

THE LINGUISTIC MANIFESTATION OF GENDERLECT IN “ELEN’S DIARY” TV SERIES

<https://doi.org/10.59982/18294359-26.1-ed-32>

Anna Sargsyan

Researcher

YSU, Chair of English Philology

annasargsyan@ysu.am

Abstract

Television, as a reflection of cultural norms and values, provides a rich platform for examining how gendered communication is portrayed and potentially shaped in popular media. This article presents the first linguistic analysis of genderlect in Armenian television by focusing on the youth drama *Elen’s Diary* (Էլենի օրագիրը). Through the study of real dialogues from the series, the research explores how gender identities are constructed through language in scripted media. Grounded in sociolinguistic and discourse-analytic theory, the study examines how male and female characters communicate differently across various interactions. Using qualitative analysis of transcribed scenes, it investigates patterns in vocabulary, speech acts, discourse markers, turn-taking, and emotional expression. The findings reveal that female characters tend to use more emotionally expressive language, hedging, and cooperative strategies, while male characters typically display directness, brevity, and assertiveness. These patterns reflect and reinforce prevailing gender ideologies within Armenian society. The study contributes to media linguistics by highlighting the role of scripted television in shaping how young Armenians perceive gender and communication.

Keywords: *genderlect, Armenian television, media discourse, sociolinguistics, gender identity, Elen’s Diary.*

Introduction

Language is not only a tool for communication but also a powerful means through which social identity is shaped and expressed. Among the most widely studied sociolinguistic variables is gender, and over the past decades, researchers have explored how language both reflects and constructs gender roles and expectations.

The term *genderlect*, introduced by Deborah Tannen, refers to the notion that men and women often speak in socially conditioned dialects that reflect their distinct communicative goals [Tannen, 18]. In her seminal work *You Just Don’t Understand*, Tannen argues that men typically use language

to assert independence and maintain status, whereas women use it to foster connection and build relationships.

Earlier, Robin Lakoff's groundbreaking book *Language and Woman's Place* laid the foundation for the linguistic study of women's speech, identifying features such as tag questions, intensifiers, and hedging as signs of women's socially subordinate position [Lakoff, 12-19]. Lakoff's work sparked decades of scholarly debate over power, politeness, and gendered communication.

Later contributions from scholars like Janet Holmes (1995), Jennifer Coates (2004), and Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (2003) expanded the conversation. Holmes emphasized the strategic use of language by both men and women depending on context and function [Holmes, 2-3]. Coates highlighted how discourse strategies differ in same-sex conversations [Coates, 125-128], while Eckert and McConnell-Ginet argued that gender is not simply reflected in language but actively performed through it [Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 228].

According to Deborah (2005), language is not simply a reflection of gender differences but also a means through which social power relations are constructed and maintained. This perspective allows us to examine how linguistic choices in television series contribute to the representation of femininity and masculinity [Cameron]. In everyday life, whether in casual conversations, films, or television, these gendered patterns of communication become highly visible. Over time, societal expectations have helped shape the distinct ways in which men and women interact linguistically, and television has become one of the most influential platforms where these norms are both reinforced and reimagined. Santoniccolo et al. (2023) provide a recent comprehensive review showing that media still frequently perpetuates gender stereotypes, along with objectification and sexualization. Such representations do not simply reflect social norms but actively reinforce traditional gender roles and expectations [Santoniccolo et al. 4-7]. This background is important because linguistic genderlect in TV dialogue is one of the channels through which media representation operates; variation in speech style, treatment of character roles, and how characters are allowed to speak are part of this larger representational ecology.

Previous research by Li, Liu, and Liu (2022) examined how characters in *The Newsroom* use linguistic devices to negotiate power during conflict talk [Li et al, 62-65]. Their results showed that both male and female characters often deviate from stereotypical gendered linguistic styles, especially female characters, and that power relations in conflict dialogue were dynamic rather than static.

In Armenia, while several studies have explored the psychological and behavioral impact of television on teenagers, these have primarily focused on the influence of media on viewer behavior. For instance, Martirosyan, Menemshyan, and Sargsyan (2015) examined how Armenian soap operas shape teenagers' social attitudes and behaviors, raising concerns about the normalization of aggression, family conflict, and vulgarity [Martirosyan et al, 97-100]. However, their focus was on the reception and psychological effects of media, rather than on language itself.

This is the first known linguistic study to investigate genderlect in Armenian television, specifically within the context of a youth-oriented drama series. The article introduces a gender-focused linguistic lens to Armenian media analysis, offering original insights into how gender identities are constructed and performed in televised dialogue. By combining sociolinguistic theory with discourse analysis, the study highlights both normative and subversive uses of language, revealing the nuanced ways in which gender is communicated in Armenian scripted media.

The aim of this study is to explore how gendered language use is linguistically manifested and performed by male and female characters in the Armenian television series *Elen's Diary 2*. The article seeks to reveal how language serves as a medium for constructing, negotiating, and reflecting gender identities in Armenian media discourse.

The main objectives of this research are to identify gender-based linguistic differences in *Elen's Diary 2*, analyze how these differences reflect communication patterns, examine the role of language in reinforcing or challenging gender ideologies, contribute to media and gender studies through an Armenian cultural perspective, and interpret instances of discursive tension and role reversal in gendered speech.

This study employs a qualitative sociolinguistic and discourse-analytic approach. The data consist of transcribed dialogues from selected episodes of the second season of *Elen's Diary 2*, purposefully sampled to include emotionally significant interactions among male and female characters. Analytical methods include thematic coding based on established gendered speech markers (e.g., hedging, directness, emotional expressivity, discourse strategies), along with pragmatic and conversational analysis. Visual and prosodic elements are also considered where relevant. The study treats the television script as a cultural artifact, using it to examine how gender is performed linguistically in a scripted media context.

This study takes a different approach by examining the linguistic features of gendered speech within the Armenian television series *Elen's Diary 2*. Rather than exploring how audiences interpret or respond to media, the article investigates how gender is constructed and performed through language in scripted dialogue. By analyzing patterns of gendered language use, this research aims to contribute to the intersection of sociolinguistics, gender studies, and media discourse within the Armenian cultural context.

Gender and language peculiarities in *Elen's Diary* TV series

While television has long played a powerful role in shaping and reflecting social identities, surprisingly little attention has been paid to how gender is represented linguistically in Armenian TV dramas. This study is the first to systematically explore how genderlect (gendered patterns of speech) is constructed within Armenian scripted media, focusing specifically on the youth series *Elen's Diary 2* (Էլենի օրագիրը).

Created by Mher Khachatryan and broadcast on Shant Premium from 2017 to 2019, *Elen's Diary* follows the lives of a group of teenagers as they navigate school, relationships, and the emotional ups and downs of adolescence. While the first season centers around high school life, the second season shifts to their university years, offering a more mature perspective on their evolving identities. The story revolves around Elen, a thoughtful and emotionally complex young girl whose inner world is partially revealed through her diary entries.

As one of Armenia's most influential youth dramas, *Elen's Diary 2* provides fertile ground for analyzing how gendered communication styles are portrayed in scripted media. Building on foundational work in sociolinguistics this study examines the ways in which male and female characters use language differently. It focuses on their dialogic patterns, lexical choices, discourse markers, and communicative strategies to reveal how gender is linguistically performed in media narratives.

This research adopts a qualitative sociolinguistic methodology to analyze the series' gendered speech patterns. The dialogues, though scripted, are treated as cultural texts that reflect and reproduce prevailing norms around gender and communication in Armenian society. The study combines elements of discourse analysis, pragmatics, and selective corpus-based observation to examine the interactions between male and female characters.

The data sample consists of selected episodes from the second season, chosen through purposeful sampling. Emphasis was placed on emotionally significant scene; involving romantic relationships, family tensions, peer conflict, or intimate conversations, especially those that involve same-gender or cross-gender interactions. These rich communicative moments provide insight into how language is used to express emotions, manage power dynamics, and maintain social relationships.

Transcripts were manually coded according to themes identified in the literature on gendered language. Where applicable, contextual cues, nonverbal communication, and intonational features were also noted to support pragmatic interpretations.

To illustrate these linguistic patterns, we begin with a scene between Arsen and Elen, which clearly demonstrates gendered differences in conversational style. Arsen's direct and assertive manner is consistent with what Tannen describes as "report-talk". This communication style is typically associated with men, characterized by control, status, and task orientation. Elen, by contrast, uses a more emotionally attuned and indirect style, emphasizing connection and politeness, which aligns with "rapport-talk", which is more often associated with women.

ARSEN: Լավ, դե հիմա ասա ու՞ր ենք գնում:

ELEN: Արսեն, գիտեմ, որ խոստացել եմ գնանք սուրճ խմելու: Ուղղակի խնդրում եմ, ինձ տուն կտանե՞ս:

ARSEN: Բայց...

ԲԱՆԱՍԻՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ

- ELEN: Կներես, հա գիտեմ, որ խոստացել եմ, ուղղակի երեկվանից շատ հոգնած եմ, ուշքի չեմ գալիս: Գնամ մի քիչ հանգստանամ, հա՛:
- ARSEN: Պարզ ա, լավ: Կտանեմ տուն, բայց մի պայմանով:
- ELEN: Ի՞նչ պայման:
- ARSEN: Մինչև երեկո կհանգստանաս, երեկոյան կգաս մեր տուն:
- ELEN: Ձե՞ր տուն, ինչի՞ համար:
- ARSEN: Ուզում եմ ծանոթացնել քեզ քրոջս հետ:
- ELEN: Դե հա, էլի ծանոթացրու: Բայց չի՞ լինի դրսում ինչ-որ տեղ հանդիպենք:
- ARSEN: Ինչի՞ ամաչում ես:
- ELEN: Դե, եսիմ. . .
- ARSEN: Պարզ ա, նորմալ: Հիմա հետս տեղ չես գալիս, երեկոյան էլ մեր տուն չես գալիս, նորմալ ա. . .
- ELEN: Վա՛յ լավ, կգամ: [Elen's Diary 2, Ep. 3 31:37-32:38]

In the given example, Elen avoids direct refusal and instead expresses her intention through apology and justification by using hedges, tag questions. Her speech includes elements of hesitation and emotional explanation, indicating a preference for minimizing conflict and preserving the relationship. Elen's indirect strategies highlights a gendered difference in communication styles, where female speakers tend to avoid direct confrontation.

In contrast, Arsen adopts a more assertive and controlling communicative style. By introducing a condition to his agreement, he shifts the interaction from a cooperative exchange to a more structured negotiation. His insistence on a future meeting demonstrates an attempt to guide the direction of the conversation and maintain control over its outcome.

As a result, Elen ultimately agrees, despite her initial reluctance. This outcome illustrates how conversational dominance can be achieved through persistence and strategic framing. While both participants are actively engaged in the interaction, the final decision reflects an imbalance in communicative power, where Elen's mitigated and cooperative style concedes Arsen's more directive and outcome-oriented approach. Thus, the final agreement is arguably shaped by **implicit pressure and cultural expectations**, particularly in the Armenian context, where women are often socialized to prioritize politeness and agreeability in interpersonal relationships.

Let us consider another example, where Elen and her two female friends, Mariam and Sara are chatting.

- MARIAM: Էլե՛ն, գոնե հիմա ասա, թե՞ ինչ ա եղել:
- ELEN: Դե. . . ամբողջ գիշեր մտածում էի գամ թե՞ չէ:
- SARA: Հա՛, Մաքսն ա պատճա՞ռը:

ELEN: Դե հա, էլ ո՛վ: Դե բայց, որ էստեղ եմ, արդեն պարզ ա՛ ինչ եմ որոշել: [Elen’s Diary 2, Ep. 4 36:54-37:15]

The conversation is marked by emotional alignment, indirectness, and a focus on relational support. The use of “զոնե” (“at least”) and the soft rising intonation expressed through “թե՛ ինչ ա եղել” shows her attempt to encourage disclosure without pressuring Elen, a polite and supportive invitation rather than a direct demand.

Elen responds hesitantly and her sentence is filled with pausing and hedging, both indicators of emotional vulnerability and uncertainty, common traits in female speech patterns. Elen avoids stating her decision directly, instead inviting interpretation and showing her inner conflict, this is an example of conversational strategy that promotes intimacy and empathy.

Sara, on the other hand, is more assertive, but her use of the name “Max” without explanation shows that the three women share contextual knowledge, a sign of solidarity and mutual understanding. This is a classic example of indirect communication for emotional effect, strengthening the bond of empathy between the women.

Overall, this scene highlights the way female characters co-construct meaning in a conversation that prioritizes emotional connection, shared experiences, and mutual understanding. Rather than delivering statements, Elen and her friends exchange emotionally loaded cues, reflecting a feminine discourse style where the process of sharing matters as much as the content. Tannen argues that such exchanges are not “weak” but are shaped by a desire for connection over control, a feature this dialogue clearly exemplifies.

ELEN: Երեխե՛ք, ուղղակի ընկերական շփվում ենք, էդքան բան, վա՛յ:

SARA: Հը՛մ, հա լավ: Ենթադրենք թե դու ճիշտ ես ասում, ենթադրենք: Բայց էդ դեպքում ո՞նց ա ստացվում, որ էդ տղեն նաև Մաքսի ընկերն էլ ա:

MARIAM: Կամ ինչի՞ ա Մաքսը թաքցնում, որ դուք վաղուց եք իրար ճանաչում, հը՛ն:

ELEN: Երեխե՛ք, ես ոչ մի բան չգիտեմ, ազնիվ խոսք [Elen’s Diary 2, Ep. 6 04:03-04:33]:

In this exchange between Elen, Sara and Mariam, we observe linguistic features such as hedging, repetition, indirectness, and affective expression, all of which maintain relational sensitivity while addressing potential tension.

Elen begins defensively yet softly, and her tone blends minimization with affective interjections like “վա՛յ,” which serves to defuse tension and downplay the seriousness of the accusation. This is a typical feature of feminine conversational style: using emotionally expressive discourse to soften face-threatening acts.

Sara responds with skeptical hedging, as well as the use of repetition and the conditional mood functions as a polite challenge, a form of indirect confrontation. Rather than directly accuse Elen of dishonesty, she uses strategic doubt. Tannen notes that women often use such collaborative questioning to seek clarity while preserving interpersonal connection.

Mariam joins in with a similar strategy, including rhetorical questioning and tag question. In response to them Elen uses solidarity markers like “Երեխե՛ք” and emotive intensifiers like “ազնիվ խոսք” (“honestly”) to reaffirm trust and appeal to shared intimacy. She avoids specifics, emphasizing sincerity over explanation, which aligns with feminine communication goals of preserving harmony even in the face of tension.

Ultimately, this scene illustrates how women use language to manage suspicion and protect social bonds simultaneously. All three characters engage in a delicate balance of emotional appeal, indirect pressure, and relational preservation.

Another example to be discussed is the dialogue between Ani and Max. We witness the linguistic interplay of uncertainty and reassurance, shaped by gendered communication styles. Ani's speech displays classic markers of female genderlect, including hedging, self-correction, pauses, and emotional withdrawal, while Max's responses exhibit the male tendency toward problem-solving and emotional stabilization.

- ANI: Համ էլ կհնոյի 2 տոմս ունեմ: Կարանք միասին գնանք. . . Այսինքն մոտս չի, մոռացել էի: Ը. . . Ես ավելի լավ ա տուն գնամ: Դու էլ, եթե ուզում ես կարաս իրանց մոտ գնա կամ չգնաս: Ը. . . , մի խոսքով, ես գնամ, հա՛:
- MAX: Անի՛, սպասի, պստո՛: Ոչինչ տոմսերը մոտդ չի, մենք էլ նորը կառնենք: Խնդիր չկա:
- ANI: Մոտս ա. . . , ոնց որ թե մոտս ա:
- MAX: Լավ, դե արի գնանք [Elen's Diary 2, Ep. 8 27:21-28:20]:

Ani begins with an offer, but immediately backtracks. Her shift from confident suggestion to a corrected negation reflects internal emotional tension, typical of a speaker managing ambivalence or vulnerability. She follows with indicating emotional distancing wrapped in polite suggestion rather than direct rejection. Ani employs multiple hedging devices (“եթե ուզում ես,” “կամ չգնաս”), the interjection “Ը...,” and the noncommittal “մի խոսքով” (“anyway”), all of which reflect emotional conflict and indecision. These linguistic strategies are often used by women to soften exits, preserve face, and avoid confrontation.

Max, in contrast, takes on a comforting and problem-solving role. His direct reassurance and use of simple, solution-oriented phrases like “խնդիր չկա” (“no problem”) reflect male genderlect

traits. Thus report-talk that aims to resolve a situation rather than dwell on emotional nuance. His speech is pragmatic, assertive, and goal-driven.

This interaction reveals a gendered dynamic in which the female speaker's emotional hesitancy and self-doubt are met with a male speaker's reassuring assertiveness. Ani's language is shaped by an internal emotional script, while Max's is externally focused on resolving the tension. Butler (1999) views gender as performative, arguing that gender identities are produced and reproduced through repeated acts, behaviors, and linguistic practices [Butler]. From this perspective, the above-mentioned speech patterns can be seen as performances through which gender identities are constructed and negotiated.

Below is presented the dialogue between Sara and Levon, which is a blend of romantic tension, teasing, and emotional negotiation, expressed through distinct gendered communication styles.

SARA: Հը՛, վայ մամա ջան: Ո՞նց էի մոռացել:

LEVON: Ի՞նչ ես շուխուր անում, Սառա:

SARA: Լևո՛ն, կներես: Մոռացել էի, որ մեր տանն ես մնացել:

LEVON: Կարող ա՛ր ամուսնանանք մոռանաս, որ ամուսնացել ենք, առավոտը քնից հելնես տենաս կողքդ պառկած եմ գոռաս:

SARA: Յա՛, էդ տենց օրիգինալ ամուսնության առաջարկություն էիր անում թե ուղեղդ դեռ քնած ա, անկապ-անկապ խոսում ես:

LEVON: Չէ, դեռ ուղեղս քնած ա ու չեմ ջոգում՝ ինչ ես խոսում: Համ էլ էս ինչի՞ր ես պատրաստվել, ու՛ր ես գնում:

SARA: Իա՛, Լևո՛ն, դասի էլ ուր: Վեր կաց, վեր կաց էսա մի հատ կոֆե բերեմ խմես, որ միասին գնանք:

LEVON: Սառա՛, արի էսօր մնանք տանը, դռները փակենք, հեռախոսները անջատենք, կլինի՞:

SARA: Հը՛, ինչ ռոմատիկ ա, Լևո՛ն: Կներես Լևոն ջան, բայց ես չեմ պատրաստվում նախկին նշանածիս հետ տանը մենակ մնամ մի ամբողջ օր:

LEVON: Նախկին նշանածի թեմայով խոսալու բան կա:

SARA: Իա՛, իրո՞ք [Elen's Diary 2, Ep. 10 08:07-09:20]:

The interaction opens with Sara's exclamatory interjections (“վայ մամա ջան”) and rising intonation indicating emotional expressiveness, a hallmark of female genderlect. Levon immediately responds by displaying male-coded conversational economy: short, direct, and somewhat dismissive. His use of “շուխուր” (fuss) minimizes her emotion, reflecting Tannen's notion that men often downplay emotion in favor of control or detachment.

ԲԱՆԱՍԻՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ

The dynamic quickly becomes flirtatious and sarcastic. When Sara apologizes for forgetting he stayed over, Levon mockingly replies, “Կարող ամ ամուսնանանք մոռանա, որ ամուսնացել ենք” (“What if we get married and you forget we’re married?”). This humorous hypothetical uses exaggeration and absurdity, typical of male teasing as a non-confrontational form of emotional expression. Sara’s use of sarcastic questions, meta-commentary, and mocking tone reflects female conversational competence, particularly in defusing emotional tension with humor while still asserting autonomy.

Levon shifts the topic, signaling interest through indirect control. Sara replies with cheerful command, but then her imperative tone is softened by nurturing care (bringing coffee), illustrating the blend of authority and support characteristic of rapport-talk. He is brief and suggestive in his speech, implying unfinished emotional business. Sara’s surprise with exclamation is both a prompt and a challenge, again blending playfulness with curiosity, a common feature in female conversational style.

This dialogue exemplifies genderlect not in opposition, but in interplay. Sara and Levon engage in a verbal dance of challenge and emotional testing, where female expressiveness and agility meet male indirect affection and humor. While both use teasing and jokes, Sara’s language is more emotionally transparent and socially strategic, while Levon’s affection is veiled in irony and humor.

- MARIAM: Էլե՛ն, շատ իրեր ունե՛ս: Շատ ժամանակ ա քեզ պե՛տք տեղափոխվելու համար:
- ELEN: Չէ, դե կարևոր իրերը կվերցնեմ, մամայիս նկարները: Եսիմ ընտանեկան ալբոմները, տենց էլի:
- SARA: Էլե՛ն, ալբոմ ասեցիր հիշեցի, ըմ. . . դու հիշում ես, որ ասեցիր մեր վերջին զանգի նկարներից ունես հանած, որ ալբոմի մեջ ես դրել:
- ELEN: Հա, ոնց չեմ հիշում:
- MARIAM: Կբերե՛ս նայենք: Ես նենց հավետով կնայեմ:
- SARA: Հա էլի, բե՛ր ես էլ:
- ELEN: Հա՛, էսա գտնեմ, ստեղ ա:
- SARA: Էլե՛ն, էդ ի՞նչ ա:
- MARIAM: Էլե՛ն:
- ELEN: Սառա՛, մի բան խնդրեմ կանե՛ս:
- SARA: Ի՞նչ:
- ELEN: Սա՛ն, խոստացի, որ կանես:
- SARA: Էլե՛ն, արդեն անհանգստացա:
- MARIAM: Ի՞նչ ես մտածել:
- ELEN: Սա՛ն:
- SARA: Վա՛յ, հա, Էլեն կանեմ: Ասա՛ ինչ [Elen’s Diary 2, Ep. 10 42:02-44:07]:

This dialogue is filled with extensive use of hedges, mitigations and politeness strategies, which serve to soften requests, reduce imposition, and maintain positive interpersonal relations.

The speakers frequently employ hedging devices such as the interrogative particle «-ե՛ս» in questions. These question forms introduce uncertainty and invite cooperation rather than direct commands, typical of female speech that values diplomacy and face-saving.

Mitigation through politeness markers is evident in the use of softening particles like «դե» and «հա՛», which attenuate statements and requests, making them less forceful and more tentative. In addition, expressive intensifiers and interjections such as «Վա՛յ» convey emotional involvement and reinforce group solidarity, while overlapping and cooperative turn-taking signal a shared conversational space where control is distributed rather than monopolized.

As Daalmans (2017) shows, female-targeted TV programming often reproduces stereotypical portrayals of women [Daalmans et al, 368-369]. In *Elen's Diary*, although female characters occupy central narrative positions, their speech is frequently marked by qualifiers, emotional framing, or indirectness; features consistent with broader patterns of gendered representation.

- LEVON: Ի՞նչ ես անում, Սառա՛:
- SARA: Միասին կտանենք, Լևո՛ն:
- LEVON: Սառա՛, համբերությունս ես փորձում: /գոռալով/
- SARA: Լևո՛ն, քեզ ծանրություն բարձրացնել չի կարելի, թո՛ղ:
- LEVON: Լսի՛, Սառա՛, հերիքա քեզ սենց պահես:/գոռալով/ Քիչ ա մնում ինձ էլ գրկած ման գաս, որ սեփական քաշիցս չվատանամ:
- ELEN: Վա՛յ երեխեք:/ծիծաղելով/
- SARA: Ծիծաղելի ա՛ ձեզ համար:
- ELEN: Չէ:
- SARA: Էլե՛ն, Լևոնը շատ դժվարությամբ ա ոտքի վրա կանգնում:
- LEVON: Վերջ տո՛ւր, Սառա՛: Սուս մնա՛:
- SARA: Չէ, ինչի՞ Լևո՛ն: Էստեղ բոլորը մտածում են, որ Սառան իրան հիմարի նման ա պահում, հա՛: Ու քո մոտ էլ ա էդ նույն տպավորությունը [Elen's Diary 2, Ep. 14 18:30-19:24]:

The dialogue between Levon, Sara, and Elen features directness and emotional intensity especially in Levon's speech, as seen in his repeated vocatives and raised volume. Levon's imperative phrases such as «հերիքա քեզ սենց պահես» (“enough of you behaving like this”) convey frustration and assertiveness typical of masculine speech patterns focusing on control and dominance.

In contrast, Sara's speech is characterized by politeness and mitigation, using vocatives with softening particles and indirect negation to advise Levon gently. This reflects female language

preference for indirectness and face-saving. Sara also uses rhetorical questioning which, while assertive, remains embedded in mitigated and polite language, balancing confrontation with social grace.

Elen's brief interjections, «Վա՛յ երեխեք» ("Oh, guys") and laughter, function as emotional softeners, reducing tension and signaling social solidarity without directly intervening.

The dialogue's turn-taking reveals a dynamic interplay between Levon's forceful, report-talk style and Sara's more mitigated, rapport-oriented communication. Vocatives serve both to attract attention and to express emotional stance, with Levon's repeated use emphasizing control and Sara's signaling engagement and concern.

Overall, this interaction demonstrates genderlect differences through Levon's direct, confrontational style and Sara's indirect, mitigated, and polite responses. The linguistic devices of hedging, politeness particles, vocatives, and rhetorical questioning collaboratively manage interpersonal conflict and relational negotiation in this Armenian conversational context.

- LEVON: Ուզում եմ ասել, որ արի փակենք էս թեման:
- ELEN: Ես էլ ուզում եմ ասել, որ Սառան նեղացած գնաց, գիտե՛ս:
- LEVON: Վաղը կխոսամ հետը:
- ELEN: Լևո՛ն, ինչի՞ ես տենց ուրիշ դարձել իրա հանդեպ:
- LEVON: Չկա տենց բան:
- ELEN: Կա, ախր դուք ուրիշ էիք:
- LEVON: Ուղղակի մեծացել ենք:
- ELEN: Հետո ի՞նչ:
- LEVON: Քեզ թվում ա, որ եթե դու ու Մաքսը բաժանված չլինեիք, հիմա էլի նույն հեքիաթային սիրահարված զույգն է՞իք լինելու: Էդ էտապն անցել ա, Էլե՛ն:
- ELEN: Եթե անցել ա, ուրեմն քայլ արա՛: Ինչի՞ չես անցնում հաջորդ էտապին: Ինչքա՞ն եք սենց շարունակելու:
- LEVON: Ես մտածում եմ էդ մասին:
- ELEN: Լավ էլի, Լևո՛ն: Դու մենակ ժամանակ ես ձգում:
- LEVON: Լսի՛, ի՞նչ ես ուզում, Էլե՛ն /գոռալով/ Elen's Diary 2, Ep. 14 34:47-35:41]:

In the example above Levon's speech exhibits a predominantly direct and controlling style, while Elen's language incorporates mitigations and challenges that aim to soften confrontation yet assert her position.

Levon initiates with a direct imperative, signaling a desire to end discussion abruptly. His statements are often short and categorical, reflecting the male genderlect tendency toward report-

talk with minimal elaboration. Despite this directness, Levon uses some hedging, which softens his stance and indicates reflection, adding nuance to his otherwise firm speech.

Elen counters with politeness and mitigated challenges, employing interrogatives with rising intonation and conditionals. These indirect strategies soften her criticism while pressing for action.

This dialogue demonstrates the genderlect pattern where the male speaker favors direct, controlling language with occasional hedges to soften face threats, while the female speaker uses mitigated questioning and polite challenges to negotiate relational tensions without escalating conflict.

- ZORI: Օրինակ, Արսենին հաստատ դուր չի գա, որ ես ու դու որ ժամին ուզենք կարանք գնանք էլենի տուն:
- LEVON: Տո՛ւ էդ Արսենը ո՞վ ա է՛ վաբշե: Ո՞վ ա, որ պետք ա չթողի ես էլենի հետ ընկերություն անեմ կամ չանեմ: /գոռալով/
- MAX: Լյո՛վ, հանգստացի՛: Զորին ճիշտ ա ասում: Մենք իրա համար անցյալից մի հատ բեռ ենք: Եթե ինքը ուզում ա առանց մեզ ապրի, առանց իրա անցյալի մարդկանց, ուրեմն թող ապրի: Մենք իրան չենք խանգարի: . . . Հը հանգստացի՛, ի՞նչ ես անում:
- LEVON: Տենց հեշտ հանձնվեցիր, հա՛: Էլենը քո համար նվեր ա, հա՛: /գոռալով/
- MAX: Լյո՛վ, արդեն չես ջոգում ինչ ես խոսում [Elen's Diary 2, Ep. 16 07:30-08:06]:

This dialogue reveals a predominantly male conversational space where emotional intensity, confrontation, and power negotiation dominate, aligning with male genderlect features such as directness, assertiveness, and minimal mitigation.

Levon's language is heavily marked by forceful directness and volume, illustrated by repeated use of vocatives, exclamatives, and shouting. His outburst exemplifies confrontational language devoid of softeners, designed to assert dominance and reject imposed limits.

Max plays a mediating role, using mitigation and appeals to reason. His line «Հանգստացի՛» (“Calm down”) is repeated, functioning as a discourse management tool. Max softens potentially face-threatening content with justifications and constructs his argument reflectively, avoiding personal blame and presenting the issue in broader relational terms.

Levon's repeated rhetorical questions («հա՛») and sarcastic phrasing («Էլենը քո համար նվեր ա, հա՛») are emotionally charged and confrontational, used to challenge Max's position and signal frustration. This strategy reinforces his emotional intensity while dismissing rational discussion.

Max concludes with a face-saving act, which both criticizes and attempts to halt intensification, maintaining the social relationship while distancing himself from the emotional outburst.

ԲԱՆԱՍԻՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ

- SARA: Ու ֆայո՛:
- ELEN: Հա ու ֆայո:
- MARIAM: Ու գնա՛ց:
- ELEN: Երեխե՛ք, ու գնա՛ց:
- MARIAM: Չէ, էլե՛ն: Դու հաստատ ինչ-որ բան կիսատ ես պատմում:
- SARA: Կարող ա՛ր ինչ-որ բան բաց ես թողել:
- ELEN: Հա, վա՛յ: Հեռախոսն էր մոռացել: Իջացրեցի շքամուտքում էր դեռ, տենց հեռախոսը տվեցի, խոսալով դուրս եկանք բակ, ճանապարհեցի, էդ տղեն գնաց, ես էլ բարձրացա տուն:
- SARA: Ու վե՛րջ:
- MARIAM: Էդքա՞նը:
- ELEN: Ի՛ր. . . [Elen's Diary 2, Ep. 17 10:01-10:40]

This conversation among three female characters manifests key features of female genderlect through its use of hedges, mitigation strategies, emotional interjections, and cooperative discourse. The speakers construct meaning not only through what is said but how it is said, using language to maintain engagement, emotional resonance, and group cohesion.

The dialogue is filled with interrogative hedges. These rising intonation questions function less as demands for information and more as pragmatic strategies to express disbelief, invite elaboration, and maintain conversational flow. They also reflect a form of collaborative storytelling, prompting Elen to continue or clarify rather than challenging her directly.

Turn-taking is collaborative and overlapping, with multiple voices prompting, echoing, and building on each other's remarks. The repetition of phrases like «*Ու գնա՛ց*» and «*Ու վե՛րջ*» creates a rhythm of shared curiosity and dramatization, which is common in conversational storytelling among women.

In the domain of digital communication, Za'rour, Damra, and Mitib Altakhaine (2023) found that **female reviewers** consistently display more detailed and descriptive-oriented writing, with attention to style, aesthetics, narrative forms, emotional expressions, qualifiers, metaphors, and markers of uncertainty. In contrast, male reviewers tend toward concise, factual, utilitarian language [Za'rour et al. 7]. Our findings in *Elen's Diary* similarly show that female characters use more qualifiers, narrative framing, emotional discourse, and metaphor in scenes involving personal or relational topics, while male characters tend to be more direct and less ornamented in interactional turns. Thus, genderlect in scripted television both draws on and reinforces broader sociolinguistic expectations.

Conclusion

This research marks a pioneering step in the linguistic analysis of Armenian television by introducing genderlect as a critical lens for examining media discourse. The results demonstrate that *Elen's Diary* portrays gendered language use in ways that largely reinforce conventional gender norms; women as expressive and relational, men as assertive and authoritative. However, the series also contains moments of discursive tension and role reversal, especially in emotionally complex scenarios, suggesting that Armenian media is beginning to reflect more nuanced and evolving conceptions of gender. The findings suggest that *Elen's Diary* not only reflects but also reinforces gendered linguistic norms within Armenian youth culture. The portrayal of genderlect in the series mirrors broader societal expectations regarding masculinity and femininity; emphasizing emotional fluency and relational orientation for women, and assertiveness and brevity for men. Overall, these linguistic features (hedges, mitigations, softening particles, and indirect requests) work synergistically to construct a polite, emotionally attuned, and inclusive discourse, aligning with female genderlect patterns that prioritize relational maintenance and social bonding. Thus, the findings support Butler's (1999) notion of gender performativity, as the characters continuously construct and express their gender identities through language and interaction. While some instances of role reversal are observed, they are typically temporary and framed within specific narrative tensions (e.g., romantic crisis, moral conflict). By documenting these linguistic patterns, this study provides critical insight into how gender identities are discursively constructed in Armenian media. Moreover, it establishes a foundation for future research into the sociolinguistic dynamics of Armenian popular culture.

References

1. Butler, J. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge. 1999, 256p.,
2. Cameron, D. *Language, gender, and sexuality: Current issues and new directions*. *Applied Linguistics*, 26(4), 2005, pp. 482–502, <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ami027>,
3. Coates, J. *Women, men and language: A sociolinguistic account of gender differences in language* (3rd ed.). Pearson Education. 2004, 260 p.,
4. Daalmans, S., Kleemans, M., & Sadza, A. Gender representation on gender-targeted television channels: A comparison of female- and male-targeted TV channels in the Netherlands. *Sex Roles*, 77(5-6), 2017, pp. 366–378, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0727-6>,
5. Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. *Language and gender*. Cambridge University Press. 2003, 379 p.,
6. Holmes, J. *Women, men and politeness*. Longman. 1995, 264 p.,
7. Lakoff, R. *Language and woman's place*. Harper & Row. 1975, 50 p.,

8. Li, H., Liu, H., & Liu, D. *Gender/power relationships in fictional conflict talk at the workplace: Analyzing television dramatic dialogue in The Newsroom. Journal of Pragmatics*, 187, 2022, pp. 58-71, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.10.030>,
9. Martirosyan, N., Menemshyan, A., & Sargsyan, Z. The influence of soap operas on Armenian TV on the formation of the social behaviour of teenagers. 21st Century: Information and Analytical Journal, (1)17, Yerevan: Noravank Foundation. 2015, pp. 96–112,
10. Santoniccolo, F., Trombetta, T., Paradiso, M. N., & Rollè, L. *Gender and media representations: A review of the literature on gender stereotypes, objectification and sexualization. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(10), 5770, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20105770>,
11. Tannen, D. *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation. Ballantine Books. 1990, 344 p.*,
12. Za'rour, R., Damra, L., & Mitib Altakhaineh, A. R. Gendered linguistic patterns in online reviews on localized E-commerce platforms in Jordan and the UAE: An exploratory study. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 10(1), 2023, <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2025.2548259>,
13. Elen's Diary 2, Khachatryan, M. M., Youtube, https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLldKbEnBj_B_chotija4YMjp8KI_wvgwn, 15.09.2025.

Submitted on 10.04.2026.

Sent for review on 06.05.2026.