

**THE MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIALISED  
EDUCATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN  
BERDAKH KARAKALPAK STATE UNIVERSITY  
DEPARTMENT OF MASTER'S**

**On the rights of manuscript**

УДК 81-11

**GENJEKARAEVA SALTANAT ADILKHANOVNA**

**Gender Peculiarities of the Concept “Man” and “Woman” in English and  
Karakalpak Languages**

Speciality: 5A120102

Linguistics ( the English Language)

**Dissertation Paper for Taking Academic Master's Degree**

The work has been discussed and recommended for defense at the State Attestation  
Commission

**Head of the Master's Department:**

Ph.D. Gulimov A.B.

---

**The Head of the Department of  
English language and literature**

Ph.D.Khadjieva D.T

---

**Scientific advisor:**

Ph.D. Tleumuratov G

---

**NUKUS 2018**

# Gender Peculiarities of the Concept “Man” and ‘Woman” in English and Karakalpak Languages

## Content

<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Chapter One Gender Problems in Modern Linguistics.....</b>	<b>9</b>
1.1. History investigation of Gender in New Linguistic Paradigm.....	9
1.2. Origin of the notion of Gender.....	16
1.3. Methodology of Gender investigation at Present Stage.....	20
<b>Chapter Two Gender Peculiarities of the concept “Man” and “Woman” in English.....</b>	<b>28</b>
2.1. Gendered Speech Communication.....	28
2.1.1. Women’s Speech.....	41
2.1.2. Men’s Speech.....	43
2.2 Gender Peculiarities in language aspects.....	46
2.2.1. Gender Peculiarities in English Lexics.....	46
2.2.2. Gender Peculiarities in English Grammar.....	55
2.2.3. Gender Peculiarities in English Phraseology.....	56
<b>Chapter Three Gender Peculiarities of the Concept of “Man” and “Woman” in Karakalpak.....</b>	<b>64</b>
3.1. Gender Peculiarities in Karakalpak Lexics.....	64
3.1.1. Gendered Speech Communication. Men’s and Women’s speech in Karakalpak.....	69
3.2. Gender Peculiarities in Karakalpak Grammar.....	71

3.3. Gender Peculiarities in Karakalpak Paremia and Phraseology.....	71
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	78
<b>References</b> .....	82
<b>Appendix</b> .....	89

## INTRODUCTION

**Topicality and relevance of the theme.** Researching the role of gender in the development of culture, their symbolical and semiotic expressions in philosophy, history, linguistics literature and art helps to see the new aspects of the development of society, get into the essence of the current events more deeply. The problems of gender linguistics are the most attractive ones in the modern language study. This is an obviously new branch of science which studies out the focus on difference of means of language between men and women. The reason for linguistic gender researches are taking strong and separate position is connected first of all with changing of social role of women in the society. Each chapter of our work constituted a powerful response to male and female cognitive studies. Now, when communicative approach in linguistics is essential, investigating different ways of communication is topical. Moreover, anthropocentric character of linguistic researches in the modern stage of development demands consideration of gender aspects of communication.

It is necessary to emphasize, that cultural and socio-psychological aspects are in the centre of gender researches which causes stereotypical conception about male and female qualities and determines the attitude of society towards men and women. It forms the mechanism of construction of authoritative system in the basis of language divergencies.

Gender approach allows to considerate human factor in language more clearly.

From the earliest years of Independence of Republic of Uzbekistan special attention as paid to the development of science. In particular, in respect of linguistics the problem of a man in surrounding world has always been leading, and at present it plays the decisive role in understanding the modern world. Formation of the question about a man and his role in the world and cognition was initially connected with separation a man from the nature, and then with recognition of himself not only a representative of mankind, but also as an individual, person. In this respect, the fifth direction of Actions Strategy

on further development of Uzbekistan Republic determines the next actions “ for the purpose of protecting the right and freedom of a man, prosperity of people, satisfaction the barest necessity and interests of citizens, establishment of supremacy of law, lawfulness and fairness in society, piece, international and civil harmony in the country” [2], and in realization of the actions, such as guaranteeing the protection the right and freedom of man, prosperity of people, satisfaction the barest necessity and interests of citizens establishment of supremacy of law, lawfulness and fairness in society, piece, international and civil harmony in the country reveals the opportunity of extensive investigation of cognitive linguistics and linguo-culturology.

And finally, investigation showed, that studying the concept which applies to conceptsphere “man” in cultural-logical, semantic-functional and linguo-cultural features of modern linguistics and one of the perspective direction in different comparative languages is one of the perspective directions in modern linguistics. This dissertation is aimed to realization in certain degree of tasks, determined in Resolution of President of Uzbekistan Republic №1875 “About measures on further development the system of high education” from the 20-th of April 2017:

- To strengthen research potential of higher establishment;
- To develop science in the higher educational system;
- To improve its integration with academic science;
- To increase the effectiveness of researches of teaching staffs of Higher Education Institutions [3].

In №4947 “ Strategy of actions in five priority directions of development of Republic of Uzbekistan in 2017-2021” from the 7<sup>th</sup> February 2017 stated that “We will continue to focus our attention on deeper teaching of English and other foreign languages as priority. At the same time, we will strengthen our work on training and professional development in those specialties required for us and other regulatory-legal acts” [2].

Correspondence of the investigation with priority directions of development of science and technology of the Republic. The dissertation is carried out in accordance with the priority directions of science and technology of the Republic “The ways of formation and realization the system of innovative ideas in social, legal, economical, cultural, spiritual-moral directions of informative society and democratic government”.

**The object of the research** - means of men's and women's language, the peculiarities of their usage of language, their behavior and gender influence on the development of the language.

**The subject of the research:** the gender peculiarities of the concept “Man” and “Woman” in English and Karakalpak languages

**The aim of the research** is to study out gender peculiarities in usage the language by two genders (phonology, grammar, morphology, syntax), and the difference between men's and women's way of speaking, writing, behavior, etc. in English and Karakalpak languages.

**The tasks of the research:**

1. To compare the phonological, morphological, grammatical and stylistic aspects of speech of men and women;
2. To show the difference between the use of language varieties of the two genders;
3. To identify the way and style of speaking of men and women with pointing at the reason;
4. To study the gender peculiarities of the development of the language

**The scientific novelty of the theme.** Gender-conceptual analysis of lexical semantic fields man and woman with aim of revealing androcentrism in English and Karakalpak languages was performed, an attempt of reflecting gender stereotypes by means of analysis of their social, psychological and physiological characteristics was made, implicit representation of gender component in the semantics of phraseological units and proverbs of English language and explicit representation of gender component in the semantics of phraseological units of

Karakalpak language has been revealed, the comparative analysis of phraseological units and proverbs of English and Karakalpak languages from the point of view of gender researches was held.

**The survey of literature on the subject (degree of investigation):** The present stage of development of linguistics is characterized with special interest to the gender investigations. In works of Kirilina A.V, Goroshko E.I., Lakoff J, Martinyuk A.P, Teliya V.N., Coats J., Philips S.U., Tannen D., Gak V.G., Levant R., McGlone J., Pushkaryova N.L., Smith S., Kubryakova E.S., Lu Mimi the general and specific problems of gender investigations are discussed. As for the scientists from our country the problem was investigated by Ergasheva G, Morozova A.A., Abdullaev M.A, Alimdjanova D and others.

**The methods used in the research:** cognitive, comparative-typological, statistic, analytical, method of observation, descriptive and others.

**The theoretical importance of the research:** Many theories connecting with the gender problems have been collected. We have studied many theories having been proposed by famous linguists as: P. Eckert, R. Lakoff and others. We have compared their theories and tried to explain our linguistic theoretical results. A lot of problems dealing with gender linguistics were discussed and investigated in the research work. Different means of language, gender peculiarities of the use of language and language varieties were deeply studied out.

**The practical importance of the research:** the results of research may be implied while lecturing such courses as general and comparative linguistics, gender linguistics, social linguistics, psycholinguistics, cognitive linguistics, linguoculturology, and also for creating manuals, graduation qualification papers, master's dissertation.

**The structure of research work.** The research work consists of Introduction, 3 chapters, Conclusion and List of used literature. Introduction has general information about the problem, reveals the aim, duties, methods, theoretical and practical value of the work. Each chapter consists of paragraphs and contains

important information and explanation of the pointed tasks of the work. Chapter I is dedicated to the history investigation of gender in new linguistic Paradigm, origin of the notion of gender, methodology of gender investigation at present stage. Chapter II contains important information about gendered speech communication women's speech, men's speech, gender peculiarities in language aspects, gender peculiarities in English lexics, gender peculiarities in English grammar, gender peculiarities in English phraseology, Chapter III reveals gender peculiarities in Karakalpak lexics, Karakalpak grammar and Karakalpak proverbs, Conclusion presents the main and significant results of the investigation. List of used literature indicates the scientific issues, articles and thesis that were used in compiling the work. The work consists of 90pages.

## CHAPTER I

### GENDER PROBLEMS IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

#### 1.1. Investigation History of Gender in New Linguistic Paradigm

In research paradigms of the last decades of anthropocentrism that is orientation to study a man has started to dominate: in linguistics new directions of research, new scientific approaches are forming. The reason for that is the effect of postmodern philosophy, according to the principles of which a language is the main tool of construction the picture of the world.

According to the opinion of V. fon Humboldt, the studying of language should be carried out taking into consideration the human aspect in language, as language is a living organism [56]. French linguist G. Giyom considered language the spirit of a nation [43:65]. In confirmation of this Uzbek scientists think that language is inseparable from traditions, mode of life of the people who speak this language, and from the outside world[65:10-12].

Modern linguistic studies also go round identification the place of a man in a language, as “ language activity is a skill, inherent in a man, and it is impossible to evade the human factor while studying the language structure” [14:7]. Individual features are considered more deeply, also from the viewpoint of dimorphism, the linguistic implementation of this problem call forth more and more interest of scientific society. The sex of a man is not only a biological aspect, it also has cultural conditional mental essence. The problems and questions of a sex are considered within the scope of so called gender studies, in the basis of which lies the idea of “gender”. These studies are relatively new branch of the humanities. The objects of study of gender studies are cultural and social aspects, according to which society treat men and women, behavior of people depending on their sex, stereotypes about the qualities of men and women. In modern science gender approach to analyzing social and cultural phenomena has started to be applied very widely. The notion of “gender” is multidimensional. It is constantly developing and is studied in various humanities such as sociology, psychology, philosophy, linguistics which

interpret gender theory according to their own standards. As I.I. Khaleeva confirms, “ approach to genderism as to the reality... allows to distinct gender as it were interdisciplinary intrigue, on the basis of which intertwine many sciences about a man, not only about his biological but also social and cultural conditional peculiarities, intrigue as the whole set conditions, events and actions, in the centre of which is a man, individual” [67:8-11].

First of all, this term should be differentiated from the term “sex”. According to the traditional approach, the notion of sex means physiological differences, depending on which people are defined as men and women. Cultural and social orientation of an individual in the world depends on sex of a man, therefore sex is one of the most socially important feature of an individual. However, besides the biological difference there are various social roles, form of activities, peculiarities of a personality, functional features, and at that each society has its own idea about masculinity and femininity, that is the thing which is acceptable for men, in other society is allowed to permissible for women as well. It allows to conclude, that biological sex is not an explanation to this difference. Therefore, necessity arises to in differentiating biological sex, which is defined strictly by anatomical features of a person’s organism, from social sex, which is formed due to the definite influence of society. Thereby, the notion of “gender” denies absolute biological predetermination of difference between men and women and supposes the extinction of biological sex and social sex. Gender is the set of social and cultural standards, required by society to people depending on their biological sex. Consequently, scientists try to consider the totality of biological and social features while defining the notion “gender”. The term “gender” was used only in linguistic context of English language to designate grammar category of gender up to the 70-s of last century. For the first time the term “gender” in this meaning was used by American psychologist , professor of California University Robert Stoller in 1968 to differentiate masculinity and femininity as sociocultural peculiarity of “male” and “female”. In his work “Sex and gender: about development of masculinity and femininity” Stoller supposes,

that the basis of gender is composed of psychological and cultural aspects.”[43:102].

Philosopher Anna Okley in her book “Sex, gender and society” has the following viewpoint: “Sex is the word, which is correlated with biological difference between man and woman: visible difference between genitals, respective difference reproducing functions. “ Meanwhile, gender is the subject of culture: it is brought the social classification into “masculine” and “feminine”... fixedness of sex should be admitted, however diversity of gender should be as well.

According to this definition, gender as a set of sociocultural feature of behavior, formed in society, cannot replace sex, which is given by nature, and composed of strictly biological feature, that is gender supplements sex. That was the first interpretation of gender, which was spread in the end of 60-s and in the beginning of 70-s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

The second interpretation of gender appeared later, to the beginning of 80-s of 20<sup>th</sup> century, according to which not only sociocultural features of men and women in the society that construct but also the ways of expressing the sexuality, which depend on their biological sex, that is gender started to include biological sex. The most famous definition of this period belongs to Joan Scott:”...gender is social organization of sexual difference. But it does not mean, that gender reflects or comes from definite and natural physical difference between men and women, most likely gender is the knowledge which creates meaning to bodily difference... We cannot see sexual difference except the functions of our knowledge about a body, and this knowledge is not “pure”, it cannot be separated from implied in the wide area of discourse contexts.” For a long time the topic of interrelations of language and gender in linguistics has not been considered, but only at present time because of the developing anthropocentric scientific paradigms it started to move to foreground of linguistic investigations. According to the opinion of A.V.Kirilina, “Linguistic data are the most significant sources of information about the character and

dynamics of constructing the gender as the product of culture and social relations” [58:6-7]. The category of gender can be applied to all linguistic phenomena, which are connected with the problems of sex, as “sex and its manifestation is not only “registered” by language, but acquire axiology, valued from the viewpoint naïve picture of world. Therefore, it is proper to ascertain, how sex fixes in language: with which tools, semantic fields, valuation and so on, also its relevance to other languages[58:33-34].A.V.Kirilina emphasizes, that even though gender is not linguistic category ( with the exception of socio- and psycholinguistics), analyze of language categories presents the investigator the information about : what role gender plays in a culture, what behavioral standards for men and women fix in texts of various types, how the ideas change about gender norms, masculinity and femininity , what stylistic features can be referred to mainly female or male, how masculinity and femininity interprets in different languages and cultures, how gender belonging effects to learning a language, what fragments and thematic spheres of linguistic picture of world it is connected with” [58:10-11].

According to A.V.Kirilina [59:134-141] there are three phases of gender investigations:Biological determinism – the investigations which were irregular, based on observation of independent facts.The factor of sex in connection with language firstly occurred in antique times while interpreting the categories of grammar gender.

It was considered, that appearing of this category was connected with physiology of people, that is category of gender correlated to biological category of sex. And to masculine nouns were ascribed the qualities such as power, energy, strength, activity, and to feminine nouns- passiveness, weakness, dreaminess, sinfulness. This hypothesis was called symbolico-semantic and existed until the 17<sup>th</sup> century, when was discovered that there are languages which don't have category of gender. Therefore, at present time gender category is interpreted solely as linguistic category. However, in spite of critical attitude, one of its points described above hypothesis about ability of gender category to

effect human perceiving related words and notions is admitted by modern science.

The second phase of development of problem reflects transitional period, which was the first half of 20<sup>th</sup> century. In this stage, linguists explain gender difference in language as social and historical cause. For example, O. Espersen in his work in 1925 “Language: its essence, origin and development” devoted the whole chapter to difference in speech behavior of men and women in different languages. For example, in language of Zulu there was a taboo for women which prohibited saying the names of relatives of males, and also to all word combinations where could be seen proper names. That was how the special feminine dialect arouse. In Bolivia in tribe of chikito there were male and female suffixes. F. Mountrier in his investigations points to some features of male and female speech. According to Mountrier, “women are less educated and therefore try to use foreign words needlessly, whereas educated men do not use them, being capable to find equivalents in their Mother tongue”. Mountrier thinks, that “ creative using the language is the prerogative of men, and women can only learn the language created by men”.

As a matter of fact, gender investigations is typical for the third phase of development, when in the 60-70-s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century started intensive and systematic learning of gender phenomena. At the same time in American universities sprang up so called women’s studies, which rapidly spread out to English speaking countries. Their main goal is studying women’s agenda in various spheres of life, interpreting the social role of women in modern world, their contribution to the development of humanity. The nucleus of women’s studies is life experience of women, engaged in social and cultural reality. The result of the investigations was the formation of feministic linguistics or feministic criticism of language. This direction exists till today, but in more reasonable condition, passing alarmistic stage, when there were spoken radical statements, which were not confirmed in practice or proved scientifically. There are two approaches in feministic linguistics. The first is directed to revealing

“sexism” in language( that’s patriarchal stereotypes, fixed in language which imposes to informants a definite picture of world, where women are given secondary role and mainly ascribed only negative qualities), and also that linguistic norms must be reinterpreted and changed, so that they do not infringe women’s right. In the scope of this approach the following questions are investigated: what characters are fixed in language, which semantic fields women are presented in and what connotation is accompanied to this image. The second approach is based on the studies of features of communications of same-sex and mixed groups: there is analyzed different speech situations. The investigation is based on the fact that the difference in male and female speech behavior is founded on the stereotypes, fixed in language.

The fundamental work in the field of feministic linguistic was the work of R. Lakoff “ Language and the place of women” [34], in which the author substantiates the androcentrism of language and lameness of the woman image in the linguistic picture of world. In the feministic linguistic the following signs of androcentrism in language are notable:

- 1) Identification of notion “human” and “man, in many languages they are meant by the same word: for example, man in English, hombre in Spanish, Mann in German. English word Man in male has the meaning “human”, in neuter gender it is used in relation to women as “strumpet, vile woman”. These facts indicates about the presence of gender asymmetry in these languages and about their androcentrism.
- 2) The nouns of female gender are as a rule derived from the nouns of male gender, not the contrary. They often have negative meaning. The usage of the nouns of male gender to women is considered acceptable and even raises the status, but usage of the nouns of female gender to men contains only negative estimate.
- 3) It is very wide spread the mechanism of “embeddedness”. It means, that in language it is more preferable the male forms to mean the persons of any gender or groups of persons of different sexes. For

example, in Spanish language there are two kinds of personal pronouns of third person of plural: *ellas* (to mean the groups of persons of only feminine gender. And *ellos* (to mean the groups of persons of masculine gender and both sexes);

- 4) Syntactical or semantic agreement, which happens according to the real sex of referent, not by the grammar gender of a word. *Wer hat hier seinen Lippenstift vergessen?*
- 5) Femininity and masculinity is clearly differentiated as poles and contrasts with each other in qualitative (positive and negative valuation) and magnitude relation (the domination of male gender as universal)
- 6) In Europe feministic linguistic spread widely thanks to the work of D. Tannen “You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation” [45] , where investigator thinks, that the speech of men and women has distinctive features, which allow mark out genderlects- regular set of signs of female speech. However, later works prove that there are no genderlects, as differences in male and female speech are not strongly pronounced. Because of that the affirmation that sex is the determinative factor of communication was disproved, though it was supposed in the initial stage of development of feministic linguistics.  
Gender investigations come from women’s studies. However, their considerable difference is there are two investigations: man and woman. Besides that, gender investigations are not so radical as feministic is, and they do not have strongly pronounced ideological load. Yu.N.Abdullayev pointsthree directions of gender aspects in language: 1) dependence of speech behavior of informants from their biological sex; 2) revelation of lexical and grammatical differences in male and female speech; 3) studying the influence of biological sex to linguistic terminology.

In modern stage of gender investigations a number of hypothesis are distinguished, on basis of which early state of gender theories reinterpreted. For example, Moscow school of gender linguistics denies constant presence of “gender” category in language. While studying the communication and speech behavior this school admits gender “floating parameter”, even right up to vanishing in some situations [55]. Thereby, gender investigations are one of the newest and most perspective directions in the field of linguistics. Gender linguistics gives an opportunity to look at the world in a different way and is beneficial field for further scientific researches. Gender approach opens wide opportunities for reinterpreting present known categories from the point of view of linguistics, philosophy, sociology, psychology. With the help of gender approach anthropo-oriented investigations of language is developing and the factor of man in language is considered more clearly.

## **1.2. Origin of the Notion of Gender**

Discussion points in the definition and use of the concept of "gender"

Although the concept of gender is recognized today by most researchers, there are a number of difficulties encountered in reading the literature and associated with some differences in the understanding of gender and the comparative novelty of this concept:

- A significant part of the works devoted to gender-based differentiation of society and the processes associated with it, was written before the emergence of the term and operates with the concepts "sex", "sex", "sexus", "sexuality" even in those cases when it comes to social aspects of the interaction of the sexes .
- The term gender originated in the English-speaking space and is an English synonym for the grammatical category of the genus, which in a number of cases leads to ambiguities precisely in the linguistic description.
- Many researchers adhere to the old concepts, using the terms sex bias, sex role, sex difference, etc., including, however, in their reasoning provisions on the

social and cultural significance of sex. In many English-language works, both concepts are used in parallel [37:1-11]. Thus, Weiss, speaking of the biological field, applies the term natural gender, providing it in brackets with an explanation (sexus). This is especially true of the works, the creation of which coincided with the emergence of the concept of "gender".

- The ambiguities also arise depending on the language on which the study is described, and also when translating foreign language works into Karakalpak. Gender is also used as a euphemism for the sexual word. - When choosing terminology, the conceptual position of the author also matters. Thus, representatives of the biological deterministic direction, insisting on a physiologically and mentally conditioned differentiation of cognitive differences and language abilities of men and women, use the traditional designation of gender, although in their works the concept of gender is encountered.

A number of authors suggest using terms that include the word gender. Thus, the concepts of gender, gender, social gender, sexual dimorphism, sex-differentiation, biosocial (biocultural) characteristics of a person are applied. The latter emphasize the dual nature of sex, its natural and cultural components. The borrowed sex lexeme reflects only the field of interaction of the sexes, related to their reproductive function.

At the same time, our observations show that in the scientific literature in Karakalpak, the term gender is more often used, but its derivatives: gender studies, gender aspects, gender relations, gender, genderology. The word gender in many cases allows us to understand from the context in which cases we are talking about biological, and in what - about the culturally conditioned aspects of it.

Attention is also drawn to the fact that in the philosophy of gender there is an increasing detail in the scope of this concept. Thus, it is proposed to distinguish up to seven criteria and levels of gender formation (from gamete to social proper, [62:5-9]). The question of the extent to which such a fractional division can make a difference in linguistic genderology remains open. In our

opinion, such a distinction - at least, at the present stage - cannot yet be claimed by linguistics. Rather, it is the prospect of an interdisciplinary approach. For linguistics, the more significant general theoretical postulate is the cultural conditioning of the sex and its manifestation in language and communication.

Given that gender relations permeate most areas of human activity, the study of gender - genderology - certainly should be of an interdisciplinary nature [68:5-9]. At the same time, linguistics has a wide range of methods and techniques that allow studying the manifestations of gender in language and speech. Therefore, we can talk about consolidation of the efforts of linguists and the formation of a separate direction - linguistic genderology, in which, along with the use of data from other sciences, linguistic competence is applied.

In the monograph we mainly use the notions of gender, social gender and gender, treating them as synonymous in the framework of our work and sharing M. Foucault's point of view: even purely biological processes in discursive practices acquire a social and cultural significance, which determines their fixation in the language, which is itself a sociocultural phenomenon. In favor of this approach, the observations of ethnographers and anthropologists also speak: even seemingly purely biological phenomena, like "coitus or childbirth, are carried out in humans by different methods, in which there are certain, and very significant, ethnic differences" [65:10-12]. Language captures just the cultural differences and different conceptualizations of the same phenomena. Sex and its manifestations are not simply "registered" in language, but acquire axiological character, are estimated from the point of view of the naive picture of the world. Therefore, the language considers gender, as it seems to us, precisely from the angle of social importance of this category, which makes it legitimate to apply the concept of gender to all phenomena of language relating to the problem of sex. The task, therefore, is to identify, by what means, in what semantic areas, with what assessment and in which cases sex is fixed in the language. It is equally important to see whether gender is equally relevant for different languages.

It is also important to note that the notion of "gender" is not a linguistic category (of course, we do not consider here the designation of the gender category in the English language, but only the "social sex", and there is a very radical view that the questions of referencing a number of nouns with the meaning of a person can be considered in a gender aspect only on the assumption that the biological sex must in this case be considered not an extra-linguistic but a semantic category, that is, be regarded as natural linguistic phenomenon.

Nevertheless, both language and speech can be analyzed in terms of reflecting gender relations in them. The most common is the understanding of gender as a factor in the study of sociolinguistic and pragmatic problems. However, these are not the only areas of linguistics where the concept of sex is manifested. The study of the lexicon and grammar, a number of questions in the theory of reference, linguodidactics and linguoculturology, the history of language, and psycholinguistics in the gender aspect makes it possible to obtain data relevant for linguistics [69:9-18; 60:5-12; 54:34-36]. As shown in the works of I. Goffman and M. Foucault, the semiotics and conventionality of gender can be examined from the point of view of discourse analysis and the cultural specificity of society, which implies extensive use of linguistic possibilities in terms of studying the social sex and its manifestation in the language.

Further, it is necessary to take into account that the methodological foundations of GR and their philosophical understanding depend on the historical factors of development of both linguistic knowledge and the general scientific model of man. An important role in the consideration and interpretation of facts is the conceptual position of the researcher, and often his ideological attitudes.

In the next section, the modern philosophical base of the GR is considered from the perspective of actual tendencies in the development of linguistics, as well as the main directions of the GR in connection with the conceptual

guidelines of individual gender schools. GR questions are discussed here from the point of view of their application in linguistics.

### **1.3. Methodology of Gender Investigation at Present Stage**

Gender research (GR), including linguistic genderology, is a new direction of humanitarian knowledge, which is in our country at the stage of formation. This fact causes us to start our work with a description of both the object and the subject of the GR, and the general philosophical context of their occurrence. It is known that the GR began to develop intensively, primarily in the Western humanities. Their emergence and development is not accidental, but is associated with a new look at the problem of cognition, the philosophy of science and the philosophy of society, with the intensive development of philosophical and psychological personology, sociology and ethnoanthropology. The very concept of gender (gender) is known since the sixties of our century, but it was widely applied only in the early eighties. In the scientific description, it was introduced in order to draw a line between the concept of sexus and the social and cultural implications implied in the male-female concepts: the division of roles, cultural traditions, the relationship of power in relation to the sex of people. The term gender is intended to exclude biological determinism, embodied in the concept of sexus and ascribes all the sociocultural differences associated with gender, universal natural factors.

The gender concept leads to the conclusion that femininity and masculinity are not only signs of specific biological organisms but also socially and culturally conditioned concepts that allow themselves to be viewed as a binary opposition, including not only the presence / absence of a certain attribute, but also the category of evaluation.

In order to understand why the introduction of the new term was necessary, it is necessary to consider the time and conditions for the emergence and wide dissemination of GR, that is, to lay out the philosophical and

methodological prerequisites for the emergence of GR in the post-structuralism era and, more broadly, postmodernism.

From this point of view, it is important to take into account that the rapid development of gender studies in the west coincided with the formation of a new philosophy of science, primarily due to the ideology of postmodernism, as well as the search for a new episteme in linguistics itself.

How can we explain why gender studies began to be intensively conducted in Western countries precisely during the period of criticism of structuralism and the formation of postmodern philosophy? To answer these questions, it is necessary to generalize the processes resulting in the formation of poststructuralism and postmodernism, to determine how they are related to the philosophy of language, and, finally, to establish what is the linguistic competence in modern genderology.

Let's start with the fact that, fundamentally new, introduced in the theory of knowledge, some trends of modern thought, which are often characterized as postmodernism. This poststructuralism, deconstructivism, post-Marxism and some trends of feminism. In many respects, the differences between them outweigh the similarities, but at the same time they share common features that can be defined as postmodern:

1. All of them deny stable epistemological foundations, undeniable theoretical premises and regularities. They are united by distrust of absolute or universal norms and comprehensive theoretical systems.

2. All the directions of postmodern thought recognize the linguistic concept of reality, arguing that what we perceive as reality is in fact a socially and linguistically constructed phenomenon, the result of the linguistic system inherited by us. Consequently, the world is cognized only through linguistic forms, so our ideas about the world cannot reflect the reality that exists outside the language; they can be correlated only with other language expressions. The language is thus separated from the contacts with external notation.

3. These lines of thought reject the provision of social integrity, as well as the notion of causality, being committed to diversity, pluralism, fragmentation and uncertainty.

4. All of them cast doubt on the rational, single subject who was the basis of Western thought since the Enlightenment, preferring to view it as socially and linguistically fragmented.

5. The linguistic and psychological studies of this period, in particular, a new look at the notion of a category that arose under the influence of E. Rosch's works, also stimulated the revision of the basic philosophical concepts and the rejection of a large number of traditional representations peculiar to Cartesian logic, and, consequently, a new comprehension of linguistic tasks. In the opinion of J. Lakoff, we must abandon a significant number of traditional views, including the following:

- value is based on truth and reference; it deals with the relationship between symbols and things in the world;
- biological species are natural genera, determined by common essential properties;
- thinking is separated from the body and independent of it;
- emotions do not have conceptual content;
- grammar - an expression of pure form;
- the mind is transcendental, in this sense it surpasses the way of thinking peculiar to man;
- there is a true view of the world (inherent in God) - this is the only way external to the human knowledge of understanding what is objective truth;
- in the process of thinking, all people use the same conceptual scheme [34:148].

These postulates "are somehow connected with the classical interpretation of the category concept. The rejection of it entails the abandonment of other concepts. They must be replaced by representations that are not only more accurate, but also more human "[34:149]. Despite the fact that not all linguists

fully share this radical point of view, the postmodern approach finds wide application in linguistics.

Thus, the dependence of the individual's consciousness on the stereotypes of his language is proved. It is assumed that in the minds of each a certain set of texts is imprinted, which determine the person's relation to reality and his behavior and is mediated by discursive practice. Because of this, language is given utmost importance, and linguistics becomes one of the central sciences, since the individual's consciousness is likened to the text: man as a subject "dissolves in the texts-consciousnesses constituting the great intertext of the cultural tradition". Thus, the idea of nominalism is revived to some extent or attempts are made to synthesize nominalism and realism [63].

An important place in the ideology of postmodernism is occupied by gender issues. The existential status of an individual is based primarily on such essential categories as age and sex. So, according to the idea of Derrida, the system of values and the world view are produced from the position of "European white men". In other words, all the consciousness of modern man, regardless of his gender, is thoroughly imbued with the ideas and values of male ideology with its priority of the masculine principle, logic, rationality and objectivity of the woman. The popular book Simone de Beauvoir "The Second Floor" and the "Will to Know" Foucault, conceived as the first volume of the "History of Sexuality", also contributed to the dissemination of this idea and showed how the social dominates the biological even in such a "naturally conditioned" sphere, as the relationship of the sexes. Following S. de Beauvoir, Foucault showed that already in ancient times, sexual morality is the moral of men: "morality is thought out, written and taught by men and addressed to men" [66: 294]. The feminists advanced the thesis of the domination of patriarchy in society and that all texts and discursive practices impose on individuals precisely patriarchal, that is, male values .

On the basis of the priority of the language, in the foreign linguistics, a gendereological direction took shape, considering, on the one hand, the

stereotypes of femininity and masculinity fixed in the language, as well as gender asymmetries, and on the other, the specific features of speech behavior of men and women.

These facts convince us that interest in GR and their intensive development have arisen not accidentally, but are one of the components of the new, postmodern concept of the humanities.

Currently, a number of conceptual directions are highlighted within gender studies, related to the ideological attitudes of authors and to the historical development of gender studies themselves. In a historical perspective, three stages of GR formation are distinguished [57:156-163]:

1. The "alarmist" stage. The main attention was paid to androcentric deviation in social sciences, criticism of the interpretative possibilities of social theory, expounded from the male point of view, accentuated the defectiveness of traditional patriarchal epistemology. This formulation of the question was developed primarily in postmodern works.
2. The stage of "feminist conceptualization." His main goal was the development of clear benchmarks in feminist theory and practice. In this period, several areas of feminist-oriented science are being created (feminist psychoanalysis, feminist linguistics) that do not hide their ideological bias. Actively mastered postmodern theory to substantiate feminist outlook and research.
3. The "post-feminist" stage is characterized by the emergence of "male studies" and a reflection on the problems of analyzing how gender is present, constituted and reproduced in social processes. In the field of gender analysis, both sexes, their relationships and interrelationships with social systems of different levels are included. As A.A. Klecin, and currently research is being conducted in all three directions, which is connected "on the one hand with the heterochronality of mastering gender problems by individual scientific disciplines, on the other - regional features of research interests and priorities, with the third - commitment

individual researchers of a particular model of theorizing and metatheorizing. " Drawing attention to the weak structuredness of the field of gender studies in the humanities, AA Klecin suggests distinguishing three areas of modern gender studies: 1) gender as a tool for sociological analysis; 2) understanding of gender as a tool for women's research; 3) gender as a cultural interpretation. We agree with this point of view, but we believe that in the field of linguistic research it is now possible to make a number of generalizations and to identify certain trends in the development of GR. In the next chapter, the peculiarities of the formation of GR in domestic linguistics are considered both from the point of view of their methodological features and from the position of thematic organization.

### **Conclusion on Chapter I**

1. In the scientific description, the concept of gender is introduced in order to draw a line between the notion of gender and the social and cultural implications of the male-female concept: the division of roles, cultural traditions, the relationship of power in relation to the sex of people. The term gender is intended to exclude biological determinism, embodied in the concept of gender and ascribes all the sociocultural differences associated with gender, universal natural factors.

2. Unlike the gender category, gender status and, accordingly, the gender hierarchy and gender-related behavioral models are not set by nature, but are "constructed" by the society (doing gender), prescribed by institutions of social control and cultural traditions. Gender relations are an important aspect of social organization. They express in a special way its system characteristics and structure the relations between speaking subjects.

3. The main theoretical and methodological provisions of the gender concept are based on four interrelated components: these are cultural symbols; normative statements that give directions for possible interpretations of these symbols and are expressed in religious, scientific, legal and political doctrines;

social institutions and organizations; as well as self-identification of the individual. Gender relations are recorded in the language in the form of culturally conditioned stereotypes, leaving an imprint on behavior, including speech, personality and the processes of its linguistic socialization.

4. Although the gender concept was to some extent prepared by the previous accumulation of facts and their comprehension, it was formed into an independent scientific direction only in the period of postmodernism. This became possible due to the rejection of the postulate that there is some truth external to human knowledge. Recognition of the plurality of truth, its subjectivity, contributed to the development of an anthropomorphic view of consciousness and thinking, and, consequently, increased attention of scientists to various parameters of the human personality. One of these parameters was recognized as sex, which is not only a biological substance, but also a culturally conditioned mental construct. This means that gender identity is one of the cognitive resources of both individuals and societies. In accordance with this, gender can be considered as a measurement, as a parameter of research in many social sciences, including in linguistics.

5. Gender is not a linguistic category, but its content can be largely uncovered by analyzing the structure of the language. It is the extra-linguistic status of gender that has caused some peculiarity in its study. First, gender itself can serve as an object of research both in individual sciences and in the interdisciplinary paradigm. Secondly, certain areas of science, in particular, linguistics, can be studied in the aspect of gender. The object in this case is a linguistic category, for example syntax, lexicon, pragmatics, etc. The subject is the gender dimension of the corresponding entity.

6. Precisely because gender is a component of both collective and individual consciousness, it must be studied as a cognitive phenomenon that manifests itself both in stereotypes fixed by the language and in the speech behavior of individuals who, on the one hand, recognize themselves as persons of a certain gender, on the other, experiencing a certain pressure of

axiologically non-neutral language structures that reflect the collective exercise of gender

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **GENDER PECULIARITIES OF THE CONCEPT “MAN” AND “WOMAN” IN ENGLISH**

#### **2.1. Gendered Speech communication**

Gendered Speech Communities Writing in the 1940s, Suzanne Langer introduced the idea of "discourse communities." Like George Herbert Mead, she asserted that culture or collective life, is possible only to the extent that a group of people share a symbol system and the meanings encapsulated in it. This theme recurred in Langer's philosophical writings over the course of her life. Her germinal insights into discourse communities prefigured later interest in the ways in which language creates individual identity and sustains cultural life. Since the early 1970s, scholars have studied speech communities, or cultures. William Labov [33:121] extended Langer's ideas by defining a speech community as existing when a group of people share a set of norms regarding communicative practices. By this he meant that a communication culture exists when people share understandings about goals of communication, strategies for enacting those goals, and ways of interpreting communication. It's obvious we have entered a different communication culture when we travel to non-English-speaking countries, because the language differs from our own.

Distinct speech communities are less apparent when they use the same language that we do, but use it in different ways and to achieve different goals. The communication culture of African-Americans who have not adopted the dominant pattern of North American speech, for instance, relies on English yet departs in interesting and patterned ways from the communication of middle-class white North Americans. The fact that diverse groups of people develop distinctive communication patterns reminds us again of the constant interaction of communication and culture. As we have already seen, the standpoint we occupy in society influences what we know and how we act. We now see that this basic tenet of standpoint theory also implies that communication styles evolve out of different standpoints. Studies of gender and communication

[14:74-86; 16; 17; 23:197-226; 29:100; 34; 45] have convincingly shown that in many ways women and men operate from dissimilar assumptions about the goals and strategies of communication. F. L. Johnson, in fact, asserts that men and Julia T. Wood to women live in two different worlds and that this is evident in the disparate forms of communication they use. Given this, it seems appropriate to consider masculine and feminine styles of communicating as embodying two distinct speech communities. To understand these different communities and the validity of each, we will first consider how we are socialized into feminine and masculine speech communities. After this, we will explore divergencies in how women and men typically communicate. Please note the importance of the word typically and others that indicate we are discussing generalizable differences, not absolute ones. Some women are not socialized into feminine speech, or they are and later reject it; likewise, some men do not learn or choose not to adopt a masculine style of communication. What follows describes gendered speech communities into which most women and men are socialized.

In her popular book, *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Communication*, linguist Deborah Tannen [45:42] declares that 'communication between men and women can be like cross cultural communication, prey to a clash of conversational styles.' Her study of men's and women's talk led her to identify distinctions between the speech communities typical of women and men. Not surprisingly, Tannen traces gendered communication patterns to differences in boys' and girls' communication with parents and peers. Like other scholars Tannen believes that women and men typically engage in distinctive styles of communication with different purposes, rules, and understandings of how to interpret talk. We will consider features of women's and men's speech identified by a number of researchers. As we do, we will discover some of the complications that arise when men and women operate by different rules in conversations with each other[45].

Both casual and serious observers of the Human condition have long recognized that communication between the sexes is often frustrating. A possible cause of the difficulty is that men and women may in fact not really be speaking the same language [39:3-15]. Aspects of form, topic, content, and use of spoken language have been identified as sex-associated. Either men or women are likely to produce specific utterances.

Informal observations, speculations, and stereotypes in each category are discussed first. This presentation is followed by a report of empirical findings from a variety of communications situations. Although reports of stereotypes and evidence for male and female spoken language differences do not always coincide, they both contribute to one's understanding of sex roles and communication. The form of utterances can be described in terms of their acoustic, phonetic shape. In terms of the unit of sound, or phonology, the unit of meaning that are words or inflections, or morphology, and the ways in which units of meaning are combined with one another, or syntax [12:18] Perhaps the most widespread belief about men's speech as compared with women's is that it is coarser and more direct. A nearly universal observer of style in language, Jespersen, observed women's speech to be generally more conservative than men's in the following way: Men are ready to coin and use new terms, puns, utterances, slang expressions, and employ profanity and obscenity. Women, on the other hand, are shy of mentioning certain parts of the human body and certain natural functions by the direct and often rude denominations which men and especially young men prefer when among themselves. Women will therefore invent innocent and euphemistic words and paraphrases which sometimes may in the long run come to be looked upon as the plain or blunt names and therefore in their turn have to be avoided and replaced by more decent words. Reikaffirmed that "we all know that there is a 'man talk' and a 'woman talk' ". He observed that "men

will not hesitate to say 'Hell' or 'Damned'.

Women will rarely say 'It stinks' preferring to state that it has a bad smell" [39:14].

More recently, Kramer quoted the following: "The New Seventeen on people whose those four letter words': Boys find it especially repugnant when girls use those words. One boy described girls whose profanity as having nothing better to say" [31:22]. Lakoff observed that men use stronger expletives such as shit and damn, whereas women use weaker or softer profanities such as oh dear, goodness, or fudge [34:234]. Farb suggested that dear means gracious are part of the female lexicon, and Ritt stated that most teachers of the sixth grade are well aware that young girls use far more "expressives" such as oh and wow than do the boys in their classes. Farb wrote, "Nowadays young women use words that were formerly taboo for them with as much freedom as young men use them", but young men are not permitted the more euphemistic expressions. However, research on people's perceptions of language use either male or female suggests that the earlier stereotypes of coarse, free male language contrasted with the euphemistic female forms still hold. Garcia-Zamor (Note 1) asked four boys and four girls in an upper-middle-class nursery school to indicate whether certain utterances were reproduced by a male or female doll; shit was seen by both boys and girls as male, and drat was seen by both as female. In a study of adults' stereotypes, Kramer [31:20] asked college students to determine whether various captions taken from New York cartoons were uttered by males or females. Men in the cartoons were found to swear more than women and for more trivial reasons. A careful review of the literature revealed no empirical studies of the comparative use of expletives. Profanity and obscenity do not readily submit to laboratory study. Documentation of this stereotype would require recordings of speech of female-only, male-only, and mixed-sex groups in various settings. These speakers should certainly not know they are being observed.

Reports by individual investigators writing about their own experiences strongly suggest that the form of expressives is sex associated. A possible explanation is that "expressives" served different functions for men and women. Males use them when they are angry or exasperated. But women's exclamations are likely to convey enthusiasm" [34:234]. The form of women's language is reputed to be more polite than the form men's. Lakoff noted that "women are supposed to be particularly careful to say 'please' and 'thank you'. A woman who fails at these tasks is apt to be in more trouble than a man who does so" [34:55]. She speculated that "the more one compounds a request, the more characteristic it is of women's speech" [34:19]. An example of a doubly compounded request is "Won't you please close the door?" [34:18].

Only one very limited empirical study of politeness forms was found: women used more politeness forms than male counterparts when interviewed by college students [24]. According to Austin, high, oral sounds and giggling sounds are appropriate for females in courtship, whereas males produce low and nasals sounds. Coser recorded verbal interactions involving humor at staff meetings of a mental hospital. She found that senior staff members (psychiatrists) made more jokes than junior staff members (paramedics) and that men made more witicism than women), But women often laughed harder. Coser suggested that this concurs with the sex roles of male authority and female receptivity. Haas similarly found that girls laughed more than boys in mixed-sex dyads. Women are permitted to cry, as reflected in Key's observation that "if a female talks or cries into a pillow it's 'muffle dsobbing'; if a male does the same, it's 'blubbing', with negative connotations". Several writers [33] have speculated that men use more slang expressions than women even though slang is man's domain. Conklin [18:17-29], however, observed that women's vernacular has not been studied and suggested an need to especially examine the dialect of female groups. Empirical Phonological studies of -inversus – inendings, of-versus-

emending's, Similar results were found in studies of pronominal apposition, as in "my brother went to the park," and multiple negation. Garvey and Dickstein noted more nonstandard forms in the speech of sixty-two boys from four population groups (black, white, and low and middle socioeconomic status) than in matched girls. In an informal survey of television panel discussions, Bernard

noted that women are more frequently interrupted than men. This may help explain the unfinished sentences. No empirical evidence for sex differences in sentence completeness has been noted. Zimmerman and West, however, reported in a study "virtually all the interruptions and overlaps are by the male speakers" [46:115]. They further noted that not one of the women who were interrupted protested. Similar results were reported by Eakins and Eakins [20]

. Women have long had the reputation for being more eloquent than men: Where there's a woman, there's no silence.

"The tongue is the sword of a woman, and she never lets it become rusty" (China). "The North Sea will sooner be found wanting in water than a woman at a loss for a word". Jespersen believed that the superior readiness of speech of women is a concomitant of the fact that their vocabulary is smaller than

that of men. But this again is connected with another indubitable fact, that women do not reach the same extreme points as men, but are nearer the average in most respects.

He gave many examples of how women are supposed to talk ahead of thinking, to talk more than men. Lakoff informally observed longer sentence forms in women than in men, possibly resulting in the impression of more speech. For example, women are more likely to compound a request: "Will you help me with these groceries, please?" is more characteristic of women than "Help me" or even "Please help me with these groceries." Empirical evidence, however, suggests that at least under certain conditions women's sentences are shorter than men's [34:236]. For example,

at professional conferences, the mean time used by women asking a question was reported to be

less than half that used by men [44:376]. Studies of sex differences in length of utterance

n children indicate that girls are significantly superior to boys at various matched age levels in mean length of utterance reported in her summary. In considering mean length of utterance of children, language maturation must be considered a factor, since utterances normally become longer as skill in language increases and most studies show that girls develop language facility earlier than boys. Limited evidence, then, suggests that although in early childhood female sentences are longer than those of males, by adulthood the reverse may be true. Mixed results have been reported in studies. Men tend to use more words than women in responding to a given stimulus. Studies dealing with children's quantity of speech reported that girls tended to exceed boys. The participants in a communication influence quantity of verbalization. In mixed-sex groups, men tend to talk more than women. Among children the composition of the communication group also seems to affect verbosity. Mueller in a study of "the maintenance of verbal exchanges between young children" found that "boys talked significantly more than girls" in a free-play situation to same-sex peers. Brownell and Smith, however, reported more verbal productivity among 4-year-old girls in comparison with same-age boys in mixed-sex dyads, triads, and small groups. In preschool children, then, boys have been found to talk more to boys and girls to talk more in mixed-sex groups—the reverse of the adult pattern. Entwisle and Garvey reported sex differences in verbal productivity among children, with girls more productive than boys; note that this finding is most marked among those of lower social class. Possibly no real difference exists in the quantity of talk that is produced by men and women, but "girls are not supposed to talk as much as men" [31:17]. In sum, the stereotype clearly shows women to be more verbose than men. Empirical evidence is mixed. Girls seem to talk somewhat more than boys, but adult women, especially in the company of men, have been found to talk less than their male companions.

Topic refers to the subject matter of the spoken utterance, to what the conversation is about. Kramer

captured much of the folklorerelated topics of male and female conversation through her study based on New York cartoons: Men hold forth with authority on business, politics, legal matters, taxes, age, household expenses, electronic bugging, church collections, kissing, baseball, human relations, health and women's speech.

Women discuss social life, books, food and drink, life's troubles, caring for a husband, social work, age, and life style. Several of the students who rated the cartoon captions said they considered all statements about economics, business or job to be male [31:83]. The interviews by Komarovskys suggests similar stereotypes in blue-collar families. Women reported that they enjoyed talking about the family and social problems. Both sexes acknowledged that men prefer to talk about cars, sports, work, motorcycles, and local politics.

Klein's observations of the working class in England are similar: Just as men in the club talk mainly about their work and secondly about sport and never about their homes and families, so do their wives talk first of all about their work, i.e.: their homes and families, and secondly within the range of things with which they are all immediately familiar [27] In mixed-sex conversations the impression is that women initiate topics that are rarely followed through by men.

Three studies in the 1920s of conversational topics using tape recorded fragments of conversations on city streets are of interest. Man-to-man topics include money and business, amusements or sports, and other men. Woman-to-woman topics men, clothing or decoration, and other women. Male to female topics were amusement or sport and money and business. Women talk to men about other men and other women. Landis suggested that in mixed sex conversations, "the Englishman when talking to a feminine companion adapts his conversation to her interests while American women adapt their conversation to the interests of their masculine companions".

In a study of "the women of the telephone company," Langer reported that men discussed politics among themselves, whereas women avoided religion and politics in their conversations. Mulcahy, using a self-disclosure questionnaire with 97 adolescents, reported that female same-sex disclosure was greater than male same-sex disclosure. Major topics for girls were "tastes, interests, and personality"; for boys his disclosure clustered about "tastes, and interests, work (studies), and attitudes and opinions". "The lowest disclosure area for males was body, whereas it was Money for females". Sauer reported that kindergarten girls made more reference to the female role than did kindergarten boys, and this was the only category that girls referred to more than boys. Boys talked more about family and home environment, recreation, other people, and animals, but the differences were not significant. Utterances were all to a male examiner who encouraged the children to talk about two stimulus objects—an irregularly shaped block and a toy fire engine. Knowledge of conversational topic is limited. Although the evidence supports the stereotypical that women talk more about people and men more about money, business, and politics. Times have been changing!

Content refers to the "categorization of the topic that are encoded in messages, "such as" objecting in general, "actions in general," and the "possession relation in general" [12:11]. Content differs from topic, since topic refers to particular objects, events, and ideas, whereas content refers to the more general concept of how the topic is referenced. Women's language is more emotional and evaluative than men's according to the stereotype [31; 39:3-15]. Jespersen wrote of women's fondness for hyperbole and their greater use of adverbs of intensity such as awful, pretty, terribly nice, quite, and so. These all suggest value judgments. Darling, divine, sweet, adorable, I could just scream, nearly fainted, and/died laughing are female-associated "extravagant adjectives" such as wonderful, heavenly, divine, and dreamy in women's speech. Again the focus is on emotional value judgment [39:3-15]. Lakoff's list of female adjectives

includes adorable, charming, lovely, and divine [34:239], Male adjectives are great, terrific and neat. Kramer suggested that "words of approval" [31:22] such as nice, pretty, darling, charming, sweet, lovely, cute, and precious are used more frequently by women. Hartman [24] tested and supported Lakoff's hypothesis that women use evaluative adjectives more than men. She found that women compared with men used many more words such as lovely, delightful, wonderful, nice, pretty, pathetic, pretty little, smartly uniformed, cute, dearest, gentle, gaily, beautifully, lovelies, very very, devoted, meek, perfectly wonderful, and stylish. Most women used awful and pretty to mean very and so. Wood found that males referred more directly to what was actually in the picture. Females were more interpretative and tended to be more subjective in their descriptions. Women use more participative and purposive cases and men use more instrumental and objective cases. Specifically, women talk more about how people felt and why they behaved in certain ways. Men's speech focuses more on objects and actions related to these objects. Women use significant more words simplying feeling, emotion, or motivation (whether positive, negative, or neutral); they make more self-references and use more auxiliary words and negations. Male subjects refer more to time, space, quantity, and destructive action. Hostility are more associated with men.

Boys also use significantly more words classified as self, space, quantity, good, bad, and negative words. Male talk more about spatial relations than females. Females describe items in terms of patterns and colors more than did males. Each sex group go into immediate detail when describing the visual which was stereotyped to their sex group, but pause to orient themselves to the environment when approaching the other visual". Comparative use of adjectives was studied by Kramer [31]. Girls use more adjectives than boys. The stereotype of the content of spoken language, then, points to positive value judgments as female marked and hostile judgments as male marked. The empirical evidence suggests that the content of adult female speech includes more words implying feeling, auxiliary words, negations, evaluative adjectives, interpretations, psychological

cal state verbs, and purposive cases. Adult males use more terms referring to time, space, quantity, destructive action, and perceptual attributes and more objective cases. Boys have been reported to use more words related to self, space, quantity, good, bad, negation, and possession. It is likely that girls use more adjectives. Studies of adult use of adjectives show mixed results.

"Language use consists of the socially and cognitively determined selection of behaviors according to the goals of the speaker and the context of the situation" [12:20]. "Instrumental" talk is male associated. Men are stereotyped as the conveyors of information and fact. Women "tend to be handicapped in fact-anchored talk. They are less likely to have a hard, factual background, less in contact with the world of knowledge". The male instrumental style includes lecturing, argument, and debate. This has not been empirically documented to date. Assertiveness was observed as part of the male stereotype by Kramer [31] in her study of cartoon captions. Lakoff suggested that women's speech is nonassertive [34:235]. This concept has been developed by other writers. Kuykendall [32:4] wrote that "clean, effective vigorous speech and writing is just what women, qua women, learn not to produce so as not to appear too assertive and so to offend". Furthermore, "Assertion of competence and power by a female is regarded as deviant behavior so that she becomes the recipient of social sanctions". In a professional peer group a woman was labeled bitchy or manipulative when her behavior was assertive and directive. Nursery school children also believe that competitive and aggressive language is appropriate for males only, as demonstrated by a study in which boys and girls were asked to ascribe various uttered sentences to a girl or boy doll (Garcia-Zamor [22:14]). Dawe found that when nursery school children quarreled, boys were assertive by threatening and forbidding more often than girls. Tentativeness has been stereotyped as female. Lakoff [34:75] suggested that tag questions (e.g., "It's cold, isn't it?") are used far more often by women than by men. This form of question avoids assertion and

dgives the address of the option of agreeing or disagreeing. Women's speech is said to be "hedged" and marked."

Empirical evidence is mixed. Hartman [24] reported that tentativeness was clearly female associated among the 70-year-old Maine natives whose speech she studied. This was revealed in the women's great reproduction of qualifiers such as perhaps, I suppose, I just feel, probably, and as I interpret it and tag questions such as "Well, most people would say marriage, wouldn't they?" and "It was grandmother, wasn't it?" Swacker [44:376] found that female college students indicated approximation when using numbers ("about six books"), whereas only one male used the tentative form in a task requiring the description of three pictures by Albrecht Direr. However, in a diary conversation of college students, Hirschman [25:132] found no difference between the sexes in the overall proportion of qualifiers such as maybe, probably, I think, and/guess. In a somewhat larger study, Hirschman [25:176] found that males uttered/think twice as much as females.

(think is usually considered a qualifier, but Hirschman suggested that it served primarily as a way for more assertive speakers to present their opinions.) Loban [35:211] reported that expressions including supposition, hypothesis, and conditionality associated with effective users of language from kindergarten through sixth grade.

Men and women may make requests in different ways. Lakoff observed that women state requests and men issue commands [34:232]. Soskin and John reported that the husband gave far more directives than the wife. In one critical situation when they were rowing and the boat capsized, mainly the husband gave regulative statements such as demands, suggestions, and prohibitions. Hirschman [25:34] tested the hypothesis that women are more supportive than men. No overall differences were found between the college men and college women studied, although females used "mmhmm" significantly more than males and most of these utterances occurred in female-to-female conversations. In deliberations women agree, concur, comply, accept, and support other speakers almost twice as much as men do. Similarly, women are

antagonistic or offensive half as often as men. Conversely, men are more assertive. Supportive behavior can be inferred from the emotional sensitivity Alvy reported to be more characteristic of grade-school girls than of boys of lower, middle and upper socioeconomic status in an experiment of listener-adapted communication. In use, then, men's speech reputedly serves to lecture, argue, debate, assert, and command. Women's speech is stereotyped as nonassertive, tentative, and supportive. Limited evidence confirms that males are more assertive and issue more directives; females are often more tentative and supportive.

The stereotypes abound, and evidence has been accumulating, especially since the beginning of this decade. Women's speech is said to contain more euphemisms, politeness forms, apology, laughing, and unfinished sentences. They are reputed to talk more about home and family and to be more emotional and positively evaluative.

Further, women's speech is stereotyped as nonassertive, tentative, and supportive. Women are also said to talk more than men. Men, on the other hand, are reputed to use more slang, profanity, and obscenity and to talk more about sports, money, and business. They are reputed to make more hostile judgments and to use language to lecture, argue, debate, assert, and command. Empirical evidence is less clear, partly because studies can only sample limited populations in specific situations. Further, sex differences in American English are only statistical differences. No feature of spoken American English is used exclusively by one sex or the other. In general, however, empirical studies of form confirm that males use more nonstandard forms than females and that females laugh and cry more. Older Maine women, at least, are more polite, and sixth-grade girls claim they use more expressives. Contrary to the stereotype, adult men have been found to be more eloquacious, but it is unclear whether boys or girls are moreover so. Studies support the stereotype that men talk more about money, business, and politics and that women talk more about home and family.

The empirical evidence supports the stereotype of content differences in men's and women's speech. Various studies found that women use

more emotional language and men focus more on perceptual attributes and destructive action. The males studied were generally more assertive and directive than the women.

One study

found that women are more supportive than men, and the results of research on tentative sentences are mixed. Are these isolated, unrelated variations in speech, or is there a logical clustering that points to "systems of co-occurring, sex-

linked signals," or "genderlects," as Kramer [31:14] proposed? If, in fact, one can say that there is a male speech style and a female speech style, then rules and restrictions can be written for each much in the way that grammatical structures are described.

### **2.1.1. Women's Speech**

For most women, communication is a primary way to establish and maintain relationships with others. They engage in conversation to share themselves and to learn about others. This is an important point: For women, talk is the essence of relationships. Consistent with this primary goal, women's speech tends to display identifiable features that foster connections, support, closeness, and understanding. Equality between people is generally important in women's communication.

To achieve symmetry, women often match experiences to indicate "You're not alone in how you feel." Typical ways to communicate equality would be saying, "I've done the same thing many times," "I've felt the same way," or "something like that happened to me too and I felt like you do." Growing out of the quest for equality is a participatory mode of interaction in which communicators respond to and build on each other's ideas in the process of conversing [23:197-226]. Rather than a rigid you-tell-your-ideas then-I'll-tell-you sequence, women's speech more characteristically follows an interactive pattern in which different voices weave together to create conversations.

Also important in women's speech is showing support for others. To demonstrate support, women often express understanding and sympathy with a friend's situation or feelings. "Oh, you must feel terrible," "I really hear what

you are saying," or "I think you did the right thing" are communicative clues that we understand and support how another feels.

Related to these first two features is women's typical attention to the relationship level of communication. You will recall that the relationship level of talk focuses on feelings and the relationship between communicators rather than on the content of messages. In conversations between women, it is common to hear a number of questions that probe for greater understanding of feelings and perceptions surrounding the subject of talk [45:56]. "Tell me more about what happened," "How did you feel when it occurred?" "Do you think it was deliberate?" "How does this fit into the overall relationship?" are probes that help a listener understand a speaker's perspective. The content of talk is dealt with, but usually not without serious attention to the feelings involved.

A fourth feature of women's speech style is conversational "maintenance work" [21:375-384]. This involves efforts to sustain conversation by inviting others to speak and by prompting them to elaborate their experiences. Women, for instance, ask a number of questions that initiate topics for others: "How was your day?" "Tell me about your meeting," "Did anything interesting happen on your trip?" "What do you think of the candidates this year?" Communication of this sort opens the conversational door to others and maintains interaction. Inclusivity also surfaces in a fifth quality of women's talk, which is responsiveness [45:57].

Women usually respond in some fashion to what others say. A woman might say "Tell me more" or "That's interesting"; perhaps she will nod and use eye contact to signal she is engaged; perhaps she will ask a question such as "Can you explain what you mean?" Responsiveness reflects learned tendencies to care about others and to make them feel valued and included [34:67]. It affirms another person and encourages elaboration by showing interest in what was said.

A sixth quality of women's talk is personal, concrete style [14:74-86; 23:197-226; 45]. Typical of women's conversation are details, personal

disclosures, anecdotes, and concrete reasoning. These features cultivate a personal tone in women's communication, and they facilitate feelings of closeness by connecting communicators' lives. The detailed, concrete emphasis prevalent in women's talk also clarifies issues and feelings so that communicators are able to understand and identify with each other. Thus, the personal character of much of women's interaction sustains interpersonal closeness.

A final feature of women's speech is tentativeness. This may be expressed in a number of forms. Sometimes women use verbal hedges such as "I kind of feel you may be overreacting. " In other situations they qualify statements by saying "I'm probably not the best judge of this, but . . ." Another way to keep talk provisional is to tag a question onto a statement in a way that invites another to respond: "That was a pretty good movie, wasn't it?" "We should get out this weekend, don't you think?" Tentative communication leaves open the door for others to respond and express their opinions. There has been controversy about tentativeness in women's speech. R. Lakoff who first noted that women use more hedges, qualifiers, and tag questions than men, claimed these represent lack of confidence and uncertainty. Calling women's speech powerless, Lakoff argued that it reflects women's socialization into subordinate roles and low self-esteem. Since Lakoff's work, however, other scholars have suggested different explanations of women's tentative style of speaking. Dale Spender in particular, points out that Lakoff's judgments of the inferiority of women's speech were based on using male speech as the standard, which does not recognize the distinctive validity of different speech communities. Rather than reflecting powerlessness, the use of hedges, qualifiers, and tag questions may express women's desires to keep conversation open and to include others. It is much easier to jump into a conversation that has not been sealed with absolute, firm statements. A tentative style of speaking supports women's general desire to create equality and include others. It is important to realize, however, that

people outside of women's speech community may misinterpret women's intentions in using tentative communication.

### **2.1.2. Men' Speech**

Masculine speech communities define the goals of talk as exerting control, preserving independence, and enhancing status. Conversation is an arena for proving oneself and negotiating prestige. This leads to two general tendencies in men's communication. First, men often use talk to establish and defend their personal status and their ideas, by asserting themselves and/or by challenging others. Second, when they wish to comfort or support another, they typically do so by respecting the other's independence and avoiding communication they regard as condescending [45:66]. These tendencies will be more clear as we review specific features of masculine talk. To establish their own status and value, men often speak to exhibit knowledge, skill, or ability. Equally typical is the tendency to avoid disclosing personal information that might make a man appear weak or vulnerable [19:376-389; 40:261-271]. For instance, if someone expresses concern about a relationship with a boyfriend, a man might say "The way you should handle that is . . ." "Don't let him get to you," or "You ought to tell him . . ." This illustrates the tendency to give advice that Tannen reports is common in men's speech. On the relationship level of communication, giving advice does two things.

First, it focuses on instrumental activity-what another should do or be-and does not acknowledge feelings. Second, it expresses superiority and maintains control. It says "I know what you should do" or "I would know how to handle that." The message may be perceived as implying the speaker is superior to the other person. Between men, advice giving seems understood as a give-and-take, but it may be interpreted as unfeeling and condescending by women whose rules for communicating differ.

A second prominent feature of men's talk is instrumentality-the use of speech to accomplish instrumental objectives. As we have seen, men are socialized to do things, achieve goals [45:123-139]. In conversation, this is often

expressed through problem-solving efforts that focus on getting information, discovering facts, and suggesting solutions. Again, between men this is usually a comfortable orientation, since both speakers have typically been socialized to value instrumentality. However, conversations between women and men are often derailed by the lack of agreement on what this informational, instrumental focus means. To many women it feels as if men don't care about their feelings. When a man focuses on the content level of meaning a woman has disclosed a problem, she may feel he is disregarding her emotions and concerns. He, on the other hand, may well be trying to support her in the way that he has learned to show supportsuggesting ways to solve the problem.

A third feature of men's communication is conversational dominance. Despite jokes about women's talkativeness, research indicates that in most contexts, men not only hold their own but dominate the conversation. This tendency, although not present in infancy, is evident in preschoolers. Compared with girls and women, boys and men talk more frequently [20:76] and for longer periods of time [20:89; 29:100]. Further, men engage in other verbal behaviors that sustain conversational dominance. They may reroute conversations by using what another said as a jump-off point for their own topic, or they may interrupt. While both sexes engage in interruptions, most research suggests that men do it more frequently [46]. Not only do men seem to interrupt more than women, but they do so for different reasons. L. P. Stewart and her colleagues [42:51] suggest that men use interruptions to control conversation by challenging other speakers or wresting the talk stage from them, while women interrupt to indicate interest and to respond. This interpretation is shared by a number of scholars who note that women use interruptions to show support, encourage elaboration, and affirm others.

Fourth, men tend to express themselves in fairly absolute, assertive ways. Compared with women, their language is typically more forceful, direct, and authoritative [20:56; 42; 45]. Tentative speech such as hedges and disclaimers is used less frequently by men than by women. This is consistent with gender

socialization in which men learn to use talk to assert themselves and to take and hold positions. However, when another person does not share that understanding of communication, speech that is absolute and directive may seem to close off conversation and leave no room for others to speak.

Fifth, compared with women, men communicate more abstractly. They frequently speak in general terms that are removed from concrete experiences and distanced from personal feelings [41:255]. The abstract style typical of men's speech reflects the public and impersonal contexts in which they often operate and the less personal emphasis in their speech communities. Within public environments, norms for speaking call for theoretical, conceptual, and general thought and communication. Yet, within more personal relationships, abstract talk sometimes creates barriers to knowing another intimately.

Finally, men's speech tends not to be highly responsive, especially not on the relationship level of communication. Men, more than women, give what are called "minimal response cues", which are verbalizations such as "yeah" or "umhmm." In interaction with women, who have learned to demonstrate interest more vigorously, minimal response cues generally inhibit conversation because they are perceived as indicating lack of involvement [21:375-384; 42:235]. Another way in which men's conversation is generally less relationally responsive than women's is lack of expressed sympathy and understanding and lack of self-disclosures [40:261-271]. Within the rules of men's speech communities, sympathy is a sign of condescension, and revealing personal problems is seen as making one vulnerable. Yet women's speech rules count sympathy and disclosure as demonstrations of equality and support. This creates potential for misunderstanding between women and men.

## **2.2. Gender Peculiarities in Language Aspects**

The typological category of the real kind is typical for systems of both compared languages because the grammatical category of the genus is absent in these languages. The question of gender in modern English attracts the attention of its contradictory position in describing the grammatical structure of the

language. However, with the disappearance of formal means of expressing concepts of the genus in the grammatical aspect, the concept of the real kind has not disappeared.

Since in connection with the lack of both a grammatical and lexical-grammatical category of the genus in modern English, the natural genus is especially important; the supposed correspondence between the genus as a language category, and natural, real or biological division by sex.

### **2.2.1. Gender Peculiarities in English Lexics.**

When denoting the difference of a real kind, units of all levels of the language hierarchy are taken. In addition, here you can identify some language tools or techniques that contribute to differentiation of the natural distinction of living things.

In English, there are the following four basic means: first-heteronymy, the so-called "lexical supplementation", i.e. the designation of objects, naturally united in pairs and rows, by words formed from different roots. The second means of affixation, the third-anaphoric use of personal and possessive pronouns, and the last-analytical tools. In this respect, the participation of one or another means takes place in different ways.

At each level of the language, more specialized or less specialized units are allocated.

At the lexical level, a more specialized way to differentiate the real kind is lexical supplementation, which distinguishes sex from the value of correlative words. Therefore, in English, the semantics of lexical groups of nouns is analyzed here.

So, the expression of the difference of the biological takes place at different levels of the linguistic system: lexical, morphological and derivational. In modern English, the most universal and uniform is the lexical way of denoting gender differences. Biological differences are found already in certain forms and meanings of these words, through the supremacy of the man-woman. In modern English, the linguistic designation of the real kind is fixed in words that are the

names of anthroponyms those of people. To express the real kind of people, certain classes of lexemes are included in the lexico-grammatical system, including nouns, personal and possessive pronouns. Along with the grammatical ideas of the genus, people live in the consciousness of real generic ideas depends on the natural differences of living beings. A specific feature of some groups of animate nouns is manifested in abilities, differentiation of a given biological property through its semantics. However, it is easy to see that often in words that are names of persons, i.e. people are not so much the idea of sex, and its attribution to a certain class or category of people on various grounds, moreover, on the social role of a person, the nature of his occupation, profession, position, etc. Therefore, we found it necessary to conduct research based on the following classifications of features and properties people: on biological, related-social, age and consistently show the presence of appropriate oppositions, because the biological sex consists of certain opposite pairs.

1. At the lexical level, as mentioned above, the main distinctives are words. Words can be to designate a real kind in its structure as non-productive. Our object of investigation is all non-derivative words that denote the real kind of living beings.
2. In modern English there are two types of nouns, which in their semantics denote the biological differences of people. John Smith was a tall and good-looking man. 2. A middle-aged woman, a print apron, stood at the door.

They have a clear correlation pair. equivalent-binary opposition. Therefore, words related to the above-mentioned different characteristics can be contrasted with each other according to the principle of equivalent-binary opposition. The typological category of the real genus encompasses only animate nouns, denoting the following signs of the attitude of people:

- A) apart from biological
- B) relationship
- C) age

#### D) Social

1. Among the woman was one who painted portraits, another who was a professional musician.
2. His brother had been a bank cashier.
3. The man of whom I speak was a low pantomime actor a habitual drunkard.
4. The readers probably remember how to do it, if he has ever been a boy.
5. Now, really, Fanny my dear, said the sister-in-law.
6. Uncle Julious insists on my coming to keep him company.

One of the ways of transferring the real kind in the English language is word-building i.e. morphologically.

At the lexical level, most lexical units are derived by their structure. Derived words are formed by attaching certain affixes to the stem. In modern English there are a number of transposing and nontransposing suffixes. For example:

-ard, -er, -ist, -ling, -ster;

These suffixes form nouns with the meaning of a person from the stem of the adjectives. However, they cannot differentiate the real kind of people except for the model

A+er-----N<sub>m</sub> Britisher

The suffixes V + ant, + ard, + er form nouns with the value of the agent and the suffix V + ess ----- N with the value of the female. Nouns with the suffix -er in English follow the male designation and are the only correlate of the suffix V + ess.

The V + ling model forms nouns with the meaning of the person, giving them a negative shading scattering.

In the nontransposing group there are suffixes that designate persons.

For example: N + ant, N + enne; N + er; N + ess; N + ette; N + ine; N + ina; N + ist; N + ster.

In modern English, the derivational morphemes of the type -ant, -ard, -ist, -ster denoting the name of the figure, does not differentiate the real kind of

person. They can designate persons, both male and female, according to the model N+Suf----N m,f

A+Suf---N m,f

N+Suf---N m,f

For example: assistant, stinkard, throwster, taxist, gamester.

Indicators of the real kind in the English language are the suffix morphemes -er- male indicator -ess, -ette (fr) -enne (fr.) -ine, -ina, -ix. (fr.)

Indicators of the feminine gender. Nouns in the transposing and nontransposing suffix model

(V + er (-or) m --- V + ess (ix) f; N + erm --- N + ess (-ette) f form an equivalent correlative pair opposition.

For example:

Actor	Actress
Waiter	Waitress
Editor	Editress
Adventurer	Adventuress
Educator	Educatrix
Farmer	Farmerette

In the designation of a real kind, nouns in the nontransposing suffixal models N + ess, N + enne, N + ine (ine)

always do not observe the derivational correlation, only the semantic oppositions are correlated.

For example:

Baron	Baroness
Actor	Actress
Negro	Negress
Hero	Heroine

This model also includes nouns with a derivation element -a, for example: Signor-signora. In modern English, the derivative nouns with suffixal morpheme (-er), (-or) do not consistently denote males. These nouns can simultaneously

refer to the male and female sex. Thus, when we talk about the category of the genus, we can distinguish the following species

1. Typological lexico-grammatical
2. Morphological
3. Syntactic

The lexical category of the genus is expressed without the aid of any suffixes:

A) root words:

	Male gender	Feminine	Common gender
1.	Father	mother	Parents
2.	Grandfather	grandmother	Parents
3.	Uncle	Aunt	
4.	Nephew	Niece	
5.	Brother	Sister	
6.	Man	Woman	
7.	Son	Daughter	
8.	Husband	Wife	Helpmates
9.	Stepfather	stepmother	Parents
10.	Bridegroom	Bride	
11.	Stepson	Stepdaughter	
12.	Brother-in-law	Sister-in-law	
13.	King	Queen	

It should be pointed out that the derived words belong to the lexical unit and appear on this level, however, by the method of formation, individual linguists refer to them as a morphological way of forming this categorical concept.

However, we will leave them within the lexicon and consider them within the given level.

b) Derivative words

	Male gender	Feminine	Common gender
1.	Waiter	Waitress	
3.	Prince	Princess	
4.	Sultan	Sultana	
4.	Editor	Editress	
5.	Sculptor	Sculptress	
6.	Author	Authoress	
7.	Poet	Poetess	
8.	Ambassador	Ambadress	
9.	Painter	Paintress	
10.	Negro	Negress	
11.	God	Goddess	
12.	Actor	Actress	
13.	Elector	Electress	
14.	Adventurer	Adventuress	
15.	Barron	Barroness	
16.	Benefactor	Benefactress	
17.	Hero	Heroine	
18.	Hunter	Huntress	
19.	Protector	Protectress	
20.	Duke	Duchess	
21.	Inamorato	Inamozata	
22.	Tutor	Tutoress	
23.	Murderer	Murderess	
24.	Traitor	Traitress	
25.	Tormentor	Tormentress	
26.	Viscount	Viscountess	
27.	Heir	Heiress	

28.	Giant	Giantess	
29.	Sorcerer	Sorceress	
30.	Patron	Patroness	
31.	Host	Hostess	

c) compound words:

	Male gender	Feminine	Common gender
1.	Teen-ager	Backfish	
2.	Airman	Airwoman	
3.	Barman	Barmaid	
4.	-	Caseworker	
5.		Chamber-maid	
6.	Kinsman	kinswoman	Kin
7.	Room-mate	-	-
8.	Salesman	saleswoman	-
9.	Pressman	-	-
10.	Housefather	housemother	The head of family
11.	Rifleman	-	-
12.	Boy-friend	Girl-friend	Friend
13.	Horseman	Horsewoman	
14.	-	housekeeper	-
15.	Head-master	Head-mistress	-
16.	Servant	Servant-maid	-

d) The syntactic way of expressing the genus is formed by means of compounding and word-combinations.

for example:

	Male gender	Feminine	Common gender
--	-------------	----------	---------------

1.	Man-doctor	Woman-doctor	Doctor
2.	Man-servant	Woman-servant	Servant
3.	Man-singer	Woman-singer	Singer
4.	Sportsman	sportswoman	Sportsmen
5.	Chairman	chairwoman	-
6.	China-man	China-woman	-
7.	Irish-man	Irish-woman	-

In English there are ranks of words that can relate either to the male sex only, or to the male and female, i.e. common gender; the discharge of words with the meaning of the female. Category of words with the meaning of the male:

1. Usher
2. Sailor
3. Policeman
4. Lackey
5. Lady's man
6. Manler
7. Liberty man
8. Handsome
9. Ploughman
10. Whaleman
11. Waterman
12. Blacksmith
13. Miller
14. Landlord
15. Knight
16. Tankman

The category of words with the meaning of the female

- 1 Air-hostess

- 2 Pretty
  - 3 Housewife
  - 4 Widow
  - 5 Dry-nurse
  - 6 Godmother
  - 7 Foster-mother
  - 8 Foster-sister
  - 9 Fiancée
  - 10 Girlie
  - 11 Flower-girl
  - 12 Peri
  - 13 Daughter-in-law
  - 14 Nixie
  - 15 Niece
1. The category of words relating to both the male and female sex
  2. Musician
  3. Gymnast
  4. Interpreter
  5. Leader
  6. Reporter
  7. Redactor
  8. Reader
  9. Realist
  10. Refugee
  11. Recorder
  12. Record-holder
  13. Representative
  14. Tutor

### **2.2.2. Gender Peculiarities in English Grammar**

Now let us consider a specific case of the expression of generic differences in the system of modern English. If in those languages in which the grammatical gender strongly differs, there is such a tricotomy: feminine, masculine, middle genus, then in English these concepts are related to the category of animation and inanity. Although in pronouns there are residual forms of the female gender, the masculine gender, the middle genus-he, she, it, the nouns do not have such a triad.

However, for nouns there may be another classification, i.e. words expressing the concepts: 1. Male; 2. The female and 3. Neutral words. All this is part of the framework of animate nouns. Schematically it will look like this:

Typological genus			
animate nouns		Inanimate nouns	
Male gender	Female gender	Neutral gender	
Uncle	Aunt	Friend	
Son	Daughter	Boy friend	Girl friend
Ram	Ewe		

In modern English, neither in the form of the article, nor in the form of the nouns themselves, is the affiliation of the noun to a particular grammatical genus. The category of the genus that existed in the Old English category completely disappeared

### **2.2.3. Gender Peculiarities in English Phraseology**

Being the most important aspect of lingual world view, phraseology in the meaningful structure of its units reflects a large store of various types of knowledge: cultural, cognitive, religious and historical, and this becomes very important in language learning.

Gender investigation of phraseological units (further PhU) is actual as in the centre of its attention there are cultural and social factors determining social attitude to men and women and peculiarities of using linguistics

means due to belonging to a definite sex. Actual becomes also a deep investigation of the process of gender conceptualization, characterization of its layers and containing parts, finding out factors and parameters forming basic gender concepts taking into account their national-cultural, etymological and historical peculiarities. Not less actual is the comparison of masculine and feminine stereotypes in the English phraseological world view, exposure and explanation of gender asymmetries and connotations, which will create ground for lexicographical description of genderly marked phraseological units of the analyzed language and their adequate interpretation in the contexts of usage. All this ensures of the actuality of description of gender construction on the material of phraseology, demonstration of gender concepts formation, genderly meaningful information connected with traditional expectations of masculinity and femininity in the English lingual culture.

In masculine and feminine lingual consciousness the concepts of beauty and ugliness have exact borders: beauty is women's attribute who try to possess it, for men this quality is not so important. This is proved by a number of phraseological units describing women's beautiful appearance: (as) red as a cherry – to have rosy skin; have roses in one's cheeks – to have rosy cheeks; a slick chick – an attractive girl.

In the investigated complex of English phraseological units there are many, symbolizing a man as a faithful assistant, decent, good-natured person, his advantages in comparison with a woman, braveness, willfulness, high intellect: square John – honest man; knight without Fear and without Reproach – fearless, brave man; a gentleman of fortune – lucky men; clever dog – a smart boy. In English culture man's main activity deals with public outside sphere, which belongs to him: lord and master; men in grey suits, a made man – a person who reached high position himself.

There is a universal stereotype that money and power in society also belong to men: a man of mark – man of high position; a man of

business –businessman; great lion – powerful (about a man); a man about town –noble man; the king of the castle – leader, chef.

In English phraseology a woman is represented as a weaker sex, she fulfills existing in society stereotypical duties of wife, girlfriend, mother and possesses suitable gender qualities: one's good lady – wife; Sister Ann –faithful friend; the softer sex – weaker sex, women; the weaker sex– women. The sphere of women's activity mostly deals with inner space, home and family. However, modern English lingual culture observes changes in stereotypical opinion that women's interests deal only with inner space and there appear outer professions, e.g. in offices: a hello girl – girl-operator; a woman of letters – woman-writer; a girl Friday – reliable secretary girl. In English culture a wife, who tries to get power in family is negatively marked: the gray mare – a woman holding husband under her heel; wear the breeches – to have power in the house. A man, who gives power to his wife is also negatively marked as he doesn't fulfill his typical behavioral norms: to be under one's heel – to be under wife's power; knight of the forked order – betrayed, altered husband.

In this way, we can conclude that the key to stereotypes comprehension exists in language function, that is responsible for storage and conveying culture, traditions, social consciousness of a definite ethnic group from generation to generation, thus creating the process of storage and conveying a definite information, repeated in an unchangeable way.

Investigation of English linguistic material containing figurative description of the concepts "man", "woman", was done from different points of view: a) age gradation; b) social status; c) behavioral activity. One of the basic procedures of analysis is precedent ideographic parameterization of the concept into its parts, reflecting all attributes of men and women: naturalphysical, physiological, psychological and intellectual (age, appearance, sexuality traits of character due to belonging to a definite sex, intellectual abilities, etc.), social-status, role, etc. In gender world view masculine image is formed

by the notions: courage, career, convenient life, preference of women, being father, equal spouse. Feminine image has social-biological functions of women, sexually-attractive appearance, age, love, being married, ideal wife, maternity, housekeeper, close friend, independent woman, equal partner.

As a rule, gender component in phraseological meaning can be expressed explicitly – in the aspect of expression and in the aspect of idiom's content (man of the moment – influential man, important person), and implicitly, i.e. to exist in the aspect of content but to be absent in the aspect of expression: bit of fluff (or skirt) – sexy woman, hot stuff – temperamental (about a woman). A.V. Kunin confirms that implicitness is an important means of economical usage of language means while their functioning [72:99].

Markers pointing at the explicit character of expression of gender component in PhU are nouns, pronouns and proper names pointing at masculinity or femininity: man, boy, girl, woman, lady, he, she, Jack, Tom, Mary, etc. It's easy to create image, meant in the semantics of phraseological unit because the component itself points at gender belonging: a man for all seasons – helpful person; a girl Friday – reliable clerk (about girl-secretary); brother in arms – brothers in army. The largest is a group of phraseological units with explicit character of expression. The least is the group of implicit aspect of expression where gender component “veiled” in the structure of PhU: skirt chaser – a man “chasing” women. In this phrase there interact two implicitly expressed components – skirt, i.e. a woman and chaser, i.e. a man. Age is differently expressed by implicit phraseological units: a dolly bird – young naïve girl; old trout – old woman; a bit of fluff – very young girlie. Among explicitly expressed phraseological units the most popular are those which have components pointing at professional activity of men and women: a boy in buttons – a boy working in hotel; a Jack of all trades – a man of various occupations; a confidence man – swindler, dishonest; a hello girl – girl-operator; a woman of letters – woman-writer.

Speaking about peculiarities of phraseological units having gender component in their structure, we can conclude that due to their representativeness they are able to be revealed on all levels of language system; gender reflects lingual reality, national culture of a language.

In the process of investigation there were found the following semantic groups, expressing subjective-objective marks:

1) phraseological units with component of femininity, characterizing a woman from negative side, contemptuously, disapprovingly, except PhU relating to mother, sister, woman-heroine: a woman of the streets – a street woman, light-minded woman – negatively; Sister Ann – a faithful friend-positively.

2) phraseological units with component of masculinity, characterizing a man by various marks, but mostly dominate positive and neutral marks: a hen-pecked husband – a man who is managed by his wife – negatively; a man of letters – a man-writer – neutrally; square John – an honest, decent man – positively; a man of his word – a man who keeps his promise – positively.

3) phraseological units with component of femininity for characterizing a man, mostly negatively marked: old woman – a shy, coward man – negatively; a girl's blouse – a scandalous man – negatively.

4) phraseological units with component of masculinity for characterizing a woman, mostly negatively marked: a tom-boy – hyperactive girl behaving like a boy – negatively; man-eater – a woman who uses men only for sexual relations – negatively.

5) phraseological units with component of femininity relating to both sexes, mostly dominates negative mark: mother's darling – mother's beloved son or daughter – negative; a weak sister – an unreliable person – negative.

All analyzed phrases with gender component are divided into PhU: 1) with positive mark; 2) with negative mark; 3) with neutral mark.

For realization of its content gender component passes three levels of conceptualization:

1) Semantic level, revealing gender component in the semantics of PhU. This component can be expressed explicitly and implicitly: a back-room boy – scientific researcher of secret laboratory; a bachelor girl – single, unmarried girl; the old man of the sea – annoying, sticking man; the old lady in Threadneedle Street – English bank.

2) Associative level – the whole meaning of phraseological unit is actualized with the help of other components which together with gender component create some associative perception, connected with realization of meaning of gender component and its being added by meanings of other components in the structure of PhU: a back-room (from PhU a back-room boy) – laboratory, secret room; bachelor (from PhU a bachelor girl) – single; PhU the old man of the sea – from the tale «One thousand one night», which retells how Sinbad-sailor couldn't avoid the old man who sat on his shoulders; Threadneedle Street (from PhU the old lady in Threadneedle Street) – the street, where there was caricature of prime-minister William Pitt Junior. The sign under this caricature announces: Political Ravishment, or the Old Lady of Threadneedle Street in Danger!.

3) Conceptual level, where takes place formation of definite characteristics of men/women, new gender meanings, gender stereotypes and gender concepts «man» and «woman»: a back-room boy – a boy who works in laboratory, i.e. scientific researcher of secret laboratory, expert, specialist; a bachelor girl – a single girl, unmarried girl who lives lonely; a the old man of the sea – a man who is difficulty got rid of; the old lady in Threadneedle Street – i.e. English bank.

In phraseological units of modern English there is a high estimation of a woman, positive attitude to a woman, importance of her appearance, high value of maternity and such qualities as love, selflessness, self-sacrifice. In nominations of feminine images there are dominating moral marks,

interconnection of genders is weakly demonstrated, maternity is highly estimated. Negative mark is presented by PhUs about women's behavior, wife's character (scolding, unsatisfied), women's intellectual abilities and their emotional instability.

In analysis of English idiomatic dictionaries there were made out 12 semantic groups of PhUs: nominations of men, nominations of women, negative characteristics of men, negative characteristics of women, positive characteristics of men, positive characteristics of women, general masculine nominations, general feminine nominations, men's labour, women's labour, men's appearance, women's appearance.

Nominations of women: one's better half – wife; one's old Dutch – wife. Women in marriage are described positively or neutrally: A sister of mercy – an assisting merciful woman; Mother Superior – a kind adviser.

Nominations of men: the good man of the house – master of house; a man about town – a man of high position. Men also have negative connotations: knight of the forked order – a betrayed husband; knight of industry – a swindler. It should be mentioned that a larger part of PhUs nominate men without their relation to marital status and have positive connotations in opposition of PhUs nominating women. A married woman is positively estimated, marital status is not so important for men. Comparative analysis shows gender asymmetries in men's advantage despite quantitative domination of men's negative characteristics, while there is only one woman's positive characteristics. The results of investigation prove the fact that represented image of a woman in the English phraseology is more negative than the image of a man.

### **Conclusion on Chapter II**

1. Gender differences are a fundamental fact of human life and it is not surprising to find them reflected in language. It should be noted that the distinction between men and women's language is a symptom of a problem in our culture, not the problem itself. Basically it reflects the fact that men and women are expected to have different interests and different

roles, hold different types of conversations, and react differently to other people. From the discussion of the features of female language, more attention should be paid to language use in social context. What's more, the linguistic phenomena in speaking community can be understood more thoroughly.

2. This task is complicated by two major observations: (a) Sex differences in spoken language that have been identified in English are sex preferential as opposed to sex exclusive; that is, there is no evidence that any linguistic feature is used exclusively by one sex in our society; variations have been found only in frequency of production, (b) Sex is not the only variable to influence speech style. There is a complex interaction of personal characteristics such as sex, age, education, occupation, geographical region, ethnic background, and socioeconomic status and contextual factors such as communication, situation, environment, and participants. Despite these complications, a start has been made at constructing a grammar of style for men's and women's language [34]. Lakoff focused on women's style and suggested that it is basically one of deference. She suggested that the various phonological and lexical forms and the syntactic pragmatic features identified as occurring more often in women's speech add up to a pattern of deference. However, deference alone does not make a woman's style. Other characteristics of the individual and the context combine to form the complete style. Lakoff pointed to a need to learn which styles can coexist and which cannot. Even more important is the need to know which sex associated spoken language features are real and to document conditions under which they occur. Communication can be viewed as a microcosm of social behavior. Much of human interaction occurs at the linguistic level [34:234]. As pointed out, If sociolinguistic research often begins as an extension of linguistics, it must end as an intension of the social sciences — but in the idiom of disciplines that is only to say that it changes from away of

studying language to a way of studying man as a social being. The stereotypes and evidence discussed in this article have significant implications for the power structure between the sexes and indeed the psyche of both men and women. Future researchers need to be sensitive to situations in which they observe sex-associated speech and to be cautious of making premature judgments. In any event, there is little doubt that recent interesting gender and language will continue to generate worthwhile exploration into this topic.

### CHAPTER THREE

## GENDER PECULIARITIES OF CONCEPT “MAN” AND “WOMAN” IN KARAKALPAK LANGUAGE

### 3.1 Gender Peculiarities in Karakalpak Lexics

In the designation of the real genus in Karakalpak language certain lexemes-nouns are used, and in karakalpak pronouns there is no distinctive function of sex.

The concept of gender in the Karakalpak language is not expressed grammatically. Usually the concept of the genus is expressed by special words or word expressions. You can distinguish two types of lexemes, to refer to people- erkek-hayal.

In the Karakalpak language, the noun designation has a clear correlative pair of persons according to the model:

Erkek-hayal, ul-qiz, ata-ana, ini-qarindas, ku'yew-kelin, er-hayal, shabaz, zayip.

In the Karakalpak language, there is a figurative and poetic use of certain lexical units and cases of "feminization" of objects for the designation of men or women.

For example:

1. Qiranim, qarag'im keldin' be- dep kempirdin' ko'zi jasawradi.[73:20]
2. Haw onda adamgershiliktin' az-maz iyisi bolg'anda, gu'ldey qizimdi o'ltirip bolip qaship keter me edi?[71:34]

The following lexical units can be cited:

Ma'rt, qiran are used to refer to the male:

To refer to the female:

Go'zzal, janan, peri, gu'l, dilbar.

In the modern Karakalpak language, the morphological element -a is unproductive in the derivation of the noun derivatives. The productivity of the derivational element is slightly observed in the proper names of people who were borrowed from other Turkic languages. Apparently the word-forming sign of this element arose on the basis of borrowed words of the Arab-Persian origin of the type:shayir-shayira.

In the Karakalpak language, the notation of the distinction of the real kind can be expressed by another, that is, syntactically. For example: mug'allim hayal, qiz and others..

From the point of view of the generic value, composites in the Karakalpak language can be divided into two structural types, i.e. Additions with rhododetecting components in prepositions and postpositions.

In this case, a certain component of composites performs the function of designating a real genus. This component is called the distinguishing component of the genus or generic distiniator of this addition.

The generic distiniator of composites in the Karakalpak language can be nouns of the type Erkek, ul, ini, a'ke, ata, jigit, (malay arx.) in the appeals of mirza for males. 2. Hayal, qiz, sin'li, apa, sheshe, (whorls of arch.) In appeals-ene, xanim.

In the Karakalpak language, the addition of data by generic distortors occurs in certain situations, moments of colloquial speech. This process occurs in the language. Apparently it is declared social-traditional, cultural-historical and external-linguistic factors.

In the Karakalpak language, the addition of data by generic distortors occurs in certain situations, moments of colloquial speech. This process occurs in the language. Apparently it is declared social-traditional, cultural-historical and external-linguistic factors.

In numerous composites there are quite clear, quite definite structural and semantic relationships of components through these words. These words, i.e. generic instigators are the basis for the formation of a different structure of nominative basic unity for biological difference. The question arises, why does Karakalpak language resort to these types of composites? Because in the Karakalpak language there are numerous words that have a common meaning and refer to one or another sex.

For example: dos, qon'si, doktor, student, bala, jaziwshi, mug'allim, qarawil.

An important factor for the formation of relations between the components of the composite, in which the noun base is, is the fact which aspect of its meaning is meant here. This is the formation of the unity of the components of addition and expression of a certain kind. For example: student jigit, student qiz. From our point of view, the main thing here is that in the words jigit, qiz the word-formation value of addition corresponds to the conceptual aspects of the generic meaning.

And so, the concept of the gender of a complex noun is manifested under the influence of certain components of postpositions or prepositions.

For example: eradam, hayal adam, erkek vrach, hayal vrach, aspaz kisi, aspaz hayal

In the modern Karakalpak language, only the following structural model is distinguished:

Erkek doktor-hayal doktor, ul bala- qiz bala; erkek adam (kisi) -hayal adam (kisi), there are no other models in the modern Karakalpak language.

In the Karakalpak language, nouns replace the description of the given person with his direct short name, which can designate this person, a separate, specific person and as a representative of a certain type of people. For example: the names of persons on the basis of the kinship characterizing them are expressed postpositive. For example: ku'yew bala, aqliq qiz, qayin ene, qayin ata, kindik sheshe, murindiq ana, murindiq ata. In the Karakalpaks language, binomial

education by the generic distinator first of all means the real kind of persons, than the designation of the profession and at the same time is not productive.

In most cases, the formation of composite units in the Karakalpak language occurs in names denoting related relationships, less often occupations, social status and age of either male or female.

For example:

Qayin ag'a	Qayin apa	O'gey ata	O'gey apa
Qayin ata	Qayin ene	O'gey bala	O'gey qiz
Qayin ini		Jetim bala	Jetim qiz
Ku'yew bala	Qiz juwan	Murindiq ata	Murindiq ene
Dayi ag'a	Dayi sheshe	Murindiq bala	Murindiq qiz
Dayi ata	Dayi apa	Jiyen bala	Jiyen qiz
Dayi jigit	Dayi qiz	Aspaz jigit	Aspaz qiz
O'gey a'ke	O'gey sheshe	Palshi kisi	Palshi hayal

Judging by the type of formation, compound nouns with the interfix -s in English correspond to the Karakalpak endings of the possessiveness -i.

For example: u'y biykesi, awil qizi. These models are also not productive. Obviously, this is due not to the widespread or narrower semantic scope of the prepositional components. In Karakalpak language these additions are referred to as compound additions.

Thus, all models of composite education with generic distinctors in preposition and postposition are means of identifying a person by the combination of the following characteristics: sex, age, professional background, specialty, occupation, social status. We give examples from art, magazine and newspaper sources.

Aymekenge bul g'arri kempir ju'da' jaqsi ko'rinip ketti.[74:55]

Quyashqa qarawitip shan' basqan betlerinen oni haqiqat miynetkesh hayal dep tu'singendey edi. [74:68]

... Qizi Aqsungu'ldi Jan'aby degen palwan jigitke bermey ju'rgeni.[73:34]

Palbiyke qayin enesinin' qasina tig'ilin'qirap otirdi.[73:38]

Ku'yew balasi Jabbarbergendi jininen beter jek ko'rip qalg'an.[73:31].

Ariwxan dayi apasi Begzada menen keshqurin a'ste g'ana so'ylesip otirdi.[73:14].

Buljerge klegennen baslap bir du'kanshi qiz bizin' ju'regimizge urdi.[73:24].

Da'slep atimnin' kim bolg'anin kindik sheshem bilmese men bilmeymen.  
[73:24]

Senin' ornin'da islegen injener jigitke bular jala jawdi.

Doktor jigit sol jerde [73:25].

Models of complex derivation with a postpositive component expressing the genus in the Karakalpak language have a more syntactical character of education and are more common.

<b>Model 1</b>	
<b>N+Nm</b>	<b>N+Nf</b>
Qarawil g'arri	Qarawil qati
Doktor jigit	Doktor qiz
Boydaq jigit	Boydaq qiz
Pensioner g'arri	Pensioner kempir
Jetim bala	Jetim qiz
Buxgalter kisi	Buxgalter qiz
<b>Idiomatic compositions:</b>	
Aqsaqal	Qa'lemqas
Jasiu'lken	Aqtamaq
Ko'shebiy	Qipshabel
Aqjigit (в общений)	Tolg'anay
<b>Model 2</b>	
<b>Adj.+Nm</b>	<b>Adj.+Nf</b>
Ma'rt jigit	Da'li qiz

Eser bala (kisi)	Qaysar qiz
Genje bala	Genje qiz
G'arri kisi	G'arri kempir (qiz)
Jas jigit	Jas qiz
Mirza ag'a	Ortanshi qiz
Er kisi	Sharbaya qatin
Aqilli adam	Aqilli hayal
Dana kisi	Dana kempir
<b>Model 3</b>	
$N^{suf}+Nm$	$V^{suf}+Nf$
Shaqiritwshi +Nm	Shaqiritwshi +Nf
Jaziwshi jigit	Jaziwshi qiz
Oqiwshi bala	Oqiwshi qiz
<b>Model 5</b>	
$N^{gen}+Nm^{poss}$	$N^{gen}+Nf^{poss}$
Qaraqalpaq jigiti	Qaraqalpaq ariwi
Awil aqsaqali	Awil sardari
Ko'she biyi	Ko'she biykesi
U'y xojeyini	U'y biykesi

Moreover, in the Karakalpak language, by means of composites, it is possible to distinguish generic distinctions in the names of people. One component positively or postpositive differentiates gender differences. Distinctions can be words like: -murat, -mirza, -bay, for males, -ay, ayim, -gu'l, -iybi, -suliw, -biyke, for females.

### 3.1.1. Gendered Speech Communication in Karakalpak Language Men's and Women's Speech

It is obvious that we feel different communication manner between man and woman genders and phraseological units, even syntactical combinations, though they speak in the same language. These cases we have already mentioned in earlier chapters. It means that communication culture exists when man and woman share opinions, information, addressing and evaluations to the matters. As we have already seen, the stand point or ways of interpreting communication are speech acts have some more differences between member of genders.

Among Karakalpak speakers women are more talkative, emotional than men. Speaking manner, choice of words of men and women are differentiated according to the age, culturally and social status.

We can study the divergencies in how Karakalpak women or men typically communicate. The problem is great but our work is devoted to the general sides of the matter. That's why we here make our observation on some speech actions of men or women on the material of the Karakalpak language. Men's speech peculiarities in Karakalpak differ according to the ages, social, cultural and ethnic differences.

All these divergences are seen in all levels or aspects of language which they speak in or with.

For example:

-Oteag'asi, to'rge o'tin', - dedi murtlash kisi.

The word "o'teag'asi" used in speech expressed the older (man) that the speaker (both of them masculine persons).

-Sadag'an' keteyin, qalanin' ballari shaqqan, qas qag'imda aldap ketedi. (man's speech)

Masculine speech is defined by the proposition acts.

The man's sentence is stricter than woman's.

-Baltani a'perip jiber, maga'n. (man's speech)

- Baltani apershi, mag'an. (woman's speech)

Women's speech is more emotional, covers request, motivation than men's.

Women need more information than men, therefore sentence structure is more extended than men's.

- Shirag'im, aman-esen barip qayttin' ba, tan'badin' ba? (Woman's speech)

-Aman keldin be, balam? (Men's speech)

Men's speech is short and concrete and not highly responsive.

Women's speech is rich in using phraseological units, proverbs and sayings, idioms than men'

For example:

-Qiz bala barg'an jerin quwantadi, ketken jerin suwaltadi degen iras-aw. Bu'gin tu'simde biykeshti ko'rip ju'rmen.

- Aynalayin-aw, u'ydi sag'inip ju'rgen g'oy.

Here we understand whose speech they are according to the proposition.

Woman's speech, relativeness (her husband's sister) and her mother. Woman's speech in Karakalpak distinguishes by using of demanative words much as type of: janim, shirag'im, ayim, ku'nim and etc. Women's speech determines her own interest, psychology and curiosity. Men's speech in Karakalpak is more characterized by general content policy events.

-

### **3.2. Gender Peculiarities in Karakalpak Grammar**

The typological category of the real kind is characteristic of the Karakalpak language systems, since the grammatical category of the genus is absent in this language.

In modern Karakalpak language there is no correspondence or divergence of gender, because it does not have a category of gender as a language category, and there are signs of the biological sex.

### **3.3. Gender Peculiarities in Karakalpak Paremia and Phraseology**

Most of the entries do not differ by gender. They are mainly composed of phraseological units, which do not represent an individual nomination.

Most of the stockings are made up of metaphors for human body, which can be used for all individuals, regardless of their sex: bas iyiw, ayag'ina jig'liw, awzina uriw

Some of the phraseological units belong to men only. Qarip quiylmag'an.

Women's units: Anasinin' basina ko'pshik dastiq boliw

The expressive-pragmatic component describes a very broad range of women's voices: tilin'e ku'ydirgi shiqqir.

The phraseological units belonging to each of the two sexes: er jetiw, kewil beriw

Sometimes it is a question of women's negative image.

There is not a significant discrepancy when confronted with men.

1. Gross beauty of women: ay desem awzi bar, ku'n desem ko'zi bar, bir qasiq suwday jutip jiberetin dey.

There are phraseological units representing the family function of women waqti –saati jetiw, ay-ku'ni jaqin

3. It is understood that the stock is used for women and can be compared with the character of men: qirq jigitke ten'.

Human beings are primarily portrayed as a moving person in the lens landscape. He performs various physical, mental activities. These movements are characterized by a certain characteristic of the person - desire, emotions, thinking, psychological experiences, and physiology, speech statuses and so on. Some of the abovementioned features are specific to males and females.

1. It is clearly expressed that specific features such as referral counseling, procurement, intercourse, and the like are specific to women's speech in Karakalpak phraseology.

Praising: janimdi bereyin.

Cursing: tandiri shiqqir, jer jutsin

Fear: Wiy biy alla

2. Women may sometimes make men be obedient: Murninan jip o'tkizip aliw

3. The woman is described as something that can be abandoned: juwabin beriw, basin baylaw
4. A negative attitude towards the age of women: otirip qaliw, otizg'a kirip otin boliw.
5. Women's nomination: otin, ala qorjin, qari qiz, erkek geshir.
6. Negative nomination for men: qizlardin' jen'gesi, qarip quyilmag'an.
7. The phraseological units with "Father" and "Mother" components were many: atan' jaqsi, anan' jaqsi dep.
8. Phraseological units representing the courage and pride of men: ata bala, er bala, haqiyqiy erkek.

In phraseology, the prevalence of negative outlook in favor of a positive is determined by the acceptance of realistic attitudes rather than with the gender factor. Negative and positive attributes are expressed in the language as the accepted standard.

Paremiology is chosen as a subject of research not by chance - it is at the intersection of phraseology and folklore, which makes the study of proverbs and sayings very significant from the standpoint of the modern linguistic and cultural approach. The paremiological fund of the Karakalpak language is an important source of interpretation, since the majority of proverbs are "prescriptions, stereotypes of people's self-consciousness, which give a wide enough scope for choice for self-identification". Paremiology is indicative from the point of view of cultural stereotypes fixed in the language. The existence of different possibilities for self-identification is undeniable, however, an analysis of a large number of units allows one to nevertheless draw a conclusion about dominant tendencies and estimates.

During the analysis of women's characters, the following human characteristics were negatively evaluated:

1. Talkativeness: Elekke barg'an qatinnin', eliw awiz ga'pi bar.
2. Slyness: Bir qatinnin' hiylesi, qiriq eshekke ju'k bolar.

3. Sometimes a woman ignores the mind: Xayt dese iyt juwiradi, iytden aldin-qiz.
4. A woman as a destroyer of home, family: Jaman arba jol buzar, jaman qatin-u'y.

Proverbs describing the positive and neutral characteristics of women:

1. Cognition: Qatinnin' ko'rki aqlinda.
2. Beautiness: Qizdin' ko'rki shash.
3. Husband's advisor: qatin-erdin' waziyri.
4. As a housewife: qatini bar u'y-gu'l, qatinsiz u'y sho'l.

When we learnt the proverbs and sayings, it was noticed that in some cases, the concept of “woman” is connoted negatively . It is especially attributed to words “qatin” Though, the word “qatin” is a synonym to the word “hayal” as in English “a wife, a woman”, it has its negative shade which is extensive with some words, combinations and phrases and intensified by its peculiar meaning in Karakalpak.

“ Jaman attan jawdag'in' jaqsi,  
Jaman qatinnan boydag'in' jaqsi”.

“El qidirg'an sinshi bolar,  
Jaman qatin tin'shi bolar”.

However, some proverbs opposes “jaman qatin” ( a bad wife) to “jaqsi qatin” ( a good wife” stressing that atmosphere in the house, peaceful life in the family , relationship among relatives and members of family depends on a large extent on a wife, her behavior and wisdom.

Jaqsi qatin erin er qiladi,	Jaqsi bolsa qatinin',	Jaman qatin alg'annin'
Jaman qatin erin qara jer qiladi.	Kelip turar jaqinin',	jawi u'yinde,
	Jaman bolsa qatinin'	Jaqsi qatin alg'annin'
	Basin'nan keter aqilin'.	toyi u'yinde,
		Eki qatin alg'annin' dawi u'yinde,

O'miri o'te beredi sol  
ku'yinde.”

In Karakalpak language phraseology men's labor activity is limited to such fields as horticulture, farming, livestock, jewelry, hunting and fishing.

Women's social status does not seem to be much higher than men's. But it is a woman who has been a responsible person for many years, and has been abusive to doing serious things. Therefore, linguistic units that represent important occupations for women are not used.

Although indifference and brutality are inherent to men, weakness, weakness, and disobedience can be characteristic of men:

Erke ul jawg'a jaramas, erke qiz iske; erkeletse anasi-taltayadi balasi, tuwri tutsa anasi, jurtqa iye balasi.

Chatter is considered to be inherent in a woman and has become the cause of many jokes: *elekke shiqqan qatinnin'-eliw awiz ga'pi bar.*

The wisdom of the woman in the Karakalpak language, her faithfulness to her husband, and her confidence in her husband is not denied: *aqilsiz qatin jamalin ko'z-ko'z etedi, aqilli qatin- aqlin.*

Karakalpak men are characterized by such qualities as patriotism, honesty, kindness, courage, courage, humility, generosity: *er jigit wa'de bermeydi, onin'so'zi wa'de. Er jigit el ushin tuwiladi, el ushin o'ledi.*

The women of Karakalpakstan possess such qualities as wisdom, goodness, purity, inexhaustibility, diligence, tolerance, hospitality and hardworking. These qualities are reflected in phraseologisms and paremmments.

Although the conceptual layer describing the physiological characteristics of women and men has been studied in women's image in the Karakalpak article (*Anan'di a'ken'e pardazsiz ko'rsetpe*), but internal and natural beauty is essential: *Suliwinan jiliwi jaqsi; qatinnin' ko'rki aqilinda.*

The purity and tenderness of the woman are also among the most important signs of her beauty: *Oyin saz benen- qiz nazi menen.*

The traditional dominant ideologies that govern the society are characterized by a high degree of vulnerability and a maladaptation of men. It does not always support this dignity. Despite the negative image of a woman over her positive attitudes, we have faced situations that could weaken androcentrism in the tongue: Ulin' axmaq bolsa da, kelinin' dana bolsin; qatin – moyin, erkek-bas.

The gender dimension of female and male masculinity has been critically examined in the semantic space of "kinship relationships". Parenting analysis shows that the role of mother in childbearing is more important than that of the father: anasina qarap qizin al.

The role of mother is more important than father's: atasiz jetim - zor jetim, anasiz jetim - xor jetim.

### **Conclusion on Chapter III**

1. In the associative experiments, a high evaluation of the female intellect, a generally positive attitude toward the woman, the significance of her appearance, and the low contradiction of the sexes were manifested. The high value of motherhood and such qualities as love, self-sacrifice, self-sacrifice remained practically unchanged. The male image is somewhat blurred. Frequency responses are both "strong" and "beautiful", and the "smart" reaction is not a frequency response. "Traditionally male" stereotype, in our opinion is not expressed. With the exception of the "force / strong" reaction and various kinds of lexemes related to the thematic group "reliability", we did not find other frequency responses. Negative assessments of men are associated mainly with drunkenness, in part with adultery. Many reactions, especially those related to personal qualities, are repeated both in the evaluation of men and in the evaluation of women. In our opinion, male domination in the results of modern associative experiments is practically not represented.

Husband and wife are considered as complementary entities and are also not practically opposed to each other. Many of their most frequent responses to

these stimuli coincide. The predominance of negative vocabulary in the evaluation of women was not recorded, although in the male evaluations of E.F. Tarasov, it takes place to a greater extent than in the results of our experiment. Perhaps this is due to the fact that a larger number of informants were interviewed.

At the same time the wife is more often defined through the relation to the husband, however the return is also presented, though to a lesser extent. The stereotype of "evil wife" is much less pronounced than in the material of proverbs and sayings, and the "smart", "kind" wife, on the contrary, appears more often than in the material of proverbs and sayings.

And in the material of system dictionaries, and in psycholinguistic experiments moral assessments predominate. Sexual interaction of the sexes is poorly represented. Motherhood is highly valued. With a certain degree of caution, it can be assumed that a woman sees the native speakers of the Karakalpak language primarily as a mother, even in situations when she acts in a different function (wife, woman, etc.), however, this issue requires further study.

It can also be concluded that the HS, on the one hand, retains its importance: in different chronological periods, motherhood, love, selflessness for women and strength for men remain significant factors, which is reflected in the language. The most constant was the maternal stereotype. An important place is occupied by the family.

On the other hand, there is a certain dynamics of the GE, related to historical and social changes. Compared with the dictionary material, positive features attributed to women have increased. Psycholinguistic experiments do not allow to assert that among the stereotyped female features are intellectual insufficiency, talkativeness. Great importance is the appearance of a woman, but the appearance of a man also matters.

Thus, the cultural representation of sex can be manipulated through the accentuation of certain GEs in public discourse.

2. Comparison of the Karakalpak language material with the English along with many similar features revealed, as shown above, some differences in the interpretation of the female image. The material of the Karakalpak language also received data confirming this fact.

### **Conclusion**

The systematization of scientific views on the study of the gender factor in the language makes it possible to classify the social sex as a number of objects relevant to linguistics. Gender can be studied not only from the standpoint of sociolinguistics, but also in a whole series of linguistic disciplines dealing with cognition, refraction, nomination, discursive patterns, text, linguocultural and many other issues.

The main theoretical and methodological provisions of the gender concept are based on four interrelated components: these are cultural symbols; normative statements that give directions for possible interpretations of these symbols and are expressed in religious, scientific, legal and political doctrines; social institutions and organizations; as well as self-identification of the individual. Gender relations are recorded in the language in the form of culturally conditioned stereotypes, leaving an imprint on behavior, including speech, personality and the processes of its linguistic socialization. Gender stereotypes (GS) can and should be explored in a comparative perspective, which will allow

one to discover the universal traits characteristic of GS in all or many cultures, and to determine their cultural specifics. Since gender is a component of both collective and individual consciousness, it must be studied as a cognitive phenomenon, manifested in stereotypes fixed by the language, and in the speech behavior of individuals who, on the one hand, are aware of their belonging to the male or female sex, on the other, experiencing a certain pressure of axiologically non-neutral language structures that reflect the collective implementation of gender.

At present, the growing interest in GR and the consolidation of efforts to form linguistic genderology, an independent scientific direction centered on the gender aspects of language and communication, can be stated in Karakalpak linguistics. The situation of becoming requires systematic understanding of important theoretical and methodological issues. However, even in countries where GRs are very intensive, they reveal a methodological heterogeneity. The most clearly defined are: a) studies carried out with the help of the Derrida deconstruction; b) Diagnostic studies that have a practical focus - the identification of identification signs of male and female speech in the form of first and second order symptoms in those cases when sex is a relevant factor of communication. In the first direction, the ideological attitudes of scientists have a greater influence on the interpretation of the results. In this connection, both general methodological issues and private-linguistic methods are essential for the development of national linguistic genderology. The bulk of research, especially in the course of deconstruction, was carried out on the material of influential European languages and American English. The degree of elaboration of the problems on the material of other languages is lower.

Domestic linguistics has some experience in researching gender aspects of language and speech, especially with regard to the development of identification techniques. Questions of the same language policy aimed at creating a gender-neutral norm that reduces the androcentricity of the language has so far only

been declared. The theoretical basis necessary for them is absent. This problem depends, in our opinion, on individual perception, and is also closely related to the development of feminist ideas. Its development will depend on the degree of development of feminist ideology. This requires linguists to focus on analyzing the expressive means of the Karakalpak language in the aspect of gender in order to create a scientifically sound basis for future discussions.

We believe that the study of femininity and masculinity as cultural concepts is one of the most promising areas of gender studies, since its results allow to increase the validity and explanatory power of the remaining directions of linguistic genderology and to reveal the degree of applicability to the Karaakalpak language of the results obtained in world linguistics. Certainly, femininity and masculinity reveal both universal and special features. The definition of general and special becomes, thus, one of the most important goals of gender studies.

Femininity and masculinity as cultural concepts have several dimensions - historical, synchronous (actual), figurative (internal form). Each of these dimensions lends itself to a linguistic description, which allows one to identify the cultural representation of gender in the language, to calculate gender stereotypes and to track their dynamics over time. Cultural representation of sex can be manipulated by accentuation of certain GSs in public discourse.

The conducted study leads to the conclusion about the cultural conditioning of this dynamics, the dialectical unity of variability and sustainability and, in general, the relevance of linguocultural research on the gender aspects of language and communication.

Masculinity and femininity are cultural concepts, the study of which should be carried out in several cultural codes, including in the language, which includes analysis and description of both the potential GS inventory in the language system and the study of the actualization of certain HS in

communication, depending on the historical period (and / or from the social order).

For a more accurate description of the features of femininity and masculinity, as well as male and female speech behavior, an analysis of the characterological properties of the language in question is needed. Characterological features of languages can be interpreted in terms of metaphysical opposition "femininity / masculinity". It should be taken into account the metaphorical character of these names. Features of the Karakalpak language are correlated with the metaphor of femininity Comparison of English linguistic material with Karakalpak, along with many similar features, revealed some differences in the interpretation of the female image. The material of the English language also received data confirming this fact. Our data suggest that - although androcentricity, of course, is inherent in all languages - the degree of androcentricity of different languages is not the same. Consequently, we can talk about the mismatch of stereotypes of femininity and masculinity in different cultural environments. It makes sense therefore to explore the reflection of the image of women and men in the language, focusing both on gender asymmetries and on contrasting analysis of gender stereotypes in different languages.

Of course, this issue should be studied more thoroughly with the use of large data sets and involving a variety of linguistic material. Our analysis is not exhaustive and can be continued, detailed and expanded in the future.

## REFERENCES

### Regulatory acts

1. Ўзбекистон Республикасы билимлендириш ҳаққидаги  
а. 29.08.1997 у. N 464-I Ўзамаи
2. Ўзбекистон Республикаси Президентининг 2017 йил 7 февралдаги  
“Ўзбекистон Республикасини янада ривожлантириш бўйича  
ҳаракатлар стратегияси тўғрисида” ги ПФ-4947-сонли Фармони.  
Ўзбекистон Республикаси қонун ҳужжатлари тўплами, 2017 й., 6-  
сон, 70-модда
3. Ўзбекистон Республикаси Президентининг 2017 йил 20 апрелдаги  
“Олий таълим тизимини янада такомиллаштириш чора-тадбирлари  
тўғрисида” ги №2909-сонли Қарори
4. Постановление Президента Республики Узбекистан «О мерах по  
дальнейшему совершенствованию системы изучения иностранных  
языков». – Ташкент, от 10 декабря 2012 года.

5. Министрлер MinistrlerKa'binetinin' 36-Qararı menen 2015-jil 2-marttatastiyiqlang'an "Magistraturahaqqindag'i nizamT., 2015.

### **The works of President**

6. Karimov I. A. «Harmoniously developed generation is the basis of progress of Uzbekistan». –T.1997. – 98 p
7. Мирзиёев Ш.М. Эркин ва фаровон демократик Ўзбекистон давлатини биргаликда барпо этамиз. Тошкент, “Ўзбекистон” НМИУ, 2017– 29 б.
8. Мирзиёев Ш.М. Қонун устуворлиги ва инсон манфаатларини таъминлаш юрт тараққиёти ва халқ фаровонлигининг гарови. “Ўзбекистон” НМИУ, 2017. – 47 б.

### **Main Literature**

9. Barren, N. Sex – typed language: The production of grammatical cases. *Ada Sociologica*, 1971, 14, 24-72.
10. Bate, B (1988). *Communication between the sexes*. New York: Harper and Row. Treichler, P.A., & Kramarae, C. (1983). *Women's talk in the ivory tower*. *Communication Quarterly*, 31, 118-132.
11. Bellinger, D. C , & Gleason, J. B. (1982) *Sex differences in parental directives to young children Sex Roles*. 8. 1123-1139
12. Bloom, L., & Lahey, M. *Language development and language disorders*. New York: Wiley, 1978.
13. Brandis, W., & Henderson, D. *Social class, language and communication*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.
14. Campbell, K. K. *The rhetoric of women's liberation: An oxymoron*. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, (1973), 59, 74-86
15. Chesler, P. *Women and madness*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1972.
16. Coates, J. (1986). *Women, men, and language: Studies in language and linguistics*. London: Longman.
17. Coates, J., & Cameron, D. (1989). *Women in their speech communities: New perspectives on language and sex*. London: Longman

18. Conklin, N. F. Perspectives on the dialects of women. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Dialect Society, 1973.
19. Derlega, V. J., & Chai, A. L. (1976) Norms affecting self-disclosure in men and women. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 44, 376-380.
20. Eakins, B. W., & Eakins, R. G. (1978). *Sex differences in human communication* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
21. Fishman, P. M. (1978). Interaction: The work women do. *Social Problems*, 25, 397-404.
22. Garvey, C., & Dickstein, E. Levels of analysis and social class differences in language. *Language and Speech*, 1972, 15, 375-384.
22. Garcia Zamor, M. A. Child awareness of sex role distinctions in language use. Paper presented at the meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, San Diego, Calif., December 1973.
23. Hall, D., & Langellier, K. (1988). Story-telling strategies in mother-daughter communication. In B. Bate & A. Taylor (Eds.), *Women communicating: Studies of women's talk* (pp. 197-226). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
24. Hartman, M. A descriptive study of the language of men and women born in Maine around 1900 as it reflects the Lakoff hypotheses in "Language and woman's place." In B. L. Dubois & Crouch (Eds.), *The sociology of the languages of American women*. San Antonio, Tex: Trinity University Press, 1976.
25. Hirschman, L. Female male differences in conversational interaction. Paper presented at the meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, San Diego, Calif., December 1973.
26. Johnson, F. L. (1989). Women's culture and communication: An analytical perspective. In C. M. Lont & S. A. Friedley (Eds.), *Beyond Boundaries: Sex and gender diversity in communication* (pp. 301-316). Fairfax, VA: George Mason University Press
27. Klein, J. The family in "traditional" working-class England. In M. Anderson (Ed.), *Sociology of the family*. Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, 1971.
28. Kotthoff, H. Die Geschlechter in der Gesprächsforschung Hierarchien, Theorien, Ideologien//*Der Deutschunterricht*, 1996.-№1.- S. 9-15
29. Kramarae, C. (1981) *Women and men speaking: Frameworks for analysis*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
30. Kramarae, & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language, gender and society* (pp. 102-117). Rowley, MA: Newbury House

31. Kramer, C. Women's speech: Separate but unequal? *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 1974, 60, 14-24. (b)
32. Kuykendall, E. Sexism in language. Unpublished manuscript, State University of New York College at New Paltz, Department of Philosophy, 1976
33. Labov, W. The social stratification of English in New York City. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966.
34. Lakoff R. *Language and Woman's Place*.-New York: Harper and Row. 1975.
35. Loban, W. D. The language of elementary school children (Report No.1). Champaign, 111.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.
36. Nicholson Linda. *Interpreting "Gender"//The Play of Reason: from the modern in the postmodern*. – Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1999. – P. 53-76.
37. Philips, 1987 - Philips S.U. Introduction: The interaction of social and biological processes in women's and men's speech // *Language, gender and sex in comparative perspective*. Eds. S.U. Philips, S. Steel, Ch. Tanz.- New York, 1987.- P. 1-11.
38. Pusch Luise. *Das Deutsche als Mannerspracher*. – Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1984. – 202 p.
39. Reik, T. Men and women speak different languages. *Psychoanalysis*, 1954, 2, 3-15.
40. Saurer, M. K , & Eisler, R. M. (1990). The role of masculine gender roles stress in expressivity and social support network factors. *Sex Roles*, 23, 261-271.
41. Schaeff, A. W. (1981). *Women's reality*. St. Paul, MN: Winston Press
42. Stewart, L. P., Stewart, A. D., Friedley, S. A., & Cooper, P. J. (1990) *Communication between the sexes: Sex differences, and. sex role stereotypes (2<sup>nd</sup> ed )*. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick
43. Stoller R. "Sex and gender: about development of masculinity and femininity" (1968) (pp. 102)
44. Swacker, M. The sex of the speaker as a sociolinguistic variable. In B. Thome & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language and sex: Difference and dominance*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1975.
45. Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation* New York: William Morrow

46. Zimmerman, D.H., & West, C. Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation. In B. Thome & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language and sex: Difference and dominance*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1975
47. Абдуллаев М.А Грамматический род как лингвистическая категория (на материале разносистемных языков). Автореф. Дис...канд.филол.наук.- Ташкент, 2007.-22с.
48. Алимджанова Д. Понятие гендера//Введение в теорию и практику гендерных отношений.-Ташкент, 2007. С.26-34.
49. Арутюнова Н.Д. Аномалии и язык (к проблеме языковой “картины мира”) // Вопросы языкознания, 1987.-№3.- С. 3 -19.
50. Н.Д. Арутюнова. Язык и мир человека. - М., 1999.
51. Вайсгербер. Й.Л. Родной язык и формирование духа.-М.: Изд-во МГУ, 1993
52. Вежбицкая А. Язык. Культура. Познание. -М.: Русские словари, 1997.
53. Воронина О.А. Введение в гендерные исследования // Материалы первой Российской школы по женским и гендерным исследованиям “Валдай-97”.- М., 1997.- С. 29-34.
54. Горошко Е.И., Кирилина А.В. Гендерные исследования в лингвистике//Гендерные исследования.-М., 1999.- №1.-С.34-36.
55. Горошко Е.И., Кирилина А.В., 1999 - Гендерные исследования в лингвистике сегодня // Гендерные исследования .- Харьков, 1999.- №2.- С. 234-241.
56. Гумбольдт. В. Избранные труды по языкознанию. – М.; Прогресс, 1984
57. Д. Кандиоти. Эволюция гендерных исследований. Обзор // Женщины и социальная политика (гендерный аспект).- М., ИСЭПН, 1992.- С. 156-163.

- 58.Кирилина А.В. Философская база и методология гендерных исследований в применении к российской лингвистике // Гендерный фактор в языке и коммуникации.- Иваново, 1999.
- 59.Кирилина А.В. Возможность гендерного подхода в антропоориентированном изучении языка и коммуникации// Кавказоведение. Caucasiology.- М., 2002. №2.-С.134-141. URL:
- 60.Кирилина А.В. Гендерные исследования в отечественной лингвистике. Проблемы, связанные с бурным развитием//Доклады Второй Международной конф. « Гендер: язык, культура, коммуникация» 22-23 ноября 2002.-М.:МГЛУ, 2002.-С.5-12
- 61.Кирилина А.В. . Развитие гендерных исследований в лингвистике// Филологические науки.- М., 1998. №2.-С.61-78.
- 62.Кочкина, 1999 - Кочкина Е. Гендерный разворот всемирного банка //We/Мы. Диалог женщин. Международный женский журнал, 1999.- №7.- С. 5-9. Халеева, 1999 - Халеева И.И. Гендер как интрига познания // Гендерный фактор в языке и коммуникации.- Иваново, 1999.- С. 5-9.
- 63.Степанов Ю. С. Язык и Метод. К современной философии языка.- М., 1998.
- 64.Тлеумуратов Г. Категория рода в системе деривации имен существительных в истории английского языка (на материале аффиксации и словосложения). Автореф. Дисс...канд.филол.наук.Самарканд, 1998.
- 65.Турниёзов Н., Турниёзова К. «Ички» ва «ташки» тилшунослик хакида баъзи мулохозалар// Тил тизими сатхлари: семантик-функционал ва структур асослар: Республика илимий-амалий анжуман материаллари.- Самарканд, 2009. -. 10-12.

- 66.Фуко М. Воля к истине: по ту сторону знания, власти и сексуальности. Работы разных лет.- М., 1996.
- 67.Халеева И.И. Задачи московского лингвистического университета в междисциплинарном проекте “Феминология и гендерные исследования в России: перспективные стратегии и технологии” // Женщина в российском обществе, 1998.- №3.- С. 8-11.
- 68.Халеева И.И. Гендер как интрига познания // Гендерный фактор в языке и коммуникации.- Иваново, 1999.- С. 5-9.
- 69.Халеева И.И. Гендер как интрига познания// Гендер как интрига познания. Сборник статей.-Рудомино, 2000.-С.9-18
70. Хазирги каракалпак адебий тилинин грамматикасы. Соз жасалыу хам морфология. Нокис «Билим», 1994.

#### **Dictionary and language materials used in the work**

- 71.К.Rakhmanov. “Aqibet”. 34b
- 72.Кунин А. “Fразеологический Slovar” 1972.
- 73.«Амиударья»журналы, №5, 2011
- 74.Бекниязова Б. Кызлар.- Нокис: Каракалпакстан. 1976
- 75.Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов (КСКТ)/ Под ред. Е.С. Кубряковой. -, 1996.
- 76.ЛЭС – Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь./ Под ред. В.Н. Ярцевой. – М.: Советская энциклопедия, 1990.
- Magazine
- 77.Нызанов М . Хауа кемесиндеги екеу. Акшагул. Зийуар. Нокис «Каракалпакстан», 2014.
- 78.Утепбергенов Е. Кумар. – Нокис: 1988.

#### **Internet resources**

- 79.<http://nbuv.gov.ua/Articles/Kult/Nar/knp49-1-149-152.pdf>
- 80.URL: <http://frgt.utmn.ru/last/No19/text07.html>
- 81.<http://www.gender-cent.ryazan.ru/school/lecturers.htm#kirilina>
- 82.<http://www.cios.org/www/ejc/v3n193.htm>

## **Appendix**

### **Different Words, Different Worlds**

**(An extract from the book by D. Tannen “You just don’t understand”  
concerning the work)**

Many years ago I was married to a man who shouted at me, "I do not give you the right to raise your voice to me, because you are a woman and I am a man." This was frustrating, because I knew it was unfair. But I also knew just what was going on. I ascribed his unfairness to his having grown up in a country where few people thought women and men might have equal rights.

Now I am married to a man who is a partner and friend. We come from similar backgrounds and share values and interests. It is a continual source of pleasure to talk to him. It is wonderful to have someone I can tell everything to, someone who understands. But he doesn't always see things as I do, doesn't always react to things as I expect him to. And I often don't understand why he says what he

does. At the time I began working on this book, we had jobs in different cities. People frequently expressed sympathy by making comments like "That must be rough," and "How do you stand it?" I was inclined to accept their sympathy and say things like "We fly a lot." Sometimes I would reinforce their concern: "The worst part is having to pack and unpack all the time." But my husband reacted differently, often with irritation. He might respond by deemphasizing the inconvenience: As academics, we had four-day weekends together, as well as long vacations throughout the year and four months in the summer. We even benefited from the intervening days of uninterrupted time for work. I once overheard him telling a dubious man that we were lucky, since studies have shown that married couples who live together spend less than half an hour a week talking to each other; he was implying that our situation had advantages. I didn't object to the way my husband responded--every-thing he said was true--but I was surprised by it. I didn't understand why he reacted as he did. He explained that he sensed condescension in some expressions of concern, as if the questioner were implying, "Yours is not a real marriage; your ill-chosen profession has resulted in an unfortunate arrangement. I pity you, and look down at you from the height of complacency, since my wife and I have avoided your misfortune." It had not occurred to me that there might be an element of one-upmanship in these expressions of concern, though I could recognize it when it was pointed out. Even after I saw the point, though, I was inclined to regard my husband's response as slightly odd, a personal quirk. He frequently seemed to see others as adversaries when I didn't. Having done the research that led to this book, I now see that my husband was simply engaging the world in a way that many men do: as an individual in hierarchical social order in which he was either one-up or one-down. In this world, conversations are negotiations in which 13 people try to achieve and maintain the upper hand if they can, and protect themselves from others' attempts to put them down and push them around. Life, then, is a contest, a struggle to preserve independence and avoid failure. I, on the other hand, was approaching the world as many women do: as

an individual in a network of connections. In this world, conversations are negotiations for closeness in which people try to seek and give confirmation and support, and to reach consensus. They try to protect themselves from others' attempts to push them away. Life, then, is a community, a struggle to preserve intimacy and avoid isolation. Though there are hierarchies in this world too, they are hierarchies more of friendship than of power and accomplishment. Women are also concerned with achieving status and avoiding failure, but these are not the goals they are focused on all the time, and they tend to pursue them in the guise of connection. And men are also concerned with achieving involvement and avoiding isolation, but they are not focused on these goals, and they tend to pursue them in the guise of opposition. Discussing our differences from this point of view, my husband pointed out to me a distinction I had missed: He reacted the way I just described only if expressions of concern came from men in whom he sensed an awareness of hierarchy.