

PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES

GENDER CONSTRUCTS IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Yurii Bilokobyl'skyi¹

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-354-5-23>

The gender dimension of political discourse is one of the relevant aspects related to the development of politics and ideas about gender, and therefore is of obvious importance. The language of politics, in particular, its gender-related aspects, is undergoing rapid transformations that occur both naturally and through institutional initiatives. However, a comprehensive methodology and coverage are needed to understand systematic changes in the gendered language of politics. Qualitative corpus analysis allows you to track changes of language in use occurring over time and understand their direction; however, to effectively apply corpus analysis, it is important to cover as many structural components of political discourse as possible. Moreover, with a sufficient number of works addressing this issue, the structure of political discourse requires additional clarification and adaptation.

Discourse refers to linguistically and extralinguistically motivated actions, which are connected by a common system of meanings [1, p. 130]. For example, if we are talking about an institutional system of meanings, the discourse is institutional (auctioneers' discourse, political discourse, medical discourse, rules-based discourse etc.); still, discourses can be organized thematically (Modernity-related discourse, violence discourse, gender discourse). Both institutional and thematic (or abstract) types of discourse rely on real-life/virtual monologues, dialogues, and polylogues, which, on the one hand, always act as a concretization of general discourses, and on the other hand, represent the only possible form of their existence. T. van Dijk defines several stages of "discourse production", which are the development of mental models, situation models, context models etc. [2, p. 171].

Discourse production is carried out by constructing mental images of the subjects of discourse, its subject-matter and context, as well as the processes of encoding/decoding new discursive information. The process is schematically similar to the Jakobson's model of communication. Jakobson's model of the functions of language distinguishes six elements, or factors of communication, that are necessary for communication to occur. They include addressers,

¹ Research and Educational Center of Foreign Languages National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Ukraine

addressees, context and message carried out as a result of the contact between the addresser and the addressee [3, p. 358].

Van Dijk stresses the need to form a mental image of one's own self, social identity and actual role, including ideas about one's goals, intentions, actions, as well as the identities and roles of all key participants in communication. Gender identity plays a vital role in the production of discourse subjects.

Apart from this, the basis of the "linguistic personality" includes mastery of conceptual (and linguistic) language, including tacit knowledge [4, p. 46]. Therefore, the "subjects" of discourse are interlinked with its "objects" – a mental model of significant things and events, which represents the context of the discursive situation, and which is partially being transformed in the communication process. Information about discursive objects is drawn from the logical content of the concepts used, and is also dictated by the presuppositions of the discourse subjects, that is, the implicit prior knowledge common to all subjects of a particular discourse. Krahmer considers the use of presuppositions "one of the main characteristic properties of knowledge management in the process of discourse production" because they represent something known by default "in order for other propositions to acquire semantic significance (be perceived as true or false)" [5, p. 69]. Van Dijk defines presuppositions as "prior knowledge" [6, p. 33]. As van Dijk notes, experience models, context models, and situation models are formed thanks to the to the concepts used, ideas about the context of communication, and a specific situation – that is, the semantics of discourse. Additionally, individuals construct a mental image of significant objects, relationships, and entities. In terms of gender, it is the number and essence genders, the relationship between them, their nature and social significance, etc.

Only after constructing a mental model of a communicative situation, including images of subjects and objects of discourse, does the actual exchange of communicative messages become possible. Their form depends on the type of language (natural, formalized, machine etc.), and organization of interactions in spacetime (conversation, correspondence, correspondence discussion).

Finally, the discourse production presupposes a set of ideas related to the norms of its organization – clarity, objectivity, evidence, as well as genres, styles, strategies for organizing discursive material and types of discourse. It is obvious that communication strategies, styles and other norms for organizing discourse may have gender characteristics.

Overall, discourse can be structurally represented in the form of a mathematical or logical construction. in which several variables are connected (such as x, y, etc.). Depending on the values of these variables, the content and form of discourse will change, and without them discourse simply does not exist. Such structural parts – variables include:

- Subjects of discourse;
- Semantics of discourse;
- Form of communication;
- Form of discourse organization.

Discursive validity is ensured by knowledge/understanding of these variables, both of which (knowledge and understanding) are formed within the framework of abstract institutional discourses, the ultimate of which being the “discourse of culture”, or “episteme” [7].

It is clear that discursive variables common to cultural subjects are mastered, translated and changed within the framework of institutional discourses. For example, the peculiarities of gender understanding (gender discourse) are also formed in the political discourse of the community.

To understand the dynamics of changes in the articulation of gender ideas in political discourse, and thereby explicate the mechanisms of the discursive construction of gender, one can turn to a corpus analysis of political discourse, if possible turning to material that represents all the structural components of the discourse.

For the level of subjects of discourse, these can be the “names” of subjects of discourse, such as agender, genderless, genderqueer, queer, gender neutral, bigender, third gender, demigender, polygender, polyamorous etc.

For the level of semantics – concepts that convey ideas about gender conceptualization and categories. Gender conceptualization includes the following words, such as transphobia, gender-based violence, gender-specific, gender identity, gender-sensitive, intersex, chair, themselves, parent 1, parent 2, ombuds, etc.

The form of communication can be considered a more or less gender-neutral parameter of discourse; as for the forms of discourse organization, we can take into account existing developments in the field of research into the characteristics of male and female strategizing. For example, D. Tannen identifies the following parameters that differentiate male communication style from female’s:

1. Conducting a conversation. For men, conversation is an exchange of information, while for women, it is interaction; women tend to put intimacy first in communication, men strive for independence; Women's attention to detail is a means of showing interest. Men are annoyed by women's attention to details.

2. The position of power. Men are more inclined to manipulate status in conversation, women more often intend to establish close relationships; women feel comfortable when talking in the presence of relatives or friends, and men – when they need to maintain their status in the team.

3. The field of communication. Most men feel comfortable speaking in public, women prefer private conversations.

4. Topics of discussion. Men are more likely to discuss football, politics, stock market affairs, etc. They prefer conversations about political relations rather than personal affairs, while women consider conversations about personal relationships to be the most relevant.

5. Listening style of men and women. Men's listening style is focused on the informational level of conversation, women's listening style – on relationships [8, p. 83–86].

References:

1. Bilokobyl'skyi Yu. (2022) Politychnyi Internet-dyskurs yak predmet linhvistychnoho doslidzhennia: definitysia ta kharakterni rysy [Political internet discourse as a subject of linguistic research: definition and characteristics]. *Aktualni problemy ukrainskoi linhvistyky: teoriia i praktyka*, vol. 45, pp. 129–143. Available at: <https://apultp.knu.ua/index.php/APULTP/article/view/134>

2. Dijk T. (2006) Discourse, context and cognition. *Discourse Studies*, vol. 8(1), pp. 159–177. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445606059565>

3. Jakobson R. (1960) Linguistics and Poetics. In T. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in Language* (pp. 350–377). Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

4. Karaulov Yu. *Yazykovaia lychnost: tekst, slovar, obraz myra* [Linguistic personality: text, vocabulary, worldview]. Nauka, 263 p.

5. Krahmer Emiel (1998) *Presupposition and Anaphora*. Stanford Univ Center for the Study, 250 p.

6. Dijk T. (2014) *Discourse and Knowledge: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 409 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107775404>

7. Foucault M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. Translated from the French by A. M. Sheridan Smith. Pantheon Books, New York, 254 p.

8. Tannen D. (1992) *You just don't understand*. Virago Press, 330 p.