

Danko Šipka
Arizona State University
Danko.Sipka@asu.edu

Data przesłania tekstu do redakcji: 08.08.2014
Data przyjęcia tekstu do druku: 29.08.2014

Gender Variation in the Emotional Construal of Russian Journalistic Non-fiction

ABSTRACT: Šipka Danko, *Gender Variation in the Emotional Construal of Russian Journalistic Non-fiction*, "Poznańskie Studia Slawistyczne" 9. Poznań 2015. Publishing House of the Poznań Society for the Advancement of the Arts and Sciences, pp. 149–167. ISSN 2084-3011.

The author analyzes gender differences in the Russian journalistic discourse using the example of the lexical field related to the concept of *зпучьмь* 'sorrow'. The more frequent use of these words is indicative of a higher level of empathy. The results demonstrate that male authors exhibit a higher proclivity towards the usage of the words from the aforementioned lexical field. The results are another piece of evidence that a higher level of empathy in women is not absolute but rather highly dependent on the concrete context.

KEYWORDS: gender differences; Russian; journalistic discourse; empathy; lexical usage

1. Introduction

The present multidisciplinary research ties into three areas of cognitive sciences. First, it is related to the psychological study of gender and empathy. Second, it draws upon the tradition of (Slavic) gender linguistics. Finally, the present research is related to the linguistic study of emotion.

There is a common theme in social psychology about gender differences in various aspects of emotional processing. Although there exists a general popular perception about a higher level of empathy in women, scholarly literature on that subject paints a more complex picture. As demonstrated in a recent study on the subject (Rueckert 2011: 221), cross-gender differences in empathy are dependent on the concrete context:

There is a long-standing belief amongst both psychologists and lay people that women are more emphatic than men. In reality, the scientific literature is mixed. While women consistently self-report higher levels of empathy, studies utilizing other, more

objective measures, have reported little or no gender difference. (...) It appears that the female advantage in empathy is not absolute, but depends on the type of empathy measured and various contextual factors, such as the instructions given or the relationship between the empathizer and the person with whom they are empathizing.

In the present research, the question is how the context of journalism affects gender differences in empathy. This particular context gives us the opportunity to see how contextual factors influence the discourse about empathy in pre-existing data, i.e., in a non-experimental context.

The second relevant research tradition, maintained by gender linguistics in general (see for example: Hellinger, Bußmann 2003, Cameron 1992, Eckert, McConnell 2003, Mills S. 2003, 2012) and Slavic gender linguistics in particular (e.g.: Mills M.H. 1999), has devoted considerable attention to various gender linguistic issues: virility, gender roles and perception, gender and diminutivization etc. The general idea of gender inequality in Slavic languages and cultures, which is well documented in this tradition, would point to the possibility that these differences may reveal themselves in the use of empathy-related vocabulary in a journalistic discourse. Given traditional gender roles, one would expect a higher use of such vocabulary items in females.

One should finally mention the linguistic study of emotion. Linguistic aspects of emotion have been addressed in a broad array of papers and monographs, from general studies such as Wilce (2009) to those works which concentrate on the conceptualization and expression of emotions (e.g.: Athanasiadou, Tabakowska 1998), to the studies of emotional metaphors (such as Kövecses 2000), to cross-linguistic comparisons, (e.g. Ogarkova, Soriano, Lehr 2012).

The present paper builds upon the three aforementioned traditions in attempting to answer the question if male and female journalistic discourse exhibit differences in the use of the words related to the feelings which can invoke empathy. The goal of this research is thus to place gender differences in a concrete discourse, using a concrete empathy-relevant lexical field.

2. Procedure

The present research looked into the group of Russian words related to the concept of *зрyсть* ‘sorrow’ in two journalistic textual subcorpora, one written by female authors and the other written by male authors. The principal research question was if the two corpora exhibit differences in the number of texts in which these words are used. A more frequent use of the aforementioned words could indicate a higher level of empathy, i.e., the ability to recognize sorrow and report about it. The analyses of the Russian emotional concepts from the same semantic field point to the fact that their use is related to a higher level of empathy. One should mention in particular Wierzbicka (1999), who analyzes *зрyсть* among other concepts, and Ogarkova, Fontaine, and Prihod’ko (2013), who analyze a similar concept of *тоска* (defined by Nabokov as follows: „At its deepest and most painful, it is a sensation of great spiritual anguish, often without any specific cause. At less morbid levels it is a dull ache of the soul, a longing with nothing to long for, a sick pining, a vague restlessness, mental throes, yearning. In particular cases it may be the desire for somebody of something specific, nostalgia, love-sickness. At the lowest level it grades into ennui, boredom” – Puškin 1990: 141, note to stanza XXXIV line 8). In addition to the indication about the relation of the conceptual field of *зрyсть* ‘sorrow’ to empathy, there is a common-sense one. It is namely so that the texts analyzed here are general newspaper articles, which means that the author is typically referring to other people when using the words from the lexical field of *зрyсть* ‘sorrow’. The mere mentioning of these words is a clear indicator of the author’s awareness of that kind of emotion in other people, which in turn also means a higher level of empathy when compared with the authors of the texts where these words are not used.

Russian national corpus (<www.ruscorpora.ru>) was used to create the two subcorpora. The two subcorpora had one restriction in common (journalistic non-fiction texts) while the gender of the author (female vs. male) was used as the defining restriction for each subcorpus. Subcorpora parameter setting is illustrated in Appendix 3. Quantitative features of the two subcorpora look as follows:

Corpus total: 85 996 documents, 19 362 746 sentences, 229 968 798 words.

Female Journalistic Corpus: 8 390 documents consisting of 1 070 582 sentences, 13 418 493 words.

Male Journalistic Corpus: 20 122 documents consisting of 4 318 938 sentences, 60 275 922 words.

The list of the words related to the concept of *грусть* ‘sorrow’ is based on Бабенко (1989). The original list is presented in Appendix 1 with a slightly modified list, which is used in this particular research, is given in Appendix 2 with the Russian category names translated into English. The only modification was the exclusion of the words which are preponderantly more frequent in their other usage than in the metaphorical usage in this semantic field. For example the word *черно* ‘black’ is used for the color much more frequently than for feelings. This particular exclusion was meant to reduce the external variable of additional meanings of some words.

Two frequency counts were performed on the aforementioned female and male corpus. Given that the two corpora were different in their size, the results were normalized by calculating the percentage of the forms in each corpus. First, the frequency count for all lexical items in 18 different categories established by Бабенко (1989) was tabulated, their percentage in the corpus was calculated, which was followed by the computation of the differences between the two corpora. The small number of categories did not allow the use of inferential statistics. Second, the frequency for each unique word, the percentage in the corpus, and the difference between the two corpora were tabulated. Given that the list contained 149 items, it was also possible to compute the T-Test to see if the relationship was statistically significant. The difference between the textual frequencies is expressed as follows: **difference = female subcorpus frequency – male subcorpus frequency** given the general expectation of a higher use of these words in females.

The present research has three principal limitations. First, there are words in the lexical pool analyzed here that have other meanings that are not related to the lexical field of the word *грусть*. The most drastic examples of such words were excluded from the pool (as mentioned earlier

in this text), but the effect of the meanings outside of the observed lexical field is still present. One should say, however, that the effect is equally present in both established corpora – female and male. Second, although the effect size was controlled by measuring the percentage of the relevant words and fields in the entirety of the subcorpus, the fact that the male subcorpus was considerably larger still has some effect. Obviously, one should also note that this disproportion in the size simply reflects the differences that objectively exist in the society – a higher number of journalistic texts is penned by males than by females. Given that the goal of this research is to investigate emotional construal in a type of discourse, it had to go with the parameters of that particular discourse. Third and final, this research is determined by all limitations of the Russian National Corpus and Бабенко (1989) which were used to tabulate the frequencies of the relevant words. Again, the female and the male corpus alike were affected by the limitations of the two principal data sources.

3. Results

The results of the analysis of the cumulative frequency of the words in the aforementioned 18 lexical fields are presented in Table 1 further in this text. As might be seen, the use of this vocabulary is consistently higher in males. The differences range from .31% to 6.19%. On average, males use the words related to the semantic field of *зреть* 2.52% more in their particular discourse than females. Given a low number of categories established by Бабенко (1989), it was impossible to check if this relationship would be statistically significant.

The results of the analysis of particular words is provided in Appendix 5. Here too, as was in the case with the categories, males use these words considerably more frequently than their female counterparts. However, in this case that is not universally true. On average, the investigated words have 31% higher frequency in the male than in the female corpus. Out of 149 words, 125 are used more frequently by males (the difference ranges between .003% and 3.76%), 15 words have identical frequency in the two corpora, and only nine words are more frequent in the female corpus (ranging from .004% to .5%). It is interesting to note that the word where the

Table 1. Lexical categories in the female and male corpus (The category “Emotional state 1” was tabulated in two batches of words given the limitations in the search size imposed by the Russian National Corpus. The categories and the numbers used here are explained and exemplified in Appendix 2)

<i>Lexical field</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>Texts</i>	<i>Subcorpus</i>	<i>Percentage Difference</i>		<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Subcorpus</i>	<i>Texts</i>	<i>Gender</i>
				<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>				
Emotional state 1/1	Female	959	8390	11.43%	-2.33%	13.76%	20122	2769	Male
Emotional state 1/2	Female	1933	8390	23.04%	-3.71%	26.75%	20122	5382	Male
Emotional state 2	Female	1311	8390	15.63%	-1.80%	17.43%	20122	3507	Male
Emotional state 3	Female	744	8390	8.87%	-4.55%	13.41%	20122	2699	Male
Formation of ES 1	Female	448	8390	5.34%	-1.58%	6.92%	20122	1393	Male
Formation of ES 2	Female	101	8390	1.20%	-0.59%	1.79%	20122	361	Male
Formation of ES 3	Female	318	8390	3.79%	-2.60%	6.39%	20122	1286	Male
Emotional impact 1	Female	778	8390	9.27%	-3.81%	13.09%	20122	2633	Male
Emotional impact 2	Female	1748	8390	20.83%	-6.19%	27.02%	20122	5437	Male
Emotional impact 3	Female	338	8390	4.03%	-2.49%	6.52%	20122	1311	Male
Emotional attitude 1	Female	76	8390	0.91%	-1.31%	2.21%	20122	445	Male
Emotional attitude 2	Female	140	8390	1.67%	-0.53%	2.20%	20122	442	Male
External expression 1	Female	983	8390	11.72%	-3.69%	15.41%	20122	3101	Male
External expression 2	Female	30	8390	0.36%	-0.33%	0.69%	20122	139	Male
External expression 3	Female	69	8390	0.82%	-1.54%	2.37%	20122	476	Male
Emotional characterization 1	Female	807	8390	9.62%	-2.99%	12.61%	20122	2537	Male
Emotional characterization 2	Female	429	8390	5.11%	-2.70%	7.81%	20122	1572	Male
Emotional characterization 3	Female	1605	8390	19.13%	-4.78%	23.91%	20122	4812	Male
Emotional property 1	Female	28	8390	0.33%	-0.31%	0.65%	20122	130	Male
Average					-2.52%				
Standard deviation					1.60%				

female use is most predominant is *депрессия* ‘depression’ (.5%), with the next most frequent items being considerably lower in the difference (.126, .188, .033, etc.).

The T-Test results are not straightforward. While the T-Test itself shows that the relationship is not significant (even though it is rather close to the significant range), Levene’s test yields statistically significant results, which means that the differences in variance between the two sub-corpora are not random. The results are presented in Table 2.

4. Conclusion

The present research has brought us to the following conclusions. First, Russian female journalists definitely do not show any proclivity toward a higher use of the vocabulary from the lexical field of *эрусьть*. This finding goes along the lines of psychological findings about empathy quoted at the beginning of this paper – females are not generally more empathic than males: their level of empathy is dependent on the concrete context. The data about the use of the lexical field of *эрусьть* are just a limited piece of contributing evidence in favor the aforementioned psychological findings – with them we are, quite obviously, not making a direct claim about empathy per se.

Second, Russian male journalists consistently use the words from the lexical field of *эрусьть* considerably more frequently than females. This goes against the traditional popular construal of gender roles in Slavic languages and societies. Here again, the results are just a small piece of contributing evidence pointing to the fact that linguistic gender differences in one Slavic language and in one particular sphere of usage are much more complex than it is commonly believed.

Third, while we can clearly see the dominance of the observed vocabulary in the male subcorpus, we cannot say that gender is a predictor of vocabulary use (the T-Test turned out not to be statistically significant). What can be stated is that the gender differences in vocabulary use are not random.

Table 2. T-Test for the words from the lexical field *эпычымб* in the female and the male corpus

Group Statistics					
Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	
Percent					
m	149	.90886	1.782957	.146066	
f	149	.58497	1.233167	.101025	

Independent Samples Test								
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances								
t-test for Equality of Means								
F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
							Lower Upper	
Percent								
Equal variances assumed	5.604	.019	1.824	296	.069	.323893	.177598	-.025623 .673408
Equal variances not assumed								
		1.824	263.229	.069	.323893	.177598	-.025802 .673587	

Literature

- Athanasiadou A., Tabakowska E. (eds.), 1998, *Speaking of emotions: conceptualization and expression*, Berlin.
- Cameron D., 1992, *Feminism and linguistic theory*, Hampshire–New York.
- Eckert P., McConnell-Ginet S., 2003, *Language and Gender*, Cambridge.
- Hellinger M., Bußmann H. (eds.), 2003, *Gender Across Languages: The Linguistic Representation of Women and Men*, vol. 3, Amsterdam.
- Kövecses Z., 2000, *Metaphor and emotion: language, culture, and body in human feeling*, Cambridge.
- Mills M.H. (ed.), 1999, *Slavic Gender Linguistics*, Amsterdam.
- Mills S., 2003, *Gender and Politeness*, Cambridge.
- Mills S., 2012, *Gender Matters: Feminist Linguistic Analysis*, Sheffield.
- Ogarkova A., Fontaine J.R.J., Prihod'ko I., 2013, *What the GRID can reveal about culture-specific emotion concepts: A case study of Russian 'toska'*, in: *Components of emotional meaning: a sourcebook*, eds. J.R.J. Fontaine, K.R. Scherer, C. Soriano, Oxford, p. 353–365, DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199592746.001.0001.
- Ogarkova A., Soriano C., Lehr C., 2012, *Naming feeling. Exploring the equivalence of emotion terms in five European languages*, in: *Dynamicity in Emotion Concepts*, ed. P.A. Wilson, vol. 27, p. 253–284.
- Puškin A.S., 1990, *Eugene Onegin*, trans. V. Nabokov, Princeton.
- Rueckert L., 2011, *Gender Differences in Empathy*, in: *Psychology of Empathy*, ed. D.J. Scapaletti, Hauppauge, p. 221–234.
- Wierzbicka A., 1999, *Emotions across Languages and Cultures. Diversity and Universals*, Cambridge.
- Wilce J.M., 2009, *Language and emotion*, Cambridge.
- Бабенко Л.Г., 1989, *Лексические средства обозначения эмоций в русском языке*, Свердловск.

Internet sources

<www.ruscorpora.ru>

Appendices

Appendix 1

Грусть 'sorrow' in Бабенко (1989: 151–152)

- III. Зудеть₂, придавить / придавливать₂, прицепиться / прицепляться₂, пришибить₂, раздавить / раздавливать₃, растравить / растравливать, растравлять₁, теснить₃, щемить₁.

Эмоциональное отношение

- I. Сожалеть.
II. Вздыхать₂, сожалеть₂.

Внешнее выражение эмоций

- I. Нерадостный, отчаянный, печальный, понуриться, скучливый, скучный, томный, тоскливый, унылый, хмурый.
II. Нюни₂, поехать₃, раздосадованный₂, скучающий₄.
III. Наохлиться / наохливаться, хохлиться₂, теснить / стеснить₆, туман₁.

Эмоциональная характеристика

- I. Безнадежный, безотрадный, безрадостный, занудный, зуда, кисляй, кручинный, меланхолик, меланхолический, меланхоличка, муторный, мымра, назойливый, опечаленный, отчаянный, пессимист, пессимистка, печальник, печальница, понурый, скучливый, скучный, смурной, сушь, хмурый, элегичный.
II. Гнетущий₂, задавленный, кислятина₂, мертвящий, монотонный₂, назола₂, переутомленный₂, придавленный₃, прилипала (прилипало)₂, смурый₄, сумрачный₃, тоска₃, туманный₄, элегичный₂.
III. Глушитель₃, гнет, панихидный₂, постный₃, прилипчивый₃, свинцовый₃, согбенный, сумеречный, темный₃, тягучий₄, черный₁₂, щемящий₃.

Эмоциональное качество

- I. Меланхоличность, мрачность, надоедливость, назойливость, пессимистичность, смурость, сокрушительность, элегичность.

Appendix 2

Грусть as used in this paper modified Бабенко (1989: 151–152) with categories translated in English

Эмоциональное состояние (emotional state)

1. безнадежность, безотрадность, безысходность, грустить, грустный, грусть, депрессия, журиться, задавленность, затосковать, ипохондрия, кручина, кручиниться, кручинушка, крутиться, кукситься, меланхолия, назола, наскучаться, натосковаться, невеселый, нерадостный, ностальгия, отчаяние, пессимизм, пессимистический, печалиться, опечалиться, печаловаться, печаль, печальный, подавленность, подосадовать, покручиниться, понурость, поскучать, потомиться, потосковать, потужить, сгрустнуться, сетовать, посетовать, скука, скучать, скучища, скучный, сожаление, сокрушаться, соскучиться, сплин, томный, тоска, тоскливость, тоскливый, тосковать, унылость, унылый, уныние, утепление, хандра, хандрить, хмуру, хмурь
2. грустно, невесело, нерадостно, неуютно, нехорошо, нудиться, нудно, омраченный, пакостно, паршиво, печально, погано, подавленный, пришибленный, прозябает, прозябание, раздосадованный, скверно, скучать, скучно, страдать, сумрачно, сумрачный, томиться, тоска, тоскливо, уныло
3. киснуть, минор, минорный, мрак, мрачный, оскомина, пасмурно, темно, тянуть, потянуть, элегия

Становление эмоционального состояния (formation of emotional state)

1. взгрустнуть, взгрустнуться, зажмуриться, закручиниться, крушить, мрачить, помрачить, надоесть, надоедать, опечалиться, опостынуть, опостыть, отчаяться, отчаиваться, погрустить, помрачиться, помрачаться, понуриться, приунуть, приунывать, раздосадоваться, раскваситься, расквашиваться, растосковаться, растузиться, скукаться, скучнеть, поскучнеть, стосковаться, унывать, угоняться, угоняться, хмуриться, нахмуриться
2. взвить, мрачиться, омрачиться, омрачиться, омрачаться, сокрушенный, соскучиться
3. гнести, давить, затуманиться, затуманиваться, отуманиться, отуманиваться, туманиться, поникнуть, поникать, никнуть, приестся, приедасться, раскиснуть, раскисать, скиснуть, скисать, сникнуть, сникать, темнеть, потемнеть

Эмоциональное воздействие (emotional impact)

1. грустный, заунывный, мрачный, надоедливый, надсадный, наскучить, невеселый, неотвязный, неотвязчивый, несносный, нудный, опечалить, опечаливать, печалить, осточертеть, потомить, прискучивать, протомить, раздосадовать, скучный, унывный, утомительный, утомить, утомлять
2. лезть, неловкий, нудный, омрачить, омрачать, мрачить, печальный, подавить, подавлять, подавляющий, пристать, приставать, сокрушать, сокрушить, сокрушительный, стеснить, утеснять, страшный, сумрачный, томить, тоскливый, унылый

3. зудеть, придавить, придавливать, прицепиться, прицепляться, пришибить, раздавить, раздавливать, растравить, растравливать, растравлять, теснить, щемить, сожалеть, вздыхать, сожалеть

Эмоциональное отношение (emotional attitude)

1. сожалеть
2. вздыхать

Внешнее выражение эмоций (external expression of emotion)

1. нерадостный, отчаянный, печальный, понуриться, скучливый, скучный, томный, тоскливый, унылый, хмурый
2. нюни, раздосадованный, скучающий
3. нахохлиться, нахохливаться, хохлиться, теснить, стеснить

Эмоциональная характеристика (emotional characterization)

1. безнадежный, безотрадный, безрадостный, занудный, зуда, кислый, кручинный, меланхолик, меланхолический, меланхоличка, муторный, мымра, назойливый, опечаленный, отчаянный, пессимист, пессимистка, печальник, печальница, понурый, скучливый, скучный, смурой, сушь, хмурый, элегичный
2. гнетущий, задавленный, кислятина, мертвящий, монотонный, назола, переутомленный, придавленный, прилипать, смурый, сумрачный, тоска, туманный, элегичный
3. глушитель, гнет, панихидный, постный, прилипчивый, свинцовый, согбенный, сумеречный, темный, тягучий, черный, щемящий.

Эмоциональное качество (emotional property)

меланхоличность, мрачность, надоедливость, назойливость, пессимистичность, смурость, сокрушительность, элегичность

тип значения 1 – основное 2 – номинативно-производное 3 – метафорически-производное (the type of meaning 1 – basic 2 referential derivative 3 metaphorical derivative)

Appendix 3

Corpus search parameter setting (journalistic texts written by females) from *Национальный корпус русского языка* (www.ruscorpora.ru)

Subcorpus

Disambiguated corpus only [?]

Main parameters [?]

Title

Author

Gender: any male female

Date of birth: between and

Date of creation: between and

Genre and type [?]

1. Fiction

Genre [select](#)

Type [select](#)

Time and place [select](#)

2. Non-fiction


Domain [select](#)

Type [select](#)

Theme [select](#)

Appendix 4

Corpus search results (journalistic texts written by males) from *Национальный корпус русского языка* (www.ruscorpora.ru)


RUSSIAN
NATIONAL
CORPUS

[to the search page](#) [reset subcorpus](#) [select subcorpus](#) [hide accents](#) [settings](#) [KWIC format](#) [русская версия](#)

Search results (main corpus)

Corpus total: 85 996 documents, 19 362 746 sentences, 229 968 798 words.

Search executed in a user-defined subcorpus of NaN sentences, 60 275 922 words.

безадекватность|безотрадность|безысходность|грустить|грустный|грусть|депрессия|журиться|задавленность|затосковать|ипохондрия|кручина|кручиниться|кручинушка|

Found 2 769 documents, 10 959 contexts.

Search in other corpora: [spoken](#), [syntax](#).

Pages: [1](#) [2](#) [3](#) [4](#) [5](#) [6](#) [7](#) [8](#) [9](#) [10](#) [11](#) [next page](#)

1. В. Р. Николенский. Комментарий сексолога // «Даша», 2004 [disambiguated] [All examples \(1\)](#)

Привести всё это может к плачевным результатам — неврозам, **депрессиям** и даже к сексуальным расстройством. [В. Р. Николенский. Комментарий сексолога // «Даша», 2004] [disambiguated] [←...→](#)

Appendix 5

Lexical items from the semantic field грусть in the female and male corpus

The first column contains the words used in this count, the second the count in the female corpus, the third the size of the female subcorpus, the fourth percentage in the female corpus, the fifth the difference between the female and male corpus percentage (a positive number means that females use the word more than males, a negative number that males are using the word more frequently than females), the sixth column contains the percentage in the male subcorpus, the seventh the size of the male subcorpus, and the eight the count in the male corpus.

<i>Word</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Subcorpus</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Percentage Difference</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Subcorpus</i>	<i>Male</i>
безнадежность	45	8390	0.54%	-0.507%	1.04%	20122	210
безнадежный	231	8390	2.75%	-1.923%	4.68%	20122	941
безотрадность	1	8390	0.01%	-0.048%	0.06%	20122	12
безрадостный	10	8390	0.12%	-0.582%	0.70%	20122	141
безысходность	41	8390	0.49%	-0.187%	0.68%	20122	136
взгрустнуть	5	8390	0.06%	0.005%	0.05%	20122	11
взгрустнуться	4	8390	0.05%	-0.022%	0.07%	20122	14
грустить	98	8390	1.17%	-0.412%	1.58%	20122	318
грустный	362	8390	4.31%	-1.540%	5.85%	20122	1178
грусть	156	8390	1.86%	-1.103%	2.96%	20122	596
депрессия	134	8390	1.60%	0.509%	1.09%	20122	219
журиться	1	8390	0.01%	-0.003%	0.01%	20122	3
задавленность	1	8390	0.01%	-0.013%	0.02%	20122	5
зажмуриться	19	8390	0.23%	-0.121%	0.35%	20122	70
закручиниться	0	8390	0.00%	-0.055%	0.05%	20122	11
занудный	13	8390	0.15%	-0.074%	0.23%	20122	46
затосковать	22	8390	0.26%	-0.041%	0.30%	20122	61
заунывный	26	8390	0.31%	-0.152%	0.46%	20122	93
зуда	29	8390	0.35%	-0.141%	0.49%	20122	98
ипохондрия	6	8390	0.07%	-0.097%	0.17%	20122	34

кислый	111	8390	1.32%	-0.302%	1.63%	20122	327
крутиться	117	8390	1.39%	-0.424%	1.82%	20122	366
кручина	2	8390	0.02%	-0.105%	0.13%	20122	26
кручиниться	0	8390	0.00%	-0.065%	0.06%	20122	13
кручинный	0	8390	0.00%	-0.005%	0.00%	20122	1
кручинушка	0	8390	0.00%	-0.010%	0.01%	20122	2
крушить	22	8390	0.26%	-0.190%	0.45%	20122	91
кукиться	1	8390	0.01%	-0.013%	0.02%	20122	5
меланхолик	8	8390	0.10%	-0.044%	0.14%	20122	28
меланхолический	13	8390	0.15%	-0.615%	0.77%	20122	155
меланхоличка	0	8390	0.00%	0.000%	0.00%	20122	0
меланхоличность	1	8390	0.01%	-0.003%	0.01%	20122	3
меланхолия	39	8390	0.46%	-0.151%	0.62%	20122	124
мрачнеть	17	8390	0.20%	-0.031%	0.23%	20122	47
мрачность	21	8390	0.25%	-0.117%	0.37%	20122	74
мрачный	285	8390	3.40%	-2.835%	6.23%	20122	1254
муторный	11	8390	0.13%	0.012%	0.12%	20122	24
мымра	1	8390	0.01%	-0.013%	0.02%	20122	5
надоедать	55	8390	0.66%	-0.512%	1.17%	20122	235
надоедливость	0	8390	0.00%	-0.025%	0.02%	20122	5
надоедливый	12	8390	0.14%	-0.319%	0.46%	20122	93
надоесть	232	8390	2.77%	-1.022%	3.79%	20122	762
надсадный	9	8390	0.11%	0.018%	0.09%	20122	18
назойливость	7	8390	0.08%	-0.160%	0.24%	20122	49
назойливый	60	8390	0.72%	-0.647%	1.36%	20122	274
назола	0	8390	0.00%	0.000%	0.00%	20122	0
наскучаться	0	8390	0.00%	-0.005%	0.00%	20122	1
наскучить	31	8390	0.37%	-0.381%	0.75%	20122	151
натосковаться	0	8390	0.00%	0.000%	0.00%	20122	0
нахмуриться	23	8390	0.27%	-0.273%	0.55%	20122	110
невеселый	69	8390	0.82%	-0.594%	1.42%	20122	285
неотвязный	11	8390	0.13%	-0.122%	0.25%	20122	51
неотвязчивый	2	8390	0.02%	-0.100%	0.12%	20122	25

нерадостный	10	8390	0.12%	-0.129%	0.25%	20122	50
несносный	32	8390	0.38%	-0.667%	1.05%	20122	211
ностальгия	99	8390	1.18%	0.126%	1.05%	20122	212
нудный	48	8390	0.57%	-0.317%	0.89%	20122	179
омрачаться	4	8390	0.05%	-0.151%	0.20%	20122	40
опечаленный	0	8390	0.00%	0.000%	0.00%	20122	0
опечаливать	1	8390	0.01%	-0.003%	0.01%	20122	3
опечалить	14	8390	0.17%	-0.425%	0.59%	20122	119
опечалиться	7	8390	0.08%	-0.066%	0.15%	20122	30
опостынуть	0	8390	0.00%	-0.015%	0.01%	20122	3
опостыть	0	8390	0.00%	-0.015%	0.01%	20122	3
осточердеть	14	8390	0.17%	-0.146%	0.31%	20122	63
отчаиваться	54	8390	0.64%	-0.062%	0.71%	20122	142
отчаяние	256	8390	3.05%	-1.894%	4.94%	20122	995
отчаянный	234	8390	2.79%	-2.176%	4.96%	20122	999
отчаяться	70	8390	0.83%	-0.284%	1.12%	20122	225
пессимизм	47	8390	0.56%	-0.498%	1.06%	20122	213
пессимист	24	8390	0.29%	-0.430%	0.72%	20122	144
пессимистический	38	8390	0.45%	-0.367%	0.82%	20122	165
пессимистичность	0	8390	0.00%	0.000%	0.00%	20122	0
пессимистка	4	8390	0.05%	0.033%	0.01%	20122	3
печалить	78	8390	0.93%	-0.715%	1.64%	20122	331
печалиться	29	8390	0.35%	-0.271%	0.62%	20122	124
печаловаться	0	8390	0.00%	-0.045%	0.04%	20122	9
печаль	141	8390	1.68%	-1.291%	2.97%	20122	598
печальник	1	8390	0.01%	-0.063%	0.07%	20122	15
печальница	0	8390	0.00%	-0.010%	0.01%	20122	2
печальный	431	8390	5.14%	-3.083%	8.22%	20122	1654
погрустить	4	8390	0.05%	-0.047%	0.09%	20122	19
подавленность	21	8390	0.25%	-0.068%	0.32%	20122	64
подсадовать	4	8390	0.05%	-0.012%	0.06%	20122	12
покручиниться	0	8390	0.00%	-0.005%	0.00%	20122	1
помрачиться	1	8390	0.01%	-0.033%	0.04%	20122	9

помрачить	9	8390	0.11%	-0.067%	0.17%	20122	35
понуричься	0	8390	0.00%	-0.050%	0.05%	20122	10
понурист	0	8390	0.00%	0.000%	0.00%	20122	0
понуры	18	8390	0.21%	-0.233%	0.45%	20122	90
посетовать	61	8390	0.73%	-0.212%	0.94%	20122	189
поскучать	5	8390	0.06%	0.000%	0.06%	20122	12
поскучнеть	5	8390	0.06%	-0.015%	0.07%	20122	15
потомить	2	8390	0.02%	0.004%	0.02%	20122	4
потомиться	0	8390	0.00%	-0.010%	0.01%	20122	2
потосковать	0	8390	0.00%	-0.015%	0.01%	20122	3
потужить	1	8390	0.01%	-0.033%	0.04%	20122	9
прискучивать	0	8390	0.00%	-0.010%	0.01%	20122	2
приунывать	0	8390	0.00%	0.000%	0.00%	20122	0
приуныть	10	8390	0.12%	-0.129%	0.25%	20122	50
протомить	0	8390	0.00%	0.000%	0.00%	20122	0
раздосадовать	14	8390	0.17%	-0.295%	0.46%	20122	93
раздосадоваться	0	8390	0.00%	-0.010%	0.01%	20122	2
раскваситься	0	8390	0.00%	-0.015%	0.01%	20122	3
расквашиваться	0	8390	0.00%	0.000%	0.00%	20122	0
растосковаться	0	8390	0.00%	0.000%	0.00%	20122	0
растужиться	0	8390	0.00%	0.000%	0.00%	20122	0
сгрустнуться	0	8390	0.00%	-0.010%	0.01%	20122	2
сетовать	136	8390	1.62%	-0.208%	1.83%	20122	368
скука	142	8390	1.69%	-1.225%	2.92%	20122	587
сुकситься	0	8390	0.00%	-0.020%	0.02%	20122	4
сучать	182	8390	2.17%	-0.390%	2.56%	20122	515
сучища	9	8390	0.11%	0.033%	0.07%	20122	15
сучливый	0	8390	0.00%	-0.010%	0.01%	20122	2
сучнеть	2	8390	0.02%	-0.036%	0.06%	20122	12
сучный	379	8390	4.52%	-1.262%	5.78%	20122	1163
смурой	0	8390	0.00%	0.000%	0.00%	20122	0
смурость	0	8390	0.00%	0.000%	0.00%	20122	0
сожаление	887	8390	10.57%	-3.760%	14.33%	20122	2884

сожалеть	76	8390	0.91%	-1.306%	2.21%	20122	445
сокрушаться	51	8390	0.61%	-0.451%	1.06%	20122	213
сокрушительность	0	8390	0.00%	0.000%	0.00%	20122	0
соскучиться	71	8390	0.85%	-0.018%	0.86%	20122	174
сплин	8	8390	0.10%	-0.089%	0.18%	20122	37
стосковаться	11	8390	0.13%	-0.008%	0.14%	20122	28
сушь	46	8390	0.55%	-0.550%	1.10%	20122	221
томный	52	8390	0.62%	-0.339%	0.96%	20122	193
тоска	265	8390	3.16%	-1.359%	4.52%	20122	909
тоскливость	0	8390	0.00%	-0.015%	0.01%	20122	3
тоскливый	88	8390	1.05%	-0.517%	1.57%	20122	315
тосковать	111	8390	1.32%	-0.734%	2.06%	20122	414
угоняться	1	8390	0.01%	-0.053%	0.06%	20122	13
унывать	45	8390	0.54%	-0.294%	0.83%	20122	167
унывный	1	8390	0.01%	-0.018%	0.03%	20122	6
унылость	8	8390	0.10%	-0.029%	0.12%	20122	25
унылый	130	8390	1.55%	-1.278%	2.83%	20122	569
уныние	72	8390	0.86%	-1.025%	1.88%	20122	379
утепление	17	8390	0.20%	0.118%	0.08%	20122	17
утомительный	73	8390	0.87%	-0.884%	1.75%	20122	353
утомить	87	8390	1.04%	-1.150%	2.19%	20122	440
утомлять	50	8390	0.60%	-0.517%	1.11%	20122	224
хандра	18	8390	0.21%	-0.138%	0.35%	20122	71
хандрить	8	8390	0.10%	-0.069%	0.16%	20122	33
хмуриться	22	8390	0.26%	-0.294%	0.56%	20122	112
хмуρο	26	8390	0.31%	-0.177%	0.49%	20122	98
хмурый	83	8390	0.99%	-0.497%	1.49%	20122	299
хмурь	0	8390	0.00%	-0.005%	0.00%	20122	1
элегичность	1	8390	0.01%	-0.013%	0.02%	20122	5
элегичный	0	8390	0.00%	-0.025%	0.02%	20122	5