Natia Zardiashvili

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN EMOTION FRAMING

Abstract

Expressing and understanding emotions can be considered one of the key activities of our lives. However, at times, the feelings of a person might be misinterpreted or the initial emotional response in a partner might be misunderstood. There have been various studies concerning the differences in emotion expression between male and female target groups (Chaplin 2015). This research discusses the issues of emotion framing in public discourse paying particular attention to the ways male and female speakers frame emotions and influence the audience.

Consequently, the article focuses on emotion framing and compares two presidential candidacy speeches (Hilary Clinton's and Donald Trump's) from the USA elections recorded in June 2015. The research showed that both speakers follow the same pattern of emotion framing (positive social identity construction-framing-emotion implication) but used different techniques and emphasise different values throughout the speech. These differences were linked to Hofstede's (1983) definition of cultures with high versus low masculinity rate and finally, assumptions were made about how gendered stereotypes influence different ways of framing emotions.

Keywords: Gender stereotypes; Framing; Sociolinguistics;

1. Introduction

Communicating emotions is one of the key goals of public speakers as it is their main tool to influence and persuade their audience. According to Schnall (2005), the aim of communication is to reach a certain cognitive outcome, to communicate relevant information. (Schnall 2005: 28) Accordingly, in the process of successful communication, the speaker and the listener develop common reality and the information in this reality is not transposed word by word as an instruction of some kind but has to be inferred. (see Schnall 2005: 28)

Holmes and Schnurr (2006) studied gender differences in organisational culture and noted that "gender is relevant at some level in every workplace interaction, an ever-present influence on how we behave, and how we interpret others' behaviour, even if our level of awareness of this influence varies from one interaction to another, and from moment to moment within an interaction."

(Holmes & Schnurr 2006: 33). Likewise, we are always conscious of gender roles, presume a certain way of expressing emotions and interpret these emotions accordingly. However, these interpretations also depend upon the culture's understanding of what is feminine and masculine. According to Hofstede (1983), in cultures with low masculinity rate "men need not be assertive, and can also assume nurturing roles. Whereas in cultures with High masculinity rates men should behave assertively, and women should be nurturing." (Hofstede 1983: 63). This means that culture encodes and prescribes gender roles that serve as a norm for social life.

According to Brody and Hall (2008) "gender differences in emotional functioning are both mediated and moderated by sociocultural, cognitive, biological, and behavioral variables." (Brody & Hall 2008: 395). In any interaction, social norms play a significant role. It is important to make a distinction between communicating emotions and framing emotions. Framing emotions does not necessarily imply communicating emotions, because the main goal of emotion framing is not directly connected to influencing audience in order to reach a certain level of understanding and agreement between the speaker and the listener. Speakers, through subconsciously following a specific pattern that will be briefly discussed below, achieve mutual understanding. The focus of the research was to observe if this pattern reveals similarity concerning male and female speakers. The specific pattern represents the hypothesis according to which, in order to achieve emotional influences, speakers follow several stages, namely, a positive social identity creation – the framing – an emotional implication.

Gendered stereotypes of emotions play a great role in the research because these stereotypes serve as guidelines of what is expected from females versus males while trying to discuss sensitive issues. Because stereotypes can be emotion-specific, one can use these expectations purposefully to frame emotions. For example, according to Brody & Hall (2008), happiness, embarrassment, surprise, sadness, fear, shame, and guilt are believed to occur more frequently in women whereas anger, contempt, and pride are observed in men (Brody & Hall 2008: 396). Revealing stereotypically female emotions can serve for men as a tool to connect with the audience and to make an emotional influence on the listener.

An additional important factor in the study of gender differences must be a cultural context. The theoretical framework for this case would be Hofstede's theory (1983) which through four dimensions (power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism versus collectivism, and

masculinity versus femininity) explains the ways we act in certain social situations. Chaplin (2015) gives several examples in which cultural context overwrites the stereotypes, see the extract:

> *"For example, in working-class or low-income U.S. settings, girls may be encouraged to appear "tough" in order to protect themselves in potentially dangerous neighborhoods, and thus these girls may not face strong socialization pressures to limit anger expressions (Brown, 1999; Eisenberg, 1999; Miller & Sperry, 1987). In addition, different ethnic groups may have different display rules for emotion, and potentially for gender and emotion. For example, Matsumoto (1993) found, in a U.S. sample, that Caucasian adults rated displays of fear as more appropriate than Hispanic adults and sadness as more appropriate than African Americans and Asian Americans. This could mean that Caucasian parents in the US may be more likely to encourage sadness expressions among girls, whereas African American parents may be more likely to discourage sadness expressions, possibly for both boys and girls."* (Chaplin 2015: 18-19)

As mentioned, social rules play a significant role in any type of communication. To study emotion framing, on the bases of Tajfei & Turner's social identity theory (1986) and frame theory (Minsky 1974) specific system was constructed. This system is represented through three stages: a positive social identity creation – the framing –an emotional implication.

One of the main goals of this research is to observe whether both male and female speakers follow the same system and if so, what initial differences may be observed between the stages. The first stage of the system is to create a positive social identity. Theoretically, this is explained through Tajfei & Turner's social identity theory (1986). This theory outlines three main principles that individuals follow to create positive social identity: 1. Maintaining positive social identity; 2. Positive social identity is based on comparisons between in-group and out-group members. 3. In case of unsatisfactory social identity, individuals will leave the group or make their existing group more positively distinct (Tajfei & Turner 2004: 284).

The second stage in the system involves the framing. Framing generally implies using cognitive structures to create a common reality. Framing can be achieved through semantic frames (see Fillmore 1976) or through bigger units like paragraphs; using humour can also serve as a tool to frame certain idea or emotion. Framing is understood as a tool for the speaker that is used for

creating common cognitive evaluation and understanding of reality. At the last stage of emotion framing appears to be the emotion implication. Following the speakers' frame, the main message is to create implications in the listener's mind. Depending on what framing strategies speakers use, this always results in certain, different emotion implications. This last stage of the process is crucial for the successful communication and correct understanding of the speaker's intentions.

2. Data and Methodology

Two speeches (one female speaker and one male speaker) from the presidential campaign (June 2015) of the United States have been analysed and compared. Both speeches are announcements of the candidates for the president. The speakers are Hilary Clinton and Donald Trump. Duration of Hillary Clinton's speech is 45:52 minutes and of Donald Trump's - 46:34 minutes. These speeches and transcriptions may be found on the following links:

1. Hillary Clinton https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-i8vdM15K6c ;

 Transcript: https://time.com/3920332/transcript-full-text-hillary-clinton-campaign-launch/

2. Donald Trump https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SpMJx0-HyOM&t=44s;

Transcript: https://www.cbsnews.com/news/transcript-donald-trump-announces-his-presidential-candidacy/

 The selected speeches share context and time span to minimise the difference concerning the social importance and emotional involvement of the society.

Methodologically, the three-level system of analysis was used, theoretically based on social identity construction theory (Tajfei & Turner 1986) and frame theory (Minsky 1974), each stage concentrating on different aspects of emotion framing. The first stage of the analysis involved identification of the episodes where the speakers tried to positively distinguish themselves. On the second stage, the framing strategies were identified and analysed and on the last, third stage the collected information was linked to corresponding framing strategies and possible emotional implications were identified.

3. Findings and Discussions

3.1 Hillary Clinton's Speech

The speaker starts the speech by identifying herself as a positive in-group member. To do this, she outlines her career paths by stating the following:

Example 1:

"It's wonderful …. To be in New York with my family, with so many friends, including many **New Yorkers who gave me the honor of serving them in the Senate for eight years.**

To be right across the water from the headquarters of the United Nations, **where I represented our country many times."**

This choice of emphasising lifelong achievements of the speaker demonstrates the social value of success and its positive value, especially for females. This seems particularly significant because throughout the whole speech, Clinton demonstrates the qualities characteristic for society with low masculinity rate, but in this particular case, when she portrays herself as a positive in-group member, she chooses to underline the qualities characteristic of the society with higher masculinity rate. These qualities include achievement ideals, independence ideal excelling, decisiveness, sympathy for the successful achiever (Hofstede 1983: 63). However, at the same time we will see the qualities like modesty, equality and unisex and androgyny ideals. These ideas are expressed in the following passage:

Example 2:

"President Roosevelt called on every American to do his or her part, and every American answered. He said there's no mystery about what it takes to build a strong and prosperous America: **"Equality of opportunity… Jobs for those who can work… Security for those who need it… The ending of special privilege for the few… The preservation of civil liberties for all… a wider and constantly rising standard of living***."*

I assume that while portraying her positive identity, Clinton emphasised the qualities that are stereotypically appreciated in men and when she moved on with the framing of the ideals, she mentioned the qualities accepted by low masculinity rate societies.

Having created a positive identity, the speaker moves on to framing, the main points of her campaign. As well as this, through framing, she manages to create emotional implications. It is worth noting that this three- stage process of emotion framing (which creates positive social identity-framing-emotional implications) does not necessarily correspond to the specific parts of texts, such as, introduction, main body and conclusion. In one small paragraph, all three stages may emerge or they can be distributed more distantly throughout the text. Through the next example (3) the speaker frames injustice by describing the sharp issues concerning gender inequality in the workplace. This framing gradually builds up the emotional implication of lack of fairness and, in

the end, reaches its peak through the question "when?" and the answer "I say now." This answer also emphasises a highly masculine trait of decisiveness.

Example 3:

While many of you are working multiple jobs to make ends meet, you see the top 25 hedge fund managers making more than all of America's kindergarten teachers combined. And, often paying a lower tax rate.

So, you have to wonder: "When does my hard work pay off? When does my family get ahead?"

"When?"

I say now.

Later on, as can be seen from example 4 below, the speaker carries on to frame injustice and again creates emotional implication of lack of fairness by again emphasising inequality.

Example 4:

"Prosperity can't be just for CEOs and hedge fund managers.

Democracy can't be just for billionaires and corporations.

Prosperity and democracy are part of your basic bargain too.

You brought our country back.

Now it's time — your time to secure the gains and move ahead.

And, you know what?

America can't succeed unless you succeed."

Through the following passage (example 4) we see another attempt to create a positive identity (*"Prosperity can't be just for CEOs and hedge fund managers. Democracy can't be just for billionaires and corporations"),* frame ideals ("*Prosperity and democracy are part of your basic bargain too")* and build up emotional implications (*You brought our country back. Now it's time — your time to secure the gains and move ahead. And, you know what? America can't succeed unless you succeed.").*

In the next example (5) the speaker creates her positive identity through making contrasts between different social classes and distinguishes financially weaker members of society.

Example 5:

*"I'm running to make our economy work for **you and for every American**.*

*For the **successful** and the **struggling**.*

*For the **innovators** and **inventors**.*

*For those **breaking barriers in technology** and **discovering cures for diseases.***

*For the **factory workers** and **food servers** who stand on their feet all day.*

*For the **nurses** who work the night shift.*

*For the **truckers** who drive for hours and the **farmers** who feed us.*

*For the **veterans** who served our country.*

*For the **small business** owners who took a risk.*

For everyone who's ever been knocked down, but refused to be knocked out.

*I'm not running for **some** Americans, but for **all** Americans."*

In this case (example 5), I assume that the process of creating positive identity also implies framing Clinton's ideals as an example of the moral values, therefore creating emotional implications of fairness. The speaker tries to depict sharp contrasts between the mentioned professions and the inferred, less important or less moral ones. These comparisons continue throughout the whole speech and serve the same goal, namely they help to implement the moral values and build an emotional implication of fairness versus unfairness.

Another interesting aspect of the speech is the framing of family values. Therefore, reaching the first step in emotion framing (positive identity construction) by framing the family values, she portrays the emotional implications of respect in the audience. (see Example 6) ;

Example 6:

"My mother taught me that everybody needs a chance and a champion. She knew what it was like not to have either one.

*Her own parents **abandoned** her, and by 14 she was **out on her own**, **working as a housemaid**. Years later, when I was old enough to understand, I asked what kept her going.*

*You know what her answer was? Something very simple: **Kindness from someone who believed she mattered.***

*The 1st grade teacher who saw **she had nothing to eat at lunch** and, without embarrassing her, brought extra food to share.*

*The woman whose house she cleaned letting her go to high school so long as her work got done. **That was a bargain she leapt to accept.***

*And, **because some people believed in her, she believed in me**.*

That's why I believe with all my heart in America and in the potential of every American."

I assume that the speaker frames her mother as her moral standard and by again contrasting completely opposite situations emphasising having nothing versus having everything, she creates emotional implications of respect in the audience. In the end of this passage (example 6) when she states: "***That's why I believe with all my heart in America and in the potential of every American***" we can assume she already has the respect of the audience because of the family values she framed by outlining traits typical for low masculinity rate societies, namely: sympathy for the unfortunate (*Her own parents **abandoned** her)*, work to live (*The woman whose house she cleaned letting her go to high school so long as her work got done)* and people orientation (*And, **because some people believed in her, she believed in me***).

The final part of the speech was also interesting, as you can see from the example 7 the speaker again carries on framing family values with the purpose to create emotional implications of respect in the audience:

Example 7:

"I wish my mother could have been with us longer. I wish she could have seen Chelsea become a mother herself. I wish she could have met Charlotte.

*I wish she could have seen the America we're going to build **together**.*

*An America, where **if you do your part, you reap the rewards**.*

*Where **we don't leave anyone out, or anyone behind**.*

An America where a father can tell his daughter: yes, you can be anything you want to be. Even President of the United States."

Overall, the speech showed that the speaker followed the emotion framing system theoretically based on identity construction theory (Tajfei and Turner 1986) and frame theory (Minsky 1974). This system can further be reintroduced as the following scheme:

Stage 1 – Creating a positive identity

The speaker uses humour or creates a sharp contrast between the different groups of society

(or)

The speaker states herself as a distinctively positive member of the group

(or)

The speaker distances herself from the negatively coloured out-group.

Stage 2 – Framing

After building a positive social identity, a certain level of trust is achieved in the audience so the speaker starts framing ideas. Framing can be achieved through employing semantic frames, or longer units like utterances and paragraphs.

Stage 3 – Emotional implication

The main goal of framing is to create emotional implication in the speaker. Depending on the context, framing different ideas can cause different emotional implications. This process is always syncronised with context.

Through framing emotions, therefore, following the system, the speaker also demonstrated various occasions (as discussed above) when she used the strategies that are stereotypically considered to be masculine by Hofstede; for example decisiveness, independence, striving to success etc. (Hofstede, 1983: 62). However, Clinton also emphasised characteristics of low masculinity rate societies such as unisex ideals, equality, orientation etc. These distinctions between using feminine versus masculine traits also follow certain guidelines. For example, she never portrayed herself to be stereotypically feminine (did not focus on her own role in a family as a mother, did not emphasise her nurturing role in her family), however, she advocated for a number of qualities usually seen in low masculinity rate cultures. This indicates that she tried to portray herself as a strong individual. To achieve this, she employed the role of a masculine character, but at the same time, while speaking about her ideals and policy, she distinguished herself from masculine society and put forward the issues, such as equality for both sexes, for minorities; Clinton advocated for women by portraying a strong female character of her mother as a role model. Although the morals of low masculinity rate society was displayed, as a political character, the speaker portrayed herself as having qualities typical for masculine societies. The reason for this can be stereotypical assertions of dividing sexes based on two opposite (strong versus weak) qualities: Strength is usually stereotyped with men and weakness – with women. One of the reasons for the speaker to use masculine traits while building up her identity can be her willingness not to associate herself with what is considered stereotypically "feminine".

3.2 Donald Trump's speech

Trump starts the speech (example 8) by using humor. In other cases, using humor would directly indicate the attempt of the positive identity construction of the speaker, but in this case, I assume it

serves as a demonstration of power to out-group members. Interestingly, this strategy still leads to the positive identity construction.

Example 8:

"And, I can tell, some of the candidates, they went in. They didn't know the air-conditioner didn't work. They sweated like dogs.

(LAUGHTER)

They didn't know the room was too big, because they didn't have anybody there. *How are they going to beat ISIS? I don't think it's gonna happen."*

Demonstrating his power over others also serves as a positive identity indicator in this context as Trump frames it as a positive trait. The humorous passage always creates a very "light" atmosphere that can be used to generate a very sharp contrast by introducing emotionally opposite settings. In this particular speech, after the joke, the speaker rapidly moves on with drawing the audience's attention to the problem (example 9).

Example 9:

"Our country is in serious trouble. **We don't have victories anymore**. *We used to have victories, but we don't have them. When was the last time anybody saw us beating, let's say, China in a trade deal? They kill us.* **I beat China all the time. All the time."**

The problem outlined by the speaker is "having no more victories". As this passage (example 9) is preceded by a humorous passage (example 8) the problem may sound harsher for the audience. This leads to the speaker being distanced from negative out-group members ("*I beat China all the time. All the time.*") and perceived to be a strongly positive in-group member. Later on, the speaker moves on to the stage of framing (example 10).

Example 10:

*When did we **beat** Japan at anything? They send their cars over by the millions, and what do we do? When was the last time you saw a Chevrolet in Tokyo? It doesn't exist, folks. They **beat** us all the time.*

When do we beat Mexico at the border? They're laughing at us, at our stupidity. And now they are beating us economically. They are not our friend, believe me. But they're killing us economically.

The U.S. has become a dumping ground for everybody else's problems.

In the following example (10) the frame "beat the opponent"[1] is employed. This frame is reintroduced through lexical unit "beat". Using this frame serves the purpose of creating emotional implications of anger. The peak is reached in the last sentence of the example 10: *"The U.S. has become a dumping ground for everybody else's problems."*

Later in the speech (example 11) Trump carries on framing wealthiness and uses it to create the emotional implication of anger.

Example 11:

"I'm using my own money. I'm not using the lobbyists. I'm not using donors. **I don't care. I'm really rich**. *I (inaudible).*

(APPLAUSE)

And by the way, I'm not even saying that in a -- that's the kind of mindset, that's the kind of thinking you need for this country.

TRUMP: So -- because **we got to make the country rich**.

It sounds crass. Somebody said, "Oh, that's crass." It's not crass.

We got $18 trillion in debt. **We got nothing but problems**.

We got a military that needs equipment all over the place. We got nuclear weapons that are obsolete.

We've got nothing. *We've got Social Security that's going to be destroyed if somebody like me doesn't bring money into the country. All these other people want to cut the hell out of it. I'm not going to cut it at all;* **I'm going to bring money in**, **and we're going to save it."**

At the same time, Trump also demonstrates his power and success (***I don't care. I'm really rich.***) This is the trait characteristic of highly masculine societies as it indicates the achievement ideal (Hofstede 1983: 62). However, from observing audience's response this statement (example 11) is not perceived to be negative. One of the reasons for this can be the stereotype that men are expected to express pride. After framing wealthiness, a sharp contrast described by "owning nothing" is created to generate the emotional implication of anger. It has to be noted that throughout the whole speech, anger is the most frequently employed emotional implication.

It is worth noting that while speaking about his family (example 12), unlike Clinton, Trump mainly expresses his pride towards the members of the family, but, at the same time, doesn't utilize

---

[1] The frame is taken from FrameNet database. The project has been in operation at the International Computer Science Institute in Berkeley since 1997 and through the theory of Frame Semantics maps meaning to form in English. https://framenet2.icsi.berkeley.edu/fnReports/data/frameIndex.xml?frame=Beat_opponent

his family as a tool for framing to create an emotional implication of pride or respect in the audience. Moreover, while expressing his own attitude towards his own family, he is very laconic and does not concentrate on family values.

Example 12:

"That's true. But actually I am. I think I am a nice person. People that know me, like me. Does my family like me? I think so, right. **Look at my family. I'm proud of my family.**

(APPLAUSE)

By the way, speaking of my family, Melania, Barron, Kai, Donnie, Don, Vanessa, Tiffany, Evanka did a great job. Did she do a great job?

(APPLAUSE)

Great. Jared, Laura and Eric, **I'm very proud of my family**. **They're a great family."**

This can also indicate to another stereotype, specifically, that men are not emotional, which implies that they do not publicly express emotions unlike women. In this case, this stereotype is employed, as the speaker does not use any emotion-related vocabulary, or framing technique to influence the audience emotionally.

Another interesting part from the speech demonstrates how the speaker frames his success and openly expresses his pride concerning what he has achieved (Example 13). This extract clearly serves to demonstrate him as a strong and successful individual. As well as this, the interesting fact here is that he himself explicitly (and not implicitly) demonstrates his pride. Although this behaviour can be accounted as negative, but according to the stereotypical thinking, men are expected to express pride and powerful emotions (see Timmer et al 2003).

Example 13:

"And after four or five years in Brooklyn, I ventured into Manhattan and did a lot of great deals -- the Grand Hyatt Hotel. I was responsible for the convention center on the west side. I did a lot of great deals, and I did them early and young. **And now I'm building all over the world, and I love what I'm doing.**

But they all said, a lot of the pundits on television, "Well, Donald will never run, and one of the main reasons is he's private and he's probably not as successful as everybody thinks."

So I said to myself, you know, nobody's ever going to know unless I run, **because I'm really proud of my success. I really am."**

Throughout the speech the speaker repeats the phrase "*nobody can do it better than me*" or uses comparisons (example 14). This phrase is used for framing his strong identity and it represents the trait characteristic of high masculinity rate cultures where excellence: trying to be the best is highly appreciated.

Example 14:

*"I would build a great wall, and **nobody builds walls better than me**, believe me, and I'll build them very inexpensively, I will build a great, great wall on our southern border. And I will have Mexico pay for that wall....*

*.....**Nobody would be tougher on ISIS than Donald Trump**. Nobody.*

*.......**Nobody can do that like me**. Believe me. It will be done on time, on budget, way below cost, way below what anyone ever thought.*

*......But if I get elected president I will bring it back **bigger and better** and **stronger** than ever before, and we will make America great again."*

Overall, it can be claimed that the speaker followed the three- stage system of emotion framing, but rather than communicating various emotions, his focus was to create emotional implications of anger. He portrayed himself as a strong individual and for this, he did not employ a set of moral principles but very straightforwardly outlined some of the milestones of his career and openly appreciated the pride he has for himself without any necessary agreement from the audience. This kind of attitude made the audience respect him as an individual. However, the question remains whether it would be the same if Trump was a female?

4. Conclusion

Having analysed both speeches made by two candidates for presidency Hilary Clinton and Donald Trump, we can single out the similarities between them. The emotion framing system constructed upon social identity theory (Tajfei & Turner 1986) and framing theory (Fillmore 1976) was followed by both speakers. Specifically, both speakers followed the following stages: 1. Positive identity construction; 2. Framing; 3. Emotional implication. The difference, however, lay in the particular strategies employed by the speakers to influence the audience emotionally.

1. **Positive identity construction:** in order to construct positive identity, Clinton emphasised her career paths and demonstrated her achievements. However, she did not openly express her pride in her success and left it to be inferred by the audience. On the other hand, Trump used humor for two

purposes, first to portray himself as a strong individual and secondly, to create a friendly atmosphere and then make the issues under discussion seem sharper. Therefore, employing the system, Trump presents himself as positively distinct from the out-group by emphasising his superiority over his opponents.

2. **Framing**: Both speakers used framing as a strategy. However, Clinton (the female speaker) mainly framed family values, injustice, morals etc. On the other hand, Trump (the male speaker) used the frames of wealthiness, success, and "beat opponent". Differences in framing strategies showed two different cultural traits, namely, the opposition between feminine versus masculine societies. Femininity as the framing strategy for moral values was employed by the female speaker, whereas, the male speaker framed his ideals through outlining traits characteristic to masculine societies.

3. **Emotional implications:** Emotional implications were different for each speaker. The female speaker used framing to reach emotional implications of the lack of fairness, respect. On the other hand, the male speaker used frames and mainly created emotional implications of anger and unfairness.

While discussing gender differences at the stage of emotion framing, it can be claimed that according to these two examples, the female speaker showed more variety of emotions and was concentrated not only on the audience's negative emotional disposition towards out-group members, but also used emotional implications of respect for herself. On the other hand, the male speaker mainly focused on portraying negative and "powerful" emotions like anger, contempt, and pride. Both speakers created negative emotional implications towards out-group members whereas negative emotions were used mainly to imply excellence and greater power over out-group members.

While creating the positive identity of speakers, Clinton revealed characteristics usually employed by high masculine rate societies, such as independence, decisiveness, achievement ideal. These characteristics can be regarded as stereotypically masculine traits. The male speaker, however, did not really emphasise any particular personal traits, but openly expressed powerful emotions, such as pride and the willingness and ability to be better than others.

As a conclusion, we can say that there are number of differences in the way male and female speakers frame their emotions. However, one cannot assume that these differences are universal. For the future analysis, it is important to analyse a bigger corpus of data for more specific answers.

In addition, a more in-depth analysis can also demonstrate the types of semantic frames used by female versus male speakers, consequently providing more information on the framing techniques employed differently by the two genders.

Bibliography:

Biehl, M., Matsumoto, D., Ekman, P., Hearn, V., Heider, K., Kudoh, T., & Ton, V. (January 01, 1997). Matsumoto and Ekman's Japanese and Caucasian Facial Expressions of Emotion (JACFEE): Reliability Data and Cross-National Differences. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 21, 1, 3-22.

Brody, L. R., & Hall, J. A. (2008). Gender and emotion in context. In M. Lewis, J. M. Haviland-Jones, & L. F. Barrett (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (p. 395–408). The Guilford Press.

Chaplin, T. M. (2015). Gender and Emotion Expression: A Developmental Contextual Perspective. Emotion Review, 7(1), 14–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073914544408

M., Matsumoto, D., Ekman, P., Hearn, V., Heider, K., Kudoh, T., & Ton, V. (January 01, 1997). Matsumoto and Ekman's Japanese and Caucasian Facial Expressions of Emotion (JACFEE): Reliability Data and Cross-National Differences. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 21, 1, 3-22.

Hofstede, G. (1983). National Cultures in Four Dimensions: A Research-Based Theory of Cultural Differences among Nations. International Studies of Management & Organization, 13(1/2), 46-74. Retrieved March 29, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/40396953

Holmes, J. and Schnurr, S. (2006), 'Doing femininity' at work: More than just relational practice1. Journal of Sociolinguistics, 10: 31-51. doi:10.1111/j.1360-6441.2006.00316.x

Schnall, S. (2005). The Pragmatics of Emotion Language. Psychological Inquiry, 16(1), 28-31. Retrieved March 29, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/20447256

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (2004). The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior. In J. T. Jost & J. Sidanius (Eds.), *Key readings in social psychology. Political psychology: Key readings* (p. 276–293). Psychology Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203505984-16

Timmers, M., Fischer, A. H., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2003). Ability versus vulnerability: Beliefs about men's and women's emotional behaviour. Cognition and Emotion, 17(1), 41–63. https://doi.org/10.1080/02699930302277

Acknowledgements:

Author's email: nati Natia.Zardiashvili347@hum.tsu.edu.ge

Author's biographical data:

The author of the article is a PhD student at Javakhishvili State University, currently working in Cognitive linguistics on the issue of framing emotions in English public discourse. She has an extensive experience of teaching English to multi-level and exam-oriented classrooms. The author teaches at a language learning center in Tbilisi.