

## Gender adjectives and identity construction in Greek corpora

Georgia Fragaki and Dionysis Goutsos  
University of Athens

### *Περίληψη*

Το άρθρο αυτό επικεντρώνεται σε τρία ζεύγη επιθέτων που συνδέονται με το φύλο (ανδρικός/αντρικός – γυναικείος, αρσενικός – θηλυκός, αγορίστικος – κοριτσίστικος) και διερευνά τη συχνότητα, τις σημασίες, τις συνάψεις και τη χρήση τους σε σώματα κειμένων (2,4 εκατομμύρια λέξεις συνολικά) που περιλαμβάνουν δεδομένα από εφημερίδες (ειδήσεις και άρθρα γνώμης) και περιοδικά (γενικού ενδιαφέροντος, ανδρικά, γυναικεία). Τα ποσοτικά δεδομένα δείχνουν ότι τα περιοδικά και μάλιστα όσα απευθύνονται σε συγκεκριμένο φύλο (ανδρικά ή γυναικεία) δίνουν έμφαση στην αναπαράσταση του φύλου σε σύγκριση με άλλα είδη κειμένων. Η ποιοτική ανάλυση υποδεικνύει ότι η γνωστή ασυμμετρία εις βάρος των γυναικών, που έχει διαπιστωθεί και για τα ελληνικά, αποτελεί μέρος μια πιο πολύπλοκης εικόνας αυτο- και ετερο-κατασκευής του φύλου και της ταυτότητας.

### 1. Introduction

This paper is part of a larger project aiming at studying the construction of gender through linguistic means in Greek corpora (see also Goutsos & Fragaki, forthcoming). Our purpose is to investigate how lexical choices affect the construction of gender in specific genres, by focusing on the frequency, collocations and meanings of basic word pairs used to refer to gender in Greek. In this paper, we concentrate on adjectives related to male and female gender in Greek, namely ανδρικός/αντρικός vs. γυναικείος, αρσενικός vs. θηλυκός and αγορίστικος vs. κοριτσίστικος, whereas in Goutsos & Fragaki (forthcoming) we study the corresponding noun terms, άνδρας/άντρας vs. γυναίκα, αγόρι vs. κορίτσι.

Gender has been one of the most widely studied topics in linguistics and neighbouring disciplines. Kendall & Tannen (2003: 548) summarize this extended line of research by pointing out the tension between documenting gender-related patterns of language use and viewing language as a symbolic resource for gender construction. Thus, there has been a gradual shift from earlier studies of language and gender that gave emphasis on individual linguistic forms as characteristic of women's and men's speech to research that focuses on gender differences as communicative strategies in a variety of genres and contexts of interaction.<sup>1</sup>

The same shift from the study of lexical items to that of discourse strategies can be observed in the Greek literature on the subject, albeit to a much less extent (see Χαραλαμπίκης 2001: 121-142, Παυλίδου 2002, and Κακριδή 2005: 78-83 for a review of relevant studies in Greek). As a result, most studies of Greek have so far concentrated on the morphological level, focusing on morphosyntactic phenomena such as endings, especially in professional or generic nouns. A second area of interest has been that of semantic gaps and lexical asymmetries in Greek, where a number of studies using

<sup>1</sup> Kendall & Tannen (2003) provide a useful summary of the main approaches to the issue.

material from various dictionaries and thesauri find that the abundance of positive terms for the masculine goes hand in hand with a mass of derogatory terms for the feminine (Τσοκαλίδου 1996, Παυλίδου κ.ά. 2004, Goutsos & Katsoyannou forthcoming). This asymmetry has also been especially observed in the case of adjectives like *ανδρικός* and *γυναικείος* in phrases such as *ανδρικές/γυναικείες δουλειές* ‘male/female business’ or *ανδρικές/γυναικείες κουβέντες* ‘male/female words’, which carry distinctly different connotations (e.g. Μακρή-Τσιλιπάκου 1996: 6, Αρχάκης & Κονδύλη 2002: 159-160, Παυλίδου 2002: 53).

However useful this research may be, it is in essence restricted since it studies language descriptions of the grammatical system and the vocabulary of Greek rather than actual use. Our study focuses, instead, on the *use* of lexical items referring to gender in Greek corpora. Electronic corpora provide access to a vast amount of authentic linguistic data, which can be thoroughly analyzed in terms of frequency and patterns of use. In addition, the employment of corpora facilitates the description and comparison of specific genres, thus allowing us to more closely specify claims about general language. By studying particular genres, we relate individual lexical choices to contextual parameters and can attempt a synthesis of approaches that have so far diverged in their interests.

Corpus approaches to the study of gender and language have already been developed to a certain extent in English. In particular, there have been a number of specialized studies on male vs. female vocabulary pairs (Stubbs 1996, Holmes 2000, 2001, Holmes & Sigley 2002, Sigley & Holmes 2002, Gesuato 2003), as well as on markers and semantic fields preferred by men and women in specific corpora (Schmid 2003). Some of the contextual parameters which these studies take into account are geographical variation, mode (spoken versus written), speaker gender and diachronic development.

At the same time, genre variation and audience design have not been extensively investigated. Our project aims at fulfilling this gap by comparing the use of individual lexical choices in five genres of Greek, namely news articles and opinion articles drawn from newspapers as well as magazine articles drawn from general interest, male and female magazines. We have chosen a number of genres which give us the opportunity to test Lakoff’s (1975: 27) claim that women are treated as inferior human beings both by men and women. Thus, our data includes gender-oriented genres (e.g. magazines addressing a male or female audience), along with texts which are not committed to a particular audience in terms of gender.

This distinction allows us to differentiate between target groups to which these texts are addressed and thus specify how language use and semantic choices are affected by gender. By analyzing these genres we are not interested in the gender of the text producer. We rather focus on the construction of the male and female position in the discourse through the allegiance of the text producer with his or her assumed audience. In other words, we assume that the writer’s sex is less important than their positioning as members of an in-group, which is discursively constructed and maintained in female and male magazines. By contrast, in general magazines or newspapers, which address an unspecified (in terms of gender) audience, gender is not equally foregrounded. At the same time, by reflecting a more vs. less formal style, the distinction between newspapers and magazines allows us to examine the extent to which established writing conventions have an effect on gender construction.

By using the notion of audience design as defined above we can more closely specify how gender construction is achieved in different genres. Our focus is on the lexical means by which gender is constructed in our data and in particular on adjectival lexical choices referring to the male and the female gender.

## 2. Data and methodology

The adjectives studied in this paper involve, as mentioned above, the three male-female pairs ανδρικός vs. γυναικείος, αρσενικός vs. θηλυκός and αγορίστικος vs. κοριτσίστικος. These adjectives are some of the basic means for explicitly ascribing the property of gender to nouns in Greek.

Our data comes from five sub-corpora of the Corpus of Greek Texts (CGT). CGT is the outcome of co-operation between the University of Athens and the University of Cyprus and constitutes a new, extensive and representative corpus of Greek, including a substantial amount of data (30 million words) as a basis for linguistic research and a resource for teaching applications (see Γούτσος 2003 for details). It must be noted that all texts collected for CGT were created in the decade 1990-2000 and thus reflect current linguistic practices.

In this study we draw data from two main sources: newspapers and magazines. The former include news articles and opinion articles from daily and Sunday newspapers published in Greece (*Ελευθεροτυπία, Καθημερινή, Ριζοσπάστης, Το Βήμα, Πατρίς*). The latter are further distinguished into:

- a. General interest magazines, mainly with a social and political focus (*Αναπηρία Τώρα, Δικαιωματικά, Ερευνητής, Σαμιζντάτ, Focus*)
- b. Male magazines (*Κλικ, Men Magazine*)
- c. Female magazines (*Είναι, Business Woman, Cosmopolitan, Fashion Club, Lipstick, Vita*).

As discussed above, the categories general, male and female are taken here as referring to the intended audience of these magazines.

The total number of words in our data is 2.400.000 and is distributed in each genre as shown in the following table:

NEWSPAPERS		MAGAZINES		
News articles	Opinion articles	General	Male	Female
600.000	600.000	600.000	300.000	300.000

**Table 1: Number of words per genre in the data**

Our method of analysis is based on the use of frequency lists to determine the relative importance of the items studied and concordances to discover and analyze specific patterns of use (cf. Stubbs 1996). In particular, the analysis of each word in its immediate context provides information about its meanings, collocations and use.

## 3. Frequency of gender adjectives

The frequency of the adjectives under investigation can be seen in the following Table:

	NEWS ARTICLES	OPINION ARTICLES	GENERAL MAGAZINES	MALE MAGAZINES	FEMALE MAGAZINES	TOTAL
<i>ανδρικός</i>	1	3	2	9	15	30
<i>αντρικός</i>	-	-	11	5	8	24
<i>ανδρικός/αντρικός</i>	1	3	13	14	23	54
<i>γυναικείος</i>	11	5	26	15	108	165
<i>αρσενικός</i>	2	1	33	6	5	47
<i>θηλυκός</i>	2	5	34	4	14	59
<i>αγορίστικος</i>	-	-	-	1	2	3
<i>κοριτσίστικος</i>	-	-	-	-	4	4

**Table 2: Absolute frequency of pairs in sub-corpora**

As we can see from Table 2, the most frequent pair is *ανδρικός/αντρικός* – *γυναικείος*, while *αγορίστικος* – *κοριτσίστικος* is marginal in our data<sup>2</sup>.

It can be noted that there is a clear quantitative preference to the female member of the three pairs in all genres. This comes to striking contrast with data from English corpora, which show a persistent tendency to overrepresent male terms, although there are no specific studies for adjectives (Leech & Fallon 2004 [1992]: 169-170, Sigley & Holmes 2002).

Secondly, we can notice that all pairs are more frequent in magazines than in newspapers. Gender adjectives seem to be particularly prominent in female magazines, which refer more to both genders but especially to women. Half of all occurrences of the pair *ανδρικός/αντρικός* – *γυναικείος*, for instance, relate to the form *γυναικείος* in female magazines. Thus, female magazines appear to be more concerned with their in-group, since there are overall more than four times as many instances of female adjectives than male ones.

In the category of magazines the pair *ανδρικός/αντρικός* – *γυναικείος* is more frequent in gender-oriented (i.e. male and female magazines) than in general magazines, taking into account the total number of words in these sub-corpora. The opposite is true for *αρσενικός-θηλυκός*, which is more frequent in general magazines. This is due to the fact that, as we will see below, this pair is also used to refer to animals. (It is also interesting that the pair *αγορίστικος* – *κοριτσίστικος* is only found in gender-oriented magazines).

A final remark can be made about the morphological variation between *ανδρικός/αντρικός*. As we can see in the table, newspapers seem to have standardized their use in favour of *ανδρικός*, while *αντρικός* is not found at all. *Ανδρικός* is also more frequent in gender-oriented magazines, whereas *αντρικός* predominates in general magazines. The choice between the two forms again seems to be an effect of standardization, since each magazine prefers to use only one of these. Furthermore, their choice is not influenced by the kind of collocate with which they co-occur.

To sum up our main finding, evidence from the frequency of the items under discussion points out that gender-oriented magazines foreground gender adjectives in comparison with general magazines and especially newspapers.

#### 4. Use of gender adjectives

A useful categorization of adjectives is that between classifying and qualitative adjectives, which has been introduced in the literature in order to differentiate between

<sup>2</sup> This may be due to the subject matter of our data, which is clearly oriented to an adult audience.

those that “identify someone or something as a member of a class” from those that “identify qualities which someone or something has” (Sinclair 1990: 63). Κλαίρης & Μπαμπινιώτης employ this distinction in their discussion of adjectives in Greek (2004: 46-47), by using the terms ταξινομικά and περιγραφικά respectively, and point out that some adjectives can belong to both categories or be in between (op.cit.: 103).

In her study of derived adjectives with the prefix περι- in Greek corpora, Φραγκάκη (2005) suggests that the category of classifying or qualitative adjectives correlates with the syntactic role, the collocational behaviour and the semantic prosody of each adjective. In particular, classifying adjectives such as περιβαλλοντικός and περιφερειακός are always found in attributive positions (cf. Sinclair 1990: 71), mainly before the noun they modify (cf. Κλαίρης & Μπαμπινιώτης 2004: 47-48). They also are non-gradable and frequently have fixed collocates (e.g. περιουσιακά στοιχεία, περιβαλλοντικές οργανώσεις). Qualitative adjectives such as περίφημος and περιβόητος can appear in both predicative and attributive positions and do not have prominent collocates but rather dominant semantic prosodies. It is also interesting that only some (e.g. περίεργος, περίπλοκος and περιθωριακός) can be graded, even though gradability is regarded as a typical feature of qualitative adjectives (e.g. Κλαίρης & Μπαμπινιώτης 2004: 49). Finally, a third, intermediate category of classifying-qualitative adjectives can be distinguished, including such adjectives as περιστασιακός and περιοριστικός, which share typical features of both categories.

The qualitative analysis of our data indicates that the distinction between classifying and qualitative adjectives is also very significant in gender adjectives, since it can be used to explain their different uses as well as their potential for gender construction.

#### 4.1. ανδρικός/αντρικός vs. γυναικείος

Our analysis of data has shown that the two members of the pair ανδρικός/αντρικός vs. γυναικείος are used in a different way. The adjective ανδρικός/αντρικός has specific classifying uses when collocating with items referring to fashion or clothes (ντύσιμο, αξεσουάρ, μόδα, φούστες, σάλι, μπόξερ, κολεξιόν) and sexuality (σεξουαλισμός, φαντασιώσεις, γυμνό), as well as when collocating with general nouns (πληθυσμός, φύλο, εκδοχή, κοινότητα, τύπου, στέλεχος του Κινήματος). However, qualitative uses are also found in examples like:

- (1) ... είχα μια πιο σκληρή, σχεδόν αντρική ιδέα για τον κόσμο γύρω μου
- (2) θεωρείται μη αντρικό το να μην έχεις ...
- (3) προσδίδουν στις γυναίκες πολιτικούς ... ανδρικά χαρακτηριστικά, βλέπετε!
- (4) ... το γυναικείο ή το ανδρικό στυλ διοίκησης.

As we can see, the role of adjectives in the above examples is not to ascribe male gender or classify people or things as male but to suggest ‘male qualities’ for certain people or things. These qualities can be gradable as in (1), where we do have some evidence about the meaning of αντρική by its association with σκληρή. In the other examples, however, the quality of ‘male’ is not explicit but is left to the readers to guess through their previous social and cultural knowledge. (We can also note that the adjective is in predicative position in (2), a feature that correlates with qualitative adjectives in Greek). These uses co-exist with intermediate cases like το λουστράρισμα θεωρείται αντρική δουλειά, in which the adjective seems to have both classifying and non-classifying meanings, especially if read in the context of the previous examples.

On the other hand, collocates of the adjective *γυναικείος* vary across genres. In newspapers, there is emphasis on oppression (*άμβλωση, περιτομή, ενδημεί, πλήττουν*), women as a minority (*αρνητικό ρεκόρ στις γυναικείες παρουσίες, μικρή/μειωμένη γυναικεία παρουσία, με πολύ χαμηλή εκπαίδευση*) and equality (*οργανώσεις, ζητήματα ισότητας*). In general magazines, there is equal emphasis on fashion (*ρούχα, παπουτσιών*), body/sexuality (*γυμνό, οίστρος, κοιλιά, γεννητικά/σεξουαλικά όργανα, σώμα*) and oppression, as in the following examples:

(5) ... καταπίεσης που υφίσταται ο γυναικείος πληθυσμός.

(6) ... ένα μεγάλο μέρος του γυναικείου πληθυσμού ζει αγκυλωμένο ...

In the latter case, it is interesting that the agent is concealed by the use of passive voice. The only qualitative use found concerns *γυναικείες ασχολίες/δουλειές*, which seems to be an intermediate case like those mentioned above for *αντρική δουλειά*.

In male magazines the emphasis is on body/sexuality (*σώμα, γοητεία, μηροί*) and appearance (*αξεσουάρ, μαγιό, ρούχα, ομορφιά, φιλαρέσκεια*). It is interesting that there is no mention here of female labour or business, while the only reference to oppression is given in an ironic tone:

(7) ... αναζητήσεις που φτάνουν μέχρι και τη γυναικεία καταπίεση. Πουλάει η επιστημονική...

In female magazines, instead, the most prominent collocations refer to business, since collocates such as *επιχειρηματικότητα, επιχειρηματικός, επιχειρήσεις* are found in almost half of all occurrences of the word. Still, there are also several instances of collocates referring to body (*πόδια, φιγούρα, κορμί*), appearance (*κομψότητα, γκαρνταρόμπα, ντουλάπα*) and fashion (*παπούτσια, κολεξιόν*), as well as some references to the magazines themselves (*περιοδικά*).

Overall, this pair of adjectives is mostly used in a classifying manner, relating to different collocates for the male and female members. However, there are several qualitative uses, especially for the male member, showing implicit evaluation. It is also interesting that, whereas the picture is quite uniform for the male member of the pair, collocates for the female member show greater variety both in terms of semantic fields and across genres. This would seem to suggest that with respect to this adjective pair, there is no consensus as yet regarding female gender construction, in opposition to male gender construction.

#### 4.2. αρσενικός vs. θηλυκός

The members of the pair *αρσενικός-θηλυκός* appear as both nouns and adjectives, as in:

(8) Τα αρσενικά, πιο μεγαλόσωμα από τα θηλυκά, διαθέτουν ...

in contrast to:

(9) Αυτός ο άνθρωπος, παρόλο που υπήρξε ένα αρσενικό τέρας, δεν είχε ...

*Αρσενικός* mainly appears as a noun (30 instances as compared to 17 as an adjective), while *θηλυκός* is almost equally noun (31 instances) and adjective (28 instances). In other words, adjective uses are more prominent in the female than the male member of the pair. Note also that in noun uses like (8) there is frequent co-occurrence of the two members of the pair in relations of co-ordination, disjunction, comparison or some other relationship as in:

(10) ... το κυρίαρχο αρσενικό ελέγχει πολλά θηλυκά.

As can be seen in examples (8) and (10), nominal uses, which are mostly found in general and female magazines (but not male magazines), also tend to refer to animals.

(A marginal nominal use, found in newspapers, concerns the grammatical category of masculine and feminine).

The collocates of αρσενικός in general magazines are related to domination and include mainly terms of size (μεγάλα, πιο μεγαλόσωμα, το μέγεθος των αρσενικών-σχεδόν διπλάσιο των θηλυκών) and reference to active or aggressive behaviour (συγκρούσεις, επιθετικές συμπεριφορές). In male magazines, most examples of use are either neutral (πληθυσμός) or emphasize the male peer-group, by presenting a negative property as positive within this group:

(11) ... του μετροπόντικα Ιάσωνα, που σαν γνήσιο αρσενικό ρεμάλι όλο κολλάει ...

(12) ... τα ρεμάλια είναι γένους αρσενικού. Γυναίκα ρεμάλι δεν υπάρχει.

In female magazines, examples of use are neutral (δυναμικού, αρέσκονται) or even positive as in the following example:

(13) ο άλλος ήταν αναποφάσιτος και η Μαρίκα πιο αρσενικό απ' όλα τα αρσενικά της οικογένειάς της.

Example (13) is significant because it shows a gradable use of the adjective, suggesting latent evaluation and thus a qualitative rather than classifying use. A similar use is found in the following nominal case:

(14) ... και κάνει τον άνδρα να νιώθει «πιο αρσενικό».

The collocates of θηλυκός in news articles present the female member of the pair as being under attack (πλήττον, δολοφονείται). In opinion articles, collocates are either negative (δυσανασχετούν, γένους θηλυκού κι ως εκ τούτου γενικώς άστατη) or refer to sexuality (η εικόνα της γυναίκας ως ... «αιώνιου θηλυκού»). In general magazines, the term mainly refers to animals in classifying uses (χέλια, χταπόδι) or presents females as passive (οι θηλυκές διαθέσιμες για ζευγάρι). In the few uses referring to human beings, we can point out two uses presenting woman as an object:

(15) ... οι αρσενικοί αφού άφησαν τη φυσική χρήση του θηλυκού ...

(16) ... για να εισέρχεται στον κόλπο του θηλυκού. Κάθε άλλη χρήση αποτελεί παραβίαση.

In male magazines, collocates can be negative as in:

(17) ... τα έβγαζε όλα και μεταμορφωνόταν σε θηλυκή alien απειλή με ανάγκη τεκνοποίησης!

They may also give emphasis on appearance or sexuality (τριάντα ετών θηλυκό) or show a demeaning stance as in (18), which contains many signals of irony:

(18) ... της πρώην μοντέλας και “party animal” ως θηλυκής σταρ που μπορεί να βασιστεί κανείς σ' αυτήν.

In female magazines, the adjective is often gradable, mainly suggesting qualitative uses with a positive evaluation:

(19) ... μας κάνετε να νιώθουμε πιο θηλυκές, μας βοηθάτε να αποκτήσουμε εμπιστοσύνη.

The most frequent collocates relate to fashion and elegance (πιο θηλυκά τσαντάκια, άκρως θηλυκά σχέδια, φίνα και διάφανα υφάσματα σε θηλυκές γραμμές, ένιωθε ιδιαίτερα κομψή και θηλυκή).

In sum, adjective uses may either be unmistakably classifying (with general nouns such as γένους, πληθυσμού or animal names) or may involve a certain degree of evaluation and thus function as qualitative. Positive or negative collocates and gradability (as in examples 13, 14 and 19) affect seemingly classifying uses and draw in qualitative functions and latent evaluation.

Nominal uses of both members of the pair, as noted above, are significantly employed to refer to animals. However, the properties associated with them in each case are different: for the male member they relate to power and domination, whereas for the female member they relate to sexuality. Nominal uses which do not refer to animals may have an evaluative meaning, which appears to be dominant in cases where their denotative use is either superfluous (η Βάνα Μπάρμπα είναι ...θηλυκό) or contradictory (η Μαρίκα είναι ... αρσενικό). In these latter examples clause subjects are clearly marked as female and thus the role of the predicates is not to classify them as such but to qualify or evaluate them.

#### 4.3. αγορίστικος vs. κοριτσίστικος

The restricted uses of this pair in our data do not allow us an extensive discussion of its use. However, we can still note that the female member of the pair is more common and is also only found in female magazines. As concerns the collocates of both adjectives, they mostly refer to fashion or style (υφάσματα, αποχρώσεις, στιλάκι) and are combined with evaluative adjectives (κλασσικές, παιχνιδιάρικα), which may also be graded:

(20) ... ή πιο ρομαντικό, πιο αγορίστικο ή πιο κοριτσίστικο, πιο ήσυχο ή πιο δημιουργικό ...

The evaluative dimension may relate to the suffix -ίστικος, which, as Μπαμπινιώτης comments (2002: 794), can also be used to derive adjectives with a pejorative sense, in contrast to derived adjectives from -ιστικός. Of course, evaluation is positive in our examples rather than negative.

#### 5. Conclusions

Our findings from the examination of male-female pairs of adjectives in five different genres of Greek can be summarized as follows. First of all, we have found that the distinction between classifying and qualitative adjectives is significant for gender adjectives. Starting from the assumption that words referring to the male and female genders would only be denotative signifying simply the sex of the referent, it is surprising that we found a host of additional meanings attached to the core concept of gender or even instances where this core meaning is secondary. This opposition between classifying and qualitative or evaluative uses is characteristically found in all adjective pairs, where we have observed a tendency to develop evaluative meanings which co-exist with classifying functions. These evaluative meanings are related to what are considered to be stereotypical roles of the two genders, since they are based on cultural preconceptions and schemas for their understanding. In other words, what it means to evaluate something as ανδρικό, αρσενικό, γυναικείο or θηλυκό depends on what we already “know” about the “typical” characteristics of the two genders, either through our cultural or our linguistic knowledge. Otherwise, it is difficult to explain what πιο αντρικό or πιο θηλυκό mean outside of a particular frame of cultural reference.

Secondly, the treatment of the two genders is not symmetrical but negative characteristics are mainly associated with female rather than male adjectives. Even when negative qualities are attributed to male behaviour, these concern excessive power or domination (σκληρή, σχεδόν αντρική ιδέα - αρσενικό τέρας), whereas the negative treatment of women is mostly ironic or demeaning. At the same time, it is interesting that negative qualities may turn into positive in the case of male magazines referring to men (αρσενικό ρεμάλι), whereas in female magazines only positive qualities are ascribed to women. It is equally interesting that prominent among these positive female



qualities is their association with business, which is only present in female magazines. Qualities like sexuality or appearance are, instead, related with women in all categories of magazines, either gender-oriented or not.

The finding of asymmetry in the treatment of the two genders is not surprising; asymmetry, as noted above, has already been found in the literature as a prominent feature in gender terms in the language system of Greek. Our study, however, has identified the ways in which gender asymmetry is constructed in specific patterns of adjectival use. Moreover, we have established a relation between genre and lexical choices in gender construction in terms of audience design. Audience design seems to be a prominent factor in gender representation. First, gender-oriented magazines seem to foreground issues of gender in terms of frequency of gender adjectives and in comparison with both general interest magazines and newspapers. This suggests that magazines constitute privileged discursive spaces for rising issues of gender and reproducing cultural dominant schemas. It is clear that this is an area where research will be especially fruitful in order to further explore this finding.

In addition, qualitative differences in the treatment of the two genders also relate with the audience to which each genre is addressed. In broad terms, newspapers and general interest magazines seem to present a mixed picture with stereotypical views co-existing with concerns about women oppression and marginalization. By contrast, male and female magazines explicitly foreground their particular stance on gender. Thus male magazines present men as dynamic and domineering and women as submissive or sexually available. They also characteristically present male negative characteristics as positive attributes. On the other hand, female magazines give a more varied picture of women, emphasizing aspects such as business or work, which are totally absent from representations of women in male magazines. At the same time, they do not appear to give so much emphasis on male negative characteristics but even seem to endorse a positive male self-image, positively evaluating male gender adjectives.

We can thus suggest that gender construction through adjectival uses in male and female magazines can be largely accounted for in terms of van Dijk's (1985: 21, 25, 33) "ideological square", an abstract ideological pattern involving emphasis on the positive characteristics of the in-group and the negative characteristics of the out-group, along with downgrading of negative characteristics of the in-group and positive characteristics of the out-group. This is the case with male magazines whereas as noted above female magazines follow a slightly different approach as regards their out-group, which is not negatively evaluated. What each gender thinks of itself and the other seems to underlie the lexical representation of gender in our data.

In all, it is obvious that much more research is needed before we are able to generalize with any certainty about gender identity construction in Greek. Our forthcoming work intends to explore different aspects of lexis with the aim to expanding our analysis of gender in Greek. However, what clearly seems to emerge from our study of gender adjectives is a multi-faceted picture, in which stereotypical polarizations are the outcome of specific lexical choices relating to parameters such as audience design. This suggests that the issue of gender cannot be easily dissociated from the specific linguistic means by which it is constructed in specific contexts of use. In our view, an approach that takes into account this close interaction in well-defined corpora is the most fruitful way of exploring the links between language, cognition and culture.

### References

- Dijk, Teun A. van (1985). *Discourse and communication: new approaches to the analysis of mass media discourse and communication*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Gesuato, Sara (2003). The company women and men keep: what collocations can reveal about culture. In Dawn Archer, Paul Rayson, Andrew Wilson & Tony McEnery (eds.) *Proceedings of the Corpus Linguistics 2003 conference*. UCREL, Lancaster University, 253-262.
- Goutsos, Dionysis & Fragaki, Georgia (forthcoming). The linguistic construction of gender identity in Greek: A corpus analysis. In Alexandra Georgakopoulou & Vally Lytra (eds.) *Pragmatics*. Special issue on Language and Identities in Greek.
- Goutsos, Dionysis & Katsoyannou, Marianna (forthcoming). Gender construction and the Word Thesaurus for Greek. In Eva Thuene & Simona Leonardi (eds.) *Corpus Linguistics and Gender: A Multilingual Analysis of an Electronic Corpus*. London and New York: Continuum.
- Holmes, Janet (2000). *Ladies and gentlemen*: Corpus analysis and linguistic sexism. In Christian Mair & Marianne Hundt (eds.) *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory. Papers from the 20<sup>th</sup> International Conference on English Language Research on Computerized Corpora (ICAME 20)*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 141-155.
- Holmes, Janet (2001). A corpus-based view of gender in New Zealand English. In Marlis Hellinger & Hadumod Bussman (eds.) *Gender across Languages. The Linguistic Representation of Women and Men*. Vol.1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 115-136.
- Holmes, Janet & Sigley, Robert (2002). What's a word like girl doing in a place like this? Occupational labels, sexist usages and corpus research In Pam Peters, Peter Collins & Adam Smith (eds.) *New Frontiers of Corpus Linguistics. Papers from the 21<sup>st</sup> International Conference on English Language Research on Computerized Corpora. Sydney 2000*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. 247-263.
- Kendall, Shari & Tannen, Deborah (2003). Discourse and gender. In Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen & Heidi E. Hamilton (eds.) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, 548-568.
- Lakoff, Robin (1975). *Language and woman's place*. New York: Harper Colophon.
- Leech, Geoffrey & Fallon, Roger (2004 [1992]) Computer corpora – What do they tell us about culture?. In Geoffrey Sampson & Diana McCarthy (eds.) *Corpus Linguistics: Readings in a widening discipline*. London and New York: Continuum, 160-171.
- Schmid, Hans-Jörg (2003). Do women and men really live in different cultures? Evidence from the BNC. In Andrew Wilson, Paul Rayson & Tony McEnery (eds.) *Corpora by the Lune: a festschrift for Geoffrey Leech*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Sigley, Robert & Holmes, Janet (2002). Looking at girls in corpora of English. *Journal of English Linguistics* 30 (2), 138-157.
- Sinclair, John (ed.) (1990). *Collins Cobuild English Grammar*. Glasgow: HarperCollins.
- Stubbs, Michael (1996). *Text and Corpus Analysis. Computer-assisted Studies of Language and Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Αρχάκης, Αργύρης & Κονδύλη, Μαριάννα (2002). *Εισαγωγή στην Κοινωνιογλωσσολογία*. Αθήνα: Νήσος.
- Γούτσος, Διονύσης (2003). Σώμα Ελληνικών Κειμένων: Σχεδιασμός και υλοποίηση. Στο *Πρακτικά του 6ου Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Ελληνικής Γλωσσολογίας, Πανεπιστήμιο Κρήτης, 18-21 Σεπτεμβρίου 2003*. Ηλεκτρονική δημοσίευση (CD-ROM).
- Κακριδή-Φερράρι, Μάρω (2005). *Γλώσσα και κοινωνικό περιβάλλον: Ζητήματα κοινωνιογλωσσολογίας*. Α' Μέρος. Αθήνα: Παρουσία αρ. 64.
- Κλαίρης, Χρήστος & Μπαμπινιώτης, Γεώργιος (2004). (σε συνεργασία με Α. Μόζερ, Α. Μπακάκου-Ορφανού & Σ. Σκοπετέα). *Γραμματική της Νέας Ελληνικής. Δομολειτουργική-Επικοινωνιακή*. 1.2. Τα ονοματικά στοιχεία. Αθήνα: Ελληνικά Γράμματα.
- Μακρή-Τσιλιπάκου, Μαριάνθη (1996). Τι άλλαξε λοιπόν; *Μελέτες για την Ελληνική Γλώσσα. Πρακτικά της 16<sup>ης</sup> Ετήσιας Συνάντησης του Τομέα Γλωσσολογίας του Τμήματος Φιλολογίας της Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής του Α.Π.Θ.* Θεσσαλονίκη, 435-446.
- Μπαμπινιώτης, Γεώργιος (2002). *Λεξικό της Νέας Ελληνικής Γλώσσας*. Αθήνα: Κέντρο Λεξικολογίας. 2<sup>η</sup> έκδοση.
- Παυλίδου, Θεοδοσία-Σούλα (επιμ.) (2002). *Γλώσσα - Γένος - Φύλο*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Παρατηρητής.
- Παυλίδου, Θ.-Σ., Αλβανούδη, Α. & Καραφώτη, Ε. (2004). Γραμματικό γένος και σημασιακό περιεχόμενο: Προκαταρκτικές παρατηρήσεις για τη λεξιλογική αναπαράσταση των φύλων. *Μελέτες για την Ελληνική Γλώσσα. Πρακτικά της 24<sup>ης</sup> Ετήσιας Συνάντησης του Τομέα Γλωσσολογίας του Τμήματος Φιλολογίας της Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής του Α.Π.Θ.* Θεσσαλονίκη, 543-553.

- Τσοκαλίδου, Ρούλα (1996). *Το φύλο της γλώσσας*. Αθήνα: Σύνδεσμος Ελληνίδων Επιστημόνων.
- Φραγκάκη, Γεωργία (2005). *Ανάλυση παραγώγων επιθέτων σε ηλεκτρονικά σώματα κειμένων: Χρήση και σημασιολογική προσωδία*. Αδημοσίευτη μεταπτυχιακή διατριβή, Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών.
- Χαραλαμπίκης, Χριστόφορος (2001). *Νεοελληνικός λόγος*. 3η έκδοση. Αθήνα.