AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE ENGLISH SYSTEM OF ADDRESS:

A Case of Linguistic Sexism

Language, a mirror of social reality, serves as an index to social organization and behaviour. Given the traditional dichotomous role structure existing between men and women in our society, it is understandable that linguistic sexism, however subtle it may at times be, also exists. To date, linguistic sex differences have been documented in phonological structure, syntactic style and complexity, pronominal/nominal referents and lexicon. Henley (1975) views language as "a micropolitical structure of everyday details. . . patterns of . . . which help establish, express and maintain power relationships. A wide range of verbal and non-verbal cues function as gestures of dominance and submission. . . ." The paradigm of address, both direct and referential, serves as one example of such a verbal cue.

English System of Address

Names, like other words, are linguistic symbols. Each symbol represents a unique entity. It is the assignment of

by Dorothy Precious

a name to an individual that defines the organism and marks the beginning of self-definition. One's name comes to be part of one's identity.

In our society, the naming convention for males and females is essentially the same, i.e., both sexes have first and last names and both may have additional names which are usually assigned less importance. However, women's names, and by implication identities, are attributed less importance than those of men. This is evidenced by the transience of women's last names as occurs in the marriage/divorce/marriage syndrome, as opposed to the permanence and continuation of a man's last name from generation to generation. It is worthwhile to note that in recent years, due to the impact of the Woman's Movement, many women are rejecting the tradition of name change with marriage. Some women retain their own surname, incorporate it as a middle name or create a compound surname. Many social/ linguistic problems arise with the retention of a married woman's maiden name. This illustrates a lack of acceptance of the trend. A second discrepancy in the naming convention exists in attachment of the forms Jr. and Sr. to men's names only. This is in accord with the tradition of paternal lineage. Clearly, it is the social sanction of patrimony that most diminishes the importance of women's names.

Names are used to address individuals; directly and referentially. The patterns of address provide substantial information about the nature of relationships and interactions. In situations of direct address, the exchange of names is done on a reciprocal or non-reciprocal basis. The choice of address form is governed by the relationship between the interlocuters. If a reciprocal pattern is used, one can infer that shared values are present, whether these derive from kinship, occupational equality, age, nationality, sex or social status. Conversely, non-reciprocal patterns reveal an absence of shared values. Linguistic imbalances reflect real life imbalances and inequities.

Brown and Ford (1961), in an analysis of address in direct verbal interaction, interpret the usage of address forms in terms of the two dimensions of status and intimacy. The choice of forms is governed by the properties of the dyadic situation as well as the properties and relationship between the speaker and addressee. Brown and Ford describe the English address system by means of a binary contrast: FN (First Name) versus TLN (Title plus Last Name). The FN index includes full first name, abbreviation and diminutive. The TLN index includes the categorical terms Mr., Mrs., Miss, Ms, as well as all professional titles.

Address patterns will either be reciprocal or non-reciprocal. Reciprocal exchange is a mutual exchange of either FN or TLN. Non-reciprocal exchange involves one person using FN while the

other responds with TLN. In a recipro-
cal pattern of address, Brown and Ford
posit that the mutual exchange of TLN
correlates with distance and formality,
whereas the mutual exchange of FN cor-
relates with a greater degree of in-
timacy. Status also governs the ex-
change. In instances of non-reciprocal
address, persons of higher status are
addressed by TLN, an indication of
respect, while those of lower status
are addressed by FN, a mark of con-
descension and assumed intimacy. They
suggest that usage of LN (Last Name)
alone represents a degree of intimacy
greater than that accorded to TLN but
less than that assumed to be related
with FN only.

It should be mentioned here that today
LN alone is often used between members
of a group as an indication of intimacy
or equality. Brown and Ford propose
that it is the person of higher status
who sets the tone of the interaction
and determines the address forms to be
used. Those who address others by FN
in a non-reciprocal dyad are in some
way superior, be it by virtue of pro-
fessional position, age, economic
status, etc. Those who are addressed
by FN are presumed to be inferiors or
dependents, e.g., children, servants,
women. Address forms and patterns are
socially accepted and the implications
are often belittling on both a sub-
liminal and overt level.

Non-reciprocal address patterns often

exist in relationships between men and
women. There is a general tendency to
use a female's first name sooner and
to be more apt to use the first name
rather than last name alone or title
plus last name. In work environments,
more women than men are called by
their first name only. (Henley, 1975)
This may be due to the fact that fe-
males are more often than not found at
the bottom of corporate hierarchies.
However, Lakoff (1973) cites that even
when women are equal to men in train-
ing and rank, they often still do not
receive the full repertoire of recip-
rocal address. This can be attributed
to the fact that women's roles are
presently in a state of transition.
As their entry into occupations asso-
ciated with greater prestige stabilizes
and becomes commonplace, associated
patterns of linguistic behaviour will
also stabilize. Meanwhile, due to the
transition, linguistic anomalies
abound. Lakoff (1973) also claims a
general tendency in media commentary
and 'talk shows' to use first names
sooner and more often with women than
with men. Such linguistic patterns
deny equality between the sexes in
terms of basic identity and respect
therefore.

A lack of parallelism exists between
male and female terms of address. One
of the most blatant disparities lies
within the categorical term Mr. as a
supposed parallel form to the female
terms Mrs. and Miss. The dichotomy
enforced by the Mrs/Miss terms brings

into focus the fact that women are referred to in terms of the men with whom they are or are not associated. Women are identified through their relationships with men and the Miss/Mrs distinction maintains a definition of women which relegates them to dependent roles. Even when in non-family settings, women continue to be defined by their relationships with men by being addressed as Mrs/Miss_____. This linguistic imbalance reinforces the perception of dominance/submission between the sexes. The term Ms was recently incorporated into the English language to act as a 'true' parallel form to Mr. Women now also have the option to use an ambiguous term regarding their marital status. Unfortunately, a stereotype has arisen regarding women who do use this form, i.e., is she divorced? is she a women's libber? Since it is still a rarity to hear the term Ms in colloquial conversation without it appearing affected and being reacted to as such and, secondly, since the term has not fully replaced the Mrs/Miss forms in written language, we cannot nor should not consider Ms a real choice. Its acceptance, without stereotype, is still a long time coming. Instead, what we now have is a linguistic trichotomy of terms for women: Mrs., Miss, Ms.

EMPIRICAL STUDY

Purpose:

An empirical study was conducted to establish the norms of referential address in print media so as to determine whether similar disparities, as those which exist between the sexes in direct address, also exist in referential address.

Print media was chosen as the vehicle for this investigation because of its reflective quality of that which exists. Communications theorists claim that media ". . . cannot create a culture, or project an image that does not reflect something already existing in some form in society." (Busby, 1974) We can, thus, gain insight into ourselves and social roles by examining media content. For purposes of this study, such insight will be derived from attending to the manner in which individuals are referred. Print media was also chosen because of its pervasive influence and potential for initiating and reinforcing social values.

Research Design and Methodology:

The research design involved a content index analysis of six magazines. The appearance and frequency of referential address terms were objectively and systematically indexed. The six magazines used in the study are well known to the public and enjoy wide circulation. They were arbitrarily chosen to represent various magazine genres. They were all of the December 1976 issue. The magazines included Newsweek, Maclean's, Playboy, Ms, Cosmopolitan and Chatelaine. Maclean's and Chate-

laine are Canadian publications; the others, American publications. News-week and Maclean's were chosen as representative of current affairs journalism, with their readership being just as likely male or female. Playboy was chosen as representative of a male-dominated readership--a "man's" magazine. Ms, Cosmopolitan and Chatelaine, on the other hand, were considered representative of "women's" magazines, more than likely enjoying a predominately female readership. Among the women's magazines, we can further classify Ms as "a liberated woman's" publication, Cosmopolitan as a "claims to be liberated" publication and Chatelaine as a "neutral" publication. This selection of magazines allows for comparisons of referential address patterns between Canadian and American publications, between the various genres and also between individual magazines or combinations thereof.

Further independent variables incorporated into the design were 'Sex of the Author' and 'First vs Subsequent References.' The variable 'Sex of the Author' allows for comparison between the referential address paradigms used by male and female writers, in the case of both male and female referents. The variable 'First vs Subsequent References' was added so as to determine whether address terms and frequency thereof differed on the dimension of first versus subsequent mention.

The dependent variable consisted of the entire range of terms possible within the paradigm of referential address. Twenty-four (24) possibilities exist. They include:

Categorical:

Mr + Last Name (LN)
Mr + First and Last Name (FLN)
Miss + Last Name (LN)
Miss + First and Last Name (FLN)
Ms + Last Name (LN)
Ms + First and Last Name (FLN)
Mrs + Last Name (LN)
Mrs + First and Last Name (FLN),
where F = name of husband
   or F = name of wife

Names:

First Name only (FN Only)
Last Name only (LN Only)
First and Last Name (FLN)
First Name + Middle Name + Last Name
               (FN + MN + LN)
First Name + Initial(s) + Last Name
               (FN + Init + LN)
Initials only (Init Only)
Initials + Last Name (Init + LN)
Diminutive only (Dimin Only)
Diminutive + Last Name (Dimin + LN)
Nickname

Titles:

Title only
Title + Last Name (LN)
Title + First and Last Name (FLN)
Title + Initial(s) + Last Name
               (Init + LN)
Title + First Name + Initial(s) + Last
        Name (FN + Init + LN)

For clarification, Diminutive refers to an abbreviated form of the first full name, e.g., Sue/Susie in place of Susan, Ed/Eddie in place of Edward.

A method of stratified sampling was used to determine which portions of each magazine to include in the analysis. By means of the magazines' indexes, which were similar across all six magazines, only those articles cited as 'Article' or 'Feature Article' were included in the analysis. All other magazine content was ignored. Subsequently, all fiction, interviews, advertisements, letters to the editor, cartoons, etc., were excluded from analysis. This ensured a similarity of sample material. In total, 36 articles were included in the sample. Each article, in its entirety, was analyzed and indexed according to the research design cited.

The method of analysis involved a thorough scanning of each article. Every reference made to a person by name, male and female, was circled. The first reference was differentially scored from all subsequent references to that person. Male and female references were indexed separately. After all references were circled, the frequency of each form was totalled and noted. This then provided for each article a paradigm of referential address forms according to sex of the referent. A consistent procedure was adhered to in determining which references would be included in the analysis.

The following types of references were excluded from the sample material:

(1) All name references appearing in direct quotes.
(2) All references appearing in photograph captions, article titles and headlines.
(3) Names used as adjectives, e.g., McCarthyism.
(4) Names used as part of a title for a program, movie or book, e.g., Autobiography of Miss Jane Pitman.
(5) Signing name of the article.
(6) Names used as part of a company name, e.g., Stevens & Kellogg.

In regard to references involving professional titles, only those titles written with a capital letter were indexed as such, e.g., Director John Martin. Otherwise, the word was considered as an attributive adjective rather than a professional title, and therefore, omitted from the analysis.

The absolute frequency of each referential address form was calculated according to each Independent Variable. An absolute frequency score was also calculated per address form across the entire sample of articles. The frequency of each address form as a percentage of the total number of male or female references was also calculated. Comparisons were then made between these various scores. This allowed for a descriptive analysis of the norms or patterns of referential address and inferences regarding such. However, as no tests of significance were applied

to the data, no statements of significance have been made.

Results:

A breakdown of data by all variables was compiled for each magazine. Table 1 presents the absolute frequency of each address form across the entire sample of material.

In total, 2226 references were indexed. 1424 were male references and 802 were female references. There were almost twice as many references to men as to women. This is an interesting fact in itself. It illustrates the dominance of male figures in the media and before the public eye.

The data on references appearing with titles was calculated separately. A total of 66 titled references were noted. Of this amount, 58 referred to males and 8 to females. The figures are illustrative of the fact that it is predominantly males who are in titled positions. From the relatively small sample of titled references, there appears to be no discrimination within this sample regarding title usage with those men and women who do have titled names. For both male and female referents, Title + FLN was the most common form used. There was no article within the sample in which a deserved title was discriminately omitted from references to either sex.

From Table 1, interesting patterns in referential address forms are evident.

Address forms which never appeared in reference to males include:
FN Only as a First Mention
Dimin Only as a First Mention
Dimin + LN as a First Mention
Also, there was only one appearance of the categorical term Mr. in the entire sample.

Forms which never appeared in reference to women include:
LN Only as a First Mention
FN + MN + LN as a First or Subsequent Mention
Init Only as a First or Subsequent Mention
Init + LN as a First or Subsequent Mention
Nickname Only as a First Mention
Regarding the categorical terms Miss/Mrs/Ms, the forms
Miss + LN
Ms + FLN
never occurred in the sample material.

The absolute frequency score of female categorical address terms (25) was very small in relation to total female references (802). These figures are encouraging in that they suggest a trend away from female references using categorical terms. It should be mentioned though, that of the 25 such references, 14 (56%) were of the Mrs + (F)LN form, 3 (12%) of the Miss + LN form and 8 (32%) of the Ms + LN form. Only one-third of female categorical references were of the Ms form. This reinforces the suggestion made earlier in the paper that Ms is still a long

TABLE I

ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY OF ADDRESS FORMS
ACROSS ALL SAMPLE MATERIAL

	Male Referents			Female Referents		
	1st Mtn.	Sub. Mtn.	Total Mtn.	1st Mtn.	Sub. Mtn.	Total Mtn.
Categorical:						
Mr + LN	1	1	2	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mr + FLN	-	-	-	n/a	n/a	n/a
Miss + LN	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	3	3
Miss + FLN	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Ms + LN	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	8	8
Ms + FLN	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
Mrs + LN	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	10	11
Mrs + FLN; F=Husband's	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	-	-
F=Wife's	n/a	n/a	n/a	2	1	3
Names:						
FN Only	4*	119	123	28** •	283	311
LN Only	48	573	621	-	104	104
FLN	503	105	608	249	58	307
FN + MN + LN	18	2	20	4	1	5
FN + Init + LN	16	3	19	-	-	-
Init Only	1	9	10	-	-	-
Init + LN	6	-	6	-	-	-
Dimin Only	-	6	6	3	32	35
Dimin + LN	-	5	5	4	9	13
Nickname	2	3	5	-	2	2
Total	599	825	1424	291	511	802
Titles: (calculated separately)						
Title Only	-	7	7	-	-	-
Title + LN	1	5	6	-	2	2
Title + FLN	36	3	39	6	-	6
Title + Init + LN	2	-	2	-	-	-
Title + FN + Init + LN	4	-	4	-	-	-
Total	43	15	58	6	2	8

n/a = Not Applicable

* These 4 references were made to children and thus discounted.
** Two of these references were made to children and discounted.

way from being a fully accepted and
freely used address form. A very
promising result was the total
avoidance of the form Mrs + FLN where
the FN is the husband's. This is en-
couraging in that the woman, even
though addressed relationally to a man
(i.e., by the use of Mrs.), is at
least given identity by her own first
name rather than her husband's. The
address form, Mrs + FLN where FN = the
husband's, is the most denigrating and
dependency-implying of all female
address forms.

By magazine, Chatelaine used 6 of the 8
Ms forms and Cosmopolitan the other 2
of the 8 forms. In 7 of the 8 occur-
rences of the Ms form, this reference
form was used by a female author. Only
once did a male author employ the Ms
form. From among the Miss/Mrs/Ms
trichotomy, Chatelaine used almost ex-
clusively the Ms form. The greatest
frequency and variation of the Miss/Mrs
/Ms terms was found in Maclean's. This
publication most frequently employed
the terms Miss/Mrs in referential ad-
dress and completely avoided usage of
the Ms form. Most disheartening re-
garding Maclean's usage of these forms
was the fact that it was a female
author who overindulged in their usage.
If women continue to use the Miss/Mrs
forms, we can hardly expect men to
discontinue their usage. It is up to
women to establish the Miss/Mrs
dichotomy as a linguistic anachronism!
In the publication, Ms, of which all
the authors were female, any usage of

these terms was avoided. It thus ap-
pears that Ms lives in accord with its
image of a 'liberated' publication.
In respect to the usage of the Miss/
Mrs/Ms forms, Chatelaine appears more
linguistically liberated than Cosmo-
politan. Even Playboy displayed less
frequency of these forms than Cosmo-
politan. Cosmopolitan's 'claims to be
liberated' stance runs counter to its
actual linguistic characteristics in
this particular matter.

The use of first name (FN) Only ap-
pears much more often in reference to
women than men, in terms of absolute
frequency. (See Table 2)

There is a more than noticeable dis-
crepancy on the basis of sex regarding
the usage of FN Only in referential
address. If we continue with the
premise given in the first part of this
paper that FN Only usage is often in-
dicative of relational or dependent
statuses, we can infer that the media
is reinforcing this attitude by virtue
of its extensive use of the form FN
Only in reference to females.

When analyzing FN Only data in terms of
First versus Subsequent Mentions (after
subtracting FN Only references made to
children), the results are extremely
interesting in that men are never in-
troduced by FN Only. On the other
hand, women are introduced by FN Only
10% of the time. In this respect,
women are introduced on the same level
of status as children. Children are

TABLE 2

ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY OF FIRST NAME (FN) ONLY

	Male Referents	Female Referents
As First Mention	4*	28**
As Subsequent Mention	119	283
Absolute Frequency	119	309
Total References	1424	802
FN Only as % of Total References	8.6%	37.5%

---

*   These 4 references were made to children and discounted. Thus, no FN Only references were made to men.

**   Of this figure, 2 references were made to children and discounted. Thus, 26 FN Only references were made to women.

---

almost always introduced by FN Only, or Qualifier + FN, e.g., his son John, the daughter Anne. Parallel to this, women are also frequently introduced in this manner, e.g., his wife Mary. It was also noted in the analysis that a greater range of qualifiers appeared in conjunction with female names. Considering all FN Only references for males, the qualifiers son/uncle/father appeared several times, whereas for females, a much more extensive range was used, e.g., wife/fiancée/girl/ girlfriend/flame/mother/aunt/sister/ daughter. Such qualifiers appeared extensively with female names. The use of Qualifier + FN introduces the person as an appendage to another person. It is the female who is most frequently introduced and referred to in this manner. This reinforces the perception of women as the dependent or submissive sex.

The absolute frequency scores for LN Only is presented in Table 3.

TABLE 3

ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY OF LAST NAME (LN) ONLY

	Male Referents	Female Referents
As First Mention	48	-
As Subsequent	573	104
Absolute Frequency	621	104
Total References	1424	802
LN Only as % of Total References	43.7%	11.7%

The use of LN Only appears in a pattern opposite to that of FN Only, for both sexes. That is, LN Only is used more widely in reference to males than females, whereas the opposite is true for FN Only. It is important to note the absolute avoidance of LN Only as a first mention form of address for females.

The appearance of LN Only sets up a strong assumption that it is a male who is being referred to. Perhaps it is for this reason that writers refrain from referentially addressing females by LN Only. What is needed is a change in our perceptions so that we do not automatically assume that the appearance of LN Only, which is a strong and forceful means of address, is a male reference. LN Only should equally im-

ply a female referent. Perhaps it is due to the transience of women's last names in our society that their first names have come to be considered the logical or appropriate counterpart to men's last names.

Table 4 presents the absolute frequency scores for FN Only and LN Only according to magazine; all other variables combined.

Chatelaine showed the least amount of differential usage of FN Only between the sexes, whereas Newsweek and Playboy discriminated the most between males and females in terms of FN Only usage.

Regarding LN Only usage, Maclean's completely avoided this form in reference to females. Ms and Newsweek used LN

TABLE 4

ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY OF FN ONLY AND LN ONLY
ACROSS ALL MAGAZINES AND ALL VARIABLES

	REFERENTIAL ADDRESS FORM			
	FN Only Females	FN Only Males	LN Only Females	LN Only Males
MAGAZINE:				
Newsweek				
Total Frequency	22	·3	17	131
% of Total References	44.4%	1.7%	34.0%	73.2%
Maclean's				
Total Frequency	3	4	-	184
% of Total References	14.3%	1.3%	-	60.5%
Playboy				
Total Frequency	63	5	18	147
% of Total References	27.1%	1.2%	7.7%	35.5%
Ms				
Total Frequency	120	42	51	19
% of Total References	55.0%	30.4%	23.4%	13.0%
Cosmopolitan				
Total Frequency	62	46	16	123
% of Total References	30.8%	13.9%	7.9%	37.3%
Chatelaine				
Total Frequency	35	23	2	17
% of Total References	46.7%	40.3%	2.7%	29.8%

Only as a female referential address form more frequently than the other publications.

Table 5 presents data on the usage of LN Only, FN Only and FLN, according to the variable 'Sex of Author.' It reveals that female authors, more so than male authors, are linguistically discrediting women by their choice of referential address forms.

TABLE 5

ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY OF LN ONLY, FN ONLY, FLN,
ACCORDING TO VARIABLE 'SEX OF AUTHOR'

	MALE REFERENTS			FEMALE REFERENTS		
	LN Only	FN Only	FLN	LN Only	FN Only	FLN
Male Authors:						
As First Mention	37	2	412	-	20	177
As Subsequent Mention	470	73	68	50	128	19
Total Mentions	507	75	480	50	148	196
% of Total References	45.3%	6.7%	42.8%	11.0%	32.7%	43.4%
Female Authors:						
As First Mention	11	2	91	-	5	72
As Subsequent Mention	103	46	37	54	152	39
Total Mentions	114	48	128	54	157	111
% of Total References	37.5%	15.8%	42.0%	15.7%	45.6%	32.3%

Male authors referred to men almost equally by LN Only (45% of the time) or FLN (42% of the time). Female authors referred to men most frequently by FLN (42% of the time).

Male authors referred to women most frequently by FLN (43% of the time). Yet female authors referred to women most frequently by FN Only (45% of the time). This is a case of women discriminating against women!

The middle name (MN) which is generally attributed less importance and mention appeared in a small proportion of the sample in the form FN + MN + LN. What is interesting to note is that the MN appeared four times as often in male references as opposed to female references. Greater importance appears to be attached to the male's middle name than the female's. Multiple names tend to be more prestigious than first and last name only. By including a middle name, additional prestige is given to the reference. In this sense, male references, as opposed to female references, are more often attributed additional prestige.

Diminutive forms of names appear much more frequently in female references than male references. This is again indicative of the presentation of women at the level of status usually assigned to children. Diminutive forms trivialize one's name. By implication, this reduces the status associated with the name and consequently, with the bearer of the name.

The use of initials in referential address appears exclusively in male references. Not once did initials appear in a female reference. There are three possible ways in which initials can be incorporated into the referential address paradigm. These are:

Initials Only
FN + Init + LN
Init + LN

The form, Initials Only, is used only when referring to well known personalities. To be recognized by Initials Only is indicative of one's success as a public figure. The mention of LBJ, JFK, creates an almost instantaneous image. There is no case of a female (and there are some who do enjoy wide public recognition) who has come to be addressed by Initials Only. Is this address form, by some unwritten law, reserved for men only?

Regarding the supposedly less important middle name, it is always men as opposed to women, who are given recognition of it by initial, as in the form FN + Init + LN.

The occurrence of the form Initial(s) + LN, like LN Only, sets up the assumption that a male is being referred to. The use of initial(s) in referential address appears to be in accordance with male references only.

The referential address form, First + Last Name (FLN), enjoyed a high frequency of absolute usage for both sexes, disregarding all other variables. This is illustrated in Table 6.

This form, devoid of all social labels, is the most equitable means of address--referentially and directly. It assigns equal status to both sexes. No person's name is trivialized or inflated. No implications of relational or marital status are involved. Each person, male and female, is referred to as just that--an individual--worthy of recognition at a level of individuality. Exclusive usage of this form should be encouraged as a means of address--referentially and directly. A truly equitable system of address would then exist.

Conclusion:

The results of this study reveal a differential usage of referential address forms according to sex of the referent. Forms which trivialize one's name, or connote dependent, relational or lower status are used more frequently with female names. This linguistic presentation of females is reflective of the traditional perception of women as the inferior, submissive sex.

If we view the experimental results in light of the theory of linguistic relativity (Whorf, 1940), which posits that cognitive organization and functioning is directly constrained by linguistic structures (in this particular case, our usage of the referential address paradigm), we can assert that the discriminatory usage of this linguistic

TABLE 6

ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY OF FIRST + LAST NAME (FLN)

	Male Referents	Female Referents
As First Mention	503	249
As Subsequent Mention	105	58
Absolute Frequency	608	307
Total References	1424	802
FLN as % of Total References	42.8%	38.2%

paradigm is serving to emphasize and maintain differences between the sexes.

This instance of linguistic sexism is rectifiable. The relation between language and social reality is two directional. That is to say, not only does social change effect linguistic change, but to a much lesser degree, language can effect social change.

It is realistic to assume that as the socio-cultural reality incorporates more egalitarian attitudes and roles vis-á-vis the sexes, a concomitant linguistic adjustment will occur in our usage of the address paradigm. Meanwhile, since language can influence attitudinal changes, however slowly and indirectly, it is also realistic to assume that implementation of journalistic policy advocating equitable usage of the referential address paradigm would have some effect, even if only minor, on our perception of the sexes.

Linguistic discrimination between the sexes is practised in our system of direct and referential address. This study has indicated the areas where disparities exist. Language policy should be implemented to erase these disparities so as to create an equitable situation. The stress for parity in the English systems of address--direct and referential--represents a quest for sexual equality.

REFERENCES

Brown, R.W. and M. Ford. "Address in American English," in Hymes, D. (ed.). Language in Culture and Society. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Busby, L.J. "Mass Media Research Needs: A Media Target for Feminists." in University of Michigan Papers in Women's Studies, Vol. 1, No. 2, June 1974.

Fishman, J.A. The Sociology of Language. Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, Inc., 1972. (Sections I, IV, VIII)

Holsti, O.R. Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1969.

Lakoff, R. Language and Woman's Place. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1975.

Miller, C. and K. Swift. Words and Women. Garden City, N. Y.: Anchor Press, Doubleday, 1976.

Thorne, B. and N. Henley. "Difference and Dominance: An Overview of Language, Gender, and Society," in Thorne, B. and N. Henley (eds.). Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance. Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, Inc., 1975.

Whorf, B. "Linguistic Relativity," in Fishman, T.A. (ed.). The Sociology of Language. Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, 1972. (Section VIII)