

clear acknowledgment that "gender" is socially constructed does not challenge the claim that "sex" is biologically determined. What is important here is that biological foundationalism remains plausible paradigm contrary to the initial criticisms of its incompleteness. If only "gender is socially constructed," then what methodological advantage, we gain by making gender a base for sexual differences? The clearer implication should be that sex and/or gender is socially constructed or that we have nothing to do with biology at all. Sex is rejected as a foundation to reject the gender dichotomy of spontaneous sociology, but the persistent dichotomy of sex-gender makes this "theoretical clarity" quite ambiguous. This problematic theoretical ambiguity will remain there unless it is clearly declared that "sex is socially constructed." Further, if both sex and gender are socially constructed, then they can be assumed as synonymous, or one of them can be rejected outright. Biological foundationalism cannot be escaped successfully until the dichotomy of sex and gender is present. The only possibility for social constructionism is the theorization that sex is socially constructed, and gender is nothing but sex; hence, using gender is unnecessary.

MULTIPLE DIMENSIONS OF GENDER

The second strategy put forward by the author is that gender "must be understood at multiple levels of meaning." This strategy is entailed by the first foundational paradigm shift, so it is natural that this too assumes sex-gender dichotomy. Important is that if gender is base for sexual difference and hence gender and ultimately, sex is socially constructed, then there is no need for this emphasis of multiple dimensions. This is due to the fact that if something is socially constructed then social, cultural, institutional, and other dimensions inevitably be taken in consideration. Again, biological foundationalism is present in this theorization. Author emphasizes the need to theorize gender in its heterogeneity but the same could be done with the construct of sex. How can be assumed that sex cannot be understood at multiple levels and multiple positions? Indeed, sex can be understood within multiple sociocultural contexts then why another categorization of gender? Moreover, this heterogeneity and diversity make untenable use gender as an independent category of analysis [7,8]. It means the very basis of heterogeneity leads to the implausibility of gender as an analytical category on which this category is expounded. It is strange that the heterogeneity that necessitates avoidance of gender analytic is used as its basis.

The author cites three components of gender as implications of research design. These are subjectivity, social institution, and cultural understanding [6]. By subjectivity, author means that one's sense of being male or female. This feature of gender is popular and incomplete, but according to the author, it "does not need to be abandoned." Emphasis on this notion indicates that gender identity or one's sense of being male and female is necessarily based on one's biology. The second feature is also limited to the structuring of individuals in women and men only. Institutional aspects of gender are emphasized but again, it is argued that even sex can be positioned at the multivariate levels of race, class, sex divisions of labor, sexual ideologies, and other social hierarchies. The cultural element is also limited to a (biological) man and woman. Masculinity and femininity can be understood as different diverse patterns of sex rather than gender. Proposing multivariate research design author enlists the variables of "race, class, age, sexual orientation, work role, gender ideology, reproductive and marital status, personality characteristics, life expectancies, and so on." All these variables can also be studied in the biological foundational paradigm to analyze and interpret sex. Furthermore, the social construction of maleness/masculinity and femaleness/femininity occurs on some distinct foundations. Social agents articulate their views and beliefs on some bases. When it is accepted that masculinity or femininity is socially constructed then it is assumed that this social construction is based on some biological foundations. Social construction cannot be based on the social construction of social construction. Moreover, when we say masculinity and femininity is socially constructed then what we actually mean with a difference to sex. The underlying problem

with this conceptualization of gender is that social construction is unconsciously considered only limited to men. Both men and women are agents of social construction, and whatever constructions occur must be respected in the social constructionist paradigm. Why is there so much emphasis on exploration and change of social realities and social constructions? In whatever pattern and hierarchy this social construction is carried out women are an equal part of this process then why only women and their empowerment is emphasized?

GENDER AS PROCESS AND OUTCOME

Third theoretical development discussed by Knaak, 2004, is that gender is a continuous process of becoming [6]. Author implicates that gender is "an outcome and effect of social forces." Here, it is not delineated by the author how gender is a process as well as an outcome at the same time. If gender is process, then its outcome or (net) effect must be something other than gender. The author cites that femininities are produced through certain practices and maintained thus. It means the femininity (gender) is the outcome of a social process that is not exclusively a gender process. Moreover, the same thing can be said about sex (maleness and femaleness) that is viewed differently from different perspectives, time, and places. The social construction of femininity does not need to "move beyond" biological sex. Gender as a process creates a problem of identity; it becomes mere a floating sensation about one's personal identity that has no sound base neither any certain goal. If the gender process is going on, then everyone has a temporary idea of one's identity, and that identity will change, no one knows in what way. Hence, it is not only uncertain subjectivity but also a crisis of identity. As the author has explained earlier that gender is "active," and this activity is going on, so it is just performance. It is "doing" and "becoming" in-itself; it has not any goal or objective because the outcome of this process is the process itself. Research implication outlined by the author is that gender should be treated as a "dependent" variable due to its "active" (ongoing process) nature. One implication of this dependent nature of gender is that every measured effect will be temporary and not suitable for personal identity. Other implication is that some independent variables (i.e. race) are fixed while others are changing (social status), but the overall effect on a dependent variable will be continuous. The question is how one's sense of self is affected by biology and culture. How a self can ignore or overcome its biological reality? Is it sensible to claim that biology along with other sociocultural factors has nothing to do with one's self and identity? Due to this critical role of biology, sex dichotomy of male and female is also challenged.

CHALLENGING THE NATURAL ATTITUDE

The author cites a number of studies in support of this claim that masculinities and femininities are not single but multiple, forming a continuum. The second point is that "behavior, personality, and cognition" are overlapping and "not necessarily congruent with one's biological sex." Interestingly, here, masculinity and femininity are attached to biological sex instead of gender as initially described by the author in the introductory debate. It gives the impression that sex and gender are the same thing as well as masculinity/femininity and maleness/femaleness. Moreover, if biological sex is also a continuum instead of fixed dichotomy, then there is no need for gender theorization. Further, when biological sex is not taken as a foundation for one's identity, then it does not matter whether sex is dichotomous or not. Explaining the implications for research design author cites that there are "900 different situations one can be in." This is challenge to dimorphism and gender category as well. A third open gender category is advised to be included in the research design/questionnaire to achieve empirical accuracy. Since both sex and gender are not dichotomous as argued by the author, so it can be said that the question about one's sex or gender should be left open-ended. Thus, highest possible accuracy will be achieved.

CONCLUSION

Reviewing the two research papers, we conclude that the concept of gender as a social construct and analytical category in the sociological

1 analysis is very problematic. A straightforward definition of gender
 2 will not solve the theoretical problems as well as practical implications.
 3 Social constructionist approach presumes reality as constructed, but this
 4 construction does not occur in a vacuum. Every construction is based on
 5 some concrete foundation. Without foundation, construction becomes
 6 impossible. A social constructionist approach to reality neglects this
 7 very fact. It criticizes foundationalism, but then itself is entangled in it.
 8 Even in the social constructionist paradigm, if gender and sexuality are
 9 social constructs, these are to be done away, rejected, and deconstructed.
 10 Therefore, we have argued that social construction of gender actually
 11 implies its rejection, not its inclusion, in analysis and social research.

12 **REFERENCES**

13
 14 1. Brickell C. The sociological construction of gender and sexuality.
 15 *Sociol Rev* 2006;54:87-111.
 16

17
 18 2. Nielsen CR. Foucault, Douglass, Fanon, and Scotus in Dialogue: On
 19 *Social Construction and Freedom*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan;
 20 2013.
 21 3. Hacking I. *The Social Construction of What?* Cambridge,
 22 Massachusetts and London: Harvard University Press; 1999.
 23 4. Dynes WR, editor. *Encyclopedia of Homosexuality*. Chicago and
 24 London: St. James Press; 1990.
 25 5. Berger PL, Luckmann T. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise
 26 in the Sociology of Knowledge*. London: Penguin Books; 1991.
 27 6. Knaak S. On the reconceptualizing of gender: Implications for research
 28 design. *Sociol Inq* 2004;74:302-17.
 29 7. Anderson ML, Collins PH, editors. *Race, Class, and Gender*.
 30 Belmont,CA: Wadsworth; 1995.
 31 8. Mohanty CT, Russo A, Torres L, editors. *Third World Women and the
 32 Politics of Feminism*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press;
 33 1991.
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69

17 Author Queries???

18 AQ1:Kindly confirm the article type

19 AQ2:Kindly mention the corresponding author name

20 AQ3:Kindly provide email id

21 AQ4:Please review the sentence as it seems to be incomplete.

22 AQ5:Please review the sentence for more clarity.
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69