rights
Commission or whatever, than he is by sitting back and they'll say,
"we fired him because he didn't do the job."

PAULEY (15): It'd be cheaper to go to the Civil Rights Commission though,
wouldn't it, than to hire a lawyer?

DONNELLY: Oh, absolutely, and I would like to see people. I wish we
had [a, a] a U.S. Department of Labor that did something.

PAULEY (16): They don't?

DONNELLY: No, they don't do anything. I have never seen the Department
of Labor, in any case that I've had, do anything for anybody. No, they
have [I, uh], in some instances, taken on weak companies like [uh] small
companies and they'll have a policy of age and they'll look and investi­
gate but individual clients, they don't have time for that.

PAULEY (17): Paul Donnelly. Thank you. He's a man who cares about
something.
INTERVIEW #7

Today Show
January 4, 1978

INTERVIEWER: Tom Brokaw
RESPONDENT: James Hoagland, political reporter, Washington Post.
SUBJECT: President Carter's trip to France

BROKAW (1): Our guest today is Jim Hoagland, who was in Paris with the Washington Post for a couple of years. He's now in this country, and he continues to watch very carefully the developments in France. President Carter will be there before too long, and he was [invah] invited originally about nine months ago now, I think, wasn't it approximately?

HOAGLAND: The visit was nailed down actually during the May summit in London.

BROKAW (2): President Giscard needed President Carter more at that time, it seems to me, than he does now, for domestic political reasons.

HOAGLAND: He seems to still need him, Tom. The polls show the combined parties on the left, the Communist and the Socialist, still getting about fifty-two percent of the vote. It's interesting that a French president today sees a visit by an American president as a political plus. That's certainly a major change since the time of General DeGaulle. [Ah] These elections are not only a test of Giscard who is, as you said earlier, under assault from the left, but also under attack from his own ranks. Right. It's also a test, in a sense, of the French political system inherited from DeGaulle. DeGaulle's shadow is still very heavy on France, the shadow of a giant, and he tailored that system for himself.
BROKAW (3): Well, what about the French people and their likely reaction to the visit of [ah] an American president who is an enigma to his own people in this country, much less to the French people. I mean, how much of an impression can President Carter make [ah] on the French people? Does he give a certain certification to President Giscard?

HOAGLAND: Apparently, Giscard thinks that he will, and I think to a certain extent that he will. The changing international climate is very important. We are in a period of post-Viet Nam. We are in a period of non-dollar [denomination, of non-dollar, uh] dominance in Europe. The French have much more confidence than they did twenty years ago in managing their own affairs. They don't have to assert the kind of prickly nationalism that DeGaulle often asserted in terms of, well, almost anti-Americanism, really.

BROKAW (4): But President Carter also will be seeing Mitterand during this trip, who is the principal spokesman for the coalition (word missing).

HOAGLAND: This will to some extent [uh] de-emphasize the political nature of the visit. After all, Carter and Giscard do have some very important matters to discuss as well. [Ah] They have nuclear affairs to discuss. They have the whole European community to discuss. By seeing Mitterand Carter will defuse the charges likely to be made from the left and from the right that he is meddling in French politics.

BROKAW (5): Isn't it likely that President Giscard will kind of wag his finger at President Carter for failing to deliver on an American energy program?
HOAGLAND: I doubt very seriously that he will wag his finger. He might say something very obliquely. He might say it very subtly, [Ah] but he will be emphasizing economic issues. He wants to be able to show the French electorate that he is talking to a world premier economic power and that this power is responding to France's need for some economic progress.

BROKAW (6): There have been some analyses that the President is going to France for, among other reasons, to show the West Germans that they're not the only economic power in Russia and Europe. Do you think there's anything to that?

HOAGLAND: I think France should be viewed more as a political influence in Europe rather than an economic power. Economically, France is not in the best of shape for now. France prides itself on being the European country that tells Americans what other Europeans think but do not say directly. I think perhaps it's good that President Carter is going to France to get that viewpoint.

BORKAW (7): Earlier this week, we saw the flap that developed inadvertently for [uh] public consumption between the President and the Indian leadership over the President's desire to check the spread of nuclear fuels. That certainly will be an issue as well when the President meets with President Giscard because they've not seen eye-to-eye on nuclear non-proliferation.

HOAGLAND: Yeh, Tom, the issue's slightly different in that the United States, since the Ford administration, had been pressing France not to
sell a nuclear reprocessing facility to Pakistan. France today says that it would not mind if that deal were cancelled. Privately, French officials say they would be very happy if Pakistan would withdraw but they say that the contract is signed, sealed. They cannot break it. Further, pretty much to please President Carter, they have added that they will no longer export this kind of facility in this kind of situation.

BROKAW (8): But the French seem to be in no way ready to sign the international nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

HOAGLAND: Not as it's currently written. [Uh] They will say that they would agree to discussions of a new form of treaty.

BROKAW (9): In the eyes of a lot of people, the French have come down more or less on the side of the Arabs in the Middle East situation. Do you expect that President Carter will attempt in any fashion to enlist the support of President Giscard for the development in the Middle East as he would like to have them take shape?

HOAGLAND: Probably not in the negotiation phase. In recent days, President Giscard himself has removed France from the negotiation stage, saying instead that France's role would be limited to guarantees and to taking part in a settlement and making a settlement stand up.

BROKAW (10): What about the role of [uh] France in the defense of western Europe as it has [uh] withdrawn militarily from NATO. There
has been some speculation [that he may be], that President Giscard may be reconsidering the role of [uh] France in NATO. Do you expect that that will come up during these talks?

HOAGLAND: I doubt very seriously that there will be any direct discussion of France rejoining NATO. The French seem to be pretty clear on this point that they will not rejoin it. However, President Giscard has edged France back into a more cooperative stance on NATO and more cooperation really with the United States. Take a look at France's record in Africa over the last two, three years. Really, since President Giscard has come to power in 1974, there's been a considerable warming of relations with Washington, I think, that perhaps has not gone noticed by American public opinion to the extent that it should.

BORKAW (11): Isn't there a good possibility as well that President Giscard will have some messages for President Carter from President Bresnev who has been in touch with President Giscard, in fact has [uh] personally [uh] visited France.

HOAGLAND: 's certainly a role that the French have played in the past (and) that Giscard would like to continue. Whether or not he has a message, I just don't know. They have tried to maintain a sort of equidistance in diplomatic terms between Washington and Moscow.

BROKAW (12): And [what about the uh] what about the French people in terms of their reaction [to this] to this man from south Georgia [uh] who comes to them as a farmer and someone who they don't understand. Do
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BROKAW (1): Dr. Suzanne Steinmetz of the University of Delaware has written a book called *The Cycle of Violence* concerning the occurrence of violence in family interactions and she is quoted extensively in the research that we've just heard from Washington about what kind of violence there is in our family life, man to woman and woman to man. The point I'd like to mention this morning is how much husband-beating there is in this society, Dr. Steinmetz. [The professors that we just heard, or] The authors that we just heard, Langly and Levy, said that one out of five husbands are beaten by their wives. Do you find that figure too high?

STEINMETZ: Well, yes, I do. [Uh] That's like saying over a quarter -- You get twelve million husbands and there are only forty-seven million couples -- Over a quarter of all husbands are beaten. That [that] to me is a little out of line. I think what has happened is they were looking at some of my data where I did find twenty percent of the husbands and wives -- and [and] the figures were about equal -- had hit each other. But [I] I don't think you can say that hitting each other is the same thing as being beaten.

BROKAW (2): It's not a "battered husband" syndrome.

STEINMETZ: No, no, not at all.
BROKAW (3): You're talking about a single exchange, maybe, in the course of a long marriage . . .

STEINMETZ: . . . Right. Or possibly two during a peak of high stress.

BROKAW (4): But nothing that would be necessarily physically damaging to one partner or the other . . .

STEINMETZ: . . . Not in that twenty percent, no.

BROKAW (5): A slap, maybe . . .

STEINMETZ: . . . Right . . .

BROKAW (!): . . . But [not] not even a frying pan.

STEINMETZ: No [not even (chuckle)]. And [even if] getting at the frying pan, even if you look at the figures, "hit with an object" or "hit with something hard," you come out with ten percent. Again, not an insignificant amount, but certainly not twelve million.

BROKAW (6): So how many [uh] battered husbands [uh] do you think that there are in this society, based on the figures that you've collected?

STEINMETZ: Okay, based on my data, which is a random sample, plus [uh] comparing it with some very carefully gathered police statistics, I estimate that there's about six-tenths of one percent. Now that is just a little under a quarter of a million battered husbands, and that's . . .
BROKAW (-): ... Two hundred and fifty thousand.

STEINMETZ: Right. [And] And that's certainly a lot of battered husbands, but I think you should recognize there is seven percent, or three and a half million, battered wives.

BROKAW (7): Do the same elements [uh] go into the "battered husband," as into the "battered wife" syndrome in a family?

STEINMETZ: Yes.

BROKAW (!): The same frustrations?

STEINMETZ: Yes.

BROKAW (8): What are some of those?

STEINMETZ: The same. Okay, I found in an in-depth study of battered husbands that very often there was jealousy, which we know affects wife-beatings. There was a feeling that they had not succeeded in what they wanted. In one family, [uh] the woman wanted to be Barbara Walters and she was a secretary and she felt that she just hadn't made it in the career world. [uh] So you have that, where you haven't quite made it to the level you wanted to make it. [uh] You find also there is depression. There is frustration. [uh] Not to the degree that you find in husbands who beat, but to a lesser degree, alcoholism.

BROKAW (9): One of the problems with [the, uh] getting to the roots of the battered wife syndrome is that the wives are often reluctant to come forward. Does the same thing happen with battered husbands?
STEINMETZ: Oh, definitely, definitely.

BROKAW (!): Even more so, probably.

STEINMETZ: Oh, of course. [Because I] In fact, I just got a letter from a man yesterday, a well-educated man, and he said he went to the police and they laughed at him, you know, so that, you know, he got up enough courage to go to the police and this is what happened. [And I think most men, uh] We have the image of the wife who's going to be small and petite, and what man is going to say he couldn't even handle this small, petite woman?

BROKAW (10): Are women just as violent-prone as men?

STEINMETZ: I think so. I think the potential is probably equal and we have data on it, fantasizing, where women are the prime perpetrators. In the child abuse data, again, women do it. So I think if you want to look at potential, I think you're going to have to say that men and women have an equal potential.

BROKAW (11): Briefly, are the families in American life today more violence-prone than they were say, twenty years ago?

STEINMETZ: I can't answer that. We don't have good base-line data to be able to make that kind of an accurate statement. We know it existed. There's marvelous data from court records, diaries, things of that sort. We know that family violence is certainly not a new phenomenon, but I can't tell you whether it's increasing or decreasing.
BROKAW (12): Dr. Susan Steinmetz of the University of Delaware, on a point of some controversy now, how many battered husbands there are in this life.
APPENDIX B

A Case Grammar Glossary
CALAS is derived from a case grammar theory of language based on the work of Fillmore (1968) and Chafe (1970) which was synthesized by Cook (1972a, 1972b). Definitions of case roles and verb types are provided in the following two sections of glossary, in order to help the reader interpret the verb classification/cas frame matrix presented in Table 4.
Essential Case Roles (after Meara, 1976)

AGENT (Agt): The typically animate instigator of the action described by the verb, which may be inanimate when presented as if it possessed the capacity for acting.

  e.g., The little leaguers hit with great accuracy.
  A rolling stone gathers no moss.

EXPERIENCER (Exp): The typically animate one who experiences the feeling sensation, or action described by the main verb. In rare cases, the experiencer may be inanimate.

  e.g., He heard them shout.
  The police questioned two suspects.

BENEFICIARY (Bene): The typically animate possessor (in its broadest sense) of some object, whether the possession be temporary or permanent, positive or negative.

  e.g., He has a cold.
  She gave each of them a high mark.

OBJECT (Obj): The typically inanimate receiver of the action described by agency verbs (A and AP); the person or thing being described by stative verbs (S, SP, SB, and somethings SEA and SEC); the person or thing undergoing change in process verbs (P, PE, and PB).

  e.g., I bought a car.
  The child found a new friend.
  They were tired.
  The picture faded with time.

Peripheral Cases Relations (from Meara, 1976)

LOCATION (L): The place where the action described by the verb occurs.

  e.g., She ran home.
TIME (T): The time when the action described by the verb occurs.

  e.g., I arrived yesterday.

MANNER (M): The way in which the action described by the verb is performed. This includes the instrument case as a subject, when the agent is presented; when the agent is absent, the instrument is called an agent.

  e.g., Our team won first place handily.

COMMITATION (C): The accompaniment case, the typically animate subject accompanying the main actor of the action described by the verb.

  e.g., She went with her mother to Chicago.

CAUSATION (CS): The cause giving the reason for the action described by the verb. Typically expressed in clauses with because, or phrases, with words cause, reason, order, command, etc. Also found in gerund phrases introduced by from.

  e.g., The captain called them to attention with a sharp command.

PURPOSE (P): The case giving the purpose of the action described by the verb. Typically expressed in clauses with so that, in order to. Also in phrases with the prepositions for (plus inanimate), and after.

  e.g., How he suffered for his sanity.

Verb Types, Case Assignments, and Rules for Classification
(After Cook, 1972b, and Pepinsky, et al., 1977)

STATIVE (S): The verb defines a property of the object, and is usually followed by an adjective or participle object.

  e.g., I am detached.

  She seems nervous.
STATIVE EXPERIENCE/COGNITIVE (SEC): The verb defines an experience's affective state or activity, and may take an adjective - or noun object.

 e.g., I know the book well.
     He listened closely.

STATIVE EXPERIENCER/AFFECTIVE (SEA): The verb defines an experiencer's affective state or activity, and may taken an adjective -or noun object.

 e.g., I want something sweet.

STATIVE BENEFACTIVE (SB): The verb describes someone or something as the beneficiary of some state or the owner of some object.

 e.g., The baby has four new teeth.
     I've got feelings.

STATIVE PASSIVE (SP): The verb to be is followed by an adjective-object, when the adjective is a past participle and the voice is passive.

 e.g., She was married yesterday.
     The law was to be passed last session.

PROCESS (P): The verb describes something happening, or having happened to an animate or inanimate object, and is usually intransitive.

 e.g., He died without a hat.
     The fragile chair collapsed.

PROCESS EXPERIENCER (PE): The verb defines an experiencer who undergoes a change in sensory/perceptual state with respect to a noun object.

 e.g., I heard a cat.
PROCESS BENEFACTIVE (PB): The verb defines someone or something as being the beneficiary of some noun object as the result of some action.

e.g., I received a new pen.
The firm acquired a new partner.

AGENTIVE (A): The verb defines someone or something acting as an agent to make something happen, and may take an object.

e.g., The storm hit the area around noon.
He walked home.

AGENTIVE EXPERIENCER (AE): The verb describes someone or something acting as an agent to give something to an experiencer, when that object is incorporated into the verb.

e.g., They congratulated the winners.

AGENTIVE BENEFACTIVE (AB): The verb defines someone or something acting as an agent to give something to a beneficiary, when that object is incorporated into the verb.

e.g., The comedian entertained a large audience.
Ticket sales support the program.

AGENTIVE-PROCESS (AP): The verb describes someone or something acting as an agent to make something happen to an object.

e.g., Put the books down.
Construction crews widened the road.

AGENTIVE-PROCESS EXPERIENCER (APE): The verb describes someone or something acting as an agent in relation to an experiencer with regard to some object. By definition, this includes all verbs of saying (speak, tell, ask), since these imply an auditor.

e.g., That one teaches chemistry.
I said no.
AGENTIVE-PROCESS BENEFACTIVE (APB): The verb defines someone or something acting as an agent to give some object to a beneficiary.

e.g., I lent him money.

The court awarded her damages.
APPENDIX C

Data Collection and Processing Procedures
In order to make replication of this study possible, the procedures are detailed for: 1) obtaining a sample of programs, 2) preparing selected interviews for computer analysis, 3) managing the processing of texts through the sequential phases of CALAS, and 4) editing computer output. Consult Rush, Pepinsky, Landry, Meara, Strong, Valley and Young (1974) for a description of development of CALAS. Refer to Pepinsky, Baker, Matelon, May and Staubus (1977) for a step-by-step explanation of the programs from a user's perspective.

Sample of Programs

A composite week of programs was drawn by a randomizing procedure (Stemple, 1955) in order to select a representative sample of interviews for study. A data set was constructed by listing the Monday through Friday dates for a four-week period beginning January 2, 1978. A simple program instructed the computer to make a random start in the set, and to select every nth date in the set to a maximum of five dates. The program was run twice to produce one set of dates for each network. The selected dates were reviewed then for day of the week. If two Friday dates and no Tuesday dates were listed by the program, the second Friday date was dropped and a randomly-selected Tuesday date was inserted.

The composite-week program was run again in March, 1978 to obtain a second sample of programs for the period beginning April 3, 1978. The results of the two runs of this program-sampling procedure are displayed in Table 12.
Table 12. Sample of Programs
Produced by Composite-week Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NETWORK</th>
<th>ABC</th>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>NBC</th>
<th>DAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td></td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27*</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* January 27 had to be dropped as a sample day, since Columbus was experiencing a blizzard, and the interview portions of the Today Show were pre-empted by the local affiliate for weather and road condition reports. February 3, the following Friday was substituted as a sample day, and yielded one eligible interview.

Preparation of the Data

Each interview was prepared for analysis by:

1. Making an audio-tape recording from the broadcast.
2. Transcribing each tape verbatim, including hesitations ("um", "er") and false starts ("I, I think . . .").
3. "Cleaning" the transcript: that is reviewing it to mark nonsense hesitations ( ), and to place habitual hesitations outside of phrase boundaries. For example, "I, I want to, you know, go to the, uh, store." becomes "I want to go, you know, to the [uh] store."

---

1 Spoken language is transformed by this process into written text. Since speakers themselves might punctuate their texts differently than the transcriber some error is inevitable. However, the same typist transcribed all of the tapes. Consequently, the error is systematic.
4. **Key-punching** the "cleaned" transcript.

The cards were then submitted to a batch program called REMFALSE which removed bracketed items and listed them separately, catalogued the mechanically-cleaned data, and created a source data set on disc file. From this point on, CALAS programs used disc storage files rather than cards.

**CALAS Programs and Procedures**

Computer analysis by means of CALAS is accomplished in three stages. Stage 1 called EYEBALL is a word-classification sub-routine which analyzes the text, identifying each word in sequence in terms of its grammatical equivalent, e.g., noun, verb, adjective, adverb, preposition. EYEBALL does this by recourse to a small dictionary and a set of rules for identifying words not in the dictionary according to where, in the sequence, each appears. Where alternative roles are plausible for a word, the computer is programmed to list these in the order of their most likely assignment for that word in that slot, (e.g., adjective/noun/verb) and to assume the first as the proper correct label.

---

2 This description of CALAS programs relies heavily on accounts of the system provided mainly by H.B. Pepinsky, a participant in the project group that created the program and the current direct of research using it. For source material and details, see Pepinsky et al., 1977; Pepinsky, 1978; Pepinsky, in press; and Rush, et al, 1974.
A second program called PHRASER aggregates the individual words into appropriate phrases, and identifies them as noun phrases, verb phrases, adjective phrases, prepositional phrases, conjunctive phrases, and subordinative phrases, according to a set of transformational rules (e.g. JJN N).

A third set of programs called CLAUSE/CASE accomplishes the final two phases of CALAS, which involve clause separation, verb typing, and case assignment. Initially, phrases are aggregated into clauses, with the component phrases displayed within each clause. The phrases within a clause are identified in terms of the roles each plays within the clause: verb phrases are typed, and noun phrases labeled as objects, agents, experiencers, or beneficiaries of the verb state or activity. Finally, the clauses themselves are arranged to display either their independent or subordinate status in relationship to another clause, by means of indentation. Thus a clause typed phrase-by-phrase flush with the left margin is a main clause; a clause indented under another clause, is assumed to be a subordinate clause "embedded" in the clause above it and dependent upon it for its meaning.

The transcript for each interview was analyzed via CALAS. The steps required for each of three program phases were the same:

1. Source data (or the edited output from the previous phase) was submitted to CALAS program phase.
2. Phase output was hand-edited.
   a. At least three raters independently made corrections on print-outs.
   b. Corrections were collated and, where different judgments had been made, the differences were noted.
c. At least two raters met to review hand-corrected print-outs and to settle differences by consensus, using or creating rules-of-thumb.

3. Each correction was entered on disc-stored phase-outputs file via computer terminal (TSO) using the appropriate editing program (EDITEye, EDITPH, EDITCL)

4. Edited output is submitted to the next program stage, or to statistical analysis.

Editing Procedures

At the EYEBALL level, hand corrections were of grammatical labels; corrections were reviewed word-by-word; and rules-of-thumb were invoked or developed for categories of words.

For example, back channel rule, "Umhmm," "Right" and "Oh, no" are labeled adverbs because each modifies the assertion in the speaking turn that proceeds it.

At the PHRASER output level, phrase labels and boundaries were hand-corrected; corrections were reviewed phrase-by-phrase; and rules-of-thumb were invoked or developed for categories of phrases.

For example, apposition rule: phrases obviously spoken in apposition (such as "I spoke to a man -- yesterday, I think -- on that very subject") are to be labeled adverbal phrases since they qualify the force the main assertion.

At the CLAUSE/CASE output level, clause boundaries, verb types and case assignments were hand-corrected; corrections were reviewed clause-by-clause; and rules-of-thumb were invoked or developed to handle categories of verbs, or clause types.

For example, transitivity rule: When an infinitive verb phrase follows another verb, the verb phrases are 1) treated as two predicates if the first verb phrase is transitive (i.e., takes an object; or, 2) combined and typed as one predicate if the first verb phrase is intransitive (i.e., cannot take an object).
Example | Clause # | Verb Phrase | Verb Type
--- | --- | --- | ---
1. "want to go" | 1 | want | SEA
 | 2 | to go | A
2. "tend to have" | 1 | tend to have | SB

The edited CLAUSE/CASE output for each interview was the basis for making comparisons between the style features of ABC and NBC interviewers, of male interviewers and female interviewers, and of interviewers talking with a person of the same or opposite sex.
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