

Lozovska K. O.,

*Postgraduate Student at The Department of English Translation
Theory and Practice
Zaporizhzhya National University*

GENDER CHARACTERISTICS OF SPEECH (BASED ON THE ANIMATED FILM “FIREHEART” 2022)

Stereotypes have taken a significant place in our life. According to Levon, stereotyping significantly impacts our perception of people and can distort our judgements [3, p. 539]. This concept has been regarded as a selective filter that can affect our perception. According to Lindvall-Östling, Deutschmann, and Steinvall: “Stereotyping means that we are likely to take in information that fits our model expectations of a particular social group and ignore details that do not” [4, p. 567]. The stereotypes also have not spared men’s and women’s speech behaviour.

The cultural and social factors that influence the way people communicate can explain the differences between men’s and women’s speech. Different studies have shown that the way people speak and communicate can be influenced by various factors, such as the type of words they use, the structure of sentences, and the way they are delivered [8, p. 38].

The research was conducted based on the animated film “Fireheart” released in 2022. This is a story of a girl called Georgia who wanted to become a firefighter, but because her father told her that girls simply could not perform such a dangerous kind of job, to accomplish her goal, she decided to dress up as a man; thus, she became Joe.

The analysis was conducted using LIWC-22 (Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count). The tool helped to distinguish particular speech features. We are going to present here the most significant categories.

The first thing to point out is the usage of pronouns. Xia, in her research “Gender Differences in Using Language”, indicates that: “Women prefer to use first person plural pronouns when they suggest something, even when she suggests the other person, while men tend to use the first person singular pronoun, and when he is suggesting the other person, he will directly use the second person pronoun” [7, p. 1486]. At the same time, the results received after conducting the analysis contradict the statement since, in our case, Georgia uses more “I” than Joe, which is 8,28 compared to 7,19. This can be

explained by the plot since the only thing that the girl wants in her life is to show herself and prove to others that she is worthy of becoming a firefighter: *I join Dad's team, I catch the arsonist, I save the city, they change the rules, and I get to be the first fireman... woman.* While Joe's value is within the norm, Georgia's goes beyond the mean. On the contrary, when it comes to "we" pronouns, Georgia underuses them: 0,47 to 1,65. She uses them when she refers to the team of men firefighters when she finally gets to work with them: *No, no, no. We have to stop her. We have to stop her!* In Joe's case, it is within the norm.

When it comes to the category "Affiliation", according to a meta-analysis conducted by Leaper and Ayres, men use more assertive speech, whereas women use more affiliative speech [2, p. 323]. In our case, Georgia has a higher value than the mean in the "Affiliation" category, while Joe's is within the standard deviation: 3,71 to 2,25. It follows thence that the value of the category "Family" is higher in Georgia's case: 2,92; at the same time, the category "Male" is also higher: 3,31. This can be explained by the fact that the girl was raised only by her dad, who is a true role model for her; that is why she often refers to him throughout the whole film. But when it comes to the category "Certitude", both Joe's and Georgia's category value is higher than the mean. If in Joe's case, it can be explained by the statement above, for Georgia, it is valid because of her certainty that she would become a firefighter no matter what.

The same can be said to explain the number received in the "Allnone" category. All-or-none thinking – more formally known as "dichotomous thinking" – refers to a style of thinking that tends to be over-generalized and more extreme [1, p. 18]. Georgia's value goes beyond the mean: 4,73 to 2,32 in Joe's case.

The next categories are "Negate" and "Auxverbs". According to Vaughn Leigh's research "Distinguishing Between Need Support and Regulatory Focus with LIWC": "Negations (e.g., no, not, never), differentiation words (e.g., hasn't, but else), and auxiliary verbs (e.g., am, will, have) were more common in descriptions of low need support" [6]. For Georgia, "Negate" is higher than the mean: 4,5, and in Joe's case, "Auxverbs" goes beyond the standard deviation: 14.

One more thing to point out is the emotiveness of speech. Parkins, in the research "Gender and prosodic features in the emotional expression", states that for women, it is more characteristic to express their emotions, for example, happiness, sadness etc, while men are believed to be more

characteristically angry [5, p. 53]. Georgia tends to be optimistic, which is why we can see an excessive number in the “Emotions positive” category: 2,44 and a lower number than the mean in “Emotions negative”: 0,24. For Joe, the value that goes beyond the mean is “Anxiety” since he has been worried all time about others to uncover his true identity.

In the research, most of the results received after performing the analysis hold expected stereotypical views on men’s and women’s speech. It was mostly seen in the categories: “Emotions”, “Affiliation”, and “Family”. Although, there were found categories that did not meet the expected results. For Georgia, it was relevant for: “Pronouns”, “Allnone”, and “Auxverbs”. Such discrepancies might be influenced by the plot peculiarities and the life path of the character, but the issue needs further investigation.

Bibliography:

1. Boyd R. L., Ashokkumar A., Seraj S., Pennebaker J. W. The development and psychometric properties of LIWC-22. Austin, TX : University of Texas at Austin. URL: <https://www.liwc.app>
2. Leaper C, Ayres M. M. A meta-analytic review of gender variations in adults’ language use: talkativeness, affiliative speech, and assertive speech. *Personality and social psychology review: an official journal of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc.* 2007. 11(4). 328–363. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868307302221>
3. Levon E. Categories, stereotypes, and the linguistic perception of sexuality. *Language in Society.* 2014. 43(5). 539–566. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404514000554>
4. Lindvall-Östling M., Deutschmann M., Steinvall A. An exploratory study on linguistic gender stereotypes and their effects on perception. *Open Linguistics.* 2020. 6. 567–583. <https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2020-0033>
5. Parkins R. Gender and prosodic features in emotional expression. *Griffith Working Papers in Pragmatics and Intercultural Communication.* 2012. 5(1). 46–54. https://www.griffith.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0026/363680/Paper-6-Parkins-Gender-and-Emotional-Expressiveness_final.pdf
6. Vaughn L. Distinguishing between need support and regulatory focus with LIWC. *Collabra: Psychology.* 2019. 5(1): 32. <https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.185>.
7. Xia X. Gender Differences in Using Language. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies.* 2013. 3(8). 1485–1489. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.8.1485-1489>

8. Yanti, Yu. (2021). Gender and communication: some features of women's speech. *Journal of Cultura and Lingua*. 2. 33–38. <https://doi.org/10.37301/culingua.v2i1.69>.
9. Fireheart. URL: <https://www1.gomovies.cyou/movie/fireheart/watching.html?ep=1&sv=9>

DOI <https://doi.org/10.36059/978-966-397-263-3/13>

Луньова Т. В.,

*кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри англійської та німецької філології
Полтавського національного педагогічного університету
імені В. Г. Короленка*

ДО ПИТАННЯ ПРО ІДЕНТИФІКАЦІЮ НУЛЬОВОГО ЕКФРАЗИСУ В СУЧАСНИХ АНГЛОМОВНИХ ЕСЕ ПРО ВІЗУАЛЬНІ МИСТЕЦТВА

Терміном *екфразис* часто послуговуються для аналізу певної взаємодії між візуальними мистецькими творами та вербальними текстами, яка виникає, коли візуальні мистецькі об'єкти репрезентуються за допомогою словесних текстів. У широкому розумінні цю взаємодію можна окреслити як опис, позначення, нагадування чи викликання в уяві візуальних репрезентацій засобами художніх і нехудожніх текстів, а також текстових фрагментів [3, с. 103]. Екфразис як вербальний опис мистецького об'єкта не має ні особливої граматики, ні єдиного визначеного характерного стилю, ні виразної семіологічної специфіки, а визначається лише за змістом [3, с. 108].

Саме за змістовим критерієм ми здійснюємо ідентифікацію екфразису в сучасних англомовних есе про візуальні мистецтва, розглядаючи як екфрастичні такі есеїстичні фрагменти, які повідомляють/ описують, що зображено у мистецькому творі, які фізичні характеристики (колір, характер поверхні тощо) він має, і/або інтерпретують, що саме змальовано в творі (особливо, коли зображення нечітке чи неоднозначне), і який смисл має цей твір. При цьому сигналом екфразису ми вважаємо експліцитну вказівку на певний мистецький твір / певні мистецькі твори, що найчастіше з дійснюється