

Linguistic and Communicative Factors in the Formation and Destruction of Professional Military Officer Stereotypes

Liudmyla Pelepeichenko, National Academy of the National Guard of Ukraine, Ukraine
Tetiana Podufalova, H. S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University, Ukraine

Abstract

This article identifies linguistic and communicative factors that determine the formation of model professional military officer stereotypes and the destruction of outdated ones, as well as suggests communicative ways to influence this process. It substantiates the structure of a professional stereotype, according to which the model stereotype of an officer is recreated as a result of the surveys. It is proved that the main factors in the formation of the model officer stereotype are national experience, fixed in words, set expressions, proverbs, sayings and aphorisms, literary and folklore works, as well as feature films. These media of mass communication form the model officer stereotype through the depiction of positive traits of literary or film characters. The factors that determine the modeling of the negative features of the real officer stereotype are experience gained in the process of a person's activity, and influence of the mass media. Static language units, which include set expressions, proverbs, and aphorisms, verbalize features of officer stereotypes that affect the formation of axiological features and a language community's mental patterns of behavior. Dynamic units, which include texts of different types, are more flexible; they can perform not only the function of forming officer stereotypes, but also that of destroying outdated ideas. In terms of the influence of feature films on the destruction of outdated stereotypes in the military sphere, two ways are distinguished: one based on the negative, and the other based on the positive. It is shown that the first method is to present information about an outdated stereotype through a negative character's lines, and the second one is to create documentaries and feature films that contradict outdated ideas. It is proved that the process of forming model stereotypes and breaking outdated ones can be regulated by encouraging film crews to perform socially important tasks.

Keywords: professional stereotype, professional stereotype structure, model officer stereotype, real officer stereotype, dynamic language units, static language units.

1. Introduction

Since Lippmann (1922/1991) pioneered the study of stereotypes, scholars' interest in them has been growing, as this problem is at the intersection of different sciences, including psychology, social communications, linguistics, and others (Tagiuri 1969; Putnam 1975; Tajfel 1981; Ageev 1986; Melnik 1996; Kashima et al. 2008; Butyrina 2009; Riabokon 2010; Blynova 2013; Andreou 2017; Bartmiński 2017; Harkavenko 2019; Burgers and Beukeboom 2020). The reason for scholarly attention to this problem is not only its obvious theoretical importance, but also its connection with urgent practical issues. Stereotypes are the basis for developing ideas about models of objects, abstract entities, and phenomena, for making evaluations, and more broadly – for creating ideals without which the spiritual life of humanity is impoverished. On the other hand, demonstrating the operation of the law of unity and conflict of opposites, stereotypes often become an obstacle to the perception of new approaches and to the understanding of the evolution of a worldview, which causes negative

phenomena in human behavior. In this context, the task of breaking outdated stereotypes in individual and social consciousness is urgent. And again, the insufficient study of this phenomenon, and therefore the lack of clear ideas about ways to change stereotypes attract attention. Among the numerous problems dealing with the topic under consideration, our attention was drawn to a set of issues concerning the linguistic factors, communicative, semantic and pragmatic ones that influence the formation and destruction of professional stereotypes. We realize that the problem of stereotypes is at the intersection of different scientific paradigms, and each of the approaches to its analysis highlights their own aspects of the stereotype phenomenon. However, the phenomena studied in different sciences, and in different paradigms within them, are always reflected in language: in the semantics of language units, their pragmatic potential, in different types and forms of communication – this idea is convincingly proven in cognitive linguistics. For this reason, we chose semantic and communicative aspects of professional stereotypes and identified the following research vectors: a) what ideas about the features of the professional officer stereotype are represented, on the one hand, in system language units (words, set expressions, and proverbs), and on the other, in texts of different styles and genres created by native speakers (aphorisms, sayings, textbooks, handbooks, texts of literary and cinematographic works); b) what role these language units play in creating professional officer stereotypes and destroying outdated ones. Since it is impossible to cover all these genres of texts within one article, we focused on those that are less studied in terms of the chosen topic. The focus of these issues on the linguistic (communicative, semantic and pragmatic) study of stereotype theory and on solving practical problems of the destruction of outdated ideas indicates the topicality of the chosen subject.

There are necessary prerequisites for studying specifics of professional stereotypes: many definitions of the generic concept of *stereotype* have been proposed in different sciences (Lippmann 1922/1991; Tagiuri 1969; Putman 1975; Tejfel 1981; Ageev 1986); aspects of stereotype analysis have been outlined and effective research methods have been offered (Lippmann 1922/1991; Petrenko 1986; Harkavenko 2019).

The study of theoretical sources revealed one feature in the investigation of the chosen phenomenon: both the proposed models of analysis and the selection of material for it deal mainly with ethnic (Sternin et al. 2003; Karasik 2004; Bartmiński 2017) and gender stereotypes (Lukianova 2009; Kim and Weseley 2017; Dniprova et al. 2018; Pelepeichenko 2019; Kochman-Haładaj 2020). The issue of their professional varieties still seems to be in the background, although some research has been undertaken in this area (Petrenko 1986; Klimanska 2011; Samkova 2017; Lyubymova 2018; White et al. 2019; Moquin et al. 2020). This state of affairs can be explained in part by a great number of professions, each one being significantly different from all others, and therefore stereotypes of different professions cannot be identical. However, there is every reason to believe that the ways of forming professional stereotypes can be similar, because both professions themselves and ideas about them are the result of interaction between people in society. This means that the results of our research can shed light on other professional stereotypes. The above observations determined the directions of our research.

Developing the main hypothesis based on the assumption of the difference between the mechanisms of various factors that influence professional stereotype formation and destruction, we chose to analyze the professional stereotype of a military officer. To avoid tautology, we use the terms *officer*, *military officer*, and *military person* as synonyms. The purpose of the study presented in this article is to identify specifics of the factors that

determine the formation of positive and the destruction of negative professional officer stereotypes, and to substantiate the communicative ways to influence this process.

The stages of the research are connected with the performance of the tasks necessary to achieve the purpose. First of all, we consider it necessary to decide on the definitions of the basic concepts involved in the paper (stereotype, professional stereotype, stereotype structure). At the next stage it is necessary to model the structure of a professional stereotype because both social and individual ideas are formed not about some vague abstract essence, but about specific features of the analyzed phenomenon. Next, we outline features of the formation of the professional officer stereotype, single out outdated stereotypes and identify the role of linguistic factors in their formation and destruction. Finally, on the basis of the identified features, we substantiate the communicative ways that influence stereotype formation and destruction.

2. Methods

Research methods were chosen in accordance with the tasks. When formulating the definition of the basic concepts involved in the study, we relied on general scientific methods. Thus, the method of analysis was employed to distinguish between common and different features in the definitions of basic concepts which are presented in theoretical sources. Analyzing the numerous definitions of the stereotype concept found in theoretical sources, we compared the scholars' views, identified the similarities and differences, and classified them according to the type of given information. As a result of this work, the information was summarized and presented in our interpretation.

Working with the language material (set expressions, proverbs, texts of dialogues in films, and texts of handbooks for cadets), we used the method of analysis to identify features of the professional military officer stereotype. In the course of our work, we applied the method of component analysis (a subtype of analysis) to the semantic paradigm. We singled out the semantic component of *a military officer's character trait* in the language units that reflect society's perception of officers.

In the creation of the professional stereotype structure, methods of modeling and component analysis were employed as the main ones, while the method of synthesis – as a supplementary one. The method of synthesis helped to model a holistic structure based on the distinguished features. The structural elements of the model were drawn mainly from viewing official websites of the National Guard of Ukraine and the Armed Forces of Ukraine (Ministerstvo oborony Ukrainy 2001–2020; Natsionalna akademiia n.d.), and from studying military handbooks created in NATO, the USA and Ukraine (Webfoot Warrior 2003; Generic Officer 2011; Voloshyna et al. 2011; McNab 2016; Ranger Handbook 2017). In addition, Ukrainian and English dictionaries (Slovnyk ukrainskoi movy 2018; Collins 2020; Merriam-Webster 2020), collections of Ukrainian and English proverbs, sayings and aphorisms (Ukrainski pryslivia ta prykazky 2020; Vislovi.in.ua 2020; BrainyQuote 2001–2020; Goodreads 2020; Wise Old Sayings 2000–2020), as well as feature films (movies) and documentaries on military topics (Reiner 1992; Spielberg 1998; Scott 2001; Horlova et al. 2017) were involved in the analysis.

The general scientific method of systematization was used at all the research stages – thanks to it, rather heterogeneous language material was correlated with the features of the professional stereotype. The method of classification served to categorize the distinguished features of the stereotype. In the description of the professional stereotype of the Ukrainian

military officer, as well as in the description of the factors in the destruction of the outdated stereotypes, the method of generalization was employed: we generalized the information obtained from the analysis of linguistic and communicative factors identified in the study. The method of comparison was used to distinguish the features common to the model officer stereotype and the real one. Descriptive methods helped to present the information obtained as a result of the study.

In order to check the completeness of the stereotype structure features that we singled out, the survey method was employed. First, the article presents the results of the surveys conducted in 2009 and in 2014 in the study of other issues and published in our research works (Pelepeichenko 2009; Pelepeichenko et al. 2014), then the findings of the survey conducted in 2020 to establish changes in the perception of an officer. The 2020 questionnaire was offered to 50 cadets and 50 students. It should be noted that the survey confirmed the results of our own observation.

We modeled the sources of stereotype formation on our own observation of the mass media materials in Ukraine and the United States (thus we used the general scientific method of observation). To confirm or refute them, we added multiple-choice questions to the questionnaires, namely: 1. What influenced you to develop the idea of an officer? (Underline all your chosen sources: your own experience of communication; stories of friends or relatives; books you read; feature films; songs; other answers). 2. What works of art and feature films had the greatest influence on you? The questionnaire findings confirmed our own observations too.

In order to substantiate the ways to influence the formation of new stereotypes and the destruction of outdated ones, modeling and argumentation methods were used. We modeled the ways of influence, proving their reliability with fact-based and example-based arguments. The use of some research methods is due to the specifics not only of the tasks, but also of the material for research. Identifying ways to verbalize stereotypes, we used the method of selection: we selected language units that provide information about military people's features from dictionaries and collections of proverbs, sayings and aphorisms. The same method was employed in the selection of articles and news that contain information about military personnel, as well as of feature films on military topics. Working with the films, we used analysis as the main method: from different scenes of the films, we singled out those which manifest the features identified in the modeled structure of the stereotype.

3. Results and discussion

The stereotype phenomenon as a research subject is interdisciplinary. It is studied in psychology (Lippmann 1922/1991; Tagiuri 1969; Tejfel 1981; Ageev 1986; Blynova 2013), social communications (Butyrina 2009; Harkavenko 2019), linguistics (Putnam 1975; Andreou 2017; Bartmiński 2017; Burgers and Beukeboom 2020), and other sciences. In her monograph on the problems of social communications, Butyrina substantiates three approaches to the stereotype study: cognitive, linguistic and metatheoretical (Butyrina 2009). The diversity of approaches to the study of the phenomenon under analysis determines differences in the interpretation of the concept. Blynova (2013: 41) notes:

From a social point of view, a stereotype is a schematic, simplified description of social objects or phenomena, an extremely stable image or idea of a certain object, class of objects, or social group. From a psychological point of view, a stereotype is a

structural part of an individual's consciousness, which is expressed in the form of evaluative judgments and ideas about social objects or phenomena and is realized through the subject's behavior and actions.

Without aiming to analyze different definitions in detail, we will distinguish their common and different features. All scholars note that a social stereotype is characterized by schematization, emotional coloring, stability of ideas, and belonging to a particular community (Lippmann 1922/1991; Tagiuri 1969; Tejfel 1981; Ageev 1986). The differences do not concern the denial of certain features, but the distinguishing of additional ones. Their main types include the tendency towards evolutionary changes (Tagiuri 1969; Tejfel 1981), the realization of particular features in certain conditions (especially in conflict), and a person's age in the creation of stereotypes (Tagiuri 1969). Other features are more related not to the essence of a stereotype itself, but to the external attitude to it, i.e. the attitude of the subjects who model the stereotype (Tagiuri 1969; Tejfel 1981; Ageev 1986), and ways to create stereotypes (Melnik 1996; Harkavenko 2019).

Summarizing the shared features of the definitions, we interpret the concept of a stereotype as a reflection in social consciousness of the typical features of a phenomenon (a social group, object, situation, or event), which is formed on the basis of common social experience and external influence, is fixed in language, and determines the formation of evaluations and mental models of communicative behavior. In the scholarly literature, ethnic and gender stereotypes are comprehensively described (Sternin et al. 2003; Karasik 2004; Lukianova 2009; Bartmiński 2017; Kim and Weseley 2017; Dniprova et al. 2018; Pelepeichenko 2019; Kochman-Haładyj 2020). We focus our attention on stereotypes about members of certain professions. We define a professional stereotype as a reflection in social consciousness of the typical features of members of a particular profession, their rational and emotional evaluations, formed on the basis of a set of factors, national and personal experience as well as external influence being the main ones. It should be noted that the issue of ways to form stereotypes remains debatable. The debates on the mechanisms of stereotype creation are analyzed in the works by Melnik (1996), Riabokon (2010), and Harkavenko (2019). In our opinion, all the factors substantiated by different scholars play a part in the formation of social ideas: both personal experience and external influence, regardless of the source of influence. And the idea of the mass media's powerful role seems to be absolutely indisputable.

The study of any stereotype requires distinguishing between structural components that form the essence of ideas and those that demonstrate the features of the formation of a stereotypical image. We define the structure of a stereotype as a set of features that make up its essence. In the structure of a professional stereotype, we distinguish components according to different features, and, following other researchers (Ageev 1986; Bartmiński 2017), consider value priorities of a member of a profession to be the main one. Important features also include components perceived by the senses (appearance, clothes, hairstyle, etc.; loudness and tone of voice); components perceived in the process of communicative interaction (features of speech – a wide range of vocabulary, expressiveness, accuracy, emotionality, knowledge of other languages, compliance with literary norms; a mastery of public speaking skills, ability to establish communicative contact, use of conversational maxims, prioritized communicative strategies and tactics, behavior in various communicative situations – compliment, conflict, threat, etc.). We also single out components that are perceived as a result of the observation of professional activity (intellectual, moral,

volitional, and physical qualities). According to axiological features, we distinguish an evaluation component (rational evaluation and emotional evaluation) and an emotional component (emotions and feelings of anxiety, enthusiasm, admiration, surprise, indignation, etc.).

In addition to these features, we distinguish those that constitute the specifics of a communicative subculture: gender, regulatory requirements for behavior and their content, the distance of power, subordination within an organization. According to gender features, we distinguish stereotypes with two gender types (masculine and feminine) and with one type (either masculine or feminine). On the basis of regulatory requirements, we distinguish stereotypes with generally accepted standards of behavior and with specific ones. The distance of power can be large and small, and subordination within an organization can be clearly and vaguely defined. In a stereotype, we distinguish between core components that are most significant for the corresponding stereotype, and peripheral ones which are also characteristic of it, but do not constitute an essential feature as a member of a particular profession. Taking into account the axiology of stereotypes, we distinguish between a model stereotype – the best example of the type, a kind of ideal that has no negative features, and a real stereotype (existing in real life) – a notion that contains both positive and negative features.

Obviously, a comprehensive study of professional stereotypes according to the proposed structure cannot be performed within a single article. Given the large number of features and areas of professional stereotype consideration, we will address the problem stated in the article title from three aspects: professional value priorities, features of communicative behavior, and moral and volitional qualities.

Let us recreate the stereotype of an officer, based on the results of the research (Pelepeichenko 2009; Pelepeichenko et al. 2014), the survey, and analysis of military handbooks (Webfoot Warrior 2003; Generic Officer 2011; Voloshyna et al. 2011; McNab 2016; Ranger Handbook 2017). One of an officer's main value priorities is the country he/she serves, the need to protect it. The core component of the stereotype is made up of the features of *patriotism* and *readiness to defend one's country*. They determine moral and volitional traits that are inherent in the model stereotype of an officer. The results of the survey conducted in 2008–09 showed that the perception of an officer includes the following characteristics: discipline, diligence, organization, responsibility, punctuality, composure, courage, decency, purposefulness, politeness, strength, endurance, integrity, thrift, readiness for difficult conditions, the ability to react, bravery, patriotism, willpower, ambition, self-control, respect for women, reliability, independence, confidence (Pelepeichenko 2009: 150).

According to the findings of our survey in 2020, the list of traits has scarcely changed, but their ranking has changed (the traits that were not named in 2009 are in italics): patriotism, *love of one's country*, strength, courage, bravery, *the ability to quickly make right decisions*, responsibility, endurance, *steadfastness*, self-confidence, *sociability*, punctuality, discipline, willpower, purposefulness, reliability, organization, composure, decency, diligence, thrift, respect for women, *gallantry*. Thus, these features are stable, which is characteristic of stereotypes. As we can see, the respondents' answers fix, firstly, value priorities, and secondly, personality traits – moral, volitional, intellectual, organizational, and communicative.

The model officer is a sociable person. According to the results of the 2014 and 2020 surveys (Pelepeichenko et al. 2014), he/she speaks clearly, distinctly, and concisely, and expresses his/her thoughts logically and accurately. The model officer has good public

speaking skills. As far as communication strategies are concerned, the politeness strategy is obligatory for the model officer stereotype in any situation whereas the imperative strategy (in accordance with the requirements of the Statute), and the explanation strategy (which is prompted by an officer's discourse practices) are compulsory in his/her service; if a situation requires it, the model officer skillfully uses the inspiration strategy.

The model officer's reactions to compliment, aggression, and dispute are specific. His/her reaction to a compliment is balanced, devoid of heightened emotionality and exaltation. The model officer understates the degree of positivity expressed in the compliment (the linguistic realization of the corresponding tactic is "Everyone would do the same", or "It is my duty"). In response to aggression in communication, the model officer first displays cold politeness, remains calm, does not raise his/her voice, does not allow an altercation, but responds clearly, demonstrating the strategy of dominance in one way or another. In a dispute, the model officer uses primarily logical arguments, refutes erroneous views with facts, and does not resort to manipulative and indecorous tactics of dispute. He/She finds it difficult to make compromises, allowing them only in difficult situations. The model officer usually wins a dispute, although does not stress the fact of his/her superiority.

According to subcultural features, the model officer stereotype allows for two gender types – masculine and feminine. His/her behavior is subject not only to generally accepted standards, but also to specific ones which are regulated by the Statute. The distance of power is great, and subordination within a military unit is clearly defined.

The real stereotype of an officer in society's perception has many features in common with the model stereotype, and yet looks a little different. Common features include value priorities, patriotism, courage, bravery, and discipline. However, public opinion also revealed negative features of the real officer stereotype: a narrow worldview, much attention to formal features and little attention to conceptual ones; a tendency to act pretentiously. Negative communicative traits include the use of obscene language, inflexibility in communication (unwillingness to take into account side factors when working towards his/her goal), the excessive use of the dominance strategy, the use of an imperative even in communication with civilians (students, teachers, regardless of status), and the inability to use the strategy of cooperation. While the real officer's reaction to a compliment coincides with that of the model officer, his/her reaction to aggression is different: the real officer makes a counterattack in response to aggression, even more aggressive than the act against him/her. In a dispute, he/she completely rejects a compromise and recognizes only his/her victory. The real officer is often guided by outdated ideas in gender behavior: officially supporting gender equality, in practice he/she prefers the masculine type. Other subcultural features coincide in the model and real stereotypes.

The next stage of our research is to identify ways to form stereotypes. In other words, it is important to establish what factors played a major role in the formation of model stereotypical ideas and real ones. We share the views of those scholars who acknowledge the primary role of national experience in this process (Lippmann 1922/1991; Melnik 1996; Karasik 2004; Butyrina 2009; Harkavenko 2019). National experience is passed down from generation to generation and is fixed in language. Forms and methods of fixing experience in language perform at least two main functions: first, they are powerful factors in the formation of a language community's stereotypes, and secondly, they are equally powerful factors in the destruction of negative stereotypes. It should be noted that in the analyzed processes, a slightly different role is played by system language units (we tentatively called them static, given their relative stability and slow change) and those formed in the process of language

functioning and a language community's activity – we called them dynamic (Pelepeichenko 2019). System units include words, set expressions, idioms, proverbs, sayings, catchwords, aphorisms, etc. They are presented in dictionaries of different types. Dynamic units include, firstly, texts of different styles and genres, and secondly, those products of people's intellectual activity in which texts are presented in one way or another – that is, songs, cinematographic works (documentaries and feature films), memes, etc. (Pelepeichenko 2019).

Let us illustrate the processes of officer stereotype formation and destruction with examples. The Ukrainian and English words reflect primarily positive features of the officer stereotype, as indicated by the meaning of the corresponding words and their associations: *воїн, захисник, оборонець* (Slovnyk ukrainskoi movy 2018); *warrior, guard, defender* (Collins 2020; Merriam-Webster 2020). The Ukrainian set expressions represent the model stereotype of an officer on the basis of evaluative information about the Cossacks, which is positive: *усіх козаків козак* (a Cossack of all Cossacks), *справжній козак* (a true/real Cossack). Both set expressions indicate the highest evaluation of a military person in relation to all the elements that make up the structure of a professional stereotype. In the modern Ukrainian language there is a phrase that is becoming common: *справжній офіцер* (a true/real officer), which cannot be called a set expression yet, but the frequency of use predicts that it is likely to become one in the future. A positive evaluation is fixed in the English phrases too: *a companion (comrade) in arms* (“a fellow soldier or associate in a militant cause”), *a brother in arms* (“a fellow member of a military service”); both phrases imply the fact that fellow soldiers/officers have shared the same difficulties and dangers. It should be noted that, in general, in both languages there are few set expressions about military people that represent the stereotypes.

Proverbs summarize a people's experience of what a warrior should be like. The Ukrainian proverbs focus on the following features of military people:

- volitional (*Козак не боїться ні тучі, ні грому* (A Cossack is not afraid of clouds or thunder); *Не той козак, що за водою пливе, а той, що проти води* (A Cossack is the one who swims upstream, not the one who swims downstream); *Береженого бог береже, а козака шабля стереже* (God protects those who protect themselves, and a sword guards a Cossack); *Або полковник, або покойник* (Either a colonel or a dead man));

- the skill/ability to behave properly in battle (*В бою козак себе славить не на язичі пилюкою, а конем та шаблюкою* (In battle, a Cossack glorifies himself not in words with dust, but with a horse and a sword); *Бій хоробрих любить* (The battle loves the brave));

- the need to always be ready to defend their country (*Козак на печі – ворог Січі* (A Cossack on the stove is the enemy of the Sich));

- leadership qualities, the ability to control the actions of soldiers (*Без доброго командира військо – отара* (The army without a good commander is a flock of sheep); *Міцний полк командиром* (The commander makes a regiment strong));

- the people's attitude to military people (*У козака життя коротке, а слава вічна* (A Cossack's life is short, but his glory is eternal); *Де козак, там і слава* (Where there is a Cossack, there is glory)).

As can be seen from the above examples, the proverbs reflect mainly the moral and volitional qualities of military people, but not all of them. It is a well-known fact that moral and volitional traits are positively evaluated in folklore and fiction. Thus, the model stereotype of military people was created as a result of gained experience and is fixed in the language system and works of fiction and folklore.

A similar conclusion can be made on the basis of the selection from the English language collections of sayings and aphorisms. Analysis of aphorisms and sayings of famous American, British and Canadian personalities allowed us to identify these positive features as components of the military person stereotype:

- moral: • patriotism (“The patriot volunteer, fighting for country and his rights, makes the most reliable soldier on earth” (Thomas J. Jackson); “The true soldier fights not because he hates what is in front of him, but because he loves what is behind him” (G.K. Chesterton));
- loyalty to one’s country and army (“You must give soldiers reasons to have confidence and pride in themselves, in their leaders, and in their units. Only then will you have loyalty. Loyalty was the primary trait I looked for in soldiers” (George W. Dunaway));

- volitional: • courage / bravery (“To be a soldier one needs that special gene, that extra something, that enables a person to jump into one on one combat, something, after all, that is unimaginable to most of us, as we are simply not brave enough” (Rupert Everett));
- self-confidence (“The most vital quality of a soldier can possess is self-confidence, utter, complete and bumptious” (George S. Patton Jr.));
- discipline (“The soldier who gropes for glory must submit himself to discipline. Subordination gives strength and security to an army. He that will not submit to it when corrected and improved by the experience of ages does not deserve the proud appellation of a soldier” (Sam Houston); “Self-denial and self-discipline, however, will be recognized as the outstanding qualities of a good soldier” (William Lyon Mackenzie King));

- moral and volitional: • morale (“The soldier’s heart, the soldier's spirit, the soldier’s soul, are everything. Unless the soldier’s soul sustains him he cannot be relied on and will fail himself and his commander and his country in the end” (George Marshall));
- selfless commitment / sacrifice (“Soldiers, when committed to a task, can’t compromise. It’s unrelenting devotion to the standards of duty and courage, absolute loyalty to others, not letting the task go until it’s been done” (John Keegan));
- tenacity (“I will never quit. My nation expects me to be physically harder and mentally stronger than my enemies. If knocked down I will get back up, every time. I will draw on every remaining ounce of strength to protect my teammates and to accomplish our mission. I am never out of the fight” (Marcus Luttrell));

- strategic thinking (“Every soldier must know, before he goes into battle, how the little battle he is to fight fits into the larger picture, and how the success of his fighting will influence the battle as a whole” (Bernard Law Montgomery));

- professionalism, combat skills (“To the soldier, luck is merely another word for skill” (Patrick MacGill); “You don’t have to be straight to be in the military; you just have to be able to shoot straight” (Barry Goldwater));

- awareness of the need to protect one’s country (“We must never forget why we have, and why we need our military. Our armed forces exist solely to ensure our nation is safe, so that each and every one of us can sleep soundly at night, knowing we have ‘guardians at the gate’” (Allen West));

- commanders’ leadership qualities, the ability to control soldiers’ actions (“If you can’t get them to salute when they should salute and wear the clothes you tell them to wear, how are you going to get them to die for their country?” (George S. Patton Jr.));

- commanders’ ability/skill to choose effective and timely strategies and tactics (“In preparing for battle I have always found that plans are useless, but planning is indispensable” (Dwight D. Eisenhower); “Battles are won by slaughter and maneuver. The greater the

general, the more he contributes in maneuver, the less he demands in slaughter” (Winston S. Churchill));

- ruthlessness / cruelty to enemies (“Every soldier thinks something of the moral aspects of what he is doing. But all war is immoral and if you let that bother you, you’re not a good soldier” (Curtis LeMay); “If the people raise a great howl against my barbarity and cruelty, I will answer that war is war, and not popularity seeking” (William Tecumseh Sherman));

- the attitude of the country to its soldiers – support, care for the soldiers and their families (“All soldiers who serve their country and put their lives at risk need to know that if something happens to them, their families will be well taken care of. That’s the bond we have with our military men and women and their families” (Jeff Sessions); “The US Military is us. There is no truer representation of a country than the people that it sends into the field to fight for it. The people who wear our uniform and carry our rifles into combat are our kids, and our job is to support them, because they’re protecting us” (Tom Clancy)).

The model officer stereotype is also reflected in textbooks, handbooks, and reference curricula for cadets and officers; it is a kind of guide in the professional training of future officers. However, in these sources the list of stereotypical features is much longer. Let us consider the *Generic Officer Professional Military Education Reference Curriculum* (2011), developed by a team of academics from 11 countries under the auspices of the Canadian Defense Academy on behalf of NATO. The Curriculum consists of three phases of education: Pre-commissioning, Junior Officer and Intermediate Officer. The structure of each of the parts is similar; it clearly represents the features of the model professional officer stereotype, all of them being core components. In addition to those fixed in static language units, much attention is paid to the following: skills and abilities to conduct military operations of various kinds; competence in the issues of universal values, ethics and morality; legal awareness; communicative competence; intercultural competence, respect for other peoples; leadership qualities. Interestingly, the Curriculum recommends analyzing particular situations on the basis of the movie *Saving Private Ryan* (Generic Officer 2011: 48). Why did the movie about the events of World War II attract the attention of the authors of the modern standard NATO Reference Curriculum? Watching the movie gives an unambiguous answer to this question: it portrays the features of the model professional stereotype of a modern officer through different movie characters. The opening shots of the movie claim: an officer never gives up in the face of life’s difficulties (the Chief of Staff is one-handed, he can no longer be on the battlefield, but does not resign, and serves at the War Department); a modern officer is a humane person (in order to support a woman who lost three sons in the war, a group of soldiers is sent on a mission to bring back home the woman’s fourth son); a military person does not leave comrades in arms in difficult circumstances (Ryan refuses to return to a peaceful life and to leave his fellow soldiers). The course of events depicted in the movie focuses on all the features of the model officer stereotype we distinguished in the description of its structure.

The viewing of other movies on military topics (Reiner 1992; Scott 2001) confirms that feature films focus on depicting positive features of the officer stereotype. In the handbooks for cadets much attention is paid to the moral and volitional traits of an officer, communicative and leadership qualities, as well as legal and ethical aspects of an officer’s activity (Webfoot Warrior 2003; Voloshyna et al. 2011; McNab 2016; Ranger Handbook 2017). Thus, both handbooks and feature films form the model stereotype of a military person, that is, the notion of the ideal that is so necessary for the younger generation.

We observe a completely different approach in the stories of such mass media as the press and television. Realizing a journalist's professional values (providing the general public with accurate information), authors of newspaper publications and television stories harshly criticize the military for every mistake, whether it is the wrong purchase of food or explosions in military warehouses. Their announcements challenge the notion of such features of the model officer stereotype as accuracy of military people in the performance of their professional duties, integrity, and their ability to anticipate possible troubles. It should be noted that mass media researchers noticed a difference between the rhetoric of Ukrainian and American media publications in the coverage of negative events in the military sphere (Pelepeichenko et al. 2014: 187–188). The Ukrainian media (Musaieva 2000–2020; Butusov 2004–2020) give a much more categorically negative evaluation. Instead, the American media provide information about a negative event and an explanation of its causes. A negative event appears as an exception to the generally accurate and coordinated activities of military people. This feature is confirmed by our observations. Sometimes it seems that the media are purposefully looking for shortcomings in the activities of the armed forces. However, negligence in the performance of professional duties did not become a feature of the military person stereotype, as indicated by the answers to the questionnaire (no respondent named this feature as inherent in a military person). However, it can hardly be denied that in real life there are military people who have negative traits. In this respect, we have noted this feature: as a rule, in movies, negative features of particular military people are shown in such a way that they draw condemnation from viewers; characters with negative traits are either defeated or forced to change their views. In other words, movies in fact explain to the viewer what is good and what is evil, and thereby form model ideas and ideals.

We can conclude from the above observations that the influence of mass communication on the creation of social ideas is undeniable: works of fiction and movies are able to form ideals, including professional ones. And do they play a part in breaking outdated stereotypes? The analysis of the answers to the questionnaire and observation of the content of fiction and cinematographic works give grounds to draw two conclusions. Firstly, the results of the survey confirmed the statement that media of mass communication, primarily fiction and cinematography, play an important role both in the formation of model professional stereotypes, and, as a result, of the ideals that young people can emulate, and in the destruction of outdated ideas. Harkavenko (2019: 122) states:

Spectacle, imagery, plot, emotional coloring and the effect of empathy for the characters, aesthetic pleasure and entertainment, intrigue and interesting performances can all be provided by movies to their viewers. Due to these communication factors, cinema creates an effective environment for the formation and dissemination of stereotypical forms.

Secondly, the processes of stereotype formation and destruction can be monitored and even channeled in a socially justified direction. Thirdly, this potential of literature and cinematography is not fully realized in Ukraine. No wonder Pocheptsov said in an interview with the newspaper *Fakty*, “Ukraine needs its mass hero of books and movies, without whom there is no strong nation” (Blok 14 2014).

Addressing the issue of breaking outdated stereotypes in the military sphere, we noted two ways to achieve this goal. One of them is based on the negative, and the other on the positive. The first method involves a psychological impact on the viewer, and this impact is

not explicitly expressed. The viewer perceives negative information about an outdated stereotype from the lips of a movie's negative character and thus forms an idea of the evaluation of a corresponding feature. For example, in the movie *A Few Good Guys* (Reiner 1992) the viewer observes the following dialogue (the negative character's line is in italics):

Jo: Wait a minute, I've got some questions.
Kaffee: No you don't.
Jo: Yes I do.
Kaffee: No you don't.
Jo: Colonel, on the morning that Santiago died, did you meet with Doctor Stone between three and five?
Kaffee: Jo --
Jessep: Of course I met with the doctor. One of my men was dead.
Kaffee (to Jo): See? The man was dead. Let's go.
Jo (to Jessep): I was wondering if you've ever heard the term Code Red.
Kaffee: Jo --
Jessep: I've heard the term, yes.
Jo: Colonel, this past February, you received a cautionary memo from the Naval Investigative Service, warning that the practice of enlisted men disciplining their own wasn't to be condoned by officers.
Jessep: I submit to you that whoever wrote that memo has never served on the working end of a Soviet-made Cuban M1-A16 Assault Rifle. However, the directive having come from the NIS, I gave it its due attention. What's your point, Jo?
Kaffee: She has no point. She often has no point. It's part of her charm. We're outta here. Thank you.
Jo: My point is that I think code reds still go on down here. Do Code Reds still happen on this base, colonel?
Kaffee: Jo, the colonel doesn't need to answer that.
Jo: Yes he does.
Kaffee: No, he really doesn't.
Jo: Yeah, he really does. Colonel?
Jessep: You know it just hit me. She outranks you, Danny.
Kaffee: Yes sir.
Jessep: *I want to tell you something Danny and listen up 'cause I mean this: You're the luckiest man in the world. There is, believe me gentlemen, nothing sexier on earth than a woman you have to salute in the morning. Promote 'em all I say [emphasis ours].*

Colonel Jessep is a negative character who hides the reasons for the soldier's murder. His familiar words about a woman in the army unequivocally betray the attitude to the gender problem. This breaks the outdated gender stereotype.

The second method of destruction is much simpler. It involves the creation of documentaries and feature films which show examples that directly contradict outdated ideas. Thus, the National Guard of Ukraine made the documentary *Invisible Battalion* (Horlova et al. 2017), which shows the participation of women in the Anti-Terrorist Operation and Joint Forces Operation. Real people in real life – such an example eloquently shows the baselessness of the stereotype “Women have no place in the army”. This example is related to gender problems in the military, however, the mass media can break any negative stereotype (as well as create a new one). We believe that this feature should be taken into account in real

practice, purposefully creating films that destroy outdated notions of the military. Regarding the gender stereotype of military people, we noted a kind of conflict between the information presented in static and dynamic language units. Phrases and proverbs fix a woman's negative stereotype. Thus, *чоловічий розум* (*a man's intelligence*) in women is a positive trait; *жіноча логіка* (*a woman's logic*) in men is a negative one; *характер, як у жінки* (*character like a woman's*) is a humiliating characteristic for a man; *чоловічий характер* (*a man's character*) in women is a compliment that fixes accuracy in work, adherence to principles, and organization. As we noted in previous publications, "proverbs state that a man is an undisputed leader, it is he who solves all important problems, and a woman only obediently follows him": *Чоловік – усьому голова* (*A man is the head of everything*); *Як жінка верховодить, то чоловік по сусідах ходить* (*If a woman dominates, a man goes to neighbors*); *Муж жоні закон* (*A husband is a law for a wife*); *Куди голка, туди й нитка, куди чоловік, туди й жінка* (*A needle is followed by a thread; a man is followed by a woman*). A woman's intelligence receives a very low social rating: *Жінки довге волосся мають, а розум короткий* (*Women have long hair and a short brain*). The social status of a woman is clearly defined in many proverbs: *Жіноча річ коло прупічка* (*A woman's thing is around the stove*); *Баби дорога – од печі до порога* (*A woman's road is from the stove to the threshold*) (Pelepeichenko 2019). Thus, static units meet outdated standards and serve as a kind of brake in the destruction of ideas that fall into oblivion. They provided a basis for the creation of gender myths. Instead, dynamic units of language – new texts about women in the army presented in fiction, movies, and songs are aimed at breaking outdated "stamps" of thinking.

4. Conclusions

The study confirmed the main hypothesis and revealed differences in the mechanisms of various factors that lead to the formation of positive professional military officer stereotypes and the destruction of negative ones. The main factors in the formation of the model officer stereotype are as follows: national experience, fixed not only in historical heritage, but also in proverbs, sayings and aphorisms, literary and folklore works, as well as feature films. These media of mass communication form the model officer stereotype through the depiction of positive traits of literary or film characters. The model officer stereotype is also represented in NATO's handbooks for cadets and reference curricula for officers.

The factors that determine the modeling of the negative features of the real officer stereotype are experience gained in the process of a person's activity, and influence of the mass media. Performing their professional duty of providing accurate information, journalists report to the general public negative events in the activities of military people, giving them a categorically negative evaluation, leaving "behind the scenes" the reasons that caused the event. In some cases, such reasons could soften the categoricalness.

In terms of the influence of feature films on the destruction of outdated stereotypes in the military sphere, two ways have been identified: one based on the negative, and the other based on the positive. The first method consists in presenting information about an outdated stereotype through a negative character's lines. The second way is to create documentaries and feature films that contradict outdated ideas. The influential power of mass communication suggests that the process of forming the model officer stereotype and destroying outdated ideas can be regulated by encouraging film crews to perform socially important tasks. The analysis of the problem stated in the article title also revealed the issues

that need further research: the national specifics of the officer stereotype reflected in interviews, essays, and works of art, in particular military songs.

References

- Ageev, Vladimir. 1986. Psikhologicheskoe issledovanie sotsialnykh stereotipov [Psychological research of social stereotypes]. *Voprosy Psikhologii [Issues of Psychology]*, no. 1. 95–101. Accessed October 4, 2019. <http://voppsy.ru/issues/1986/861/861095.htm>.
- Andreou, Marios. 2017. Stereotype negation in Frame Semantics. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics*, vol. 2, no. 1. Article 79. 1–30. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.293>.
- Bartmiński, Jerzy. 2017. What does it mean for stereotypes to “reside in language”? In Dąbrowska, Anna, Pisarek, Walery, and Stickel, Gerhard (eds.). *Stereotypes and linguistic prejudices in Europe: Contributions to the EFNIL Conference 2016 in Warsaw*. 115–135. Budapest: Research Institute for Linguistics. Accessed October 24, 2019. <http://www.efnil.org/documents/conference-publications/warsaw-2016/EFNIL-Warsaw-16-Bartminski.pdf>.
- Blok 14. Telebachennia yak zasib formuvannia kartyny svitu natsii: vrehuliuvannia kryzy na rivni smysliv [Block 14. Television as a means of forming a nation’s worldview: Resolving a crisis at the level of meanings]. 2014. In *Navchalni materialy onlain [Learning materials online]*. Accessed February 17, 2020. <https://pidru4niki.com>.
- Blynova, Olena. 2013. Rol sotsialnykh stereotyviv u rehuliacii povedinky osobystosti [The Role of social stereotypes in the regulation of individual behavior]. *Naukovyi Visnyk Mykolaivskoho Derzhavnogo Universytetu imeni V. O. Sukhomlynskoho (Serii: Psykholohichni Nauky) [The Scientific Bulletin of Mykolaiv V. O. Sukhomlynskyi State University (Series: Psychological Sciences)]*, vol. 2, no. 10. 37–41. Accessed October 8, 2019. http://mdu.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/files/9_19.pdf.
- BrainyQuote*. 2001–2020. Accessed January 30, 2020. <https://www.brainyquote.com>.
- Burgers, Christian and Beukeboom, Camiel J. 2020. How language contributes to stereotype formation: Combined effects of label types and negation use in behavior descriptions. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, vol. 39, no. 4. 438–456. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X20933320>.
- Butusov, Yurii (ed.). 2004–2020. *Tsenzor.NET [Censor.NET]*. Accessed March 17, 2020. <https://censor.net>.
- Butyrina, Mariia. 2009. *Stereotyp masovoi svidomosti: Osoblyvosti formuvannia ta funkcionuvannia u mediaseredovyshchi [Stereotype of mass consciousness: Features of formation and functioning in the media environment]*. Dnipropetrovsk: Slovo.
- Collins*. 2020. Accessed January 15, 2020. <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english>.
- Dniprova, Olga, Yermolaieva, Tetiana, and Cherniak, Nataliia. 2018. Henderni stereotypy ta vybir profesii [Gender stereotypes and profession choice]. *Visnyk Universytetu imeni Alfreda Nobelia (Serii: Pedahohika i Psykholohiia) [The Bulletin of Alfred Nobel University (Series:*

- Pedagogy and Psychology*), vol. 2, no. 16. 46–51. Accessed November 12, 2019. http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/vduep_2018_2_9.
- Generic Officer Professional Military Education Reference Curriculum*. 2011. Accessed December 9, 2019. https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_topics/20111202_Generic-Officer-PME-RC.pdf
- Goodreads*. 2020. Accessed March 3, 2020. <https://www.goodreads.com>.
- Harkavenko, Yuliia. 2019. *Mas-mediinyie dzherela heterostereotypizatsii Ukrainy: kommunikatsiinyi aspekt [Mass media sources of heterostereotypization of Ukraine: Communication aspect]*. Dnipro: Oles Honchar Dnipro National University. PhD thesis.
- Horlova, Alina, Tsilyk, Iryna, and Lishchynska, Svitlana. 2017. *Nevydymyi Batalion [Invisible batalion]*. Ukraine. DVD.
- Kashima, Yoshihisa, Fiedler, Klaus, and Freytag, Peter. 2008. *Stereotype dynamics: Language-based approaches to the formation, maintenance, and transformation of stereotypes*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Karasik, Vladimir. 2004. *Yazykovoii krug: lichnost, kontsepty, diskurs [Language circle: Personality, concepts, discourse]*. Moscow: Gnozis.
- Kim, Yena and Weseley, Allyson J. 2017. The Effect of teacher gender and gendered traits on perceptions of elementary school teachers. *Journal of Research in Education*, vol. 27, no 1. 114–133. Accessed November 15, 2019. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1142365>.
- Klimanska, Maryna. 2011. Psykholohichni osoblyvosti stereotypnoho spryimannia profesii psykholoha [Psychological features of stereotypical perception of the psychologist profession]. In Maksymenko, Serhii (ed.). *Zbirnyk naukovykh prats Instytutu psykholohii imeni H. S. Kostiuka NAPN Ukrainy "Problemy zahalnoi ta pedahohichnoi psykholohii" [Scientific papers of H. S. Kostiuk Institute of Psychology of the NAPS of Ukraine "Problems of general and pedagogical psychology"]*, vol. 13, no. 3. 171–177. Kyiv.
- Kochman-Haładyj, Bożena. 2020. The vexing problem of gender stereotyping in world proverbs. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics*, vol. 17, no. 1. 73–86. Accessed August 4, 2020. http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL43/pdf_doc/04.pdf.
- Lippmann, Walter (with Curtis, Michael). 1991. *Public Opinion*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers. Original work published 1922. Accessed September 10, 2019. https://monoskop.org/images/b/bf/Lippman_Walter_Public_Opinion.pdf.
- Lukianova Tetiana. 2009. *Vilni atrybutyvni slovospoluchennia yak zasib obiektyvatsii hendernykh stereotypiv (na materialy suchasnoho brytanskoho hazetnoho dyskursu) [Free attributive phrases as a means of objectification of gender stereotypes (based on the contemporary British newspaper discourse)]*. Kharkiv: V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. PhD thesis.
- Lyubymova, Svitlana. 2018. A professional identity stereotype in a cognitive linguistic aspect. *Rhetoric and Communications E-journal*, no. 34. Accessed October 21, 2019. <http://journal.rhetoric.bg>.

- McNab, Chris. 2016. *SAS and Special Forces Mental Toughness Training: How to Improve Your Mind's Strength and Manage Stress*. London: Amber Books Ltd.
- Melnik, Galina. 1996. *Mass Media: Psikhologicheskie protsessy i efekty [Mass Media: Psychological processes and effects]*. Saint Petersburg: Saint Petersburg State University.
- Merriam-Webster. 2020. Accessed January 15, 2020. <https://www.merriam-webster.com>.
- Ministerstvo oborony Ukrainy [Ministry of Defence of Ukraine]. 2001–2020. Accessed January 6, 2020. <https://www.mil.gov.ua>.
- Moquin, René, Rutner, Paige, and Giddens, Laurie. 2020. Stereotyping and Stigmatizing IT professionals: Toward a model of devaluation. *The Journal of the Southern Association for Information Systems*, vol. 6, no. 1. Article 2. 1–21. Accessed May 7, 2020. <https://aisel.aisnet.org/jsais/vol6/iss1/2>.
- Musaieva, Sevhil (ed.). 2000–2020. *Ukrainska pravda [Ukrainian truth]*. Accessed March 10, 2020. <https://www.pravda.com.ua>.
- Natsionalna akademiia Natsionalnoi hvardii Ukrainy [National Academy of the National Guard of Ukraine]. n.d. Accessed December 16, 2019. <http://nangu.edu.ua>.
- Pelepeichenko, Liudmyla (ed.). 2009. *Movna komunikatsiia v diialnosti syl okhorony pravoporiadku: Teoretychny zasady haluzevoi komunikatsii [Linguistic communication in the activities of law enforcement forces: Theoretical tenets of sectoral communication]*. Kharkiv: Academy of Internal Troops of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine.
- Pelepeichenko, Liudmyla, Lysyckina, Iryna, Lysyckina, Olga, Mykhailova, Oksana, Pavlova Oksana, Posmitna, Viktoriia, and Revutska Svitlana. 2014. *Komunikatyvna osobystist viiskovosluzhbovtsia Natsionalnoi hvardii Ukrainy v suchasnomu sotsialnomu konteksti [Communicative personality of an officer of the National Guard of Ukraine in the modern social context]*. Kharkiv: National Academy of the National Guard of Ukraine.
- Pelepeichenko, Liudmyla. 2019. Chynnyky zapobihannia hendernym konfliktam u viiskovii sferi diialnosti [Factors in preventing gender conflicts in the military sphere]. *Informatsiina bezpeka liudyny, suspilstva, derzhavy (Serii: Yurydychny nauky) [Information Security of the Person, Society, and State (Series: Legal Sciences)]*, vol. 2, no. 26. 144–151.
- Petrenko, Viktor. 1986. Semanticheskii analiz professionalnykh stereotipov [Semantic analysis of professional stereotypes]. *Voprosy Psikhologii [Issues of Psychology]*, no. 3. 133–143. Accessed October 16, 2019. <http://www.voppsy.ru/issues/1986/863/863133.htm>.
- Putnam, Hilary. 1975. The Meaning of “Meaning”. In *Language, mind, and knowledge. Minnesota studies in the philosophy of science*, vol. 7. 131–193. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Accessed October 10, 2019. <http://hdl.handle.net/11299/185225>.
- Ranger Handbook. 2017. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army. Accessed December 12, 2019. https://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/DR_pubs/DR_a/pdf/web/ARN3039_TC%203-21x76%20FINAL%20WEB.pdf.

- Reiner, Rob. 1992. *A Few Good Guys*. United States: Castle Rock Entertainment. DVD.
- Riabokon, Oleksandr. 2010. Stereotyp yak mekhanizm spryimannia informatsii ta stereotypizatsiia yak metod vplyvu ZMI na masovu svidomist [Stereotype as a mechanism of information perception and stereotyping as a method of the mass media's influence on mass consciousness]. In *Naukovi pratsi Natsionalnoi biblioteki Ukrainy imeni V. S. Vernadskoho [Scientific works of V. I. Vernadskyi National Library of Ukraine]*, no. 20. 100–109.
- Samkova, Olesia. 2017. *Transformatsiia sotsialnoho stereotypu profesii u protsesi navchannia ta praktychnoi diialnosti psykholoha [Transformation of profession social stereotypes in the process of a psychologist's training and practice]*. Kherson: Kherson State University. PhD thesis.
- Scott, Ridley. 2001. *Black Hawk Down*. United States; United Kingdom: Columbia Pictures; Revolution Studios; Jerry Bruckheimer Films; Scott Free Productions. DVD.
- Slovyk ukrainskoi movy. Akademichnyi tlumachnyi slovnyk (1970–1980) [Dictionary of the Ukrainian language. Academic explanatory dictionary (1970–1980)]*. 2018. Accessed January 9, 2020. <http://sum.in.ua>.
- Spielberg, Steven. 1998. *Saving Private Ryan*. United States: DreamWorks Pictures; Paramount Pictures; Amblin Entertainment; Mutual Film Company. DVD.
- Sternin, Iosif, Larina Tatiana, and Sternina Marina. 2003. *Ocherk angliiskogo komunikativnogo povedeniia [An Outline of English communicative behavior]*. Voronezh: Istoki.
- Tagiuri, Renato. 1969. Person perception. In Lindzey, Gardner and Aronson, Elliot (eds.). *The Handbook of social psychology*. 2nd ed. Vol. 3. 395–449. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.
- Tajfel, Henry. 1981. Social stereotypes and social groups. In Turner, John C. & Giles, Howard (eds.). *Intergroup behavior*. 144–167. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Ukrainski pryslivia ta prykazky [Ukrainian proverbs and sayings]*. 2020. Accessed January 20, 2020. <http://igra1.com/ua/index.htm>.
- Vislovi.in.ua. Prykazky. Pryslivia. Aforyzmy. [Vislovi.in.ua. Sayings. Proverbs. Aphorisms]*. 2020. Accessed January 23, 2020. <https://vislovi.in.ua>.
- Voloshyna, Nataliia, Dziuba, Mykola, Zharkov, Yakiv, and Mekhed, Petro. 2011. *Viiskovyi etyket i dyplomatychnyi protokol [Military etiquette and diplomatic protocol]*. Kyiv: Military Institute of Taras Shevchenko University of Kyiv.
- Webfoot Warrior Battalion Cadet Handbook*. 2003. University of Oregon ROTC. Department of Military Science.
- White, Sam, Lambert, Susan, Visker, Joseph, Banez, J. Christian, Lasser, Ben, Cichon, Taylor, Leong, Marissa, Dunseith, Nicole, and Cox, Carol. 2019. Public health education student stereotypes of other health professions before and after an interprofessional education program. *Health Professions Education*, vol. 5, no. 2. 120–125. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hpe.2018.06.006>.

Wise Old Sayings. 2000–2020. Accessed January 27, 2020. <https://www.wiseoldsayings.com>.

Liudmyla Pelepeichenko
Department of Philology, Translation, and Strategic Communications
National Academy of the National Guard of Ukraine
3, Maidan Zakhysnykiv Ukrainy
Kharkiv, 61001, Ukraine
e-mail: pelepln2014@gmail.com

Tetiana Podufalova
Department of Spoken and Written English Practice
H. S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University
29, Vulytsia Alchevskykh
Kharkiv, 61002, Ukraine
e-mail: podufalova.tatyana@gmail.com

In SKASE Journal of Literary and Cultural Studies [online]. 2020, vol. 2, no. 2 [cit. 2020-12-11]. Available on web page http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/SJLCS04/pdf_doc/04.pdf. ISSN 2644-5506.