

პირდაპირი და არაპირდაპირი აგრესიის ენა ქართველ
პოლიტიკოსებს შორის
The Language of Indirect/Direct Aggression among Georgian Politicians

ლანა გიორგაძე
თბილისის სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტი

Lana Giorgadze
Tbilisi State University

აბსტრაქტი

კვლევა გახლავთ პირველი მცდელობა იმისა რომ, გამოვიკვლიოთ პირდაპირი და არაპირდაპირი აგრესიის ენა ქართველ პოლიტიკოსებს შორის. მთავარი ყურადღება ეთმობა, მათ მეტყველების მახასიათებლებს. ამასთანავე, განსაკუთრებით გვინტერესებს შეიმჩნევა თუ არა გენდერული განსხვავება აგრესიის გამოხატვის დროს. სტატია მოიცავს 5 ვიდეოს, რომლებიც აღებულია ქართული პოლიტიკური თოქ-შოუებიდან და პარლამენტის 3 პლენარული სხდომიდან. კვლევა მიმდინარეობდა 2 თვის განმავლობაში, სექტემბერსა და ოქტომბერში.

კვლევის მეთოდოლოგიაში ვიყენებთ დისკურსის კრიტიკულ ანალიზს, რაც გულისხმობს, წერილობითი ტექსტების და ვიდეოების ანალიზს აგრესიის ენის გამოსაკვეთად.

კვლევის დასაწყისში სხდასხვა მახასიათებლები შეიმჩნევა პოლიტიკურ დებატებში. პირველადი დაკვირვების საფუძველზე ეს ეხება არათავაზიან გამონათქვამებს. შესაბამისი ინფორმაციის ფლობამ უფრო გაამარტივა იმ მიზნების აღმოჩენა, თუ რატომ იყენებდნენ ისინი აგრესიის ენას. შემდგომ, დავინწყეთ ქალი და მამაკაცი პოლიტიკოსების მეტყველების მსგავსების შედარება. მათ მეტყველებაში აგრესიის ენის აღმოჩენამ შესაძლებლობა მოგვცა, გვეპოვნა ამ ყოველივეს გამომწვევი ერთ-ერთი მთავარი მიზეზი. შეგროვებული მასალა ასევე მოიცავდა პარლამენტის პლენარულ სესიებს. გამოიკვეთა, რომ პლენარულ სესიებსა და პოლიტიკურ ვიდეოებში გამოყენებული ლინგვისტური მახასიათებლები განსხვავდებოდა პოლიტიკური თოქ-შოუებიდან აღებული მასალისგან. მიუხედავად ამისა, არ გამოვლინდა რაიმე გენდერული განსხვავებები პირდაპირი და არაპირდაპირი აგრესიის გამოხატვის დროს.

გამოყენებული თვისობრივი მეთოდოლოგია გვიჩვენებს მონაწილეთა რაოდენობას და კონკრეტულ მასალას. დამატებით, კვლევაში ასევე ნახსენებია პირდაპირი და ირიბი უშუალო აგრესიის ფორმები.

კვლევა გვიჩვენებს თუ როგორ იყენებენ ქართველი პოლიტიკოსები აგრესიის ენას და განსაკუთრებით კარგად გამოიკვეთა, რომ არ არსებობს გენდერული ზღვარი თუ განსხვავებები აგრესიის გამოხატვის დროს.

საკვანძო სიტყვები: ქართველი პოლიტიკოსები, სქესი, აგრესიის ენა

Keywords: Georgian politicians, Gender, Language of aggression

Introduction

Aggression is part of our everyday life and it has become common in every field. Interestingly, the linguistic observation of the language of aggression can be seen from different perspectives. Aggression is part of interaction, so it is always with us, whether it is direct or indirect. As claimed by Harutyunyan (2020), verbal aggression depends on the context, which makes words aggressive. Additionally, this paper investigates the forms of verbal aggression among Georgian politicians. Throughout the paper, we'll see how direct/indirect forms of aggression differ from each other, whether it depends on context, situation, etc.

Specifically, the paper investigates whether there are some gender differences between male/female forms of aggression in their speech. According to the selected data which consists of some political videos and plenary sessions, there can be some specific differences between their speeches. More precisely, the paper will focus on two main research questions: (1) What is the language of aggression and how does it occur in the case of gender? And (2) whether there are any gender-related differences between politicians while expressing direct and indirect forms of aggression?

The following chapter will review and discuss the important articles done in the field to build up the theoretical background for this research. This enables us to have an overall idea of the article. Moreover, one of the central articles based on the research named, "Gender differences in support for direct and indirect political aggression in the context of protracted conflict" (Ben Shitrit, L., Elad-Strenger, J., & Hirsch-Hoefler, S. 2017) is helpful in this case. It doesn't coincide with the same theme that we have in our article, but it'll still help us to have an overall view if there are gender difference forms of verbal aggression.

Also, according to the employed methodology, we found 5 political videos, mainly taken from political talk shows and plenary sessions. The selected data helped us to analyze the topic better and find if there was any significant difference between female/male forms of

aggression. At the end of the article, it became increasingly clear that there isn't gender-based difference while expressing forms of aggression.

Theoretical Framework

The Language of Indirect/Direct Aggression among Georgian Politicians

According to the history of mankind, aggression has always been a part of our life. This aggressiveness is expressed through language or physical violence. The paper aims to investigate the verbal type of aggression expressed through language in the field of politics, special emphasis is laid on Georgian politicians. The paper will focus on two main research questions (1) what is the language of aggression and how does it occur in the case of gender? And (2) whether there are any gender-related differences between politicians while expressing direct and indirect forms of aggression?

The main focus should be on these differences. Some say that we should differentiate between direct and indirect aggression. Some say that aggression starts from an early period in human life. According to Archer (2004, p. 312), they discovered the early development of physical aggression. But, in the case of indirect one, *“In-direct aggression showed an increase between 6 and 17 years, consistent with its importance for girls during the early teenage years.”* The concept of aggression also appeared first in Darwin's theory (1871) where he explains and speaks about male/female differences, and the factors due to these differences occur. While, some say that, aggression can take place according to opponents' responses. For instance, according to (Gloria, & Ridder, 1979, p. 63) *“the aggressive character of a response is not an objective property of behavior but the product of an attributional process, relating one response to its interpersonal context.”*

Furthermore, social behavior and the historical division of roles between males and females created these differences among them. Archer (2004, as cited in Eagly, 1987) claims that the SRT Social Role Theory covers the sex differences in the case of social behavior, which can be formulated in the names of “worker” and “homemaker.” Moreover, Eagly, Wood, & Diekmann (2000) also presupposes that these differences are created by gender roles between men and women, which are created by society. As Eagly, Wood, & Diekmann (2000) say, women are associated more with domestic labor, while men are engaged in different activities.

Consequently, Card (2008) also shares the common ground around this issue and research that has been done previously in this specific field, (Maccoby, & Jacklin 1974 as cited in Hyde, J. S, 1984) they think that men are more likely to be aggressive, while women tend to find other non-aggressive ways. According to Card 2008, p.1209), their research *“demonstrate an absence of meaningful gender differences in indirect aggression.”*

On the other hand, as claimed by Harutyunyan (2020), the language of aggression itself is very interesting, and he investigated the aggressive language between American political leaders. So, as he mentions, words that can express verbal aggression aren't violent, but it mainly depends on the context, which makes them aggressive. So, as for the second research question, several researchers could be found.

According to the previous research in this field, which took place in the Middle East, in Israel, due to the researchers, (Ben Shitrit, L., Elad-Strenger, J., & Hirsch-Hoefler, S. 2017) couldn't find any significant difference between males and females while expressing direct political aggression towards the politicians. Also, the research done in Israel showed that women became politically as aggressive and active as men. So, this can be one of the reasons why the language of aggression among males/females wasn't different. Moreover, they express their anger as men, to state their opinion.

Therefore, in our research, we are interested in whether the language of Georgian politicians is different while using aggressive language. We are mainly interested if there is any gender-related difference while expressing anger.

Methodology

Earlier studies were collected due to the speeches done by various Georgian politicians, in their interviews or Plenary sessions of the Parliament, which is applied to (1) what type of language is used by politicians while expressing aggression and (2) whether that language is gendered or there are any gender-related differences between them while expressing direct and indirect forms of aggression. The analyzed data is collected due to the CMC (computer-mediated communication) method, during the 2 months of 2023 (September, October). Previous research in this field showed no difference between political language differences. The fact was explained in a way that, nowadays women are more powerful and they express anger as men. On the other hand, as we know, men are engaged in violence and aggressive activities or speeches frequently. Therefore, it became one of the characteristics of men. Even more than this, the way people express direct/indirect aggression is also similar. But somehow, the difference still exists, which is due to the gender roles that are created by society (Eagly, Wood, & Diekmann, 2000). What's more, as previous research (Hyde, J. S. 1984; Maccoby, & Jacklin, 1974) done in this field showed higher levels of aggression in men, now we are interested if the same happens in the case of politicians.

Also, these political speeches can be divided into two parts: (1) Display of aggression during interviews with opponents or alone on political talk shows, and (2) during plenary sessions of Parliament. As well as this, the topics are chosen due to their similarity, to make it easier to compare their speech patterns. According to it, a more or less similar context will give us the ability to determine the language of aggression in a broader sense. This type of approach proves the range of aggressiveness, whether it is gendered, and if so, how they convey it.

The country of Georgia is chosen for this research due to several reasons. First and foremost, in Georgia, this type of research has never been done, and we are interested in the results. How will it vary through different countries or regions? As well as in other regions, like Israel where this research was done, women in Georgia started to live actively only several decades ago. Also, the role of women in Georgia was not always as dominant as it is now. Moreover, political dominance remains under pressure when it comes to women. These and other factors determine the level of interest in this sphere.

Identification of direct language of aggression in political speeches is rather simple than in indirect ones because in the previous case, we need to examine the context carefully. The research examined the 3 plenary sessions and 5 videos from political talk shows.

Sometimes, this context consists of incongruous or cynical implications and it shouldn't be confused with indirect forms of aggression. As well as this cynical context helps to raise the level of aggressiveness in some of the cases. The language of aggression to be found and analyzed should be divided into four steps:

1. Listen to the speeches of politicians carefully and if it's necessary listen again as many times as needed.
2. Write down the expressions and divide them into:
 - a) Male expressions or use of offensive language.
 - b) Women use offensive language.
3. Pay attention to the context and group words and sentences into:
 - a) Direct form of aggression.
 - b) Indirect forms of aggression.

Contrast different or similar offensive sentences/words and determine whether they are gendered or not.

Data, Results, and Analysis

Introduction

This chapter focuses on the data and the results of selected videos and parliament plenary sessions, including offensive, direct, or indirect forms of aggression. Along with debates between Georgian politicians. Mainly, the data includes speeches, debates, etc. among various Georgian politicians.

Data and Results

The research is based on approximately 300 words, which is shown by various extracts. The selected data was divided into female (25) and male (30) politicians. Selected data included 5 debatable videos among male or female politicians, as well as 3 plenary sessions. Moreover, the videos were collected and do not cover similar themes, besides they only include debates between politicians, to see if there was any gendered difference. Additionally, with the help of the CMC (Computer-Mediated Communication) method, we selected part of the data from political talk shows and plenary sessions of parliament.

Table 1.

Data	Men, woman
Political talk show videos	2(females); 1(males); 3(female/male)
Plenary sessions of parliament	3
Direct forms of aggression	15(females); 20(males);
Indirect forms of aggression	36(females); 42(males);

Debates between politicians: (male vs male, female vs female, male vs female)

2 videos which will be discussed and analyzed below are taken mainly from the political shows and political debates. In these videos, the main actors are women against women and the main interest is to find out if their forms of aggression and aggressiveness differ from males. This phenomenon can be explained by the fact that it gets easier to see their real speech and the forms of aggression during the debates. We can see two specific videos, where female politicians debate with each other.

Extract1 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cHPm9iFe2Ls&list=LL&index=28>)

1. **Charkviani** - I didn't come here to debate with you!
2. **Kiladze** - These are questions as well.
3. **Charkviani** - Ask me questions when I'll be in your show, not here.
4. **Charkviani** - please without spreading your hands out, somehow try not to lose your face, like **you** are used to doing it. This isn't a street, but **you** are used to talking there as well.
5. **Kiladze** - **you** were standing during pre-election meetings and were saying that the people were raped by mopping sticks.

Extract 2 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bnwJKKB4ZhY&list=LL&index=25>)

1. **Chergoleishvili** - This is the reason why they didn't respect **you**.
2. **Kiladze** - I am not respected and they respect **you**?!
3. **Chergoleishvili** - You calm down, please you calm down. **You** were shouting about Tabula and we are about 5 million people in a year.

These two extracts shown above reveal the details and some of the peculiarities of having debates between female politicians. The two specific videos were selected with completely different topics to see, their real-life interactions and real speech. This enables us to better examine the language of aggression. In the very first extract, from the beginning of their discussion, they try to control their tone along with the forms of interaction. But, as they

continue debates, we see and hear that one of them frequently uses the second pronoun **you** in a singular form, to be heard and show her real dependence on her. Somehow, while debating they use indirect forms of aggression intertwined with the changed voice along with cynical or ironic expressions which cause debates and interaction between them. The same can be said according to the second extract, where we've various participants, but they use that second singular pronoun **you** frequently as well.

Moreover, in Charkviani's case, **you** is in plural form, so she somehow tries to control herself while debating and still tries not to use the singular form of you. But, on the other hand, we'll see how this picture changes while debating with males. According to these extracts, some women try to control their speech patterns even while debating, but on the other hand, they speak and express anger as men do.

Extract 3 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F-co2p65Pdc&list=LL&index=50>)

Vashadze	you are pro-Russian. Have you ever said anything about Putin? you are impolite, you aren't brave, this won't work, you're the slave of Russia.
Zarqu	I'll beat you, f&#k the person who is corrupted between me and you, how dare you speak at all.

In the third extract which is based on a debate between male politicians, the anger is identified therefore we get the forms of direct and indirect forms of aggression. In the case of male politicians, we have abusive words as well. Interestingly, this type of debate is different from the previous one.

On the one hand, they still use the singular form of **you**, this can be explained by the fact that the anger more or less depends on the context and the interaction they use with each other. Uncontrolled emotions create an unconditional flow of anger. More precisely, as claimed by Harutyunyan (2020), the language of aggression mainly depends on the context, which makes them aggressive.

On the other hand, one of the arguments mentioned by Vashadze that "you are pro-Russian" makes it exacerbated. According to Georgian history, politicians know that's very sensitive topic for the Georgian people. Therefore, this topic intensifies the debate between them.

Extract 4 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hhyk2K64URM&list=WL&index=2>)

Charkviani - Now **you're** saying too much and stop and maybe you think you are at home. Speak like that in your home.

Saba Buadze - Shame on you, you are shameful,

Charkviani - Do not beat **your** hands, speak like that with **your** “mevakhshe” leader, do not dare to speak like that. In that way speak with **your** mother and with **your** “mevakhshe” leader.

Saba Buadze - I’m angry about myself spending time like your person and being in the same environment, in this toxic one, which is created by you, you’re shameful

Extract 5 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L3PLPkMVigc>)

Mariam - Who were you, this is the reason why I’m asking for the right of lustration to shut up your type of people, you act a little bit more polite.

Giorgi Otxmezuri - If you were a man, I would speak to you differently.

Giorgi Otxmezuri - Pay attention to the words and speak like that in **your** home when you will go back with **your** spouse and father, shut up woman.

According to the fourth and fifth extracts, debates take place between males and females. While reading the scripted text it gets easier to identify and analyze the topic in depth. As cited above already, female politicians while debating with males, use the impersonal pronoun **you**. In addition, women express anger and impolite forms of aggression as well. This phenomenon can be explained due to various factors. According to one of them, they try to raise their voices against men and start to be active or heard. Their tone and the level of anger while expressing their opinion don’t differ from males. They still try not to use direct forms of aggression, but during plenary sessions or in other circumstances they use direct forms as well. Therefore, with the help of these forms of aggression a woman tries to defend herself, she uses the linguistic forms, which are used stereotypically by men.

plenary sessions

table 2.

Plenary sessions	Direct forms of aggression	Indirect forms of aggression
05.09.2023	Shame on you; you jackal, coward; you can’t guess it, you should learn to understand it; shameful depute;	You are afraid of Georgian people; don’t dare to move on to the next topic; how dare you attack innocent people; how dare even speak up; calm down; you know where to take that.

19.09.2023	You are feeble authority and people don't need you; you are Russian authority;	You are occupied by the harmfulness you and your colleagues;
17.10.2023	This coward escaped from the building;	How dare you? you're a liar; Slave of Russia.

According to the forms of expressions we have both direct/indirect forms of aggression. Specifically, these differences are based on the use of impolite words by male/female politicians. To differentiate the live debates from the parliamentary session, we examined the text used by Georgian politicians while speaking in parliament.

This examination showed that the difference exists. Thus, they used already-written texts. therefore, it was easier for them to control the voice or the words used by them. On the other hand, when they were involved in live debates, it changed. Additionally, as cited already according to Harutyunyan (2020), anger depends on the context. According to this, the main aggressive expressions used by them were according to the topics, which they thought were incorrect. Moreover, they used the less **you** form, which is understood as an impolite form of speaking. During these sessions, there were no significant gender differences based on the speech patterns. Eventually, the aggressive forms used during plenary sessions were different from the live debates.

Conclusion and discussion

Debates and videos revealed the real speech forms and forms of aggression among Georgian politicians. According to scripts and various samples, indifference occurs while expressing anger, whether it comes from males or females. Moreover, the research called direct/indirect forms of aggression among Georgian politicians repeated the previous research findings in this field, which took place in Israel (Ben Shitrit, Elad-Strenger, & Hirsch-Hoefler, 2017). There couldn't be any significant gender-based difference while expressing anger. In Georgian female politician's cases, they used direct/indirect forms of aggression, verbally and physically. Thus, the article aimed to answer the two basic questions, and the questions this research answered were as follows: (1) what is the language of aggression and how does it occur in the case of gender? And (2) whether there are any gender-related differences between politicians, while expressing direct and indirect forms of aggression?

The collected data analysis emphasized that there is no difference between female/male forms of verbal aggression. Using aggressive language was familiar for both. More specifically, females used the second pronoun **you** and indirect forms of aggression. This can be explained for several reasons. For instance, Georgian female politicians try to be politically active and listen as men, because the social attitudes towards their gender differ in this case. It is assumed that Georgia is characterized as a more masculine society rather than a feminine one.

Undoubtedly this defines their social role in society. On the other hand, research revealed that women tend to use similar aggressive forms of verbal aggression. Various debate videos proved the real fact that women are against stereotypes claimed in SRT (Social Role Theory) with the specific names of “worker” and “homeworker.”

In the second stage, one of the peculiarities can be seen through videos of political talk shows and plenary sessions of parliament. The forms of speech, impressions, etc. differ among them. This can be explained through that they have scripts of their speeches in parliament, which are already analyzed. Besides, during live speeches, they couldn't control their feelings and their level of verbal aggressiveness.

Suggestion for further research

Conclusively, the research answered the main research questions, but there are still some of the topics that should be detailed. The study was limited to the case of Georgian politicians. On the other hand, it would be interesting to study this particular topic in-depth and find out more detailed signs of direct/indirect forms of aggression for more relevant data. Other examples and cases will also provide more information about this topic and give comprehensive results.

References:

1. Archer, J. (2004). Sex differences in aggression in real-world settings: A meta-analytic review. *Review of General Psychology*, 8(4), 291-322. doi:10.1037/1089-2680.8.4.291
2. Ben Shitrit, L., Elad-Strenger, J., & Hirsch-Hoefler, S. (2017). Gender differences in support for direct and indirect political aggression in the context of protracted conflict. *Journal of Peace Research*, 54(6), 733–747. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343317714301>
3. Bjorklund, D. F., & Pellegrini, A. D. (2000). Child development and evolutionary psychology. *Child Development*, 71(6), 1687–1708. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00258>
4. Card, Noel A; Brian D Stucky, Gita M Sawalani & Todd D Little (2008) Direct and indirect aggression during childhood and adolescence: A meta-analytic review of gender differences, intercorrelations, and relations to maladjustment. *Child Development* 79(5): 1185–1229.
5. Conover, P. J., & Sapiro, V. (1993). Gender, feminist consciousness, and war. *American Journal of Political Science*, 37(4), 1079. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2111544>
6. Da Gloria, J., & De Ridder, R. (1979). Sex differences in aggression: Are current notions misleading? *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 9(1), 49–66. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420090105>

7. Eagly, A. (1987). Sex differences in social behavior: A social role interpretation. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
8. Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Diekmann, A. B. (2000). Social Role Theory of sex differences and similarities: a current appraisal. In T. Eckes, & H. M. Trautner (eds.), *The developmental social psychology of gender* (pp. 123-174). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. - references - scientific research publishing. (n.d.). [https://www.scirp.org/\(S\(lz5mqp453edsnp55rrgjct55\)\)/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=442750](https://www.scirp.org/(S(lz5mqp453edsnp55rrgjct55))/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=442750)
9. Golan, G. (2015). Militarization and gender in Israel. *Pioneers in Arts, Humanities, Science, Engineering, Practice*, 221–235. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95213-0_11
10. HARUTYUNYAN, R. (2020). Linguistic means of expressing verbal aggression in political communication. *Foreign Languages in Higher Education*, 24(1 (28)), 52–63. <https://doi.org/10.46991/flhe/2020.24.1.052>
11. Hyde, J. S. (1984). How large are gender differences in aggression? A developmental meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, 20(4), 722–736. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0012-1649.20.4.722>
12. Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). *The psychology of sex differences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. - references - scientific research publishing. (n.d.). [https://www.scirp.org/\(S\(i43dyn45teexjx455qlt3d2q\)\)/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=1268315](https://www.scirp.org/(S(i43dyn45teexjx455qlt3d2q))/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=1268315)

ავტორის შესახებ:

მე ვარ ლანა გიორგაძე, ივანე ჯავახიშვილის სახელობის თბილისის სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტის მაგისტრატურის, ინგლისური ფილოლოგიის პირველი კურსის სტუდენტი. მაინტერესებს სხვადასხვა ლინგვისტური საკითხები და ეს სტატია, მიზნად ისახავს აგრესიის ენასთან დაკავშირებული საკითხების გამოკვლევას. მინდა მადლობა გადავუხადო ჩემს ლექტორს სოფიო თოთიბაძეს, რომელიც დამეხმარა ამ საკითხების სიღრმისეულ ანალიზში.

About the author:

I'm Lana Giorgadze, a first-course MA student of English philology at Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University. I'm interested in various linguistic topics and this article was my first

attempt to investigate issues connected to hate or aggressive speech. I want to thank my Lecturer Sophio Totibadze for helping me to deepen my understanding of the subject matter.

E-mail: lanagiorgadze54@gmail.com