



**ATTEMPTS AT REFORMING THE ENGLISH
LANGUAGE:
ORIGINAL GOALS AND LATEST OUTCOMES**

doi: 10.34142/astraea.2020.1.2.01



DUDOLADOVA Alyona, DUDOLADOVA Olga

Alyona Dudoladova,
Candidate of Science in Pedagogy, Associate Professor,
V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University,
Ukraine. E-mail: sun2122@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7827-4701>

Olga Dudoladova,
Candidate of Science in Linguistics, Associate Professor,
V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University,
Ukraine. E-mail: sun2120@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5654-6887>



ABSTRACT

Human speech exists as a special type of activity - clearly structured, organized, regulated by the society we live in, its norms and traditions. However, communication being determined by social relations still leaves the individual some space for personal choice of certain speech acts and language units in accordance with his/her previous experience, which is undoubtedly based on the individual picture of the world created in the brain through diverse interaction with the world. Language and culture (namely: a set of traditions, ideas, habits, knowledge and rules of conduct imbedded in language units) are closely interrelated allowing to transfer experience from one generation to another, while influencing people's attitudes to things, facts, events, and reinforcing certain stereotypes. This allowed activists to start a language reform in the 70s of the twentieth century. First, feminists proclaimed the need for linguistic change in women's nominations, then this trend became national in many countries around the world and affected members of other minorities. Currently, this

trend is called social correctness, because it fights for well-being of all members of society. The proposed changes were considered socially and culturally desirable and useful due to the assumption that changes in people's language would lead to changes in their attitude to certain phenomena and life in general. Given the recent events in the United States, it should be noted that the current interest in "politically correct" language is not declining, but continues to gain momentum. It seems interesting to trace the socio-cultural origins and principles of this phenomenon, as well as its linguistic reflection.

Keywords: biased language, female, male, feminist critique of the language, non-sexist alternatives, political correctness.

АНОТАЦІЯ

Спроби реформування англійської мови: оригінальні цілі й останні результати

Людське мовлення існує як особливий вид діяльності – чітко структурований, організований, впорядкований, що регулюється суспільством, у якому ми живемо, його нормами та традиціями. Проте детермінованість комунікації суспільними відносинами залишає індивідові певний простір для особистого вибору тих чи інших мовленнєвих актів та мовних одиниць у відповідності до його попереднього досвіду, який безперечно базується на індивідуальній картині світу, створеній у мозку завдяки багатоманітній взаємодії з оточуючим світом. Саме соціальні відносини і є своєрідною засадою комунікативної діяльності будь-якого представника цього суспільства. Мова та культура (а саме: сукупність традицій, уявлень, звичок, знань та правил поведінки, що зафіксовані у значеннях мовних одиниць) нерозривно пов'язані та дозволяють передавати досвід від однієї генерації до іншої, закріплюючи й певні стереотипи. Отже, здатність мови впливати на ставлення людей до речей, фактів, подій цілком зрозуміла, що й дозволило активістам запропонувати мовну реформу у 70-і роках ХХ століття. Спочатку феміністки проголосили необхідність мовних змін у жіночих номінаціях, потім ця течія стала загальнонаціональною у багатьох країнах світу і торкнулася представників інших меншин, отримавши назву політичної коректності. Наразі цю течію називають соціальною коректністю, оскільки вона опікується злагодою усіх

членів суспільства. Запропоновані зміни вважалися соціально та культурно бажаними й корисними через припущення, що зміни в мові людей призведуть до змін у їхньому ставленні до певних явищ та життя в цілому. Зважаючи на останні події у Сполучених Штатах Америки, слід зауважити, що сучасний інтерес до “політично коректної” мови не вщухає, а й далі набирає обертів. Цікавим видається прослідити соціо-культурні витоки та засади цього явища, а також його лінгвістичне відображення.

Ключові слова: антисексистські альтернативи, жіноче, чоловіче, політична коректність, упередженість мови, феміністська критика мови.

INTRODUCTION

In the value system of most ethnocultural traditions all over the world, consideration of masculinity and femininity as polar principles that make up a binary opposition creates a favorable basis for their metaphorical rethinking not only in terms of difference, but also in terms of hierarchy in a great number of binary oppositions that constitute the basic categories of almost all known philosophical systems: good – evil, light – darkness, mind – body, spirit – matter, logic – emotion, activity – passivity, power – submission, man – woman, where the left members united around the basic essence of “man” are associated with a positive value and are hierarchically superior to the right ones, united around the basic essence of “woman” and associated with a negative value.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The above-mentioned concepts have attracted attention of numerous thinkers since the times immemorial, however, it was feminists who suggested certain steps to change the status quo.

The feminist language reform has undergone several stages in the past decades and each of them has been extensively covered by home and foreign scientists. There are a number of studies that show close connection between gender and social status (as well as status-marked nominations) where, as numerous surveys show (M. Hellinger, 2001; Ch. Kramarae, 1985; D. Cameron, 1999; et al.), the higher degree of prestige is associated mainly with male referents in the English-speaking discourse. The researchers revealed the underlying social stereotypes and practices by



distinguishing “female” and “male” nominations and antecedents and by comparing their share in the English discourse of the second half of XX century.

Numerous articles and theses have been devoted to understanding the interrelation of mind and language, as well. In the structuring of sociocultural categories of masculinity and femininity there are universal principles of categorization (Lakoff G., 1990, p. 95-96), in particular: the “principle of centrality” (centricity), where only the main central members (associated with masculinity) of the category are distinguished, while the periferic members (associated with femininity) are typically left out of discourse, as well as life.

AIM OF THE ARTICLE

The scientific problem is to revise the current stance on the feminist critique of language, as well as politically correct language, and describe the results of the attempts at reforming the English language initiated in the 70s of XX century and still taking place in XXI century. The review of patriarchal, racist and other stereotypes and meanings imbedded in language units contributes to a better understanding of the extent a language can be influenced by society, in particular, and the interrelation of mind and language and society in general.

We suggest tracing the evolution of gendered and other biased nominations in the English discourse from the 70s of XX century to the 20s of XXI century. This will help understand the progress of the feminist language reform started in the 70s of XX century and still going on at the beginning of XXI century.

METHODOLOGY

In interpreting the topic selected, it is appropriate to apply the principles of feminist criticism (J. Butler, 1990; D. Tannen, 1999) which promote understanding men’s and women’s images in language, help distinguish power relations, focusing on the difference between men and women regarding their socially constructed roles. It also includes descriptive analysis, which enables us to reveal the existing biased and politically-correct language units in the English discourse of the time period specified above.

RESULTS

To fully understand the role of language in the communication process, it will be useful to recall the characteristics inherent in all functioning languages. Namely, the fact that any human language: 1) is guided by certain linguistic rules; 2) is determined by its social and cultural environment; 3) is an arbitrary verbal system of symbols; 4) provides opportunity for abstraction.

The ability of language to influence people's attitudes to facts and events is quite conceivable, which is clearly demonstrated by the current interest in the "politically correct" language. Although the exact nature and extent of the cause-and-effect relationship between language and attitudes is not clearly defined, various institutions and organizations continue to publish handbooks discussing or proclaiming the need for a language change. These changes are considered socially and culturally desirable and beneficial due to the assumption that changes in people's language will lead to changes in their attitudes towards certain social phenomena and life in general.

Despite all the apparent unpredictability and subjectivity, our speech exists as a special type of activity which is clearly structured, organized in an orderly manner and governed by the society in which we live, its norms and traditions (Ye. Tarasova, 1999). However, the fact of communication being determined by social relations, within which it occurs, leaves some space for the individual to make their personal choice of certain speech acts and language units. The speech constructions that the individual chooses are determined by his or her personal previous experience, which is undoubtedly based on the individual picture of the world created in the brain of the individual due to their diverse interaction with the surrounding world. It is social relations that act as a kind of basic principle of communicative activity of any representative of this or that society. Language and culture being intertwined, the set of traditions, ideas, habits, rules of behavior (etiquette), peculiar for a person or the whole nation would be reflected in the language. While mirroring the outer world and culture, language provides a speaker with the idea of how this world is organized and what it should be like.

Language is not just a means of communication. By using our language on a daily basis, we do not just speak, we teach, repeat and reinforce our ideas of what men and women should be like in the society around us. The set of words we use is passed down from generation to generation and is not neutral: behind each word is an object, thing or concept and attitude to them. By repeating words and constructing sentences,



we repeat the culture reflected in them and once again remind ourselves how it is meant to be. As a result, mastering the language, we get the key to understanding and evaluating everything that happens, which we use throughout life (Hellinger, M. & Bussmann, H. 2001).

The set of language stereotypes of gender includes “male” and “female” traits, expectations of certain characteristics and actions by women from men and men from women. This also includes stable metaphors and aphorisms about real men and women. The automatic transfer of the full range of gender-specific traits to a person is also an example of gender discrimination. The belief that men are the stronger sex and women are the weak, beautiful and tender sex was established in language, society and culture and used to be perceived as a “natural state of affairs”. Although strength (physical and inner), beauty and emotionality are equally inherent in both women and men, these should be viewed as individual characteristics, but not signs of gender, as a social category.

Let’s consider the difference between sex and gender. While the former is strictly a biological category, the latter represents a complex unity of social characteristics, as well as centuries-long stereotypes, ascribed to representatives of the two sexes and determining their social behaviour.

Besides, gender is a grammatical category inherent in different parts of speech and consists of the division of words into two or three classes, which traditionally correlate with the features of animacy or inanimacy, “humanness” or non-humanness, and biological sex. These genders are called masculine, feminine and neuter. The category of gender is a characteristic feature of the grammatical structure of Indo-European languages, despite the fact that they reflect varying degrees of preservation of gender, which is directly dependent on the stability of synthesis in the system of word change. The development of analytics in the English language led to the destruction of word change and the loss of generic oppositions in names. Thus, gender has become a hidden category, which is manifested only through the anaphoric pronouns “he”, “she”, “it”).

A number of nouns denoting living beings can refer to both the masculine and the feminine. When you want to indicate to which sex the animal belongs, the word indicating its gender is added to the noun. A series of feminine nouns are formed from the corresponding masculine nouns by adding the suffix -ess or others. This type of forming feminine words is considered to be offensive to women as equal members of

any society.

This is a basic situation that has developed during the evolution of some modern societies, and causes a negative attitude on the part of a certain group of linguists who are fighting for the revision of the category of gender in modern English. Thus, they believe that the practice of consolidating the masculine gender in neutral terms is due to the presence of prejudices in English society during its historical development, when it was a “society for men” with a dominant patriarchy, which inevitably affected the evolution of English.

Thus, the word “man” in English has two meanings: it can mean a human being or a male human being. It is believed that in line with previous changes in the social sphere, the use of the word “man” as a generic term has led to the exclusion of the word “woman” from everyday use, which was the result of a distorted representation of the underestimated role of women in English society. As an example illustrating this position, there is a statement that carries to some extent an element of inconsistency with reality. “As with other mammals, man breastfeeds his young.” (Here, “man” translates as “human being”, but this, from the point of view of the above linguists, is contrary to common sense.) From this perspective, any language that uses a gender category is associated with certain stereotypes about the roles of men and women in English-speaking society. The use of words (Girls, Babes, Chicks, etc.) to refer to female living beings at an earlier stage of their development (and throughout their lives) reinforces the stereotypical view of prejudice, according to which a woman is viewed as inferior and her mind incapable to equal a man’s.

In this regard, we turn to some examples and recommendations of a number of English-speaking linguists, for example, J. Coates, C. Miller, K. Swift, D. Spender, D. Tannen (*The Feminist Critique of Language*, 1990), who proposed certain changes in English communication.

Feminist analysis revealed the manifestations of linguistic sexism in all patriarchal languages and described the laws of society, expressed in the following linguistic phenomena:

- 1) The masculine principle is a social norm, and the feminine – a deviation from it. This is especially evident at the morphological and lexical-semantic level;
- 2) Male is associated with the positive, and female – with the negative. This is evidenced by studies of the meanings of words and lexical fields;
- 3) The masculine dominates the language, and the feminine is invisible. This



statement is proved, first of all, by examples of designations of persons (for example, names of trades) from the point of view of possibility of adequate self-identification of native speakers by means of language material (J. Butler, 1990).

Of course, a feminist analysis of language discrimination cannot stop at describing the causes, forms, and effects of this phenomenon. That is why, assuming that changes in language behavior would promote a change in social perceptions, researchers continued to search for ways to eliminate language discrimination against women by developing and imposing neutral or unbiased language units to name women and all the practices related to them.

Changing language behavior can happen under different circumstances, for instance simply out of a sense of solidarity. An individual may still feel bound by patriarchal language norms, even if he or she supports feminist ideas in other areas of life, such as politics. However, the desire to feel confident and comfortable in a certain social group can lead to a change in their own language behavior. The list of circumstances that lead to the prevention of sexist language models includes, first of all, political goals. It should not be forgotten that women make up a significant percentage of voters, so a separate nomination of women is often used in various election campaigns. Even if the candidates' own beliefs and behavior may not coincide with his or her things, the obligatory mention of women still plays a role: the woman ceases to be a linguistic "invisible" (M. Foucault, 1987).

Thus, one of the central themes of the feminist language reform is the usage of -man in compound words, such as chairman, policeman, etc. Although sometimes some try to prove that such a reform is superfluous, because the last syllable -man, which is usually not stressed in English, is actually only a suffix and clearly different from the stressed syllable of the noun "man", suggestions for change are quite common and successful. A large number of states have already officially established the names of professions that are not labeled by gender (for example, police officer, Congressional representative, Congressperson, etc.) (Kramarae, Ch. & Treichler, D.,1985).

For example, under the laws of the state of Connecticut, if the name of any public office changes by gender, the title must correspond to the sex of the person holding that position. Because using masculine names in relation to women is not only unfair to a particular woman, but also denies all women the definition and respect (Kramarae, Ch. & Treichler, D.,1985).

The problem is not that different stereotypes and patterns are assumed to characterize the sexes, but that previously, for many centuries, we most often did not see this “difference”, did not perceive it as something significant, and even if we did notice it, we did not attach much importance to things we said in our everyday speech. By using language on a daily basis, we do not just speak, we teach, repeat and reinforce our ideas of what men and women should be like in the society around us. Nowadays we have come to a better understanding of all the weight a name has.

Thus, language is most often defined as the main issue in disputes over “political correctness”. The origins of this term seem to be a little obscure: some believe that it was created by right-wing political forces, due to heated discussions about the national problems of students in American colleges; others suppose that the representatives of the left wing introduced it to denote some of their own ideas. However today, the term has become a label to be pinned to any attempt to name changes in our society that run counter to the status quo. That is why the term is often referred to as a tool used by the left, and as a blow towards feminism, and women who, according to conservatives, mutilate language in the name of ideology.

Formed on the basis of such words, as “socially correct”, “morally correct”, etc., the term “politically correct” has had almost a century of existence. In the beginning, it was defined as “the accordance with the party doctrine”, especially within the communist movement. Restored in the 1960s, it used to denote “compliance with various doctrines in modern cultural development, especially the doctrine of the elimination of those language units, which did not show compliance with the political situation regarding race, class, sex, sexual orientation, physical and mental capabilities,” etc. (D. Tannen, 1999).

Political circles have always fought for power over language, and this struggle has been marked by rather high stakes, because it is language that consolidates and transmits ideas and attitudes. With the appearance of every new generation, language has adapted to reflect changes in society. Yet, any change does not happen by itself, many changes are hard-won results of the long social struggle against discrimination of certain social groups. For example, the replacement of “crippled” with “disabled” and then “people with disabilities” and “negro” with “black” and then “Afro-American” is no longer perceived as hostile. However, such social and linguistic transformations were preceded by hard work and they constitute part of a much larger process that arose much earlier than the term “political correctness”.



One of the goals of such processes was to give representatives of certain marginalized groups the opportunity to define words to denote their existence, namely: to alter words with negative meanings that are considered offensive, although they are quite common among certain groups as self-determining, positive in meaning (e.g., “black”, “queer”) (Kramarae, Ch. & Treichler, D.,1985).

“Political correctness” has attracted considerable media attention and has become a useful way of reasoning (though often misused) in arguments. It reflects the desire of different communities to have a language that does not exclude them from their system. If language does not reflect the way we all live, if it becomes awkward, ambiguous, unclear, leads to misunderstandings or offends people, then it does not meet our requirements and ceases to be an effective communication tool. Such a situation can develop in a sexist or otherwise biased language. We define a sexist language as discriminating against or excluding women, while a biased language discriminates all social groups. Linguistic sexism and bias restrict communication between the members of society, impose certain rules and labels on its members, prevent distinction, options, equal representation and opportunities, etc. However, speaking of a non-sexist language, we ought to realize that each of us has his or her own definition of sexism. What some find sexist or offensive, may be well acceptable to others.

In gendered languages, masculinity is typically seen as the norm, the standard, and femininity as the exception, the deviation. This is most evident in the use of pronouns “he / his / him” and words such as “man”, “mankind” to denote both men and women. This also applies to the names of professions ending in “-man”: words like “businessman” (especially in the plural), “salesman” and “chairman” until recently were considered completely neutral in nature, even when applied to denote females only.

Today, there have been large-scale positive changes not only in language itself, but also in the attitude of society, first of all, to the feminist, and recently overall, linguistic reform and a non-sexist, gender-neutral or non-biased language. Talking about any kind of biased language, we should mention that over centuries a white Anglo-Saxon male used to be seen as the norm, the standard, while the representatives of other races, ethnic origins, religious beliefs, sexual orientations and sex were considered marginal and not deserving the freedom of self-naming. The latest development in reforming the English language has been the notion of

inclusive language, a kind of language that allows to include every single member of society speaking that language, without regard to race, national origin, age, religion, color, gender, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, genetics, citizenship and immigration status, disability, or retirement. All officials, journalists and any other public speakers are now committed to compliance with all fair naming practices regarding all the above-mentioned aspects.

The emergence and development of the movement for political correctness and feminism at the end of the second millennium dramatically changed our long-standing view of the world and language and forced us to look anew at the words we had been using for many centuries. Based on the issues of gender/ race/physical inequality, as well as sexism in society, leading feminists consider language to be a factor that perpetuates the status quo. According to Simone de Beauvoir, “You are not born a woman, you become one” and Sulamif Firestone, “Nature created woman different from man. Society made her different from man”, sexist social practices exclude women from public life (Beauvoir, S.,1972) and language adds to it by perpetuating sexist social ideas and strengthening stereotypes. As Angela Carter writes, language is “power, life, an instrument of culture, an instrument of domination and liberation” (Angela Carter: *New Critical Readings*, 1998, p. 34).

Through institutionalized processes and policies, some forms of language are becoming privileged, and the traditional focus on masculine forms overshadows the existence of women as communication participants, as independent speakers and agents. The systematic exclusion of one sex preserves the linguistic, cultural tradition of the other.

The above-mentioned is also absolutely true about all other so-called social minorities, for instance: Afro-Americans, LGBT, people with disabilities, people of different ethnic background, weight, height, etc. By labeling them with some names, other members of society operate in bad faith limiting opportunities for such groups.

Language is a symbolic system that presents both a major problem and a brilliant opportunity. Feminist linguistics, which aimed at eliminating the sexist component in language, was far from the first discipline to study the relationship between language and gender. But it was feminist linguistics, dealing with linguistic phenomena related to the designation of women and men in the language system, that succeeded in interpreting the asymmetries in the designation of different individuals and a native speaker’s choice of one form over another as a manifestation of linguistic



discrimination against women and other groups. “Eliminating generic masculine pronouns precisely eliminates generic masculine pronouns. And in so doing it changes the repertoire of social meanings and choices available to social actors” (D. Tannen, 1999). It was feminist linguistics that managed to trace such manifestations directly to the level of discrimination in society in general, while not accepting the manifestations of linguistic sexism as the given world order, but goes on seeking alternatives that would correspond to the principle of linguistic equality. It pursues clear political goals, criticizing the dominant language norms and considering its proposed changes in language as part of the transformation of society as a whole. No other linguistic discipline has so far demanded the abolition of linguistic and social discrimination on the basis of a description of linguistic asymmetries. It merged with the movement for political correctness and, we believe, it would be safe to call these united efforts the movement for social correctness aiming at abolition of any form of social prejudice or injustice. Language has always been viewed the main factor which is able to change the status quo.

Naturally, the movement for social correctness cannot stop at describing the causes, forms, and effects of the phenomenon of linguistic suppression. It has continued as a search for ways to eliminate all kinds of language discrimination. Dissemination and implementation of recommendations how to avoid biased language models is one of the most important tasks of the movement for social correctness.

Advocating the implementation of these recommendations, researchers believe that, first of all, there is a connection between the social behavior of the individual and his or her worldview, including the attitude to the existing state of affairs. They assume that changes in language behavior contribute to the gradual change of social perceptions. It often happens that during the experiment the attitude of its participants to its subject changed from negative to positive (J. Coates, 1993; D. Tannen, 1999). Therefore, it seems to be a quite real situation in which the new language rules, established officially or legally, after a period of controversy and resistance will be accepted by society and cause changes in a number of social perceptions (O. Dudoladova, 2003).

An individual tends to change his or her language behavior under different circumstances. Firstly, an individual, accustomed to patriarchal language norms, even if he or she supports the ideas of women`s empowerment, may start using unbiased language alternatives because of the belief that some minority groups are

usually excluded from language communication and find themselves in a subordinate position. Secondly, changing language behavior can happen simply out of a sense of solidarity with those advocating equality, which will often imply a different choice of lexical units and a totally different pattern of linguistic behaviour. For instance, some men may not favour the so-called “generic masculine” forms, i.e., the use of masculine nouns and pronouns to denote both sexes:

- Everyone should respect his parents (Daily News, 1973)
- A secretary makes coffee for her boss (Good Housekeeping, 1975)

The list of circumstances that could lead to the prevention of biased language models includes, first of all, political goals. It should not be forgotten that Afro-Americans, women, LGBT representatives make up a significant percentage of voters in the United States, so very favorable nominations are often used in various election campaigns. Even if the candidates’ own beliefs and behavior may not coincide with his or her speeches, the obligatory mention of the above-mentioned groups still plays a significant role in attracting voters: thus, these groups cease to be linguistically, and as a result socially, “invisible” (Tannen D., 1999).

One of the tasks of the movement for social correctness is to propose, as neutral as possible, “equal” or favorable language models, which could be supported by proponents of the social and linguistic status quo in order to change the “biased language” and to achieve universal equality.

Proponents of gender equality suggested that it was not worth talking about the beautiful appearance of a woman in situations where no appropriate comments were made about the appearance of a man.

With regard to gender aspects of communication, it is no longer possible to come across such slang units as “chick” or colloquial “cry like a girl”; job evaluations as “man’s work” or any male executive saying that a smart woman “thinks like a man.” Employing terms such as “male ego” or “female intuition” is strictly forbidden as all these words have negative connotative potential. All employers, from transnational corporations to small businesses in the United States are now very careful about all aspects of the employment process, starting with job postings and using short-and-sweet inclusivity statements that tie in milestones of progress and stories of various employees; creating a diverse environment and providing equal opportunities for all qualified applicants. Comparing to the 70s of XX century, stakeholders have made a great progressive move towards both social and language inclusivity.



DISCUSSION

Language has long represented a battlefield between proponents of unbiased speech and supporters of freedom of speech. The former state that alternative ways of nomination can help eliminate social inequality, while the latter claim political correctness to be a tool for limiting free expression of ideas and distorting reality. Started as a movement for women's liberation, the current social trend has come to be known as social correctness which requires to involve people from a wide variety of backgrounds in everyday life of society. However, seeing the results makes us want more reforms both in language and in society.

It should be emphasized that language and society have always been an inseparable unity. That is why today, when forming a new picture of the world with its image and lifestyle, it is so important to change outdated language options, thereby changing our lives for the better.

CONCLUSIONS

As a result of the changing role of men and women (as well as the groups distinguished on the basis of ethnicity, age, profession, etc.) in modern society in many countries all over the world, a number of English-speaking linguists proposed to introduce certain changes in both the lexical and grammatical aspects of the language. This is primarily due to the fact that language is closely interrelated with human mind and can affect social practice. Thus, changes in naming different groups can be of great use to promoting equality, rights and opportunities for all members of society.

Our research shows that at the present stage of the functioning of the English language, along with the use of sexist models, there are a large number of unmarked, or neutral, terms. We have studied modern British and American newspapers, observed public speeches by senators, officials, etc. in order to compare the status quo with the initial situation in the English language in the 1960s, which sustained a lot of criticism at that time.

The findings are quite reassuring, as the biased language units have given way to neutral alternatives. For example, a "chair" is an existing solution to a problem caused by a "chairman" nomination. "Chairperson, chairer, presider, coordinator,

president, convener, chairone” is by no means a complete list of anti-sexist alternatives that can be found in newspapers and magazines today. Undoubtedly, “chair” is the most widely used of analogs (up to 80%). In other cases, such as “congressman”, “statesman”, the part of “-person” is mostly omitted nowadays in favor to the popular “officer”, “official”, “representative” (up to 70%). In our opinion, some alternatives of this kind are of great interest and can be assimilated into the structure of the language, while others sound extremely artificial. The list of changes in the language material is immense and requires a separate survey. Thus, with regard to the functioning of group names in modern English at the level of vocabulary and grammar, linguists should now pay special attention to the fixation and analysis of important linguistic changes associated with changing perceptions of various representatives of modern English-speaking society.

However, the social changes greatly outweigh the linguistic part of the feminist language reform, as we can all see today the roles of women in modern societies all over the world. We believe that this is a bright example of the premise that a human mind and behavior can be influenced with the help of a language to achieve social equality.

Funding: This study received no specific financial support.

Competing Interests: The author declares that there are no conflicts of interests regarding the publication of this paper.

References

- Dudoladova, O.V. (2003). Otrazhenie gendernykh stereotipov v angloyazychnom publitsisticheskom diskurse [Gender stereotypes reflected in English publicistic discourse]. Vestnik Mezhdunarodnogo Slavianskogo Universiteta (g. Kharkiv) [Journal of International Slavonic University], Vol.6, № 1, pp. 16-18. (in Russian).
- Tarasova, Ye.V. (1999). Kognitivnye osnovaniya sistemnoi organizatsii rechi [Cognitive foundations of speech systemic organization]. Visnyk Kharkivskogo Derzhavnogo Universitety [Journal of Kharkiv State University], Vol. 424, pp. 174-184. (in Russian).
- Fuko, M. (1991). Volia k istine: po tu storonu znania, vlasti i seksualnosti [Strive for Truth: on the other side of knowledge, power and sexuality]. Mode of access: https://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Culture/.../07.php (in Russian).
- Angela Carter: New Critical Readings. (1998). Ed. by Sonya Andermahr, Lawrence Phillips. NewYork, London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.
- Bates, B. (1987). *Nonsexist language use in transition*. In: Journal of Communication. № 28 (1), pp. 139-148.



- Beauvoir, S. (1972). *The Second Sex*: Transl. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Butler, J. (1990). Gender Trouble, Feminist Theory and Psychoanalytic Discourse. In: L. Nikolson, ed., *Feminism / Postmodernism*. NewYork, London: Routledge., pp. 324-341.
- Coates, J. (1993). *Women, Men and Language*. London: Longman.
- Hellinger, M. and Bussmann, H. (2001). *Gender across languages. The linguistic representation of women and men*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 13-29.
- Kramarae, Ch. and Treichler, D. (1985). *A Feminist Dictionary*. London: Pandora Press, pp. 15-72.
- Lakoff, G. (1990). *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal About Mind*. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press.
- The Feminist Critique of Language. A Reader*. (1999). Ed. by D. Cameron. NewYork, London: Routledge.

Received: 20.08.2020

Accepted: 20.09.2020

Cite this article as:

Dudoladova, Alyona, Dudoladova, Olga (2020). Attempts at reforming the english language: original goals and latest outcomes. *Astraea*, 1(2), 8-23. doi: 10.34142/astreaa.2020.1.2.01

