



УДК 811.111

DOI 10.35433/philology.3(98).2022.126-136

THE STUDY OF MALE AND FEMALE SPEECH IN SPOKEN ENGLISH

T. V. Kryvoruchko*, N. V. Diachuk**, I. L. Biliuk***

This scientific work is devoted to the study of male and female speech in vernacular English. Gender is the reason why men and women use a language differently. The question arises – what types of language resources people use or can use and what types of language practices express and support certain gender ideologies and norms. The linguistic construction of gender is not limited to the usual use of the lexeme "gender". Gender in a language acts as a parameter of variable intensity, which manifests itself in different ways, even to the point of complete disappearance in a number of communicative situations. Linguistic representation of gender is considered as the implementation of gender representation in language through its mirror (gender) reflection using linguistic resources and the existence of such phenomena as male and female language. Language reflects not only the gender differentiation that exists in society, but also constructs gender differences. Analyzing the linguistic representation of gender, the main task is to understand gender as a continuous process of society that produces differences in male and female roles, in particular, mental and emotional characteristics of linguistic behavior. Male communication style is formed in early childhood. Its main distinguishing features are: coldness, emotional restraint, desire to dominate, clarity and precision in statements, perspective orientation when formulating desires and needs. Women are focused on interpersonal communication, they adapt more easily to new social conditions, are more open and responsible, active, attentive, friendly, sensitive, socially competent, have the ability to analyze and holistically see the situation, and seek to avoid conflicts. This specificity of the female figure is also projected onto her language portrait.

Keywords: male speech, female speech, gender, gender differentiation, gender construction, sex, spoken English.

* Candidate of Philological Science (PhD), Associate Professor
(Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University),
kryvoruchkotv@ukr.net
ORCID: 0000-0001-7473-518X

** Candidate of Psychological Science (PhD), Associate Professor
(Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University),
natadiachuk@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-5905-6813

*** Candidate of Philological Science (PhD), Associate Professor
(Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University),
innabilyuk@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-7409-6100

ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ ЧОЛОВІЧОГО ТА ЖІНОЧОГО МОВЛЕННЯ В РОЗМОВНІЙ АНГЛІЙСЬКІЙ МОВІ

Криворучко Т. В., Дячук Н. В., Білюк І. А.

Наукова розвідка присвячена дослідженню чоловічого та жіночого мовлення в розмовній англійській мові. Гендер є причиною того, що чоловіки та жінки по-різному використовують мову. Виникає питання: якими типами мовних ресурсів люди послуговуються або можуть користуватися та які типи мовних практик виражають і підтримують певні гендерні ідеології та норми. Лінгвістична побудова статі не обмежується звичайним уживанням лексеми "стать". Стать у мові є параметром змінної інтенсивності, який проявляється по-різному, навіть до повного зникнення в низці комунікативних ситуацій. Лінгвістичну репрезентацію статі розглядаємо як реалізацію гендерної репрезентації в мові через її дзеркальне (гендерне) відображення за допомогою лінгвістичних ресурсів та існування таких явищ, як чоловіча та жіноча мова. Мова не лише відображає гендерну диференціацію, яка існує в суспільстві, але й будує гендерні відмінності. Аналізуючи мовне уявлення про стать, основним завданням вважаємо розуміння гендеру як безперервного процесу суспільства, що виробляє відмінності в чоловічих та жіночих ролях, зокрема психічних та емоційних характеристиках мовної поведінки. Чоловічий стиль спілкування формується в ранньому дитинстві. Його основними диференційними ознаками є: награна холодність, емоційна стриманість, прагнення до домінування, зрозумілість та чіткість у висловлюваннях, орієнтація на перспективу під час формулювання бажань та потреб. Жінки орієнтовані на міжособистісне спілкування, вони легше адаптуються до нових соціальних умов, більш відкриті та відповідальні, активні, уважні, дружелюбні, чуйні, соціально компетентні, мають здатність до аналізу та цілісного бачення ситуації, прагнуть уникати конфліктів. Така специфіка жіночої постаті спроектується й на її мовний портрет.

Ключові слова: чоловіче мовлення, жіноче мовлення, гендер, гендерна диференціація, гендерна конструкція, стать, розмовна англійська мова.

Defining the problem. The study of male and female speech in modern society focuses on various aspects of human life investigation in relation to gender. are Cultural and socio-psychological factors that form ideas about male and female qualities, as well as mechanisms of building one's own system of stereotypes based on different languages constitute the scope of gender research.

The study of gender issues in a language is one of the priority areas of foreign linguists and gender specialists' researches today. These studies are aimed at analyzing the status of a language in society and also at trying to prove that a language is not only a product of community activity, but also a tool for the cultural and gender identity formation.

The topic of the relationship between a language and gender has not been sufficiently studied, and systematic research on this issue has not been conducted. Only at the beginning of the

20th century a thorough study of a language and gender problem in linguistics began. At the same time, the social aspect, which considers a language in connection with society and the role of a man in society came to the fore. Thus, an anthropocentric approach was developed in linguistics, the centre of which was a man who creates a language and the manifestations of the human factor in the language.

Analysis of previous research. The problem of gender was considered in such foreign researchers' works as S. Bern, A. Bodain, B. Dennis, O. Kikineji, R. Lakoff, B. Sorrels, E. Fildler. However, the study of male and female speech in a spoken language is almost unexplored in Ukraine, which complicates the process of gender aspects translation studying. The relevance of this work is determined by the need to study discursive manifestations of gender as one of the main characteristics of a person. The topic of gender issues in international

business communication remains relevant and insufficiently covered.

The aim of the article is to investigate male and female speech in spoken English.

Research object: gender issues in spoken English.

The subject of the study: peculiarities of male and female speech functioning in spoken English.

Reliability of scientific results is ensured by methodological substantiation of the initial provisions, a systematic approach in the research organization use, adequate methods of theoretical analysis application.

Modern linguistics suggests that gender is the reason of men and women's different language usage. Men and women use language to be perceived adequately by the opposite sex representatives. Accordingly, the question arises as to what types of linguistic resources people use or can use to present themselves as a certain type of a man or woman and what types of linguistic practices express and support certain gender ideologies and norms.

The linguistic construction of gender is not limited to the usual use of the lexeme "gender". The construction is based on the correlation of language forms with gender representations (associations, stereotypes), which are the part of the universe of a certain culture. Gender construction in all types of social practice has its own specificity. The role of a language is not limited to communication in the narrow sense of the word (reception-transmission of information) or storage and transmission of knowledge. A language builds life, being at the same time an integral part of this life. Gender in a language acts as a parameter of variable intensity, that is, a floating parameter, a factor that manifests itself with different intensity, even to the point of complete disappearance in a number of communicative situations [3: 41].

The linguistic representation of gender is considered in modern linguistics according to two main directions: the

implementation of gender representation in a language through its mirror (gender) reflection with the help of linguistic resources; the existence of such phenomena as male language and female language.

A language not only reflects the gender differentiation that exists in society, but also constructs gender differences. From the feminists' point of view, the linguistic space carries out its dictation in relation to representatives of both sexes, forming "standardized ideas about patterns of behaviour and character traits that correspond to the concepts of "man" and "woman" [1: 85].

In foreign studies, two main approaches to the linguistic representation of gender prevail. The first is based on the theory of dominance (Fishman, 1983; Lakoff, 1973; Zimmerman, 1975, 1983), the second – on the theory of differences (Cameron, 1989; Cotes, 1987, 1995; Jones, 1980; Milroy, 1980). Early linguistic research is related to the former. In particular, the American researcher Robin Lakoff came to the conclusion that women speak in the so-called "powerless language", which expresses a lack of authority [4: 38]. Such a language is characterized by hesitant intonation, softened offensive forms, statements formulated as questions. This language format is called "female style". Critics of such studies have pointed out that such conclusions are based only on the author's own intuition, and not on empirical data. Further research on the first approach was based on actual recordings of conversations between men and women. The result of such research was a well-known phrase that characterizes the peculiarities of speech behaviour of both sexes: "Men compete, women cooperate" [4].

As a result of male and female speech style analysis, other global oppositions were revealed, in particular: men's conversation has a kind of "reporting" character, and women's is a conversation "about trifles". Men's conversation aims at achieving a certain "status quo", while

women's talk – at achieving agreement and intimacy.

An alternative is the theory of differences, which has become a critical response to the theory of dominance. Representatives of this theory do not compare men's norms of speech with women's. The purpose of their research is women's use of their own terms in speech. Such studies identify certain types of people or the social environment in which men and women interact. In this approach, linguists explain gender differences by distinguishing between "female" and "male" subcultures.

Two theories based on different criteria are not mutually exclusive. Both have a number of similar elements related to the conceptualization of "gender". Firstly, both theories are "characterized by an almost exclusive problematization of women." This means that the gender uses the word "women" as a synonym. As a result, little is known about masculinity and men. Secondly, both theories use the term "gender based on binary opposition" [5: 47]. This means that the main hypothesis of many studies is the statement that men and women are inherently different, these differences are reflected in their use of language in a certain way. At the same time, another fact is overlooked: both sexes use the same linguistic resources. Therefore, the language of men and women should have a certain similarity so that communication does not cause problems in communication. The implicit assumption that men and women are binary opposites, that language is a symbolic representation of this opposition, is deeply problematic in terms of language and in terms of gender.

Most scholars believe that there is a dialectical relationship between language and society. This is because of the fact that gender is associated with special behavior manifestations, in particular, masculinity and femininity perception differs significantly in different cultures, which leads to the variability of speech behavior norms.

Thus, gender can be classified as a deep contextual variable. Based on this, it becomes clear why "there is a small number of generalizations, how the formal, structural aspects of the language of one gender can be made opposite to the language of the other one" [6: 125] This assumption can be made from the fact that masculinity and femininity are not actually opposites, but dialectically interrelated categories, which are social processes that are not fixed and given only once. Language is not just a mirror of gender, it helps to constitute it without being a permanent state of human existence. Gender is a certain set of practices, actions, it is performed differently in different situations. If we draw a linguistic analogy, then gender is not a noun, it is a verb. From a methodological point of view, when studying the linguistic processes of building gender identities, language should not be defined in a narrow sense, guided by conversational constructions. The object of research should be a written, visual text, language resources in general, which are not permanent, but changeable. The gender meanings associated with certain linguistic resources are not attributes of language. This is explained by the fact that, firstly, the same actions are possible for both men and women, but they are evaluated differently, in particular the struggle for equal pay and work. Secondly, the gendered meanings of the linguistic means of expressing these meanings can vary, for example, offensive expressions and slang, which are traditionally considered a male linguistic space. They are not seen as a male way of thinking, as women also use such forms, especially today. The implementation of gender roles by men and women involves the use of language devices that they perceive to be appropriate for their gender group, for example, "the two sexes wear clothes that meet gender expectations." [Is this a quote?]

Similarly, men and women choose language according to the "gender rules". Therefore, regardless of the time context,

the manner of speaking or the manner of dressing is associated with a certain article. In this sense, the binary opposition associated with masculinity and femininity is absolutely real and relevant when discussing gendered linguistic behavior.

A hundred years ago, the reasons for the different verbal behavior of both sexes were outlined. Women are not as verbally inventive as men, and if men were suddenly "switched" into female mode, their speech would quickly become very boring. The point of view reflected society views at that time on women and their passive role. Women were considered linguistically imperfect in comparison with men [12: 424].

However, later, during the 20th century, ideas about differences in men and women language began to change. The first serious studies in gender linguistics appeared already after the sexual revolution in the 1970s.

Among the most noticeable signs of female and male speech are:

I. In female speech:

- 1) presence of interjections, modal constructions;
- 2) use of clichés and so-called "book vocabulary";
- 3) evaluation statements;
- 4) avoiding naming a person or name;
- 5) figurative language;
- 6) use of adverbs and adjectives;
- 7) constructions "adverb + adverb";
- 8) simple and complex sentences, syntactic phrases containing a double negation;
- 9) extensive use of punctuation marks;

II. In male speech:

- 1) repeated use of introductory words, namely statements of facts;
- 2) use of monotonous lexical techniques when talking about the expression of emotions and smallest emotional indexing;
- 3) low level of punctuation use in emotional speech.

In recent decades, a special place in research is occupied by "gender studies, which focus on social factors that determine society's attitude towards men

and women, people's behavior in relation to gender, stereotypes about the quality of men and women, and all this means the question of gender from the field of biology to the field social life and culture" [4: 39]. The gender approach to linguistic material involves analysis at the macro- and micro-level. The latter makes it possible to focus attention on the relationship between the grammatical category of gender and the idea of biological and social gender, on the ways of conveying these meanings in language, on the various connotations and semantic increments that accompany masculine and feminine gender nominations.

Gender linguistics at the current stage development explores the discourse between femininity and masculinity; various methodological issues are studied, such as variational and interactive sociolinguistics, linguistic ethnography, speech analysis, critical discourse analysis, discursive psychology, feminist poststructuralist discourse analysis. The topic of language communication in articles is widely covered, especially in foreign studies.

In modern linguistics, there is a concept of gender-neutral language, which is used in such communicative situations when it is necessary to avoid familiarity. Gender-neutral language is a form of linguistic prescriptivism that is aimed at minimizing assumptions about people's gender or biological sex in spoken or written form. The use of gender-specific language often presupposes male superiority or reflects the unequal state of society [10: 60].

In the English language, there are such linguistic features that are peculiar of women: a preference for dividing (tag/disjunctive?) questions, the use of upward intonation where it should be descending?, the use of semantically broken vocabulary, special layers of vocabulary that describe traditionally female spheres of life, often stressed usage, different intensifiers and modals particles "Feminine" modal expressions are much more diverse and are used more often by women, but women joke

much less often than men. If a woman starts using "masculine" language tactics, she is perceived as unfeminine, impudent, feminist. Such language behavior of women often leads to failures in communication. This state of affairs is called "a double bind situation" [12: 226].

Based on the structural and stylistic principle, it is possible to distinguish 4 groups of types of English women in gender linguistics:

1. Names with the structural type "noun + word-address". These are polite forms of address such as Miss Smith. Among the modern trends affecting the behavior belonging to the first group, we note the appearance of the abbreviation MS to designate both married and unmarried women in order not to draw attention to the woman's marital status [1: 85].

2. The address word is the key word and characterizes the addressee by profession, age, external qualities and character: nurse, waitress. These are neutral, colloquial or slang names.

3. Words-names of kinship, there are few of them. Communication with relatives involves a lack of formality, so the address-name of kinship, denoting relatives other than the neutral mother and grandmother, belongs to the colloquial language or jargon: sis.

4. Quasi-addresses ("nicknames"), in which contemptuous and offensive lexical units appear instead of women's names: You, pig, get out! (Get out, pig). In English, politeness towards women is a separate aspect of gender-neutral language. Polite addresses are linguistic coding of social relations in discourse. Thus, they are closely related to pragmatic and sociolinguistic phenomena. They are often grammaticalized and require not only pragmatic but also formal consistency.

The practical material of the article is neologisms of the English language of the international economic sphere with a gender component, used for business communication. Economy is developing rapidly, and some economy transformations cause changes in the

vocabulary. The interest that has arisen in the economy among broad segments of the population, specialists, and entrepreneurs characterizes modern society as a whole. Gender-neutral neologisms are words that do not explicitly indicate whether the object is masculine or feminine.

Let's move on to the consideration of gender-neutral neologisms. Examples can be *activist investor*, *pentpreneur*, *edupreneur*, *bankster*, *funt*, *office plankton*, *knowledge angel*, *sugar daddy*, *glow boy*. The definitions of all the above-mentioned neologisms include the following lexemes: someone, person, individual, worker, people, which give the neologisms a gender-neutral color. So, for example, the neologism *activist investor* – someone who buys shares in a company in order to use the influence in a major change in the company is translated as an active investor, a person who buys company shares in order to use influence during campaigns; *glow boy* – a worker in a nuclear power plant who repairs equipment in hazardous areas and is often exposed to extremely high levels of radiation. We note that all considered gender-neutral neologisms mean the professional sphere of the individual, without dividing it into female and male spheres. The universal nature of the images underlying gender-neutral neologisms is emphasized by the evaluative component. The nomination predicate highlights and clarifies the key distinguishing feature of the neologism *bankster* – a banker whose actions are illegal (a banker whose actions are inadmissible); *knowledge angel* – an individual with extensive knowledge in one or more aspects of business who helps a start-up company that lacks expertise in those areas knowledge and experience in certain areas).

The evaluation component can indicate:

- behavior of an individual – illegal (*bankster*);
- social status – a poor credit history (*funt* – someone who finds it very difficult to get a loan because they have a poor credit history);

- level of qualification – extensive knowledge, little or average skill or knowledge (*office plankton* – people who work in offices, especially if they have little or average skill / or knowledge);

- age – pensionable age (*pentepreneur* – an entrepreneur of pensionable age).

When nominating a profession, the evaluative component is clearly expressed in neologisms semantics, which makes it possible to accurately determine the evaluative feature. The conducted analysis allows us to conclude that new gender-neutral words are used among the neologisms of the international economic sphere. The considered gender-neutral neologisms mean various types of professions, often without specifying gender, using generalizing lexemes to designate a person. The designation of gender and its absence in the vocabulary indicate changes in the social order.

In the course of gender studies in English neologisms semantics, special attention should be paid to the process of men and women's social roles formation, as well as to the changes in socio-cultural, economic and political spheres of society, which are reflected in gender stereotypes existence. It is accepted to understand "culturally and socially conditioned opinions regarding qualities, properties and norms of behaviour of both sexes and their reflection in any language." Characteristically, the number of gender-neutral neologisms prevails due to the

linguistic tendency of the XXI century towards equality.

Language, which is a verbal product of thinking, reflects the world around us and the society in which we live. Social stereotypes are inevitably reflected in a language, and a language, in its turn, contributes to the consolidation of these stereotypes. One of these stereotypes is the so-called a gender discriminatory or sexist language.

Sexist language reflects the preferences of one gender and thus discriminates the other. As a rule, it's discrimination against women. Such a sexist direction of speech, which makes women seem invisible in the process of communication, suggests that a woman is lower than a man. Non-discriminatory, or non-sexist, or gender-equal language recognizes the differences between the sexes, but treats both from a position of equality. Non-sexist language avoids false stereotypes about the nature and role of women and men in society [7: 134].

So, for example, a common form of sexist language is the use of the noun *man* and the pronouns *he*, *his* when referring to both male and female human beings. This deprives women of equal representation in the language. In addition, there is also an ambiguity of understanding, since the words *man*, *he*, *his* can refer exclusively to men. To prevent this, the following alternative solutions can be suggested:

Table 1.

Alternatives to the noun *man*

Recommended to avoid	Recommended to use
Man	Humans, human beings, humankind, man and woman, person, people
Manpower	Workforce, personnel, staff, human resources
Man-made	Artificial, constructed, fabricated, handmade
Man in the street	Average person, ordinary people, people in general

It is recommended to avoid the use of complex words containing the *man*

component and replace them with gender-neutral words.

Table 2.

Alternatives to pronouns *he* and *his*

Recommended to avoid	Recommended to use
Chairman	Chair person, convenor, coordinator

Workmanlike	Skillful, efficient
Policeman	Police officer

In the English language, there is no third person singular pronoun that combines the forms *he* and *she*. As a result the masculine pronoun *he* is used to refer to both men and women. As this usage of the pronoun is ambiguous and excludes women from this category, it is necessary to look for alternative language forms. The simplest solution is to use the double forms *he/she* and

his/her. However, where this becomes burdensome, the best solution is to use plural pronouns or change the sentence structure.

Gender-neutral terms should be used for all professions. If it is necessary to clarify the gender, it is recommended to use the adjectives *male/female* before professions.

Table 3.

Professions

Recommended to avoid	Recommended to use
Groundsman	Gardener, grounds worker, landscaper
Spokesman	Principal advocate, official, representative, speaker, spokesperson
Businessman	Business person, business executive, entrepreneur

Also it's better to avoid professions containing the feminine suffixes *-ess*, *-ette*, *-trix*, *Anne* or the word *woman* in compound nouns. These forms often

carry a derogatory or negative connotation and create the impression that women are derived from the male norm.

Table 4.

Peculiar professions

Recommended to avoid	Recommended to use
Actress	Actor
Authoress	Author
Waitress	Waiter
Sculptress	Sculptor
Businesswoman	Business person, business executive, entrepreneur

Inconsistent use of proper names, titles, and addresses creates the impression that women deserve less respect or less serious treatment than men. The principle of clear sequence and parallel use of titles and ranks should be followed.

The forms of address *Miss* and *Mrs* not only identify a person as a woman, but also emphasize her marital status. At the same time, the form *Mr*, apart from identifying the person as a man, does not carry any additional social information.

Table 5.

Proper names, titles and addresses

Recommended to avoid	Recommended to use
Prof. Green, Judy Gonzales and Hien Nguyen	Alan Green, Judy Gonzales and Hien Nguyen Or Prof A. Green, Senior Lecturer J. Gonzales and Dr. H. Nguyen
The novels of Tolstoy and Jane Austen	The novels of Tolstoy and Austen Or The novels of Leo Tolstoy and Jane Austen

Therefore, it is recommended to use the *Ms* form when addressing all women as a form parallel to *Mr*. The *Ms* form should also be used in all cases where the woman's marital status and preferences are unknown. In cases where

it is known what form of address a woman prefers, this form should be used in communication with her.

Realizing that a language is often used as a means of disparaging women, one should strive to present both sexes as

equals in it. So, for example, the words *man/woman, girl/boy, gentleman/lady* should be used in parallel.

Table 6.

Use of descriptive vocabulary when referring to men and women

Recommended to avoid	Recommended to use
Girls in the office	Secretaries, office assistants, women in the office
Ask my girl	Ask my secretary or assistant

Using diminutive forms of direct address such as *dear love, sweetie, honey* in communication with women in official situations is inappropriately condescending, humiliating and even offensive.

It is not recommended to use language forms that reflect stereotypes of the social roles of women and men. Thus, in the sentence *Lecturers have wives and children to support*, it is assumed that all lecturer-scientists are men.

Table 7.

Gender-role stereotypes

Recommended to avoid	Recommended to use
Henry Lee is a prominent engineer and his wife Ann is a stunning redhead.	The Lees are an attractive couple. Henry is a handsome blond and Ann is a stunning redhead or The Lees are highly respected in their fields. Ann is a noted accountant and Henry is a prominent engineer.

It is also not recommended to refer to a woman's appearance or marital status. In a professional context, where this

information is not provided for men, it cannot be used as a characteristic of a woman either.

Table 8.

Peculiarities of stereotypes in male and female behaviour description

Male characteristic	Female characteristic
Strong	Domineering
Cautious	Timid
Assertive	Aggressive
Firm	Stubborn
Conversation	Gossip

Stereotypes in the description of male and female behavior should be avoided. If certain traits of behavior or character of a man and a woman match, then they should be described using the same linguistic means. The following evaluative adjectives and nouns vividly testify to the establishment of social and linguistic stereotypes.

Conclusion. Therefore, the linguistic representation of gender is considered in modern linguistics as the implementation of gender representation in language through its mirror (gender) reflection using linguistic resources and the existence of such phenomena as male language and female language. The behavior and communication of women and men are significantly influenced by psychophysiological features and gender stereotypes.

Gender characteristics of language behavior are personal manifestations of knowing the world through the prism of male and female vision, which include universal and nationally specific characteristics, reveal the peculiarities of nominative and communicative activity of men and women, as well as the influence of gender on language practice and language behavior.

The most noticeable signs of female speech include: 1) the presence of interjections, modal constructions; 2) the use of clichés and so-called "book vocabulary"; 3) evaluation statements; 4) avoiding naming a person or name; 5) figurative language; 6) use of adverbs and adjectives; 7) constructions "adverb + adverb"; 8) simple and complex sentences, syntactic phrases containing a double negation; 9) extensive use of punctuation marks.

The most noticeable features of male speech include: 1) repeated use of introductory words, namely statements of facts; 2) the use of monotonous lexical techniques when talking about the expression of emotions and the use of the smallest emotional indexing; 3) low level of use of punctuation with emotional stress of speech.

Sexist language reflects the preferences of one gender and thus discriminates the other. As a rule, this is

discrimination against women. Non-discriminatory, non-sexist, or gender-equal language recognizes the differences between the sexes, but treats both from a position of equality. Non-sexist language avoids false stereotypes about the nature and role of women and men in society. Realizing that language is often used as a means of disparaging women, one should strive to present both sexes as equals in it.

REFERENCES

1. Архангельська А. М. Маскулінність та фемінінність як соціокультурні категорії на тлі слов'янського антропонімікону. *Мовознавство*. 2016. № 1. С. 84–85.
2. Бабаш Г. А. Мовна особистість та гендерні стереотипи. *Науковий часопис НПУ імені М. П. Драгоманова. Серія № 9. Сучасні тенденції розвитку мов*. К.: НПУ імені М. П. Драгоманова, 2017. Вип. 2. С. 147–150.
3. Белова А.Д., Д'яконова І.Л. Гендерні ознаки вербальної поведінки в комунікативній ситуації флірту. *Лінгвістика XXI століття: нові дослідження і перспективи*. К.: ЛОГОС, 2017. С. 38–55.
4. Гапон Н. Гендер у гуманітарному дискурсі: філософсько-психологічний аналіз. Львів: Літопис, 2018. 310 с.
5. Засекін С. В. Психолінгвістичні аспекти перекладу: навчальний посібник. Луцьк: ВІЕМ, 2016. 144 с.
6. Мартинюк А. П. Гендер як конструкт дискурсу. *Дискурс як когнітивно-комунікативний феномен / Під загальн. ред. Шевченко І. С.*: Монографія. Харків: Константа, 2015. С. 295–318.
7. Мартинюк А. П. Конструювання гендера в англomовному дискурсі. Харків: Константа, 2018. 292 с.
8. Марценюк Т. Гендерна рівність і недискримінація: посібник для експертів і експерток аналітичних центрів. К., 2017. 65 с.
9. Маслова Ю. П. Мовна реперзентація гендеру. *Наукові записки. Серія Філологічна*. Острого: Вид-во НаУ Острозька академія, 2019. Вип. 12. С. 224–233.
10. Ставицька Л. О. Гендерна лінгвістика: Українська перспектива. *Українська мова*, 2018. № 3. С. 58–66.
11. Сидоренко Н. М., Остапенко Н. Ф. Українські аспекти гендерної рівності. *Вісн. Київ. нац. ун-ту. Сер.: Журналістика*. 2016. Вип. 12. С. 26–28.
12. Яценко М. О. Актуалізація аксіологічного змісту концептів маскулінність та фемінінність у сучасному англomовному художньому дискурсі: автореф. дис... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.04 / Харківський національний ун-т ім. В. Н. Каразіна. Х., 2008. 20 с.

REFERENCES (TRANSLATED & TRANSLITERATED)

1. Arkhanhelska, A. M. (2016). Maskulinnist ta femininnist yak sotsiokulturni katehorii na tli slovianskoho antroponimikonu [Masculinity and femininity as sociocultural categories on the background of the Slavic anthroponymicon]. *Movoznavstvo*. № 1. P. 84–85. [in Ukrainian].
2. Babash, H. A. (2017). Movna osobystist ta henderni stereotypy [Linguistic personality and gender stereotypes]. *Naukovyi chasopys NPU imeni M. P. Drahomanova. Seria № 9. Suchasni tendentsii rozvytku mov*. K.: NPU imeni M. P. Drahomanova. Vyp. 2. P. 147–150. [in Ukrainian].

3. Bielova, A.D., Diakonova I.L. (2017). Henderni oznaky verbalnoi povedinky v komynikatyvniy sytuatsii flirtu [Gender characteristics of verbal behaviour in the communicative situation of flirtation]. *Linhvistyka XXI stolittia: novi doslidzhennia i perspektivy*. K.: LOHOS. P. 38–55. [in Ukrainian].
4. Hapon, N. (2018). Hender u humanitarnomu dyskursi: filosofskopsykholohichnyi analiz [Gender in humanitarian discourse: a philosophical and psychological analysis]. Lviv: Litopys. 310 p. [in Ukrainian].
5. Zasiakin, S. V. (2016). Psykholinhvistychni aspekty perekladu: navchalnyi posibnyk [Psycholinguistic aspects of translation: a study guide]. Lutsk: VIEM. 144 p. [in Ukrainian].
6. Martyniuk, A. P. (2015). Hender yak konstrukt dyskursu [Gender as a discourse construct]. *Dyskurs yak kohnityvno-komunikatyvnyi fenomen* / ed. by. Shevchenko I. S.: Monohrafiia. Kharkiv: Konstanta. P. 295–318. [in Ukrainian].
7. Martyniuk, A. P. (2018). Konstruiuvannia hendera v anhlovmovnomu dyskursi [Gender construction in English discourse]. Kharkiv: Konstanta. 292 p. [in Ukrainian].
8. Martseniuk, T. (2017). Henderna rivnist i nedyskryminatsiia: posibnyk dlia ekspertiv i ekspertok analitychnykh tsentriv [Gender equality and non-discrimination: a guide for analytical centers experts]. K. 65 p. [in Ukrainian].
9. Maslova, Yu. P. (2019). Movna reperzentatsiia henderu [Linguistic representation of gender]. *Naukovi zapysky. Seriia Filolohichna*. Ostroh: Vyd-vo NaU - Ostrozka akademiia. Vyp. 12. P. 224–233. [in Ukrainian].
10. Stavytska, L. O. (2018). Henderna linhvistyka: Ukrainaska perspektyva [Gender linguistics: Ukrainian perspective]. *Ukrainska mova*. №3. P. 58–66. [in Ukrainian].
11. Sydorenko, N. M., Ostapenko N. F. (2016). Ukrainski aspekty hendernoi rivnosti [Ukrainian aspects of gender equality]. *Visn. Kyiv. nats. un-tu. Ser.: Zhurnalistyka*. Vyp. 12. P. 26–28. [in Ukrainian].
12. Yatsenko, M. O. (2008). Aktualizatsiia aksiolohichnoho zmistu kontseptiv maskulinnist ta femininnist u suchasnomu anhlovmovnomu khudozhnomu dyskursi [Actualization of the axiological content of masculinity and femininity concepts in modern English discourse]: avtoref. dys... kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.04 / Kharkivskiy natsionalnyi un-t im. V. N. Karazina. Kh. 20 p. [in Ukrainian].

Стаття надійшла до редколегії: 10.09.2022

Схвалено до друку: 25.11.2022