search. Although graduate students and beginning researchers would, I think, especially benefit from brief, focused exchanges relating specific aspects of individual studies to general issues in the field, all *RTE* readers will benefit from access to this kind of dialogue. Too often such exchanges take place only in small seminars, in private conversations, or in occasional panel discussions at conferences. I would like to see them take place more frequently in *RTE*.

As both a researcher and a teacher, I have an abiding concern for clear and coherent academic writing and a strong interest in new ideas, especially those ideas that can help educators with the critical educational problems of our time. I believe we must do more as a profession to stimulate academically rigorous but imaginative thinking about these problems. Thus, above all, I welcome manuscripts with new ideas and original approaches for research in the English language arts.

Sandra Stotsky

Gender-Typical Style in Written Language

Donald L. Rubin
University of Georgia
Kathryn Greene
University of Georgia

Three lines of inquiry bear on the supposition that women's written language differs from men's in socially significant ways: (1) research on women's speech, (2) analyses of women's belles lettres, and (3) research on women's epistemology. This study was designed to test the supposition that male and female writing styles differ. College students' writing was subjected to a variety of lexical, syntactic, and text-level analyses for features that have been linked to writers' gender in previous research and theory. To determine whether gender differences were more pronounced in spontaneous expressive writing to an intimate audience, relative to revised instrumental writing to a distant audience, compositions representing these polar extremes were elicited. In addition to considering writers' biological gender, the design of the study took into account measured gender role orientation as described in androgyny theory. Overall, the results of this study warrant the view that the writing of men and women is far more similar one to the other than different. Differences due to mode of discourse were more widespread than differences due to gender. Still, where male and female styles did diverge, they differed in predicted directions. For example, women used far more exclamation points than did men. In addition, women were more likely than men to acknowledge the legitimacy of opposing points of view. The findings of this study can inform discussions of instructional proposals regarding gender and writing.

Theoretical Background

Everyone "knows" that girls and women write differently from—i.e., better than—boys and men; that is part of the common wisdom of the classroom. One of the most influential contemporary books about teaching writing (Kirby, Liner & Vinz, 1988) makes precisely that point in passing:

> And why talk about the Good Writer like Cary? You don't have to worry about him (he is usually a *she* in high school classes). She sits on the front row in your class and cheerfully cranks out those Grade A papers week after week—well organized, carefully worded, with a minimum of errors, and sometimes even good to read. (p. 13).

The expectation that women excel in writing is deep seated. In one study of young adults, cross-gender dyads were asked to make a public report. When the reports were required to be delivered orally, men most often emerged as the spokespersons. But when reports were instead required in writing, women most often ended up drafting the reports (Wazenried, Franks & Powell, 1989). That is not to say that women are particularly confident in their own writing abilities. To the contrary, female professionals typically express greater anxiety about their writing than do their male counterparts (Boice & Kelly, 1987), and the young female writers who "cheerfully crank out those Grade A papers week after week" may actually be stifling their own development as writers in an effort to please those who will be evaluating their compositions (Bolter, 1979; Cayton, 1990; Sperling & Freedman, 1987).

Reviewing earlier empirical research, Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) essentially confirm the educational commonplace that writing is an area of particular achievement for females. They concluded, "It is about the age of 10 or 11 that girls begin to come into their own in verbal performance. From this age through high school and the college years we find them outscoring boys at a variety of verbal skills . . . [including] considerably higher level skills" (p. 84). Indeed, even the most contemporary of surveys, the National Assessment of Educational Progress, reported consistently superior writing performance of girls over boys across age levels and writing tasks (Applebee, Langer & Mullis, 1990).

But in exactly what ways does women's writing differ from men's? Much of the earlier work that examined gender and writing was not motivated by any strong theoretical underpinning. It vaguely presumed the normative explanation that women would naturally have more verbal aptitude than men since girls are socialized to specialize in socio-emotional tasks. (The converse of this account rationalizes why women do more poorly in science and mathematics.) More recently, however, interest in women's writing has burgeoned as a result of advances in gender-related theory and research (Annas, 1987). Three inter-related lines of inquiry bear on the supposition that women's written language and men's written language differ in socially significant ways: (1) research on women's speech, (2) analyses of women's belles lettres, and (3) research on women's epistemology.

Women's Speech as Women's Writing

Research on women's spoken language identifies a cluster of stylistic features that are stereotypically associated with women's speech (Lakoff, 1973). These features reflect women's devalued status vis à vis the dominant culture. They include qualifiers ("nearly," "kind of"),

hedges ("maybe," "I guess"), intensifiers ("really," "very"), tag questions ("Cogently argued, isn't it?"), extremely polite language, and other devices that seem to blunt the force of assertions.

Studies of spoken language are, however, divided as to the degree to which powerless language is distributed in a gender-typical fashion (see, for example, Rubin & Nelson, 1983; see Penelope, 1990, for a critique of this entire approach to conceptualizing gender-linked language). Empirical studies suggest that it may be more appropriate to conceive of this constellation of stylistic features as "powerless language" (O'Barr & Atkins, 1980). Rather than simply gender-typical, powerless language is typical of any speaker who is on the bottom end of asymmetric power relations. In too many contexts, that speaker is likely to be a woman.

In fact, even when a particular language feature is demonstrably not gender-typical, it may still be gender-typed by listeners. Edelsky (1979) showed this to be the case for rising intonation at the ends of declarative sentences. Women used rising intonation no more often than men, yet people stereotypically associate it with women's speech (see also Rasmussen & Moely, 1986). In this respect, language conforms to the same pattern as much gender-linked behavior. Wallston and O'Leary (1981) conclude that in general, ". . . the belief in sex differences persists. Perceivers (both men and women) attribute differential behavioral characteristics, traits, and even causes for identical performances by women or men" (p. 10).

People who utter powerless language—whether they be males or females—often suffer from negative stereotyping by listeners (Erickson, Lind, Johnson, & O'Barr, 1978). In writing, female-typical language cues are likewise potent enough to elicit stereotyped impressions of otherwise anonymous message sources. A series of related studies found that even unidentified women writers were judged more refined and pleasant than men (Mulac, Incontro & James, 1985; Roulis, 1990), though in some cases less active and dynamic (Mulac, et al., 1985; Mulac & Lundell, 1980). (Note that in these studies, no attempt was made to analyze male- and female-authored texts for specific features of gender-typical language.) Curiously, though readers in these studies ascribed gender-typed traits to writers on the basis of written style, readers could not reliably infer the gender identity of those writers.

It is not at all clear, however, how such gender-typed impressions of writers might affect evaluations of the quality of their written products. Lakoff (1973) observed that certain features associated with women's or powerless speech—especially hedges—are characteristic of academic

talk for both women and men. To Lakoff, this observation is consistent with the marginal, relatively powerless status of academics in the broader capitalist society. Still, if academic writers and teachers value a highly qualified and conditional oral style, then it is possible for female-typed language to actually engender positive reactions to *academic* writing in particular.

Oral and written language, to be sure, are by no means isomorphic (Rubin, 1987). It has been an error to presume that because people speak a particular language variety (e.g., Black English Vernacular), that their written language necessarily carries similar linguistic markers (Hartwell, 1980). Indeed, Lakoff (1977), whose earlier work (1973) opened the floodgate of research on women's language, doubted that gender differences characteristic of speech are replicated in writing. She reasoned that writing is less a spontaneous expression of identity, and more governed by deliberate application of editorial conventions.

Nevertheless, a number of studies have proceeded by analyzing writing for gender-typical (or at least gender-typed) markers in speech. Taylor (1978), for example, extrapolated from notions of women's speech and observed that in many traditional college composition classes, women are criticized for using language that is too personal. Such writing blunts the "argumentative edge" which is a traditional hallmark of effective exposition. Taylor suggested that women's language need not be a liability in writing if teachers accept more inclusive notions of acceptable argumentative style (see also Lott, 1987). Contrary to Taylor's conclusions, however, Lynch and Strauss-Noll (1987) found male and female first-year college students about equally distributed among the writers of "forceful" or "mild" argumentative compositions. The few gender differences which did emerge in this study pertained to specific word choices; women used more precise color terms and more politeness markers.

The possibility of transfer between women's speech and women's writing has also been addressed in the context of business and commerce. Smeltzer and Werbel (1986) developed nine scales for rating aspects of presumed gender-linked style in business writing. They also examined several text features such as length in number of words, sentences, and paragraphs. They found no significant difference between male and female writers on any of the measures, although writing genre (memo vs. letter) did exert measurable effects. Sterkel (1988) examined 20 gender-typed text features in samples of business letters. These variables included courtesy words, qualifiers, superlatives, and an index of directness/indirectness. This study likewise found no differences between males and females. Once again, however, writing task (sales

letter, collection letter, and persuasive letter) manifested a strong impact on writing style.

Literary Style of Women Authors

Scholarship more closely allied with belletristic studies seeks to identify what elements of language style, among other literary elements, might distinguish male from female authors. Feminist literary studies constitute an especially vital area of intellectual ferment (see a review of several related works in Schweikart, 1990). One feminist literary project seeks to identify women writers who have been ignored, belittled, or otherwise excluded from the canon of world literature. Spender (1980), for example, contended that society has long imposed a taboo on serious public writing by women. On the other hand, she claimed, private and manifestly superficial women's writing has been tolerated. Only a handful of women writers have been admitted to the pantheon of Great Authors (Heilbrun, 1988). According to Spender and other feminist scholars, a myriad of others have gone unpublished, forgotten, or marginalized. The male-dominated literary critical establishment has often stereotyped such female writing as gushy, excitable, confused, trivial, or uncontrolled (see examples of these critical comments cited in Hiatt, 1977).

Hiatt (1977) sought to ascertain whether any empirical basis could be found for those stereotypes of female literary style. She sampled works by 50 published male authors and 50 published females. Half were fiction and half non-fiction. Hiatt examined a wide array of linguistic features presumed to reflect stereotypes of gender-typical literary style. For example, verbs of conjecture and perception—stereotyped as female-typical—were compared with verbs of reasoning. Similes were taken as an index of presumably female-typical imaginative perception. Exclamation points were analyzed as signs of excitable and illogical style. Dashes represented informality. The number of adverbs, especially -*ly* adverbs, was examined as a reflection of gushiness and hyperbole.

It is difficult to evaluate Hiatt's (1977) results since they are reported only as raw frequencies with no indication of variation within each gender. For some variables, Hiatt inferred gender differences despite rather small absolute numerical differences in frequencies of occurrence. Hiatt found, in this manner, that contrary to expectations male authors wrote longer sentences than females, while females used more syntactic structures creating parallelism and balance. Women writers did produce more exclamatory sentences than men writers, but few other gender-typed differences were confirmed. Interestingly, Hiatt

found some "interactions" between gender and mode of discourse. Male and female writing appeared most similar in nonfiction. In fiction, however, women tended to use more adverbs of emotion while men produced more adverbs showing pace and rate.

While Hiatt's (1977) writing samples were limited to published literature, Scates (1981) applied similar stylistic analyses to essays elicited from first year college students. She found that male college students wrote more simple sentences, used more numerals, and drew explicit conclusions using illative connectives (e.g., "therefore"). Females produced more exclamations, questions, figurative language, color terms, and generally more connectives. These constellations of features depict men writing in a somewhat more denotative style, women more expressively. In general, however, gender differences were not great. Like Hiatt, Scates found that gender differences were greater in one mode of discourse (description) than in others (process explanations and argumentation). Also like Hiatt, Scates reported only raw frequencies for each stylistic feature. The findings of this study are therefore valuable mainly in generating hypotheses to be tested.

Women's Epistemology/Women's Rhetoric

Recent insights into women's epistemologies—women's ways of seeking and assimilating information about the world—likewise warrant investigations of gender differences in written language. Articulated especially convincingly in Gilligan (1982) and Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986), notions of women's epistemology hold that women are most likely to see the world in terms of connections, including webs of interpersonal relationships: response-abilities, group memberships, and personal identities. Men, according to these theories of women's epistemologies, are in contrast more likely to see the world as sets of impersonally denoted categories.

The link between women's epistemology and women's writing was explored in an influential essay by Flynn (1988). Because of gender-typical patterns of socialization and development, women's predominant styles of problem solving and argument may differ from men's. Women's interests tend to be affiliative rather than objectifying or rawly competitive, according to this view. Correspondingly, women's characteristic styles of resolving conflict may rely more on identification and collaboration than on stasis and refutation. Personal narrative form, for example, may be a vehicle especially well suited for female-typical modes of understanding and influencing the world. Lunsford and Ede (1990), by way of illustration, used a loose collection of narratives to explicate collaboration as an especially "feminine" mode of composing.

The argumentative essay—which generally serves as the paragon of school writing—in contrast, represents a male-typical mode of confronting positions (Flynn, 1988; Gearhart, 1979; Lamb, 1991). Writing with male-typical rhetorics, essayists sometimes cast alternative positions as diametrically opposed, sometimes resulting in considerable distortion (e.g., the strawman syndrome). This kind of agonistic argumentation is viewed by some composition theorists as antithetical to feminist—if not to female-typical—ways of knowing (see also Cooper, 1989).

In a similar vein, readers in one investigation (Roulis, 1990) judged female college writers, as compared to their male counterparts, to be more cooperative and focused on others. This was true even when those readers received no identifying information at all about the authors. These reader impressions of the writers were apparently induced solely by some set of gender-typical stylistic features.

Consistent with Flynn's (1988) account, several scholars have pointed to Virginia Woolf's frequently anthologized essay, "A Room of One's Own," as paradigmatic of a women's rhetoric (Farrell, 1979; Taylor, 1978). In advancing her thesis that a woman requires autonomy in order to write with an authentic voice, Woolf illustrates what is held to be a female-typical mode of exposition. She is indirect rather than confrontational, seemingly digressive rather than linear, allows the reader to draw her own conclusions, uses first-person voice and second-person address, and depends a great deal on narrative and implicit analogy. Although some critics (e.g., Rich, 1972; Spender, 1980) argue that Woolf herself never gave authentic or unbridled expression to feminist principles in this essay, others propose the rhetorical mode exemplified in that piece as at least one acceptable alternative to what they identify as male-dominated norms of essay writing (Annas, 1985; Lott, 1987; but for a dissenting view of nonagonistic rhetoric see Lassner's 1990 critique—from both feminist and student-centered perspectives—of the neutral and dispassionate voice imposed by nonconfrontational Rogerian [Rogers, 1961] argument).

Hunter and Pearce (1988; Hunter, Pearce, Lee, Goldsmith, Feldman & Weaver, 1988) used the framework of women's epistemologies to design a study comparing basic college women writers with more proficient college women. Two modes of discourse were elicited: "reflexive" personal narrative and "extensive" exposition. (See Emig, 1971 for a discussion of these two modes.) The researchers found that all writers used more first-person reference in the reflexive mode of discourse. The less proficient writers, however, inserted additional personal references when they revised their extensive essays. Second-person references predominated in extensive writing, especially for basic writers.

These pronouns, typically expressing "advice language," (i.e., "You should always . . .") tended to be edited out during revision. The researchers concluded that less proficient basic writers rely in both modes of writing on a subjective/interpersonal style associated with female-typical epistemology. In contrast, the more proficient writers used a more impersonal, abstract mode in producing exposition. It should be noted that all participants in this research were women; cross-gender comparisons were not possible. This has been a criticism of other studies which claimed to be investigating women's epistemologies (see the critique in Crawford, 1989).

Pronominal reference—with first-person purportedly indicating an expressive and subjective approach, and second-person indicating interpersonal orientation—was also the focus of other studies of gender and writing. Among first year college students, Peterson (1986) found women writers using much higher frequencies of both types of pronouns. Among employees of a large Federal agency (Lentz, 1986), female writers responding to a personnel audit used a great many more first-person references than males. Gender differences in the topics writers addressed also emerged in this study. Men listed a greater number of problems in their work environments, but they did so in a more impersonal manner. Women elaborated on just a few problems, and used a more personal voice. Women were more likely to write about the need for job rewards—including personal recognition. Women also wrote a good deal more about the nature of work place problems, including issues of fairness and concern for self and others.

Indeed, theories of gender-typical epistemologies suggest that women and men will adopt different topical foci: women will focus on interpersonal relationships and affect, and men will focus on denotative detail. Thus, when college students wrote descriptions of their rooms, men tended to objectively catalogue their contents, while women were more likely to express the personal emotional significance of their rooms (Scates, 1981). In an examination of college placement examinations (Pigott, 1979), in which students were free to select their writing topics from among several alternatives offered, women were more likely than men to write about lifestyle expectations. Men were more likely to choose to write about a historical topic or about an educational policy decision. Women tended to write about their personal preferences and aspirations, while men drew universal conclusions. In contrast, another study of first year placement essays (Keroes, 1990) found that men and women alike most often wrote in an "autonomous" mode rather than in a "connected" mode. Qualitative text analyses, on the other hand, showed that women were especially likely to

address interpersonal themes like family ties, relationships, and responsibilities toward others.

Considerations of the Present Study

Taken as a whole, the three lines of inquiry discussed above—women's speech, women's literature, and women's epistemologies—provide strong conceptual support for research on gender-typical style in writing. In particular, this body of work points to several likely candidates as stylistic features differentiating female from male prose. These features include sentence types like exclamations, that signal high affective involvement; and questions, that signal indirectness and interpersonal contact with readers. Other features similarly warranting investigation include uses of first- and second-person pronouns, terms used for cataloguing objectified facts (e.g., numerals), and various qualifiers and intensifiers. As for connective adverbs and conjunctions, previous literature suggests that women may favor temporal connectives ("then," "after") crucial to narrative, while men tend to use illative connectives ("therefore," "so"), which explicitly state conclusions readers are to draw.

Beyond discrete syntactic and semantic markers, the writing of women and men may be differentiated by holistic aspects of discourse such as topic choices or modes of argumentation. Specifically, if women's rhetoric is especially nonagonistic and indirect, then women's written argument is likely to be especially open in acknowledging the validity of alternative positions and in freely admitting reservations to one's own point of view.

Though previous inquiry provides fertile theoretical grounding for studies of gender and writing, empirical studies to this point have been sparse and hardly conclusive. (The small number of empirical studies on this subject is perhaps due in part to perceived incompatabilities between feminist research concerns and standard social science methods.) Where only female writers have been studied, conclusions about cross-gender differences are not justified. Where intra-gender variability has not been taken into account, reported findings of cross-gender differences are not meaningful. Those few studies that have been adequately designed to detect possible gender differences (e.g., Keroes, 1990; Lentz, 1986) have not yielded dramatic findings.

If gender differences in writing do exist, it is likely that they are suppressed in some genres and accentuated in others. In general, composition studies show that discourse function or mode is a powerful contextual factor that can affect style as much as individual differences such as age or ability (Rubin, 1984). Those genres of writing that are

most conventionalized and most schooled are least likely to accommodate expressions of gender identity. Indeed, feminist educators claim, female students are usually taught to suppress alternative and perhaps more natural modes of expression if they wish to succeed at academic writing (Annas, 1985; Bridwell-Bowles, in press; Flynn, 1988; Lassner, 1990; see also various papers collected in Caywood & Overing, 1987). Thus, among published authors, most differences between males and females emerge only in fiction writing, not in more conventionalized essay writing (Hiatt, 1977). To the extent that gender differences in writing can be found at all, they are most likely to be found in writing which is reflexive and expressive rather than in writing which is extensive and instrumental. Moreover, if "good" (i.e. institutionally successful) women writers are those who edit out women's features from their prose (Lentz, 1986; Spender, 1980; Sterkel, 1988), then gender differences are most likely to appear when comparing initial drafts of compositions, and likely to be less prevalent in revised writing.

The construction of gender itself is yet another issue that must be considered in understanding weak findings in previous research about writing and gender. Simplistic comparisons between people who check off the category "male" and those who check "female" can mask important gender effects. Lakoff (1973) averred that what she identified as women's language is not female-exclusive; men as well as women may speak it so long as they adopt a sociopolitically marginal role. By the same token, Gilligan (1982) held that it is an empirical fact—and not some biological imperative—that locates women's epistemology among women; presumably males who are similarly socialized might acquire knowledge in the same manner. Currently, feminist theory is concerned to avoid the fallacy of "essentialism:" that there is some readily enumerated hegemonous set of female traits to which all women would revert were it not for social and political forces to the contrary. With respect to research on women's writing and rhetoric, it is important to acknowledge that any dichotomy of female and male styles delimited and determined by a dichotomous notion of sex—male versus female—is an essentialist fiction (Ritche, 1990).

The gender-related variable that explains much communication behavior is not biological sex (as if even biological sex were not culturally constructed—see Kessler & McKenna, 1978; cf. Weinstein, 1990), but psychological gender role or gender schema. At the least, information about psychological gender role ought to be analyzed in order to triangulate with findings regarding biological sex (Weider-Hatfield, 1987). Bem (1974; 1981) provided a useful framework for conceptualizing and measuring psychological gender roles. According to this framework,

individuals vary along dimensions of expressiveness (originally called "femininity") and instrumentality (orginally "masculinity"). Individuals holding traditional male sex roles would score high on instrumental traits and low on expressive. Individuals who are both highly expressive and highly instrumental are known as "androgynous." A number of studies regarding attitudes toward "sexist" language and speakers (Greene & Rubin, 1991; Rubin & Greene, 1991; Schwartz & Banikiotes, 1982) or toward speakers using gender-typed language (Warfel, 1984) used Bem's perspective on androgyny to explain patterns of language attitudes. It is not known, however, the degree to which one's psychological gender role affects one's oral or written language *production*.

The present study, accordingly, examines the compositions of males and females by tabulating occurrences of several stylistic and discourse features associated with women's writing. Writing samples were elicited in two modes of discourse—a revised argumentative message directed to a university official and a spontaneous expressive letter to a friend—selected to maximize likely differences in the use of gender-typical writing. The writers were also administered a measure of psychological gender role orientation.

Methods

Research Participants

Participants were drawn from basic speech communication courses at a large Southeastern university. Writing sessions were conducted outside of class on a voluntary basis, with participation substituting for a written class assignment. Participants attended a first session and then returned two days later to complete the project. Eighty-eight students provided usable data. Sixty-five percent were female (N = 58) and 35% male (N = 30).[1] Participants were randomly assigned to either an expressive/reflexive writing task (14 males and 31 females) or an argumentative/extensive writing task (16 males and 27 females).

Procedures

Procedures for eliciting writing samples were designed to produce extreme contrasts between modes of discourse (spontaneous first drafts of expressive/reflexive messages directed toward well-known readers, contrasted with second draft revisions of argumentative/instrumental messages directed toward a remote audience), while still controlling for topic. Each participant wrote a letter in response to a fictional proposal[2] to test all university students for drug use. Pretesting the

writing prompts showed that drug testing was perceived as a significant, highly involving topic which could be expected to elicit a wide range of responses among this population. Moreover, it is a topic that appeared in the pilot testing to be equally familiar to males and females.

For the first writing session, participants were instructed to write first drafts which they would have the opportunity to revise later. They were encouraged to devote more attention to expressing their ideas than to grammar and mechanics, and they were urged to fill at least two pages. Each participant received an information sheet that described the proposed drug testing policy under consideration by the University administration. Those participants assigned to the expressive/reflexive writing task were told to write to a friend with whom they could easily share their feelings, and they were encouraged to express their feelings about this new policy as openly as they could. Participants assigned to the argumentative/extensive writing task were told to address their messages to a particular vice-president who would be representing the University's position to the state legislature. Students in this group were urged to write in a well-reasoned and persuasive manner. No writer took fewer than 20 minutes to complete a draft, nor longer than 50. At the end of the writing session, scripts were collected and photocopied.

During the second data collection session, participants in the expressive/reflexive condition did not revise their letters any further. Instead, they filled out a gender role survey (Wheeless & Dierks-Stewart, 1981) and provided certain demographic information. They also completed other experimental tasks not under consideration here. Those in the argumentative/extensive writing group were asked to revise their letters and put them into presentable format on new paper. They also completed the gender-role and demographic questionnaires. All subjects were debriefed about the purpose of the study at the end of the second session.

Language Analyses and Measurement

The coding scheme used for tabulating occurrences of gender-linked written language is presented in Table 1. It was developed by modifying a coding scheme for women's/powerless speech (Rubin & Nelson, 1983) in consideration of stylistic variables that have been nominated in scholarship about women's writing, in particular (e.g., Flynn, 1988; Hiatt, 1977; Hunter, et al., 1988; Peterson, 1986; Scates, 1981). In addition to tabulating loquacity in terms of total number of words and total number of sentences, the scheme enumerates sentence- or phrase-level

Table 1

Coded Stylistic Features

Features	Key Examples	Instance from writing samples
Egocentric sequences	I believe, I think, I guess	*I believe* this is a good idea.
Refusals	I don't know, I'm not sure	So *I don't know* how effective the 5 non-credit course would be.
Illative connectives	Therefore, so	You tested positive *so* you have to take a course.
Adversative connectives	However, but, yet, otherwise	*On the other hand*, I do believe the drug testing would prove beneficial in other areas.
Causal connectives	Because, since	I'm not going to worry about it *because* I don't think they will get away with it.
Illustrators	For example, for instance	Professors, *for example*, would have to be tested as well.
Additive connectives	And, also	*Furthermore*, how could you be sure that everyone took the test?
Temporal connectives	Next, after, lastly, first	I can only ask that you think about my letter *when* you present your argument to the legislature.
Conditional connectives	If, while	*If* this testing procedure passes, do you really think it will make a difference?
First-person pronouns	I, me, my, we	*I've* never used drugs.
Second-person pronouns	You, your	It is *your* responsibility to pass these ideas on to the legislature.
Intensifiers	A lot, quite, really	I *strongly* agree with the mandatory drug testing proposal.
De-intensifiers	Just, only, not really	I *just* think it'll do more harm.
Proximals	About, around, nearly	*About* half the students would refuse.
Modal adjuncts	Maybe, hopefully, probably	*Maybe* this would make some people think twice about drugs.
Auxiliaries of possibility	could, may	My school *may* be forced to begin drug testing of students.
Perceptual verbs	looks, seems	It *seems* like a good idea.

attributes (exclamation points; dashes; parentheses; underlines; questions; egocentric sequences, e.g., "I think" or "I guess;" refusals, e.g., "I don't know;" illustrators, e.g., "for example;" and illative, adversative, causal, additive, temporal and conditional connectives). Also tabulated were gender-typical word choice and modifiers (first-person pronouns; second-person pronouns; numerals; intensifiers; de-intensifiers/vestigials, e.g., "sort of" or "not really;" proximals, e.g., "almost;" modal adjuncts, e.g., "maybe" or "possibly;" auxiliaries of possibility, e.g., "might" or "could;" and perceptual verbs, e.g., "looks like" or "appears to be"). Finally, the coding scheme recoded rhetorical structures whose scope was the whole discourse: acknowledging opposition's legitimacy of concern; acknowledging reservations; refuting reservations; and mentioning alternative remedies.

The several stylistic features coded were reduced to seven multivariate clusters. This was done to more easily conceptualize and report the multivariate outcomes and also to reduce spurious findings of significance that can result when a great many dependent variables are tested. Clustering was determined a priori (as opposed to empirically, say, on the basis of factor analysis) on the basis of grammatical and semantic similarities between the coded stylistic features and on the basis of precedent in earlier research. The resulting multivariate clusters included (1) markers of excitability (exclamation marks, underlines), (2) nonessentials (dashes, parentheses), (3) connectives (illatives, adversatives, causals, illustrators, additives, temporals, conditionals), (4) hedges (intensifiers, de-intensifiers/vestigials, proximals, modal adjuncts, auxiliaries of possibility, perceptual verbs), (5) audience acknowledgments (questions, second-person pronouns), and (6) first-person markers (egocentric sequences, first-person pronouns). Numerals were not included in any of the multivariate clusters and were analyzed solely by separate univariate means.

Two coders independently analyzed each script. Their reliability (Cronbach's alpha) was calculated for each multivariate grouping as follows: markers of excitability, .967; nonessentials, .943; connectives, .918; hedges, .795; audience acknowledgments, .829; and first-person markers, .978. Intercoder reliabilities for variables that were not clustered were: numerals, .773; total words, .988; and total sentences, .986. For holistic discourse-level coding of rhetorical structures, intercoder reliability was estimated as the percentage of agreement between coders in classifying each paper. These classifications were dichotomous judgments; either the paper included an instance of a particular rhetorical feature or it did not. Resulting reliabilities were: acknowledging opposition's legitimacy of concern, 78%; acknowledging reservations,

70%; refuting reservations, 73%; and mentioning alternative remedies, 76%. As a conservative measure, statistical analyses of rhetorical features were performed only on those papers which both judges coded identically.

The psychological gender role scale used in this study is taken from Wheeless & Dierks-Stewart (1981), a short form originally derived from Bem's BSRI (1974). While the BSRI is a sixty-item instrument, the Wheeless & Dierks-Stewart scale contains a more manageable twenty items. Each item asks subjects to describe themselves by responding to the statement "how much this characteristic (stimulus adjective) is true of me". This revision of the BSRI has the advantage of brevity, and it also has improved reliability and validity. The instrument yields two subscales for each individual: (1) instrumental gender role orientation and (2) expressive gender role orientation. For the sample in the present study, the internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of the instrumental subscale was .904. The reliability of the expressive subscale was .894. Males on the average displayed significantly higher instrumental scores than did females ($t_{(85df)} = 2.62$, $p < .05$; $M_{male} = 54$, $M_{female} = 48.67$). Females rated themselves significantly higher on expressive traits than did males ($t_{(85df)} = 2.36$, $p < .05$; $M_{female} = 57.09$, $M_{male} = 53.17$).

Analyses

In the case of the stylistic variables, statistical analyses were performed on the average of the two coders' feature counts. The design of the study was a 2×2 factorial with subjects nested in combinations of discourse mode (expressive, argumentative writing tasks) and biological gender (female, male). The six dependent variable clusters were tested via separate multiple analyses of covariance (MANCOVA). Mode of discourse and biological gender were the independent variables for each analysis. Covariates were the two gender role subscales: (1) instrumental and (2) expressive. A third covariate, (3) total number of words, was used to statistically adjust for effects of varying composition length. This covariance procedure thus took into account differences in composition length when considering mean differences in the frequencies of the various stylistic features.

When significant results were found in the MANCOVAs, the individual dependent variables were then retested via univariate 2×2 analyses of covariance (ANCOVA). ANCOVAs were also used to analyze frequencies of numerals, total number of words, and sentence length (words/sentence). As in the MANCOVAs, independent variables for the ANCOVAs were mode of discourse and biological gender.

Covariates were instrumental gender role orientation, expressive gender role orientation, and (except where inappropriate) composition length. Dunn's multiple comparisons (Bonferonni t's) were used to examine significant interactions for nonorthogonal contrasts of interest. The .05 level of probability was set for significance on all tests.

In the case of the holistic discourse-level judgments of rhetorical structures, each rhetorical structure variable (coded dichotomously as either present or absent in each paper) was analyzed by separate cross-tabulations with biological gender (at two levels) and with discourse mode (also at two levels). Chi-square statistics were calculated for each such 2×2 contingency table.

Results

Markers of Excitability

This multivariate cluster was a combination of exclamation points and underlines. A statistically significant multivariate effect emerged for mode of discourse (lambda$_{(2,79)}$ = .895; p<.05).

As a follow-up to the MANCOVA, separate univariate ANCOVAs were run for exclamation points and underlines. A significant effect was achieved on exclamation points for gender ($F_{(1,80)}$ = 4.81, p<.05, eta^2 = .048). Female writers used significantly more (M_{female} = .86) exclamation points than did males (M_{male} = .31).

Mode also exerted a significant impact on exclamation points ($F_{(1,80)}$ = 10.27, p<.01, eta^2 = .103). Expressive writing (M_{exp} = .92) manifested more exclamation points than argumentative (M_{arg} = .26).

The ANCOVA for underlines revealed a significant main effect for discourse mode ($F_{(1,80)}$ = 5.32, p<.05, eta^2 = .058). More underlining occurred in expressive writing (M_{exp} = .56) than in argumentative (M_{arg} = .07). No other significant factorial or covariate effects were found for these variables.

Nonessentials

This multivariate cluster was a combination of dashes and parentheses, both presumably indicating inclusion of relatively extraneous information. No significant effects were found in the MANCOVA. Consequently no follow-up ANCOVAs were run.

Connectives

This multivariate cluster was a combination of illustrators, illatives, adversatives, causals, additives, temporals, and conditionals. Significant

multivariate effects were found for the covariate total words (lambda$_{(2,79)}$ = .588; p<.001) and the main effect mode of discourse (lambda$_{(2,79)}$ = .705; p<.001).

To follow up the MANCOVA, separate univariate ANCOVAs were run for each type of connective. A significant main effect for gender was found for illustrators ($F_{(1,80)}$ = 7.08; p<.01, eta^2 = .076). More illustrators appeared in men's writing (M_{male} = .29) than in women's (M_{fem} = .06).

For additive connectives, the covariate total words exerted a significant effect ($F_{(1,80)}$ = 31.93, p<.001, eta^2 = .268). The positive regression weight for this covariate (0.015) indicated a directly proportional relationship between verbosity and use of additives.

The covariate total words similarly exhibited a statistically significant effect on use of adversative connectives ($F_{(1,80)}$ = 13.52, p<.001, eta^2 = .134). The positive regression weight (0.009) likewise indicated a directly proportional relationship between composition length and frequency of adversatives. With variance due to composition length thus statistically controlled, discourse mode exerted an additional main effect on use of adversatives ($F_{(1,80)}$ = 4.22, p<.05, eta^2 = .041). Expressive writing contained significantly more adversative connectives (M_{exp} = 3.26) than did argumentative (M_{arg} = 2.53).

The covariate total words emerged as a significant effect for conditionals ($F_{(1,80)}$ = 9.54, p<.01, eta^2 = .089). The positive regression weight for this covariate (0.009) indicated direct proportionality between verbosity and frequency of conditionals. In addition, the ANCOVA revealed a significant main effect for mode ($F_{(1,80)}$ = 16.08, p<.001, eta^2 = .149). Expressive writing manifested more conditional connectives (M_{exp} = 4.03) than argumentative (M_{arg} = 2.54).

ANCOVAs revealed no additional covariate or factorial effects on these variables, and no covariate or factorial effects whatsoever were found for illative, causal or temporal connectives.

Hedges

This multivariate cluster was a combination of intensifiers, deintensifiers/vestigials, proximals, modal adjuncts, perceptual verbs, and auxiliaries of possibility. The MANCOVA showed a multivariate effect for the covariate total words (lambda$_{(6,75)}$ = .679; p<.001), and also a multivariate main effect for mode of discourse (lambda$_{(6,75)}$ = .799; p<.01).

As follow-ups to the MANCOVA, separate univariate analyses of covariance were run for each type of hedge. The ANCOVA of intensifiers revealed a statistically significant effect for the covariate total

words ($F_{(1,80)} = 24.7$, $p < .001$, $eta^2 = .228$). The positive regression weight for this covariate (0.014) indicated that composition length and use of intensifiers were directly proportional. In the same manner, total number of words exerted the sole significant effect on deintensifiers ($F_{(1,80)} = 10.97$, $p < .001$, $eta^2 = .114$). The regression weight for composition length as a predictor of deintensifiers was positive (0.007).

Discourse mode exerted a significant main effect on use of modal adjuncts ($F_{(1,80)} = 10.97$, $p < .001$, $eta^2 = .113$). More modal adjuncts were found in expressive writing ($M_{exp} = 1.72$) than in argumentative ($M_{arg} = .896$).

For auxiliaries of possibility, gender and mode of discourse interacted significantly ($F_{(1,80)} = 7.40$, $p < .01$, $eta^2 = .084$). Post hoc comparisons between cell means showed that men who wrote in the expressive mode ($M_{exp,male} = 1.57$) used more auxiliaries of possibility than did men who wrote in the argumentative mode ($M_{arg,male} = .563$). In addition, women writing argumentative prose ($M_{arg,female} = 1.31$) produced more auxiliaries of possibility than did men who were also writing argumentation. On the other hand, women writing in the expressive mode ($M_{exp,female} = .97$) did not significantly differ from the other groups.

No additional covariate or factorial effects were found for these variables, and no significant univariate effects whatsoever emerged from the ANCOVAs of proximals or perceptual verbs.

Audience Acknowledgments

This multivariate cluster was a combination of questions and second-person pronouns. The MANCOVA of audience acknowledgments indicated a significant multivariate effect for the covariate total words (lambda$_{(2,79)} = .909$; $p < .05$). In addition, discourse mode exerted a significant multivariate main effect (lambda$_{(2,79)} = .657$; $p < .001$).

To follow up the MANCOVA, separate univariate ANCOVAs were run for frequency of questions and for second-person pronouns. The ANCOVA of questions revealed a covariate effect for total words ($F_{(1,80)} = 4.44$, $p < .05$, $eta^2 = .043$). The positive regression weight (0.006) indicated that frequency of questions was in direct proportion to composition length. The univariate analysis also exhibited a main effect for mode on use of questions ($F_{(1,80)} = 16.12$, $p < .001$, $eta^2 = .179$). More questions were used in expressive writing ($M_{exp} = 2.46$) relative to argumentative writing ($M_{arg} = .78$).

In a like manner, the ANCOVA of second-person pronouns revealed a main effect for mode ($F_{(1,80)} = 37.15$, $p < .001$, $eta^2 = .306$). Many more second-person pronouns were used in expressive writing

($M_{exp} = 6.23$) than in argumentative ($M_{arg} = 1.67$). No other significant factorial or covariate effects were found for these variables.

First-Person Markers

This multivariate cluster was a combination of egocentric sequences and all other first-person references including plural first-person and possessive first-person pronouns. The MANCOVA of first-person markers showed a covariate effect for total words (lambda$_{(2,79)} = .688$; $p < .001$). Gender exerted a multivariate effect on first-person markers (lambda$_{(2,79)} = .906$; $p < .05$), as did mode of discourse (lambda$_{(2,79)} = .670$; $p < .001$). The interaction between gender and discourse mode also exerted a multivariate effect (lambda$_{(2,79)} = .901$; $p < .05$).

To follow up the MANCOVA, separate univariate ANCOVAs were run for egocentric sequences and for all other first-person references. The covariate instrumental gender role orientation significantly affected production of egocentric sequences ($F_{(1,80)} = 4.452$; $p < .05$, $eta^2 = .039$). The negative regression on weight ($-.084$) indicated that instrumental gender role orientation was inversely related to production of egocentric sequences.

In addition, gender exerted a main effect on egocentric sequences ($F_{(1,80)} = 5.94$, $p < .05$, $eta^2 = .053$). Women produced significantly more egocentric sequences ($M_{female} = 5.00$) than did men ($M_{male} = 2.75$).

A main effect for mode on egocentric sequences also emerged ($F_{(1,80)} = 11.49$, $p < .001$, $eta^2 = .102$). Expressive writing contained more egocentric sequences ($M_{exp} = 4.79$) than did argumentation ($M_{arg} = 2.96$).

These main effects were modified, however, by the interaction between gender and mode of discourse ($F_{(1,80)} = 8.13$, $p < .01$, $eta^2 = .072$). Post hoc comparisons between cell means showed that women writing expressive discourse produced significantly more egocentric sequences ($M_{exp,female} = 7.08$) than did men who were also writing in the expressive mode ($M_{exp,male} = 2.5$). In addition, women produced more egocentric sequences when writing expressive prose than they did when writing argumentation ($M_{arg,female} = 2.93$). In contrast, males did not differentiate on this stylistic feature between expressive and argumentative ($M_{arg,male} = 3.00$) writing, nor were males writing argumentatively different from females writing in the same mode.

The ANCOVA of all other first-person references (excluding egocentric sequences) revealed a covariate effect for total number of words ($F_{(1,80)} = 15.04$, $p < .001$, $eta^2 = .116$). The positive regression weight (0.036) indicated that composition length was directly proportional to

frequency of these first-person pronouns. In addition, the covariate expressive gender role orientation affected production of first-person pronouns ($F_{(1,80)} = 5.838$; $p < .05$, $eta^2 = .045$). The positive regression weight (.215) indicated that expressive gender role orientation was directly proportional to production of this stylistic feature.

In addition, gender exerted a significant main effect on use of first-person references ($F_{(1,80)} = 5.85$, $p < .05$, $eta^2 = .045$). Men wrote more of these first-person references ($M_{male} = 11.63$) than did women ($M_{female} = 9.03$).

Mode also exhibited a main effect on first-person references ($F_{(1,80)} = 18.82$, $p < .001$, $eta^2 = .145$). More such references occurred in expressive ($M_{exp} = 13.55$) than in argumentative ($M_{arg} = 7.12$) writing.

Numerals

The ANCOVA of frequency of numerals revealed no significant covariate or factorial effects.

Sentence Length

The ANCOVA of words per sentence (total number of words was not a covariate for this analysis) revealed a significant effect for the covariate instrumental gender role orientation ($F_{(1,80)} = 4.59$, $p < .05$, $eta^2 = .044$). The positive regression weight (0.082) indicated a directly proportional relationship between instrumental gender role orientation and sentence length.

Mode of discourse also exerted a significant main effect on sentence length ($F_{(1,81)} = 12.32$, $p < .001$, $eta^2 = .119$). Argumentative writing ($M_{arg} = 19.08$) resulted in longer sentences than expressive ($M_{exp} = 16.04$).

Composition Length

The ANCOVA of total words (total number of words was the dependent measure, and therefore not a covariate, for this analysis) revealed no significant covariate or factorial effects. The ANCOVA of total number of sentences (again, total number of words was not used as a covariate here), however, indicated a significant covariate effect for expressive gender role orientation ($F_{(1,80)} = 6.00$, $p < .05$, $eta^2 = .064$). The positive regression weight (0.200) indicated that expressive gender role orientation was directly proportional to total number of sentences.

Discourse-Level Rhetorical Structures

Separate contingency tables were constructed to identify associations between gender, mode of discourse and the presence or absence of

each of four rhetorical structures. Proportionally more women (52.4% of female participants) than men (24% of males) acknowledged the legitimacy of concerns opposing their own views ($Chi^2_{(1df)} = 5.189$; $p < .05$; $eta^2 = .077$). Discourse mode was not significantly associated with this variable.

Neither gender nor mode of discourse was associated with acknowledging specific reservations to one's position or with mentioning alternative solutions to the problem. Too few compositions (only 6.3%) refuted reservations, and this prevented computation of a meaningful Chi-square statistic.

Discussion

This study was designed to test the supposition that male and female writing styles differ. College students' writing was subjected to a variety of lexical, syntactic, and text-level analyses for features that have been linked to writers' gender in previous research and theory. To determine whether gender differences were more pronounced in spontaneous expressive writing to an intimate audience, relative to revised instrumental writing to a distant audience, compositions representing these polar extremes were elicited.

Overall, the results of this study warrant the view that the writing of men and women is more similar one to the other than different. Differences due to mode of discourse were more widespread than differences due to gender. On the other hand, where male and female styles did diverge, they generally differed in predicted directions.

Effects of Gender

One of the features for which clear gender effects were manifest is use of exclamation points. On the average, women used about three times as many exclamation points as did men. Some scholars regard exclamation points in prose writing as a sign of excitability, a departure from the cool and detached standard of male writing (Hiatt, 1977). Alternatively, a high frequency of exclamation points can be regarded as a sort of orthographic intensifier signaling, "I *really* mean this!" As an example, one woman who participated in this study wrote, "The spread of drugs on our campuses has got to stop!" Like most intensifiers (Lakoff, 1973), this sort of gratuitous use of an exclamation point can have the effect of conveying a sense of the writer's *lack* of stature. People more confident of the seriousness with which they would be received could instead affirm their views by simply asserting them.

Another aspect of style which was associated with women's writing was the discourse-level feature, acknowledging the legitimacy of opposing concerns. One woman wrote, for example, "It's really important to reduce the number of students who are abusing drugs. Those people are not only hurting themselves, but they can potentially hurt others, too. Still, mandatory drug testing is no solution . . ." More than half of the women writers in this sample included such acknowledgments, while only a quarter of the men did likewise. This finding confirms the position of feminist rhetoricians (e.g., Flynn, 1988) who contend that women's writing is less confrontational and more affiliative than men's.

Along with these straightforward gender differences, gender also affected several stylistic features in interaction with discourse mode. It was predicted that male and female styles would lie closest together in revised argumentative/extensive writing, but that they would be most divergent in first draft expressive/reflexive writing. This was exactly the case for egocentric sequences. Overall, women used expressions like "I think," "I guess," and "I feel" nearly twice as often as men. These egocentric sequences were especially prevalent in women's expressive writing; women used many fewer in writing argumentation. Indeed, in argumentation the mean for women did not differ significantly from the mean for men. As a number of observers (e.g., Hiatt, 1977; Lentz, 1986; Sterkel, 1988) have remarked, whatever differences may hold between women's and men's language in some circumstances, many of those differences evaporate when writing in formal, conventionalized modes.

A somewhat different pattern characterized the interaction between gender and mode on auxiliaries of possibility. These hedges—"might" and "could"—appeared least often in men's argumentative writing. Men used about three times as many hedges when writing expressively compared to their writing of argumentation. Similarly, women used more auxiliaries of possibility when writing argumentation than did men when writing argumentation. But men and women did not differ from each other on this variable when writing expressively. That is, men and women alike tended to express tentativeness in their less formal writing. In the more formal mode, however, men tended to edit out these hedges. Women, in contrast, did not curtail these expressions of tentativeness when they were writing argumentation; women were equally tentative across modes of discourse.

In addition to participants' biological gender, this study also examined the impact on style of writers' psychological gender role. Two dimensions of gender role were measured: expressive (associated with traditional female-typed traits) and instrumental (associated with traditional male-typed traits). Instrumental gender role typing was found to be negatively related to use of egocentric sequences. That is, people who perceived themselves to be relatively more competitive and aggressive were least likely to write expressions like "I think" and "I guess." In contrast, people high in expressive gender role typing were most likely to use other first-person markers (e.g., "I don't use drugs myself" or "Our campus will be shunned by high school students who . . .").

It is interesting to note that after factoring out variance due to psychological gender role, results showed that men used more of these other (i.e., non-egocentric) first-person markers than did women. For many men, use of first-person occurred in qualitatively "powerful" expressions of assertion such as, "I say we should do away with this idea of drug testing," or, "As a student at this university, I have a right to have my privacy protected." Men also used more illustrators than did women. That is, men were especially likely to mark their examples with connective phrases like "for example" and "for instance." This does not necessarily mean that men supplied more examples than did women, only that they were more likely to signal them explicitly.

Instrumental gender role was also positively related to average sentence length. That is, typically masculine traits were related to complex sentence structure. This is somewhat supportive of Hiatt's (1977) finding that published male authors wrote longer sentences on the average than women authors. This is also consistent with National Assessment of Educational Progress findings, in which boys wrote longer sentences on the average than girls (Applebee, et al., 1990). On the other hand, other studies of students' syntactic complexity have been mixed with respect to biological gender differences (Hillocks, 1986). Loban (1976), for example, found no meaningful average differences between boys and girls in syntactic complexity. Boys, however, were especially represented at both extremes of complexity; they wrote the very least complex sentences and the very most complex sentences.

As for average composition length, no differences were found in this corpus for sheer verbosity, disconfirming some previous research (e.g., Labrant, 1933) as well as the common belief that women are more verbally fluent than men. Expressive gender role typing was, however, associated with production of more sentences. This may simply be the converse of the finding regarding instrumental gender role typing and sentence length, discussed in the preceding paragraph. That is, expressives had to write more sentences not because they had more propositional content to get across, but simply because they were

writing shorter sentences. A similar pattern for biological sex is reported in Applebee, et al (1990).

These findings regarding effects of biological gender and psychological gender role, interesting though they surely are, must be weighed in the context of the totality of stylistic variables examined in this study. No such gender effects were found for most of the features that had been nominated by previous research: no effects of gender on verbosity, nor on inclusion of nonessential information, nor on use of numerals, nor on any of the connectives save one, nor on the markers of audience acknowledgments, nor on most of the hedges and qualifiers. As for rhetorical structures, gender was not associated with mentioning specific reservations nor with mentioning alternative solutions.

Examining Extreme Cases of Psychological Gender Role Types

The above conclusions, of course, are based on mean differences between groups, or on linear relations between variables, as indicated by ANCOVAs. It is instructive, in addition, to look at gender effects as revealed by comparisons between the most extreme cases. As a sort of archetype of male writing style we consider the composition written by that male whose psychological gender role typing revealed the most traditional male schema. This person scored highest among the participants on the instrumental scale and quite low on the expressive scale. An excerpt from his argumentative/extensive composition reads as follows:

> Another major problem in the Legislature's proposal is the extent or rather what array of drugs will be tested as a negative factor, which in turns, make the student have to take a drug course. If we define drugs, everything from cocaine to alcohol falls under and is between those boundaries. If they don't include alcohol then they are going to face a crowd of angry accused drug offenders who want to know why beer is an O.K. drug to use and abuse but cocaine isn't. But if they do decide to include alcohol, XYZ would be better off offering the course in Sanford Stadium because I guarantee you over 95% of the students here are guilty of alcohol abuse . . . College students has made it thus far without drug testing being institutionalized in school; Why start now? Of course the need to educate the effects of drugs is necessary but the steps proposed by the legislature is the wrong way.

In contrast, consider the extreme case female writer—she scored highest on the expressive scale and among the lowest on instrumental. She writes here in the expressive/reflexive mode:

> I think the most important reason we should be tested is maybe it will save someone's life. If we had a mandatory drug test two years ago, maybe Brian would still be here. I still can't believe that he is gone. Every

> time I hear the word "crack" I get nauseous . . . What really scares me is how each year kids younger and younger are using drugs. My sister is 14 and she knows people that do and sell drugs. I just hope she will not be persuaded to even try them. Who knows when you'll get hooked. Just imagine what it will be like for our kids. I really sound like I'm for this proposal, don't I? I guess there is kind of a bad side to it also. I mean if you decided to try pot once and then you took that test and came out positive, it wouldn't seem fair. I don't know though . . . The more I write the more I'm for this proposal.

The paradigmatic female writer here differs from her male counterpart on a number of obvious dimensions. While he is discursive, she is narrative. While she is particularistic, he is abstract. He is definitive, she is subjective. Her point of view unfolds as a process of discovery and revelation, his stance is conclusive from the outset.

Important further comparisons arise by examining the writing of deliberately selected unclear cases. Here, for example, is a writing sample from a woman who happened to score among the highest on the instrumental scale and among the lowest on expressive. That is, she displayed traditionally male gender role schema.

> The testing of drugs on college campuses, in particular the University of XYZ has no significance. As in the workplace where many jobs affect the community, drug abuse among students only affects the individual. A student who comes to class after using some form of drugs doesn't hamper the learning process of any other student surrounding him or her. As stated before, the proposal is merely an invasion of privacy instituted to make certain students outcasts.

No males in the participant pool for this study fell into traditional female role schema group (i.e., none scored both in the highest quartile on expressive traits and the lowest quartile on instrumental traits). As another unclear case of interest, however, it is instructive to examine writing produced by a male who displayed a highly androgynous sex role schema. That is, he scored among the highest on both instrumental and expressive traits. In this case, the student wrote in response to the expressive discourse prompt.

> If for some dumb reason I was to induce a drug to my body I could be embarrassed to take the class but the benefits out way any negatives, i.e., I learn my lesson. If you break the rules you must pay the consequences. I strongly urge you to contact your local representative & ask him to voice your opinion on this matter. I feel with enough support this could pass and become legislation.I know you will feel the same as I do. Even though we both tried drugs @ a younger age it would have been beneficial to have taken that course.

These two unclear cases suggest the greater potency of psychological gender role relative to biological gender. The tone of the high in-

strumental female writer sounds remarkably like that of the paradigmatic male writer. Both are certain, unqualified, and impersonal. The androgynous male writer, on the other hand, displays at least some of the features that are likewise apparent in the writing of the paradigmatic female writer. Both of these frame assertions subjectively, make reference to emotions and relationships, and include some element of narrative. At the same time, one could identify within the androgynous writer's paper some characteristics associated with paradigmatic male writing. For example, the exposition of point of view is linear, not digressive or evolutionary. The suggested recourse to "contact your local representative" seems oddly depersonalized in the midst of otherwise subjective language.

These extreme comparisons involving psychological gender role identity are certainly provocative. Still, it must be reemphasized that gender-linked effects in this study were on the average not as dramatic as these selected cases would otherwise imply.

Effects of Discourse Mode

Discourse mode, in contrast, was on the average a more active factor than gender. Argumentative/extensive writing, predictably, was marked by longer sentences than expressive. This finding is consistent with earlier research on syntactic complexity (see reviews in Hillocks, 1986; Rubin, 1984). Argumentation, with its considerations of cause and condition, is naturally hypotactic. Syntactic connectives, of course, make for longer sentences.

Expressive/reflexive writing contained especially frequent usage of exclamation points and underlining, i.e., markers of excitability. More first-person markers—egocentric sequences as well as other first-person pronouns—were found in expressive writing compared with argumentative. Acknowledgments of audience—both use of questions and frequency of second-person pronouns—were likewise most characteristic of expressive compositions.

In all these ways, the expressive discourse mode is shown to encourage subjective expression, emotional expression, and explicit interpersonal linking from writer to reader. Thus expressive writing in this study—whether written in fact by males or by females—was marked by many of the kinds of features previous research and theory had associated with women's written style. In this sense, expressive writing would appear to be female-typed, if not always female-typical.

It is important to recall that males and females in this study were *assigned* to one writing task or another; they did not volunteer. But suppose instead that participants had not been so manipulatively directed

as to mode of discourse. According to studies bearing on gender and topic in writing (e.g., Keroes, 1990; Piggot, 1979; Scates, 1981), women have a proclivity for selecting more expressive/reflexive topics, or for adopting expressive/reflexive stances to writing prompts. It seems reasonable to conclude that some part of what has been called "women's style" in writing is an appropriate adaptation to expressive writing tasks. In those instances when men do write expressively—whether by choice or when "en-gendered" by assignment—they too are competent to use features that are gender-typed as "women's writing."

In addition to these markers associated with "women's writing," the expressive mode of discourse was rather less explicably characterized by expressions of uncertainty phrased as modal adjuncts ("maybe," "perhaps"). Compositions in this mode also contained higher frequencies of adversative connectives like "but" and "however," along with higher frequencies of conditional connectives like "if" and "unless." One would have expected each of these stylistic features to be more prevalent in argumentation. Perhaps their frequent occurrence in the expressive mode reflects the deep personal ambivalence many writers felt about drug testing. Most of the writers opposed drug testing because of its invasion of privacy and because of logistical concerns. Yet the majority of writers were sympathetic with the objectives of drug abuse prevention programs. This ambivalence could have resulted in expressions of conditions, oppositions, and tentativeness.

Implications for Instruction

By and large, women and men adapted similarly and appropriately to the differing demands of two modes of discourse. The question arises, then, whether the findings of this study can provide any basis for evaluating various proposals for considering gender in the teaching of writing (see papers collected in Caywood & Overing, 1987 for a sample of relevant instructional approaches). Some such proposals seek to eliminate those female-typical stylistic and rhetorical patterns that diverge from traditionally accepted writing standards (e.g., Piggot, 1979). According to these proposals, women's writing—to the degree it is an identifiable language variety—is a potential liability that could result in negative evaluations (Smelzer & Werbel, 1986). Women's writing, therefore, is to be remediated.

Other instructional proposals promote composition curricula centered upon gender issues in discourse (e.g., Flynn, 1988; Morahan, 1981). According to these views, a feminist approach to teaching about discourse is justified because it is intellectually satisfying and ideologically sound (Bauer, 1990). Women's style in writing is to be celebrated

as a set of viable options within the heteroglossic domain of writing styles (Lott, 1987). Rather than a liability, women's writing—again, to the extent it constitutes a stable entity—can be an asset in promoting a spirit of open-ended inquiry and in transcending agonistic approaches to conflict (McEdwards, 1985).

Presumably a feminist approach to teaching composition can be beneficial for both women and men, and women's writing can be made available as a stylistic option for all students. A third set of instructional proposals for linking gender and writing, however, focuses instead on writing as a means for women to find personal and political voice (e.g., Annas, 1985, 1987; Cooper, 1989; Fiore & Elsasser, 1981; Howe, 1971; Lassner, 1990; Ritchie, 1990). That is, women's social and political status dictate that writing instruction for women can and must serve an agenda of empowerment. According to this view, the dominant androcentric writing standard oppresses women in a number of ways (Annas, 1985). Not least, proponents of this position claim, women's psychic and intellectual competencies are enervated by traditional instruction that suppresses their authentic voice and demands constant adaptation to an imposed standard.

Curriculum decisions are ultimately decisions about ideology, and require a commitment to what *ought to be* as well as knowledge of what *is*. A number of feminist composition theorists have proposed new shapes for women's writing that "ought to be," even though they are not currently prevalent. Bridwell-Bowles (in press), for example, encourages writers to throw off the yoke of traditional academic essaying and instead experiment with diverse discourses that may celebrate personal/emotional responses or which may break the expected spatial boundaries of textual margins and indentations. Others have spoken for a kind of conative discourse that eschews direct confrontation, dialectic, or attitude manipulation in favor of a discourse of negotiation (Lamb, 1991) or a discourse of multiple perspectives (Gearhart, 1979).

These alternative feminist-inspired forms can be conceptualized. Value-based claims for the validity and necessity of these feminist-inspired forms can be expressed. Teachers may embrace those claims and decide to model and promote these alternative forms among their students (e.g., Bridwell-Bowles, in press). But in what ways can or ought empirical findings influence such curricular activity?

The present study, designed for descriptive purposes, cannot conclusively address any of these positions on gender and writing instruction. It can, however, help us understand prevailing gender-typical writing patterns, help us understand something about the sociolinguistic *status quo*. It can at least inform teachers who are strug-

gling with ways to address feminist values in writing instruction. But that is rather a different task than deciding whether and in what ways to commit to the teaching of feminist writing patterns.

As for the view that women's writing must be remediated in order to avoid negative evaluation, it is true that some previous research shows negative judgments attached to female-typical speech when it is transcribed in writing (Mulac & Lundell, 1980), but these negative judgments were not replicated when more authentic written language stimuli were evaluated (Roulis, 1990). The present research shows relatively few female-typed speech features comprising women's writing: no simple effects for gender on hedges, for example. It is true that women tended to use relatively many exclamation marks, and these may convey a sense of unwanted hyperbole. Yet it was men who used more of certain first-person constructions than did women, and first-person reference in formal writing remains the bane of many traditionalist evaluators.

An important follow-up to the present research would analyze data such as those collected here to determine the degree to which observed gender-typical features affect raters' quality judgments. Do writers who produce a higher than average frequency of female-typical markers like exclamation points suffer from negative reader evaluations? Perhaps other female-typical features like acknowledging opposing points of view or shorter sentences induce positive evaluations, and help account for the higher ratings given girls' writing samples in many large-scale assessments. While error rates were not examined in the present study, it certainly must be to girls' advantage in large-scale assessments that they tend to produce fewer mechanical errors in spelling and usage than do boys (Applebee, et al., 1990).

Of course in contexts less rarified than large-scale ability assessment, evaluators are influenced by factors quite extraneous to the language encoded on a piece of paper. Judgments of writing quality are profoundly affected by what evaluators know about the social identities of the writers (Piché, Michlin, Rubin & Sullivan, 1977). When evaluators know the gender identity of a writer, their gender-typed biases may influence judgments of writing quality, independent of any effects of actual gender-typical language. Such independent effects of writers' gender identities on readers' judgments have been verified (Mulac, et al., 1985; Roulis, 1990). Bearing in mind that gender-linked evaluations differ from context to context (Wallston & O'Leary, 1981), at least some studies have concluded that ascribing a female identity to an otherwise anonymous writer can adversely affect raters' judgments of writing quality (Goldberg, 1968) or of the writer (Mulac, et al., 1985). To the ex-

tent that such findings generalize to other contexts—and it is quite possible they do *not* generalize to classroom evaluations of writing—language "remediation" would in any event only marginally help women writing in the real world.

As for the view that all students could benefit from instruction that accepts and even encourages female-typical style, the ostensive definition of women's writing provided by this study does include some generally desirable traits. Female-typical writing, for example, acknowledges the legitimacy of opposing points of view. This sort of acknowledgment is fundamental to resolving conflicting claims, yet it does not require that writers abandon their own strong convictions and voices (cf. Lassner, 1990). In addition, there is some indication that women (and/or high expressive gender role types) write simpler sentences. If uncluttered syntax is an aspect of women's writing, then surely all learners would do well to draw upon it. Of course some features which were found in this study to be atypical of both women and men—for example suggesting alternative solutions to problems—warrant instructional efforts addressed to all students.

Finally, the instructional perspective that regards women as especially oppressed by the demands of standard edited writing receives very limited support from these data. In the design of the present study, one would need to detect interactions between gender and mode of discourse in order to locate features which women were differentially suppressing as they moved from spontaneous expressive writing to revised argumentation (cf. Hunter & Pearce, 1988). Exactly this pattern did emerge for use of egocentric sequences ("I guess," "I think"): only women reduced their use of this construction as they moved toward the male norm for extensive writing. On the other hand, only men decreased their use of auxiliaries of possibility ("might," "could") as they moved from reflexive to extensive. Women maintained the same relatively high frequency of these hedges across both modes of discourse. In short, these data do not portray women as making any more taxing adaptations than are men. On the other hand, a more direct and informative test of the suppressed voice hypothesis would compare each woman's first draft with her final draft to see whether her revision process was especially focused on eliminating gender-typical features of style. That proposed analysis would also require a similar between-draft comparison for men's writing.

Notes

1. Male and female students were about evenly divided in the classes that served as the participant pool for this study. The under-representation of male

participants in this study is therefore in itself an interesting finding. No doubt many men selected themselves out of the sample when, during recruitment, they heard that the study was going to ask them to write.

2. As one indication that participants were writing in a more-or-less authentic manner, it may be noted that many of them were convinced that the drug testing proposal was genuine. They had to be disabused of this belief during debriefing.

References

Annas, P. J. (1985). Style as politics: A feminist approach to the teaching of writing. *College English, 47*, 360–371.

Annas, P. J. (1987). Silences: Feminist language research and the teaching of writing. In C. Caywood and G. Overing (Eds.), *Teaching writing: Pedagogy, gender, and equity* (pp. 3–18). Albany: SUNY Press.

Applebee, A. N., Langer, J. A., & Mullis, I. V. S. (1990). *The writing report card, 1981–1988.* Princeton: National Assessment of Educational Progress/Educational Testing Service.

Bauer, D. M. (1990). The other "F" word: The feminist in the classroom. *College English, 52*, 385–396.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind.* New York: Basic Books.

Bem, S. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*, 155–162.

Bem, S. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review, 88*, 354–364.

Boice, R., & Kelly, K. (1987). Writing viewed by disenfranchised groups. *Written Communication, 4*, 299–309.

Bolter, J. (1979). Teaching Griselda to write. *College English, 40*, 906–908.

Bridwell-Bowles, L. (in press). Experimenting with diverse discourse in writing classrooms. In L. Phelps and J. Emig (Eds.), *Feminine principles and women's experience in American composition and rhetoric.* Chicago: Modern Language Association.

Cayton, M. K. (1990). What happens when things go wrong: Women and writing blocks. *Journal of Advanced Composition, 10*, 321–337.

Caywood, C. L., & Overing, G. R. (Eds.). (1987). *Teaching writing: Pedagogy, gender, and equity.* Albany: SUNY Press.

Cooper, M. M. (1989). Women's ways of writing. In M. M. Cooper and M. Holzman (Eds.), *Writing as social action* (pp. 141–156). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Crawford, M. (1989). Agreeing to disagree: Feminist epistemologies and women's ways of knowing. In M. Crawford and M. Gentry (Eds.), *Gender and thought: Psychological perspectives* (pp. 128–145). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Edelsky, C. (1979). Question intonation and sex roles. *Language and Society, 8*, 15–32.

Emig, J. (1971). *The composing processes of twelfth graders.* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Erickson, B., Lind, E. A., Johnson, B., & O'Barr, W. M. (1978). Speech style and impression formation in a court setting: The effects of "powerful" and "powerless" speech. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 6,* 1375–1399.

Fiore, K., & Elsasser, N. (1981). Through writing we transform our world: Third world women and literacy. *Humanities in Society, 20,* 395–418.

Farrell, T. (1979). The male and female modes of rhetoric. *College English, 40,* 909–921.

Flynn, E. (1988). Composing as a woman. *College Composition and Communication, 39,* 423–435.

Gearhart, S. M. (1979). The womanization of rhetoric. *Women's Studies International Quarterly, 2,* 195–201.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goldberg, P. (1968). Are women prejudiced against women? *Transaction, 5,* 28–30.

Greene, K., & Rubin, D. L. (1991). Effects of gender inclusive/exclusive language in religious discourse. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 10,* 81–98.

Hartwell, P. (1980). Dialect interference in writing: A critical view. *Research in the Teaching of English, 14,* 101–118.

Heilbrun, C. (1988). *Writing a woman's life.* New York: Ballantine.

Hiatt, M. (1977). *The way women write.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Hillocks, G. (1986). *Research on written composition: New directions for teaching.* Urbana, IL: National Conference on Research in English and ERIC/RCS.

Howe, F. (1971). Identity and expression: A writing course for women. *College English, 32,* 863–871.

Hunter, P., & Pearce, N. (1988). Writing, reading and gender. *Journal of Developmental Education, 12,* 20–26.

Hunter, P., Pearce, N., Lee, S., Goldsmith, S., Feldman, P., & Weaver, H. (1988). Competing epistemologies and female basic writers. *Journal of Basic Writing, 7,* 73–81.

Keroes, J. (1990). But what do they say? Gender and the content of student writing. *Discourse Processes, 13,* 243–257.

Kessler, S., & McKenna, W. M. (1978). *Gender: An ethnomethodological approach.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kirby, D., Liner, T., & Vinz, R. (1988). *Inside out: Developing strategies for teaching writing.* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Labrant, L. (1933). A study of certain language developments of children in grades 4–12 inclusive. *Genetic Psychology Monographs, 14,* 387–491.

Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and women's place. *Language and Society, 2,* 45–79.

Lakoff, R. (1977). Women's language. *Language and Style, 10,* 222–247.

Lamb, C. E. (1991). Beyond argument in feminist composition. *College English, 42,* 11–24.

Lassner, P. (1990). Feminist responses to Rogerian argument. *Rhetoric Review, 8,* 220–231.

Lentz, T. M. (1986). Communication difficulties in a large Federal agency. *American Behavioral Scientist, 29,* 303–319.

Loban, W. (1976). *Language development: Kindergarten through grade twelve.* (Research Report No. 18). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Lott, C. (1987, March). *Alternative shapes in expository writing.* Paper presented at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Atlanta. (EDRS No. ED282248).

Lunsford, A., & Ede, L. (1990). Rhetoric in a new key: Women and collaboration. *Rhetoric Review, 8,* 234–241.

Lynch, C., & Strauss-Noll, M. (1987). Mauve washers: Sex differences in freshman writing. *English Journal, 76,* 90–94.

Maccoby, E., & Jacklin, C. (1974). *The psychology of sex differences.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

McEdwards, M. (1985). Women's language: A positive view. *English Journal, 74:3,* 40–43.

Morahan, S. (1981). *A woman's place: Rhetoric and readings for composing yourself and your prose.* Albany: SUNY Press.

Mulac, A., Incontro, C., & James, M. (1985). Comparison of the gender-linked effect and sex role stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49,* 1098–1109.

Mulac, A., & Lundell, R. (1980). Differences in perception created by syntactic-semantic productions of male and female speakers. *Communication Monographs, 47,* 111–118.

O'Barr, W., & Atkins, B. K. (1980). "Women's language" or "powerless language"? In R. Borker, N. Furman, and S. McConnell-Ginet (Eds.), *Women and language in literature and society* (pp. 93–110). New York: Praeger.

Penelope, J. (1990). *Speaking freely: Unlearning the lies of the fathers' tongues.* New York: Pergamon.

Peterson, S. L. (1986). Sex-based differences in English argumentative writing: A tagmemic sociolinguistic approach. University of Texas at Arlington. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University Microfilms No. 86-21, 740. (*DAI,* 1986, 47, 8621740).

Piche, G. L., Michlin, M. L., Rubin, D. L., & Sullivan, A. (1977). Effects of dialect-ethnicity, social class, and quality of written compositions on teachers' subjective evaluations of children. *Communication Monographs, 44,* 60–72.

Pigott, M. (1979). Sexist roadblocks in inventing, focusing, and writing. *College English, 40,* 922–927.

Rasmussen, J., & Moely, B. (1986). Impression formation as a function of the sex role appropriateness of linguistic behavior. *Sex Roles, 14,* 149–161.

Rich, A. (1972). When we dead awaken: Writing as re-vision. *College English, 34,* 18–30.

Ritchie, J. S. (1990). Confronting the "essential" problem: Reconnecting feminist theory and pedagogy. *Journal of Advanced Composition, 10,* 249–273.

Rogers, C. (1961). *On becoming a person.* Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Roulis, E. (1990). *The relative effect of a gender-linked language effect and a sex role stereotype effect on readers' responses to male and female argumentative-persuasive writing.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Rubin, D. L. (1984). The influence of communicative context on style in writing. In A. Pellegrini and T. Yawkey (Eds.), *The development of oral and written language in social contexts* (pp. 213–232). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Rubin, D. L. (1987). Divergence and convergence between oral and written communication. *Topics in Language Disorders, 7:4,* 1–18.

Rubin, D. L., & Greene, K. (1991). Effects of biological and psychological gender, age cohort, and interviewer gender on attitudes toward gender-inclusive/exclusive language. *Sex Roles, 24,* 391–412.

Rubin, D. L., & Nelson, M. W. (1983). Multiple determinants of a stigmatized speech style: Women's language, powerless language, or everyone's language? *Language and Speech, 26,* 273–290.

Scates, C. (1981). *A sociolinguistic study of male/female language in freshman composition.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi.

Schwartz, K. A., & Banikiotes, P. G. (1982, August). *The impact of gender and sex role orientation on preferences for professors and counsellors utilizing sexist and nonsexist language.* Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C. (EDRS No. ED230877).

Schweickart, P. (1990). Review: Feminist currents. *English Journal, 52,* 457–465.

Smeltzer, L., & Werbel, J. (1986). Gender differences in managerial communication: Fact or folklinguistics? *Journal of Business Communication, 23,* 41–50.

Spender, D. (1980). Women and writing. In *Man made language* (pp. 191–233). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Sperling, M., & Freedman, S. (1987). A good girl writes like a good girl: Written responses to student writing. *Written Communication, 4,* 343–369.

Sterkel, K. (1988). The relationship between gender and writing style in business communication. *Journal of Business Communication, 25,* 17–38.

Taylor, S. O. (1978). Women in a double bind: Hazards of the argumentative edge. *College Composition and Communication, 29,* 385–389.

Wallston, B. S., & O'Leary, V. E. (1981). Sex makes a difference: Differential perceptions of women and men. In L. Wheeler (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology,* Vol 2 (pp. 9–41). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Wanzenried, J., Franks, L. J., & Powell, F. C. (1989, October). *He speaks, she writes: An experimental study of gender and choice of communication mode.* Paper presented at the Conference of the Organization for the Study of Communication, Language, and Gender, Cincinnati.

Warfel, K. A. (1984). Gender schema and perceptions of speech style. *Communication Monographs, 51,* 253–267.

Weider-Hatfield, D. (1987). Differences in self-reported leadership behavior as a function of biological sex and psychological gender. *Women's Studies in Communication, 10,* 1–14.

Weinstein, S. (1990, December 27). 'Gender' can't replace 'sex' (but what can?). *New York Times,* A14.

Wheeless, V. E., & Dierks-Stewart, K. (1981). The psychometric properties of the Bem Sex Role Inventory. *Communication Quarterly, 29,* 173–186.

Promising Research: An Historical Analysis of Award-Winning Inquiry, 1970–1989

Russel K. Durst
University of Cincinnati

This study examined the history of research on the teaching and learning of English and the growth of an emerging field, as reflected in the 20-year history of the Promising Researcher Award, which was established in 1970 by the NCTE Committee on Research. The study is based on an analysis of the 71 awardees' and 57 finalists' studies and of the institutional context surrounding the award. Analysis of the research focused upon changes over time in the kinds of questions asked, topics addressed, conceptual frameworks employed, and methodologies used in the studies. Results of the analysis of studies revealed a strong but shifting influence of approaches borrowed from other disciplines, including linguistics, sociolinguistics, cognitive psychology, anthropology, and literary criticism. Findings suggest that the development of research has been characterized not by "pendulum shifts" from one extreme to another, but by the gradual discovery of a new area of interest, exploration and broader analysis of the area through a variety of approaches, followed by a move to a new focus of investigation, with some researchers investigating more deeply the original area.

Since 1970, NCTE has sponsored an annual award for beginning researchers. At the time of the award's creation, NCTE's research community was still very much in the process of constituting itself. *Research in the Teaching of English* was only three years old; Janet Emig had not yet published her landmark study of high school students' composing processes; and the very question of whether English educators should even *be* researchers was a hotly-debated issue (Graves & Koziol, 1974). In the first 20 years of the award, 71 people were named Promising Researchers. Early winners' research was often strongly influenced by transformational grammar, dialectology, and other linguistic approaches. By the late 1970's and early 1980's, cognitively-oriented studies of writing process dominated. More recently, cultural and ethnographic research on writing has been prominent, and studies of teaching and teacher education are coming into their own. Numerous other topics of study and approaches to research have at different times been represented among the list of winners. Since the inception