

## GENDER SETERIOTYPES IN NATIONAL CULTURE

Kodirova Mahira

Andijan State University of Foreign Languages

2nd year graduate student of the Faculty of Foreign Language and Literature

### Abstract:

The paper explores gender stereotypes as one of the most important aspects of social and cultural life of society. The opposition «men's» - «women's» is fundamental to human culture, and there are numerous proofs to it originating in ancient philosophical ideas of the world. The purpose of this publication is studying an ethnic component of gender stereotypes in language consciousness of carriers of the German and Adyghe cultures. The comparative - typological method is used to identify and to analyze national cultural specifics of gender stereotypes in the German and Adyghe language consciousness. An attempt is undertaken for the first time to reveal gender stereotypes in language consciousness of carriers of the cultures under study. The general components and ethnic component of gender stereotypes are defined, as well as national and cultural specifics of language consciousness of Germans and Adyghe are detected that promotes accumulation of data on ethnocultural specifics of language consciousness of people of the world. Gender stereotypes in language consciousness of representatives of various ethnoses demonstrate the original cultural specifics which are displayed in cross-cultural communication. The successful solution of problems of optimization of communication requires studying national and cultural specifics of language consciousness, ethnic and gender stereotypes.

**Keywords:** Gender stereotype, language consciousness, masculinity, femininity, lingual culture, language personality, phraseological units, picture.

Gender Differences in Personality, Values, and Emotions Across Cultures The upsurge of interest in the role of culture in psychology has allowed researchers to examine whether existing theories have universal applicability and also to document the extent to which a given gender difference is found not only in Western cultures but in other cultural settings. In terms of personality traits, Costa et al. (2001) published the results of secondary data analyses from 26 cultures using the NEO-PI-R personality inventory (see also McCrae et al., 2005). They found, as



expected, that women were generally higher than men in neuroticism, agreeableness, warmth, and openness to feelings, whereas men were generally higher than women in assertiveness and openness to ideas. However, they also found that, contrary to expectations, these gender differences were variable across cultures and were in fact stronger in European and American cultures than in African and Asian ones. As Costa et al. (2001) put it, The social role model would have hypothesized that gender differences would be attenuated in progressive countries, when in fact they are magnified. Evolutionary theory also appears to be unable to account for this pattern; evolved species-wide characteristics ought to be uniform across cultures. (p. 329) Independent of Costa et al. (2001), Schwartz and Rubel (2005) similarly observed, in a comprehensive cross-cultural study of values with 127 samples from 70 different countries, that men value power, achievement, and self-direction more than women do. Women, in contrast, value benevolence and universalism more than men do. Furthermore, these gender differences were variable across cultures, being stronger in countries where gender inequality is reduced. Schwartz and Rubel (2005) stated, “These findings contradict the idea that gender equality reduces gender differences” (p. 1023). In their review of emotion research, Niedenthal et al. (2006) also highlighted the fact that sex differences are more pronounced in Western cultures. They cited the study by Fischer and Manstead (2000) in particular as showing, among participants from 37 countries, that sex differences in emotional reactions were greater, not smaller, in Western individualistic countries compared with more traditional, collectivistic countries. These studies make a fundamental contribution by documenting worldwide patterns of gender differences. However, the reasons for the variability in these gender differences across cultures are not clear. Researchers usually rely on evolutionary theory (e.g., Buss, 1996) and social role theory (e.g., Eagly, 1987; Eagly, Wood, & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2004) to speculate about the meaning of their results. Yet, it is clear that neither of these major theoretical frameworks predicted the findings that have been obtained. Thus, as Schwartz and Rubel (2005) proposed, progress now must come from efforts at generating and testing explanations for cross-cultural variations in gender differences. The present research represents a step in the direction of explaining why gender differences are observed in some cultural settings but not in others. Although our data assess a limited number of countries, we move beyond descriptive findings to



experimentally test a new theoretical explanation of gender differences that can account for the variation of those differences across cultures. The proposed explanation is intended to complement existing models rather than replace them. It blends and integrates ideas derived from the model of self-construal developed by Cross and Madson (1997), self-categorization theory (Turner & Onorato, 1999), social comparison theory (Festinger, 1954), and Hofstede's (1980, 2001) work on the cultural dimension of power distance. We put forward three central propositions about the role of self-construal, social comparison, and power distance, respectively, and show how they can explain the variability in gender differences across cultures. The Self Across Cultures and Gender Following Cross and Madson (1997), our first proposition is that gender differences in self-construals can explain gender differences in other important psychological domains (i.e., motivation, emotion, personality, values, etc.). The concept of self-construal is distinct from the concept of group stereotype (or gender stereotype) and refers to the sense of self that is psychologically meaningful for people (Hardin, Leong, & Bhagwat, 2004). Interest in self-construal has been motivated in part by the realization that the self is defined in fundamentally different ways across cultures (Triandis, 1989). Markus and Kitayama (1991) provided an influential conceptualization by arguing for a distinction between independent (agency) and interdependent (relational) construals of the self. As Sedikides, Gaertner, and Toguchi (2003) noted, "In individualistic cultures, the relevant dimension is agency, defined as concern with personal effectiveness and social dominance. In collectivistic cultures, however, the relevant dimension is communion, defined as a concern with personal integration and social connection" (p. 63). The dimensions of agency and communion have been also used to characterize gender differences (see Judd, James-Hawkins, Yzerbyt, & Kashima, 2005). Indeed, extending the cultural thesis of Markus and Kitayama (1991) to the domain of gender, Cross and Madson (1997) proposed that one of the most basic gender differences is in the self-concept, with women being more likely than men to develop an interdependent or relational self-construal, whereas men are more likely than women to develop an independent or agentic self-construal. Although more research is needed, the evidence so far confirms the thesis that gender differences in various domains can be explained by individual differences in self-construal (see A. P. Buunk, 2005; Cross, Morris, & Gore, 2002; Gabriel & Gardner, 1999; Kimmelmeier & Oyserman, 2001; Maddux



& Brewer, 2005). For example, Gardner, Gabriel, and Lee (1999) demonstrated the causal impact of self-construal on values, as measured by the instrument developed by Schwartz (1992). Participants randomly assigned to a condition in which they were led to construe the self in an interdependent manner were found to value benevolence and universalism more than those led to construe the self in an independent manner. The reverse was the case for the values of power, achievement, and self-direction. Thus, there is direct evidence to suggest that gender differences in values (i.e., Schwartz & Rubel, 2005) can be explained by gender differences in self-construals (rather than the other way around).

We compared perceived cultural stereotypes of diverse groups varying by gender and ethnicity. Using a free-response procedure, we asked 627 U.S. undergraduates to generate 10 attributes for 1 of 17 groups: Asian Americans, Blacks, Latinos, Middle Eastern Americans, or Whites; men or women; or 10 gender-by-ethnic groups (e.g., Black men or Latina women). Based on intersectionality theory and social dominance theory, we developed and tested three hypotheses. First, consistent with the intersectionality hypothesis, gender-by-ethnic stereotypes contained unique elements that were not the result of adding gender stereotypes to ethnic stereotypes. Second, in support of an ethnicity hypothesis, stereotypes of ethnic groups were generally more similar to stereotypes of the men than of the women in each group. Third, a gender hypothesis postulated that stereotypes of men and women will be most similar to stereotypes of White men and White women, less similar to ethnic minority men and ethnic minority women, and least similar to Black men and Black women. This hypothesis was confirmed for target women, but results for target men were mixed. Collectively, our results contribute to research, theory, and practice by demonstrating that ethnic and gender stereotypes are complex and that the intersections of these social categories produce meaningful differences in the way groups are perceived.

### **GENDER STEREOTYPES**

Gender stereotypes are often described as the roles that the sexes fulfill in the culture. These are the beliefs that people have about the characteristics and behavior of males and females. These stereotypes vary over culture and time depending upon the beliefs and traditions of the respective society.



## Where do gender stereotypes come from?

These stereotypes are complex and originate from local culture and traditions. These are often developed at the early stages of human life when children learn about the differences between boys and girls in their academic era. These develop quickly during pre-school years and reach a high level later by broadening their concept to include sports, school subjects, and personality traits.

Children learn what constitutes male and female behavior from their family & friends, media, educational and religious institutions. These stereotypes grow powerfully in a person's mind when young people are exposed to instructions about how boys and girls should look, behave and play. Even the choices children make are often a result of these stereotypes, for example, US research considered pink as a feminine color and blue as masculine. Thus, these stereotypes have a controlling impact on children's mental growth.

These stereotypes also affect the choices concerning play activities or selecting toys categorizing sports as masculine and indoor games to be feminine. Boys at this age hold more rigid stereotypes than girls and use these stereotypes to make inferences about others. They often make judgments according to the stereotypic perception and expectations they have for other people.

That's how these socially accepted and unconscious concepts begin to develop in a person's mind during early childhood.

## Types of Gender Stereotypes

Gender stereotypes depend upon the mindset people have for both sexes and often cause unfair and unequal treatment because of a person's gender.

Four basic types of gender stereotypes are;

*Personality traits*; Women are often considered to be emotional, weak, shy, and caring. Whereas, men are represented as Bold, aggressive, and self-confident. Women are often given fewer decision-making opportunities because of such stereotypes.

*Domestic behaviors*; these stereotypes have described women to be a homemaker and in need of protection. While men are considered to be strong, rational, and career-driven. Household chores and pampering children are labeled to be the responsibilities of women whereas, bringing facilities home is the primary job of men.



*Occupations*; assumptions related to the career label nursing and teaching as female occupations whereas, doctors and engineers are marked to be males.

*Appearance*; socially approved stereotypes direct women to be thin and graceful and men to be tall and muscular.

### **Stereotyped expectations**

Stereotype expectations are different for both sexes in different communities. In some way, the common of all cast men as more agentic, powerful, strong, and career-oriented whereas women are represented to be caring, polite, emotional, and supportive. These stereotypes led to the concept of men as a primary breadwinner and women as a homemaker depending upon the traditions of the society.

While in various communities the roles have changed and women are also working alongside men at different platforms. Studies have shown that women comprise 47% of the US labor market and 59% of American women work outside the home. This changed gender attitude makes it easier and acceptable for society to see women have careers than in the past. In addition, the cultural belief of making men more socially valued is also demolished by this changed gender role.

### **Referances**

1. Taylor, S. E. (1981). A categorization approach to stereotyping. In D. Hamilton (Ed.), *Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior* (pp. 83-114). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. Taylor, S. E., & Crocker, J. (1981). Schematic bases of social information processing. In E. T. Higgins, C. P. Herman, & M P. Zanna (Eds.), *Social cognition: The Ontario symposium* (Vol. 1, pp. 89-134). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. Taylor, S. E., Fiske, S. T., Etcoff, N. L., & Ruderman, A. J. (1978). Categorical and contextual bases of person memory and stereotyping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 778-793. Taynor, J., & Deaux, K.. (1973). When women are more deserving than men: Equity, attribution, and perceived sex differences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 28, 360-367. Triandis, H. C. (1977). *Interpersonal behavior*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole. Upshaw, H. S. (1969). The personal reference scale: An approach to social judgment. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 4, 315-371. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. (1980). *Perspectives on working women: A databook* (Bulletin 2080).



Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. Weber, M. (1947). The theory of social and economic organization. Glencoe, IL: Free Press. Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1982). Measuring sex stereotypes: A thirty-nation study. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. Zuckerman, M. (1979). Attribution of success and failure revisited, or: The motivational bias is alive and well in attribution theory. *Journal of Personality*, 47, 245-287. Received March 28, 1983 Revision received November 9, 1983 *New Journal on Aging: Cal*

