



The Relationship Between the Concepts of “Gender”, “Gender Identity” and “Gender Display”

Sheraliyeva Nodirakhon Abduvokhid qizi¹, Kasimova Nodira Inomova²

Kokand State Pedagogical Institute, Contacts: +998911552333.

ORCID ID: 0009-0003-4117-2335¹

*Corresponding author's E-mail: nodiraxon.sheraliyeva@gmail.com

Article History	Abstract
Received: 06 June 2023 Revised: 05 Sept 2023 Accepted: 14 Dec 2023	<p><i>This study is devoted to identifying the specific ways of linguistic representation of women and men in English-language mass media based on articles about gender. This problem is considered from a linguocultural perspective. As linguocultural aspects of language are increasingly becoming objects of research, and, secondly, the practical and social need to understand the media as one of the main resources of power, which promotes social values, approves norms and patterns of behavior and shape's public opinion. In this regard, the study of the linguistic representation of gender in the discourse of English-language media is of particular value.</i></p> <p>Keywords: <i>English-Language Mass Media, Gender, Linguocultural, Discourse, Anthropocentrism, Genderology, Femininity, Masculinity, Performative Theory, “Postfeminist” Stage</i></p>
CC License CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0	

1. Introduction

As many scientists note, in the 20th century, under the influence of a number of cultural and social factors, a paradigm shift occurred in the humanities. The dominant research approach in linguistics has become the anthropocentric paradigm, within which man and his consciousness play a decisive role in understanding and solving existing scientific problems.

The anthropocentrism of modern linguistics allows us to take into account those linguistic phenomena that previously were not the subject of scientific understanding. In particular, the focus of researchers was on the problem of the relationship between language and gender, which became the subject of study for a new scientific direction - linguistic genderology. Within its framework, the concept of “gender” is used to study a wide range of issues, one of which is the culturally and socially determined process of constructing male and female identities in a certain social and historical context.

This aspect represents a vast area for scientific analysis, since its material can be used to track which linguistic means are involved in constructing gender in discourse. In this regard, the study of media discourse is of particular interest, since in many ways it is the media that shape public consciousness.

An anthropocentric paradigm, within the framework of which linguocultural aspects of language are increasingly becoming objects of research, and, secondly, the practical and social need to understand the media as one of the main resources of power, which promotes social values, approves norms and patterns of behavior and shapes public opinion. In this regard, the study of the linguistic representation of gender in the discourse of English-language media is of particular value.

We know that modern linguistics studies various types of discourse from the point of view of various socio-demographic factors. In this regard, the concept of “gender,” which appeared in science relatively recently, is of significant interest for linguistics, which is reflected in the growing number of studies on this topic. There are many interpretations of gender and closely correlated concepts. First of all, let's consider the history of the emergence and evolution of the concept of “gender”.

2. Materials And Methods

Originally in English-language linguistics, the term “gender” denoted the grammatical category of gender of certain parts of speech, such as nouns and pronouns. Then this concept entered the terminological apparatus of other sciences: psychology, sociology, philosophy, anthropology, history,

etc. This was primarily facilitated by the second wave of feminism, the movement for social equality of men and women, in the context of which biological sex, i.e. “anatomical and physiological characteristics of people, on the basis of which human beings are defined as men or women” [Dictionary of Gender Terms 2002: 7], ceases to be perceived as a universal explanation of social differences between people. The term has returned to modern linguistics with a new meaning. Initially, it was viewed as a sociocultural, psychological construct associated with biological differences between women and men [Shapiro 1981: 446]. However, this approach has since been criticized because it assumes that there are only two genders, which correspond to two biological sexes.

A fundamentally different position regarding the determinacy of gender is taken by J. Butler, the author of the performative theory of gender [Butler 1990: 172]. This concept is based on the theory of speech acts by the British philosopher J. Austin, who identified the so-called performative utterances, which do not describe reality, but create it at the moment of their utterance [Austin 1962: 166]. Based on this position, as well as on the concept of power by M. Foucault [Foucault 1999: 480], J. Butler comes to the fair conclusion that gender is not the original characteristic of human existence, but rather “is constructed and asserts itself in the very act of representation” [Quote from: *Anthology of Gender Theory* 2000: 300]. This occurs through multiple repetitions of performative actions carried out in a specific cultural context. The repeated repetition creates the illusion of the naturalness of this process.

According to this theory, a person has the opportunity to choose alternative patterns of behavior that are designed to overcome the binary gender ideas that exist in many cultures.

However, it is also worth noting that J. Butler was far from the first to express the idea that gender is constructed as a result of actions. The premises of this theory can be found in the work of K. West and D. Zimmerman “The Making of Gender,” where femininity and masculinity are considered as both a process and a result of constant repetitions of cultural practices inherent in a particular gender identity [West, Zimmerman 1987: 126].

In linguistic genderology, according to one of the leading scientists in this field, A.V. Kirilina, gender is defined as “a sociocultural construct, as a conventional phenomenon and as a discursive factor of variable intensity” [Kirilina 2003b: 12].

Within the framework of linguoculturology, the relationship between gender and culture is also emphasized. So, V.A. Maslova writes that “gender is a large complex of social and psychological processes, as well as cultural attitudes generated by society and influencing the behavior of a national linguistic personality” [Maslova 2001: 124].

Summarizing general scientific approaches to the study of gender, A.V. Kirilina notes that it is a product of the development of culture and society, characterized by institutionalization, ritualization and relativity [Kirilina 2003a: 132].

The institutionalization of gender is manifested in the division of spaces into male and female, as well as in the formation of a dichotomy of masculinity and femininity in accordance with the forms of its expression generally accepted in society [Serova 2010: 62].

As for the ritualization of gender, as is known, people’s behavior is largely determined by their values and attitudes. Accordingly, certain patterns of behavior accepted in a particular social group often become the norm. When people behave in accordance with established norms, their behavior over time becomes ritualized, that is, it is consolidated in the consciousness and becomes part of the unconscious [Lakhani, Sacks, Heltberg 2014: 16].

Finally, gender is dynamic and subject to change over time, as is the culture itself that defines it. It is generally accepted that “culture is directly related to ideas that exist and are transmitted in symbolic form (through language)” [Ionin 1996: 47], and ideas, values, ideas, of course, constantly undergo transformations in the process of development of society.

Therefore, we can conclude that gender is fundamentally different from grammatical gender or biological sex, since it is a social construct and not a biological imperative. Moreover, gender is culturally determined.

The concept of “gender display” is associated with how gender manifests itself in real life. We identify a person as a man or a woman, relying on “communicative-behavioral aspects of female and male discursive practices, manifested by a system of behavioral forms” [Prokudina 2002: 31]. Gender

display, being the main way of constructing gender in the process of communication, is expressed, among other things, in gestures, facial expressions, appearance and speech patterns.

It seems appropriate to note that this phenomenon does not initially depend on the personal preferences of the individual. A change in this parameter is not inherent in nature, just like a change in gender identity, which can be defined as “an aspect of self-awareness that describes a person’s experience of himself as a representative of a certain gender” [Ozhigova 2005: 48]. In this case, the most powerful argument is a person’s self-identification.

Modern gender approach (from the 2000s to the present). This “postfeminist” stage proceeds from the fact that gender categories are not universal and cannot be explained solely by the social dominance of men over women. Rather, “men and women construct their subjectivity within the limitations imposed by discursive practices, and structure their desires and actions in conscious resistance or consent to these restrictions” [Gritsenko 2005: 38]. During this period, such areas as men's studies, cross-cultural and linguocultural approaches to the study of gender appeared.

As K. West notes, studies of the relationship between language and gender, interest in which arose thanks to gender studies that were relevant at that time and the formation of feminist ideology, developed simultaneously with discourse analysis. From the late 1960s – early 1970s. Researchers in these areas began to recognize the decisive role of language in the development of society.

3. Results and Discussion

Discourse researchers point out that discourse is always, on the one hand, immersed in a certain social context and, on the other hand, determines it [Allan, Capone, Kecskes 2016: 210]. Thus, society and discourse are two mutually constitutive concepts, which makes it possible and necessary to study the system of social stratification in relation to the linguistic behavior of members of this society. In relation to the field of gender studies, it is scientifically expedient to consider the existing relationships between gender inequality, language and discursive practices of a particular society.

The defining study in the field of feminist criticism of language was the work “Language and the Place of Women” by R. Lakoff, published in 1975 [Lakoff 1975: 328], which notes that masculinity at many levels of language is established as the norm, and femininity as a deviation from norms.

Moreover, according to E. Bodine, at the end of the eighteenth century, the use of the words “he” (he) and “man” (man/person) for gender-neutral designation of referents was established in the prescriptive grammar of the English language [Bodine 1990: 166].

However, more recent research on language and gender clearly demonstrates that masculine pronouns are not neutral with respect to the gender of the referent, so many feminists are fighting for the wider use of gender-neutral alternatives. For example, in English, such alternatives could be using the singular pronoun “they”, alternating between “he” and “she”, and using “she” as a generic.

Deborah Cameron, who uses the feminine pronoun “she” as a generic, emphasizes that such a choice reflects the political views of the speaker. By choosing certain linguistic forms, we either automatically agree and thereby help maintain the status quo, or we oppose it and thus help change it.

Research on gender and the language system has revealed many ways of verbalizing negative social attitudes towards women [Thorne, Kramarae, Henley 1983: 7]. Addresses to women indicate their marital status, for example, “missis” (Mrs.) and “miss” (Miss) in English, which emphasizes the woman's dependence on the man. As is known, similar addresses to men do not exist in the lexical composition of the English language.

Interestingly, even the speech of men and women is often represented by different descriptive verbs, i.e. those verbs that contain figurative and expressive components and express the speaker’s attitude to what was said. Thus, women's speech is described using verbs such as “scream”, “yell”, “nag”, “gossip” or “chatter”, which create a negative image of a woman [Caldas-Coulthard 1994: 250].

4. Conclusion

Studies of the representation of women in media discourse demonstrate that authors of media publications often describe women as irrational and helpless; The marital status of female characters is often emphasized, and too much attention is paid to their appearance and sexuality. Women are represented by appealing to gender stereotypes that question their ability to participate in traditionally male-dominated areas of public life, such as politics.

Moreover, studies of the ideological aspect of the discursive representation of gender have revealed the existence of semantic asymmetries. Women in media discourse are constructed as objects, and men as subjects of action; men are often depicted in the process of active social activity, and women

exist only against the background of this activity, being in a state, for example, of motherhood or marriage.

Studies of such speech practices, which construct unequal concepts of femininity and masculinity, reveal a sexist context in which women are perceived as a group different from and unequal to men. But since not all of these studies focus on the systematic study of discourse itself, they do not offer sufficient explanations of why such contexts arise. Recently, however, researchers have increasingly turned their attention to real-life examples of language in an attempt to understand the conditions under which such patterns emerge.

A.V. Kirilina identifies the following areas of gender linguistics [Kirilina 1999: 180]:

1. Sociolinguistics;
2. Feminist linguistics;
3. Gender studies themselves;
4. Masculinity studies;
5. Psycholinguistics;
6. Cross-cultural, ethno- and linguistic-cultural studies.

The nature of this work involves turning, among other things, to the linguoculturological direction, since "the tasks of linguoculturology include the study and description of the relationships between language, culture and consciousness" [Slyshkin 2004:15], which is undoubtedly relevant for the study of the peculiarities of gender construction in the English language media text.

References:

1. Dictionary of Gender Terms 2002, p. 7.
2. Shapiro J. Anthropology and the study of gender // *Soundings: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 1981. N 64. p. 446-465.
3. Butler J. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990, p. 172.
4. Austin J.L. *How to Do Things with Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962, p. 166.
5. Foucault M. *Supervise and punish: the birth of prison*. M.: Ad Marginem, 1999, p. 480.
6. *Anthology of Gender Theory 2000*, p. 300.
7. West C., Zimmerman D. *Doing Gender* // *Gender and Society*, 1987. N 2. p. 125-151.
8. Kirilina A.V. Some results of gender research in Russian linguistics // *Gender: Language, Culture, Communication: collection. abstract Third International conf. "Gender: language, culture"* November 27-28, 2003 M., 2003b. pp. 12-13.
9. Maslova V.A. *Linguoculturology: A textbook for higher education students. textbook establishments*. M: Publishing Center Academy, 2001, p. 208.
10. Kirilina A.V. Research of gender in linguistic scientific disciplines / A.V. Kirilina // *Gender education in the higher education system: state and prospects: materials of the international. scientific-practical conf. Ivanovo, 2003a*. pp. 132-136.
11. Serova I.G. Ontology of social facts and specificity of social cognition // *Cognitive linguistics: mechanisms and options for linguistic representation. Sat. articles for the anniversary of prof. N.P. Kobrina / Ed. O.E. Filimonova, O.A. Kobrina, Yu.V. Sharapova*. St. Petersburg: Publishing house "LEMA", 2010. pp. 62-69.
12. Lakhani S., Sacks A., Heltberg R. "They are not like us": Understanding Social Exclusion, 2014, p. 46.
13. Ionin L.G. *Sociology of culture*. M.: Logos, 1996, p. 280.
14. Prokudina O.N. Gender discourse analysis of speech strategies of female linguistic personality (based on Russian and English dialogical speech): dis. ...cand. Philol. Sci. Kemerovo, 2002, p. 209.
15. Ozhigova L.N. Gender identity: search, achievement and self-realization of the individual, or very personal about gender psychology // *Man. Community. Management*, 2005. N 4. pp. 45-56.
16. Gritsenko E.S. Language as a means of constructing gender: dis. ... Dr. Philol. Sci. Nizhny Novgorod, 2005. 405 p.
17. Allan K., Capone A., Kecskes I. *Pragmemes and Theories of Language Use*. Cham: Springer, 2016. P. 910.
18. Lakoff R. *Language and Woman's Place*. New York: Harper & Row, 1975, p. 328.
19. Bodine A. 'Androcentrism in prescriptive grammar: singular "they", sex-indefinite "he", and "he or she"' // *The Feminist Critique of Language: A Reader / ed. by D. Cameron*, London, New York: Routledge, 1990. p. 166-186.
20. Thorne B., Kramarae C., Henley N. 'Language, gender and society: opening a second decade of research' // *Language, Gender and Society / ed. by B. Thorne, C. Kramarae, N. Henley*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1983, p. 7-24.
21. Caldas-Coulthard C.R. 'Women Who Pay for Sex. And Enjoy it': Transgression versus Morality in Women's Magazines' / ed. by C.R. Coulthard, M. Coulthard // *Texts and Practices*. London: Routledge, 1996, p. 250-270.

22. Кирилина А.В. Гендер: Лингвистические аспекты. М.: Институт социологии РАН, 1999, p. 180.
23. Slyshkin G.G. Linguocultural concepts and metaconcepts / G.G. Slyshkin. Volgograd: Peremena, 2004, p. 340.