

UDC 81'373.612.2:791.43

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/2412-933X/2025-XXIV-11>

## PECULIARITIES OF THE FORMATION OF ANIMATION VOCABULARY ON THE BASIS OF ANIMATED CARTOONS MOANA 2 AND INSIDE OUT 2

### **Maloivan Maryna**

Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences,  
Associate Professor at the Department of English Philology  
Kryvyi Rih State Pedagogical University  
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3330-1312

### **Dyrda Iryna**

Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences,  
Associate Professor at the Department of English Philology  
Kryvyi Rih State Pedagogical University  
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3145-7428

*This research investigates the domain-specific vocabulary used in animation production, with particular emphasis on the etymological origins, semantic transformations, and functional applications of core terms such as animation, cartoon, clean-up, layout, and storyline. The study underscores the substantial linguistic influence exerted by Disney, a company whose creative innovations have significantly shaped both professional nomenclature and wider cultural semantics. The concept of cartoon is explored in its diachronic development – from its origins as a preparatory art sketch to its current identification with a genre of animated productions marked by stylized visual exaggeration and humor. Although related, cartoon and animation are shown to possess nuanced distinctions.*

*Further attention is directed toward technical terminology such as clean-up and layout, which refer to discrete stages in the animation workflow. These terms reflect metaphorical adaptations of everyday language into specialized industry jargon. The study also explores narrative-related lexicon, including storyline, storyman, and story sketch man, each denoting unique creative functions in animation storytelling.*

*Additionally, the research examines the evolving semantic field surrounding the Disney brand, including neologisms like Disneyism and Disneyfication, which signal the corporation's extensive influence on language and cultural expression. By analyzing the recent Disney and Pixar films "Moana 2" and "Inside Out 2", the study demonstrates how novel animation vocabulary arises through metaphor, personification, cross-cultural borrowing, and internal studio lexicon.*

**Key words:** animation, cartoon, layout, Disneyism, Disneyfication.

### **Малоіван Марина**

кандидат педагогічних наук,  
доцент кафедри англійської філології  
Криворізький державний педагогічний університет

### **Дирда Ірина**

кандидат педагогічних наук,  
доцент кафедри англійської філології  
Криворізький державний педагогічний університет

## ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ФОРМУВАННЯ ВОКАБУЛЯРУ АНІМАЦІЇ НА ОСНОВІ МУЛЬТФІЛЬМІВ «МОАНА 2» ТА «ДУМКАМИ НАВИВОРІТ 2»

У статті розглянуто спеціалізовану лексику, пов'язану з виробництвом анімаційної продукції, з акцентом на етимологію, семантичну еволюцію та функціональне навантаження ключових термінів, як-от анімація, мультфільм, чистовик, компоновка та сюжетна лінія. Особливу увагу приділено лінгвістичному впливу компанії Disney, інновації якої суттєво вплинули як на професійну термінологію, так і на ширший культурний дискурс. Термін «мультфільм» проаналізовано в контексті його історичної трансформації – від підготовчого художнього ескізу до окремого жанру анімаційного кіно, що характеризується візуальними перебільшеннями та гумористичним елементом, при цьому межуючи, але не тотожного поняттю «анімація».

Також розглянуто технічні терміни, зокрема «чистовик» і «компоновка», що позначають окремі етапи виробничого процесу та демонструють метафоричне переосмислення загальноживаної лексики в межах професійного жаргону аніматорів.

Особливе місце в дослідженні займає аналіз термінів, пов'язаних із наративом, зокрема «сюжетна лінія», «сторімен (storyman)» та «художник сюжетних ескізів (story sketch man)», які позначають специфічні творчі ролі в межах побудови анімаційної оповіді. Також розглядається семантичне та культурне розширення значення самого бренду Disney, включаючи неологізми «диснейзм (Disneyism)» і «диснейфікація (Disneyfication)», що відображають глибокий вплив компанії на мовлення і масову культуру.

На прикладі сучасних фільмів студій Disney та Pixar, «Моана 2» та «Думками навиворіт 2», проілюстровано, як нова анімаційна лексика формується шляхом метафоризації, персоніфікації, культурного запозичення та внутрішнього студійного сленгу. Дослідження підтверджує провідну роль Disney у збагаченні анімаційної лексики як у професійному середовищі, так і в публічному дискурсі.

**Ключові слова:** анімація, мультфільми, компоновка, диснейзм, диснейфікація.

**Introduction.** In recent decades, the lexicon of animation has undergone dynamic evolution, shaped by technological progress, shifting narrative strategies, and expanding cultural influences. As animation transcends its traditional boundaries to encompass complex storytelling and diverse representational practices, there arises a need to examine the linguistic mechanisms that underpin this transformation. This study addresses the formation and semantic development of key terms within the animation industry, with particular attention to their etymology, metaphorical usage, and functional roles in production contexts. Of special interest is the influence of major animation studios, primarily Disney and Pixar, whose contributions have significantly enriched the professional vocabulary of the field. Using *Moana 2* and *Inside Out 2* as case studies, this paper explores how narrative innovation, cultural borrowing, and studio-specific jargon contribute to the emergence of new animation terminology. By analyzing these linguistic processes, the study seeks to illuminate how animated media not only reflect but also generate specialized language that bridges artistic expression, technical precision, and cultural identity.

**Relevance of the paper.** The relevance of this paper lies in its detailed linguistic analysis of animation vocabulary, a dynamic and rapidly evolving linguistic field shaped by technological advances and cultural influences. By examining foundational terms such as *animation*, *cartoon*, *clean-up* and *layout*, alongside narrative-specific vocabulary and neologisms introduced by Disney and Pixar's recent films *Moana 2* and *Inside Out 2*, the study fills a gap in understanding how specialized language in animation reflects broader socio-cultural and artistic trends. The paper highlights the significant role Disney plays not only in popularizing animation globally

but also in enriching its professional and popular lexicon through metaphorical and culturally adaptive processes.

**The aim of the study** is to analyze the formation and evolution of specialized animation vocabulary, with a particular focus on the semantic, etymological, and functional characteristics of key terms used in the animation industry. Using *Moana 2* and *Inside Out 2* as case studies, the research seeks to uncover how Disney and Pixar contribute to the enrichment of animation terminology through metaphorical, cultural, and technical innovations. Additionally, the study aims to explore the interplay between traditional animation lexicon and contemporary neologisms, highlighting the role of linguistic creativity in the development of professional and popular discourse within animated film production.

**Research tasks:**

- to identify and define key animation terminology frequently used in Disney and Pixar productions, particularly in *Moana 2* and *Inside Out 2*;
- to analyze the etymological origins and semantic shifts of selected animation terms such as *cartoon*, *clean-up*, *layout*, and *storyline*;
- to examine how metaphor, personification, and cultural borrowing contribute to the creation of new animation vocabulary in these films;
- to investigate the influence of Disney's brand and studio practices on the formation and popularization of specialized animation lexicon.

**Main findings.** The field of animation production is characterized by a rich and evolving terminology, much of which reflects the historical, semantic and technological development of the industry. This research explores several key terms such as *animation*, *cartoon*, *clean-up*, *layout* and others, focusing on their etymological origins, semantic transformations and functional distinctions. Special attention is also given to the linguistic influence of the Disney studio, whose innovations have left an indelible mark on animation vocabulary.

In contemporary animation discourse, the term *cartoon* is frequently used alongside and in some contexts, interchangeably with the term *animation*. However, this dual usage reflects both historical developments and ongoing semantic distinctions. The English word *cartoon* traces its etymology to the Greek origin, meaning "papyrus" or "sheet of paper". This evolved into Latin as *charta* ("paper"), then into Italian as *cartone*, which referred to a large sheet of heavy paper or card used for preliminary sketches in the fine arts. During the 17th century, English adopted the term *carton*, and later *cartoon*, to denote a full-scale preparatory drawing for a fresco, tapestry or stained-glass design [8; 14].

By the mid-19th century, *cartoon* acquired an extended meaning in English such as a humorous or satirical illustration, particularly in newspapers and magazines [14]. This shift from preparatory artwork to visual humor laid the foundation for its eventual association with animated media. In the early 20th century, as motion picture technology advanced, *cartoon* came to describe short, hand-drawn animated films featuring exaggerated, often humorous characters and narratives. These animated sequences, composed of numerous illustrated frames shown in rapid succession to simulate movement, became known as animated cartoons.

Consequently, *cartoon* developed a dual semantic load: it retained its association with humorous or caricatured drawings in print media while also denoting a genre of animated moving images. Notably, the term *cartoon* in the context of animation has often implied a particular style – typically 2D, hand-drawn, and character-driven and is frequently associated with content designed for children or comedic effect. In contrast, *animation* serves as a broader umbrella term encompassing all forms of animated moving images, including stop-motion, computer-generated

imagery (CGI), and experimental techniques, and is not necessarily restricted by tone, audience, or medium [2].

Film and animation scholar Paul Wells highlights this distinction, arguing that while animation refers to the broader technical and aesthetic practice of creating the illusion of motion through successive images, cartoon is more closely tied to the visual language of graphic exaggeration and narrative simplification [20].

Similarly, Giannalberto Bendazzi notes that the term cartoon is culturally contingent: in the United States, it typically refers to short animated films or television episodes with comedic or children's content, whereas in European contexts, animation is more commonly used as a neutral, genre-inclusive term [2, pp. 11–12].

Therefore, while the terms cartoon and animation often overlap in casual usage, especially in popular discourse, they are not fully synonymous. Their historical trajectories, stylistic connotations, and professional applications reflect the evolving language of visual storytelling across media.

Considering both the etymology and semantics of *animation*, we assert that the expressions *animated film* and *animated cartoon* are largely synonymous in denoting the final product. However, British film scholar Annette Kuhn makes a subtle yet important distinction: while *animated film* is a broader term, *cartoon* typically refers to short-form works aimed at younger audiences [11].

Another significant term in animation production is *clean-up*, often translated into Ukrainian as “промальовування”. Director Thomas White defines it as “the process carried out by a clean-up artist” [21]. Etymologically, the term is derived from the phrasal verb *to clean up*, which, according to the *Macmillan Dictionary*, means “to remove dirt from a place or industrial process” and “to make a place completely clean and tidy” [12]. In the context of animation, the meaning is metaphorically extended: initial sketches, often rough and cluttered with construction lines, require refinement to produce the final clean artwork.

Equally integral to the animation workflow is the term *layout*, which stems from the phrasal verb *to lay out*. The *Merriam-Webster Dictionary* defines it as “to arrange or design something” [13]. Within animation, *layout* refers to the preparatory stage in which composition, camera angles and scene staging are established.

A core narrative term is *storyline*, which Thomas White defines as a concise written description of a film's dramatic content [22]. The *Collins Online Dictionary* defines a *storyline* as “the plot of a book, film, or play and how it develops” [4]. This definition emphasizes the narrative sequence and structural coherence of events within a creative work. In the context of animation and film studies, the term *storyline* refers to the overarching narrative framework that guides the progression of characters, settings, conflicts, and resolutions throughout a production. It encapsulates both the chronological arrangement of events and the causal relationships that link them, offering the viewer a coherent and emotionally engaging experience.

The *storyline* functions as an essential narrative component within the broader framework of screenwriting and cinematic storytelling. It aligns closely with, but is not identical to, a *screenplay*, which includes not only the narrative arc but also detailed scene descriptions, dialogues, character actions, and technical cues. While the *screenplay* serves as the formal, written blueprint for production, the *storyline* provides the conceptual backbone, a distilled version of the plot that captures the essence of the narrative before it is expanded into full scenes and scripted dialogue [6; 15].

In animation specifically, the storyline often emerges early in pre-production, during the conceptual and storyboarding phases. Story artists and writers collaborate to translate

the narrative into visual sequences that can be reviewed and revised before full animation begins. As Maureen Furniss notes, the development of the storyline in animated films frequently involves iterative processes, including visual ideation through storyboards and animatics, which help refine pacing, character arcs, and thematic elements [7].

Moreover, the distinction between *storyline* and *plot* is often highlighted in narrative theory. While *plot* refers to the specific sequence of events as they are presented in the final work, *storyline* may refer more generally to the conceptual structure or summary of those events, including subplots and character developments that might not follow linear chronology. This conceptualization is crucial in non-linear or experimental animated works, where the storyline can serve as a navigational map for otherwise fragmented or abstract narrative forms [18].

Closely related to the term *storyline* are the designations *story sketch man*, *storyteller*, and *storyman*. While these may appear synonymous to general audiences, each denotes a distinct function within the animation production pipeline. According to the *Macmillan English Dictionary*, a *storyteller* is defined as “a person who writes, tells, or reads stories aloud” [12]. In contrast, the term *storyman*, particularly within the context of Disney animation, does not refer to a scriptwriter but rather to a visual script artist, an individual responsible for illustrating the story conceptually, rather than scripting it in written form [17]. The *story sketch man* functions as a subordinate yet essential member of the story department, operating under the direction of the storyman. While the storyman is chiefly responsible for shaping the overarching narrative structure, encompassing plot development, character arcs, and dramatic progression, the story sketchman visually interprets and materializes these narrative components.

The role of the story sketch man involves the creation of schematic or exploratory drawings that anticipate key scenes, character expressions, environmental elements, and pivotal actions. These sketches frequently function as preliminary visual frameworks for complete storyboards, delineating the initial aesthetic style, spatial composition, and cinematic *mise-en-scène* of scenes prior to the initiation of the animation process. French animation historiography offers valuable insight into this function. In *Walt Disney: L'Âge d'Or* (Walt Disney: The Golden Age), Pierre Lambert underscores the collaborative contributions of story sketch artists in early Disney productions. He emphasizes their importance in determining the *rythme visuel* (visual rhythm) and maintaining continuity across animated sequences, thereby shaping the audience's cinematic experience of the narrative.

Although these specialized terms may appear interchangeable to the uninitiated observer, they in fact encapsulate nuanced distinctions that reflect the layered complexity of animation as both an artistic practice and an industrial process. Although the domain of animation encompasses a wide-ranging and technically intricate vocabulary, the terminological units examined in this study represent some of the most recurrent and widely acknowledged elements within both industry-specific and scholarly contexts, reflecting their integral role in articulating key concepts and processes.

Closely associated with this linguistic investigation is a complementary yet separate line of analysis that focuses on the lexical item *Disney* itself, with particular emphasis on its semantic evolution, etymological origins, and the morphological mechanisms underlying the formation of derivative expressions and neologisms. The name Walt Disney has become synonymous with creative innovation and technical advancement in animated cinema. According to *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Walt Disney is described as “an American film and television producer, showman, pioneer of animated cartoons, and creator of such iconic characters as Mickey Mouse and Donald Duck”, as well as the founder of Disneyland and Disney World [5]. *Merriam-Webster Dictionary* provides a more concise entry, identifying Disney simply as “Walter Elias, 1901–1966, American

film producer” [13]. A more detailed profile is offered by *Biography: Historical & Celebrity Profiles*, which outlines Disney’s contributions as a co-founder of Walt Disney Productions, a recipient of 22 Academy Awards, and a trailblazer in the development of both animation techniques and theme parks [3].

From an etymological perspective, the surname *Disney* is believed to derive from the Norman toponym *Isigny*, as evidenced by the 12th-century form *William de Ysini*, indicating geographic origin from Isigny-sur-Mer in Calvados, Normandy. In contemporary usage, however, the name *Disney* is less associated with its geographic or genealogical roots than with the global media corporation it represents. Alan Bryman makes a helpful semantic distinction: whereas *Walt* signifies the individual, *Disney* denotes the company and its brand identity, illustrating a linguistic and conceptual shift from personal name to institutional symbol [1]. This transition underscores the metamorphosis of a personal surname into a potent symbol of institutional authority and widespread cultural impact, signifying the extent to which a single brand identity can evolve into a multifaceted emblem representing both commercial dominance and pervasive influence within the contemporary media and entertainment industries.

The influence of Disney extends deeply into animation lexicon. Numerous compound expressions incorporate the name to signify affiliation with the brand, such as *Disney animator*, *Disney storyman*, *Disney Channel*, *Disney fans*, and *Disney magic* [10]. D. Smith, chief archivist of the Walt Disney Archives, adds the term *Disney Dollars* to this list [16].

Of notable linguistic and sociocultural significance are the neologisms *Disneyism* and *Disneyfication*, which exemplify the far-reaching semantic impact of the Disney brand. The lexeme *Disneyism* represents a morphological blend of the proper noun *Disney* and the suffix *-ism*, the latter commonly associated with distinctive ideologies, systems of belief, or behavioral patterns [13]. In non-academic usage, *Disneyism* has come to denote phenomena such as the frequent citation of dialogues from Disney productions, the integration of Disney-related motifs into everyday language practices, and an overt, at times excessive, admiration for the company’s narratives and values. These connotations, frequently documented on participatory digital platforms like Urban Dictionary [19] *disneyism*, suggest that *Disneyism* is primarily employed in informal registers, often accompanied by humorous, ironic, or exaggerated undertones. Although absent from formal lexicons and academic classifications, such interpretations underscore the pervasive influence of Disney media on personal expression and cultural behavior.

In contrast, the term *Disneyfication*, which was first recorded in 1959, has acquired broader acceptance within academic and critical frameworks. It is frequently employed to describe processes of cultural simplification or commodification, particularly in contexts where complex or authentic elements are altered to conform to idealized, market-friendly representations associated with the Disney aesthetic. It denotes “the transformation of an environment or experience into one that is sanitized, commercialized, and overtly controlled, often for mass consumption and entertainment purposes” [14]. This concept is frequently employed in cultural criticism to describe processes whereby historical, cultural, or urban spaces are rendered safe, family-friendly, and visually idealized, often at the cost of complexity or authenticity. Informal sources such as *Urban Dictionary* provide further elaboration, describing *Disneyfication* as involving censorship, the creation of fairy tale-like settings, and the prioritization of corporate values such as harmony and wholesomeness.

A notable expansion of the term appears in media studies, where *Disneyfication* is also associated with the anthropomorphization of non-human entities, an aesthetic and narrative hallmark of Disney’s animated canon. This usage underscores the ideological and visual shaping of content to conform to Disney’s branding and storytelling formulae. In this

context, *Disneyfication* represents not merely a style but a mode of cultural production and representation.

The verb *to disneyfy*, derived from *Disneyfication*, is similarly defined by the *Collins English Dictionary* as meaning “to convert (something), especially historical or cultural sites or narratives, into superficial or commercial entertainment, often stripped of complexity or controversy” [4]. Compared to *Disneyism*, *Disneyfication* and its verbal form enjoy broader usage and critical traction, particularly in fields such as media studies, cultural geography, and urban planning, where scholars examine the socio-cultural consequences of corporate aesthetics and ideology.

In conclusion, the lexical and etymological development of Disney-related terminology, particularly neologisms such as *Disneyism*, *Disneyfication*, and *to disneyfy*, reflects both the internal dynamics of animated film production and the wider cultural impact of the Disney enterprise. These terms encapsulate how a single media conglomerate can influence not only the professional vocabulary of animation but also broader societal discourses on culture, identity, and representation. As such, the linguistic imprint of Disney constitutes a compelling case study in the intersection of branding, language formation, and cultural hegemony.

Disney and Pixar's recent animated films, *Moana 2* and *Inside Out 2*, continue the studio's tradition of expanding the lexical field of animation through the use of semantically rich, metaphorical, and often idiomatic expressions. These films do not merely rely on existing cinematic language but actively contribute to the evolving discourse of animation-specific terminology.

For instance, in *Moana 2*, the lexicon is deeply intertwined with Polynesian culture and maritime vocabulary, yet transformed into expressive idioms tailored to the animated medium. Consider the following example: *wayfinding*. The film introduces or recontextualizes terms like *wayfinding*, traditionally a navigation technique, into a metaphor for inner guidance and personal growth. Additionally, the film introduces the song “Can I Get a Chee Hoo?”, performed by Maui to uplift Moana during a moment of self-doubt. This upbeat, percussion-driven track incorporates the cultural phrase “Chee Hoo”, a Hawaiian expression of excitement and solidarity, further embedding Polynesian cultural elements into the film's lexicon. Another example is the personification of the ocean, which continues in *Moana 2*, where the ocean is not just a setting but a sentient guide. This contributes to a metonymic animation vocabulary where natural elements are imbued with character agency, a hallmark of Disney's lexicon in animating non-human entities. For instance, the phrase “the ocean connects us”, used by the filmmakers to encapsulate the sequel's central theme, reflects this narrative strategy. Similarly, newly introduced elements like spiritual wayfinding blend metaphysical and physical movement, drawing on Polynesian cosmology and navigation traditions. These concepts demand a visual grammar in which motion must reflect both emotional resonance and spiritual significance, continuing Disney's pattern of inventing or adapting language to align with both narrative and animation logic. Thus, these expressions are constructed through metaphorical blending and semantic extension. They serve both narrative and technical functions, bridging the storyline with the animators' visualization process.

In *Inside Out 2*, the lexicon is built around the personification of emotions and psychological states, offering a fertile field for linguistic innovation. Considering the example of “Sense of Self”, a narrative construct visualized as a glowing crystalline core of Riley's identity, the following phrases, like memory vault, imagination land or belief system collapse, are not only narrative metaphors but are mapped onto the animation pipeline. Each serves as a visual structure requiring consistent spatial design and motion logic to convey the complexities of internal emotional life.

Each character's design process yields new terminologies. For example, “brainstorm”, as used in *Inside Out 2*, is a visual metaphor brought to life through animation – depicting ideas as

bolts of lightning falling into the mind during moments of intense thinking. This coined concept enables animators to translate an abstract mental event into a stylized, sensory-driven visual sequence.

Consequently, these are instances of metaphorical neologism, semantic borrowing from cognitive science, and creative compounding. Such phrases often begin as internal studio jargon but become embedded in the broader discourse of animation analysis and fan commentary.

Both *Moana 2* and *Inside Out 2* exemplify key strategies of animation term formation: metaphorization, personification and metonymy, cultural borrowing and adaptation, in-house jargon to public lexicon.

**Conclusion and study forward.** The conducted study confirms that the formation of specialized animation vocabulary is a complex and dynamic process deeply influenced by cultural, psychological and technological factors. This linguistic development is particularly evident in contemporary animated productions such as *Moana 2* and *Inside Out 2*, which serve as rich case studies for understanding how animation terminology evolves in response to narrative innovation and cultural representation.

In these films, vocabulary formation reflects a deliberate blending of culturally specific lexemes and metaphorically charged terms that transcend purely technical descriptions. *Moana 2* exemplifies the integration of indigenous cultural concepts into animation language, where terms evoke natural elements and ancestral connections, thus enriching the lexicon with culturally meaningful expressions. Meanwhile, *Inside Out 2* illustrates how abstract psychological states and emotional experiences are linguistically transformed into concrete, visually interpretable terms, facilitating audience engagement with internal cognitive processes.

The research highlights that animation vocabulary is not a static set of technical terms but a living lexicon characterized by idiomatic and metaphorical features. These specialized terms function as linguistic tools that embody movement, emotion, and narrative rhythm, core aspects of animation as both an art form and a storytelling medium. The formation of such vocabulary involves semantic shifts, metonymic transfers, and creative lexical blends, demonstrating how language adapts to the demands of new media and evolving cultural contexts.

While this research provides insights into the lexical creativity inherent in *Moana 2* and *Inside Out 2*, additional studies are warranted to examine how such specialized vocabulary affects audience reception, translation strategies, and intercultural communication in animation. Investigating the diachronic development of animation terminology and its dissemination across languages and cultures will further deepen our understanding of the linguistic mechanisms that underlie this vibrant and influential domain.

### Bibliography:

1. Alan Bryman. The Disneyization of society. London : Sage, 2004. 256 p.
2. Animation and America. Paul Wells. New Brunswick : Rutgers University Press, 2002. 185 p.
3. Bendazzi G. Animation: A world history. Volume III: Contemporary times. London : Routledge, 2016. DOI: 10.4324/9781315720746. URL: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319153294\\_Animation\\_A\\_world\\_history\\_Volume\\_III\\_Contemporary\\_times](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319153294_Animation_A_world_history_Volume_III_Contemporary_times)
4. Biography.com Editors. Walt Disney. URL: <https://www.biography.com/business-leaders/walt-disney>.
5. Collins English Dictionary. 2024. URL: <https://www.collinsdictionary.com>
6. Encyclopædia Britannica. URL: <https://www.britannica.com>
7. Field S. Screenplay: The foundations of screenwriting. Rev. & updated ed. New York : Delta, 2005.
8. Furniss M. The animation bible: A guide to everything – from flipbooks to Flash. London : Laurence King Publishing, 2008.



9. Harper Dictionary of Contemporary Usage / ed. by William Morris, Mary Morris. New York : Harper & Row, 1975. 650 p.
10. Harper Dictionary. Cartoon, 2024.
11. Kuhn A., Biltereyst D., Meers P. Memories of cinemagoing and film experience: An introduction. *Memory Studies*. 2017. Vol. 10, № 1. P. 3–16. DOI: 10.1177/1750698016670783.
12. Korkis J. The revised vault of Walt. Theme Park Press, 2012. 282 p.
13. Macmillan Dictionary. 2009. URL: [https://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/clean-up\\_1](https://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/clean-up_1)
14. Merriam-Webster Dictionary. URL: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/layout>
15. Oxford English Dictionary. URL: <https://www.oed.com>
16. Seger L. Making a good script great. 3rd ed. Beverly Hills : Silman-James Press, 2010.
17. Smith D. Disney A to Z: The updated official encyclopedia. New York : Hyperion, 1998. 633 p.
18. The Walt Disney Studios. Guide. New York, 1938.
19. Thompson K., Bordwell D. Film art: An introduction. New York : McGraw-Hill Education, 2012. 544 p.
20. Urban Dictionary. Disneyism. URL: <https://www.urbandictionary.com>
21. Wells P. Understanding animation. London : Psychology Press, 1998. 265 p.
22. White T. Animation from pencils to pixels. London : Routledge, 2006. 400 p.

### References:

1. Bryman, A. (2004). The Disneyization of society. London: Sage.
2. Bendazzi, G. (2016). Animation: A world history. Volume III: Contemporary times. London: Routledge. Retrieved from: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319153294\\_Animation\\_A\\_world\\_history\\_Volume\\_III\\_Contemporary\\_times](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319153294_Animation_A_world_history_Volume_III_Contemporary_times)
3. Biography.com Editors. (n.d.). Walt Disney. Retrieved from: <https://www.biography.com/business-leaders/walt-disney>
4. Collins English Dictionary. (2024). Retrieved from: <https://www.collinsdictionary.com>
5. Encyclopædia Britannica. (n.d.). Retrieved from: <https://www.britannica.com>
6. Field, S. (2005). Screenplay: The foundations of screenwriting (Rev. & updated ed.). New York: Delta.
7. Furniss, M. (2008). The animation bible: A guide to everything – from flipbooks to Flash. London: Laurence King Publishing.
8. Harper, W., & Morris, M. (Eds.). (1975). Harper dictionary of contemporary usage (Rev. ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
9. Harper Dictionary. (2024). Cartoon. Harper.
10. Kuhn, A., Biltereyst, D., & Meers, P. (2017). Memories of cinemagoing and film experience: An introduction. *Memory Studies*, 10(1), 3–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698016670783>
11. Korkis, J. (2012). The revised vault of Walt. Theme Park Press.
12. Macmillan Dictionary. (n.d.). Clean-up. Retrieved from: [https://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/clean-up\\_1](https://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/clean-up_1)
13. Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Layout. Retrieved from: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/layout>
14. Oxford English Dictionary. (n.d.). OED Online. Retrieved from: <https://www.oed.com>
15. Seger, L. (2010). Making a good script great (3rd ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Silman-James Press.
16. Smith, D. (1998). Disney A to Z: The updated official encyclopedia. New York: Hyperion.
17. The Walt Disney Studios. (1938). Guide. The Walt Disney Studios.
18. Thompson, K., & Bordwell, D. (2012). Film art: An introduction (10th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
19. Urban Dictionary. (n.d.). Disneyism. Retrieved from: <https://www.urbandictionary.com>
20. Wells, P. (1998). Understanding animation. London: Psychology Press.
21. Wells, P. (2002). Animation and America. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
22. White, T. (2006). Animation from pencils to pixels. London: Routledge.