

Міністерство освіти і науки України
Київський національний лінгвістичний університет
Кафедра англійської філології і філософії мови

Курсова робота

**Маркери статі в сучасному англійськомовному дискурсі:
прагмалінгвістичний підхід**

Студентки групи Мла 05-19
факультету германської філології і перекладу
денної форми навчання
спеціальності 035 філологія
спеціалізація Германські мови та літератури (переклад
включно) перша – англійська
Сус Вікторія Анатоліївна

Науковий керівник:
кандидат філологічних наук,
доцент
Чхетіані Тамара Дмитрівна

Національна шкала _____
Кількість балів _____
Оцінка ЄКТС _____

Київ 2023

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
Kyiv National Linguistic University
Department of English Philology and Philosophy of Language

Term Paper

**Sex markers in modern English discourse: A pragmatic
approach**

Victoria Sus

Group MLa 05-19

Germanic Philology and Translation Department

Research Adviser

Prof. T.D. Chhetiani

PhD (Linguistics)

Kyiv 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	2
1. Theoretical Framework	5
1.1 Pragmatics and Gender	5
1.2. Speech Acts and Gendered Language	6
1.3. Politeness Theory and Gendered Communication	7
1.4. Pragmatic Theories of Language and Communication	8
2. Overview of Sex Markers in Modern English Discourse	10
2.1. Types of sex markers in English discourse	10
2.2. Function and significance of sex markers in communication	11
2.3. Examples of sex markers in various contexts	13
2.4. Language and gender stereotypes	14
2.5. Gender bias in English discourse	15
2.6. Examples of gender stereotypes and bias in various contexts	16
3. Challenges and Opportunities in Addressing Sex Markers in English Discourse	17
3.1. Challenges in addressing sex markers in English discourse	17
3.2. Opportunities for promoting gender equity and diversity through language use	19
CONCLUSIONS	20
PE3IOME	21
LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIALS	22

INTRODUCTION

In modern English conversation, the use of sex markers has become a hot topic of debate. While some argue that gendered language is necessary for effective communication, others believe that it reinforces harmful stereotypes and excludes non-binary individuals. This thesis explores a pragmatic approach to the use of sex markers in modern English conversation. Pragmatics, as a branch of linguistics, studies the ways in which context and social factors influence the meaning of language. By examining the contexts in which sex markers are used and their impact on communication, this article seeks to illuminate the complex relationship between language, gender and social norms. The use of sex markers in modern English conversation has attracted great interest and debate among linguists, social scientists, and the general public. Sex markers refer to linguistic features such as pronouns, titles, and other gendered language that indicate the gender of the person being referred to. Although such signs have traditionally been used to distinguish between men and women, their potential to reinforce gender stereotypes and exclusionary practices has been increasingly explored. A pragmatic approach to this topic is particularly useful because it takes into account the social context in which language is used. Pragmatics is concerned with the ways in which language is used to achieve certain communicative goals and how social factors such as power, social identity, and culture shape those goals. By studying how gender signs are used in different social contexts, we gain an understanding of how these signs affect communication and promote the renewal of social norms and power relations.

This article uses various theoretical frameworks in pragmatics to examine the use of sex markers in contemporary English discourse. It begins by looking at some key debates about gender language and highlighting the ways in which sex markers are used to reinforce gender stereotypes and exclude non-binary individuals. The communicative functions of gender signs are then explored in different contexts such as personal relationships, work environments and media discourses.

Overall, this article aims to contribute to understanding the complex relationship between language, gender and social norms. With a pragmatic approach, we want to shed light on the role of language in shaping and reflecting social attitudes towards gender and promote more inclusive and effective communication practices in all areas of life.

The research objectives of this paper are the following:

1. To examine the concept of sex markers in modern English discourse and their role in shaping social attitudes towards gender.
2. To critically evaluate the arguments for and against the use of sex markers in modern English discourse and their impact on communication.
3. To explore the communicative functions of sex markers in different social contexts, such as personal relationships, workplace settings, and media discourse.
4. To analyze examples of sex markers in use and their impact on communication, considering the social context, speaker intention, and receiver interpretation.

The subject of this term paper is the use of sex markers in modern English discourse, especially from a pragmatic point of view. The term paper examines the communicative functions of sex markers in different social contexts, critically evaluates the arguments for and against their use, and analyzes their impact on communication. In addition, the paper explores the implications of these findings for language policy and language use in a diverse and inclusive society.

The object of this term paper is to advance the understanding of the complex relationship between language, gender and social norms and to promote more effective and inclusive communication practices in all areas of life. Examining the use of sex markers in modern English discourse from a pragmatic perspective, the

paper seeks to shed light on the ways in which language shapes and reflects social attitudes towards gender and encourages further research in the field.

1. Theoretical Framework

1.1 Pragmatics and Gender

Pragmatics and gender is a complex and multifaceted topic that has been studied by many scholars over the years. Gender differences in language use have been shown to be influenced by pragmatic factors such as context, social norms and expectations.

Holmes in “Women, men, and politeness” argues that gendered conversational styles are shaped by social expectations and norms. Women are often socially polite and gracious, which makes them use more indirect and gentle language. For example, women may use tag questions ("It's a beautiful day, isn't it?") or hedging language ("I was just wondering if...") to soften their requests or opinions. In contrast, men are often socialized to be confident and competitive, which causes them to use more direct and forceful language (Holmes, J. 1995). For example, men may use imperatives ("Give me the salt") or interruptions to assert dominance in a conversation.

Lakoff in “Language and woman's place” argues that language itself is inherently sexist and that women are linguistically disadvantaged in a culture that prefers masculine ways of speaking. She suggests that language reflects and reinforces gender roles, with masculine language associated with authority, rationality, and objectivity, and feminine language associated with emotionality, subjectivity, and weakness. Lakoff argues that women are pressured to adopt a more masculine style of speaking to be taken seriously in male-dominated spaces (Lakoff, R. 1975).

Cameron in “Feminism and linguistic theory” suggests that feminist linguistics can help to uncover and challenge the gender biases that are embedded in language. She emphasizes the importance of analyzing language use in its social and cultural context and argues that language reflects and reinforces power relations in society. Cameron also emphasizes the need to

challenge traditional gender norms and promote more inclusive and equal language use (Cameron, D. 1992).

Tannen (1990) emphasizes the importance of understanding gender differences in conversation styles to improve communication between genders. She suggests that women and men have different goals in conversation, women use language to build relationships and connections, while men use language to assert their dominance and status. Tannen argues that recognizing and respecting these differences can lead to more effective communication and better mutual understanding.

Coates in “Women, men and language: A sociolinguistic account of gender differences in language” examines the ways in which language use reflects and reinforces gender roles in society. She suggests that gender language use is shaped by social expectations and norms, and that men and women often use language to perform and reinforce their gender identity. Coates also argues that language can be used to challenge and undermine traditional gender norms, and that speakers use language creatively to resist and challenge gender stereotypes (Coates, J. 2013).

In general, pragmatics and gender studies have highlighted the ways in which language use can both reflect and reinforce gender inequality, as well as ways to promote gender equality and diversity through language use. This highlights the importance of understanding the social and cultural context in which language is used and the role of gender in shaping communication.

1.2. Speech Acts and Gendered Language

The use of speech acts and gendered language is an important area of research in the field of pragmatics, especially when it comes to the influence of gender on the understanding of language use and communication.

Lakoff in “Language and woman's place” argues that language reflects and reinforces gender stereotypes and inequalities, with women being linguistically disadvantaged in a male-dominated culture. She emphasizes how language is used to create and reinforce gender roles, such as "man" as a general term for all people, which erases the presence of women in language (Lakoff, R. 1975).

In “A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication” Maltz and Borker take a cultural approach to male-female miscommunication, arguing that the conversational styles of men and women differ because of their different socialization experiences. They suggest that women are socialized to be more cooperative and considerate of the needs of others, while men are socialized to be more competitive and assertive. These differences can lead to misunderstandings and conflicts in cross-gender communication (Maltz, D. N., & Borker, R. A. 1982).

Kotthoff in “Disagreement and concession in disputes: On the context sensitivity of preference structures” examines the role of disagreement and concession in disputes and argues that these speech acts are context-dependent and can be used to signal power and solidarity. She suggests that women often use concession as a strategy to avoid conflict and maintain social harmony, while men are more likely to use disagreement to assert their opinions and dominance (Kotthoff, H. 1993).

Overall, the study of speech acts and gendered language highlights the ways in which gender norms and cultural expectations influence language use and communication, and how these biases can be challenged and overturned through a better understanding of pragmatic principles

1.3. Politeness Theory and Gendered Communication

Politeness Theory, developed by sociolinguists Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson, posits that speakers use language to maintain social relationships and avoid face-threatening acts (FTAs). Holmes in “Women, men, and politeness”

applies this theory to gendered communication and argues that women tend to use more polite language than men in order to avoid FTAs and maintain relationships. For example, women can use grounding, indirectness and labeled questions to soften their speech and avoid being too assertive (Holmes, J. 1995).

Ide adds to the discussion of politeness by examining the role of formal forms and distinctiveness in linguistic politeness. Formal forms refer to the language used in formal situations, such as job interviews or meetings with superiors, while discernment refers to the ability to perceive social hierarchy and adjust language accordingly. Ide argues that understanding these aspects of linguistic politeness is important for both cross-cultural and gender communication (Ide, S. 1989).

Kádár and Haugh provide a comprehensive overview of politeness theory and its application in various contexts, including gender communication. They suggest that gender differences in politeness may be due to differences in socialization and cultural norms rather than to natural biological differences between men and women. They also point out that the ways in which politeness is expressed can vary between cultures and languages (Kádár, D. Z., & Haugh, M. 2013).

Overall, the application of politeness theory to gendered communication highlights the ways in which language is used to maintain social relationships and avoid FTAs. Women may be more likely to use polite language in order to navigate social situations and maintain relationships, while men may be more likely to use language to assert status and negotiate. Understanding these patterns of gendered language use can provide insights into the dynamics of modern English discourse and the ways in which language reinforces and challenges traditional gender roles.

1.4. Pragmatic Theories of Language and Communication

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies language use in context. It aims to understand how people use language to convey meanings beyond the literal interpretation of words. In the context of sex markers in modern English discourse,

pragmatic theories provide a framework for analyzing how language use reinforces or challenges gender stereotypes and biases.

One prominent theory of pragmatics is relevance theory developed by Sperber and Wilson in “Relevance: Communication and cognition”. This suggests that communication is driven by the desire to convey important information to the listener. According to this theory, speakers assume that their listeners will tend to process and interpret their utterances in ways that maximize meaning. In the context of sex markers, relevance theory can help identify how speakers use gendered language to convey relevant information about themselves or their audience (Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. 1995).

Another influential theory in pragmatics is Grice's theory of discourse implication ("Logic and conversation"). This indicates that speakers convey meaning not only through the literal meaning of their words, but also through implicit meanings that depend on the conversational context. Grice identifies four conversational maxims that speakers follow when conveying implications: the maxim of quantity (say no more or less than needed), quality (be truthful), relation (be relevant), and manner (be clear and concise). In analyzing sex markers in discourse, Grice's theory can help identify how speakers use gendered language to convey implicatures that reinforce or challenge gender stereotypes and biases (Grice, H. P. 1975).

Austin's theory of speech acts in “How to do things with words” (1962) is also relevant to the study of sex markers in discourse. It suggests that language use is not only descriptive but also performative, meaning that utterances can have the power to create new social realities or reinforce existing ones. In the context of sex markers, Austin's theory can help identify how language use reinforces or challenges gender norms and expectations, and how it can be used to promote gender equity and diversity (Austin, J. L. 1962).

Finally, the grounding theory of Clark and Brennan (1991) is relevant to the study of sex markers in discourse. This indicates that successful communication depends on the ability of speakers and listeners to establish a common basis of knowledge, beliefs and assumptions. In the context of sex markers, this theory can help identify how speakers use gendered language to establish or challenge shared assumptions about gender roles and expectations, and how they can promote greater understanding and acceptance of diverse gender identities and expressions (Clark, H. H., & Brennan, S. E. 1991).

2. Overview of Sex Markers in Modern English Discourse

2.1. Types of sex markers in English discourse

Sex markers refer to linguistic features or cues that are used to indicate a person's sex or gender identity in discourse. These markers can be explicit or implicit and can include a range of linguistic features such as pronouns, honorifics, titles, job descriptions, and clothing and appearance descriptors. The use of sex markers is an important aspect of language use because it reflects and reinforces cultural norms and social expectations surrounding gender roles and identities.

Sex markers are linguistic features that are used to refer to or distinguish between males and females in discourse. They can be explicit or implicit, and may include words, phrases, or grammatical structures.

According to Eckert and McConnell-Ginet "Language and Gender", sex markers can be divided into two categories: lexical markers and grammatical markers. Lexical markers are specific words related to males or females, such as "man" and "woman" (Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. 2013). Grammatical markers, on the other hand, are grammatical features that distinguish between masculine and feminine references, such as pronouns and inflections.

In "Language and woman's place" Lakoff also identified different types of sex markers, including lexical items that carry connotations of dominance or

subordination, and grammatical structures that reinforce gender roles and stereotypes. For example, Lakoff notes that women are more likely to use tag questions (such as "It's hot today, isn't it?") and thoughtful language that can convey uncertainty or respect (Lakoff, R. 1975).

Tannen (1990) focuses on the differences between the communication styles of men and women and states that certain linguistic features can function as sex markers in conversation. For example, Tannen identifies "rapport talk" as a communication style more often used by women that focuses on building rapport and bonding. "Report talk," on the other hand, is a more direct and information-oriented style of communication that is associated with men.

In "Feminist critical discourse analysis: Articulating a feminist discourse praxis" Lazar emphasizes the importance of analyzing sex markers from a feminist perspective and argues that language can be used to reinforce or challenge gender inequality. Feminist critical discourse analysis seeks to reveal how language is used to maintain power imbalances between men and women and to identify opportunities for resistance and change (Lazar, M. M. 2005).

Overall, the study of sex markers in English discourse is important for understanding how language reflects and reinforces gender roles and stereotypes, and for determining how to promote more inclusive and egalitarian communication practices.

2.2. Function and significance of sex markers in communication

Sex markers in communication refer to linguistic features or expressions that indicate the gender of the speaker or the person being referred to in discourse. The function and significance of sex markers in communication have been widely studied in sociolinguistics and gender studies.

According to West and Zimmerman (1987), gender is not a fixed identity, but a social construction made in everyday communication through linguistic and non-linguistic practices. Sex markers in communication perform several functions and have a significant impact on social interaction. One of the main functions of sex markers is to signal gender identity, which in turn influences the social roles and expectations associated with that gender. For example, the use of feminine pronouns and gendered job titles may signal that a person is female and therefore expected to perform certain roles and behaviors that are considered appropriate for women.

Sex markers also serve to reinforce gender norms and stereotypes. Linguistic features such as intonation, vocabulary, and grammar have been shown to vary by gender, leading to the notion that men and women speak differently. These perceptions can reinforce gender stereotypes and expectations, such as the idea that women are more emotional and nurturing, while men are more rational and persuasive.

Additionally, sex markers can create and maintain gender hierarchies. Language and communication play a crucial role in the negotiation of power dynamics between individuals and groups. Sex markers can be used to reinforce dominance or subordination in social interactions. For example, the use of diminutive forms of address or derogatory language can be used to slander or dismiss someone of lower social status, such as a woman or a subordinate.

Cameron (2007) further argues that the use of sex markers in communication can have important social consequences because they can reinforce or challenge existing gender roles and power structures (Cameron, D. 2007). For example, the use of gender-neutral language in certain contexts can challenge the dominant male-centric discourse and promote gender equality. On the other hand, excessive use of gendered language can reinforce traditional gender stereotypes and marginalize people who don't conform to them.

Furthermore, Holmes in “Women, men, and politeness” emphasizes the importance of politeness strategies when using sex markers in communication. She argues that politeness is a fundamental aspect of social interaction and that sex markers can be used to express social distance and respect. For example, speaking by surname or using formal titles can indicate respect and social hierarchy, while using first names can indicate familiarity and informality (Holmes, J. 1995).

In summary, the function and significance of sex markers in communication are complex and multifaceted. They serve as a way of signaling gender identity and social roles, reinforcing gender norms and stereotypes, conveying social meanings and power relations, and expressing politeness.

2.3. Examples of sex markers in various contexts

Sex markers can be found in different contexts, and their use can reinforce gender stereotypes and power relations. According to Lakoff “Language and woman's place”, women often use language that is more respectful and polite language than men, which can be considered as a sex marker (Lakoff, R. 1975). Tannen (1990) notes that men often interrupt women more frequently than women interrupt men, which can also be a sex marker in conversation.

In the workplace, job titles and professional expressions can also be gendered, as argued by Holmes (1995). Words like "manager" and "engineer" are often associated with men, while words like "secretary" and "nurse" are often associated with women. In some cases, gender-neutral job titles, such as "administrator" or "technician," are used to avoid perpetuating gender stereotypes (Holmes, J. 1995).

Advertisements are another context where sex markers are often used. As noted by Lakoff, advertisements often rely on gender stereotypes and use language and images that appeal to a particular gender (Lakoff, R. 1975). Advertisements for household cleaners are often aimed at women, while advertisements for cars or tools

are often aimed at men. This use of sex markers reinforces traditional gender roles and expectations.

Sex markers can also be non-verbal cues in interpersonal communication, as argued by Tannen (1990). Women may use a higher pitch or more thoughtful language to express submission or respect, while men may use a lower pitch or more assertive language to express dominance or authority. These nonverbal cues may be subtle, but they can have a significant impact on how gender is perceived and constructed in communication.

2.4. Language and gender stereotypes

Language and gender stereotypes are prevalent in modern English discourse and are often used to reinforce and maintain power relations between the sexes. According to Kramarae and Spender “Routledge International Encyclopedia of Women: Global Women's Issues and Knowledge”, gender stereotypes are preconceptions about the characteristics, roles and behaviors that are associated with men and women. These beliefs are often reflected in the language that is used to describe and interact with individuals of different genders (Kramarae, C., & Spender, D. 2000).

For example, the use of gendered language in the workplace can perpetuate gender stereotypes and contribute to the marginalization of women. Kramarae in “Women and Men Speaking: Frameworks for Analysis” points out that women are often portrayed using language that emphasizes their physical appearance and personal characteristics rather than their professional achievements. This can lead to the perception that women are less competent and less qualified for leadership positions than their male counterparts (Kramarae, C. 1981).

Similarly, Sunderland in “Gendered Discourses” emphasizes the use of sexual language in media representations of men and women. Women are often portrayed using language that emphasizes their emotional and nurturing qualities, while men

are portrayed as strong, independent and rational. These stereotypes can reinforce traditional gender roles and expectations and limit opportunities for those who don't conform to these norms (Sunderland J. 2004).

Language and gender stereotypes can also be perpetuated through the use of gendered pronouns and titles. For example, the use of "he" as a generic pronoun to refer to both men and women can perpetuate the notion that men are the default and women are the exception. This can contribute to the marginalization of women in many contexts, including academia, politics and the workplace.

2.5. Gender bias in English discourse

In English discourse, gender bias refers to the ways in which language is used to reinforce gender stereotypes and maintain power imbalances between men and women. Gender bias in English discourse can take many forms, including the use of gendered terms, gendered job titles, and the unequal distribution of power in language use. Language can be used to perpetuate gender stereotypes and reinforce social expectations and norms about gender roles.

The argument of Maltz and Borker ("A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication") emphasizes the influence of cultural norms and expectations on language use and its consequences for communication between men and women. Their analysis shows that gender bias in conversation is not simply a matter of individual choices or preferences, but rather a reflection of broader cultural and social factors that shape the way men and women use language. Their research also indicates that language use can reflect and reinforce gender power imbalances, particularly in terms of status and dominance. Men may use language to assert their power and authority, while women may use language to show their willingness to cooperate and build relationships. These differences in communication styles can lead to misunderstandings and even conflicts in certain contexts (Maltz, D. N., & Borker, R. A. 1982).

Similarly, O'Barr and Atkins in "Women's language or powerless language?" argue that women's language is often perceived as "powerless" or "less authoritative" compared to men's language. This perception is based on gender bias and stereotypes that associate power and authority with masculinity. As a result, women's language is often sidelined or ignored in professional and academic settings, resulting in a lack of representation and recognition of women's contributions (O'Barr, W. M., & Atkins, B. K. 1980).

Spender in "Man Made Language" also emphasizes gender bias in language use, particularly in how language is used to reinforce gender roles and expectations. She argues that language is not a neutral tool but is shaped by cultural and social forces that reflect and reinforce male-female power imbalances. Exploring the ways in which language is used to reinforce gender stereotypes and prejudices, Spender suggests that language can be a site of resistance and change (Spender, D. 1980).

Together, these sources show the complexity of gender biases in English conversation and the importance of understanding the cultural and social factors that influence language use. By recognizing and challenging gender bias in discourse, we can work towards a more just and inclusive society that values and recognizes the contributions of all people, regardless of gender.

2.6. Examples of gender stereotypes and bias in various contexts

Gender stereotypes and biases can be found in various contexts, from education to the media, workplace, politics, and social interactions. These stereotypes and biases not only perpetuate harmful gender norms but also create unequal opportunities and power imbalances between men and women.

Education: In some English-speaking countries, girls are encouraged to study "soft" subjects such as English and art, while boys are encouraged to study "hard" subjects such as math and science. This reinforces the stereotype that girls are not as

competent as boys in STEM fields and can discourage girls from pursuing careers in these fields.

Media: Advertisements and TV shows often portray women in stereotypical roles such as housekeepers or sex objects. Men are often portrayed as dominant and powerful, reinforcing the idea that men are the natural leaders of society.

Workplace: Women are often paid less than men for the same work and can be hindered by gender bias. Job interviews and performance reviews can also be biased against women, as male managers perceive women as less competent and less committed than men.

Politics: Sexist remarks and gender-based insults are often made against women in political discourse, which can undermine their authority and legitimacy. Female politicians may also be criticized for their appearance or clothing, which may distract from their political positions and qualifications.

Social interactions: Men and women are often expected to behave differently in social situations. For example, women can be expected to be more emotional and nurturing, while men are more assertive and competitive. These expectations can lead to misunderstandings and misunderstandings between the genders.

Furthermore, gender stereotypes and prejudices are not limited to binary gender identities. Transgender and non-binary people also face discrimination and exclusion based on their gender identity and are often subject to harassment and violence.

3. Challenges and Opportunities in Addressing Sex Markers in English Discourse

3.1. Challenges in addressing sex markers in English discourse

The use of sex markers in English discourse raises a number of challenges that must be addressed when adopting a pragmatic approach. One of the biggest

challenges is the inherent gender bias that often occurs in the use of language, especially when it comes to the representation of women. This bias can manifest itself in many ways, including the use of sexist language, the use of gender stereotypes, and the reinforcement of gender norms and expectations. (Mills, 2014)

Another challenge is the ambiguity of sex markers in English discourse, especially when it comes to gender-neutral language. Some argue that using gender-neutral language can help reduce gender bias in language use, while others argue that it can also hide important information about gender and identity. (Pauwels, 2010)

In addition, the use of sex markers in English discourse can also be influenced by cultural and social factors, such as the historical and cultural context in which certain words and expressions are used. This can lead to differences in the interpretation and use of sex markers across different cultures and communities, making it difficult to establish general guidelines for their use. (Lazar, 2005)

In addition, the increased use of social media and other digital platforms has created new challenges for dealing with gender markers in English conversation. The fast and informal nature of online communication can make it difficult to monitor and regulate language use, leading to the spread of problematic and discriminatory language.

Finally, there is also the issue of language development and change, which over time can affect the use and meaning of gender markers in English discourse over time. As such, any pragmatic approach to addressing sex markers in English discourse needs to be flexible and adaptable to changing social and linguistic contexts.

3.2. Opportunities for promoting gender equity and diversity through language use

Language use can play an important role in promoting gender equality and diversity in different contexts. Talbot in “Language and Gender: An Introduction” suggests that promoting inclusive language can create opportunities for gender equality and diversity by challenging gender stereotypes and encouraging inclusion. For example, using gender-neutral language can help reduce the gender binary and encourage the inclusion of non-binary and gender non-binary individuals (Talbot, M. 2010).

In addition, Litosseliti in “Using focus groups in research” notes that focus groups can be used as a tool to explore language use and promote gender equality and diversity by bringing together different perspectives and encouraging participants to reflect on their own language use and biases (Litosseliti, L. 2014).

Using inclusive language in the workplace can promote gender equality and diversity by reducing gender bias in job descriptions, performance appraisals and workplace communication. It can also create a more comfortable and inclusive environment for diverse employees. In the media, language that challenges gender stereotypes and promotes diversity can create more accurate and representative images of gender and encourage greater participation.

Overall, promoting gender equality and diversity through language requires a commitment to inclusive language and a willingness to challenge gender stereotypes and prejudices. It also requires constant reflection and evaluation of language use to ensure inclusion and diversity are promoted.

CONCLUSIONS

In summary, the study of sex markers in modern English discourse from a pragmatic approach, involves analyzing how language is used to construct and convey gender identity and gendered power dynamics. Through the lens of pragmatic theories of language and communication, we explored the ways in which speech acts, gendered language, and politeness strategies reflect and reinforce social norms and gender roles. The reviewed literature points out that women and men often have different conversational styles and language use due to cultural and social expectations related to gender. Furthermore, gendered communication is influenced by the preference structures that exist in different discourse communities. Finally, pragmatic approaches to gender and language offer insights into how language is used to construct and reflect gender identity, social roles and power dynamics in modern English discourse. As such, understanding these issues can affect social justice, equality and inclusivity in a communication context.

РЕЗЮМЕ

Курсова робота на тему: Маркери статі в сучасному англійському дискурсі: Прагматичний підхід.

Виконала – Сус Вікторія Анатоліївна

Курсова робота складається зі вступу, трьох розділів, висновку, резюме та списку використаних джерел. У першому розділі «Теоретичні основи» розглянуто декілька теоретичних аспектів: прагматика і гендер, мовленнєві акти та гендерна мова, теорія ввічливості та гендерна комунікація, прагматичні теорії мови та комунікації. У другому розділі «Огляд маркерів статі в сучасному англійському дискурсі» представлена інформація про типи маркерів статі в англійському дискурсі, функції та значення маркерів статі в комунікації, приклади маркерів статі в різних контекстах, мовні та гендерні стереотипи, гендерні упередження в англійському дискурсі, приклади гендерних стереотипів та упереджень в різних контекстах. У третьому розділі «Проблеми та можливості у вивченні маркерів статі в англійському дискурсі» розглянуто два напрямки цієї теми: проблеми вживання маркерів статі в англійському дискурсі, можливості сприяння гендерній рівності та розмаїттю за допомогою мовних засобів.

У даній курсовій роботі всього:

Сторінок – 22;

Список використаних джерел: 24.

LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIALS

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
2. Cameron, D. (1992). *Feminism and linguistic theory*. Palgrave Macmillan.
3. Cameron, D. (2007). *The Myth of Mars and Venus: Do Men and Women Really Speak Different Languages?*. Oxford University Press.
4. Clark, H. H., & Brennan, S. E. (1991). "Grounding in communication." In L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine, & S. D. Teasley (Eds.), *Perspectives on socially shared cognition* (pp. 127-149). American Psychological Association.
5. Coates, J. (2013). *Women, men and language: A sociolinguistic account of gender differences in language*. Routledge.
6. Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2013). *Language and Gender*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Grice, H. P. (1975). "Logic and conversation." In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts* (pp. 41-58). Academic Press.
8. Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, men, and politeness*. Longman.
9. Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua-Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 8(2-3), 223-248.
10. Kádár, D. Z., & Haugh, M. (2013). *Understanding politeness*. Cambridge University Press.
11. Kotthoff, H. (1993). Disagreement and concession in disputes: On the context sensitivity of preference structures. *Language in Society*, 22(2), 193-216.
12. Kramarae, C. (1981). *Women and Men Speaking: Frameworks for Analysis*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.
13. Kramarae, C., & Spender, D. (2000). *Routledge International Encyclopedia of Women: Global Women's Issues and Knowledge*. Routledge.
14. Lakoff, R. (1975). "Language and woman's place." *Language in Society*, 2(1), 45-80.

- 15.Lazar, M. M. (2005). "Feminist critical discourse analysis: Articulating a feminist discourse praxis." *Critical Discourse Studies*, 2(2), 141-164.
- 16.Litosseliti, L. (2014). *Using focus groups in research*. A&C Black...
- 17.Maltz, D. N., & Borker, R. A. (1982). A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. In J. J. Gumperz (Ed.), *Language and social identity* (pp. 196-216). Cambridge University Press.
- 18.Mills, S. (2014). *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge University Press.
- 19.O'Barr, W. M., & Atkins, B. K. (1980). "Women's language or powerless language?" In S. McConnell-Ginet, R. Borker, & N. Furman (Eds.), *Women and language in literature and society* (pp. 93-110). Praeger.
- 20.Pauwels, A. (2010). "Sexism and gender stereotyping in the Flemish press." In M. Mills & K. Mullany (Eds.), *Language, Gender and Feminism: Theory, Methodology and Practice* (pp. 73-87). Routledge.
- 21.Spender, D. (1980). *Man Made Language*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- 22.Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and cognition* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.
- 23.Sunderland, J. (2004). *Gendered Discourses*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- 24.Talbot, M. (2010). *Language and Gender: An Introduction*. Polity.