California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

1994

A difference in women's and men's academic prose

Judith Bernadette Hawkins

Recommended Citation

Hawkins, Judith Bernadette, "A difference in women's and men's academic prose" (1994). *Theses Digitization Project*. 854.
https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/854

A DIFFERENCE IN WOMEN'S AND MEN'S ACADEMIC PROSE

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

in

English Composition

---

by

Judith Bernardette Hawkins

June 1994

A DIFFERENCE IN WOMEN'S AND MEN'S ACADEMIC PROSE

_____

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

_____

by

Judith Bernardette Hawkins

June 1994

Approved by:

███████████████████

Rong Chen, Chair, English   June 14 /94
                                     Date

███████████████████

Loralee Mac Pike

███████████████

Kevin Burne

ABSTRACT

A question posed by Elizabeth Flynn in the December 1990 issue of College Composition and Communication, "Do Men and Women Compose Differently?" spawned this analysis of forty randomly selected abstracts from master's theses and projects by twenty women and twenty men at California State University, San Bernardino. Flynn says that women do compose differently and justifies her statement as "humanistic inquiry": "Research can be empirical without being posivitistic." Consequently I wondered whether the question "Do women and men compose differently?" could be proven by empirical analysis?

After developing a methodology for analysis based on sex/gender studies in the recent findings in sociological, sociolinguistic, business and research communities--all of which indicate sex/gender differences in style and structures for their communities--I analyzed forty abstracts for the same features. The results indicate highly significant differences between the women and the men in my sample group: the women used connective structures significantly more often than did the men and the men used contrastive structures significantly more often than did the women. This study indicates that a significant stylistic difference between these women's and men's academic prose.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE: The Question

> Within a given context or a given writer there
> is a certain correspondence between the rhetorical,
> syntactical, grammatical patterns and the writer's
> way of looking at the world. And when there is
> a high degree of regularity in the use of these
> patterns we may guess that the pattern comes from,
> and therefore reveals something of, the writer's
> habitual way of seeing reality, and that the
> pattern is one of the ways in which a similar
> way of looking at the world is created for the
> reader. (Thale 286)

What would it do to our way of teaching writing if
we were to acknowledge that women's and men's "habitual
way of seeing reality" is reflected in the way they compose
or write? What if women and men think differently and
learn to interact differently and, accordingly write
differently? How might that knowledge affect the way
we teach writing?

In the December 1988 issue of College Composition
and Communication, Elizabeth Flynn asks "Do males and
females compose differently?" In her article, "Composing
as a Woman," she operates from the position that women
and men reflect social and psychological differences in
their written expression. Her discussion includes ideas
which surface in Nancy Chodorow's The Reproduction of
Mothering, specifically the idea that "[f]eminine
identification processes are relational, whereas masculine
identification processes tend to deny relationship" (Flynn,
"Composing" 426). Flynn cites as examples to support

her hypothesis four student essays, two by women and two by men, which reflect the patterns derived from Chodorow's work. Flynn claims that the two women's essays, Kim's and Kathy's, emphasize horizontal relationships and communion or interconnectedness while the two men's essays, Jim's and Joe's, "stress individuation rather than connection" (Flynn, "Composing" 429).

Flynn also discusses Carol Gilligan's book, In a Different Voice, which was influenced by Chodorow's work. While Gilligan's work discusses morality, an issue which I am not approaching in this paper, her schematic metaphors illustrate another voice speaking to apparent differences in women's and men's styles of thinking: "the web [which] suggests interconnectedness" speaks to women's method of relating; and the "ladder [which] suggests an achievement-orientation as well as individualistic and hierarchical thinking" speaks to men's method of relating (Flynn, "Composing" 426). Flynn regards Kathy's expression of "strong need for connection, for affiliation" as well as Kim's "strong need to feel part of a group" (429) to be distinctly different from Jim's "solitary flight" in which he "emerges the somewhat shaken hero of his adventure" by achieving "his goal in the face of adversity" (430) and Joe's narrative in which Flynn sees him fulfilling "his gender role identification, his

socialization into a male role and a male value system, that allows him to become an achiever" (431). Flynn concludes

> we ought not assume that males and females use language in identical ways or represent the world in a similar fashion. And if their writing strategies and patterns of representation do differ, then ignoring those differences almost certainly means a suppression of women's separate ways of thinking and writing. ("Composing" 431-432)

While Flynn does not claim to have isolated any "characteristic patterns of male and female student writing . . . [as she] would need a considerably larger and more representative sample to make such a claim hold" ("Composing" 431), she does believe that she had "little difficulty identifying essays that revealed patterns of difference among the twenty-four papers [she] had to choose from, and [she] could easily have selected others" (431).

Although Flynn considers this work to be research, she qualifies it as "humanistic inquiry" in which the "illustrative example is often sufficient evidence to support a claim. The example may be an informative one or a representative one, to use Kenneth Burke's terms" ("Staffroom" 86). She further states that her research is not to be considered "positivistic" and claims that "research can be empirical without being positivistic" (87). She cites Clifford Geertz, whose "Thick Description" is intended to "yield defensible interpretations as new

phenomena arise that need to be interpreted" and is not intended to be "predictive" as positivistic empirical research is (87). Flynn also discusses her feminist approach which she sees as "necessarily skeptical of claims of the value-neutrality of research methods, theories, and facts" because they "all too often mask androcentrism" (87). "Research which. . . reflects the concerns of one group, white males, to the exclusion of others, often women and people of color" (87) Flynn sees as inherently biased from its inception.

All of this raises the question for me: Can this hypothesis--that women and men writers compose differently--be proven or disproven using posivitistic empirical research? What would that type of research look like? Who else has spoken to the question of differences in expression between women and men? Has this question been asked before?

I found that this question of distinctions between women and men is not new. As I look back to texts in rhetoric studies, I hear women's voices asking and speaking to this same question. Perhaps women writers have suggested this idea of difference as long as they have been writing.

In the 15th century, in response to Bibulus Sempronius having "brashly and publicly lament[ed] that [Laura Cereta]

was said to possess as fine a mind as nature ever bestowed

upon the most learned man" (495) (implying that other

women did not possess such minds), Cereta delivers strong

arguments to him as she aligns herself with her sisters

in her paper "Letter to Bibulus Sempronius, Defense of

the Liberal Instruction of Women." The implication by

Bibulus is simple: women are usually different because

they are of less distinction and have less ability in

expression. The implication by Cereta is equally clear:

women are equally gifted by nature, and if they appear

less distinct, it is due to their choices, not their

abilities. As she says, "The explanation is clear: women

have been able by nature to be exceptional, but have chosen

lesser goals" (497). According to Cereta, although women

have not been seen as equally competent with men, women

are.

In the early 19th century, Sarah Grimke, in her

"Letters on the Equality of the Sexes and the Condition

of Woman," responds to a letter by the General Association

of Congregational Ministers of Massachusetts. In response

to their statements regarding "the dangers which at present

seem to threaten the FEMALE CHARACTER with widespread

and permanent injury" (685), (the dangers being that women

might be perceived as spiritual equals with men before

God both in position and responsibility) Grimke argues:

> the New Testament has been referred to, and I
> am willing to abide by its decisions, but must
> enter my protest against the false translation
> of some passages by the MEN [sic] who did that
> work, and against the perverted interpretation
> by the MEN [sic] who undertook to write
> commentaries thereon. I am inclined to think,
> when we are admitted to the honor of studying
> Greek and Hebrew, we shall produce some various
> readings of the Bible a little different from
> those we now have. (686)

Grimke differs with those in power in her day, differs

with their mode of relating, thinking and expressing,

and also differs with the translators and commentators

of the Bible. According to Grimke, women would produce

a different written text, both in content and in form,

and that women's translation would reflect women's point

of view.

In the mid to late 20th century, due largely to the

feminist movement, many studies were begun on gender and

language. French feminists, continuing in this same line

of thinking, contend that women not only have something

different to say, but also have a different language in

which to say it; women have a different way of viewing

life and will reflect that difference as they develop

their own forms in language to reveal their own point

of view. The French feminists purport that men have

determined the forms language has take. Therefore

languages reflect the voices of the men. Helene Cixous

maintains

unequivocally that there is such a thing as marked
writing; that, until now, far more extensively
and repressively than is ever suspected or
admitted, writing has been run by a libidinal
and cultural--hence political, typically
masculine--economy; that this is a locus where
the repression of women has been perpetuated
. . . ; that this locus has grossly exaggerated
all the signs of sexual opposition. . .where woman
has never her turn to speak, this being all the
more serious and unpardonable in that writing
is precisely the very possibility of change, the
space that can serve. . .[as] a transformation
of social and cultural structures. (1235)

Cixous argues that women need their own language,
a language which reflects women and their perspective
on life. By developing a feminine language with a system
of references in language which illuminate women's
perspective, both culture and society will experience
positive changes.

Adrienne Rich, in her essay "Taking Women Students
Seriously," states that women think differently than men
do. To Rich, women's thinking is equated with critical
thinking: women's thinking challenges the givens, the
assumptions we usually operate under; women's thinking
makes connections between facts and ideas; women's thinking
remembers that "in every mind resides a body;" and women's
thinking remains accountable to that "body" as she compares
hypotheses against her experience (175-176). Rich
characterizes women's thinking and expression of those
thoughts as finding "the silences" (175), the unspoken
truths with which women live. She says it is by naming

7

ourselves, as Paulo Freire calls us to do, that we speak out and write that which is hidden, that we "take women seriously" (176), that women develop their own voices and styles of composing. Therefore, Rich concludes along with Cixous that because women think differently than men and are often silenced because of those differences that women will demonstrate differences and learn to use them constructively as they learn to write themselves into existence and give voices to their silences.

These and many other women have spoken out of their experiences, and their voices echo the same message through the ages: women have something to say; women speak from a different perspectives; and women want to express their perspectives on life from their own points of view. When we listen to the voices of these women, not as isolated and unique cries in the night, but as a harmony of echoes growing louder and stronger, then the messages from women become clear and resonate within us. Many women, both past and present, believe they possess their own messages and their own voices. The question now is whether it can it be proven? Namely, are there any significant empirically demonstrable differences between the way men and women think and write?

CHAPTER TWO: The Context

Often times the forces silencing women's voices are buried in deep layers, hidden layers of assumptions. Because the assumptions of those in power determine the public course language takes (Bakhtin 930), the visible markers in language must be examined to detect the assumptions beneath the expressions. According to Smith,

> without awareness of assumptions, we remain
> mechanical members of our society, dangerously
> oblivious to the abstractions that govern us and
> without the ability to question them or to seek
> alternative new assumptions. The first requisite
> of intelligent freedom is to discover the
> assumptions that restrict our thinking and writing.
> (242)

In order to understand these assumptions, we must consider the possible ways language may be marked. First, it may be that men make all the choices and their assumptions totally govern language use. Although some may think that this is true because patriarchy has been so pervasive and exclusive, it has not totally encompassed all women or women would never have had any voice. And not all men have been or are patriarchial. So although at times in history women have come close to being fully silenced and even today many suffer in silence, some have managed to speak out for women rights and perspectives throughout the centuries even in patriarchy's strongest moments.

Second, it may be that women make all the choices
and their assumptions totally govern language use. Women
have never made all the choices in language use, in fact
not even most, and at best perhaps women have made a few
choices and assumptions which govern language use because
women are not the dominant factor in society.

Third, it may be that neither women nor men make
choices with regard to assumptions about language use,
that power in language use is a neutral quality which
either may appropriate and use. This theory may appear
plausible but when women are able to appropriate power
positions and powerful behavior, most often they have
been derogated.

Fourth, it may be that men and women both make choices
and assumptions about language use and they are equally
valued. Although this is a worthy goal for both men and
women, no evidence anywhere suggests that it is true.
We are not currently at a point of awareness in our society
where this is possible.

Fifth, it may be that women and men both make
assumptions and choices about language use but they are
unequally valued. Women's choices for the most part are
not valued by society as highly as are men's. Men's
choices and assumptions currently dominate much of life
for most societies because it is assumed by those in power

that women either do not make significant or powerful choices or assumptions about language use or do not see life differently from men or their choices are of lesser value.

Many women believe that women's and men's assumptions and choices should be valued equally but acknowledge that they are not. With that in mind, many women have spoken out or are speaking out of their silences to challenge the assumptions of those in power. Women like Laura Cereta have questioned the patriarchial power structure they face and its point of view which has limited the boundaries of women's lives and experiences. Women like Sarah Grimke have questioned the patriarachial assumptions they face which say that different means lesser quality, that women, because they possess obvious differences from men and are judged in relation to men, are of lesser distinction and ability. Although today this view may not be widely held among educated people, its residual effects still impact women as they work to express themselves from their own points of view. Grimke says that women's perspective will surface, if given the opportunity. If these differences do come to the surface of language use, it should be possible to find them.

While many believe that there is no difference between women and men writers, that each uses the same language

in relatively the same way, this study contends, along with Cereta, Grimke, Cixous and others, that women may have their own way of seeing reality. Women's and men's ways of seeing reality and language use may differ and those different perspectives and choices should be valued equally.

The problem is how to find those differences specifically in academic prose. I began by looking at differences in language use which were already well established, and from there I sought to discover if differences existed in arenas of language use apart from university level writing before moving onto the analysis of university level academic prose.

If there are unisolated, demonstrable differences in language use, and if they cross over into academic prose, there may be common denominators between women's perspective on life and their writing style and men's perspecitive on life and their writing style. These women and men may also differ from each other in their perspectives and writing styles. And while there are evidently factors which further group women and men into other subgroups such as age, class, ethnicity and culture, patterns and strategies of language use of women and men--seen as sex/gender differences--may override the age, class, ethnicity and cultural differences. Further

study should be conducted which includes these factors

if significant differences are found between women's and

men's writing styles.

Sex/gender differences in language use, which have

already been identified, can be seen in "marked language"

such as Helene Cixous speaks of when she discusses language

which privileges those in power. This marked language

shows one way women have been subordinated and reveals

sexual bias against women.

One example of a residual effect of this "marked

language" is seen in a simple question raised by Robin

Lakoff in a 1974 article for MS. magazine and is expanded

upon in Language and Women's Place. As part of her public

stance in the linguistic search for gender differences

in language use, Lakoff identifies two language structures

--markers--which have been used to subordinate women.

Lakoff names two areas causing derogation of women:

women's use of precise and discriminating terms in naming

and describing and the use of euphemisms in the naming

of women by male speakers. First, Lakoff contends that

"[w]ords like mauve, beige, ecru, aquamarine, lavender

and the like, are unremarkable in a woman's active

vocabulary, but largely absent from that of most men"

(311). Although this propensity toward specificity in

language, the naming of an item as mauve instead of pink

13

or red, indicates a high intellectual ability to make

subtle distinctions, it is seen by patriarchial society

as frivolous and is remarked on pejoratively. Second,

a woman may be called lady which "confer[s] an exalted

stature" but also implies "helpless[ness]" and "does not

contain the sexual implications present in woman" (314).

A woman can also be called a "girl" which stresses

"immaturity" and "irresponsibility" while also "removing

the sexual connotations lurking in woman" (315). Thus,

Lakoff concludes in the first instance that female speakers

use different modes of naming the world that are often

described as frivolous. When those in power use this

same technique of specific naming, they are said to be

distinct and discriminating and subtle. In the second

instance, Lakoff concludes that women are named differently

and in diminutive modes. This divorces sexuality from

women while permitting and encouraging it in men. Thus

it causes women to be seen in polite and childlike forms,

neither of which convey ability, power or wisdom, and

it robs women of a portion of their humanity. Again,

those in power have controlled both the language used

and those using the language.

If these differences are analyzed in light of Norman

Fairclough's theory of social power structure, it reveals

that controlling occurs in three ways. First, in content

(what is said): certain kinds of specificities of men
are valued, while those of women are not. This reveals
an inequal valuation of a performative linguistic ability
which disadvantages women because they are women.
Therefore women, not men, are named linguistically in
diminutive modes, revealing an unequal valuation based
on sex/gender alone. Second, in relations (when people
enter into social relations in discourse, the meaning
of statements is most often determined by the speakers
in power): women's speech is judged in relation to men's
and found wanting because it is women's speech, and,
accordingly denigrated. Third, in subjugation (the
positions people are permitted to occupy in discourse):
both in naming and in being named, women are put into
positions of lesser power (Fairclough 46). Fairclough's
theories illuminates Lakoff's findings by examining and
explaining how the power structures in society work to
achieve the distinctions she has isolated. Patriarchy,
which is the dominant system, achieves and maintains its
power by explicitly or implicitly subordinating other
groups, the largest of which is women.

Another example of how this dominance has been
maintained in language is sexual bias in favor of the
male default. This sexual bias is aptly discussed by
Alleen Pace Nilsen. In her article "Sexism in English:

A Feminist View," she concludes that the male form is not the default for both sexes. And such bias has been and is being confronted in most public arenas, most predominantly in the publishing, education and business communities. Thus, these surface reflections of marked language are being changed and the question of sexual bias in language use is no longer strongly contested. No reasonable argument exists today over the inappropriateness of the male default: the use of "he" when implying "he" and "she"; the use of "man" and "mankind" for "humans," "people" and "humankind" as indicators of both genders.

The male model should no longer function as the dominant means to express or explain human society. The dissolution of the male default continues throughout society, most notably in places where the male default has been used as a research standard: using the male model as norm, as opposed to a value-neutral norm or a norm which sets criteria based on the informants' subcultures' norms, skews results in that it does not reflect men as members of society as a whole but as representative of the whole society, and it does not reflect women at all. Deborah Cameron and Jennifer Coates, listing points needing to be considered when conducting research in the future, indicate that

> traditional sociolinguistic methods and measuring
> instruments have frequently been designed for
> male speakers and may not be maximally well adapted
> for female informants. Care needs to be taken
> to select informants of both sexes and to
> investigate all-female as well as all-male groups;
> to design non-linguistic criteria such as social
> class, network strength, etc. in ways that are
> applicable to both sexes; and to avoid definitions
> of important concepts that mean women are
> automatically excluded. (11)

Along with the dissolution of the male default, its

extension in the pro-male-bias in research also needs

to be dissolved.

Researchers, in a effort to clarify the assumptions

we have operated under with regard to sex/gender issues,

call for specificity and intertextuality, which add to

the complexity of the question. For example, Penelope

Brown in 1976 concluded that "explanations of language

usage should come from a theory of social forces and a

consideration of social status, race, and individual goals"

(Thorne 234). In 1980, Virginia A. Eman and Benjamin

W. Morse raised the issue of "Gender schema theory" when

looking at child rearing and gender differences in language

and "argue against using 'dichotomous biological

classification' in research, suggesting that one's

psychological orientation towards one's sex allows better

understanding of such variables as. . .language" (Thorne

234). Also in 1980, Patricia C. Nichols argued that

researchers should consider contextual matters such as

gender roles, types of education and activities of

participants in their "speech communities" as part of

the interpretive process when looking at gender differences

in speech. In 1982, Noreen Carrocci proposed the use

of "communication theory" as a field for context of

interpretation of gender differences found.

Today, the question is not so much if there are

sex/gender differences, but where do they exist. In

phonemes and morphemes, researchers such as Mulcaster,

Jesperson, Sapir, Trudgill, Labov, Cheshire, and Milroy

have worked on differences for decades. In intonation,

Sally McConnell-Ginet's research clearly indicates

differences exist. In children's gendered use of language,

Jacqueline Sachs has completed studies which reveal

differences. Regarding the effect of behavior caused

by use of gender markings, Norma Shepelak shows

relationships between cause and effect. Sex/gender

differences are discussed with regard to the moral

implications by Carol Gilligan and Katha Pollitt; to female

style in science by Nancy DiTomaso, Mary Frank Fox, and

Marcia Barinaga (384-391); to gender style in the corporate

world by Judy Rosener, F. Schwartz, Marilyn Loden, and

B.M. Vetter; and to the speakers' social and interpersonal

aspects of communication by Deborah Tannen. And these

are but a few of the many voices speaking out on sex/gender

differences.

Today researchers in linguistics, sociolinguistics, psychology, business, and science agree differences exist; today their research focuses on the context in which these differences occur, on who has observed the differences, on what factors the observers bring to their observations, on what demographical factors may complicate the observations, on what significance can be found in the differences, and finally, on how are we to act in response to the knowledge gained. Today, Cixous' "marked" language is being documented. The questions for us now are: what do the markers look like? Can they be used to identify patterns in women's and men's academic prose?

In Jacqueline Sachs' study, "Preschool Boys' and Girls' Language Use in Pretend Play," she asks if boys and girls speak differently in pretend play situations. She concludes that while there were some similarities, boys and girls speak differently in pretend play situations in several ways:

1. Boys used the simple Imperative form much more frequently than did the girls. . .In fact, only one girl used more than one Imperative during the sixteen-minute interaction.
2. The boys used Prohibitions five times as frequently as did the girls.
4. Taken together, the Imperative, Prohibition, and Declarative Directives are directive forms showing no mitigation. . .the boys' Obliges were unmitigated (42% as compared with 17% for the girls). . . . .

7. The girls made heavy use of tag questions
   [35 to the boys' 16.]
8. Joint utterances are mitigated because they
   imply cooperation between the listener and
   hearer. Fifteen percent of the girls'
   Obliges were Joint, five times as many as
   were spoken by the boys, and they talked
   about joint activities and roles, . . .
10. The only mitigating category in which we
    find more utterances by boys than girls
    is State [direct] Questions. Boys more
    often asked [directly] what the other wanted
    or how he felt, . . .
11. Looking overall at categories with
    mitigation, we find that many more of the
    girls' utterances were mitigated (65% as
    compared with 34% for the boys). (182-184)

While it is highly unlikely that imperatives or tag

questions might be found in student compositions, we might

find signs of the assertiveness, mitigation and joining

activities Sachs finds in children's speech. It can also

be concluded that even at an early age, girls and boys

make choices and enact assumptions about language use.

Jennifer Coates, in Women, Men and Language, discusses

"the social consequences of linguistic sex differences"

in "miscommunication between women and men" (151). In

discussing studies of women's interactions in all-women

groups, and men's interactions with all-men groups, Coates

indicates that

> women often discuss one topic for half an hour
> or more; they share a great deal of information
> about themselves and talk about their feelings
> and their relationships. Men on the other hand
> jump from one topic to another, vying to tell
> anecdotes which cent[er] around themes of
> superiority and aggression. They rarely talk
> about themselves, but compete to prove themselves

> better informed about current affairs, travel,
> sport, etc. (151-152)

Women here appear to parallel Chorodow's "feminine

identification processes" (Flynn, Composing 176) by

directing conversation to share personal information,

thus making horizontal connections, as opposed to the

men's anecdotes which centered on superiority and

aggression. Here the men's behavior parallels Chodorow's

idea of individuation while the women's behavior parallels

her idea of feminine connection. There is also a parallel

with Gilligan. Men's talk, like their moral reasoning,

was hierarchial and moved toward abstraction and

separation, while women's talk balanced self and other

and placed relationality at the center of the activity.

While it is unlikely that written student work will

be conversational, structures which reveal connection

in women writers and which reveal separation in men writers

would indicate stylistic differences. These stylistic

differences are also evident in Coates' discussion "links

between speaker turns" and "topic shifts" (152-153).

She comments that research indicates that women, when

in conversation, will make connections with the previous

speaker while men "do not feel they have to make a link.

. ." and "are more likely to ignore what was. . .said

before and concentrate on making their own point" (152).

"Elaboration and continuity," which are paralleling

activities, "are key notions in any analysis of women's talk," whereas "shifts between topics tend to be abrupt in all-male conversations" (153). "Women tend to organi[z]e their talk co-operatively," Coates continues, "while men tend to organi[z]e their talk competitively" (154). Coates' deductions suggest to me that if women use connective structures and men use contrastive structures, stylistic differences in writing would parallel stylistic differences in speech.

Judy Rosener, in the November-December 1990 issue of <u>Harvard Business Review</u>, also parallels the findings above as she discusses women's and men's managerial styles. Although Rosener found that both men and women in the survey experienced "work-family conflicts" (120) and that members of this study did not reflect the more common wage-gapped groups often surveyed, she did find clear differences in their management styles. "The men are more likely than the women to describe themselves in ways that characterize what some management experts call 'transactional' leadership" (120). Men, as "command-and-control" leaders, used "linear logic" in a "hierarchial system" (153). These men saw themselves in a superior or hierarchial position to their "subordinates" while women, as "interactive leaders," used "consensus building" and saw themselves as

interrelated with those working with them (153). Rosener's
research reveals clear distinctions which indicate women's
ways of leading and thinking, expressing information and
interacting with others in the world differ from men's.
Thus, identifying writing styles which reflect women's
tendencies toward interrelational activities in
business--making connections--and identifying writing
styles which reflect men's tendencies toward hierarchial
or status-oriented activities in business--making
distinctions--would further prove a difference in writing
styles.

Marcia Barinaga, writing for Science in April of
1993, asks "Is There a 'Female Style' in Science?" While
she acknowledges exceptions (as I found in all other
research), she believes that there is a difference, even
though many women are reticent to admit it. This is
because, as Caitilyn Allen, says, "'Women are afraid that
if they discuss the possibility that they are doing science
differently, it will be assumed that the science they
are doing is not as good'" (384). Although some female
scientists may see differences in style, they are hesitant
to publicly voice their thoughts (Barinaga 384).

Barinaga also cites a small study done by Henry
Etzkowitz and student Carol Kemelgor which

> investigated lab management styles of faculty
> in a medical school microbiology department. "We

found there were two styles by which the investigators were running their labs," says Etzkowitz. Male faculty members were more likely to have students "competing with each other for the professors' attention," he says, while students in women's labs generally felt less competitive pressure. (385)

Additionally she says that Etzkowitz found that "many female faculty members feel additional responsibility for giving students extra encouragement and support" (385-386). Thus another component of women's style in management is to offer support, help and encouragement to those who work with them. Indications of this tendency to support and encourage along with a hesitancy to reveal difference, if found, would further develop the parallel between women's management styles and writing styles; and indications of separation or competition, if found, would further develop the parallel between men's management styles and men's writing styles. In each of the studies, regardless of the field in which they were conducted, consistent gender differences have appeared.

Thus, in each of these fields, sex/gender differences can be documented. Coates, while speaking within the socio-linguistic community, discusses the significance of these types of differences in order to contextualize the theories and philosophies within the events of the last several decades. She proposes two general theories: the dominance approach, which "sees women as an oppressed

group and interprets linguistic differences in women's
and men's speech in terms of men's dominance and women's
subordination;" and, the difference approach, which
"emphasi[z]es the idea that women and men belong to
different subcultures" in which "women claim they 'have
a different voice, a different psychology, and a different
experience of love, work and family from men'" (13).

Evidence so far suggests that neither polarity
--neither all dominance theory nor all difference
theory--may in itself be fully accurate. Women and women's
language use have been derogated, as Lakoff, Nilsen and
hundreds of others have shown. Yet, some women also
believe that they have different ways of thinking, that
their approach, purpose in language use, and speech differ
from men's, that their styles of relating in management
situations differs from men's, so that women may indeed
be a separate subculture as Coates suggests. But perhaps
our best understanding will be found in the overlapping
of Coates' two theories, which would be similar to the
fifth option discussed earlier in this chapter--women
and men both make assumptions and choices about language
use but women's are not valued to the degree that men's
are. Consequently, although some women have been
subjugated and derogated, and therefore some women's
language use may be different due to that subjugation

and derogation, it is also that those differences may be due to women's personal choices in language use.

At the same time, in the struggle between personal choice and expectations, lines of distinction can get blurred for women. If indeed women are a subculture with distinct methods for expressing their values which differ from those of men's, then the subjugation of women's culture to the power or status culture may in some cases obliterate, in some cases overwhelm or overshadow, and in some cases taint women's knowledge and awareness of their first culture. Women may be blind to their first culture. The desire for approval, acceptance, and accomplishment may motivate women, knowingly or unknowingly, to accede to the expectations, styles, methods, and culture of those in power, thus making women appear not to have assimilated but to have always been a part of the power group's culture.

But language use reveals perspectives and assumptions about life. If language is also marked by women and their language use specifically reveals their ways of seeing reality just as men's language use reveals their own ways of seeing reality, then sex/gender differences may be determined by women when they express their own ways of seeing reality in their speech, interaction, and writing. So if these distinctions appear, and if they are an

accurate reflection of women's way of seeing reality,
then the problem is not that women speak and write
differently but that women's expressions in society are
not highly valued.

Because argumentation--discourse which draws a
conclusion by proving differences between positions or
by separating and contrasting positions--has generally
been the preferred and the valued form of discourse since
the time of the Sophists, Plato and Aristotle, it has
been the expected and preferred form of academic discourse
for men and women. While argumentation may suit the
purposes of men speakers and writers as these studies
indicate that boys and men tend to choose to define by
contrast, separation and status-oriented structures, it
may not suit women's purposes. If women reveal their
perspectives on life and ways of seeing reality in their
language choices and if those choices in writing are the
same as those revealed in these studies on girls' speech,
women's talk, and women's management styles, then women's
style of academic prose may not be the same as men's.
Women's style may develop connections and synthesize.
Synthesis--discourse which combines varied elements into
a complex and unified whole--may reflect women's ways
of viewing the world. Because the studies referred to
in this chapter indicate a consistent pattern of

difference, then analysis of women's and men's academic

prose should also reveal the same type of differences.

CHAPTER THREE: The Analysis

In order to approach the question of difference in women's and men's academic prose, I chose to analyze forty abstracts from master's theses and projects at California State University, San Bernardino. The abstracts selected were written between 1987 and 1993. They reflect several schools within the university, most prominently English Composition and Education.

These abstracts provide a uniform set of research materials for several reasons. First, all the writers had the same purpose: to provide synopses of their theses. Second, the abstracts were required to be of similar length: one to three pages. Third, the abstracts reflect accomplished writers in similar programs of study at the graduate level who have received all the writing instruction they are required to receive. Fourth, the abstracts are readily available in the university library for the purpose of further research.

The abstracts were randomly selected. The first twenty abstracts--ten by women writers and ten by men writers--were the first available on the library shelves in the English department. The next twenty--ten women writers and ten men writers--were selected for me by a librarian, as they are kept in a special reserve section of the library.

Once the abstracts were selected and sorted, but before I began counting for particular features, I found it necessary to establish a quantitative base line: word, sentence and paragraph counts to indicate whether like entities were being compared. By working with material of reasonably equal quality and quantity, I believe that the results of the analysis will be more likely to show relative significance. The women writers' abstracts were labeled F1 to F20, (female writer 1 through female writer 20,) and the men writers were labeled M1 to M20, (male writer 1 through male writer 20) as shown in all tables. I used the NCSS, a statistics software, to determine the presence or absence of statistical significance.

The word count for women writers is 4,148 words with a low of 131 and a high of 356 as shown in TABLE 1: WORD COUNTS. The mean for women writers (F1-F20) is 207.4. The word count for men writers (M1-M20) is 4,272 words with a low of 111 and a high of 356 as shown in TABLE 1: WORD COUNTS. The mean for men writers is 213.6. The word frequency distribution between the women and men writers, as shown in TABLE 2: WORD FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION, is not significant. Although there is some variance in the first category of individual writers' word use, 110-125 words, as the women writers did not write any abstracts

less than 125 words, this is not significant because the sum of the adjacent categories is nearly equal such that 5 women writers and 5 men writers wrote abstracts between 110 and 150 words; and 5 women and 5 men writers wrote abstracts between 150 and 200 words. Although 6 women and 4 men writers wrote abstracts between 200 and 250 words, this is not a significant difference; neither are the differences between 250 and 300 words--2 women writers, 3 men writers; nor are the differences between 300 and 375 words significant with 2 women writers and 3 men writers.

TABLE 1: WORD COUNTS			
F1	174	M1	191
F2	245	M2	135
F3	206	M3	192
F4	167	M4	122
F5	212	M5	169
F6	356	M6	200
F7	170	M7	225
F8	183	M8	242
F9	241	M9	181
F10	152	M10	189
F11	265	M11	123
F12	245	M12	356
F13	150	M13	327
F14	202	M14	130
F15	131	M15	277
F16	145	M16	259
F17	125	M17	111
F18	136	M18	344
F19	347	M19	210
F20	296	M20	289
	4,148		4,272

TABLE 2: WORD FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION					
	110-125	125-150	150-175	175-200	200-225
Females	0	5	4	1	3
Males	3	2	1	4	2

225-250	250-275	275-300	300-325	325-350	350-375
3	1	1	0	1	1
2	1	2	0	2	1

The results of the word count, as shown in TABLE 3: WORD COUNT STATISTICS, indicate that the difference between women writers and men writers is not significant: the T-Value is .2719989 and the Probability is 0.7870 at the 0.05 confidence level. These women writers and the men writers produced a relatively equal number of words.

TABLE 3: WORD COUNT STATISTICS				
	Total	Mean	T-Value	Probability
Females	4,148	207.4	.2719989	0.7870
Males	4,272	213.6		

N=20 for both groups.

Thus, there is no significant difference in the number of words written by women and men writers and no significant difference in the length of the abstracts in this sample.

Also there is no significant difference in the number of sentences in this sample. In fact, the similarity of the total number of sentences is remarkable. Twenty women writers produced 181 sentences total in their abstracts with a low of 4 sentences and a high of 17 as shown in TABLE 4: SENTENCE COUNTS. The mean for women

32

writers is 9.05 sentences. Twenty men writers produced
183 sentences in their abstracts with a low of 4 and a
high of 18 as shown on TABLE 4: SENTENCE COUNTS. The
mean for men writers is 9.15 sentences.

TABLE 4: SENTENCE COUNTS			
F1	9	M1	6
F2	12	M2	7
F3	4	M3	9
F4	5	M4	5
F5	8	M5	5
F6	9	M6	5
F7	6	M7	8
F8	7	M8	15
F9	9	M9	4
F10	6	M10	5
F11	12	M11	6
F12	17	M12	18
F13	9	M13	17
F14	10	M14	7
F15	9	M15	13
F16	6	M16	12
F17	8	M17	5
F18	6	M18	12
F19	17	M19	10
F20	12	M20	14
	181		183

TABLE 5: SENTENCE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION							
	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-15	16-18	19+
Females	0	6	8	4	0	2	0
Males	0	8	4	3	3	2	0

The range of differences in the sentence frequency
distribution between women and men writers is also not
significant as shown on TABLE 5: SENTENCE FREQUENCY
DISTRIBUTION, although almost one-half of the men writers,
8 out of 20, wrote between 4-6 sentences in their
abstracts, compared with about one-third of the women

33

writers who wrote 4-6 sentences in their abstracts. Almost

one-half of the women writers, 8 out of 20, wrote in the

7-9 sentence category. Although all writers wrote between

4-18 sentences with the natural midpoint occurring at

the 11 sentence level, the mid point for the men writers

is just a bit lower than for the women writers.

TABLE 6: SENTENCE COUNT STATISTICS				
	Total	Mean	T-Value	Probability
Females	181	9.05	7.882992E-02	0.9376
Males	183	9.15		

N=20 for both groups.

The difference between the number of sentences by

women writers and men writers is not significant, as shown

on TABLE 6: SENTENCE COUNT STATISTICS. The T-Value is

7.882992E-02 and the Probability is 0.9376 at the 0.05

confidence level. There is no significant difference

between women and men writers' number of sentences.

Women writers produced 68 paragraphs with a low of

1 and a high of 7 paragraphs as shown in TABLE 7: PARAGRAPH

COUNTS. The mean is 3.45 paragraphs. Men writers produced

56 paragraphs with a low of 1 and a high of 5 paragraphs

as shown in TABLE 7: PARAGRAPH COUNTS. The mean is 2.9

paragraphs.

TABLE 8: PARAGRAPH FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION reveals

some differences, although the differences are not

significant. Most men writers, 11 out of 20, wrote between

34

3 and 4 paragraphs while women writers were slightly more

varied in the number of paragraphs they wrote.

TABLE 7: PARAGRAPH COUNTS			
F1	3	M1	4
F2	4	M2	3
F3	3	M3	1
F4	4	M4	2
F5	1	M5	2
F6	5	M6	3
F7	3	M7	2
F8	2	M8	3
F9	3	M9	2
F10	3	M10	3
F11	5	M11	3
F12	6	M12	5
F13	2	M13	5
F14	5	M14	2
F15	2	M15	3
F16	2	M16	3
F17	1	M17	1
F18	1	M18	4
F19	6	M19	3
F20	7	M20	4
	68		56

TABLE 8: PARAGRAPH FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION					
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10
Females	7	7	5	1	0
Males	7	11	2	0	0

The difference between women writers' and men writers'

number of paragraphs is not significantly different as

shown in TABLE 9: PARAGRAPH COUNT STATISTICS. The T-Value

is 1.138073 and the Probability is 0.2633 at a 0.05

confidence level.

TABLE 9: PARAGRAPH COUNT STATISTICS			
	Total	Mean	T-Value	Probability
Females 68	3.45	1.138073	0.2633
Males 56	2.9		

N=20 for both groups.

No significant differences exist between women writers and men writers in either number of words, sentences or paragraphs. Women writers and men writers, who are thought to have relatively the same access to language and have completed their B.A.'s and M.A.'s produced abstracts of close-to-equal length and proportion as reflected in the statistical analysis of the base line features of their abstracts.

In Chapter Two, sex/gender differences appeared in each of the fields of study: sociolinguistics, sociology, management and scientific research communities. Consistently women tended to use supportive and inclusive and connective strategies. Consistently men tended to use strategies which developed distinctions in status, in contrast or separation by exclusion or negation. So I analyzed these abstracts for language structures which would reveal writers making choices to connect or choices to separate.

Jerome Thale, when analyzing an historian for his style and voice, said, "Within a given context or a given writer there is a certain correspondence between the rhetorical, syntactical, grammatical patterns and the

writer's way of looking at the world" (286). Thale makes

the connection between the way we look at life, the

patterns we see life organized into, the ways we see people

or things interacting and our way of organizing language,

of using language to express our view of reality.

Further, Thale says that when "there is a high degree

of regularity in the use of these patterns we may guess

that the pattern comes from, and therefore reveals

something of, the writer's habitual way of seeing reality"

(286.) We are what we say, or rather we say the way we

see. Thale concludes that pattern of reality through

which we speak and write "is one of the ways in which

a similar way of looking at the world is created for the

reader" (286). Not only do we express ourselves in

distinct patterns, but when we do so with some regularity,

we say something about ourselves, and we also recreate

our pattern of seeing the world within the minds of our

readers.

With this in mind, I began looking for rhetorical,

syntactical and grammatical patterns or markers in the

abstracts. Markers which indicate support, inclusion,

connection and addition I called "Connective." Along

with these, markers which reveal distinction by status

or hierarchy, separation, and negation I called

"Contrastive." I found that these patterns respectively

set a tone within each abstract which controlled the

overall pattern of the abstract.

What follows is a listing of the choices of connective

and contrastive terms and strategies made by each writer,

and thereafter an analysis of them.

TABLE 10: WOMEN WRITERS' MARKERS

F1 Connectives: integral part of-1, also-1, (and)-3, provide-1, help-2, and-11, App-4, interaction-1, support-1. Total=25.
    Contrastives: Total=0.
    Purpose: to propose that we can incorporate whole self into writing process, both conscious and subconscious.
Connective.

F2 Connectives: App-1, encourages-2, (and)-5, and-8, interconnectedness-1, also-1, help-2. Total=20.
    Contrastives: rather than-3, isolate-1, takes away-1, not-1, distinguish from-1, while-1, only-1. Total=9.
    Purpose: to propose idea of familiar essay of personal exploration in which the writer makes connections and interprets the world through personal point of view.
Connective.

F3 Connectives: mutually-1, and-7, (and)-8, interact-1, include-2, also-2, combined-1, integrate-1, as part of-1, help-1. Total=25.
    Contrastive: outstanding-1, transcends-1. Total=2.
    Purpose: poetry must incorporate certain rhetorical elements.
Connective.

F4 Connectives: and-6, (and)-12, App-5, provide-1, bridge between-1, both-1. Total=26.
    Contrastives: to break-1, raises-1. Total=2.
    Purpose: to support idea of connecting innovations with the writing process.
Connective.

F5 Connectives: and-12, (and)-2, App-3, engage-2,

also-1, both-1, help-1. Total=22.
Contrastives: but-3, not-3, while-1. Total=7.
Purpose: to contrast student writers' methods
    with those of professional writers with
    the purpose of connecting students with
    professional writers' revision techniques.
Connective and contrastive.

F6 Connectives: and-14, (and)-7, App-1, within-1,
        support-1, enable-1, as well as-1,
        facilitate-1. Total=27.
    Contrastives: only-1, otherwise-1, neither-1,
        nor-2, but-1. Total=6.
    Purpose: to connect craftsmanship and
        creativity as elements of invention.
Connective.

F7 Connectives: and-5, (and)-10, App-3, provide-1,
        also-1, include-3, help-1, support-1.
        Total=25.
    Contrastives: while-1. Total=1.
    Purpose: to propose that elements of
        Stevenson's writing, when added together,
        identify him as a Scot.
Connective

F8 Connectives: and-3, (and)-3, also-1. Total=7.
    Contrastives: shorter than-1, difference
        between-1, not-1, but-1, only-1. Total=5.
    Purpose: to reveal the differences between
        two versions of Cather's novel.
Contrastive.

F9 Connectives: and-6, (and)-3, App-5,
        comprises-1, also-1, incorporate-1,
        support-2, encourage-1, connection-1.
        Total=21.
    Contrastives: less than-1, down played-2,
        denial-4, cut off from-1. Total=8.
    Purpose: to support the idea that we need
        to integrate feelings and ideas in the
        writing process.
Connective.

F10 Connectives: and-4, (and)-4, as well as-1,
        facilitate-1, include-1. Total=11.
    Contrastives: no-1. Total=1.
    Purpose: to show that after new program tried,
        students in sample had positive feelings
        about computer use, and working with

students will help them to improve.
Connective.

F11 Connectives: and-16, (and)-5, include-3,
        relate-2,incorporate-1. Total=27.
    Contrastives: failure-1, neglect-1. Total=2.
    Purpose: to show that students can improve
        math skills through journaling and
        supportive teaching techniques.
Connective.

F12 Connectives: and-6, (and)-9, App-1, also-2,
        additionally-1, enable-1, as well as-1,
        help-1, provide-1. Total=23.
    Contrastives: none-1=1.
    Purpose: an assessment model was developed
        to help universities to be more responsive
        to minority students.
Connective.

F13 Connectives: and-2, also-1. Total=3.
    Contrastives: differences-4, not-2. Total=6.
    Purpose: to identify the differences in levels
        of emphasis on career awareness in middle
        school settings.
Contrastive.

F14 Connectives: and-5, (and)-15, provide-1,
        assemble-1, also-1, summed together-2.
        Total=25.
    Contrastives: but-1, not-2, no-1, lack-1,
        different-1. Total=6.
    Purpose: to connect survey with resultant
        in-services.
Connective.

F15 Connectives: and-4, (and)-13, accompany-1,
        include-3, also-2. Total=23.
    Contrastives: Total=0.
    Purpose: to connect 2nd-4th grade students
        with information on water project.
Connective.

F16 Connectives: and-1, interpersonal-3,
        incorporate-2, consisting of-1, provide-1.
        Total=8.
    Contrastives: but-1, not-1. Total=2.
    Purpose: to connect hospital based management
        program with adult education theory.
Connective.

```
------------------------------------------------------------
```
F17 Connectives: and-2, additionally-1, enable-1,
     an integral part of-1. Total=5.
   Contrastives: however-1, only-1, too-1.
   Total=3.
   Purpose: to support adding additional teachers
     to enhance students' writing skills.
Connective.
```
------------------------------------------------------------
```
F18 Connectives: and-2, supplement to-1, enhance-1,
     relationship-1, between the two-1. Total=6.
   Contrastives: no-1, difference-1, greater-1.
     Total=3.
   Purpose: to examine and then connect computers
     with the teaching of geometry.
Connective.
```
------------------------------------------------------------
```
F19 Connectives: and-13, (and)-5, integrate-1,
     participants in-5, component of-1,
   strengthen-1, match between-1, include-2,
     integral part of-1, support-3, bridge-1,
     provide-1, incorporate-1, encouraged-1,
     align-1, facilitate-2, engage-1. Total=41.
   Contrastives: however-2, fragment-1, rather
     than-1, regardless-1. Total=5.
   Purpose: to develop a connection between
     home-based and school-based learning to
     support emergent preschool writers.
Connective.
```
------------------------------------------------------------
```
F20 Connectives: and-19, (and)-5, together-1,
     facilitate-2, co-learner-1, involve-1,
     both-1, immerse-1, provide-3, enable-1,
     connection-1, within-2, integral part of-1,
     interrelated-1, integrate-1, both-1.
     Total=42.
   Contrastives: failure-1. Total=1.
   Purpose: to make connections between teachers
     and students in order to immerse students
     in literature.
Connective.

TABLE 11: MEN WRITERS' MARKERS
M1 Connectives: and-5, (and)-4, support-2,
     conform-1, relate-1, equally-1. Total=14.

41

Contrastives: excerpts-3, certain-1, other-1,
    however-1, to be questioned-1,
    questionable-2, on the other hand-1, but-2,
    less than-1, not-1. Total=14.
Purpose: to contrast Orwell's writing guidelines
    with his writing to reveal the
    inconsistancies.
Contrastive.

M2 Connectives: and-3, (and)-2, in tandem with-1,
        interplay-1, connect-1. Total=8.
    Contrastives: used apart from-1. Total=1.
    Purpose: to reveal connections between spatial
        rhetoric and verbal rhetoric.
Connective.

M3 Connectives: and-8, (and)-2, relate-2, App-1=13.
    Contrastives: preferred-1, comparison with-1,
        argue-1, renders out-1, not-1, slights-1,
        contrary-1, instead of-1. Total=8.
    Purpose: to contrast Fish's and Bacon's methods
        and to show differences between them.
Contrastive.

M4 Connectives: and-5, (and)-1, also-1. Total=7.
    Contrastives: conflict-1, negative-1,
        preferred-1, lack of-1, different-1, mistaken
        for-1, rated weaker-1. Total=7.
    Purpose: to reveal differences between Japanese
        ESL students' strategies and English
        teacher's expectations and how ESL students
        may be rated lower in status accordingly.
Contrastive.

M5 Connectives: and-12, (and)-2, App-1,
        relation/ship-3. Total=18.
    Contrastives: that though-1, unique sets-1.
        Total=2.
    Purpose: to reveal that although speech and
        writing are related, they are essentially
        two different sets of codes.
Contrastive.

M6 Connectives: and-5, (and)-1, App-1, both-1,
        additionally-1. Total=9.
    Contrastives: juxtapose-1, against-1,
        secondary-1, certain-1, uniqueness-1,
        critical-1, not-1, only-1, but-1. Total=9.
    Purpose: to contrast one writer's work against
        others to reveal certain poetic qualities.

Contrastive.

M7 Connectives: and-5, (and)-13, App-1, help-1,
     relate-1. Total=21.
   Contrastives: inadequate-1, not-1, different-1,
     regardless-1, primarily-1, placed under-1.
     Total=6.
   Purpose: to reveal how high school teachers
     are inadequately trained, to help then make
     connections with material in the study and
     to define "content" as an item of primary
     importance in the study.

Contrastive (with a connective element).

M8 Connectives: and-10, (and)-2, App-2, enlist-1.
     Total=15.
   Contrastives: certain-1, stand out-1,
     greatest-1, few-1, superficial to-1,
     however-1. Total=6.
   Purpose: to identify Churchill's oratory style
     as extraordinary and unique.

Contrastive.

M9 Connectives: and-6, (and)-4. Total=10.
   Contrastives: failure-2, however-1, not-1,
     rather-1, argue-2, conflicts-2, differ/ent-3,
     certain-2. Total=14.
   Purpose: to reveal differences in strategies
     between high school and university teachers.

Contrastive.

M10 Connectives: and-7, (and)-11, App-1, both-1,
     include-1, help-1, facilitate-1. Total=23.
   Contrastives: however-1, not-1, counterpoint
     to-1, supra-3, beyond-1, limitations-1,
     overly-1, certain-1. Total=10.
   Purpose: to help student with superior skills
     via certain types of assignments.

Contrastive and connective.

M11 Connectives: and-3, (and)-2, combined-1,
     consist of-1, interface-1, infuse into-1.
     Total=9.
   Contrastives: Total=0.
   Purpose: to make connections between computer
     technology and social science/history.

Connective.

M12 Connectives: and-11, (and)-4, interpersonal-2,
     relations-3, also-2, incorporate-1,

support/ive-2. Total=25.
    Contrastives: certain-1, problematic-1,
        abandon-1, without-2, only-1, deprived-1,
        barriers-1, unless-1. Total=10.
    Purpose: to identify problems and barriers
        to an advisor/advisee program.
Contrastive.

M13 Connectives: and-7, App-1, in addition-1,
        include-1, as well as-1, encourage-1, work
        together-1, cooperative-1, help-1, both-2.
        Total=17.
    Contrastives: only-1, not-1, but-1, little-1,
        not-1, lack-1, although-1, however-1, better
        than-1, divided-1, alternative-2, most
        important-1. Total=13.
    Purpose: to encourage students to see
        alternatives to war in a cooperative learning
        group.
Connective and contrastive.

M14 Connectives: and-2, also-1, include-1,
        contain-1. Total=5.
    Contrastives: not-2, too-1. Total=3.
    Purpose: to identify wildlife material that
        is not local or usable and contrast it with
        material which is local and more usable.
Contrastive.

M15 Connectives: and-8, (and)-2, include-2.
        Total=12.
    Contrastives: problem-1, although-1,
        differences-2, however-1, only-1, which-2,
        even greater-1, best-1. Total=10.
    Purpose: to reveal differences with existing
        physical education program and the
        superiority of the proposed program.
Contrastive.

M16 Connectives: and-7, (and)-6, as part of-1,
        enable-1, include-1. Total=16.
    Contrastives: no-2, relative worth-1, while-2,
        only-1, differences-1, best-2, which-2.
        Total=11.
    Purpose: to reveal differences between existing
        physical education program and the proposed
        one.
Contrastive.

M17 Connectives: and-1, (and)-2, App-1, related-1,

```
            include-1, cooperative-1, agreement-1
            Total=7.
        Contrastives: increased-1, advantage-1. Total=2.
        Purpose: to show the advantages of community
            college instruction through cooperative
            agreements.
Connective.
------------------------------------------------
M18 Connectives: and-10, (and)-3, incorporate-1,
            encourage-1, support-1, App-3. Total=19.
        Contrastives: polarization of-1, more than-1,
            few have-1, dissimilar-1, primarily-1,
            while-2, not-2, certain-1, differences-1,
            segment-1, which-3. Total=15.
        Purpose: to identify differences and polarities
            such that voters will vote correctly and
            not in a confused manner.
Contrastive.
------------------------------------------------
M19 Connectives: and-4, (and)-2, provide-1, as
            well as-1, incorporate-1, bridge-1, engage-1.
            Total=11.
        Contrastives: disregard-1, instead-1 outside-1
            different-1, regardless-1, rather than-1.
            Total=6.
        Purpose: to support whole language learaning
            by contrasting it to traditional methods.
Contrastive.
------------------------------------------------
M20 Connectives: and-9, (and)-2, provide-1,
            assist-1, contain-2, equal-1. Total=16.
        Contrastives: primary-1, however-1. Total=2.
        Purpose: to provide a handbook on a year round
            school calendar for school administrators.
Connective.
```

Each writer's use of connective and contrastive

patterns is listed in TABLE 10 and TABLE 11. These are

condensed into TABLE 12, provided below.

The writers' main purposes defined within these

abstracts reveal tendencies in each group. Of the women,

17 made connections their overall pattern, 2 made contrasts

their overall pattern and 1 made both connection and contrast her pattern. Of the men, 15 made contrasts their overall pattern, 4 made connections their overall pattern, and 1 made both connection and contrast his overall pattern.

TABLE 12: CONNECTIVE AND CONTRASTIVE TOTALS							
Connectives				Contrastives			
F1	25	M1	14	F1	0	M1	14
F2	20	M2	8	F2	9	M2	1
F3	25	M3	13	F3	2	M3	8
F4	26	M4	7	F4	2	M4	7
F5	22	M5	18	F5	7	M5	2
F6	27	M6	9	F6	6	M6	9
F7	25	M7	21	F7	1	M7	6
F8	7	M8	15	F8	5	M8	6
F9	21	M9	10	F9	8	M9	14
F10	11	M10	23	F10	1	M10	10
F11	27	M11	9	F11	2	M11	0
F12	23	M12	25	F12	1	M12	10
F13	3	M13	17	F13	6	M13	13
F14	25	M14	5	F14	6	M14	3
F15	23	M15	12	F15	0	M15	10
F16	8	M16	16	F16	2	M16	11
F17	5	M17	7	F17	3	M17	2
F18	6	M18	19	F18	3	M18	15
F19	41	M19	11	F19	5	M19	6
F20	42	M20	16	F20	1	M20	2
	412		275		70		149

The women used 412 connective terms and the men used 275 connective terms and structures. The mean for the women, as shown in TABLE 13: CONNECTIVE STATISTICS, is 20.6. The mean for the men, as also shown, is 13.75. The T-Value is 2.487104 and the Probability is 0.0189 at the 0.05 confidence level. These women used significantly more connectives structures than did the men.

TABLE 13: CONNECTIVE STATISTICS				
	Total	Mean	T-Value	Probability
Female	412	20.6	2.487104	0.0189
Male	275	13.75		

N=20 for both groups.

Women also show greater diversity in their individual
number of choices of connective terms or strategies.
In TABLE 14: COMPARISON OF CONNECTIVE TERMS, I compared
the choices only women made to the choices both women
and men made and to those made only by men. I looked
at three connective categories as suggested by the research
studies examined in Chapter 2: terms of support; terms
of inclusion/ connection; and terms of addition.

TABLE 14: COMPARISON OF CONNECTIVE MARKERS		
Women	Both	Men
Terms of support		
enhance	enable	assist
strengthen	encourage	
	facilitate	
	help	
	provide	
	support	
Terms of Inclusion/Connection		
accompany	as part of	conform
align	both	contain
between the two	bridge	cooperative
co-learner	combine	enlist
component	consist	incorporate
comprises	engage	infuse into
connection	include	in tandem
immerse	interpersonal	interface
integral part	incorporate	interplay
integrate	interpersonal	connect
interact	relate	
interaction	relationship	
interconnected	together	
interrelated		

```
          involve
          match between
          mutually
          participants in
          summed together
          supplement to
          within
          assemble
```

Terms of Addition
	additionally	agreement
	also	equal/equally
	and/(and)	in addition to
	(appositives)	
	as well as	

The women and men both chose many of the same terms of support: "enable," "encourage," "facilitate," "help," "provide" and "support." One man also used "assist" and two women also used "enhance" and "strengthen" once each. While no significant difference exists between the types of words chosen by these writers, it is significant that women chose to use terms of support three times more often than did the men: 42 to 14 times.

In terms of inclusion and connection, a greater difference of choices appears. Both women and men chose several of the same terms, 12 terms, as shown in TABLE 14: COMPARISON OF CONNECTIVE MARKERS in the "both" column. While men chose only 10 different terms of inclusion beyond the ones both groups chose, women chose 22 different terms of inclusion and connection beyond the terms that both groups chose more than twice as many as the men. When

48

looking at the actual number of terms used, we find that women again used almost twice as many terms of inclusion and connection as did men: 72 to 42.

In terms of addition, women did not make any choices in addition to the ones that both women and men made, while three men chose to use 3 more terms of addition, beyond those chosen by both groups. But 3 choices out of the men's 219 choices is not significant. Again women chose to use terms of addition significantly more often than did men: 298 to 219.

In all of these categories, women chose to use terms of support, inclusion and addition significantly more often than did men. Women's behavior as writers appears to parallel women's behavior as speakers, managers and researchers: They tend to make connections.

In TABLE 12: CONNECTIVE AND CONTRASTIVE TOTALS, although women used significantly more connectives overall than did men, the men used significantly more contrastive terms or structures than did women: 149 to 70. The mean for women, as shown in TABLE 15: CONTRASTIVE STATISTICS, is 3.5 compared to 7.45 for the men. The difference is significant: The T-Value is 3.236681 and the Probability is 0.0028 at the 0.05 confidence level.

TABLE 15: CONTRASTIVE STATISTICS				
	Total	Mean	T-Value	Probability
Female	70	3.5	3.236681	0.0028
Male	149	7.45		

N=20 for both groups.

When analyzing for contrastive terms, I again turned
to the studies examined in Chapter Two which revealed
that the men in the studies exhibited hierarchial or
status-oriented behavior and speech, as well as behavior
which separates and negates. Thus I organized the analysis
of the contrastive terms into three sections: terms of
distinction, hierarchy and status; terms of separation;
and terms of negation.

Men and women only made five overlapping choices
in terms of distinction, hierarchy and status, as shown
in TABLE 16, "greater," "rather than," "while," "less
than" and "too." The women chose six terms that the men
did not choose, but the men chose 22 different terms that
women did not choose to use, nearly four times as many
different choices as the women's choices. The men also
used terms of distinction, hierarchy and status almost
three times as often as did women: 50 to 17.

The men's range of choices of terms of separation
is even more dramatic. While both men and women chose
to use only 3 of the same terms, "difference/different,"
"however," and "while," and women only selected 7 different

choices, the men chose to use 34 different terms of
separation, almost 5 times as many as the women. Equally
dramatic is the men's number of uses of terms of separation
compared to women's, 74 to 15, again almost five times
as many as the women.

The women used terms of negation more often than
did the men: 35 to 25. While they made three more
different choices of these terms than did men only, these
numbers are not high enough to be significant.

Women	Both	Men
TABLE 16: COMPARISON OF CONTRASTIVE MARKERS		
Women	Both	Men
Terms of Distinction, Hierarchy and Status		
outstanding	greater	better than
raises	rather than	best
transcends	while	beyond
down play	less than	certain
shorter than	too	increased
neglect		more than
		most important
		overly
		preferred
		primarily/primary
		stand out
		supra-
		which
		few
		inadequate to
		lack of
		limitations
		little
		placed under
		rated weaker
		secondary
		superficial to

Women	Both	Men
Terms of Separation		
break	difference	abandon
cut off from	however	against
distinguish from	while	although

otherwise
takes away
neglect
fragment

certain
counterpoint to
disregard
advantage
alternative
argue
comparison with
contrary to
deprive
disregard
dissimilar
divided
excerpts
instead
juxtapose
mistaken for
other
on the other hand
outside
polarization of
problem/atic
question/able
relative worth
renders out
segment
slights
that though
unique
unless
used apart from
without

Terms of Negation

denial	but	negative
neither	failure	
none	lack	
nor	only	
	no	
	not	

Thus, while men did not use more terms of negation, they did use a significantly greater number of terms of distinction, hierarchy and status and terms of separation than did the women.

The patterns of use of these connective and
contrastive terms and structures by women and men are
just as revealing of difference as are the numbers. Women
used connective structure to join simple elements, such
as a series of nouns or verbs or adjectives, to join a
series of complex ideas, and to synthesize a series of
ideas. Women often used connective structures in series
such as paragraph three of F3's abstract. (The connective
structures are underlined and the contrastive are in **bold**.)

> The outcome of this thesis is the realization that
> for poetry to "work" it must have effective rhetoric,
> (and) it must bring to the surface of the text processes
> such as parallelism, (and) additions, (and) suppressions
> and substitutions--(appositive) all the transformations
> of the symbol which help to bring languages into existence
> and particularly poetry into existence (Hobson iii).

F3 has used connective structures to develop a series
of ideas which become interrelated and synthesized to
speak to the nature of language and to its poetry. This
stylistic feature and F3's regular use of it reflect her
way of looking at the world and her way of organizing
the components in it: it reveals her way of thinking and
writing as one of making connections.

This same use of intensive connectives to synthesize
information is seen in F4's abstract, paragraph 2:

> New Journalism, (appositive) a technique developed
> by a few innovative American nonfiction writers
> (appositive) (Wolfe, (and) Mailer, (and) Capote,
> (and) Didion) during the postmodern period and
> designed to break the hundred-year-old British

pattern of rigid expository writing, **raises**
journalism from objective reporting to the realm
of art by using post modern fictional devices
in nonfictional prose (Kollitz iii).

F4's uses connectives densely to synthesize a half
dozen complex ideas as she reveals her way of looking
at the world by means of this connective stylistic
technique. She builds one relationship to another: New
Journalism to authors to periods to technique to genres.

This same type of pattern is seen in F7's second
paragraph as she connects ideas--genre to authors to
specific linguistic elements--to reveal relationship.
This is her way of seeing and arranging reality, and it
in turn becomes a reality for her readers.

> The genre of Scottish writers, having been firmly
> established by such writers as Norman Wilson,
> (and) Robert Watson, (and) Kurt Wittig, (and)
> Roderick Watson, (and) Edwin Muir, (and) Karl
> Miller, (and) Tom Narin, and Roderick Watson [sic],
> is identified by linguistic elements which help
> support the established element of theme.
> Specifically, these linguistic elements include
> the use of contrast and counterpoint, (and)
> juxtaposition and antithesis, (and) paradox and
> parallelism (Dunsmore iii).

"Women's way of thinking makes connections between
facts an ideas" and "compares hypothesis against
experience" (Rich 175-176). Women writers even use
contrastive structures to enhance their connections.
For example, in the opening paragraph of F2's abstract
on the familiar (or personal) essay, she uses contrastive

54

structures to support her idea of the student's need to make connections and in doing so also supports Rich's idea that women writers compare hypotheses, the status-quo givens, to their own experiences.

> The familiar essay is an informal, open work of non-fiction prose. This kind of essay encourages exploring, (and) testing and playing with ideas rather than proving a thesis. Familiar writers give us a sense of ourselves and our interconnectedness with the rest of our world at a time when our obsession with the high speed transmission of information works to isolate us from one another by minimizing the importance of curiosity, (and) contemplation, (and) interrogation, (and) conversation and discussion. This obsession also takes away some of our freedom because it requires that we accept other's answers rather than discovering our own. The familiar essay can help students learn to find their own answers (Butler iii).

F2's purpose is to promote opportunities for inter-connectedness. She uses the contrastive structure rather than to elevate her idea that students should be permitted to learn by making their own connections with the world by exploring, by comparing their experiences to the ideas they find in their studies. In her second paragraph, she says, "the familiar essay offers an intimate audience, open forum and friendly tone. . . . "[T]hese qualities distinguish this essay form from the informational and scientific essay" (Butler iii). F2 uses three contrastive structures in order to blend a discussion of style, "familiar essay," with purpose, "exploring life's questions."

M10's essay, however, uses connective structures to support his contrastive ideas. In his first paragraph he too finds it necessary to "challenge the givens, the assumptions that we operate under" (Rich 175-176).

> There are, **however**, a significant number of
> Rhetoric/ Composition theorists (both ancient
> and modern) who have explored the realm of
> influences in writing which are **not limited** to
> conventional rationality (appositive) (such as
> inspiration, (and) intuition, (and) emotion, (and)
> etc.), often in the context of "creativity."
> **As a counterpoint to** the predominating rationalist
> approaches, this paper examines a number of these
> "**supra**-rational" (**beyond** the rational) works,
> in an effort to identify key common elements,
> (and) beliefs, (and) assumptions, (and) etc.,
> and to consider ways to successfully implement
> these insights in the Composition class. (Cofer
> iii)

M10 uses 6 contrastive structures and 10 connection structures to distinguish the old way from the new, the rational way from the "supra-rational." M10's use of contrastives builds a paragraph with just as many complex ideas as do those who use a predominance of connective structures, but the use of contrastives has a tendency to build bi-polarities. This bi-polar tendency can be seen in M3's abstract.

> A comparison of Baconian criticism **argues** that
> Brian Vicker's stylistic analysis **renders out**
> important qualities in Bacon's prose which Stanley
> Fish's reader-response method **cannot**. (Minard
> iii)

M3 sets Vicker's analysis against Fish's in order to compare them, but more importantly, to contrast them

in order to find one of them better or of superior quality
in some regard: "Vicker's method demonstrates that Bacon's
prose can be visionary and dialectical, **contrary** to Fish's
thesis" (Minard iii).

The strategy of defining by contrast is common to
these male writers. M6 writes: "**Juxtaposing** passages
of Don DeLillo's prose **against** like passages from his
contemporaries reveals DeLillo's distinct stylistic
presence. . .(Sisk iii). M7 writes: "**regardless** of the
method of response used, response should be **primarily**
to content" (Sonnenburg iii) which implies that response
to content is different from and superior to other
responses. M8 writes about Winston Churchill's oratory
style: "He **stands out.** . ,**few** published studies exist
examining this man's ability. . .and those are **superficial**"
(Stark iii) in which the implication is that Churchill
is not connected with most others, that he and M8's
critique of his oratory style are not superficial but
are distinct and unique. M9 writes: "college writers
[sic] experience is **not** necessarily the result of **a failure**
of our nation's secondary school system; **rather** I wish
to argue that they are the result of **certain conflicts**"
(Wood iii). M9 here **argues** or sets himself against others,
sees himself as disconnected from others regarding this
issue; he sees college writers' inability to be part of

the better group who can write well not as a **failure** of
the nation's secondary school system but as something
else apart from that and sees the real problem as the
result of **certain conflicts** instead of students having
levels of competence which might connect them with other
writers at the same skill level. M12 writes: **"Certain**
aspects. . .were determined **to be problematic** <u>and</u> in need
of **revision.** This writer believed that the faculty might
abandon the program . . ." (West iii).

Each of these statements, which are consistent with
the balance of the men writers' sample, reveals a "certain
correspondence between the rhetorical, syntactical,
grammatical patterns and the writer's way of looking at
the world" (Thale 286). These men writers tend to define
by contrasting and by using contrastive structures to
express their method of thinking, their method of seeing
the world and how people and objects interrelate.

> And when there is a high degree of regularity
> in the use of these patterns we may guess that
> the pattern comes from, and therefore reveals
> something of, the writer's habitual way of seeing
> reality, and that the pattern is one of the ways
> in which a similar way of looking at the world
> is created for the reader. (Thale 286)

Thus, we can see that Flynn's conclusion that "we
ought not to assume that men and women use language in
identical ways or represent the world in a similar fashion"
(431) is justified. These men do define the world and

58

their relationship to it most often by use of contrastive
structures, and these women most often do define their
world and their relationship to it by means of connective
structures even though they use the same basic language,
English, and the same basic grammatical structures in
about the same number of words, sentences and paragraphs
to do so. There is a stylistic difference between women's
and men's academic prose.

CHAPTER FOUR: Concluding Thoughts

In the Educated Imagination, Northrup Frye discusses three different "levels of the mind": the level of consciousness and awareness of self; the level of social participation or our identity which comes from relating with others; and the level of imagination which Frye sees as the means of producing literature. "There are not really different languages, of course, but three different reasons for using words" (Frye 23). It is not that we speak or write in different languages, but we have different reasons for using language. We use the same type of words, the same type of sentence structures, and the same type of paragraphing. But we have different purposes for writing, and along with different purposes, there comes different uses of language.

This difference in use of language has become evident in this thesis. As Flynn suggested in her essay, we should not be surprised if women and men use language differently. A "characteristic pattern" (431) has emerged in this analysis: women writers have a strong tendency to define by connection; men writers have a strong tendency to define by contrasting. The men in this study tend to separate and disconnect while the women tend to synthesize and combine. "Males and females use language . . .[and] writing strategies and patterns of representation"

differently (Flynn 431). Men tend to find it easier to

write about information and objects by contrasting and

separating them, finding a status level to attach to them

to and putting them in that status-oriented compartment.

Women find it easier to write about information and objects

by connecting them, seeing how they are interrelated and

synthesizing them. Thus men tend to disconnect when they

speak, contrast when they write, command when they lead

while women tend to connect when they speak, synthesize

when they write, support when they lead.

Each is a valid method of looking at the world, a

valid method of using language, of analyzing, associating,

synthesizing and producing academic discourse. Each should

be encouraged, taught and valued. But they are not

currently equally valued. Although synthesis in academic

prose is not negated, it is not seen on the same plane

as argumentation, which is taught as the higher mode of

discourse. Centuries of study have been devoted to

variations on the theme of argumentation. Rhetoricians,

classical and modern, consistently have worked for the

strongest and most effective way to argue. Classes in

critical thinking are taught based on the idea that

argumentation is the primary mode of academic discourse

while synthesis sits off in a corner as a silent junior

partner. As long as we have a status-oriented hierarchy

of prose modes, we privilege contrast over connection, and thus the very nature of academic prose works against women and women's way of seeing reality and women's way of writing.

If women's and men's different ways of seeing and writing are to be valued equally, a clearer understanding of what the male and female models of academic prose look like is needed. We need a clearer picture of the different ways men and women use language. Because expectations for prose were not developed predominant by or for women writers, and women have written in this climate, women have adopted this system and styles expected of them in order to succeed. So it is hard to know what a female model of academic prose is or might be if fully realized independently of these forces. But we can listen to people who have been working on this question.

Patricia Sullivan suggests that women can and have "cross-dressed" or cross-voiced. Indeed, Laura Cereta's accolades in the 15th century were not due to her writing as a woman, but due to her ability to cross-voice, her ability to take on the perspective, the knowledge, the tone of Bibulus Sempronius. But when she spoke as a woman and used her acquired skills to connect herself with other women and to confront Bibulus Sempronius as one who would "admire [her] as a female prodigy," he challenged

her belief in the ability of women. She found his behavior
"low and vulgar" and saw it as an attempt "to halt Medusa
with honey" (495). She could have ignored a personal
attack, even been "silent," but she could not tolerate
an attack on her "entire sex" (496). Herein was the
problem for Bibulus, that women could have their own
voices, their own messages, their own perspectives, and
their own uses of language. Just as Laura Cereta spoke
out and just as Sarah Grimke spoke out and as Adrienne
Rich and Helene Cixous and many others have spoken out,
more women will continue to speak out. Women may tire
of cross-voicing, of editing themselves out of their
academic prose, of hearing "don't use the authorial 'I'",
"speak from the third person or the voice of the academic
community," "be objective," "argue."

And at the same time, women are asking what might
a feminine model of academic prose look like? What are
the implications for academic prose if women's perspective
on life, if women's style, if women's ways of thinking
and writing are inculcated into the expectations for
academic discourse? First, women should be encouraged
to speak though their own perspectives, and acknowledge
their contexts in the world and use them to develop
contexts for their questions and their answers. For
example, if a woman writer is speaking to the criminal

justice community on the topic of rape and she or her sister has been raped, for her to separate herself from her rage is dishonest to her as a writer and dishonest to us as readers. Her perspective, her story, is part of the evidence that she integrates into her text. To attempt to be objective--to separate herself from the human or emotional or personal aspects of the topic--is often not only dishonest, it is undesirable for it does not permit the fuller revelation of a personal and knowledgeable perspective on her present understanding of the truth. By honestly and honorably conveying what she understands of the truth, her authorial "I" becomes authoritative.

Second, women connect the cognitive and the affective (Lamb 11), thinking and feeling, logos with pathos with ethos, much as the Sophists and Aristotle did. Women tend to make connections among their emotional processes, their ethical processes, and their cognitive processes as they organize, synthesize, and express ideas. It is all part of making connections for women.

Third, beyond women's personal approach to academic discourse, women are collaborative: multivoiced. Because women make connections readily, collaboration could be an essential component of learning and expression for women whether with other persons or with other texts.

Because most women may tend to rely on their ability to make connections with others and with texts, they may see a consensus of many voices and varied perspectives as strength.

Women's personal perspective and collaborative efforts may indeed produce a different text, perhaps one as different as Sarah Grimke hoped for early in the 19th century. Ruth Ellen Boetcher Joeres, writing an editorial for Signs, says "the way" we express our ideas is "fundamentally" important and we must speak "individually" as well as "collectively" (701, 703).

Fourth, as Joeres suggests, feminist prose promotes accessibility. Exclusionary jargon may separate reader from text and ideas (702). While feminist prose requires particularity, it also requires the kind of clarity which invites reader to participate with the ideas in the text. It invites connection with the reader and text.

Most women may not tend to set up contrasts, to divide and argue; as this study indicates, they may tend to connect and synthesize. Both styles should be reflected in the way we teach academic discourse. Synthesis should be used as fully as is argumentation, not as an occasional extra tool but as a primary means of creating academic prose alongside argumentation. The current system of teaching writing throughout academia is a reflection of

the primary emphasis on argumentation. Argumentation

is how the world has been seen, how the world has been

patterned. It has been assumed that others--including

women--also view the world argumentatively. This should

be reconsidered.

Women writers should be given the opportunity to

learn according to their own styles of thinking and their

own ways of using language also. It's time, as Rich tells

us, to take women seriously, to give women an equal footing

with the men in academia: yes, we should require critical

thinking; yes, we should require argumentation; but we

should also require collaboration; we should also require

synthesis. We should make sure the doors are open for

women writers and for all writers to make connections

as a primary means of academic reasoning.

In order to facilitate this process we must do more

research, more empirical academic research. First this

study must be empirically confirmed. Next, it should

be applied to other student writers at other academic

levels. And we must look at how people deal with

differences. Also we must examine more ways to help women

out of their "silence" (Rich 176).

Although the female voice and the female model in

academia is just taking form, the female academic voice

of women writers does exist, alongside the male academic

voice. Often women have had to adopt the male voice to fit in, to survive, to perform in an academic system based on the male model. Until the female model is well established, women will still have to do both, to meet the requirements of male academia and find their voices as women.

Perhaps it would be good to remember that language use is a matter of choices as Cereta tells us and a matter of varied purposes as Frye tells us. This study offers evidence of more than one style, more than one way of seeing the world, more than one model of language use available to writers of academic prose. This study has shown that there is a difference. It is time we paid attention to that difference.

WORKS CITED

Bakhtin, Mikhail. From "Marxism and the Philosophy of
     Language." The Rhetorical Tradition. Ed. Patricia
     Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg. 924-944.

Barinaga, Marcia. "Is There a 'Female Style' in Science?"
     Science 16 April 1993. 384-391.

Brown, Penelope. "Women and Politeness: A New Perspective
     on Language and Society." Reviews in Anthropology,
     May/June (1976): 240-249.

Burke, Kenneth. A Grammar of Motives. Berkeley:
     University of California Press, 1969.

Carrocci, Noreen. "Clarifying Gender Differences or
     Communication Effectiveness: Which is Our Aim?"
     Proceedings of the 2nd and 3rd Conferences on
     Communication, Language, and Gender. Madison:
     University of Wisconsin--Extension, 1982. 329-337.

Cereta, Laura. "Letter to Bibulus Sempronius, Defense
     of the Liberal Instruction of Women." The Rhetorical
     Tradition. Ed. Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg.
     Boston: Bedford Books, 1990. 495-498.

Chodorow, Nancy. The Reproduction of Mothering. Berkeley:
     University of CA Press, 1978.

Cixous, Helene. "The Laugh of the Medusa." The Rhetorical
     Tradition. Boston: Bedford Books, 1990. 1232-1245.

Coates, Jennifer and Deborah Cameron. Women in Their
     Speech Communities. London: Longman, 1988.

Coates, Jennifer. Women, Men and Language. London:
     Longman, 1993 Ed.

-----Women, Men and Language. London: Longman, 1986 ed.

Eman, Virginia and Benjamin W. Morse. "The
     Construct of Androgeny: An Overview and Implications
     for Research." Communication, Language and Sex.
     Ed. Cynthia L. Berryman and Virginia Eman. Rowley,
     Mass.: Newbury House, 1980. 76-90.

Fairclough, Norman. Language and Power. London: Longman,
     1989. 46.

Flynn, Elizabeth. "Composing as a Woman" College,
     Composition and Communication. 39, Dec 1988. 423-435.

-----Staffroom Interchange:"Composing 'Composing as a
     Woman': A Perspective on Research." College,
     Composition and Communication. 41, Feb. 1990. 83-89.

Freire, Paulo. Pedogogy of the Oppressed. New York:
     Seabury Press, 1968.

Frye, Northrup. The Educated Imagination. Bloomington:
     Indiana UP, 1964. 13-33.

Gilligan, Carol. In a Different Voice: Psychological
     Theory and Women's Development. Cambridge: Harvard
     University Press, 1982.

Grimke, Sarah. "Letters on the Equality of the Sexes
     and the Condition of Woman." The Rhetorical
     Tradition. Boston: Bedford Books, 1990. 685-696.

Joeres, Ruth Ellen Boetcher. "Editorial." Signs 7,
     701-703.

Lakoff, Robin. "You Are What You Say?" Language
     Awareness. Ed. Paul Eschholz, Alfred Rosa and
     Virginia Clark. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986
     Ed. 311-318.

Lamb, Catherine. "Beyond Argument in Feminist
     Composition." College Communication and Composition
     42, Feb. 1991. 11-24.

McConnell-Ginet, Sally. "Intonation in a Man's World."
     Signs 3, (1978): 541-559.

Nichols, Patricia C. "Women and Their Speech Communities."
     Women and Language in Literature and Society. Ed.
     Sally McConnell-Ginet, Ruth Borker, and Nelly Furman.
     New York: Praeger, 1980. 140-149.

Nilsen, Alleen Pace. "Sexism in English: A Feminist View."
     Language Awareness. Ed. Paul Eschholz, Alfred Rosa
     and Virginia Clark. New York: St. Martin's Press,
     1986. 301-310.

Pollitt, Katha. "Are Women Morally Superior to Men?"
     The Nation. 28 Dec. 1992. 799-807.

Rich, Adrienne. "Taking Women Students Seriously." <u>The
     Norton Reader, Shorter Eighth Edition</u>. New York:
     W.W. Norton, 1992. 169-176.

Rosener, Judy. "Ways Women Lead." <u>Harvard Business
     Review</u>. Nov./Dec. 1990.

-----"Debate: Ways Men and Women Lead." <u>Harvard Business
     Review</u> Jan.-Feb. 1991. 150-153.

Sachs, Jacqueline. "Preschool Boys' and Girls' Language
     Use in Pretend Play." <u>Language, Gender, and Sex
     in Comparative Perspective</u>. Ed. Susan U. Philips,
     Susan Steele, and Christine Tanz. Cambridge:
     Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Smith, Charles Kay. <u>Styles and Structures</u>. New York:
     W.W. Norton, 1974. 242.

Sullivan, Patricia A. "Feminism and Methodology in
     Composition Studies." <u>Method and Methodology in
     Composition Research</u>. Ed. Gesa Kirsch and Patricia
     A. Sullivan. Carbondale, Ill.: So. University Press,
     1992. 37-60.

Tannen, Deborah. <u>You Just Don't Understand: Women and
     Men in Conversation</u>. New York: Morrow, 1990.

Thale, Jerome. "Style and Anti-Style: History and
     Anti-History." <u>College English</u> 29 Jan 68. 286-302.

Thorne, Barrie, Cheris Kramarea and Nancy Henley.
     <u>Language, Gender and Society</u>. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury,
     1983.