
© EKATERINA G. SETCHENOVA

e-sechenova@mail.ru

УДК 811.111'42:316.346.2

**GENDER IDENTITY
IN THE FOCUS OF MODERN SCIENTIFIC DISCOURSE**

SUMMARY. The aim of the article is to describe different language means of the author's gender identity representation in the monographs in linguistics. Special emphasis is put upon the reflexive aspect of a scientific text, as it helps to reveal individual pragmatic purposes.

KEY WORDS. Gender, gender identity, scientific discourse, reflection, author's modality.

At the present-day stage of Russian humanities development gender identity is, without exaggeration, one of the most interesting, but at the same time challenging research subjects. Theoretical and methodological approaches to its study make up a complex of sociological, psychological, philosophical and cultural knowledge, which has been formed in the process of development and understanding of the term "gender". It should be noted that interpretation of the concept of gender identity has come a long way from the biological and evolutionary understanding of sex and gender, through the theory of social roles to the modern theory of gender identity.

Gender identity (along with ethnic, professional, etc.) is understood by us as one of the substructures of social identity which characterizes personality in terms of its roles conception, status and the mission of men and women in society.

The concept of gender identity has been in the focus of such authors as E. Belinskaya, N. Antonov, O. Arestova, L. Babanin, A. Voiskunsky, E. Artemyev, A. Arkhipov, I. Kletskin, A.N. Nechaev, N. Radin, S. Ageev, etc.

I.S. Cohn defines the basic methodological position of modern theory of gender identity and believes that it incorporates a methodology for feminist analysis of gender as a structure of social relations and especially relations of power, sociological studies of subcultures and problems related to marginalization and resistance to social minorities, as well as analysis of the discursive nature of all social relations, including sex, sexual and other (racial, class, national) identity [1].

In such a pronounced interdisciplinary theory of gender identity I.S. Cohn sees its strengths and weaknesses. The strengths are associated with the fact that the research subjects and research strategies and practices are significantly expanded. Weakness, in author's opinion, is revealed in the complexity of definition of the subject and the research methods and, therefore, increases the demands for the researcher himself — for his methodological competence in various fields of scientific knowledge, the ability to hold high-quality research methods and, finally, to its gender sensitivity (ability to see, to assess the degree and depth of the influence of gender stereotypes, to distinguish their own interpretation of discourse studies, etc.) [1].

In this context it should be stressed that a great number of philological research conducted from a gender perspective, has often been based solely on “feminine” linguistic material. As noted by A. Kirilina and D.O. Dobrovolskiy, the works of local and foreign linguists in the specified field are often marked with a high degree of feminist ideology [2].

Linguistic gender studies, formed on the basis of feminist language criticism, very often continue to focus on “feminine” discourse. The object of most of the works is particularly “feminine” language, “female” texts, “feminine” writing, while the texts of “male” discourse are outside the researcher’s view, or they are optionally involved in the research [2].

Let’s consider the possibility of singling out three areas of study and application of gender studies results [3].

In the first area of research the object is sex differences between the psychological characteristics or conditions of men and women (characteristic features of attention, memory, emotions, or behavior, differences in personal and professional choices, etc.). The strategy of research, measurement procedures (often quantitative) and interpretations will tend to associate the knowledge gained with the general psychological laws.

In the second area the object of study is gender socialization. The strategy of research, measurement procedures (a combination of quantitative and qualitative) and interpretations will tend to refer this knowledge to practical or applied scientific fields.

In the third area of research the object is masculinity constructs, androgyny, femininity and their relationship to other psychological characteristics and states. The strategy of research, measurement procedures (mostly qualitative) and interpretations will be linked, to a greater extent, to the researcher’s tendency to revalue (to double-check, to reinterpret) the existing general laws.

The third area is different from the first one by examining gender identity mainly in the greatest distance from the biological component of gender. It is different from the second by trying to understand the individual’s gender identity. The third area is considered by us as the most promising in terms of gender invariance study and the experiences of the personality of its gender identity in the space of the modern world. This direction, in our opinion, is designed to solve a number of important theoretical and methodological challenges facing gender studies [3].

Thus, gender community is faced with a double challenge: first, it needs to determine for themselves the paradigm within which research can be conducted, to make a choice in favor of this or that methodology and ideological orientation, and secondly, to develop such techniques of reasoning, which would promote mutual understanding in scientific circles. Gender community, therefore, is faced with the choice of methodological normativity and tools (meta-language, in particular) of argumentation [4; 118].

Under the methodological normativity we understand conventional principle, which is formed on the basis of the unity of theories, methods, meta-language studies and arguments, accepted by historically specific scientific community. One can not talk about the existence of universal normativity in gender studies, because there is no single system of gender, gender socialization and tradition of the symbolic field of distinguishing the sexes for different ages and nations.

The denial of methodological monism, however, does not deny the possibility of discussion and development of a unified methodology for the normativity of concrete material.

With regard to the written academic style, there is very little research of gender effect. Probably, it is believed that the scientific genres level the gender differences due to strictness of the norm, inviolability of the canons of scientific style and the inability of their variation. Many linguists note androcentrism and gender asymmetry of scientific speech, talk about the identification of scientific thinking with the male style, apparently, because the stereotype of men's speech typical features is almost identical with those characteristics of the scientific style [5].

Indeed, scientific style was developed as an exclusively male speech style. It would be unreasonable to expect that women's style of work will be significantly different from that of men. But there have already been several generations of women and their role and prestige in the scientific world, especially in linguistics, has become quite prominent. We can therefore assume that in modern scientific discourse, gender identity of the author can somehow be traced.

Nowadays there is no consensus regarding the possibility of manifestation of the author's personality in a scientific text. There are two opposing views on this matter. On the one hand it is considered that the ultimate standard style of modern scientific texts leads to their anonymity, the leveling of style. On the other hand, this categorical view is denied and the possibility to display the author's personality in scientific text is determined.

Anthropocentrism, recognizing the author's presence in the text, encourages researchers to use personal constructs, which are not a manifestation of authoritarianism of the language personality, but an expression of the continuity of knowledge of the subject, reflected in the scientific text. The frequency of operation of personal constructs in scientific text demonstrates not only the degree of invasion of the author's opinion in the cognitive consciousness of the reader, what about the specific intentions of the researcher to express the subjective results of his observations in scientific communication. For example: "*For over 30 years, I along with colleagues ...; **My personal work with the Muscovites was instructive** (Gerd A., 2005)", "*Continuing the reflection on the same topic, I would like to make a number of other considerations issues not specified in the work I have enlightened ...*" (Kubryakova, 2002:5), "*The experience of my work with students, linguists ...*" (Kobozev I., 2000). As the above examples from Russian books on linguistics show, the pronoun "I" can already hold a strong position in a scientific text.*

We found out that the increase of the dialogic presentation of this type is a consequence of the trend towards subjective principle in modern scientific language, non-authoritarian nature of the linguistic identity of the researcher. Updating of the authorial "I" through the implementation of reflective subtext in the following ways:

- analysis of the mental states of the author;
 - control of verbal activity and find the best way of expression;
 - use of discrete "operators subjectively reflective intervention"
 - explicit expression component of knowledge in the aspect of his individual perception;
 - use of personal constructs.
-

Thus, the stylistic markedness appears to the modern researcher as a pragmatic basis for verbalization of new knowledge, the key to a productive dialogue with the readership.

Analysis of expressions containing the author's modality of the above books allowed to make their own scale with a number of modalities of communication systems. We considered it possible to break the means of expressing subjective modality in the scientific discourse into two larger groups. The first group includes the means of expression "**logic modality**" (neutral expression, call or emotional relationships; lexical amplifiers; standardized expressions, pronouns, and verbs of the 1st person plural. Number.) The second group was called "**author-individual modality.**" It includes non-typical for scholarly communication expressions, borrowed from other registers, emotionally colored expression, individual author's metaphor, the use of 1st person singular, and philosophical rhetorical questions.

The vast majority of books is marked with logic type of modality, which is explained by the specifics of the text governing verbal behavior of a scientist in the given framework. In the texts of the prefaces, we find neutral words, naming emotions or attitudes (*the author expresses his gratitude; special thanks to the author ...; old hobby of the author, we found it interesting*), the standardized expression (*this book seeks to show, it should be noted ...; we consider it necessary ...*) pronouns and verbs of the 1st person plural. number (*We are fully aware ... and if we are not mistaken, we were forced to give up ...*), positioning himself in 3rd person units. number (*a special thanks to the author ... and the author sincerely thanks all ...; book summarizes the author's thinking about the period ...*).

Obviously, the ratio of personal expression and depersonalization in a scientific presentation for each author is individual, and yet the present study has noted that often the authors of books (in particular, male authors), formally following all the traditions of scientific presentation, move away from the main goal of scientific communication (communication of new scientific information) and put their own personal goals (belief in the reader's professionalism and competence of the author's original work). For the author's scientific presentation it is important to show the significance of his personal contribution to the research, stress that he performed such work, has achieved results that will help him win (strengthen) his credibility among peers.

Comparing our results in terms of gender, we can conclude that female authors are less free in the manifestation of individual authors' modality. Here we face the following questions: Is the regularity influenced by gender-specific parameter? Or does the dominant role belong to a number of other parameters of discourse?

It is obvious that these questions, we can not give a definite answer, and evidence-primarily because of modern descriptive linguistics does not allow us to argue and gender-dependency, we clearly see that the differences in the verbal behavior of both sexes are probabilistic in nature, ie related to the relative frequency of their occurrence in the speech. The unequal frequency is not only a consequence of the gender of the author, but also a manifestation of the impact of several factors: social characteristics, communicative situation, ethnic and cultural traditions of communication. Thus, to highlight the author as the main

text-setting, we are talking about the impact on a range of discursive parameters [6] or discursive situation [7].

Nevertheless, our results support the thesis about trends in scientific communication, namely the trend towards the author's "self-", the tendency to weaken the authoritarian nature of the linguistic identity of the researcher, the strengthening of the dialogic type of presentation, the desire to influence the readers in a more efficient way. Moreover, this thesis can be traced both in the scientific works of male authors, and scientific works of women.

REFERENCES

1. Kon, I.S. Changing Men in a Changing World. Masculine Nature as a History. Russian Man and his Problems (Lectures 1-3) // Gender Kaleidoscope. Lektion Course / Edited by M.M. Malysheva. Moscow: Academia Press, 2001. P. 189-209.
2. Dobrovolsky, D.O., Kirilina, A.V. Feminist Ideology in Gender Researches and Criteria of its Scientific Reference // Gender as a Cognitive Intrigue. The Collection of articles, composed by A.V. Kirilina. Moscow, 2000. P. 16.
3. Ozigova, L.N. The Problems of researching Personal Existence Gender Aspects in Psychology // Gender Aspects of Personal Existence. Proceedings of the All-Russia Scientific Conference. Krasnodar: Kubansky State University Press, 2004. P. 5-18.
4. Zdravomyslova, E.A., Temkina, A.A. Women Researches and Gender Researches in Russia and Abroad // Woman in Society: Myths and Truths. Сборник of articles, composed by Kruming L.S. Moscow: Information - XXI century Press, 2000. P. 111-120.5.
5. Zavershinskaya, N. The Techniques of Gender Abuse in Mass Media and the Ways to Deconstruct them // Justice and Non-Violence: Russian Context. Veliky Novgorod, 2005. P. 140-162.
6. Karasic, V.I. The Types of Discourse // Language Identity: Institutional and Personal Discourses. Volgograd: Peremena Press, 2000. P. 5-20.
7. Rakitina, S.V. Scientific Text as a multy-dimensional phenomenon: Textbook. Volgograd: Peremena Press, 2004. 153 p.