



PRAGMATIC CHARACTERISTICS OF UTTERANCES, DEPENDING ON THE GENDER OF THE AUTHOR

Baymirzaeva Madina Radjapovna

Teacher of Department of Foreign Language and Literature
Faculty of Foreign Philology, National University of Uzbekistan named
after Mirzo Ulugbek, Tashkent, Uzbekistan
madinabaymirzaeva@yandex.ru

Tel: +998 90 988 28 06

<https://www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7973672>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 18th May 2023

Accepted: 25th May 2023

Online: 26th May 2023

KEY WORDS

Gender linguistics, male author, female author, pragmatic characteristic, pragmatic potential of the text, syntactic construction, the features of female and male speech, interlocutors, emotional exclamations.

ABSTRACT

This article deals with the notion of Pragmatic characteristics of utterances, which depend on the gender of the author provided them. It is clear that female and male texts (messages) are distinguished. It turned out that the text written by a woman is much more emotional and complex, whereas male author resort to very harsh and vulgar expressions. However, other linguists who make own research in gender study express a different opinion. So, gender studies in linguistics are a promising area in which scientists are waiting for important discoveries.

The aspect of Gender linguistics research should be mentioned - the scientific analysis of the features of the pragmatic characteristics of the text, depending on the gender of the author. The pragmatic potential of an utterance, its quality, and adequacy are influenced not only by the characterological qualities of languages, but also by the personal, cultural, social, and gender qualities of the author.

Scientists have tried to find the features that distinguish the text of a female author from the text written by men, and to determine how this affects the pragmatic potential of the text. It turned out that the text made by a woman, in many cases, has a greater severity of emotional meanings. This is achieved not only by using more expressive vocabulary, but also by using various syntactic constructions.

The author - woman often abuses the exact transmission of a direct denotative meaning, which in most cases leads to more complex and cumbersome syntactic constructions. This, in turn, is often the reason why the text becomes more difficult both to read and to understand. However, it cannot be argued that gender differences (gender factors) are the only reason, while the personal characteristics of the author do not have any influence on the process.

Regarding the differences in male and female speech, J. Edwards notes the so-called "gender-preferential" language means, i.e. the choice of language means and markers is determined by the gender of the individual. Consider the features of female and male speech, highlighted by those researchers who adhere to the point of view according to which the speech of men and women is different.



Additionally, some linguists noted that women are likely to use euphemisms and a lesser tendency to use filthy language. According to Russian linguists women do not use strong words like men. Zhelvis studied scrupulously the layer of reduced vocabulary and paid great attention to which insults women and men prefer to use. His conclusion coincides with the data indicated above where men resort to very harsh and vulgar invectives, women, as a rule, prefer to use softer phrases or outwardly very modest-sounding interjections. The researcher believes that men use grating, harsh or blatant invectives in order to release themselves from excessive aggression that has accumulated as a result of stress. Nevertheless, two American linguists D. Cameron and D. Coates, having studied the speech and speech behavior of men and women, suggested another explanation for tendency of men to rude, harsh expressions: the reason is that profanation and deflection from generally accepted norms have the status of implicit prestige. What is more, in the study of I.A. Sternin there is an idea that active foul language is an essential feature of male communication.

The other linguists like E.A. Zemskaya, M.V. Kitaygorodskaya, N.N. Rozanova concluded that the woman's speech is much more affective and emotive. To express their emotions and feeling, women use, firstly, adverbs so, such, awfully, terribly, and secondly, empty adjectives gorgeous, divine, splendid. In addition to this, women have tendency to use interjections as a means of expressing meanings associated with a person's emotional reaction. Men, as observations show, keep away from the usage of too emotive interjections.

The greater emotionality of women manifests itself in the greater tendency of women to estimate. According to the research of M.A. Yagubova, female account for 2.5 times more evaluative or estimating word usage than male. M.A. Yagubova insists on the fact that women frequently use emotional assessment and overstatements in their speech compared with men. The most noticeable differences between women in the use of evaluative words M.A. Yagubova calls the great significands of emotional assessments and the tendency to exaggerate assessments and emotions, which is expressed in the more frequent use of intensifiers with strong adjectives, stylistically and emotionally colored means. Men, on the other hand, are characterized by greater concreteness, impulse, and rationalistically assessments. Their speech is more critical, frequently directed to significant problems like: work, professional and business qualities.

Unlike E.A. Zemskoy, M.V. Kitaygorodskaya, N.N. Rozanova, who consider that the use of adverbs and empty adjectives is associated with the emotionality and affectivity of women. What is more, O. Jespersen attributed the usage of these lexical features of female speech as talkativeness. To prove his concept O. Jespersen gave examples from all major European languages. However, J. Coates criticizes the scientist for the fact that these derivations are observational in nature and are not based on reliable facts that would clearly show that they are used only or mainly by women. R. Lakoff in her monograph "The Language and Place of a Woman" also distinguishes the so-called "empty" adjectives, for example, *excellent*, *charming*, *sweet* ... as typical by Lakoff's definition for female language and the use of the amplifying *so*, which is more frequent in a feminine language than in a masculine one, although, certainly, men can also use it. According to R. Lakoff, the characteristic of female speech make her weak, unreliable, feeble and powerless.



The researchers also mark that women use modal elements much more intensively, which are called qualifiers in English linguistics. These include the modal verbs *might, could*; modal constraints, including combinations as: *kind of, sort of, to some extent, particles just, only, somewhat*; introductory sentences *I suppose, I think, I guess, I mean, I'm afraid, I wonder, you know*; adverbs: *maybe, possibly, probably, apparently, presumably, etc.*

R. Lakoff attributes the frequent use of tag questions (dividing questions) to the grammatical features of women's speech, which, in her opinion, creates a feeling of uncertainty and indecision among communicants. However, J. Coates notes the multifunctional orientation of interrogative sentences: maintaining a conversation, the ability of all speakers to participate in a conversation, as well as preventing a threat to a negative / positive person. This allowed researchers to establish that female communication behavior is cooperative. The woman chooses such linguistic means with the help of which she manages to maintain closeness and equality with the interlocutor, to criticize, using polite forms, and also to accurately convey the words of the other person. The author also introduces the concept of "double-voice discourse", i.e. dialogue, in the process of which the speaker is guided by the goals and interests of the interlocutor, without prejudice to his interests and his opinion". The author believes that "double-voice discourse" is characteristic of female communicative behavior.

In addition, J. Coates emphasizes the tendency of women to use rhetorical questions. O. L. Antineskul notes that a rhetorical question expresses the emotionality of perception and the impossibility of finding a rational solution. E.A. Zhigaykova calls interrogative sentences the driving force of the conversation, considering them an integral part of the structure of the dialogue, which presupposes the communicative influence of two interlocutors.

As a feature of female speech, J. Coates also singles out repetition, which can be actualized at the lexical, grammatical and syntactic levels.

According to the results of foreign researchers, men use more nouns and verbs in their colloquial speech, and adjectives and adverbs are more common in women's speech.

Thus, we can conclude that studies of the features of the verbal speech of men and women until the end of the 20th century practically did not consider sociocultural factors, but were largely based on differences in biological sexes. At the initial stage of the evolution of feminist linguistics, it was assumed that gender is the determining factor in communication.

However, later scientists began to note that the distinction between male and female speech are not so significant and do not manifest themselves in any speech act. So, in the 90s, linguists finally refuted the existence of the "female language" described by R. Lakoff. As noted by S.K. Taburova constant gender differences were not found either in the volume of the vocabulary, or in the choice of adjectives and adverbs, which does not exclude the possibility that representatives of different genders may use a slightly different vocabulary within different social groups. Also, no constant differences were found in the field of syntactic constructions, for example, in terms of the use of certain patterns of interrogative sentences. The female and male languages are more likely to suggest gender similarities and differences than they actually exist.



References:

1. Jespersen O. "Language: Its nature, development and origin". London: Allen & Unwin. 1922
2. Tannen D. "You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation". New York: Ballantine. 1990
3. Lakoff R. "Language and woman's place: Text and commentaries" (M. Bucholtz (Ed.)). New York, NY: Oxford University Press. 2004
4. Lakoff R. Language and woman's place. *Language in Society*, 2(1), 1973
5. Кирилина А. В. "Гендер: лингвистические аспекты". – М.: Институт социологии РАН, 1999. – 180с.
6. Земская Е.А., Китайгородская М.В., Розанова Н.Н. "Языковая игра // Русская разговорная речь". – М.: Наука, 1983.
7. Жигайкова Е.А. Риторический вопрос и его функционирование в англоязычном тексте // Сборник: Язык в жизни человека и общества. Материалы международной научно-практической конференции. Московский педагогический государственный университет. Москва. 2020. С. 105-110.
8. R.Stoller,; *Sex and Gender: On the Development of Masculinity and Femininity*, Science House, [New York City](#), 1968, P.383
9. Горошко Е.И. Гендерная проблематика в языкознании. [Электронный ресурс] Owl.ru: мнформ.-справочный портал. М., 2000.
10. 11.Тукачева Ю.С. Методологические проблемы гендерного подхода // Материалы II междунар.научно-практ. конф. «Теория и практика гендерных исследований в мировой науке» Научно-изд.центр «Социосфера».- Пенза-Махачкала-Ереван, 2011. — С. 10-16.
11. Пушкарь Г.А. Типология и поэтика женской прозы: гендерный аспект: дис.канд.фил.наук. – Ставрополь, 2007. – 234 с.
12. Money John, and Anke Ehrhardt. *Man & Woman, Boy & Girl: Gender Identity from Conception to Maturity*. Northvale, N.J.: Jason Aronson, 1996. Originally published: Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972.