DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 286 237 CS 505 703

AUTHOR Greenstreet, Robert W.
TITLE Researching Sex Roles in Human Communication: An Annotated Bibliography.
PUB DATE Nov 87
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (73rd, Boston, MA, November 5-8, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Annotated Bibliographies; Behavior Patterns; Communication Research; Females; *Interpersonal Communication; Language Usage; Linguistics; Males; Psychology; Sex Bias; *Sex Differences; *Sex Role; Sex Stereotypes

ABSTRACT

Intended to help classroom teachers, students, or researchers fathom or simply explore the impact of sex roles in human communication, these 47 annotated citations cover a variety of sources written in a range of disciplines. Sources, which are arranged alphabetically by author, include books and journals in communication, psychology, linguistics, popular culture, and women's studies. (HTH)

RESEARCHING SEX ROLES IN HUMAN COMMUNICATION:

AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

by

Robert W. Greenstreet

East Central University

Researching Sex Roles in Human Communication:

an Annotated Bibliography

These 47 sources should prove helpful to the classroom teacher, student, or researcher trying to fathom or simply explore the impact of sex roles in human communication. This bibliography covers a variety of sources written in a range of disciplines, but it does not claim to be comprehensive. As researchers continue to explore the enigma of sex roles material thought to be true rapidly becomes outdated. Improvements in research methods and increasingly sophisticated methods of analysis have brought into question studies thought to be convincing less than a decade ago.

Judgements concerning the utility and value of these works are strictly my own, and reflect the values and knowledge of the person judging as much as the intrinsic worth of the work discussed. My objective is to help you save time and to encourage you to explore these resources. Where an annotation uses quotation marks, they designate material from the source being discussed, generally to provide some of the flavor of that work.

Bate, B. (1976). Assertive speaking: An approach to communication education for the future. Communication Education, 25, 53-59. Bate suggests training in assertive speaking as a useful approach not only for intersex communication, but for all communicators. She defines such speaking as "the clear, direct, and appropriate expression of personal feelings, opinions, and purposes without undue anxiety and with respect for oneself and others," and posits women are particularly impeded by skill deficiencies in this area. She cites considerable, though often anecdotal, support for the claim that women are much less likely to receive such training than are men. The article is long on solution in a general sense, but short on specific methods of implementation.

Berryman, C. L. (1979). Instructional materials for teaching a course in women

and communication. Communication Education, 28, 217-224. Berryman has gathered materials for a course covering any of all of four areas: "I. Intrapersonal: Socialization and Self Concept; II. Interpersonal Relations between the Sexes; III. Female Communication in Structured Groups; and IV. Female Orators." She has set overall course goals, and includes unit objectives, required and supplementary readings, media support, and projects. This article provides an excellent beginning for a teacher willing to update and supplement.

Bock, D. G., Butler, J. L. P., & Bock, E. H. (1984). The impact of sex of the speaker, sex of the rater and profanity type of language trait errors in speech evaluation: A test of the rating error paradigm. The Southern Speech Communication Journal, 49, 177-186. The authors study the effects of three types of profanity (religious, excretory, and sexual function/organ references) on ratings of male and female speakers. They find profanity lowers speaker ratings for all speakers, but excretory profanity specifically reduces ratings of females while sexual profanity lowers evaluation of males. The article represents more specific analysis and variable selection than earlier research into the influence of sex on communication.

Bradley, P. H. (1980). Sex, competence, and opinion deviation: An expectancy states approach. Communication Monographs, 47, 101-110. Bradley's study is conducted in male-dominated groups. She is able to demonstrate that high task competence leads toward acceptance of women as co-workers, though it does not increase their interpersonal attractiveness. Bradley thoroughly documents gender as a status characteristic to demonstrate women would have lower initial credibility and fewer opportunities to demonstrate their abilities. This article has application for women entering male-dominated fields or companies, and should have application for courses focused on small group and organizational

communication as well as numerous other areas within the discipline.

Bradley, P. H. (1981). The folk-linguistics of women's speech: An empirical examination. Communication Monographs, 48, 73-90. Bradley focuses on the use of tag questions and disclaimers, "some of the most commonly discussed and poorly documented" aspects of folk linguistics, in order both to validate sex differences and to analyze their impact on audience acceptance of the speaker and her message. She also hypothesizes greater support, regardless of sex, for speakers using "well-supported arguments" (in the most traditional sense of documentation.) Her results indicate support increases source influence, while use of disclaimers and tag questions reduces the impact of women more than that of men. Unfortunately, the published results compare the low female and high male groups, the two extremes of her study. High female and low male groups might bear comparison, if only to see if there is some middle ground where source sex becomes less important than situational or evidentiary variables.

Bradley, P. H. (1987). Gender differences in persuasive communication and attribution of success and failure. Human Communication Research, 13, 372-385. Bradley finds males likely to be no more effective nor more capable than females as persuaders, though males are likely to be more confident. Males also appear to attribute their success to their ability while women seem to credit intense effort. Men also generally rate themselves higher, while women rate themselves lower, than those who evaluate them. Women's lack of confidence does not appear to reduce their effectiveness. This article supports the claim women are as effective as men in persuading audiences, though sex appears to play a role in the way speakers feel about themselves as persuaders.

Brown, B. L., Strong, W. J., and Rencher, A. C. (1975). Acoustic determinants of perceptions of personality from speech. Linguistics, 166, 11-32. Brown, Strong,

and Rencher summarize the status of study in this area and point to directions for future research. The thoroughly annotated article offers few insights by itself (indeed, it is not intended to), but represents a good starting point for researchers in the area of sex roles and linguistics.

Cline, R. J. (1983-1984). Gender and geography: Sex differences in spatial pattern preferences. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 49, 380-395. This very well researched article attempts to extend the work of R. Sommer into seating arrangements. Four choices--opposite (competitive), right angle (cooperative), side-by-side (co-optive), and diagonally at a distance (coactive)--are presented in male/male, male/female, and female/female settings in a library and a restaurant doing the following activities: conflict, personal problem, different exam, same exam, acquaintance, and conversation. Basically, women are found to sit closer than men, with differences attributed to differential treatment of the sexes by males, who sit closer to women and farther away from other men. Males also assume the "head of the table" more often.

Cline, R. J. (1986). The effects of biological sex and psychological gender on reported and behavioral intimacy and control of self-disclosure. Communication Quarterly, 34, 41-54. Cline may support Gilligan's claim of an alternate female consciousness. She finds males and females perceive intimacy differently, with males both overrating and overreporting intimacy in relationships. She feels there may also be a small but consistent difference in the intimacy of disclosure by males and females.

Crosby, F. and Nyquist, L. (1977). The female register: An empirical study of Lakoff's hypotheses. Language and Society, 6, 313-322. Because they find Robin Lakoff's work unsupported, Crosby and Nyquist test her hypotheses in three separate and different studies. Unlike Lakoff, they suggest the presence of a

"female register" (which may be used by either sex) connoting submissiveness. Their results indicate women use the female register more than men, but the use appears triggered more by role and by sex. "The implication...is that differences between women's speech and men's speech are, to some degree, context specific." Well-written and -documented, this article is particularly helpful to those who argue for an alternative female consciousness.

Deaux, K. (1976). The behavior of women and men. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole. Intended to appeal to expert and naive readers, this text is an attempt to draw together the growing body of research into gender differences. Unlike many other authors, Deaux consistently attempts to examine both male and female behavior. Her perspective is refreshing, as people remain people in her text. Deaux avoids the tendency to accept Lakoff as fact ("Robin Lakoff believes...") and qualifies her study citations with footnote references and brief discussion of methods. This work is both useful and readable.

de Castillejo, Irene Claremont. (1973). Knowing women: A feminine psychology. New York: Harper & Row. de Castillejo presents her own explanations in a heavily stereotypical (e.g.--woman needs emotion; man requires rationality) view. Based on Jungian anima/animus, her work accepts commonly held preconceptions then spins out a mythos of how the masculine and feminine (which are present in each of us) influence behavior.

Dindia, K. (1987). The effects of sex of subject and sex of partner on interruptions. Human Communication Research, 13, 345-371. Dindia contradicts earlier studies in finding men do not interrupt more than women and women are not interrupted more frequently than men. Rather, she finds more cross-sex than same-sex interruption. Women in her study do not behave less assertively than men, they do not interrupt less assertively, nor do they respond to interruptions

less assertively. This article features an excellent discussion of what Dindia claims are faulty methods of statistical analysis in earlier studies. Like Bock, Butler, and Bock, Dindia's work represents more specific variable control and analysis than earlier studies in the area.

Eakins, B. W. and Eakins, R. G. (1978). Sex differences in human communication. Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin. Intended as a college textbook, Sex Differences is an appropriately footnoted attempt to bring into focus diverse efforts to study the way women communicate. Men are discussed as something women differ from, but they are not researched nearly so deeply. While the book is directed more toward everyday transactions, it should also probe helpful to those who want to specialize in a specific area. The book affords the reader an opportunity to more fully grasp the totality of the female communicative experience, but the reader will also encounter a tendency to accept stereotypes as fact.

Foss, K. A. & Foss, S. K. (1983). The status of research on women and communication. Communication Quarterly, 31, 195-204. This article represents a substantial review of trends in research along with commentary about the quality of that research. Foss and Foss find much of the research into sex differences in communication lacking from the standpoint of perspective. In essence, they feel contemporary researchers begin with the a priori that women should hold the same world view as men. They feel if Gilligan is correct and women embrace a different world view, presuppositions of current research ignore that perspective.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Gilligan examines moral decision making by women at a variety of ages in attempting to establish that women's morality develops differently from men's, but no less fully. Her work is largely an effort to refute theories of moral development (primarily Lawrence Kohlberg's) which preclude women from arriving at mature moral judgements.

Essentially, she claims men's development is toward individuation, while women develop an ethic of caring in which they define themselves in terms of relationships. Gilligan sees women developing from selfishness through a complete other-focused world view to a maturity in which both the self and the other are significant.

Hall, N. (1980). The moon & the virgin: Reflections on the archetypal feminine. New York: Harper & Row. Hall's background is archeology, but she also borrows from psychology, entymology, and anthropology. The book was prepared as a series of lectures; as a result it offers a series of thematically-linked anecdotes and images. Support is tenuous, frequently speculative (without apparent recognition from Hall), and occasionally inaccurate ("A woman begins the normal phases of ovulation again shortly after a child is born and weaned.") While the book offers some interesting narrative concerning myth, legend, icon, and deification of female entities, it is a fragmented work. The sometimes speculative nature of Hall's argument seriously undermines both her credibility and the value of the work. The book is an exploration without a concrete destination.

Infante, D. A., Trebing, J. D., Shepherd, P. E., & Seeds, D. E. (1984). The relationship of argumentativeness to verbal aggression. The Southern Speech Communication Journal, 50, 67-77. The authors first clarify that argument is not aggressiveness. Rather, they define argumentativeness as a personality trait predisposing a person to recognize controversy, advocate positions, and refute others' positions. While argumentativeness is generally considered male behavior, females engage in argumentativeness too, but more situationally. The authors find males more argumentative with adaptable opponents, females with opponents of equal ability or high obstinance.

Johnson, F. L. (1983). Political and pedagogical implications of attitudes

towards women's language. Communication Quarterly, 31, 133-138. Johnson is not comfortable with the a priori that men's speech is the norm since such a presupposition means women's speech, if different, is by definition deviant or deficient. She suggests an attitude that both male and female speech patterns are appropriate in different situations. Recognizing the appropriateness (and presumably removing the sexist labels) allows teachers to focus on code-switching and establishing broader repertoires of communication behaviors.

Johnson, F. L. and Goldman, L. (1977). Communication education for women: A case for separatism. Communication Education, 26, 319-326. Johnson and Goldman suggest a separate course (or courses) for women as communicators could be tailored toward the specific needs of women. As a result, such a course should be much more effective for them than a general (mixed) course. Effective use of references, though heavily influenced by Henley and Thorne, supports their basic premise: women and men communicate differently and women are generally at a disadvantage. Both Johnson and Goldman have taught courses for women, and their experiences are discussed briefly in the article. They feel the absence of a male audience allows their students to risk more freely. There are no suggestions concerning a male instructor.

Jones, S. E. (1986). Sex differences in touch communication. The Western Journal of Speech Communication, 50, 227-241. Jones confirms some broad truisms of contemporary research in finding females initiate more touch and are involved in more total touching than males. He differs when he finds both males and females engage in more cross-sex than same-sex touching, females initiate more of that cross-sex touching, and females specifically initiate more cross-sex control touching than males. (He suggests this latter finding results from the plethora of alternative methods available to males.) Jones posits a possible

explanation is that women touch more because they touch more appropriately; men may be less likely to know how to touch. This article is a more specific study than some of the earlier studies into touch behavior.

Kennedy, C. W. & Camden, C. T. (1983). A new look at interruptions. The Western Journal of Speech Communication, 47, 45-58. While Kennedy and Camden find no significant difference in the style of interruptions used by women and men, they do ascertain interruptions are not always a dominance behavior. They point out people interrupt for a variety of reasons, some of which may even connote subordination. They suggest the task orientation and higher education of their subjects might explain the difference between their findings and earlier studies. Differences might also be explained by their more specific breakdown of the variables studied.

Key, M. R. (1975). Male/Female language. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press. The first sentence in Key's preface is "Not another book on women!" Indeed this book is not, like so many others, limited to what women do, but instead deals with both sexes. The text is very readable, well researched, and fair. The focus of the work is on language and use of language, and Key provides excellent insight for the uninitiated reader.

Kramer, C. (1980). Folk linguistics: Wishy washy mommy talk. In Weinberg, S. (ed.). Messages: A reader in human communication (3rd edition). New York: Random House. 312-319. Kramer analyzes New Yorker cartoons to develop social stereotypes of female speech characteristics. Her findings: women speak much less and in fewer locations, their topics are different, their phrasing is less direct, they swear less and "gush" (mommy talk) more. The second half of this brief article attempts to determine if some of these stereotypes are based on fact, with a limited experiment failing to confirm any of them. This article is early in Kramer's research, and likely represents the opening of a door rather than

the entirety of her thought on the matter.

Kramer, C. (1973-1974). Stereotypes of women's speech. The word from cartoons. Journal of Popular Culture, 8, 624-630. Kramer expands beyond New Yorker to include cartoons from Playboy, Cosmopolitan, and Ladies Home Journal. Cosmopolitan proved most heavily stereotyped. This article essentially expands the first half of the article above, and comes to the same basic conclusion. The stereotypes of women's speech are consistent with other sources, but are not substantiated as fact.

Kramer, C. (1974). Women's speech: Separate but unequal? Quarterly Journal of Speech, 60, 14-24. Kramer begins this article with a selective review of the literature, then turns quickly to anecdotal evidence (Robin Lakoff, Letty Cottin Pogrebin) when empirical data becomes unavailable. She also examines the general positive male bias of English. The article is a good goad to further research, and it familiarizes the reader with commonly held stereotypes of powerless speech.

La France, M. and Mayo, C. (1978). Moving bodies: Nonverbal communication in social relationships. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole. An attempt to do more than describe nonverbal behavior, this text tries to develop a framework which explains and interperets the phenomenon. Of particular value is the oft-cited chapter on "gender gestures," which provides a thorough review of major research efforts in this area. Unlike many other works in this developing field, La France and Mayo draw conclusions from pretty solid empirical research.

Lakoff, Robin. (1975). Language and woman's place. New York: Harper & Row. Lakoff's now-famous hypotheses claim women's speech differs from that of men in terms of: (1) a large stock of words related to special interests (women's work); (2) use of empty adjectives; (3) an upward inflection for declarative statements

and overuse of tag questions; (4) hedges; (5) use of the intensive "so"; (6) hyper-correct grammar; (7) superpolite forms and meaningless particles; (8) absence of jokes; and (9) speaking in italics. Reliance on anecdotal rather than empirical evidence means the book is almost entirely assertion based on Lakoff's years of casual observation. While the book is not appropriately based on reliable data, Lakoff touched a nerve and sparked considerable research with this slender volume.

Lange, A. J. and Jakubowski, P. (1976). Responsible assertive behavior: Cognitive/behavioral procedures for trainers. Champaign, IL: Research Press. This assertiveness trainer's manual is well written and direct in tracing the development of assertiveness training, differentiating between assertive, nonassertive (acquiescent), and aggressive behavior, and detailing the consequences of each. The authors include exercises and quizzes and try to help the reader thoroughly master the various types of assertive behavior. Many examples of nonassertive behavior parallel behavior Lakoff and her followers associate with women's speech.

Maccoby, E. E. (ed.) (1966). The development of sex differences. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press. This anthology of different writings on the general topic of differences between the sexes is a notable initial effort to formalize some understanding in the field. Of particular interest are Maccoby's chapter on intellectual functioning, Lawrence Kohlberg's chapter on sex-role concepts and attitudes, and Roy G. D'Andrade's chapter on cultural institutions. A 98-page annotated bibliography is included. While the book is dated, it remains a landmark work and a helpful research tool for those interested in sex roles in human communication.

Maccoby, E. E. and Jacklin, C. N. (1974). The psychology of sex differences.

Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press. This sequel to the above work is both more comprehensive and more consistent in perspective and style. 15 pages of "references cited" and a 232-page annotated bibliography provide extremely helpful tools for verification or further reading. While speech communication related areas are not grouped, this book should prove very helpful to researchers. It is a superior reference work, noteworthy for its breadth as well as its approach.

Martin, J. N. & Craig, R. T. (1983). Selected linguistic sex differences during initial social interactions of same-sex and mixed-sex student dyads. The Western Journal of Speech Communication, 47, 16-28. Martin and Craig explore periods of initial social interaction with an eye toward supporting or disconfirming some of Lakoff's hypotheses. They find no deference/dominance pattern, no evidence females are more adaptive as communicators, and very few tag questions. Females do tend to use more qualifying words, but most of the time that behavior occurs in same-sex dyads (and not when thay are speaking to men.) Females also display more false starts in this study. The more specific data compilation used for this study serves the authors well as it apparently precludes stereotypical conclusions.

Mayo, C. and Henley, N. (eds.) (1981). Gender and nonverbal behavior. New York: Springer-Verlag. Mayo and Henley attempt to draw together two areas which have been hotbeds of research activity in recent years. Their book does more than simply gather research, however. The first of three major sections examines current research, the second explores androgyny, and the third both summarizes and calls for future research. This text should prove a very helpful source for students of both nonverbal and sex role behavior as well as for teachers of lower level graduate courses.

McMillan, J. R., Clifton, A. K., McGrath, D., and Gale, W. S. (1977). Women's

language: Uncertainty or interpersonal sensitivity and emotionality? Sex Roles, 3, 545-559. This article reports a study isolating the use of intensifiers, modal constructions, tag questions, and imperatives in question form by women in group discussions As anticipated, women's constructions and intonations tend to connote greater uncertainty than those of men. Such behavior also intensifies in the presence of men. Women are also more likely to be interrupted by men than the inverse. It is in the discussion of these results that this article makes its most significant contribution. Here the authors posit women's speech reflects women's culture, which differs from men's in its emphasis on "interpersonal and emotional dimensions." Well researched and footnoted, this article offers another perspective on the causes of women's speech.

Mulac, A. and Torborg, L. L. (1980). Differences in perceptions created by syntactic-semantic productions of male and female speakers. Communication Monographs, 47, 111-118. Transcripts are used to rate anonymous speakers in four age groups. Males are rated more dynamic, females more aesthetically pleasing. There is no significant difference in perceived socioeconomic status. The article is thoroughly footnoted and provides a number of possible sources for further reading.

Mulac, A., Studley, L. B., Wiemann, J. M., & Bradac, J. J. (1987). Male/female gaze in same-sex and mixed-sex dyads. Human Communication Research, 13, 323-343. Only a couple of significant differences in gazing behavior emerge from this study. Same sex female dyads display more mutual gaze/mutual talk as well as more mutual gaze/mutual silence than do male same-sex or mixed dyads. Female same-sex pairs also display less one gaze/same talks and mutual gaze aversion/one talks than do the other combinations. There is no significant difference between male same-sex and mixed-sex dyads. The authors feel in the

latter instance women "converged to the male behavior." That conclusion may provide an example of the type of reasoning both Johnson and Foss and Foss discuss.

Ney, J. W. (1976). Sexism in the English vocabulary: A biased view in a biased society. etc., 33, 67-76. Ney suggests language reflects more than shapes the culture which uses it. He conducts a non-scientific study in a somewhat scientific manner, polling his night classes at Arizona State University then thoroughly analyzing his results. He claims English contains more pejorative male than female forms, more ameliorative female terms than male. Of course, he considers "doll," "sweetie," and "blonde" to be ameliorative while "broad " and "babe" are neutral. Ney's main theses--language reflects rather than shapes its culture--is worth attention. Most of the rest of the article is, as the title says, the product of a less than neutral perspective.

Pearson, J. C., Miller, G. R., & Senter, M. (1983). Sexism and sexual humor: A research note. Central States Speech Journal, 34, 257-259. In this very brief peek into their research, Pearson, Miller, and Senter find women tell the same type of jokes as men, with men usually the target of both sexes' humor. Their findings rather pointedly contradict those of Robin Lakoff.

Pilotta, J. J. (ed.) (1983). Women in organizations: Barriers and breakthroughs. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press. This compendium of seven articles includes two by men (Pilotta and Lawrence Baum) with the remainder by women (Kay Deaux, Tricia S. Jones, Linda L. Putnam, Mary Anne Fitzpatrick, and Sue DeWine.) Pilotta sets out an overview, then Deaux, Jones, and Putnam discuss obstacles confronting women in organizations. Baum addresses the law, then Fitzpatrick and DeWine suggest potential breakthroughs. Basically, Fitzpatrick advises women to "think like a man, talk like a lady, and work like a dog". DeWine posits networking will

lead a woman to greater success in the business world. This slim volume should be required reading for business majors, and probably has its best application in courses related to organizational communication.

Rossi, Alice S. (ed.) (1973). The feminist papers: From Adams to de Beauvior. New York: Columbia University Press. This is a masterful background reference for anyone interested in the development of feminism. Rossi is a sociologist with a track record in feminism. She divides the book into four sections, each of which is prefaced by a lengthy orientation by Rossi. Each individual author/speaker/ feminist is also introduced. Rossi's sociological perspective sees chronological linkage as less important than intent or perspective. She argues persuasively for her groupings. The combined result is an effort which could easily be considered a feminist primer. The book is full of strong militant rhetoric and pointed argument: wonderful stuff.

Serafini, D. M. and Pearson, J. C. (1983-1984). Leadership behavior and sex role socialization: Two sides of the same coin. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 49, 396-405. This adaptation of Serafini's M.A. thesis defines feminine behavior as relationship-oriented and masculine behavior as task-oriented, then discovers people with feminine characteristics (regardless of their sex) are more likely to be relationship-oriented while people with masculine traits are more task-oriented. Androgynous people exhibit flexibility and match levels of both masculine and feminine folk in both behaviors.

Siegler, D. M. and Siegler, R. S. (1976). Stereotypes of male's and female's speech. Psychological Reports, 39, 167-170. This test of predicted stereotypes shows subjects attribute assertive speech forms more readily to men. They also rate "syntactic forms associated with males" as more intelligent than those associated with females. The authors conclude reported changes in attitude do not really demonstrate greater acceptance of women, only increased awareness of the

movement. The potential for explanation of audience behavior is significant.

Stone, V. A. (1973-1974). Attitudes toward television newswomen. Journal of Broadcasting, 18, 49-62. Stone examines results of five surveys of different audience groups plus television news directors. The news directors frequently and substantially underestimated their audiences' readiness to watch women anchor and report the news. Two exceptions are cited: war and football, where males are still preferred (as of 1973). This finding may support the sex role-responsiveness of communication suggested by several other sources.

Tavris, C. and Wade, C. (1984). The longest war: Sex differences in perspective (2e). This update of their 1977 work includes substantial revision and offers a thorough updating of Maccoby and Jacklin. Tavris and Wade set out to explore the facts and explain inequalities which have emerged. While the book frequently offers strong review of expermental/theoretical exploration in the field, it more often devolves into a justification of feminist perspective. Analysis is generally strong, however biased the authors' view, and specific comments concerning specific studies shed new light on old claims. The work is likely to offer greatest value to a class on current culture or the psychology of sex differences. Communication is not the book's main focus.

Thorne, B. and Henley, N. (eds.) (1975). Language and sex: Difference and dominance. Rowley, MA: Newbury House. Written from a sociolinguistic perspective, this landmark anthology is divided into two major sections. The first, a collection of essays, provides a thorough (as of publication date) reflection of the field. The second, an annotated bibliography, is equally important as a research aid. Excellent chapters by Marjorie Swacker, Ruth M. Brand, Jacqueline Sachs, and Henley are directly related to speech communication studies. This book is a must for anyone studying language and sex because it

rigorously avoids reliance on stereotypes in its quest for accurate identification and exposition of reality.

Van Riper, W. R. (1979). Usage preferences of men and women: Did, came, and saw. American Speech, 54, 279-284. Van Riper analyzes data collected in two linguistic atlases to compare usage preferences. He supports the hypothesis that for low and middle cultural level groups, women exhibit a significantly stronger preference for the standard verb forms. For the upper cultural level "the homogenizing influences of formal education, wider reading, and more social contact" level the results. He offers no explanation, but supports the notion women's speech is more likely than that of men to be correct.

Wright, J. W. II & Hosman, L. A. (1983). Language style and sex bias in the courtroom: The effects of male and female use of hedges and intensifiers on impression formation. The Southern Speech Communication Journal, 48, 137-152. In avoiding the general tendency to discuss male and female registers, Wright and Hosman study powerless and powerful speech patterns. Powerless speech is characterized by frequent hedges. overuse of intensifiers, hypercorrect linguistic forms, polite language, and hesitation. It is associated with low status. Powerful speech offers infrequent use of the above devices and is associated with high status. Women do not use powerless speech more than men in this study, but they pay a higher price when they do engage in powerless speech. They are not more likely to demonstrate powerless behaviors; they are simply hurt more by such utterances.