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Previous research suggests that gender-appropriate and gender-inappropriate use of sex-linked linguistic markers alters subjects' perceptions of the speaker. The present study examined the effects of male and female speech styles on clients' perceptions. Undergraduates (N = 160) listened to audiotapes of clinical psychologists introducing the same client to psychotherapy. Clinician gender and sex-linked linguistic markers were manipulated. The results suggested that sex-stereotypes of males, females, and occupations played an important role in altering clients' perceptions of clinical psychologists. Sex-stereotypes did not, however, determine the desirability of the speaker as a therapist. The use of female speech styles increased the clinician's perceived femininity and desirability as a therapist.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Cross-cultural studies have determined that males and females utilize different speech styles (Smith, 1979). In addition, the sex-linked speech patterns have been found to alter listeners' perceptions of the speaker (Berryman-Fink & Wilcox, 1983). Socialization may dictate the utilization and the perception of speech variants (Lakoff, 1973). According to Lakoff, gender differences in speech styles are taught as part of the subtle sex-role training within cultures. Thus effects usually occur without intentional effort by either the speakers or listeners. The effects, however, alter perceptions of the speaker in both positive and negative directions (Liska, Mechling, & Stathas, 1981). A significant number of sex-linked linguistic markers (e.g., question marks, tag questions, compound requests, qualifiers) appear to have opposing effects. For example, a particular marker may lead to a speaker's being perceived as friendly. This same marker may, however, create the opposite impression on a trustworthiness dimension, indicating a friendly but untrustworthy individual. Different contexts would dictate which effect is more
desirable. Other contexts would require the speaker to be perceived as both friendly and trustworthy.

The communication setting also affects the listeners' perceptions of the speaker (Warfel, 1984). A marker may create an opposite or completely different effect in different settings. Sex of the speaker is another factor affecting perceptions (Berryman-Fink & Wilcox, 1985). Since the markers are sex-linked, the speaker may increase his or her ratings on one dimension and at the same time may alter effectiveness on another dimension for deviating from the sex-role norms. Different situations will once again dictate which trade-off will be worthwhile. The problem with trade-offs is particularly important to therapists. As Strong's (1968) research indicates, therapist characteristics have a significant effect on therapy outcome. The implementation of different linguistic markers may possibly enable the therapist to emphasize those characteristics that enhance the therapeutic process and de-emphasize detrimental characteristics. At the present time, however, the specific effects for different markers in different situations are unknown.

This paper reports an experiment which investigated the perceptions of sex-linked speech patterns. The focus was on the perceptions of male and female speakers utilizing male and female speech styles. The communication setting was a therapist's introductory statement about therapy.
Speech Styles

The suggestion that the two sexes utilize different speech styles arose from the casual observation of people (Lakoff, 1973). Researchers have studied the hypothesized differences in a systematic fashion. Empirical evidence, however, remains limited (Wiley & Eskilson, 1985). The research conducted on verbalizations has included investigations of actual speech, measured as it naturally occurs. The markers (e.g., qualifiers, intensifiers, tag questions, etc.) found in studies of actual verbal behavior have also been manipulated in experiments to determine whether these markers alter individuals' perception of speakers (Erickson, Lind, Johnson, & O'Barr, 1978; Liska et al., 1981; Wiley & Eskilson, 1985). Male and female speech styles have been found to differ in experimental research (Eakins & Eakins, 1978; McMillian, Clifton, McGrath, & Gale, 1977; Smith, 1979; Smythe, Arkin, Huddelson, & Nickels, 1983). In general, female speech patterns are rated as being more feminine and less powerful than male speech patterns.

A review by Smith (1979) discussed over 70 studies in which speech differences between the sexes were found to exist. Most of the cultures studied possess sex linked linguistic markers, with the particular cues differing from culture to culture. For example, in the United States, females have been found to pronounce the postvocalic r in
words such as car more often than males. Another pronunciation variant is the male usage of an abbreviated -ing ending (e.g., pitchin' instead of pitching). Some researchers (Bailey & Trimm, 1976; Head, 1977; Oftedal, 1973, cited in Smith, 1979) believe strict social sanction explains the absence or lower frequency of profane and obscene expletives in female speech in Sweden, the United States, and Brazil. Females have been found to utilize more numerical approximations (e.g., around four or five sticks) than do males. Male speech is more source and object oriented (e.g., then he ran over to her house) and female speech is more internally and functionally oriented (e.g., he did it because he felt guilty).

According to Smith's 1979 review, the findings on speech verbosity and speaking time are mixed. Generally the research finds male speech dominating in mixed sex dyads. An overview of the research presented by Smith and others (McMillian et al., 1977; Smythe et al., 1983) shows that the linguistic markers of verbosity and speaking time are highly sensitive to situational factors, as indicated by the variability found between cultures and situations. This, in turn, suggests that all markers may be situation specific. However, as is evident throughout this paper, research rarely attends to mainly situational variables.

Kramer's (1974) review cites many of the same sex linked linguistic markers as Smith (1979). Some additional
speech patterns enumerated by Kramer (1974) are the more correct language forms and greater intonation range used by females. Louder volume and higher pitch are also associated with female speech styles, but the author cautions that this may be more of a negative stereotype than an accurate description of female verbalizations.

Lakoff (1973) discussed what she believed were sex-typed speech patterns in females. She suggested that these verbalizations are developed through socialization to ensure that females act like ladies. That is, polite, gentle, and submissive. According to her, "women's language" is primarily reserved for irrelevant and meaningless subject matters and to express uncertainty and lack of power. For example, precision in color naming is considered irrelevant in the professional world and such discussions are relegated to interior decorators and women. Lakoff asserts that it is not unusual to hear a female referring to the color puce. A male who did so would be assumed to be homosexual. The weaker quality of women's speech is evident in the lack of strong expressive phrases such as damn and shit. Female speech patterns are lacking any form of coarseness, but include fluffy, powerless adjectives such as darling and precious. Though some of these notions may be outdated due to changes in our culture since the early 1970's, the underlying premise of females utilizing powerless speech forms may still be applicable.
According to Lakoff (1973), sex differences in speech styles are not restricted to vocabulary. The more frequent use of tag questions by females conveys uncertainty. For example, the statement, *I said no*, loses strength when the tag question *didn’t I?* is added to the end of a possibly powerful statement. Lakoff states that females have their own intonation patterns which express emotionality and uncertainty. The use of compound requests conveys a lack of certainty and power. The more compounded the request, the less power it contains and the more indicative it is of female speech patterns. The command *Put that here*, is more assertive than the request *Please, put that here*. Uncertainty in the request is conveyed when a questioning form is used (e.g., *will you put that here*?). The uncertainty and lack of power is conveyed further in such compound requests as, *Won’t you please put that here?* Although Lakoff’s observations may or may not have been accurate, they lacked the necessary empirical validation.

Eakins and Eakins (1978) report research supporting the hypothesis of a difference between female and male speech styles. They draw a number of conclusions. Females choose words related to cooking and sewing while males choose words related to tools and cars. Male expletives are predominantly swear words while those of females convey less intense anger (e.g., *oh dear, oh my goodness*). Females are also believed to utilize more qualifiers such as *perhaps,*
seems to me, and sort of. Males, on the other hand, are more likely to take credit for their idea by stating, I think. The use of disclaimers such as I could be wrong, but, is considered a female speech pattern. Slang, abbreviated pronunciations (e.g., goin'') and jokes are more indicative of male speech. Unfortunately, much of the research they reported was conducted in their classes. Numbers and statistical analysis were seldom reported.

Other studies have indicated that additional sex-typed markers exist (Eakins & Eakins, 1978; McMillian et al., 1977; Smythe et al., 1983). A study of actual verbal behavior was conducted by Eakins and Eakins (1978). They required a student to turn his or her back to the class and instruct classmates on how to draw a design of squares. During the time task speakers were not allowed to gesture and classmates were not allowed to ask questions. Female speakers were creative with their speech as they interpreted the design. Males, in contrast, used a more factual description. The males' descriptions required more words than the interpretive descriptions. Males also repeated themselves more frequently. The females' descriptions were perceived as more casual. Counting was indicative of a male speaker, while females were more vague, using numerical approximations. To shift the topic, females used conjunctions such as and. Males used exclamations such as okay to shift topics. Both speech styles were considered
equally efficient. This study indicates a sex difference in speech styles while describing a geometric design. Describing a design, however, is not a common situation for most individuals and has little generalizability to the real world.

McMillian and her associates (1977) examined the actual use of intensifiers, modal constructions, compound requests, tag questions, interruptions, and talking time using videotapes of small-group problem-solving situations. Intensifiers are believed to de-emphasize the cognitive meaning by drawing listeners' attention to the emotional message (e.g., That test was so ridiculous). Modal constructions refer to the use of words from the modal class that indicate predication (sic) of an action rather than a direct statement of fact (e.g., could, may, might, and verb auxiliaries such as have and been). These words are commonly used to express doubt in the future. The use of modal construction in reference to a past event (e.g., I might have put that file on your desk) is more frequent in female speech.

McMillian et al. (1977) examined their data in a number of different ways. Talking time was not significantly different for females and males. Modal constructions and tag questions were used twice as often by females than by males. Compound requests were utilized three times more frequently by females than by males. The authors suggested
that the frequent use of these syntactic categories by females conveys uncertainty. Female use of modal constructions, compound requests, and tag questions increased in mixed-sex groups. Male usage of these markers did not differ with the composition of the group. Analysis indicated that females used intensifiers six times more frequently than males. Females in same-sex groups used intensifiers at a higher frequency than those in mixed-sex groups.

When McMillian and her colleagues analyzed the data obtained from the same-sex groups, they found that males and females interrupted others of the same sex at the same frequency. Females interrupted other females more frequently than they did males. Males interrupted others, regardless of sex, twice as often as females and interrupted females five times more often than they interrupted other males. McMillian et al. concluded that the higher frequency of male interruptions and the increased usage of uncertain speech styles by females reflected and reinforced the imbalance of power between the sexes. However, it may be argued that the findings were artificially exaggerated because the subjects knew they were being videotaped. This same argument can be used in support of the research. Subjects who are aware their behavior is being scrutinized may intentionally resort to what they believe is appropriate behavior in such a situation.
Examination of qualifier usage in verbal behavior was reported by Smythe et al. (1983). Subjects were initially tested to determine their sex role orientation according to the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974). Random pairs of subjects participated in a 12 minute casual conversation. The conversations were videotaped and coded on duration and frequency of speech, topic initiation, use of questions, interruptions, fillers, and qualifiers. Their analysis found that females, regardless of sex-role orientation, asked more questions. The fewest questions occurred when a male was conversing with an androgynous partner. The fewest fillers occurred when a male was paired with a sex-typed partner. Males spoke more when interacting with a sex-typed female, while females spoke more often when paired with an androgynous partner, regardless of sex.

Smythe et al. found that sex-role orientation also influences verbalizations. Androgynous males exhibited a sensitivity to the sex-typing of their partner regarding the use of questions. When conversing with an androgynous individual these males asked few questions. Pairing with a sex-typed partner, however, increased their frequency of questions. Androgynous individuals also used fewer fillers when talking to same-sex androgynous individuals. Interactions were found for patterns of speech frequencies and topic initiation. Sex-typed females spoke more frequently and initiated more topics than androgynous
females. In contrast, the androgynous males spoke and initiated more topics than sex-typed males or androgynous females. Sex-typed males used fewer qualifiers while androgynous males used qualifiers at a higher rate. Androgynous individuals were found to utilize more qualifiers when conversing with the opposite sex than with the same sex.

Previously reported sex differences in interruptions and speech duration were not found by Smythe and her colleagues. Perhaps frequency of interruptions and length of speech are more situationally specific than is the use of qualifiers, topic initiation, questions, and fillers. When the data were collapsed across the sex-role variable, the results support the findings of earlier research (Eakins & Eakins, 1978; Lakoff, 1973; McMillian et al., 1977; Smith, 1979), indicating a male and female difference in verbalizations. Additional support for Lakoff's (1973) perception of a feminine speech style is obtained from the analysis of androgynous males' speech patterns. According to Bem (1974), androgynous males possess a significant level of feminine attributes. The speaking behaviors of androgynous males, as indicated by this study, are similar to the speech patterns of sex-typed females.

In summary, research examining the speech patterns of males and females has discovered significant differences between the sexes. Females and males appear to implement
different vocabularies, with the sexes using differing frequencies of certain categories of words (e.g., intensifiers, qualifiers). Males are more detached from their subject of conversation, while females utilize a more interpretive, internalized communication. Male speech is also more precise. The verbalizations of females appear to convey uncertainty and powerlessness. Factors such as the sex and sex-role orientation of the discussion group members have a significant effect on some of these cues (e.g., use of tag questions and fillers). Other markers, such as speech length and verbosity, appear to be highly sensitive to situational cues. However, these situational cues have not been studied directly. The perceptions of such verbalizations in the research reported thus far have been the perceptions of the researchers and authors. The reports of an average population are necessary to give the investigators' perceptions validity.

Perceptions of Speech Styles

Speech patterns have a significant effect on the perception of speakers. In order to discover which and in what manner linguistic markers alter perceptions, research has been conducted to elicit subjects' reactions to varied verbalizations (Edelsky, 1976). Other researchers have utilized the markers that are believed to be sex-linked and manipulated the gender of the speaker and respondent
(Berryman-Fink & Wilcox, 1983; Erickson et al., 1978; Liska et al., 1981; Wiley & Eskilson, 1985). In general, the reports of subjects are in agreement with the perceptions of investigators reported above. That is, female speech patterns are perceived as powerless, uncertain, and feminine.

Edelsky (1976) examined subjects' perceptions of three female and three male phrases. The three female verbalizations were: that's adorable, oh dear, and my goodness. The three male language forms were: shit, damn right, and I'll be damned. Subjects were instructed to rate each language form according to ten, seven-point bipolar adjective scales from Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, and Rosenkrantz (1972). Only adjectives with a male and female pole were utilized in this study. Edelsky reports that male and female subjects did not differ significantly on their ratings of the language forms. The female language forms were associated with the female adjectives and the male language forms were associated with the male adjectives. Only the scale logical/illogical rendered a non-polar association. As the author indicates, these results support the belief that when an individual uses female speech styles, he or she conveys submission, dependence, passivity, and other stereotypic female qualities. The verbalizations studied by Edelsky are, however, limited. A broader category of verbalizations is
necessary before these findings and conclusions can be applied to the other forms of female and male speech.

Erickson et al. (1978) investigated the use of intensifiers, hedges (e.g., I guess, kinda), questioning forms, formal grammar, hesitation forms (e.g., uh, well, you know), and polite forms (e.g., thank you, please), in courtroom testimonies. Subjects heard or read the testimony of a male or female witness who utilized either a powerless (feminine) or powerful (masculine) speech style. The powerless script was obtained from actual courtroom testimony. A powerful script was created by reducing the frequency of the powerless cues (i.e., intensifiers, hedges, questioning forms, etc.). Powerful speakers were perceived as more credible and attractive than were powerless speakers, regardless of the sex of the speakers. This difference was greater when the subject and witness were of the same sex. Female witnesses were perceived as more credible and attractive than were powerless speakers, regardless of the sex of the speakers. This difference was greater when the subject and witness were of the same sex. Female witnesses were perceived as more attractive than male witnesses when the testimony was heard, but less attractive when the testimony was read. In addition, the male witnesses were rated as more masculine, regardless of speech style. The authors cite the correlation of masculinity with male witnesses as contradicting Lakoff’s (1973) assertions
of feminine and masculine speech styles. However, they altered the powerless script to obtain a more psychologically appropriate script for the male witness. Given the authors' alterations, the main effect of sex over speech does not contradict Lakoff.

Erickson et al. (1978) also found that speech style affected subjects' recommended damages which were considered indicative of acceptance of testimony. Powerful speakers received higher damages than did powerless speakers when the testimony was presented via audiotape. No significant difference was found between speech styles when the male testimonies were transcribed. When read, the female powerful testimony was more highly accepted than her powerless testimony. In general, powerful speech was found to be more persuasive than powerless speech.

A more recent study, Wiley and Eskilson (1985), altered powerful and powerless speech styles in the written script of a managerial job interview. A photograph of a female or male applicant was presented with each script. The powerless script contained intensifiers, hedges, questioning, and hesitation forms. In the powerful script such cues were absent. Subjects rated the applicant on scales representing three major categories: liking, perceived future business success, and perceived acceptance in the work place. The female applicant, regardless of speech style, was perceived by both sexes as possessing more
situationally relevant traits than the male. Male respondents liked the female powerless applicant more than the female powerful applicant. Female respondents rated the powerful female applicant more positively on the liking dimension than the powerless female applicant. Neither sex made a differentiation for the male applicant. Applicants utilizing a powerful speech style received higher success and acceptance ratings. Interactions of speech style by gender of respondent were also found. Female ratings of success, acceptance, and liking differed significantly for the powerful and powerless scripts. Male ratings on these dimensions did not show this difference. The powerful applicant was also rated as possessing more situationally relevant traits than the powerless applicant. Again female respondents differed significantly on their ratings of the powerful and powerless scripts, while male respondents did not.

Wiley and Eskilson (1985) also examined particular items from the masculine and feminine dimensions. They found that the female applicant was rated as warmer. Applicants utilizing the powerful speech style were perceived as more aggressive, regardless of their gender. Aggressiveness ratings were, however, more extreme for the female applicant. The powerless female was rated as significantly less aggressive than the powerless male, and the powerful female was seen as more aggressive than the
powerful male. Male subjects differed from females in their perception of aggression. Females rated the male applicant as more aggressive than the female applicant, while males rated the female applicant as more aggressive than the male. Female respondents' ratings on aggression were more extreme than the ratings of male respondents.

This study suggests the importance of verbalizations to the female population. As Wiley and Eskilson's research indicates, females differentiate between the powerful and powerless speech styles more than do males. This could be interpreted as females' greater sensitivity to subtle cues as indicated in the literature on verbal (Gitter, Black, & Mostofsky, 1972; Kramer, 1974) and nonverbal behavior (Argyle, 1976). Moreover, females are judged more severely by both sexes when they use or omit these same linguistic markers. The more extreme aggression ratings of the female speaker using powerful or powerless speech can be interpreted as an instance of Lakoff's (1973) "damned if you do, damned if you don't" double bind on females. That is, females are not perceived as slightly aggressive or slightly non-aggressive. Instead, it appears to be an all or none phenomenon in which linguistic markers can make the difference between the two polar perceptions. With this in mind, females need to be aware of which image their speech style is creating and possibly alter their speech style as the situation dictates.
A study by Berryman-Fink and Wilcox (1983) investigated the cross-gender use of speech styles. The use of task and socioemotional verbalizations, pronunciation of -ing word endings, interruptions, pitch, intonation, and the number of words were manipulated in audiotaped conversations. The gender-appropriate tape consisted of one female using female language and one male using male language. For the gender-inappropriate tapes, female and male speakers exchanged scripts. Operationally, female speech used socioemotional verbalizations, correct pronunciations, no interruptions, high pitch, expressive intonation, and was 290 words in length. Male speech was defined as using task verbalizations, incorrect -ing pronunciations, interruptions, low pitch, nonexpressive intonation, and was 582 words in length. Subjects listened to either the gender-appropriate or gender-inappropriate audiotape. They then rated either the speaker on 20 scales of credibility, 15 scales of extroversion, 4 scales of activity, and 4 scales of confidence.

Berryman-Fink and Wilcox reported that speakers were rated differently according to the speech style utilized. The male utilizing male verbalizations was rated as more extroverted, less credible, confident, and active than the female speaker using gender-appropriate language. The male speaker using gender-inappropriate language was perceived as more credible, and less extroverted, active, and confident.
than the female utilizing male verbalizations. The use of gender-appropriate language by the male led to ratings of more extroversion, but less credibility and activity than when the male used female language. The female speaker was rated as more credible, but less extroverted and confident when she used female language than when she used male language.

In sum, Berryman-Fink and Wilcox found that female language contributed to the speaker's credibility. The authors concluded that speech styles, rather than gender, were the critical cues of differential perceptions. They also supported Lakoff's (1973) contention that an individual should utilize different speech rules as determined by the purpose and situation of the communication.

Berryman-Fink and Wilcox's finding of female language contributing to the speaker's credibility appears to contradict Erickson et al.'s (1978) finding of powerful speakers (i.e., those utilizing male language) being perceived as more credible. Berryman-Fink and Wilcox's analysis did not explain why female language was perceived as more credible. Moreover, past research is unable to explain this result. Comparison of Berryman-Fink and Wilcox's with Erickson et al.'s differing linguistic markers may be more telling. While the presence of the markers in the formers' scripts (e.g., correct pronunciation of -ing endings, less interruptions) made the speaker appear more
credible, the absence of the markers utilized in the latters' scripts (e.g., hedges, intensifiers) created the same impression. This suggests that the linguistic variations comprising female language may not be as homogeneous in their effect as once predicted. This in turn underlines the need for future research to study the effects of isolated markers. Another possible explanation for the discrepancy may be the differing situational cues. Erickson et al.'s scripts portrayed a courtroom testimony. The Berryman-Fink and Wilcox scripts, on the other hand, portrayed a male and female "in conversation." The level of formality, gravity of the situation and status cues were sufficiently disparate to alter the subject's perceptions of the speakers.

In regard to the authenticity of the research, listening to a conversation is a relatively realistic manipulation. However, having both speakers utilizing gender-appropriate or gender-inappropriate language is less realistic. In addition, having both speakers using gender-appropriate or inappropriate language may increase or diminish the effects of the markers. Having only one speaker gender-appropriate in some of the conditions would have controlled this problem.

A study by Liska et al. (1981) investigated the use of deferential and nondeferential language in written form. Deferential speech style was characterized by question
marks, tag questions, compound requests, absence of coarse language, lower frequency of interruptions, apologetic phrases, modal constructions, and qualifiers. Subjects read a script of four participants discussing a topic. Each side of the issue advocated by one deferential and one non-deferential speaker. After reading the script, subjects rated each participant on 32 scales derived from the Bem Sex Role Inventory (1974) and various scales of believability.

Liska et al. reported a number of findings. The deferential speech style was rated as more submissive, less assertive, less willing to take a stand, less believable, more feminine, and more caring. Males rated the deferential speakers as more friendly. Female subjects rated the deferential language users as more sincere and honest, although they were less likely to accept the opinion expressed deferentially. The masculine and feminine rating scales were found to be of less import than scales of power and personal warmth. That is, the speech styles had a stronger impact on the ratings of power and personal warmth, but did not affect the masculinity and femininity ratings to the same degree. The authors suggested that the use of stimuli in which the participant's gender was made more salient may cause the masculine and feminine scales to assume more importance. The possible relationship between power, personal warmth, masculinity, and femininity was not
explored in this study. Perhaps powerfulness and masculinity are correlated as may be warmth and femininity.

Until recently, there has been a gap in the research investigating female and male verbal patterns. A study investigating the effects of an isolated linguistic marker was not reported until 1986 by Rasmussen and Moely. These two researchers investigated the perception of speakers utilizing the seven linguistic categories proposed by Lakoff (1973, 1975). The seven categories were: tag questions, the intensifier so, polite forms, "empty" adjectives, precise color naming, hedges, and weaker expletives for female speech. Two short stories were created utilizing one of the markers from each of the seven categories. This rendered a total of 14 stories. Subjects were presented the 14 stories with a male or female character utilizing either male or female language forms. After reading a story, the subjects rated the speaker on 23, 5-point scales of instrumentality and emotionality derived from the sex-role literature.

Rasmussen and Moely found that speakers utilizing female speech were perceived as more feminine and socially positive and as less masculine and instrumental. The female speaker implementing cross-gender verbalizations was perceived as uppity. The male speaker using female speech was perceived as homosexual. Males rated speakers utilizing female language as less instrumental than did females.
Males also perceived female speakers as more instrumental than male speakers on some categories.

In addition, Rasmussen and Moely report an unexpected finding. Males rated females as more competent than males in some instances, regardless of the language form utilized. The authors surmise that this finding is due to two factors. The first is the increase of the average female competency score through the use of the more instrumental male language by some females. The second factor is the converse: when males utilize the less competent female speech forms, the average competency score for males decreased. Statistical support for this contention was non-significant. Another possible explanation for this finding is relative comparison. For example, the subjects may have assumed that males are competent and females are incompetent, in general (Broverman et al., 1972). Given this, the listeners may have rated a male using female language forms as severely incompetent after reading about a female using the more competent male speech. Perhaps female competency makes male incompetency more poignant. Having one subject read 14 stories in one sitting, as in this study, could enhance such carry-over effects, thereby throwing doubt on all of the research's findings.

Of the linguistic categories, Rasmussen and Moely found that only five (expletives, adjectives, polite forms, hedges, and intensifiers) altered subjects' perceptions of
the speakers. The use of weaker expletives was seen as more feminine. Speakers using stronger expletives were rated as more masculine, competent, influential, important, etc., and as less socially positive. The use of strong expletives by a female led to the perception of that female as being uppity. Speakers using empty adjectives were rated as more feminine, trivial, incompetent, and as less masculine and instrumental. Individuals implementing males' non-polite verbalizations were seen as less socially positive, but not as more instrumental. Likewise, females' polite verbalizations increased perceived social positiveness but did not decrease perceived instrumentality. Regardless of whether males used the female (e.g., so) or the male (e.g., very) intensifier, males were rated as more homosexual. Although not mentioned by the investigators, this finding suggests that all intensifiers, not just the intensifier so, may be indicative of female speech.

While Rasmussen and Moely's research begins to address the question of which specific linguistic markers alter perceptions, word choice is probably not the whole of it. Perceptions are most likely altered through the interaction of specific word usage and frequency of usage. Therefore, the much needed research investigating specifics will have to be complex, altering word choice and word frequency.

In summary, results from the research on male and female verbalizations are missed. Some indicators of male
and female speech styles appear to be more sensitive to situational cues than are other indicators. While intensifiers, qualifiers, and questions appear to be used in a more consistent fashion, markers such as interruptions, speech time, and verbosity appear to be used in more varied patterns. Little research has been done in this area, and the specifics of these patterns remain elusive. The relatively consistent powerless markers are the more frequent use of qualifiers, questions, hedges, intensifiers, tag questions, compound requests, hesitation forms, and modal constructions. These powerless markers alter perceptions of the speaker on a number of dimensions of likability, competence, and power. The powerless markers are perceived as more feminine and indicative of a female speaker. The research on speech styles has found that females utilize these powerless markers more frequently than do males. In addition, individuals who use powerless verbalizations are seen as possessing a significant level of feminine traits. Replication of findings in this literature is rare due to the vast range of cues and rating dimensions utilized in the research. The operational definitions of markers are absent in some studies. Different labels are frequently utilized for the same marker (e.g., compound requests may be referred to as imperative constructions). In addition, the written presentation of speech styles may not be an appropriate means of assessing an aural
phenomenon. While the research utilizing written dialogues has rendered promising results, little research has manipulated auditory stimuli.

Situational Cues

As indicated earlier, investigators rarely attend to situational cues in their research. Experience, logic, and implications of the research indicate that such cues may have significant impact on verbal behavior (Berger, 1985; Kramer, 1974). Some investigators acknowledge this, but only after they have completed their research (Berryman & Eman, 1980; Berryman-Fink & Wilcox, 1983; Smythe et al., 1983). Other researchers have examined contextual cues and report significant effects (Crosby, Jose, & Wong-McCarthy, 1981; St. Lawrence, Hansen, Cutts, Tisdelle, & Irish, 1985; Steckler & Rosenthal, 1985; Warfel, 1984).

Steckler and Rosenthal (1985) instructed 25 male and 25 female subjects to simulate conversations with a boss, a peer, or a subordinate. The audiotapes were edited and transcripts were made. The tapes were re-recorded through a content filtering machine, which blocked out the words leaving the tone of voice and tempo audible. A separate group of subjects, four males and four females, listened to the tapes and read the transcripts. The subjects were informed that the segments would include calls to a boss, to
a coworker, and to a subordinate. The subjects rated each segment on six, 9-point scales of warmth and competence.

Steckler and Rosenthal's analysis rendered a significant difference between the tapes and the transcripts. The individuals in the transcripts were rated as being more competent and warm than the taped speakers. Females were rated as highly competent when speaking to the boss and subordinate, but received low competence ratings when speaking to the peer. Males were perceived as more highly competent when speaking to the peer and subordinate, but received low competence ratings when speaking to the boss. Speakers were not rated differentially on the warmth dimension. The findings of this research indicate that individuals do utilize different speech depending upon the receiver of the communication. In this regard, perhaps the relevant cue is relative status. In addition, males and females differ significantly as to which speech styles they utilize in the different situations. A major problem with this study, however, is the small number of raters.

Montepare and Vega (1988) studied women's spontaneous speech with intimate versus casual male friends. Six female undergraduates were asked to record the first 20-second portion of their telephone conversations with one intimate and one casual male friend. Twenty female undergraduates were then asked to listen to each of the segments and rate the speakers on seven vocal and four trait qualities.
Subjects were also asked to identify the partner as either an intimate or casual male friend. Two independent judges coded the transcripts as to the number of words, sentences, 2-second pauses, repetitions, nouns, pronouns, questions, words per sentence, and utterances without verbs from transcripts. The judges also coded the scripts with regard to speaking rate, the total number of different words used, and the number of times the pronouns I, you, and we were used. A follow-up study was then conducted using two additional subjects. The subjects were asked to read each transcript and rate speakers using the same rating scales as the original twenty listeners.

The findings of Montepare and Vega’s (1988) research are questionable. The research has a number of flaws such as using relative comparisons, low stimulus exposure of 20 seconds, failing to control testing in groups versus individually, and treating a random variable (random assignment of the stimuli to one of two "sets") as an independent variable. Despite these errors, the authors conclude that women’s speech is perceived as more feminine, pleasant, approachable, sincere, submissive, and scatterbrained when talking to an intimate versus casual male friend. The women’s speech was also perceived as higher in pitch with more variable intonation when speaking intimately as opposed to casually. In addition, Montepare and Vega (1988) report that neither the judges ratings nor
those of the subjects in the follow-up study were able to show a significant difference between intimate versus casual conversation partners. The authors concluded that the variables of intimate versus casual conversational partners had more of an effect on paralinguistic rather than linguistic aspects of women's spontaneous speech.

A study by Crosby et al. (1981) investigated the use of female register, verbal reinforcers (e.g., okay, uh-huh) and number of words spoken in mixed-sex, dyadic, role-playing situations. Female register was defined as the use of tag questions, hedges, empty adjectives, and the intensifier so. Subjects were tested to determine their sex-role orientation on both the Bem Sex Role Inventory and the Spence and Helmreich Personal Attributes Questionnaire. Measures of self-esteem and assertiveness were also administered. Either prior to or following completion of the self-report inventories the subjects were given one of two ethical dilemmas in either a party (expressive) or debate (instrumental) role-playing situation. The subjects were then instructed to arrive at a mutual resolution to the dilemma.

Crosby et al. (1981) report that females gave more verbal reinforcers. Females with low self-esteem scores utilized more female register than females with high self-esteem scores. Androgynous females utilized more female register than did androgynous males. Androgynous females
were found to be less assertive and androgynous males more assertive than the other sex-role groupings. Feminine females utilized significantly more female register in the expressive situation and significantly less female register in the instrumental situation than the other sex-role groupings. Masculine, assertive individuals used more words, regardless of the situation. Subjects of both sexes utilized significantly more words in the instrumental condition than in the expressive condition.

The findings of Crosby et al. (1981) indicate that situational factors such as the formality or level of structure of the communication setting alters the spontaneous use of sex-linked speech patterns. However, the grouping of four different categories of linguistic markers into one category makes conclusions about specific categories impossible.

The effects of situation on the perception of the speaker were investigated by St. Lawrence et al. (1985). St Lawrence et al. manipulated three situations (commendatory, refusal, or a combination of both), speaker behavior (assertive, unassertive), speaker sex, and subject sex. Assertive behavior was defined as louder speech, shorter speech latency, shorter speech duration, and more assertive verbal content. The stimulus videotapes consisted of a male or female speaker who responded to prompts from an off-stage male or female partner. The speakers responded in either an
assertive or unassertive manner in all three situations. Subjects viewed four everyday scenarios of one assertive or unassertive speaker in one of the three situations. Speakers were then rated on likability, competence, honesty, and interpersonal sensitivity.

St. Lawrence et al.'s analysis of the data rendered a significant difference between situations. Speakers in the refusal situations were rated as more honest than speakers viewed in both situations. Speakers in commendatory situations were rated as less honest than speakers viewed in both situations. Assertive speakers were perceived as more competent and honest but less likeable and interpersonally sensitive than unassertive speakers. Assertive speakers seen in commendatory situations were rated as more likeable than assertive speakers seen in only refusal situations.

St. Lawrence et al.'s findings indicate the importance of situational factors on the perception of speakers. This research, however, is unsystematic in its definitions and manipulations. The term "assertive verbal content" is not defined nor described. The verbal content was not presented in a consistent manner, such as a script. Rather, the speakers appeared to have created spontaneous dialogues. In addition, nonverbal cues (e.g., facial expression, body posture) were not controlled in a systematic manner. The lack of precision in this study may explain why the gender of the speaker appeared to have no effect. Likewise,
without a clear definition of assertive verbal content, this research is limited as to its contribution to the study of perceptions of verbal patterns.

A study by Warfel (1984) manipulated three communication settings (courtroom, business, and social settings) and sex and communication style of speaker. To manipulate speech styles, the authors utilized the script format similar to that of Erickson et al. (1978). The powerless scripts contained qualifiers, compound requests, tag questions, and disclaimers. The generic scripts lacked these linguistic markers. Subjects read one version of the conversation and rated the speaker on 32, nine-point scales of credibility, competence, personal and task attraction. Following this, the Bem Sex Role Inventory (1974) was administered to determine the subject's sex-role orientation.

Warfel (1984) found that sex-typed subjects labeled generic speech as masculine and powerless speech as feminine. Non-sex-typed individuals did not make this differentiation. Generic speakers were rated as more dominant, but less competent than powerless speakers. Speakers in the office setting were perceived as least competent and attractive. Speakers in the social setting were perceived as most competent and attractive. There was no significant interaction between speech style and communication setting. In this and most of the
aforementioned research, the speaker is cast in a lower status role (e.g., courtroom witness, job applicant). Therefore, this study demonstrates the effect of certain situational cues and speech styles on perceptions of lower status speakers. It does not address how these situational cues and verbalizations may alter the perception of speakers who are in positions of higher status.

The research reviewed above indicates that females and males alter their verbalizations dependent upon the intended receiver of the communication. A significant cue may be relative status. In addition, the formality of the situation has been found to have an effect on linguistic styles. Communication situation and setting have also been shown to have significant effects on subjects' perceptions of speakers. This indicates that what may be seen in one situation as competent cannot be generalized as competent behavior in all situations. To date, the research has not addressed perceptions of high status speaker. In addition, the research has been limited to conversations of two or more. This introduces the confound of comparative perceptions.

Rationale and Hypothesis

This review of the literature suggests that the genders utilize different speech styles. Males and females differ in the pronunciation of words and vocabulary choice (Smith,
1979), the use of expletives, qualifiers, disclaimers, numerical approximations, and topic shifters (Eakins & Eakins, 1978). Female speech has been found to contain more intensifiers, modal constructions, compound requests, tag questions (McMillian et al., 1977), and fillers than male speech (Smythe et al., 1983). The female speech patterns are believed to convey uncertainty, topic irrelevance, and powerlessness (Eakins & Eakins, 1978; Lakoff, 1973; McMillian et al., 1977; Smith, 1979; Smythe et al., 1983). The use of these verbalizations by females may serve to maintain and reinforce the imbalance of power between the sexes. Situational cues, such as receiver of the communication, affect individuals' speech patterns (Crosby et al., 1981; Steckler & Rosenthal, 1985).

The perception of sex-linked speech styles has also been investigated. Subjects do perceive some speech forms as gendered, and the females who use the female verbalizations are perceived as submissive, dependent, passive, etc. (Edelsky, 1976). Speakers who use male (powerful) speech are perceived as significantly different than those who use female (powerless) speech (Berryman-Fink & Wilcox, 1983; Erickson et al., 1978; Liska et al., 1981; Warfel, 1984; Wiley & Eskilson, 1985). How these linguistic markers are perceived is affected by the gender of the speaker (Erickson et al., 1978; Wiley & Eskilson, 1985), the gender of the subject (Erickson et al., 1978; Liska et al.,
1981; Wiley & Eskilson, 1985), and the mode of script presentation (Erickson et al., 1978). Communication settings also alter the subjects' perceptions of the speaker.

The present experiment investigated the effects of male and female speech styles on the perceptions of clinical psychologists. The research to this point has been in other settings such as business and law (Erickson et al., 1978; Steckler & Rosenthal, 1985; Warfel, 1984; Wiley & Eskilson, 1985). Due to the different type of power issues in therapy, it is reasonable to assume that the perceptions in other contexts would not necessarily apply to the therapeutic relationship (Strong, 1968; Strong & Matross, 1973). As Warfel's (1984) research indicates, such situational cues do alter perceptions. In addition, the present research obtained data that addresses how perceptions differ when the speaker is in the higher status role, rather than the lower status role of past research.

The literature on perceptions of speech indicates that the gender of the speaker affects perceptions (Erickson et al., 1978; Wiley & Eskilson, 1985). Based on this research, the current experiment focused on subjects' perceptions of gender-appropriate and gender-inappropriate speech. To avoid the possible confound of relative evaluations, this study utilized a one-sided script. Being subjected to a one-sided conversation may not be as unusual or unrealistic
as listening to a two-sided conversation and rating one of the two speakers.

The mode of presentation has also been shown to alter perceptions of the speaker (Erickson et al., 1978). Audiocassettes were chosen for this study for two reasons. Liska et al. (1981) suggest that speaker sex may need to be of sufficient salience to have an effect on the listeners' perceptions. Written presentation may diminish the salience of gender while aural and visual presentation may allow gender to remain salient. Visual presentation, however, brings in possible confounds of physical attractiveness and nonverbal cues.

The current investigation hypothesized that:

1. Clinicians using male speech styles would be perceived as more powerful, competent, and masculine than those using female speech styles.

2. Clinicians using female speech styles would be perceived as more attractive, trustworthy, and feminine than those using male speech styles.

3. Clinicians using gender-inappropriate language would be less liked and perceived as less trustworthy.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects were 80 male and 80 female undergraduates enrolled in introductory psychology classes at the University of North Texas and received extra credit for their participation. The sample was limited to native speakers of American English.

Design

The experiment was a 2 (subject sex) x 2 (stimulus sex) x 2 (speech style) design. All variables were between subjects with 20 subjects in each cell.

Stimulus Materials

Four audiotapes were made, two for each stimulus condition. A male actor and a female actor read from a script depicting a clinical psychologist introducing a client to psychotherapy. These actors were trained to deliver the speech at the same rate and with similar intonations. The tapes were matched for length and were recorded and presented at similar volumes. Two versions of the script were used for the manipulation of speech style. The powerless script utilized intensifiers, questioning
forms, tag questions, qualifiers, modal constructions, compound requests, hedges, and hesitation forms. (See Appendix A.) The powerful script lacked these linguistic markers. (See Appendix B.)

Each audiotape was approximately 2 minutes long. This exceeds the length of Steckler and Rosenthal's (1985) audiotape segments. In written form, the script was approximately a page and a half, or 391 words, in length. This is equal to the script length of Wiley and Eskilson's (1985) research and exceeds the scripts of Warfel (1984), Smythe et al. (1983), Rasmussen and Moely (1986), and Edelsky (1976), and the female language script of Berryman-Fink and Wilcox (1983).

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted to serve as a manipulation check on the choice of language style markers and voice qualities of the speaker. Forty-one female and thirty-three male undergraduates served as the subjects. Subjects read either the female or male script and then rated the speaker on 7-point scales of perceived status, professionalism, certainty, dominance, self-confidence, script believability, and realism. Subjects were asked to guess the speaker's sex and the number of questions the speaker asked. In addition, the subjects were asked if the speaker appeared to be hesitant and unsure, and if the speaker qualified, hedged,
or exaggerated while speaking. Finally, the subjects were asked to guess the number of requests the speaker made, the number of questions the speaker asked, and the speaker's gender. After completing the items, the subjects were asked to repeat the procedure using the other script. The order of script presentation was counterbalanced. The subjects were then asked to listen to a 3-minute audiotape of either the male or female voice discussing the benefits of psychotherapy. When the subjects were finished listening to the audiotape, they rated the speaker on three, 7-point scales of perceived pleasantness, soothingness, and smoothness. Subjects were also asked to guess the speaker's sex. After completing the items the subjects were asked to repeat the procedure with the other audiotape. The order of tape presentation was counterbalanced.

The means for the scripts are presented in Table 1. T-tests were performed to determine the significance of the mean differences. Analysis indicates that the scripts were rated similarly on believability ($M = 4.95, SD = 1.64$), understandability ($M = 5.66, SD = 1.33$), and realism ($M = 5.32, SD = 1.52$), friendliness ($M = 4.85, SD = 1.39$), qualifying ($M = 1.24, SD = 4.3$), exaggeration ($M = 1.89, SD = .32$), and number of requests ($M = 4.12, SD = 2.26$). Thus, the scripts were equivalent in several ways.

The female language script was rated as having significantly more questions ($M = 4.94, SD = 2.77$), $t (63) =$
-4.56, \( p < .001 \), than the male language script (\( M = 1.88, SD = 2.04 \)). The script containing male language markers was rated as significantly higher on the dimensions of self-confidence (\( M = 6.1, SD = 1.22, t(63) = 4.77, p < .001 \), status (\( M = 5.61, SD = 1.25 \)), \( t(63) = 3.62, p < .001 \), professionalism (\( M = 5.52, SD = 1.7 \)), \( t(63) = 3.12, p < .01 \), certainty (\( M = 5.90, SD = 1.37 \)), \( t(63) = 4.55, p < .001 \) and dominance (\( M = 5.6, SD = 1.43 \)), \( t(63) = 5.28, p < .001 \), than the female script (\( M = 4.69, SD = 1.7; M = 4.47, SD = 1.55; M = 4.61, SD = 1.6; M = 4.92, SD = 1.89; M = 4.2, SD = 1.7 \); respectively). In addition, subjects rated the male language script as more hesitant (\( M = 1.97, SD = .17 \)), \( t(63) = 7.56, p < .001 \), unsure (\( M = 1.78, SD = .45 \)), \( t(63) = 2.56, p < .05 \), hedging (\( M = 1.97, SD = .3 \)), \( t(63) = 7.56, p < .001 \), than the script containing female language markers (\( M = 1.3, SD = .5; M = 1.48, SD = .5; M = 1.3, SD = .5 \); respectively).

The ratings for the male language script appear to be a contradiction. A possible interpretation is that listeners did not consciously count hedgers, hesitation forms, and other linguistic markers. The overall effect and its extrapolation to the characteristics of the speaker, however, are in the expected direction. The subjects inability to determine the correct gender for each script is also an indication that these perceptions are not totally on
a conscious level, as asserted in Lakoff's (1973) initial work.

The two scripts were accepted as a result of their similarity on the dimensions of believability, understandability, and realism. The manipulations of language style are of sufficient strength as indicated by the expected higher ratings of the male scripts on the dimensions of self-confidence, status, professionalism, certainty, and dominance.

The means for the male and female voice are presented in Table 2. T-tests were performed to determine the significance of mean differences. Results indicate that the speakers' voices were not rated as significantly different on the dimensions of pleasantness (M = 4.89, SD = 1.49), soothingness (M = 4.19, SD = 1.57), and smoothness (M = 5.06, SD = 1.45). All subjects were able to correctly identify the male voice as a male and the female voice as a female $\chi^2(2) = 146.00, p < .001$. The two speakers were accepted as a result of these similarities and being correctly identified as a male or female.

Instrumentation

Demographic Sheet

This part of the questionnaires collected demographic information about the subject. Age, sex, native tongue,
race, place of origin, major, and year in school were requested. (See Appendix E.)

The Bem Sex-Role Inventory

The Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem, 1974) was used to determine perceived masculinity and femininity of the speaker. (See Appendix F.) The BSRI was originally designed to assess an individual’s sex-role orientation by self-report. Support for using the BSRI as a means of rating another individual comes from previous research. Gillen’s (1981) research utilized the BSRI to determine perceived sex-role orientation of a stimulus person. Liska et al. (1981) used the BSRI to determine subjects’ perceptions of speakers who utilized male or female speech styles.

The BSRI consists of 60 adjectives or phrases that are divided into three, 20-item scales: Masculinity, Femininity, and Social Desirability. The Femininity scale is comprised of items that are considered more socially desirable for females than for males. The Masculinity scale is comprised of items that are considered more socially desirable for males than for females. The remaining 20 neutral items were originally included to assess social desirability response sets. These neutral items now serve as a neutral context for the Masculinity and Femininity scales (Bem, 1974).
To obtain the 40 sex-role items of the BSRI, Bem compiled approximately 200 personality characteristics that she and her associates perceived to be positive for males or females. Undergraduates were then asked to rate each of those items on its social desirability for either an American male or female. The characteristic was incorporated into the Femininity scale if it was rated by both males and females to be significantly more desirable for a female than for a male. Likewise, if a characteristic was rated as significantly more desirable for a male than a female, it was incorporated into the Masculinity scale.

The reliability and validity of the BSRI was reported by Bem (1974). The BSRI was re-administered to 56 subjects from the normative sample approximately 4 weeks after the first administration. The resulting product-moment correlations for the Masculinity and Femininity scales were .90, indicating that both scores were reliable over the 4-week period. In addition, correlations were run on the BSRI with the Masculinity and Femininity scales of the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (GZTS). The BSRI was moderately correlated with the CPI and not at all correlated with the GZTS. Bem stated that since none of the correlations were particularly high, this indicates that the BSRI is measuring aspects of the sex-roles that are not directly tapped by either of the other scales.
To determine the therapist's perceived sex-role orientation, subjects rated the therapist on each of the items. The ratings are based on a seven-point, Likert-type scale, with one being "not at all descriptive" and seven being "very descriptive." To obtain the masculinity scale score, the masculine items were summed and the mean for each subject was calculated. The mean of the masculine items served as the masculine scale score. The femininity score was obtained in the same manner.

Power

Perceived power was measured using a semantic differential scale consisting of 42 counterbalanced bipolar adjectives. (See Appendix G.) This scale was developed for Young's (1986) thesis and was used in Kratz, Marshall, and Young (1989). One problem with the scale is a probable overlap with status. Others (e.g., Henley, 1977; LaFrance & Mayo, 1979) have addressed the issue of separating variables of status and power. At the conceptual level there is a difference. However, to date, operationalization of these variables remains confounded. A recent factor analysis of this scale (Marshall, personal communication) yielded three dimensions, roughly corresponding to the competence, leadership, and non-directiveness of powerful individuals. A reliability analysis was performed on each of the three dimensions using this sample. Obtained alphas were .92,
.92, and .87, respectively. Scores were summed and a mean obtained for each dimension.

Counselor Rating Form - Short Version

The Counselor Rating Form - Short Version (CRF-S) (Corrigan & Schmidt, 1983) is an abbreviated version of the Counselor Rating Form (CRF) developed by Barak & LaCrosse (1975). The CRF-S consists of four items from each of the CRF's subscales of expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness (See Appendix H).

Corrigan and Schmidt (1983) developed the CRF-S by compiling factor analytic studies of the CRF and selecting items with consistent high factor loadings. Items were also selected to reflect an eighth-grade reading comprehension level. College students were then instructed to view the counseling films of Carl Rogers, Frederick Pearls, and Albert Ellis and rate each therapist on the items. In addition, clients from a community mental health outpatient program were asked to rate their counselor immediately following a session using the CRF-S. Factor analysis of the ratings supported the three dimensional structure of the CRF-S. Reliability of the scale was determined through split-half procedures and was found to be reasonable. Additional research has demonstrated the CRF's ability to discriminate within and between counselors on the three dimensions (Ponterotto & Furlong, 1985).
A more recent statistical analysis (Tracey, Glidden, & Kokotovic, 1988) explored goodness-of-fit on several theoretical models. The authors report that the two-step hierarchical model obtains the best fit to the constructs of the CRF-S. This model contends that the CRF-S is comprised of three relatively independent social influence factors of attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness. Each of these three factors is then independently related to a single global "good guy" factor. Following Tracey et al.'s (1988) recommendations, scores were summed for each social influence dimension as well as the global dimension.

Additional Items

Six supplemental questions assessed the desirability of the speaker as a therapist (See Appendix I). Subjects were asked how much they liked the therapist and how likely they would be to see the speaker for general assistance, for help with a vocational problem, and for help with a personal problem. Each question was presented along a seven-point scale from "not at all likely" to "very likely." Subjects were also asked to rate the therapist on assertiveness and to determine the therapist's gender.

Procedure

The tape presentation was randomized by the time on the subject sign-up sheets. Each session contained 3 to 25 subjects. Experimenters were trained to run the sessions
and were given scripts to minimize experimenter effects. (See Appendix J.) An experimenter met the subjects and ushered them into the room, ensuring subjects sat in chairs with envelopes placed below them, leaving an empty seat between subjects. The experimenter then distributed the informed consent forms and collected the forms as they were completed. (See Appendix H.) Reading from the scripts, the experimenter explained the study's purpose as the evaluation of various introductory statements by clinical psychologists. Subjects were also told that a group discussion of the introductory statements would follow completion of the forms. This statement was designed to create a higher level of task involvement so that the subjects would attend to the statements of the clinician. Chaiken (1980) found that low task involvement may allow the listeners to utilize only simple decision rules (e.g., gender stereotypes). High task involvement, however, may cause subjects to attend to the message rather than relying on salient superficial cues. The tape was then played, followed by the subjects completing the questionnaires. Debriefing occurred after the participants had finished with the forms.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on the two scales of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, using masculinity and femininity as dependent variables and subject sex, speaker sex, and language style as independent variables. This analysis addressed Hypotheses 1 and 2. Significant main effects were found for language style, multivariate $F(2, 150) = 4.38, p < .05$, and speaker sex $F(2, 150) = 6.79, p < .01$. Univariate ANOVAs were performed to determine which dependent variables were involved in these effects. Hypothesis 1, which proposed that the male speech style would be rated as more masculine than the female speech style was not supported ($M = 99.89, SD = 17.43$). The main effect for language style involved the rating of femininity $F(1, 151) = 8.06, p < .01$. Subjects rated the speaker utilizing female language markers as more feminine ($M = 76.65, SD = 16.87$) than the speaker utilizing male language markers ($M = 68.3, SD = 16.37$). This finding supports Hypothesis 2 and is evidence for the effectiveness of the manipulation. The main effect for speaker sex involved the rating of masculinity $F(1, 151) = 10.83, p < .001$. Subjects rated the female speaker as more masculine.
than the male speaker ($M = 95.44$, $SD = 19.02$).

A MANOVA was performed on the three sub-scales of the Counselor Rating Form - Short Version, using attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness as dependent variables and subject sex, speaker sex, and language style as independent variables. This analysis addressed Hypotheses 2 and 3. A significant main effect was found for speaker gender, multivariate $F (3, 149) = 6.14, p < .001$. Univariate ANOVAs were performed to determine which dependent variables were involved in this effect. The main effect for speaker gender involved the rating of expertness $F (1, 151) = 10.03, p < .01$. Subjects rated the female therapist as more expert ($M = 23.16$, $SD = 3.62$) than the male therapist ($M = 21.08$, $SD = 4.57$). Hypothesis 2, which proposed that the speaker utilizing female speech styles would be rated as more attractive than the speaker utilizing male speech styles was not supported at the multivariate level, but was supported at the univariate level $F (1, 151) = 5.26, p < .05$ ($M$ male = 15.15, $SD = 5.39$; $M$ female = 17.27, $SD = 6.15$).

Hypothesis 2 which also proposed that the therapist using female speech styles would be rated as more trustworthy than the therapist using male speech styles was not supported at the multivariate or univariate level ($M = 20.75$, $SD = 4.11$). Nor was Hypothesis 3 supported which proposed an interaction between speaker gender and language
Clinicians using gender-inappropriate language markers were not perceived as less trustworthy than speakers using gender-appropriate language markers ($M = 20.75$, $SD = 4.11$).

A MANOVA was performed on the three factors of the power scale using competence, leadership, and non-directiveness as the dependent variables and subject gender, speaker gender, and language style as independent variables. This analysis addressed Hypothesis 1. A significant main effect was found for speaker sex, multivariate $F(3, 149) = 9.52$, $p < .001$. The main effect for speaker sex involved the ratings of competence $F(1, 151) = 5.36$, $p < .05$, leadership $F(1, 151) = 25.94$, $p < .001$, and non-directive style $F(1, 151) = 4.65$, $p < .05$. Subjects rated the male therapist as more competent ($M = 45.3$, $SD = 12.58$), and as possessing more leadership qualities ($M = 46.18$, $SD = 13.82$) than the female therapist ($M = 40.54$, $SD = 12.99$; $M = 35.79$, $SD = 11.14$; respectively). On the other dimension of power, however, the female clinician was rated as more non-directive ($M = 50.49$, $SD = 10.11$) than the male clinician ($M = 46.86$, $SD = 10.66$). Hypothesis 1, which proposed that the speaker using male language markers would be rated as more competent than the speaker using female language markers was not supported ($M = 42.91$, $SD = 13.37$). Language style did render a main effect on one dimension of power at the univariate level $F(1, 151) = 4.33$, $p < .05$, but not at the
multivariate level. The male language style was rated as more non-directive ($M = 50.43$, $SD = 9.93$) than the female language style ($M = 46.92$, $SD = 10.5$).

A MANOVA was performed on the supplemental questions using the individual questions as dependent variables and the subject gender, speaker gender, and speech style as independent variables. A significant main effect was found for speaker sex, multivariate $F (6, 146) = 164.94$, $p < .001$. The main effect for speaker sex involved the rating of assertiveness $F (1, 151) = 14.07$, $p < .001$. Subjects rated the female clinician as more assertive ($M = 5.4$, $SD = 1.32$) than the male clinician ($M = 4.51$, $SD = 1.64$).

A significant main effect was found for speech style, multivariate $F (5, 146) = 3.18$, $p < .01$. The main effect for speaker sex involved the ratings of how much they liked the therapist $F (1, 151) = 5.36$, $p < .05$, how likely the subject would go to the therapist in general $F (1, 151) = 5.13$, $p < .05$, and how likely the subject would go to the therapist for a personal problem $F (1, 151) = 6.13$, $p < .01$. Subjects rated the clinician who used female linguistic markers as the clinician they liked more ($M = 3.66$, $SD = 1.62$), were more likely to go to ($M = 3.35$, $SD = 1.87$), and were more likely to go to for a personal problem ($M = 3.23$, $SD = 1.91$), than the clinician using male linguistic markers ($M = 3.1$, $SD = 1.4$; $M = 2.76$, $SD = 1.39$; $M = 2.56$, $SD = 1.44$; respectively).
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The results of this experiment provided partial support for two out of three hypotheses. Only the independent variables of language style and speaker sex were found to affect the ratings of various speaker characteristics. Before discussing the results, limitations due to the methodology should be addressed.

First, manipulating a number of linguistic markers at the same time makes it impossible to determine which particular marker rendered which effect or to even ensure that the markers do not have counteracting effects. At the same time, manipulating a selected few linguistic categories may not reflect real world speech patterns.

Second, the methodology utilized only auditory stimuli. The lack of visual presentation of the clinician limits the generalizability to an actual therapeutic setting. In the same regard, listening to a one-sided conversation while in a group has generalizability to some situations (e.g., classroom, group desensitization), it may not be applicable to all therapeutic settings.

Finally, the utilization of only one male and one female speaker limits the strength of the conclusions.
Idiosyncratic voice qualities may have accounted for the differences by gender. The pilot study was employed to decrease the possibility that the two speakers varied along the dimensions of pleasantness, smoothness, and soothingness. The possibility of a confound, however, is acknowledged.

Effect of Speaker Gender

The manipulation of clinician gender was found to differentially affect ratings of clinicians' characteristics. The female speaker was perceived as more attractive than the male speaker, as in Erickson et al.'s (1978) study. The female speaker was also perceived as less competent and as possessing less leadership qualities than the male speaker. This finding is consistent with the theories underlying and previous research on sex stereotyping (Bem, 1974; Broverman et al., 1972).

Surprisingly, the female speaker was rated as more expert, masculine, and assertive than the male speaker. This finding is not consistent with the sex stereotype research. One study on non-verbal communication (Kratz, 1988) did find similar results. The author suggests that the higher masculinity and expert ratings of the female therapist may be an artifact of being in an occupation that is perceived as male dominated. In reference to power, the female clinician was perceived as more non-directive than
the male clinician. Extrapolating from Kratz's (1988) conclusion, it would logically follow that a female clinician would be perceived as possessing power. Combined with the theories on sex-stereotypes, it is reasonable that the female psychologist's power would not be the competent and leadership power of the male psychologist, but a more gentle or mentoring non-directive type of power.

Effect of Speech Styles

The hypotheses involved the effects of language styles on ratings of power, attractiveness, trustworthiness, femininity, and masculinity. Hypothesis 2, stating that the clinician using female speech style would be perceived as more attractive, trustworthy, and feminine than the clinician using male speech style, received partial support. The female utilizing female linguistic markers was perceived as more feminine than the speaker utilizing male linguistic markers. This is consistent with past research on speech styles (Edelsky, 1976; Liska et al., 1981; Rasmussen & Moely, 1986; Warfel, 1984). This finding also supports Lakoff's (1973) initial contention that the use of female language styles leads to the perception of the speaker as possessing feminine qualities.

Examination of the general desirability questions renders two more relevant findings. First, the utilization of female language resulted in being liked more than the
clinician using male language. This is similar to Rasmussen and Moely's (1986) finding that female speech was perceived as more socially positive. Second, subjects indicated that they would be more likely to go to the clinician using female language for help with a general or personal problem than the clinician using male language. These results are viewed as supporting the finding that the speaker using female language was perceived as more feminine, and, therefore, more cheerful, understanding, warm, and sympathetic.

Hypothesis 1, stating that the clinician using male speech styles would be perceived as more powerful, competent, and masculine than the clinician using female speech styles received partial support. Male linguistic markers resulted in higher ratings powerful on one of the three dimensions of power. The speaker using male speech styles was rated as more non-directive than the speaker using female speech styles. Given that this finding was significant only at the univariate level while the main effects of speaker sex on power were significant at both the univariate and multivariate levels, the conclusion that speech style significantly affects the perception of the speaker's power is probably premature.

The general failure of language style to alter subjects' perceptions of the speaker may be due to the failing of another manipulation. Subjects were told that
they would be expected to participate in a group discussion about the introductory statements. This was an attempt to increase task involvement, thereby reducing the likelihood of sex stereotypes (Chaiken, 1980). The large number of speaker gender main effects, the lack of language main effects, and interactions between speaker gender and language suggests that sex stereotypes were the primary cues to the ratings of the speaker.

The failure to replicate the finding of male language being perceived as more masculine while female language was perceived as more feminine may be due to an erroneous definition of male language. Some researchers have used the lack of female linguistic markers to define male speech styles (Erickson et al., 1978; Liska et al., 1981; Rasmussen & Moely, 1986; Wiley & Eskilson, 1985). Warfel (1984), however, used the lack of female linguistic markers as the definition of generic language. Berryman-Fink and Wilcox (1983) used one set of markers (e.g., socioemotional verbalizations) for female language and a different set of markers (e.g., task verbalizations) for male language. Erickson et al.'s (1978) study assumed, as did the current study, that the less female linguistic markers utilized the less the speech was indicative of female language. Erickson et al.'s research also failed to obtain a main effect of language style on the perceived masculinity of the speaker. It may be that the definitions utilized in Warfel's and
Berryman-Fink and Wilcox's research are more accurate, or perhaps more effective, at altering perceptions of speakers' masculinity.

**Effect of Subject Gender**

Subject sex did not affect the perceptions of clinicians. This finding is not consistent with most of the past research on speech styles (Erickson et al., 1978; Liska et al., 1981; Rasmussen & Moely, 1986; Wiley & Eskilson, 1985). Edelsky (1976) also failed to demonstrate a gender difference in the ratings of the speakers. Warfel's (1984) research found that subjects' sex-typing, rather than gender, rendered significant differences in the ratings of the speakers. Smythe et al. (1983) found that sex-role orientation rather than gender predicted subjects' sensitivity to the sex-typing of their partner. Since the present study did not attend to the sex-typing of the subjects, it is impossible to determine what role sex-typing may have played.

**Conclusions and Implications**

Two important conclusions can be drawn from the results of this experiment. First, the perception of the clinician was altered by the sex-stereotypes of males and females and the occupation of clinical psychologists. The perception of the male speaker as more competent and powerful is in agreement with the gender stereotype research (Bem 1974;
Broverman et al., 1972). The role of clinician, however, may have led to attributions of the female as more expert, masculine, and powerful than the gender stereotype research would predict. Speech styles had no effect upon these perceptions, indicating that gender and occupation are important cues in the attribution of clinician characteristics. Gender and its attributions, however, did not determine subjects' preference for a therapist.

Second, the clinician who utilized female linguistic markers was perceived as more feminine. This finding supports Lakoff's (1973) initial contention that the use of female speech styles would lead to the speaker being perceived as possessing more feminine qualities. In addition, the clinician using female language was preferred for assistance in a general or personal problem and was liked more than the clinician using male language. These findings indicate that the subjects preferred the more feminine clinician and that clinicians, regardless of gender, can significantly increase their perceived femininity by utilizing female speech styles. Moreover, it appears that the qualities associated with femininity are more important in the selection of a therapist than the qualities attributed by sex-stereotypes.

In regard to future research, it is recommended that the definition of male speech styles be more closely examined. The definition of male language that was used in
the current study may be artificial. Male speech styles may not be simply the lack of female linguistic markers, but the addition of other linguistic markers as Berryman-Fink and Wilcox's (1983) and Eakins and Eakins' (1978) studies would indicate.

Future research examining subject variables is also recommended. Since an underlying theory of speech style research is that the language differences are learned as part of the socialization of sex-roles, it logically follows that the perception of, as well as the use of, linguistic variants would differ with socialization (Lakoff, 1973). Until the subject's socialization is examined more systematically, it will be difficult to assess what components of the subject and stimuli alter perceptions.

The current experiment also indicates the need to study speech styles in a specific context. Future attention to this cue may significantly reduce the inconsistency of findings in this area of research. The present study and the research of Kratz (1988) suggest that situational cues have a profound effect, altering previously consistent gender stereotype findings.
APPENDIX A

FEMALE LANGUAGE SCRIPT
Female Language

(words in parenthesis indicates linguistic categories)

Hello Terry. I'm Dr. Curtis. Won't you please call me Pat? (compound request) I'm so (intensifier) glad you were able to meet with me today. Before we get started, I'd like to lay down some guidelines or cardinal rules for our sessions together. Perhaps (qualifier) that way we'll both know what to expect. Let's see -- (hesitation form) there's some bookkeeping we need to address. You will need to pay the receptionist for the day's session prior to meeting with me. Won't you please come in a little early to take care of that? (compound request) You will also need to notify me if you plan to miss a session. About two hours in advance? (questioning form) If you don't cancel in advance you'll still have to pay for the session. I guess (modal construction) I have all of this information written down on the admission form you received. Maybe (qualifier) we should also address confidentiality. What goes on in our sessions is between you and me. I will not repeat our discussions with anyone else. You may feel the need to discuss our sessions with someone you trust. Well, (hesitation form) under those circumstances the decision is totally yours. Your doctor, Dr. Williams?, (questioning form) will call me from time to time to make sure all is going well, but we won't go into specifics. In regard to
the actual sessions, will you please try to remember that you need to talk? (compound request) We're here to assist you and that's difficult to do if you don't talk, okay? (tag question) There will also be times that you will have to follow my lead. For example, I may have you to keep a record of your sleeping patterns for the week. Therapy will sort of (hedge) be at a stand still until you complete the task. Even more (intensifier) importantly you must be prepared to work. I guess (hedge) many people think going through therapy means the therapist does all the work. But it doesn't. Remember that only you can make things turn around in your life, okay? (tag question) Another key to successful therapy is motivation. Um -- (hesitation form) not only is motivation necessary to arrive at your goals but the source of motivation is important as well. While someone may have referred you here, self motivation is essential. It's really (intensifier) important for you to want to change for reasons of your own. Now that the guidelines are out of the way, Terry, let's talk about what brings you here.
APPENDIX B

MALE LANGUAGE SCRIPT
Male Language

Hello Terry. I'm Dr. Curtis. You may call me Pat. I'm glad you were able to meet with me today. Before we get started, I'd like to lay down some guidelines or cardinal rules for our sessions together, that way we'll both know what to expect. First there's some bookkeeping we need to address. You will need to pay the receptionist for the day's session prior to meeting with me. Could you come in a little early to take care of that? You will also need to notify me at least two hours in advance if you plan to miss a session. If you don't cancel in advance you'll still have to pay for the sessions. I have all of this information written down on the admissions forms you received. We should also address confidentiality. What goes on in our sessions is between you and me. I will not repeat our discussions with any one else. You may, however, feel the need to discuss our sessions with someone you trust. Under those circumstances the decision is totally yours. Your doctor, Dr. Williams, will call me from time to time to make sure all is going well, but we won't go into specifics. In regard to the actual sessions, try to remember that you need to talk. We're here to assist you and that's difficult to do if you don't talk. There will also be times that you will have to follow my lead. For example, I may have you keep a record of your sleeping patterns for the week.
Therapy will be at a standstill until you complete the task. It is important that you must be prepared to work. Many people think going through therapy means the therapist does all the work. But it doesn't. Remember, only you can make things turn around in your life. Another key to successful therapy is motivation. Not only is motivation necessary to arrive at your goals but, the source of motivation is important as well. While someone may have referred you here, self motivation is essential. It's important for you to want to change for reasons of your own. Now that the guidelines are out of the way, Terry, let's talk about what brings you here.
APPENDIX C

MEAN RATINGS FOR SCRIPTS
Table 1

Pilot Study: Mean Ratings of Stimulus Scripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>friendly-unfriendly</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional-unprofessional</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believable-unbelievable</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certain-uncertain</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submissive-dominant</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incoherent-understandable</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-reliant-doubts self</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>realistic-unrealistic</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high status-low status</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hesitant</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualify</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsure</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hedge</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exaggerate</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requests</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

MEAN RATINGS FOR VOICES
Table 2

Pilot Study: Mean Ratings of Stimulus Voices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pleasant-unpleasant</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annoying-soothing</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smooth-rough</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

QUESTIONNAIRE 1
Questionnaire 1

Please complete the following by writing the correct number in the space on the left:

_____ _____ _____ Last four digits of Social Security number.

_____ Age

_____ Sex 1=Male
2=Femail

_____ Is English your native language?
1=No
2=Yes

_____ Race 1=Asian
2=Black
3=Hispanic
4=Anglo-American (White)
5=Other

_____ What region of the country are you from?
1=New England or Northeast
2=Southeast
3=MIdwest
4=Northwest
5=Southwest

_____ Major 1=Social Science
2=Business
3=Arts, Music
4=Physical or Biological Sciences
5=Computer Science
6=Other

_____ What year are you in college?
1=Freshman
2=Sophomore
3=Junior
4=Senior
APPENDIX F

QUESTIONNAIRE 2
Questionnaire 2

INSTRUCTIONS: In this questionnaire you are asked to give your impressions of the therapist's personality. Circle the number after each adjective or phrase that most closely indicates your impression. On the top of the next few pages is a seven point scale with a description of each point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Never or almost never true</th>
<th>Usually true</th>
<th>Sometimes but infrequently true</th>
<th>Occasionally true</th>
<th>Often true</th>
<th>Usually true</th>
<th>Always or almost always true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defends his/her own beliefs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectionate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to needs of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jealous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forceful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has leadership abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eager to soothe hurt feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to take risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to take a stand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loves children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never or almost never true</td>
<td>Sometimes but infrequently true</td>
<td>Occasionally true</td>
<td>Often true</td>
<td>Usually true</td>
<td>Always or almost always true</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentle</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reliant</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yielding</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsystematic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes decisions easily</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flatterable</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatrical</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft-spoken</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpredictable</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gullible</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solemn</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childlike</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeable</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not use harsh language</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts as a leader</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

QUESTIONNAIRE 3
INSTRUCTIONS: The next set of items has opposing adjectives at the ends of the scales. Circle the number which best represents your impression of the therapist that you heard.

- constraining
- checking
- not interfering
- expanding
- weak
- compelling
- persuasive
- enforcing
- freeing
- controlling
- not confining
- liberating
- enslaving
- meek
- high status
- forceful
- follower
- effective
- dominant
- potent
- intelligent
- dynamic

loosening
facilitating
restraining
limiting
powerful
not intimidating
coercive
not imposing
suppressing
not regulating
restricting
repressing
freeing
bold
low status
spineless
leader
ineffective
submissive
impotent
dumb
static
| foolish | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | wise |
| mature  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | immature |
| superior| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | inferior |
| deep    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | shallow |
| reasonable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | arbitrary |
| compulsive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | not compulsive |
| passive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | active |
| successful | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | unsuccessful |
| important | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | unimportant |
| assertive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | not assertive |
| efficient | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | inefficient |
| makes rules | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | follows rules |
| privileged | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | not privileged |
| not persuasive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | persuasive |
| incompetent | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | competent |
| weak | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | strong |
| powerless | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | powerful |
| simple | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | complex |
Questionnaire 4

INSTRUCTIONS: Using the description at the top of this page, circle the number that best represents your opinion of the therapist you heard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never or almost never true</th>
<th>Usually not true</th>
<th>Sometimes but infrequently true</th>
<th>Occasionally true</th>
<th>Often true</th>
<th>Usually true</th>
<th>Always or almost always true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experienced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reliable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sociable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepared</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sincere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skillful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trustworthy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire 5

Now, answer the following questions by circling the appropriate number.

1) Do you like this therapist:

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   not at all  very much

2) How likely would you be to go to this therapist for help:

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   not at all  very likely
   likely

3) How likely would you be to go to this therapist for help with a personal problem:

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   not at all  very likely
   likely

4) How likely would you be to go to this therapist for help with a vocational problem:

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   not at all  very likely
   likely

5) How assertive is this therapist:

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   not at all  very

6) What is this therapist's gender:

   male  female
INTRODUCTION:
The experiment you are about to begin is a study of various introductory statements by clinical psychologists. You are asked to assume the role of a prospective client, seeking a psychotherapist. This is your first visit in to meet the psychologist. The audio tape you will hear will be the psychologist explaining to you what psychotherapy will entail. Following the tape you will be asked to complete some questionnaires and participate in a group discussion regarding what you heard. If you have already been a subject in this research, please leave at this time.

QUESTIONNAIRE:
Below each of your chairs you will find your questionnaires. Please be sure to read the directions to each questionnaire. Complete them in the order they are presented. Please do not look forward or backward to other questionnaires. Do not share your responses. You may begin answering the questionnaires now.

DEBRIEFING:
The experiment is concluded. Now for the debriefing. This research is not a comparison study of clinicians’ introductory statements. The true purpose of this research is to study perceptions of clinicians using either male or female language. Research has shown that the sexes use different words and verbal styles to communicate. Research has also shown that speakers are judged differently depending on their gender and which language they use. There are four conditions in this experiment: a male using male language, a female using male language, a male using female language, and a female using female language. You heard ___________________. If you would like additional information regarding this study, please contact Beatrice W. Sager at (214) 620-9902. Are there any questions I may be able to answer for you?
APPENDIX K

INFORMED CONSENT
Informed Consent Form

Please read this form carefully. After everyone has read and signed this form, the experimenter will explain in detail what is expected of you. You will be evaluating opening dialogs used by clinical psychologists. You will listen to an audiotape, fill out some questionnaires, and discuss the audiotape. After the experiment you will learn more about the research and will be given an opportunity to ask questions. You will receive two extra credit points for your participation.

During or after the experiment, you may find yourself experiencing some slight discomfort. Many people have similar reactions when they participate in psychological research, and find these feelings dissipate in a short while.

You are free to withdraw from the research at any time and for any reason. No negative sanctions will be taken against you should you choose to withdraw.

If you are interested in learning the results of this experiment, you may leave a message for Beatrice Sager at 214-620-9902. I will be glad to talk to you after the results are analyzed next semester.

Thank you for your participation.

I have read and understand the informed consent form. My signature below is indication of my understanding.

Signed,______________________________

Date,______________________________
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