Masters Theses

Graduate College

4-1986

Gender-Related Language Usage as Related to Psychological Sex Role Orientation

Kathleen Mulder Parker
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses

Part of the Communication Commons

Recommended Citation

GENDER-RELATED LANGUAGE USAGE AS RELATED TO PSYCHOLOGICAL SEX ROLE ORIENTATION

by

Kathleen Mulder Parker

A Thesis
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts
Department of Communication Arts and Sciences

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
April 1986

GENDER-RELATED LANGUAGE USAGE AS RELATED TO PSYCHOLOGICAL SEX ROLE ORIENTATION

Kathleen Mulder Parker, M.A.

Western Michigan University, 1986

The relationship between gender-related language and psychological sex role orientation is explored. Research findings are cited that support the existence of sexist language and the influence of language on thought. Evidence of the behavioral expectations relating to psychological sex role orientation is presented. A relationship between psychological sex role orientation and gender-related speech usage is hypothesized. An instrument for measuring gender-related speech was developed and subsequently administered to a group of community college students along with the Bem Sex Role Inventory. The hypothesis is only supported for psychologically feminine participants who report significantly high use of feminine speech. Despite a problem with inadequate sample size, results suggest a need for greater flexibility and latitude in the use of gender-related speech for women than for men.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author of this study wishes to express appreciation and recognition to the following persons: Dr. George Robeck, as Committee Chair, for his invaluable encouragement, editing assistance, and high expectations; Dr. Steve Rhodes, as Committee Member, for his expertise in methodology, organization, and for his persistent support; Dr. Shirley Woodworth, as Committee Member, for her knowledge and able assistance in male/female study; and Alecia and Thomas Parker, for their patience, moral support, and tolerance throughout the past year.

<div align="center">Kathleen Mulder Parker</div>

ii

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

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

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

.

1328112

Parker, Kathleen Mulder

GENDER-RELATED LANGUAGE USAGE AS RELATED TO PSYCHOLOGICAL
SEX ROLE ORIENTATION

Western Michigan University   M.A.   1986

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright by
Kathleen Mulder Parker
1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents--continued

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

People use "words" to represent experience and thoughts. In the past, people believed that words are nothing more than a reflection of experience. Within the last century, however, there has been a recognition of the reciprocity between language and experience; language can shape experience.

This phenomenon is evident in sexist language. This paper will explore the implications of sexist language for gender role expectations. It will describe the nature of sex role classifications as they relate to demonstrated behavior patterns, and will present examples of research demonstrating reported flexibility on the part of psychologically androgynous subjects toward gender-related attitudes and behaviors. The thesis is that there will be relationship between psychological sex role orientation and gender-related speech use. Those who perceive themselves as not limited to male or female sex roles, as culturally defined, will report use of both masculine and feminine language behaviors. Traditional male and female role adherents will report use of traditionally masculine or feminine language behaviors respectively.

1

Review of the Literature

Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language defines "sexism" as "the economic exploitation and social domination of members of one sex by the other, specifically of women by men" (Guralnik, 1984, p. 545). Based on this definition, sexism in language refers to those aspects of language that contribute to a domination of women by men. Though this is a simplified statement of the concept, it is a sufficient beginning for the purpose of this study.

There is little empirical evidence to support examples of sexism in language; however, many have been described in the literature. Lakoff (1974), as quoted by Spender (1980) documented sexist language, and though much of her methodology was questioned, she stimulated numerous others to additional investigations of linguistic sexism (Adler, 1978; Berryman-Fink & Wilcox, 1983; Henley, Kramer, & Thorne, 1978; Spender, 1980). Many specific characteristics of sexism in language are described in these studies. Sexist language can be viewed as words and their inherent sexist meanings, and also as speech characteristics that are stereotypically expected of members of one sex or another.

Some stereotypes associated with gender-related language usage include:

1. "a supposed preference for refined euphemistic, and hyperbolic expressions (for females) as opposed to men's alleged greater use of slang and innovations" (Berryman-Fink & Wilcox, 1983, p. 664).

2. "female style that is emotional, vague, euphemistic, sweetly proper, mindless, endless, high pitched, and silly" (Berryman-Fink & Wilcox, 1983, p. 664).

3. male traits that include a demanding voice, deep voice, boastful, use of swear words, dominating, showing anger, being straight-to-the-point, authoritarian, forceful, blunt, and having a sense of humor (Berryman-Fink & Wilcox, 1983).

4. female traits that include enunciating clearly, using hands and face to express ideas, gossiping, showing concern for the listener, being gentle, talking fast, talking a lot, being detailed, smooth, open, self-revealing, enthusiastic, using good grammar, and jibberish (Berryman-Fink & Wilcox, 1983).

5. the more likely use by women of empty adjectives, tag questions, and intensifiers (findings not well supported by some) (Henley, et al., 1978).

6. a greater use by women of speech patterns marked by uncertainty, triviality, lack of clarity and forceful self-expression (Spender, 1980).

7. a governing of speech by the rules of politeness and interpersonal exploration for women . . . and a governing of speech by use of factual communication, logic, and directness for men (Spender, 1980).

8. the use of sex-related terms generally by men in accepted conversation; the use of adjectives like admirable, charming, sweet, lovely, and divine by females; the use of adjectives like great, terrific, cool, and neat by males; speaking with intelligence (a virtue in males, but unexpected and undesirable in females); the practice of apologizing, more associated with females than with males (Adler, 1978).

The unfortunate effect of these stereotypes, whether real or imagined, is twofold. First, that they exist in the minds of people at all creates a negative impression of female speech patterns, and second, they quite possibly create what is, in reality, a false impression of female as well as male speech patterns. For example, there is evidence to support the use of tag questions by males as well as females (Spender, 1980). And though this speech pattern is seen as evidence of a lack of confidence for women, it is not seen as such for men.

According to Berryman-Fink & Wilcox (1983), there is a limited number of conclusions about gender-related linguistic behaviors:

1. Males more often assume a task, or instrumental, role and females more often assume a socioemotional, or expressive, role when communicating.
2. Female speech is more likely than male speech to be characterized by correctness, especially in pronouncing the "ing" suffix.
3. In mixed-sex dyadic interaction, males engage in more interruption than do females.
4. Males are more likely than females to generate a greater volume of discourse.
5. The pitch of the female voice is higher than the pitch of the male voice. (p. 667)

Out of the context of these many stereotypes associated with language, one is led to wonder about the implications for men and women who are steeped consciously or unconsciously in the behavior manifestations these role expectations proscribe.

Benjamin Lee Whorf held that language is fundamental to thinking (Carroll, 1956). He hypothesized from his study of the Hopi language that differences in language can affect each person's picture of the universe. This idea of language relativity was echoed by Edward Sapir, who held that all of language powerfully conditions thinking (Harrison, 1975). The Whorf-Sapir hypothesis reflects the basis of concern in

regard to the consequences of sexist language (Berger & Luckman, 1967; Bolinger, 1980; Dayhoff, 1983; Edson, 1984; Spender, 1980; Thorne, 1976). Sexist language does not merely reflect a sexist society, but contributes to the sex role expectations of society. Consequently, when sexism refers to a philosophy that sees an imbalance in the role expectations for men and women with a bias in favor of males, linguistic sexism suggests that this bias is reflected and perpetuated by language. Thus, the Whorf-Sapir theory of linguistic relativity is manifested in the relative nature of sexist language.

The American Psychological Association's "Guidelines for Non-sexist Language in APA Journals" (1982) is a clear reflection of the growing concern with the language practices that imply and encourage male superiority (cited in Briere & Lanktree, 1983). The following studies illustrate this concern.

The language and role models presented by television have an impact on viewers. In a study reported by Beuf (1974), 76 percent of children who were heavy viewers of television chose sex-stereotyped careers on a questionnaire, while only 50 percent of children who were moderate to light viewers chose sex-stereotyped careers on a questionnaire. This audience had been, and still is, subjected to "women . . . who spray their husbands, children, and garbage cans with Lysol" (Trahey, 1979, p. 33), and to men who say things like, "My wife, I think I'll keep her" (Beuf, 1974, p. 144).

Briere and Lanktree (1983) studied three groups of men and women who were asked to read the statement of the APA regarding ethical

standards for psychologists. For one group, the statement was unchanged linguistically, and all gender pronouns (he, him) were left intact. For the second group, the pronouns "he" and "him" were changed to "he she" and "him or her." For the third group, the pronouns "he and him" were changed to read "she or he" and "her or him." After reading the paragraph, the respondents in each group were asked, among other things, how the paragraph affected their desire to become a psychologist. The results indicated that the use of the masculine pronouns "he and him" to the exclusion of "she or her" seemed to preclude the female subjects choosing psychology as a desirable career possibility for themselves.

Sexism in language appeared to influence the perceptions of readers when 360 male and female college students read articles authored by males, females, and someone identified only by initials. A follow-up judging of the articles by the students showed a more favorable evaluation of articles allegedly authored by males, and a less favorable evaluation of articles authored by females, or by persons identified with initials perceived to be those of a female (Bauer & Paludi, 1983).

In summary, this research suggests that sexism in language contributes to the role expectations of men and women. Many researchers have noted this relationship, but also note that both men and women actively protect and perpetuate these language differences (Henley, et al., 1978; Edson, 1984; Spender, 1980).

Women, as well as men, use the stereotypes. Often women who have resisted the stereotype have been judged as unreasonable and having an ax to grind. Often men who have resisted the stereotype have been

labeled as effeminate, a negative label by most accounts. Spender (1980) says that a woman who refuses to play the female stereotype role of facilitator and listener will "pay the penalties of being called bitchy, aggressive, and domineering" (p. 49). Lips (1981) states that the women who hold a position of power may be viewed with circumspection, if not disparagement. Powerful women are pejoratively described with words such as "castrating bitch, ballbreaker, iron maiden, and witch" (p. 16). Journalists have made reference to Margaret Thatcher as the "iron maiden" and "Attila the Hen" (p. 15). These terms link gender disparagement with political criticism in a manner that would never be applied to a man behaving in the same manner.

Acceptance of these norms seems pervasive, yet there are some who have envisioned an alternative to their acceptance. Assuming an autonomous, androgynous viewpoint is seen as less dichotomous. The concept of psychological androgyny described by Sandra Bem (1974), as cited by Greenblatt, Hasenauer, & Freimuth (1980), suggests that persons may possess a high degree of both traditionally masculine and feminine traits, making it possible to be both assertive and compassionate, instrumental, and expressive, etc., depending on the situation (Carlsson & Magnusson, 1980). In a number of studies, individuals tested and found to be psychologically androgynous have displayed more behavioral adaptability than more traditional sex-typed subjects than those deemed to be undifferentiated, that is, possessing neither masculine nor feminine traits to any great degree (Brunner & Phelps, 1980; Orlofsky & Windle, 1978). Selected related studies are described in the following section of this chapter.

Psychological Androgyny--A Sex Role Alternative

Orlofsky & Windle (1978) compared scores for sex role orientation, obtained by administering the Bem Sex Role Inventory, with scores for emotional expressibility (feminine task), assertiveness (masculine task), and personal integration. These last three measures were obtained with the use of three instruments. After responding to the BSRI, respondents completed the Thematic Apperception Test, the Adult Self-Expression Scale, and the Omnibus Personality Inventory Scales. The latter two tests are 5-point Likert scales judging tolerance for ambiguity and uncertainty, readiness to express impulses, feelings of hostility, rejection, isolation, and loneliness. The findings from this research analysis were consistent with previous research conclusions. Psychologically androgynous subjects displayed greater behavioral adaptability than traditionally psychologically sex-typed subjects and greater adaptability than undifferentiated subjects. The researchers concluded that behavioral flexibility derives from strong identification with both masculine and feminine roles, rather than a lack of identification with either of them.

Although the BSRI is probably the most widely used, it is not the only measure of Sex Role Orientation. Another sex role measure is the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ), developed by Spence and Helmreich (Helmreich, Spence, & Holahan, 1979). Helmreich et al., (1979) used the PAQ to replicate a study by Bem and Lenney (1976, as cited by Helmreich et al., 1979) in which respondents were asked to

complete the PAQ (Bem and Lenney had used the BSRI in 1976), as well
as the Attitudes Toward Women Scale, developed by Spence and Helmreich
in 1973 (Helmreich et al., 1979). In addition, the respondents rated
two lists of activities according to (a) how comfortably they would
anticipate performing these activities, and (b) what preference they
would have in selecting these activities. The activities listed had
been previously classified as masculine, feminine, or neutral. The
results showed psychologically androgynous subjects expressed the great-
est comfort toward all tasks combined, followed by masculine, undiffer-
entiated, and feminine subjects. From these results the researchers
concluded that androgynous persons are more likely to be flexible in
manifesting a higher degree of instrumentality (traditionally masculine)
and expressiveness (traditionally feminine) in their behavior.

Brunner & Phelps (1980) sought to compare psychological androgyny
with communication competence. The BSRI and the revised Wiemann Scale
of Communications Competence were administered to 472 under graduate
students. From analysis of the results, three major conclusions were
drawn:

1. A hierarchy of sex roles with respect to interpersonal communi-
cation competence was established such that psychologically androgynous
subjects were seen at the highest levels of communication competence,
psychologically feminine and masculine individuals were seen as a rela-
tively equal second, and psychologically undifferentiated subjects fell
into the lowest levels of communication competence

2. Females, in each sex role category, were rated higher than
males in the same category.

3. Psychologically androgynous and undifferentiated subjects were deemed to be the high and low ends, respectively, of the interpersonal competence continuum.

Greenblatt et al. (1980) had men and women respond to the BSRI and the Personal Report of Communications Apprehension. From the results, obtained with a testing of 240 subjects, it was determined that psychologically androgynous males and females were not significantly different from each other in levels of communication apprehension than any of the other groups studied (i.e., feminine females, masculine males, and cross-sex typed groups).

These findings suggest that if psychologically androgynous subjects are not as tied to stereotypical sex role expectations, they might also not be tied to stereotypical gender-related language expectations. Worded another way, the literature of sex roles indicates a relationship between sexist language and thought and behavior such that stereotypical sex role expectations inherent in sexist language may be proscriptive in their effect. The literature also indicates psychologically androgynous individuals are less limited to traditional sex role expectations than are psychologically sex-typed and psychologically undifferentiated individuals. Based on these findings, this study will examine the relationship between stereotypical sexist language usage and psychological sex roles, using Bem's (1979) definitions. Sex roles will be categorized into four sex role groups: masculine, feminine, androgynous, and undifferentiated. Although research has not yet viewed the undifferentiated as strongly defined, that group will be considered in this

study, as it has been in previous studies (Brunner & Phelps, 1980; Greenblatt et al., 1980; Wiggins & Holzmuller, 1978).

A Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to explore the nature of the relationship between psychological sex role orientations (i.e., masculine, feminine, or androgynous, and undifferentiated) and the use of gender-related behaviors.

Hypotheses

Previous research has shown that there is a relationship between psychological sex role orientation and reported behavior, that is, gender-related speech usage.

<u>Hypothesis 1.</u> Participants' scores on the Bem Sex Role Inventory and Reported Speech Behavior Scale will be related.

Previous research has shown that psychologically androgynous persons identify with both masculine and feminine gender behaviors. With regard to psychologically androgynous subjects, the prediction for this study will be:

<u>Hypothesis 2.</u> Participants who are psychologically androgynous, as determined on the Bem Sex Role Inventory, will report using both masculine and feminine speech behaviors to a higher degree than will either psychologically masculine, feminine, or undifferentiated participants.

Previous research has also found that psychologically masculine and feminine participants identify most strongly with same-sex related attitudes toward gender behaviors. Again, this prediction will extend beyond behavior expectations into reported behavior usage. Thus, with regard to psychologically masculine and feminine participants, the predictions for this study will be:

Hypothesis 3. Psychologically masculine subjects, as determined on the Bem Sex Role Inventory, will report using primarily masculine speech behaviors.

Hypothesis 4. Psychologically feminine subjects, as determined on the Bem Sex Role Inventory, will report using primarily feminine speech behaviors.

Finally, previous research has found that psychologically undifferentiated persons identify strongly with neither masculine nor feminine attitudes toward gender behaviors. Consequently, extending the behavioral expectations into reported behavioral usage for psychologically undifferentiated subjects, the prediction for this study will be:

Hypothesis 5. Psychologically undifferentiated subjects, as determined on the Bem Sex Inventory, will report using neither typically masculine nor feminine speech behaviors.

CHAPTER II

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Overview

The hypotheses of the study relate speech usage and psychological sex role orientation. Since no measure of the reported use of gender-related speech exists, a Reported Speech Behavior Scale (RSBS) was developed in the first stage of this study. The measure of sex role orientation is the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), and instrument devised in 1974 and revised in 1979 by Sandra Bem (Bem, 1979; Catalogue, 1985). In the second stage of the study, these two instruments are used to test the hypotheses.

This chapter describes the procedures used to accomplish the first and second stages of the study. The independent variables in this study are the sex role orientations of the participants as determined by the BSRI. The dependent variables are the reported use of gender-related speech behaviors as determined by RSBS.

Stage 1: Formulating a Measure of Gender-Related Speech Use

Problems in Developing the RSBS

There were two concerns in developing an instrument that would measure reported use of sexist language. Would it be possible to compile a list of gender-related language attributes that would be valid, and would it be possible to measure reported use of these language phenomena?

13

Regarding the first concern, many authors have suggested that certain attributes of language belong to men and certain other attributes belong to women. Although these gender language attributes have not been substantiated empirically, there seems to be a consensus regarding the attributes that can be used to develop a reported language usage measure.

Previous research on sex roles measured the attitudes of participants toward the use of certain gender behaviors. The second concern is that such measures do not indicate whether these behaviors (or in this case, speech patterns) are characteristic of the respondent's behavior.

To develop a measure of reported speech usage, a list of gender-related speech characteristics was compiled. Each characteristic was then restated in the form of a subjective statement of usage, i.e., "use of slang terms" became "I use slang terms," and "self-revealing" became "I tell people I care about them." A total of 50 speech characteristics (25 feminine, 25 masculine) was translated into statements of usage. The 50 statements were presented in a questionnaire. Respondents rated each statement on a scale of 1 to 5 according to whether the speaker of each statement would be "most likely masculine" (the low end of the scale) or "most likely feminine" (the high end of the scale). The "feminine" and "masculine" statements were listed in random sequence on the questionnaire in order to mask the gender-relatedness, which could possibly have been detected had there been a pattern in the arrangement of the statements.

This initial questionnaire, the Preliminary Speech Behavior Scale (see Appendix A), was thus designed to determine whether there was any support for these statements being representative of stereotypical feminine and masculine speech usage. It was expected that the questionnaire participants would validate some statements and disqualify others. This expectation was supported.

Stage 1: Procedures

The 50-item preliminary questionnaire was administered to three groups of students at a community college in a midwestern city. The groups were selected on the basis of convenience; the questionnaire was administered in an identical manner to each group.

The researcher explained to each group that the study was being conducted to learn about the speech habits of men and women. The participants were asked to rate each item according to how "typical" they thought each statement was for a feminine person or masculine person. The questionnaires were collected from the participants upon completion, and each group was thanked for its participation.

Stage 1: Participants

Thirty-eight people participated in the first stage of the study. There were 15 males and 23 females (see Table 1). Twenty-four were between the ages of 15-25, 7 were between 25-35, 6 were between 35-50, and 1 was over 50. Twenty-one reported completing 2 years of college or less, 14 completed 2 to 4 years of college, 2 were in high school, and 1 was at the post graduate level (see Table 1).

Table 1

*Stage 1: Characteristics of Participants

Characteristics	Number of Participants	Percentage
Gender:		
Male	15	39.5%
Female	23	60.5%
Age:		
15-25 yrs	24	63.2%
25-35 yrs	7	18.4%
35-50 yrs	6	15.8%
Over 50 yrs	1	2.6%
Education Level:		
High School	2	5.3%
1-2 yrs college	21	55.3%
2-4 yrs college	14	36.8%
Over 4 yrs college	1	2.6%

*Gender, age, and education level breakdown for the 38 participants from Stage 1 of the study.

Stage 1: Method

The method used for quantitatively examining the results was an analysis of central tendency. The mean of 38 responses was computed for each of the 50 questionnaire items. Thus it was possible to see whether the respondents, on the average, viewed each item as most likely masculine or most likely feminine. To set up a viable basis of selection for the items that would be included in the final RSBS, a grand mean was computed from all of the item means.

The grand mean was 3.195. An interval one-half standard deviation above and below the grand mean was established as a neutral range on the five-point scale. The neutral range was 2.7074 to 3.6826. Each feminine item was judged acceptable as a stereotypical feminine statement if its mean fell above 3.6826. Each masculine item was judged acceptable as a stereotypical statement if its mean fell below 2.7074, the low end of the neutral range. This mean score suggested that the 38 respondents rated it most likely masculine with an average rating lower than 2.7074. If one standard deviation from an item mean extended beyond the neutral range in the opposite direction, the item was disqualified of its acceptability.

Stage 1: Results

Following this procedure, 29 items were found acceptable. The scores for these statements indicated they were judged by respondents to be significantly "typical" of statements a masculine or feminine

person would make. One further qualification had been predetermined for use in the instrument. So-called masculine items had to be perceived as feminine to be acceptable.

Of the 29 acceptable items, 13 were masculine and 16 were feminine. In the interest of providing a balanced number of masculine and feminine items for the second stage of the study, the item means were rank-ordered. This final procedure enabled the researcher to select 24 items from the 29, 12 of which were chosen as most likely masculine and 12 as most likely feminine. Tables 2 and 3 list the item numbers which correspond to the item statements on the questionnaire (see Appendix A). At the top of this table is a scale similar to the response scale presented with each item on the questionnaire. The scale is a five-point scale, extending from most likely masculine (low end) to most likely feminine (high end). The grand mean of the mean scores for the 50 items is depicted on the scale at 3.195% along with its plus or minus one-half standard deviation. The masculine items bearing an asterisk are those items having a mean below the "neutral range" (2.7074 to 3.6826), and are acceptable for the final RSBS questionnaire as masculine items. The feminine items bearing an asterisk are those items having a mean above the "neutral range," and are acceptable for the final RSBS questionnaire as feminine items.

Table 2

Stage 1: Masculine Means for Preliminary Speech
Behavior Scale.

Most Likely Masculine				Most Likely Feminine
1.............2.................3...............4...............5				
	2.7074	3.195 3.6826		

Neutral Range

*Masculine Items	Mean	S.D.	X+1 S.D.	X-1 S.D.
2.*	2.100	1.172	2.854	1.346
3.*	2.470	.924	3.394	1.546
5.*	1.730	.928	2.658	.802
6.	2.590	1.490	4.080	1.100
9.*	2.030	.905	2.935	1.125
10.	3.090	1.022	4.112	2.068
12.*	2.370	1.139	3.509	1.231
15.	2.590	1.044	3.634	1.546
17.	2.605	.933	3.538	1.672
19.	2.737	1.213	3.950	1.524
22.	2.830	.837	3.667	1.993
24.*	2.430	1.089	3.519	1.341
27.*	2.520	1.057	3.577	1.463
30.	2.750	1.037	3.787	1.713
31.	2.842	1.000	3.842	1.842
33.	2.800	1.254	4.054	1.546
35.*	1.760	.833	2.593	.927

Table 2, Continued

*Masculine Items	Mean	S.D.	X+1 S.D.	X-1 S.D.
38.	2.760	1.080	3.840	1.680
40.	2.797	1.009	3.896	1.698
43.	2.842	.854	3.796	1.888
44.	3.645	.986	4.631	2.659
47.*	1.184	.462	1.646	.722
48.*	2.500	.980	3.480	1.520
49.*	2.197	.932	3.129	1.265

*Masculine items are acceptable if mean falls below neutral range on Likert Scale at top of table, and 1 S.D. does not extend above neutral range. Items refer to statements on Preliminary SBS in Appendix A.

Listed are Preliminary RSBS item numbers, the mean score for each, and 1 S.D. from the mean. Scale at the top depicts grand mean (3.195) for all response means on 5-point Likert Scale, similar to response scale on questionnaire. (Plus or minus one-half S.D. from grand mean indicates neutral range.)

Table 3

Stage 1: Feminine Means for Preliminary Reported Speech
Behavior Scale

**Feminine Items	Mean	S.D.	X+1 S.D.	X-1 S.D.
			Neutral Range	
1.	3.300	1.172	4.472	2.128
4.	3.670	.924	4.750	2.590
7.*	4.300	.721	5.021	3.579
11.	3.580	.975	4.555	2.605
13.	3.408	1.149	4.557	2.259
14.*	3.947	.825	4.772	3.122
16.*	4.368	.930	5.298	3.438
18.*	4.632	.509	5.141	4.123
21.	3.026	1.082	4.108	1.944
23.*	4.145	1.237	5.382	2.908
25.	3.882	1.154	5.036	2.728
26.	3.868	.901	4.769	2.967
28.	3.729	1.043	4.772	2.686
29.*	4.039	1.232	5.271	2.807
32.*	4.197	.693	4.890	3.504
34.*	3.947	.985	4.932	2.962
36.	3.737	1.081	4.818	2.656
37.*	4.211	.889	5.100	3.322
39.	3.670	.955	4.625	2.715

Table 3, Continued

**Feminine Items	Mean	S.D.	X+1 S.D.	X-1 S.D.
41.*	4.211	.859	5.070	3.352
42.*	4.171	.691	4.862	3.480
45.	3.289	1.074	4.363	2.215
46.*	4.329	.672	5.001	3.657
50.	3.645	.930	4.575	2.715

**Feminine items are acceptable if mean falls above neutral range on Likert Scale, and 1 S.D. does not extend below neutral range. Item numbers refer to statements on Preliminary SBS in Appendix A.

Listed are Preliminary SBS item numbers, the mean score for each, and 1 S.D. from the mean. Scale at top depicts grand mean (3.195) for all response means on 5-point Likert Scale, similar to response scale on questionnaire. (Plus or minus one-half S.D. from grand mean indicates neutral range.)

In compiling the final Reported Speech Behavior Scale (see Appendix B), the acceptable 24 items were presented in random order. The wording of the instructions was changed from the wording on the preliminary Speech Behavior Scale. The directions on the final instrument read: "Listed below are some typical statements representative of people's speech behaviors. For each statement, please rate yourself according to how frequently you might use these speech behaviors (in most situations)." The respondents rated the statements on a 5-point Likert Scale from "1) Not at all frequently to 5) Very frequently." The obvious difference between the preliminary Speech Behavior Scale (Stage 1 scale) and the final Reported Speech Behavior Scale (Stage 2 scale), besides the quantity of items, is the nature of the response.

The former asks respondents to rate the usage of the statements by any hypothetical individual; the latter asks respondents to rate the statements according to their own personal usage.

Stage 2: Testing the Hypotheses

The Bem Sex Role Inventory

The instrument used to identify the sex role orientations of subjects was the Bem Sex Role Inventory, originally developed in 1974 (Bem, 1979; Whitley, 1983; Catalogue, 1985) as a 60-item scale, and later refined in 1979 (Whitley, 1983; Catalogue, 1985), as a Short Form 30-item scale. It has been one of the most commonly used and accepted scales for measuring sex role orientation in studies of psychological well-being (Whitley, 1983). Increasingly, research has supported sex roles as a valid construct and the instrument as a valid sex role measure of instrumental (masculine) and expressive (feminine) attributes (Helmreich et al., 1979). In 1974, Bem computed coefficient alphas separately for masculine and feminine traits in each of two nominating samples. The scores were highly reliable (Masculine, a = .85; Feminine, a = .82; Androgynous, a = .85). Test-retest reliability estimates were Masculine, r = .90; Feminine, r = .90; and Androgynous, r = .93 (Greenblatt et al., 1980).

The BSRI Short Form consists of a 30-item scale. For each item, a 7-point Likert type scale ranges from "1) never, almost never true of me" to "7) always, almost always true of me." This instrument allows the researcher to categorize participants into four psychological sex types:

1. Psychologically masculine (men and women)--higher scores for masculine traits than for feminine traits.

2. Psychologically feminine (men and women)--higher scores for feminine traits than for masculine traits.

3. Psychologically androgynous (men and women)--high scores for both masculine and feminine traits.

4. Psychologically undifferentiated (men and women)--low scores for both masculine and feminine traits (Greenblatt et al., 1980).

The Short Bem Sex Role Inventory is shown in Appendix C.

Stage 2: Procedures for Testing the Hypotheses

To test the hypotheses, several groups of community college students completed the Reported Speech Behavior Scale and the Bem Sex Role Inventory. Participants also completed a conventional consent form and demographic sheet. Each group received a brief explanation concerning the nature of the research project similar to the following:

> There has been much research studying the relationship between language and personality roles. This research project has to do with learning more about these relationships. Please read the items in each questionnaire carefully, but generally, try to respond with your first impulse. Because these are self-report scales, the possibility for bias is present. I only ask that you be as honest and objective as you can be in rating yourself. Try not to be too self-analytical--just think of how you are or how you speak in most situations.

The two questionnaires were presented in alternating order. Upon completion of all the items, participants handed in the consent forms first and the completed questionnaires second. The consent forms were shuffled in the presence of the respondents to insure their anonymity.

They were thanked for their participation and were assured availability of an abstract upon completion of the study. Each participant received the reseacher's name, address, and phone number, should he or she wish to contact the researcher for further information about the study.

Stage 2: Participants

The participants were students enrolled in classes at a community business college offering 2-year and 4-year degree programs. The school was approximately 10,000 full and part-time students. Participants were enrolled in the following courses: Small Business Development, Marketing, Accounting, Economics and Report Writing. Course instructors described the time requirements of the study beforehand. The selection of groups of participants was based on convenience. Of the 121 students in the courses, 118 agreed to fill out the questionnaire packet (53 men and 65 women).

Stage 2. Method

A Chi-Square analysis was used to examine the relationship between the variables of the BSRI and RSBS. The analysis was divided into four steps.

The data represented the responses of 118 subjects to 30 items on the BSRI and 24 items on the RSBS. In step one, the means for all of the items were calculated and identified according to gender-related categories. In step two, the means were rank-ordered from low to high. In step three, the medians were calculated--a masculine and feminine median, respectively, for the BSRI, and a masculine and feminine median,

respectively, for the RSBS. Using these medians as points of differentiation, in step four, the means of the respondents' scores were classified into the categories of masculine, feminine, androgynous, and undifferentiated on the BSRI, and into the categories of high masculine speech, high feminine speech, high masculine and feminine speech, and low masculine and feminine speech on the RSBS.

If the hypotheses were to be supported, it was expected that the distribution of scores on the RSBS would be significantly similar to the distribution of scores on the BSRI. More specifically, subjects whose "role" score fell into the androgynous category, would have a score on the RSBS that would fall into the category of frequent use of masculine and frequent use of feminine speech. Likewise, subjects whose BSRI score fell into the masculine category would have an RSBS score which would fall into the category of frequent use of masculine, not frequent use of feminine speech; subjects whose BSRI score fell into the feminine category, would have an RSBS score which would fall into the category of not frequent use of masculine, not frequent use of feminine speech; and subjects whose BSRI score fell into the undifferentiated category, would have an RSBS score which would fall into the category of not frequent use of masculine, not frequent use of feminine speech.

The following chapter describes the construction of the contingency tables and reports the Chi-Square value obtained from the analysis.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Overview

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship
between sex role orientation and gender-related language usage.
Chapter II described the procedures used to assess this relationship.
This chapter presents the results of the statistical analysis of the
data obtained with those procedures.

Description of the Sample

The gender, age, and education level of the participants were
determined via a checklist included in each questionnaire packet.
Fifty-three participants were men and 65 were women. Of the 118
subjects, 57 were between the ages of 15-25, 32 were between 25-35,
26 were between 35-50, and 3 were over 50. Sixty-three participants
had 2 years of college or less, 40 had 2-4 years of college, 13 had
more than 4 years of college, and 2 were still in high school (see
Table 4).

Table 4

Stage 2: Characteristics of Participants

Characteristics	Number of Participants	Percentage
Gender:		
Male	53	45.0%
Female	65	55.0%
Age:		
15-25 yrs	57	48.0%
25-35 yrs	32	27.5%
35-50 yrs	26	22.0%
Over 50 yrs	3	2.9%
Education Level:		
High school	2	1.7%
1-2 yrs college	63	53.0%
2-4 yrs college	40	34.3%
Over 4 yrs college	13	11.0%

Gender, age and education level breakdown for the 118 participants from Stage 2 of the study.

Establishing the BSRI and RSBS Categories

Response means for each of the 118 subjects were computed for each of the questionnaire items from the BSRI and RSBS. These means represented masculine traits, feminine traits, masculine speech use, feminine speech use and were rank-ordered from low to high. As the traditional method for scoring the BSRI employs a median split method, a median was calculated for each mean range.

With regard to means calculated from the BSRI scores, the following can be noted: with a possible response range of 1 to 7, the means for the masculine items ranged from 2.500 to 6.700 with a median of 5.250; the means for the feminine items ranged from 3.500 to 6.100 with a median of 5.00 (see Table 5).

Using the medians of the mean scores, the respondents were divided into four categories:

1. Masculine--having a mean above the median on the masculine scale, a mean below the median on the feminine scale

2. Feminine--having a mean above the median on the feminine scale, a mean below the median on the masculine scale

3. Androgynous--having a mean above the median on the masculine scale, a mean above the median on the feminine scale

4. Undifferentiated--having a mean below the median on the masculine scale, a mean below the median on the feminine scale.

Calculating the means from the RSBS scores resulted in the following breakdown of scores. Within a possible response range of 1.000 to 5.000,

the range of means for the masculine items was 1.500 to 4.292, with a median score of 1.085; the range of means for the feminine items was 1.417 to 3.916, with a median score of 1.915 (see Table 6).

Again, using the median split method, the means were divided into four categories:

1. Masculine speech--having a mean above the median for masculine speech, below the median for feminine speech

2. Feminine speech--having a mean above the median for feminine speech, below the median for masculine speech

3. Masculine/Feminine speech--having a mean above the median for both masculine and feminine speech

4. Neither Masculine nor Feminine speech--having a mean below the median for both masculine and feminine speech.

The Chi-Square Analysis

The hypotheses of this study proposed a relationship between sex role orientation and the reported use of gender-related language. Two instruments (the BSRI and RSBS) were utilized to obtain subject ratings for both sex role orientation and the use of gender-related language (as described in the previous section). To compare the relative ratings of each subject, and thereby test the hypotheses, a Chi-Square statistic was used.

To confirm the relationship between sex role orientation and gender-related speech usage, the scores on the RSBS were expected to conform to the scores on the BSRI. The Chi-Square was constructed such that the

RSBS and BSRI became the "observed" distribution and the BSRI scores became the "expected" or predicted distribution. The 30 subjects who scored masculine on the BSRI were expected to score in the category of high use of masculine speech. The expected values for the remaining sex role categories of feminine, androgynous, and undifferentiated categories of the RSBS.

Regarding the results, please note the following disclaimer. It became apparent that the subject population should have been larger in order to obtain sufficient data for a 4 x 4 Chi-Square. This problem will be discussed in greater detail in the limitations section of Chapter IV, but bears mention here for the purpose of qualifying to some degree the findings of the Chi-Square.

Hypothesis 1 predicted an overall positive relationship between sex role orientation and the use of gender-related speech. In order to support this hypothesis, it was necessary to accept the null hypothesis, i.e., that there would not be a significant difference between the expected and the observed. The results of this analysis yielded a Chi-Square value of 40.901 (df = 9; crit. val. = 16.9; p = .05), which reflected a significant difference and did not reject the null. Therefore, hypothesis 1 was not supported, and the predicted relationship between sex role orientation and gender-related speech usage was not validated (see Table 7). Further exploration of cell categories, a procedure considered customary with the use of a ChiSquare statistic, yielded the following results for hypotheses 2-5.

Table 5

Stage 2: Bem Sex Role Inventory Means

Items	Low	Median	High
Masculine	2.500	5.250	6.700
Feminine	3.500	5.00	6.100

Range of masculine and feminine mean scores with calculated median for each range

Table 6

Stage 2: Reported Speech Behavior Scale Means

Items	Low	Median	High
Masculine	1.500	2.9085	4.292
Feminine	1.417	2.915	3.917

Range of masculine and feminine mean scores with calculated median for each range.

Table 7

Chi-Square Contingency Tables for Hypothesis 1

| | OBSERVED | | | | | EXPECTED | | | |
| | BSRI | | | | | BSRI | | | |
RSBS	Masc.	Femin.	Androg.	Undiff.	RSBS	Masc.	Femin.	Androg.	Undiff
Mascul. Speech	M = 10 F = $\frac{1}{11}$	M = 0 F = $\frac{1}{1}$	M = 6 F = $\frac{1}{6}$	M = 6 F = $\frac{0}{6}$	Mascul. Speech	30	0	0	0
Femin. Speech	M = 0 F = $\frac{5}{5}$	M = 2 F = $\frac{12}{14}$	M = 0 F = $\frac{9}{9}$	M = 2 F = $\frac{1}{3}$	Femin. Speech	0	27	0	0
Mas/Fem. Speech	M = 3 F = $\frac{5}{8}$	M = 2 F = $\frac{7}{9}$	M = 7 F = $\frac{4}{11}$	M = 2 F = $\frac{5}{7}$	Mas/Fem. Speech	0	0	32	0
Neither Mas/Fem. Speech	M = 6 F = $\frac{3}{9}$	M = 0 F = $\frac{3}{3}$	M = 3 F = $\frac{3}{6}$	M = 5 F = $\frac{8}{13}$	Neither Mas/Fem. Speech	0	0	0	29

Chi-square Vlaue = 40.901; df = 9; critical value = 16.9; p = .05.

Observed table shows actual distribution of respondents' RSBS scores in relation to BSRI scores.
Expected table shows predicted distribution of RSBS scores in relation to BSRI scores.

33

Hypothesis 2 predicted psychologically masculine participants would report a high use of masculine speech. A Chi-Square computed for masculine participants yielded a value of 12.033 (df = 3; crit. val. = 7.8; p = .05), which reflected a significant difference and did not reject the null. Therefore, hypothesis 2 was not supported (see Table 8).

Hypothesis 3 predicted psychologically feminine participants would not report high use of feminine speech. A Chi-Square computed for feminine participants yielded a value of 6.259 (df = 3; crit. val. = 7.8; p = .05), which did not reflect a significant difference, and therefore, did reject the null. A contingency coefficient of .434 indicated that the degree of the relationship demonstrated in the significant Chi-Square was low to moderate. Thus, hypothesis 3 received support (see Table 9).

Hypothesis 4 predicted psychologically androgynous participants would report high use of both masculine and feminine speech. A Chi-Square computed for androgynous participants yielded a value of 13.78 (df = 3; crit. val. = 7.8; p = .05), which reflected a significant difference and did not reject the null. Therefore, hypothesis 4 was not supported (see Table 10).

Hypothesis 5 predicted psychologically undifferentiated participants would report neither high use of masculine nor high use of feminine speech. A Chi-Square computed for undifferentiated participants yielded a value of 8.829 (df = 3; cir. val. = 7.8; p = .05), which reflected a significant difference and did not reject the null. Therefore, hypothesis 5 was not supported (see Table 11).

Table 8

Chi-Square for Hypothesis 2--Psychologically Masculine Participants

Observed Masculine Subjects		Expected Masculine Subjects	
Mascul. Speech	11	Mascul. Speech	30
Femin. Speech	5	Femin. Speech	0
Mas/Fem. Speech	8	Mas/Fem. Speech	0
Neither Mas/Fem. Speech	9	Neither Mas/Fem. Speech	0

Chi-Square = 12.033; df = 3; critical value = 7.8; p = .05

Observed table shows actual distribution of psychologically masculine respondents' RSBS scores in relation to BSRI scores. Expected table shows predicted distribution of RSBS scores in relation to BSRI scores for psychologically masculine subjects.

Table 9

Chi-Square for Hypothesis 3--Psychologically Feminine Participants

Observed Feminine Subjects		Expected Feminine Subjects	
	BSRI		BSRI

RSBS		RSBS	
Mascul. Speech	1	Mascul. Speech	0
Femin. Speech	14	Femin. Speech	27
Mas/Fem. Speech	9	Mas/Fem. Speech	0
Neither Mas/Fem. Speech	3	Neither Mas/Fem. Speech	0

Chi-Square = 6.259; df = 3; critical value = 7.8; p = .05; C. = 434.

Observed table shows actual distribution of psychologically feminine participants' RSBS scores in relation to BSRI scores. Expected table shows predicted distribution of RSBS scores in relation to BSRI scores.

Table 10

Chi-Square for Hypothesis 4--Psychologically Androgynous Participants

Observed Androgynous Participants	Expected Androgynous Participants

	BSRI		BSRI
RSBS		RSBS	
Mascul. Speech	6	Mascul. Speech	0
Femin. Speech	9	Femin. Speech	0
Mas/Fem. Speech	11	Mas/Fem. Speech	32
Neither Mas/Fem. Speech	6	Neither Mas/Fem. Speech	0

Chi-Square = 13.78; df = 3; critical value = 7.8; p = .05.

Observed table shows actual distribution of psychologically androgynous participants' RSBS scores in relation to their BSRI scores. Expected table shows predicted distribution of RSBS scores in relation to BSRI scores.

Table 11

Chi-Square for Hypothesis 5--Pscyhologically
Undifferentiated Participants

Observed Undifferentiated Participants		Expected Undifferentiated Participants	

RSBS	BSRI	RSBS	BSRI
Mascul. Speech	6	Mascul. Speech	0
Femin. Speech	3	Femin. Speech	0
Mas/Fem. Speech	7	Mas/Fem. Speech	0
Neither Mas/Fem. Speech	13	Neither Mas/Fem. Speech	29

Chi-Square = 8.828; df = 3; critical value = 7.8; p = .05.

Observed table shows actual distribution of psychologically undifferenntiated participants' RSBS scores in relation to their RSBI scores. Expected table shows predicted distribution of BSRI scores.

Thus, only psychologically feminine participants responded to the speech usage patterns predicted in the hypotheses.

Biological Sex and Gender-related Speech--An Exploratory Study

The analyses described up to this point have dealt with the five hypotheses of this study relating psychological sex roles. Because of the nature of this study and its focus on gender, an additional exploratory examination of the data, not directly related to the hypotheses, was conducted to explore how biological males and females might differ in relation to the overall prediction.

Hypothesis 1 was not supported for all participants; however, when it was applied to the 53 biological participants only, Chi-Square yielded a value of 16.197 (df = 9; crit. val. = 16.9; p = .05), which did not reflect a significant difference and, therefore, did reject the null hypothesis (see Table 12). The contingency coefficient of .484 indicated a low to moderate relationship. Therefore, it can be stated that men who scored high masculine on the BSRI tended to score high masculine on the RSBS.

A Chi-Square was also computed to test hypothesis 1 for the 65 biological female participants only. This Chi-Square yielded a value of 16.863 (df = 9; crit. val. = 16.9; p = .05), which reflected a significant difference and did not reject the null hypothesis (see Table 13).

Biological female participants with psychological feminine sex role did not score high feminine on the RSBS. Thus, the first hypothesis received support for the men who participated in the study, but not for the women participants.

Table 12

Chi-Square--Biological Males Only

	Observed Males					Expected Males			
	BSRI					BSRI			
RSBS	Masc.	Femin.	Androg.	Undiff.	RSBS	Masc.	Femin.	Androg.	Undiff.
Mascul. Speech	10	0	5	6	Mascul. Speech	19	0	0	0
Femin. Speech	0	2	0	2	Femin. Speech	0	4	0	0
Mas/Fem. Speech	3	2	7	2	Mas/Fem. Speech	0	0	15	0
Neither Mas/Fem. Speech	6	0	3	5	Neither Mas/Fem. Speech	0	0	0	15

Chi-Square = 16.197; df = 9; critical value = 16.9; p = .05; C. = 484.

Observed table shows actual distribution of biological male participants' RSBS scores in relation to their BSRI scores. Expected table shows predicted distribution of RSBS scores in relation to BSRI scores.

Table 13

Chi-Square--Biological Females Only

Observed Females				Expected Females			

	BSRI					BSRI			
RSBS	Masc.	Femin.	Androg.	Undiff.	RSBS	Masc.	Femin.	Androg.	Undiff.
Mascul. Speech	1	1	1	0	Mascul. Speech	11	0	0	0
Femin. Speech	2	12	9	0	Femin. Speech	0	23	0	0
Mas/Fem. Speech	5	7	4	5	Mas/Fem. Speech	0	0	17	0
Neither Mas/Fem. Speech	3	3	3	8	Neither Mas/Fem. Speech	0	0	0	14

Chi-Square = 26.863; df = 9; critical value = 16.9; p = .05.

Observed table shows actual distribution of biological female participants' RSBS scores in relation to their BSRI scores. Expected table shows predicted distribution of RSBS scores in relation to BSRI scores.

A Summary of the Results

There were five hypotheses and only one, hypothesis 3, was supported for psychologically feminine subjects scoring high on reported use of feminine speech. Although hypothesis 1 was not supported for all participants, an exploratory analysis showed support for this hypothesis for biological male subjects. The next chapter is a discussion of these findings.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

Overview

The suggestion that there might be a relationship between sex role orientation and gender-related language usage grew out of findings from previous research. The use of sexist language has been documented as has been the influence of language on thought. Additional research has evidenced some gender flexibility for people classified as psychologically androgynous. This study related these findings to sexist language usage.

Chapter I reviewed previous research relating to sex role orientation, sexist language, and the reported behavioral flexibility of psychologically androgynous persons. The hypotheses predicted a positive correlation between measures of sex role orientation and measures of gender-related language usage. The Bem Sex Role Inventory measured psychological sex role orientation. An instrument was devised for rating speech usage, the Reported Speech Behavior Scale. Chapter II described the administration of these two instruments, and Chapter III provided a summary of the findings. The predicted relationship between sex role orientation and gender-related speech was only supported for psychologically feminine participants. In an exploratory study, biological males who were psychologically masculine also supported the

43

predicted relationship. The following section describes the strengths and limitations of the study.

Strengths and Limitations of the Study

In order to test the hypotheses of this study, an instrument was developed to measure people's reported use of gender-related language. Measuring participants' reported speech usage is a step toward the actual measure of speech in relation to sex role orientation. Prior research has focused on behavioral expectations or attitudes, whereas this study sought to measure personal behavior as reported by the participants.

The major problem with the study is the small sample size used in the Chi-Square analysis. The number of participants was not sufficient to have a meaningful 4 x 4 Chi-Square contingency table. A theoretical minimum of 10 subjects per cell is usually recommended, which would require, in this case, a minimum of 160 subjects. However, given the unpredictability of score distribution across cells, an even larger number than 160 would be advisable. An examination of the contingency tables suggests a trend in the scores, which, while insignificant, might have supported the hypotheses, given a sample size appropriate for the requirements of the statistic.

Future Research

Replication of the study would allow for further examination of the validity of the RSBS. Additionally, with a larger sample for the

replication of Stage 2, support for the hypotheses may be obtained. Any replication would probably need a minimum of 250-300 participants.

Future research might explore further differences between men and women in relation to the hypotheses. A breakdown analysis for biological males and females could be completed with regard to their respective BSRI scores (masculine, feminine, androgynous, and undifferentiated). Since this study was not originally designed to look at biological sex as a variable, very little more was done other than to compare the ratings for men and women on their reported usage of gender language. It must be acknowledged that the BSRI assumes there is no biological differentiation within the framework of psychological sex role orientations. Even though such an analysis contradicts the BSRI assumptions, examining the hypotheses in relationship to biological sex of the participants may be fruitful.

Future research might compare educational, age, and economic characteristics of the participants in relationship to the hypotheses. One could speculate that psychologically androgynous subjects achieving high scores in the use of both masculine and feminine speech would coincide with higher levels of education, age, and socioeconomic status.

Discussion

The thesis of this study predicts a relationship between psychological sex role orientation and use of gender-related language. The fact that the prediction is supported for psychologically feminine participants should not be suprising in light of previous research findings

cited in Chapter I. These findings communicate the strength of the pervasive expectation for psychologically feminine people (in this study, feminine participants are 85% female) to use stereotypically feminine speech. If, in fact, the expectation is perpetuated and protected by women, as Schaef (1981, as quoted by Edson, 1984) indicates, it might be considered inevitable that more support is found for psychologically feminine undifferentiated participants using comparable speech.

Perhaps psychologically masculine people (in this study, masculine participants are 63% male) feel a certain freedom to be more flexible than feminine subjects by virtue of societal reinforcement for use of sexist language (see Chapter I). This flexibility may conceivably be inferred from the finding that psychologically masculine subjects did not report use of mostly masculine speech to a significant degree.

Psychologically androgynous subjects, who did not report a significantly greater use of both masculine and feminine speech, may be representative of a psychologically androgynous population that is not as flexible in its speech as previous research findings suggested it might be. Of course, these findings are limited because of inadequate sample size. Therefore, it may be reasonable to remain open to the possibility that psychologically androgynous persons do use both masculine and feminine speech to a higher degree than other person.

The psychologically undifferentiated subjects, who represented 24.5% of the subject population in this study, are often looked upon as a vague, somewhat undefinable entity. Brunne & Phelps (1980) found that psychologically undifferentiated persons scored on the low end of

a communication competence scale, while psychologically androgynous subjects scored on the high end of the scale. This was, in part, the basis for predicting the undifferentiated participants' relatively low use of masculine and feminine speech behaviors. Although the responses of the psychologically undifferentiated participants in this study do not significantly confirm the predictions, some evidence of a trend indicates that perhaps they do, after all, avoid these gender-related statements. In the Chi-Square contingency table, this trend is apparent in that more undifferentiated participants report use of neither masculine nor feminine speech than use of masculine speech, feminine speech, or a combination of both. Taking into account the problem of the sample size, further research may yield more conclusive results.

Summary

The major conclusion of this study is that there is consensus regarding the existence of gender-related expectations for language, as evidenced in the identification of the statements for the RSBS. It can be inferred from the literature that these statements are reflective of identifiable feminine and masculine language characteristics. The feminine characteristics reflect a nurturing, sensitive, apologetic, expressive, open quality, and concern with personal matters. The masculine characteristics reflect a demanding, assertive, funny, sophisticated quality, the use of profanity and rough language, and concern with business and political matters. The development of a measure of self-reported gender language usage provides a useful tool for future research in gender-related language.

Additionally, the significance of the results with psychologically feminine subjects, reporting greater use of feminine speech than any other category, suggests a greater need to encourage broader acceptance for masculine and feminine speech for women, and less need to encourage acceptance for men to use feminine, as well as masculine speech. This conclusion is substantiated in an examination of the findings for biological male participants, who confirmed the predictions for all sex role categories. These findings suggest that the male participants are more flexible than the female participants, since male androgynous participants upheld the prediction for flexible speech use and female androgynous participants did not. Again, the implication is that the biological male participants are more flexible than the biological female participants, and thus males in general may be viewed as more flexible than females in general.

Through decades of human interaction, language has reflected and perpetuated social, cultural, and psychological roles for men and women. The focus of this study has centered around a concern with the relationship between sexist language usage and psychological sex role orientation. Underlying the study of this relationship has been a concern with the proscriptive effects of sexist language expectations, and a hope for diffusing those expectations with a psychologically androgynous orientation. Further research in this area will contribute to increased understanding of the role of language in the psychological and political expectations for communication among men and women.

APPENDICES

49

APPENDIX A

Preliminary Speech Behavior Scale

50

Preliminary Speech Behavior Scale

SPEECH BEHAVIOR SCALE

       Listed below are some typical statements that represent people's speech behaviors. Please read each statement carefully and rate to what extent you think the "speaker" would most likely be masculine or feminine. Your response options range on the scale from:

1) Most likely masculine . . . . to . . . . 5) Most likely feminine.

Please indicate your response by placing an "x" at the most appropriate spot on the scale.

For these statements:

The SPEAKER would be:

	Most likely Masculine				Most Likely Feminine
1. I use my hands and face when speaking.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I frequently use slang terms.	1	2	3	4	5
3. When I get angry, I raise my voice.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I talk a lot.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I swear if I feel like it.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I generally control the conversation.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I tell people I care about them.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I use correct grammar.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I use sex-related terms in accepted conversation.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I don't exaggerate.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I invite people to tell me what they think.	1	2	3	4	5

51

For these statements:	The SPEAKER would be:				
	Most Likely Masculine				Most Likely Feminine

12.	I say what I think.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
13.	I end statements with "don't you think?"	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
14.	I talk about other people.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
15.	I am aloof in my conversation.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
16.	If something is light purple, I say is lavender.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5.
17.	I refer to God as "He."	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
18.	My voice is high pitched.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
19.	I state my point clearly.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
20.	I talk about how jobs are accomplished.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
21.	I begin my opinions with "I think."	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
22.	I talk knowledgeably.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
23.	I show excitement when I'm speaking	. 1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
24.	I tell funny stories.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
25.	I say "coming," not "comin."	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
26.	I am attentive to others when they talk to me.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
27.	I describe things as "cool" or "terrific."	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
28.	I laugh a lot.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
29.	I use "so" and "very" in my speech.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
30.	I talk about my work.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
31.	I tell people my opinions.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5

For these statements: The SPEAKER would be:

	Most Likely Masculine	Most Likely Feminine

32. I speak with a caring tone of voice.	1	. . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
33. I interrupt others.	1	. . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
34. I say "I'm sorry" to smooth a disagreement.	1	. . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
35. I speak with authority.	1	. . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
36. I speak rapidly.	1	. . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
37. I talk about my favorite colors.	1	. . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
38. I tell others about my achievements.	1	. . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
39. I try to say the appropriate thing at the appropriate time.	1	. . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
40. I speak logically.	1	. . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
41. I refer to God as "She."	1	. . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
42. I show my feelings when I speak.	1	. . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
43. I talk reasonably and sensibly.	1	. . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
44. I tell people my wishes.	1	. . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
45. I include details in my conversation.	1	. . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
46. I speak softly.	1	. . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
47. I have a deep voice.	1	. . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
48. I speak confidently.	1	. . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
49. I talk about what's in the news.	1	. . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
50. I don't tell people what to do, I ask them.	1	. . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			

APPENDIX B

Reported Speech Behavior Scale

54

THE REPORTED SPEECH BEHAVIOR SCALE

Listed below are typical statements representing people's speech behaviors. Please read each statement carefully and rate yourself according to how frequently you use each speech behavior (in most situations). Your response choice ranges on a 5-point scale from:

1) not at all frequently . . . . to . . . . 2) very frequently.

Please indicate your response by placing an "x" at the most appropriate spot on the scale.

Statements:	Not at all Frequently	Very Frequently
1. I use slang terms.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5	
2. When I get angry, I raise my voice.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5	
3. I swear if I feel like it.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5	
4. I tell people I care about them.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5	
5. I use sex-related terms in accepted conversation.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5	
6. I say what I think.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5	
7. I talk about other people.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5	
8. If something is light purple, I say it is lavender.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5	
9. I am aloof in my conversation.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5	
10. My voice is high pitched.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5	
11. I show excitement when I'm speaking.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5	
12. I tell funny stories.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5	
13. I describe things as "cool" or "terrific."	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5	

55

Statements:	Response Choices:
	Not at all Very Frequently Frequently
14. I use "so" and "very" in my speech.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
15. I speak with a caring tone of voice.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
16. I say "I'm sorry" to smooth a disagreement.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
17. I speak with authority.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
18. I talk about my favorite colors.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
19. I speak confidently.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
20. I show my feelings when I speak.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
21. I refer to God as "She."	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
22. I have a deep voice.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
23. I talk about what's in the news.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5
24. I speak softly.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5

APPENDIX C

Short Bem Sex Role Inventory

57

PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document
have not been filmed at the request of
the author. They are available for
consultation, however, in the author's
university library.

These consist of pages:

Short Bem Sex Role Inventory   Pages 58-59

A Role Inventory   Pages 65-66

**University
    Microfilms
International**
300 N Zeeb Rd., Ann Arbor, MI 48106 (313) 761-4700

APPENDIX D

Stage 2 Questionnaire Packet

60

May, 1985

Dear Potential Research Participants:

I am a master's candidate at Western Michigan University, and I need your help to complete my studies. I am conducting a research project, and am requesting your participation.

In recent years there has been much research in the area of language and gender behavior. The purpose of this study is to explore some of these relationships.

You have been selected to participate in this study because of your membership in this Community of Continuing Education Students. Your participation will require that you simply answer the attached questionnaire in as honest and objective a manner as possible.

Your response will be held in confidence, and neither you, nor this class, will be identified with the results of this study in any way.

If you decide to participate, please sign the attached consent form, and then proceed in responding to the enclosed questionnaire. Below you will find telephone numbers where I may be contacted to answer any questions. I will be very happy to share the results of this study with you upon its completion. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated. Thank you in advance.

Sincerely,

Kathy Parker
Western Michigan University Student
Davenport College Part-Time Faulty Member
Ph: 456-0663 or 456-0438 (ofc.)
      459-2207 (res.)

May, 1985

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I have read the letter explaining the purpose of this study.

By agreeing to participate in this study, I understand I will be answering the questions in the attached questionnaire. I will answer them to the best of my ability, being honest and conscientious in each response.

I understand I am not required to participate in this study, and at any time, I may withdraw my participation.

I further understand that any and all parts of my participation in this study will not be identified with me personally, and test results will never reflect my personal contribution or response.

I understand that I can call Kathy Parker and request any additional explanation or information about this study.

I understand that if I request it, an abstract of this study will be available to me upon completion of the study.

Signed:

Name (subject)_____ Date_____

Name (researcher)_____ Date_____

THE REPORTED SPEECH BEHAVIOR SCALE

Listed below are typical statements representing people's speech behaviors. Please read each statement carefully and rate yourself according to how frequently you use each speech behavior (in most situations). Your response choice ranges on a 5-point scale from:

1) not at all frequently . . . . to . . . . 2) very frequently.

Please indicate your response by placing an "X" at the most appropriate spot on the scale.

Statements	Not at all Frequently			Very Frequently
1. I use slang terms.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
2. When I get angry, I raise my voice.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
3. I swear if I feel like it.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
4. I tell people I care about them.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
5. I use sex-related terms in accepted conversation.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
6. I say what I think.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
7. I talk about other people.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
8. If something is light purple, I say it is lavender.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
9. I am aloof in my conversation.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
10. My voice is high pitched.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
11. I show excitement when I'm speaking.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
12. I tell funny stories.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
13. I describe things as "cool" or "terrific."	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			
14. I use "so" and "very" in my speech.	1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4 . . 5			

Statements:	Response Choices:				
	Not at all Frequently				Very Frequently
15. I speak with a caring tone of voice.	1	. . 2 . . 3	. . 4	. . 5
16. I say "I'm sorry" to smooth a disagreement.	1	. . 2 . . 3	. . 4	. . 5
17. I speak with authority.	1	. . 2 . . 3	. . 4	. . 5
18. I talk about my favorite colors.	1	. . 2 . . 3	. . 4	. . 5
19. I speak confidently.	1	. . 2 . . 3	. . 4	. . 5
20. I show my feelings when I speak.	1	. . 2 . . 3	. . 4	. . 5
21. I refer to God as "She."	1	. . 2 . . 3	. . 4	. . 5
22. I have a deep voice.	1	. . 2 . . 3	. . 4	. . 5
23. I talk about what's in the news.	1	. . 2 . . 3	. . 4	. . 5
24. I speak softly.	1	. . 2 . . 3	. . 4	. . 5

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Age: _____ (15-25) _____(25-35) _____(35-50) _____(50+)

Sex: Male _____   Female _____

Education (circle last or current status): _

High school . . . College (2 yrs or less) . . . College (2-4 yrs) . . .

College (post graduate)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adler, M. K. (1978). Sex differences in human speech: A socio-linguistic study. Hamburg: Helmut Buski Verlag.

Bauer, W. D., & Paludi, M. A. (1983). Goldberg revisited: what's in an author's name? Sex Roles, 9(3), 387-390.

Bem, S. L. (1979). Theory and measurement of androgyny: A reply to the pedhazur-tetenbaum and locksley-coltoen critiques. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37(5), 1047-1054.

Berger, P., & Luckman, T. (1967). The social construction of reality. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc.

Berryman-Fink, C., & Wilcox, J. R. (1983). A multivariate investigation of perceptual attributions concerning gender appropriateness in language. Sex Roles, 9(6), 663-679.

Beuf, A. (1974). Doctor, lawyer, household drudge. Journal of Communication, 24(2), 142-145.

Bolinger, D. (1980). Language, the loaded weapon: The use and abuse of language today. New York: Longman Group.

Briere, J., & Lanktree, C. (1983). Sex-role related effects of sex bias in language. Sex Roles, 9(6), 625-631.

Brown, F. L., Amos, J. R., & Mink, O. G. (1975). Statistical concepts (pp. 31-41). New York: Harper & Row.

Bruning, J. L., & Kintz, B. L. (1968). Computational handbook of statistics (pp. 209-213). Chicago, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Brunner, C. C., & Phelps, L. A. (1980). Interpersonal communication competence and androgyny. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, Acapulco, Mexico.

Carlsson, M., & Magnusson, E. (1980). Construct validation of the Bem Sex Role Inventory. Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 21(1), 27-31.

Carroll, J. B. (Ed.) (1956). Language, thought, and reality. Cambridge, MA: The M.I.T. Press.

Catalogue: Testing, teaching, & training materials. (1985). Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.

68

Daly, M. (1978). Gyn-ecology: The meta-ethics of radical feminism. Boston: Beacon Press.

Dayhoff, S. A. (1983). Sexist language and person perception: An evaluation of candidates from newspaper articles. Sex Roles, 9(6), 527-539.

Edson, B. (1984, November). Feminist inquiry--the truth or consequence of an assumptive bias. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Chicago, IL.

Erdwins, C., Small, A., & Gross, R. (1980). The relationship of sex role to self-concept. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 36(1), 111-115.

Greenblatt, L., Hasenauer, J. E., & Freimuth, V. S. (1980). Psychological sex type and androgyny in the study of communication variables: Self-disclosure and communication apprehension. Human Communication Research, 6(2), 117-129.

Guralnik, D. B. (Ed.) (1984). Webster's new world dictionary of the American language. New York: World Publishing.

Harrison, L. (1975, April). Cro-magnon woman--in eclipse. Science Teacher, 8-11.

Helmreich, R. L., Spence, J. T., & Holahan, C. K. (1979). Psychological androgyny and sex role flexibility: A test of two hypotheses. Personality and Social Psychology, 37(10), 1631-1644.

Heilbrun, A. B., Jr. (1976). Measurement of masculine and feminine sex role identities as independent dimensions. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 44(2), 183-190.

Henley, N., Kramer, C., & Thorne, B. (1978). Perspectives on language and communication. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 3(3), 638-651.

Jacobson, L. M., & Shellan, W. N. (1980). Androgyny and self-disclosure among adults: Some discouraging words. Paper presented to the Women's Caucus of International Communication Association, Acapulco, Mexico.

Kolbenschlag, M. (1981). Kiss Sleeping Beauty good-bye. New York: Bantam Books.

Lips, H. M. (1981). Women, men, and the psychology of power. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Locksley, A., & Colten, M. E. (1979). Psychological androgyny: A case of mistaken identity? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37(6), 996-1016.

Lubinski, D., Tellegan, A., & Butcher, J. N. (1983). Masculinity, femininity, and androgyny viewed and assessed as distinct concepts. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44(2), 428-439.

Orlofsky, J. L., & Windle, M. T. (1978). Sex-role orientation behavior adaptability and personal adjustment. Sex Roles, 4(6), 801-811.

Pedhazur, E. J., & Tetenbaum, T. J. (1979). Bem Sex Role Inventory: A theoretical and methodological critique. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37(6), 996-1016.

Purnell, S. E. (1978). Politically speaking, do women exist? Journal of Communication, 150-155.

Rafferty, J., & Wise, E. (1982). Sex bias and language. Sex Roles, 8(12), 1189-1196.

Spence, J. T. (1983). Comment on Lubinski, Tellegen, and Butcher's masculinity, femininity, and androgyny viewed and assessed as distinct concepts. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44(2), 440-446.

Spender, D. (1980). Man made language. London: Kegan Paul.

Thorne, B. (1976). Review of language and woman's place. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 1(2), 744-746.

Trahey, J. (1979). Down the tube. Working Woman, 4(9), 32-35.

VanderWeyden, J. (1980). The interpretation of generic language as male or female by nine or ten year old children. Unpublished master's thesis, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI.

Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1983). Sex role orientation and self-esteem: a critical meta-analytic review. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44(4), 765-778.

Wiggins, J. S., & Holzmuller, A. (1978). Psychological androgyny and interpersonal behavior. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46(1).