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

**English System of Address**

Names, like other words, are linguistic symbols. Each symbol represents a unique entity. It is the assignment of
a name to an individual that defines
the organism and marks the beginning of
self-definition. One's name comes to be
part of one's identity.

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

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

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

Address patterns will either be recip-
rocal or non-reciprocal. Reciprocal
exchange is a mutual exchange of either
FN or TLN. Non-reciprocal exchange in-
volves one person using FN while the
other responds with TLN. In a reciprocal pattern of address, Brown and Ford posit that the mutual exchange of TLN correlates with distance and formality, whereas the mutual exchange of FN correlates with a greater degree of intimacy. Status also governs the exchange. In instances of non-reciprocal address, persons of higher status are addressed by TLN, an indication of respect, while those of lower status are addressed by FN, a mark of condescension and assumed intimacy. They suggest that usage of LN (Last Name) alone represents a degree of intimacy greater than that accorded to TLN but less than that assumed to be related with FN only.

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

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

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

EMPIRICAL STUDY

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

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

Research Design and Methodology:
The research design involved a content index analysis of six magazines. The appearance and frequency of referential address terms were objectively and systematically indexed. The six magazines used in the study are well known to the public and enjoy wide circulation. They were arbitrarily chosen to represent various magazine genres. They were all of the December 1976 issue. The magazines included Newsweek, Maclean's, Playboy, Ms, Cosmopolitan and Chatelaine. Maclean's and Chate-
laine are Canadian publications; the others, American publications. Newsweek and Maclean's were chosen as representative of current affairs journalism, with their readership being just as likely male or female. Playboy was chosen as representative of a male-dominated readership—a "man's" magazine. Ms., Cosmopolitan and Chatelaine, on the other hand, were considered representative of "women's" magazines, more than likely enjoying a predominately female readership. Among the women's magazines, we can further classify Ms as "a liberated woman's" publication, Cosmopolitan as a "claims to be liberated" publication and Chatelaine as a "neutral" publication. This selection of magazines allows for comparisons of referential address patterns between Canadian and American publications, between the various genres and also between individual magazines or combinations thereof.

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

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

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

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

### Titles:
- Title only
- Title + Last Name (LN)
- Title + First and Last Name (FLN)
- Title + Initial(s) + Last Name
  (Init + LN)
- Title + First Name + Initial(s) + Last Name
  (FN + Init + LN)
For clarification, Diminutive refers to an abbreviated form of the first full name, e.g., Sue/Susie in place of Susan, Ed/Eddie in place of Edward.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Results:

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

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

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

From Table 1, interesting patterns in referential address forms are evident. Address forms which never appeared in reference to males include:
FN Only as a First Mention
Dimin Only as a First Mention
Dimin + LN as a First Mention
Also, there was only one appearance of the categorical term Mr. in the entire sample.

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

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

**ABSOlute Frequency of Address Forms Across All Sample Material**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male Referents</th>
<th>Female Referents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st Mt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Categorical:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr + LN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr + FLN</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss + LN</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss + FLN</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms + LN</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms + FLN</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs + LN</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs + FLN; F=Husband's</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F=Wife's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Names:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN Only</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LN Only</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLN</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN + MN + LN</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN + Init + LN</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Init Only</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Init + LN</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimin Only</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimin + LN</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickname</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Titles:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(calculated separately)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title Only</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title + LN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title + FLN</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title + Init + LN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title + FN + Init + LN</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n/a = Not Applicable

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

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

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

In respect to the usage of the Miss/Mrs/Ms forms, Chatelaine appears more linguistically liberated than Cosmopolitan. Even Playboy displayed less frequency of these forms than Cosmopolitan. Cosmopolitan's 'claims to be liberated' stance runs counter to its actual linguistic characteristics in this particular matter.

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

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

When analyzing FN Only data in terms of First versus Subsequent Mentions (after subtracting FN Only references made to children), the results are extremely interesting in that men are never introduced by FN Only. On the other hand, women are introduced by FN Only 10% of the time. In this respect, women are introduced on the same level of status as children. Children are
TABLE 2

ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY OF FIRST NAME (FN) ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male Referents</th>
<th>Female Referents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As First Mention</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Subsequent Mention</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Frequency</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total References</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN Only as % of Total References</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

The absolute frequency scores for LN Only is presented in Table 3.
The use of LN Only appears in a pattern opposite to that of FN Only, for both sexes. That is, LN Only is used more widely in reference to males than females, whereas the opposite is true for FN Only. It is important to note the absolute avoidance of LN Only as a first mention form of address for females. The appearance of LN Only sets up a strong assumption that it is a male who is being referred to. Perhaps it is for this reason that writers refrain from referentially addressing females by LN Only. What is needed is a change in our perceptions so that we do not automatically assume that the appearance of LN Only, which is a strong and forceful means of address, is a male reference. LN Only should equally imply a female referent. Perhaps it is due to the transience of women's last names in our society that their first names have come to be considered the logical or appropriate counterpart to men's last names.

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

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

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

### Table 3

**Absolute Frequency of Last Name (LN) Only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male Referents</th>
<th>Female Referents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As First Mention</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Subsequent</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Frequency</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total References</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LN Only as % of Total References</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4

**Absolute Frequency of FN Only and LN Only Across All Magazines and All Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAGAZINE:</th>
<th>REFERENTIAL ADDRESS FORM</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FN Only</td>
<td>FN Only</td>
<td>LN Only</td>
<td>LN Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsweek</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Frequency</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total References</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maclean’s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Frequency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total References</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playboy</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Frequency</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total References</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Frequency</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total References</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmopolitan</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Frequency</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total References</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatelaine</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Frequency</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total References</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only as a female referential address form more frequently than the other publications.

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

### Table 5

**Absolute Frequency of LN Only, FN Only, FLN, According to Variable 'Sex of Author'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE REFERENTS</th>
<th>FEMALE REFERENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LN Only</td>
<td>FN Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Authors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As First Mention</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Subsequent Mention</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mentions</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total References</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Authors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As First Mention</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Subsequent Mention</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mentions</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total References</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Male authors referred to men almost equally by LN Only (45% of the time) or FLN (42% of the time). Female authors referred to men most frequently by FLN (42% of the time).

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

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

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

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

- Initials Only
- FN + Init + LN
- Init + LN

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

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

The occurrence of the form Initial(s) + LN, like LN Only, sets up the assumption that a male is being referred to. The use of initial(s) in referential address appears to be in accordance with male references only.
The referential address form, First + Last Name (FLN), enjoyed a high frequency of absolute usage for both sexes, disregarding all other variables. This is illustrated in Table 6.

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

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

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

| TABLE 6 |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY OF FIRST + LAST NAME (FLN) |
| Male Referents | Female Referents |
| As First Mention | 503 | 249 |
| As Subsequent Mention | 105 | 58 |
| Absolute Frequency | 608 | 307 |
| Total References | 1424 | 802 |
| FLN as % of Total References | 42.8% | 38.2% |
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paradigm is serving to emphasize and maintain differences between the sexes.

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

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

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