

A Cultural Journey  
through the English Lexicon



A Cultural Journey  
through the English Lexicon

Edited by

Roberta Facchinetti

**CAMBRIDGE**  
**SCHOLARS**  

---

**P U B L I S H I N G**

A Cultural Journey through the English Lexicon,  
Edited by Roberta Facchinetti

This book first published 2012

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2012 by Roberta Facchinetti and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-3509-9, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-3509-1

# CONTENTS

Introduction .....	1
<i>Roberta Facchinetti</i>	
Cultural Keywords across Communities of Practice, Languages and Cultures: The <i>Glass-ceiling (Effect)</i> .....	7
<i>Silvia Cacchiani</i>	
Metaphors we Translate by? Towards a Domain-based Approach to Conventional Metaphor in L2 Translation Pedagogy .....	35
<i>Dermot Heaney</i>	
A Computation Approach to Meaning Evolution in Law .....	63
<i>Daniela Tiscornia and Maria Teresa Sagri</i>	
'Europeanization' of Family Law: Interaction/Intersection of Cultural and Lexical Diversities .....	85
<i>Patrizia Ardizzone and Giulia Adriana Pennisi</i>	
Register Variation in Tourism Terminology .....	109
<i>Virginia Pulcini</i>	
New Sport Media Language: Lexicon and Culture in New Media.....	133
<i>Richard Chapman</i>	
Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions in ELF Company Websites of European Countries: Lexical Choices in Sweden and Greece .....	153
<i>Costanza Cucchi</i>	
Unexpected Lexical Creativity: The Rise of Context-dependent Cultures?.....	183
<i>Francesca Vigo</i>	
World Englishes and ELF in ELT Textbooks: How is Plurality Represented?.....	201
<i>Paola Vettorel and Sara Corrizzato</i>	

Lexicon and Intercultural Competence in EFL Manuals .....	235
<i>Maria Angela Ceruti and Lucilla Lopriore</i>	
The <i>General Service List</i> : Vocabulary Selection beyond Frequency .....	265
<i>Andrea Nava and Luciana Pedrazzini</i>	

# INTRODUCTION

ROBERTA FACCHINETTI

This book has been envisaged as a metaphorical journey through the English lexicon, viewed as a vehicle and a mirror of cultural identity. Our journey takes off from the cultural implications of one word (*glass-ceiling*) and moves on to discuss the issue of translatability of English phrases and metaphors. Then we touch on genre-specific terms – particularly the lexicon of law, of tourism and of sport websites – and land on the slippery slope of lexicological studies of English as a Lingua Franca. Finally, we focus on lexicon from the perspective of English language teaching, bearing in mind that increasing attention is being devoted to teaching language and culture in integrated ways.

More specifically, in the first chapter (“Cultural keywords across communities of practice, languages and cultures: The *glass-ceiling (effect)*”), Silvia CACCHIANI explores the meaning dynamics behind the conceptualization of *glass-ceiling (effect)* as a general term and a cultural keyword, its related word-formations and the mechanism of re-conceptualization of its calque, loan translations and related compounds in Italian. To do so, she focuses on meaning descriptions in expository texts from the specialist press, research articles, dictionaries, glossaries, encyclopaedic entries and textbook sections. The data show that, while English *glass-ceiling* describes a (hidden) limit and a barrier to the advancement of women and other minorities – thus covering potential cultural keywords such as ‘equal opportunities’ (for all) and ‘social mobility’ in a fluid society –, its Italian calque and loan translations show conceptual narrowing in that they appear to only address gender ‘(in)equality’.

From word-meaning to metaphorical sense, in the second chapter Dermot HEANEY (“Metaphors we translate by? Towards a domain-based approach to conventional metaphor in L2 translation pedagogy”) explores the potential usefulness of a systematic comparative analysis of source-language and target-language conventional metaphors in discourse, to define cross-cultural congruence and non-congruence in their use. By means of two comparable corpora of texts on the discourse of industrial

heritage museology in the Italian-English language pairing, the author analyzes source domains in congruent conceptual metaphors to identify differences in their frequency and in their respective linguistic realizations, particularly for the light these shed on variations in cultural attitudes and values. The analysis suggests how a systematic approach to conventional metaphor can increase trainee translators' figurative awareness and strengthen their intercultural sensitivity concerning the cultural implications of the lexico-grammatical choices involved in translating conventional metaphors.

The issue of translatability is at the core of the following chapter as well, which dips the paintbrush into the legal discourse of European and non-European countries. Daniela TISCORNIA and Maria-Teresa SAGRI ("A computation approach to meaning evolution in law") start from the assumption that such specific terminology expresses the legal concepts which operate in the different countries and further mirrors the differences between the various systems and the varying interpretations of lawyers in each system. Bearing this in mind, they posit that the translation of legal terms is virtually impossible in certain legal domains. Indeed, the translational correspondence of two terms may satisfy neither the semantic correspondence of the concepts they denote nor the requirements of the different legal systems. Bearing this in mind, the authors illustrate the usefulness of computational tools in supporting the study of the interrelation between legal language and legal phenomena and propose the design of a formal framework aimed at filling the gap between dogmatic conceptual models and lexical patterns extracted from texts.

Still dealing with legal discourse, Patrizia ARDIZZONE and Giulia Adriana PENNISI ("'Europeanization' of family law. Interaction/Intersection of cultural and lexical diversities") focus on the lack of a uniform terminology in European legal family laws, due to their culture-bound great variety. The authors discuss such issues as the relativity and perspectival structure of family law knowledge and the translatability of domestic orientations and highlight how the linguistic and cultural constraints acting upon the latest most important EU family law documents (the so-called '*Brussels* regulations') reflect either the success or the failure of EU institutions in the attempt to overcome legal, cultural and terminological diversities in national substantive family laws. Finally, they advocate the need for the establishment of a set of standards, on the one hand, and the creation of a 'common core' of family law rules, on the other, as one of the main goals of the EU institutions in order to make the principle of community freedom effective.



Moving from legal lexicon to the terminology used in expert-to-expert tourist communication, Virginia PULCINI (“Register variation in tourism terminology”) posits that, due to the influence of English as a *Lingua Franca*, Italian tourism discourse has borrowed many English terms, which often coexist with Italian equivalents, giving rise to ‘multiple terminology’ and thus violating the terminological principle of monoreferentiality. Drawing on a corpus of specialized tourist texts, the author argues that, in Italian, English terms are often preferred by professionals not only for socio-cultural, stylistic and pragmatic reasons, but also for semantic ones; indeed, anglicisms seem to better fulfill the terminological principle of monoreferentiality with respect to Italian equivalent terms.

Touching on the terminology of sport as it transpires in the New Media environment, Richard CHAPMAN (“New sport media language: Lexicon and culture in new media”) explores BBC live event webpages, which offer a rich mix of text, sms, twitter and blog contributions, with quotations from radio and TV broadcasts. In such new environment, limitations of time and space (a web-page produced in real-time) permit analysis of ‘real’ constraints on language, while the novel mode – which the author terms “written-to-be-read-as-spoken” – emphasizes the potential significance of this resource in studying lexicon, syntax and sociolinguistics. While analyzing these webpages, the author discusses (a) if and to what extent these ‘official blogs’ constitute a different dialect from ‘mainstream’ English, (b) if students should learn and be tested on its lexicon and, finally, (c) if the technology typifying these webpages has profound effects on the development of English lexicon and language in general.

Discussing ‘Internet-English’ leads us to deal in more detail with English as a *Lingua Franca* (ELF). Specifically, Costanza CUCCHI (“Hofstede’s Cultural Dimensions in ELF company websites of European countries: Lexical choices in Sweden and Greece”) verifies whether Hofstede’s model of cultural dimensions can explain the lexical choices in the ELF websites of two companies respectively from Sweden and Greece, which differ significantly along Hofstede’s dimensions. Assuming that national identity is particularly manifest in food and drink, the author has set up a corpus of local cheese and chocolate companies. Her quantitative and qualitative analysis of the corpus testifies to the fact that the companies studied put different emphasis on tradition, quality, achievement and experimentation, thus confirming that Hofstede’s model may be utilized in linguistic research to unveil lexical choices related to cultural differences, even when English is used as a *Lingua Franca*.

In turn, Francesca VIGO (“Unexpected lexical creativity: The rise of context-dependent cultures?”) posits that, although a language is normally related to a culture, this is not entirely true in ELF contexts, since there is no one single culture to refer to. Starting from this assumption, the author advocates a reflection on the concept of ‘speech community’, in order to show how content-focused ELF speakers may turn into lexical creative agents, as her corpus of job interviews testifies to; she further shows that, in job interviews conducted in English by non-native speakers of English, appropriateness is assessed against company and not linguistic needs. In such contexts, managers become lexical creative agents, since they coin new words for specific corporate aims, while the company itself can be paralleled to a ‘culture’. Thus, job interviews can be considered examples of ELF speakers’ pragmatic attitude towards language innovation and variation.

Linking up the world of ELF to that of English Language Teaching (ELT), Paola VETTOREL and Sara CORRIZZATO (“World Englishes and ELF in ELT textbooks: How is plurality represented?”) posit that the diversification of English into a plurality of Englishes calls into question which varieties could and should be included in ELT textbooks. In this chapter, they investigate representations of World Englishes, English as an International Language and ELF in a corpus of upper secondary school ELT civilization textbooks in the Italian educational context. Their data testify to the fact that recognition is given to the role of English as an international language and Lingua Franca of communication, though often with reference to its global spread rather than in connection to relevant research in ELF.

The next chapter is also dedicated to the role played by culture in ELT textbooks, particularly for the study of English lexicon. Specifically, Maria Angela CERUTI and Lucilla LOPRIORE (“Lexicon and intercultural competence in EFL manuals”) illustrate the preliminary results of a case study carried out on four of the main coursebooks currently in use in Italian schools at intermediate level. The study investigates the relation between the pedagogical tasks devised for learners’ lexicon development and the cross-cultural awareness tasks linked to the source texts aimed at developing learners’ intercultural communicative competence. The results suggest that the close connection between the cultural dimension of lexicon and that of the texts learners are presented with is often overlooked; indeed, the types of tasks proposed seem to pay very little attention to the relevance of specific language and cross cultural awareness activities within multilingual contexts.

The book ends with the chapter by Andrea NAVA and Luciana PEDRAZZINI (“The *General Service List*: Vocabulary selection beyond frequency”), which focuses on general English words and their cultural implications both for teaching and research purposes, thus recalling from a different perspective some of the topics touched on in the previous chapters. The authors focus on a set of ‘subjective’ culture-bound criteria implemented in the creation of Michael West’s *General Service List*, dating 1953 and aimed at defining the core vocabulary of English. Although partly based on ‘less scientific’ criteria than contemporary endeavours, the *General Service List* proves to be as reliable and of practical relevance in syllabus and material design and language testing as recent corpus-based projects. Indeed, with the advent of statistical lexicology, emphasis has increasingly been placed on word frequency regarded as ‘objective’ *vis-à-vis* ‘subjective’ selection criteria based on common knowledge and experience. Nava and Pedrazzini’s study proves that these very ‘subjective’ selection criteria often embody cultural bias.

The above-mentioned eleven chapters, each marking a stop in this journey through the English lexicon, are a selection of the papers originally presented at the LEXIS conference in Verona on 11-13 November 2010, entitled *The study of lexicon across cultural identities and textual genres*. The research studies presented here testify to the fact that in English – and overall in language – word contextualization or lack of contextualization impinges on linguistic utterances and leads to differing interpretations of the textual message.

This book may be of interest to a wide range of scholars and students who are concerned with the study of the English lexicon, bearing in mind that, be it made by general words or by specialized terms, by metaphorical phrases or by terminological listings, lexicon provides the bricks of any language, and language, in turn, needs the cornerstone of Culture to stand firmly and thrive.

Verona, September 2011



CULTURAL KEYWORDS  
ACROSS COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE,  
LANGUAGES AND CULTURES:  
THE *GLASS-CEILING* (*EFFECT*)

SILVIA CACCHIANI  
(UNIVERSITY OF MODENA AND REGGIO EMILIA)

**1. Introduction: Contemporary Western society  
and the *glass-ceiling* (*effect*)**

The changing character of contemporary Western society brings to the fore the urgent need to renegotiate the roles and identities of employed and unemployed men and women at the intersection of their public and private lives, within the relevant communities of practice and the society at large. Although more and more women and members of ethnic minorities have entered the job market, discrimination continues in the workplace and social mobility is still an issue, possibly due to the persistent nature of cultural values, stereotypes and ideology from the past. They are deeply entrenched in society and communities of practice, and reflect and foster the apparent legal and attitudinal barriers which prevent women and members of ethnic minorities from reaching the top of the corporate hierarchy and climbing up the career ladder in a changing society.

This is the so-called *glass-ceiling* (*effect*), where *glass ceiling* qualifies as a *cultural keyword* in the sense of Williams (1983 [1976]). As such, it constitutes the vocabulary that allows for the explanation of the ideology of a specific culture and society. If we extend the notion of culture to *disciplinary and professional communities*, or communities of practice defined by co-participation in specific activities and centered on core key-concepts that characterize their discourse (Wenger 1998), then the *glass-ceiling* (*effect*) is a keyword in specific *communities of practice*.

As a recent general term from the soft sciences and a semispecialist word, *glass ceiling* is found in corporate relations and the welfare state,

(micro-)economics, gender studies, law, politics, sociology. It is used in academia, in the public and private sectors, by professionals and non-professionals in profit and non-profit organizations, and by the general public as well. The term was first coined in the mid-eighties and gained general currency in the mid-nineties in the US. It is said to have been initially used in an interview with the *Washington Post* (G115) by Alice Sargent, a Fortune 500 consultant, to describe women “looking up at the top and not making it into the board room of the executives suites” in corporate America. Following the recommendations of the *First Glass Ceiling Report* (1991) and the *Second Glass Ceiling Report* (1995), however, the term then evolved to address the inequities faced not only by women, but also by members of other minorities in the workplace and brought to the fore the need to renegotiate the power relations, roles and identities of employed and unemployed men and women within communities of practice and the society at large (Cacchiani 2008).

*Glass ceiling* has recently hit the Italian language as a gap filler and a cultural loan. More specifically, it is now used along with its loan translations (*soffitto di cristallo* [crystal ceiling], *soffitto di vetro* [glass ceiling], *tetto di cristallo* [crystal roof], *tetto di vetro* [glass roof]). It serves as a cultural keyword in the specialist press, academia, political debates, forums organized by non-profit organizations, professionals in profit and non-profit organizations. While in Italian *glass ceiling* and its loan translations cut across disciplinary boundaries and communities of practice, however, they do not appear to have gained general currency. *Glass ceiling* is not an established word yet. Witness to this is its absence from most Italian dictionaries, with one exception being *Lo Zingarelli 2011* (cf. Section 4).<sup>1</sup>

This chapter takes a look at the meaning dynamics behind the conceptualization of *glass ceiling* as a cultural keyword in English and,

---

<sup>1</sup> GRADIT (*Grande Dizionario Italiano dell'Uso*) and later additions (*Nuove Parole dell'Uso*, Volumes 7, 8) do not record the neologism. Similarly, *glass ceiling* and its loan translations are not included in the *Vocabolario Treccani* (<http://www.treccani.it/vocabolario>). They are found neither in the neologisms webpage ([http://www.treccani.it/Portale/sito/lingua\\_italiana/neologismi/](http://www.treccani.it/Portale/sito/lingua_italiana/neologismi/)) nor in the vocabulary of economics pages ([http://www.treccani.it/Portale/sito/lingua\\_italiana/parole/delleconomia/](http://www.treccani.it/Portale/sito/lingua_italiana/parole/delleconomia/)). Whereas ample coverage is given for recent words used in the press and also found at the interface of economics, the sociology of work and the sociology of family life (e.g. *inattivo* [economically inactive]), *glass ceiling* is not recorded in the Treccani.it. *Glass ceiling* and its counterparts are not recorded in the *Accademia della Crusca/La lingua in rete/Parole Nuove* webpage ([http://www.accademiadellacrusca.it/parole/parole.php?ctg\\_id=58](http://www.accademiadellacrusca.it/parole/parole.php?ctg_id=58)) either, nor in most desk dictionaries.

second, the process of (re-)conceptualization of *glass ceiling* and its loan translations in Italian. To this purpose, in Section 2 we deal with corpus design, motivate and articulate our procedure. Section 3 concentrates on English *glass ceiling*, its genetic motivation (Radden and Panther 2004) and conceptual broadening, mostly based on information from the Oxford English Dictionary and on meaning representations from encyclopaedias, research articles and the quality press. Additionally, we touch upon words whose sense extension can be motivated, i.e. made conceptually possible, along the same lines (e.g. *glass cliff*, *greenhouse effect*), and related phraseologies. Section 4 addresses the question: how do *glass ceiling* and its loan translations emerge as constructs which structure and conceptualize an otherwise barely structured situation in private, public, institutional and professional settings in Italy. The main findings are then briefly summarized in the concluding section of the chapter.

## 2. Data and methodology

Since our focus is on the conceptualization of *glass ceiling* in English and on its (re-)conceptualization in Italian, we shall deal with the representation of *knowledge-oriented information* (cf. Bergenholtz and Tarp 1995). Specifically, we shall carry out a qualitative corpus-based investigation mainly into text passages which instantiate the *expository text type* (Werlich 1983 [1976]),<sup>2</sup> or *information mode* (Smith 2003), in the *meaning descriptions* (Wiegand 1992) of *glass ceiling* provided in general dictionary entries, specialized dictionary entries and glossaries, general and specialized encyclopaedic entries (for English), introductory textbooks (for Italian), as well as natural definitions in discourse (specifically, in research articles and the quality press).

We extend Wiegand's (1992) notions of lexicographical definition and lexicographic meaning description to natural definition and meaning description in discourse. Following Wiegand (1992), a *lexicographical definition* is a text made up of a *definiendum* (LZGA [Lemmazeichengestaltangabe], *definitior* (*definition copula* or absent relational expression) and *definiens*, e.g. a *meaning paraphrase* (BPA [Bedeutungsparaphrasenangabe]). *Lexicographic meaning descriptions*

---

<sup>2</sup> The *expository text type* relates to the cognitive process of comprehension. The encoder explains how component elements interrelate in a meaningful whole. He/she presents constituent elements that can be synthesized into a composite concept (a term) or a mental construct (manifested in a text), or, the other way round, constituent elements into which concepts or mental constructs of phenomena can be analyzed (Werlich 1983 [1976]).

answer potential questions on the part of the intended user in order to solve specific problems in actual situations of use. In terms of Langacker's (1987, 1991) Cognitive Grammar, *definiendum* and *definiens* are things which belong to the same nominal predication, while the *definitor* or equivalence relation is a process or atemporal relation.<sup>3</sup> This is the text-base of *exposition* (Werlich 1983 [1976]), also called *information mode* (Smith 2003). It is characterized by the prevalence of *general statives*, which do not express particular events or states and say something about a kind or an abstract individual (*generic sentences*), or express a pattern or regularity rather than specific episodes or isolated facts, while still concerning objects and individuals which are located in the world (*generalizing sentences*) (Smith 2003: 24). Passages from the corpus are selected for analysis with the help of these features.

## 2.1. Data

The present study is based on two corpora which comprise texts on the *glass ceiling* and related phenomena in English and Italian. Asymmetries in the use of *glass ceiling* across the two lingua-cultures result into discrepancies in corpus size and genre distribution. While the English subcorpus is bigger and more varied, the Italian subcorpus is more restricted in size and coverage of genres and disciplines (Table 1). Since the sample initially chosen from Italian journal research articles (RAs) and encyclopaedic entries did not return any hits for *glass ceiling* or its loan translations, we partly altered the initial corpus design and methodology. For the sake of comparability, the Italian corpus thus comprises expository passages from RAs from edited volumes available at *Google Libri* ([http://books.google.it/advanced\\_book\\_search](http://books.google.it/advanced_book_search)) and manually transcribed expository sections on the sociology of family life and the sociology of work, which were selected from chapters of introductory textbooks.

---

<sup>3</sup> The *definiendum* is the trajector or primary figure. The *definiens* is the landmark or secondary conceptual entity (Langacker 1987).



**Table 1: Materials.**

<b>ENGLISH</b>	
<i>RESEARCH ARTICLES</i> (90 RAs, 2000-2010): <a href="http://192.167.125.34:9003/unimore/az/unimore">http://192.167.125.34:9003/unimore/az/unimore</a>	
AAAPSS: <i>Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences</i>	JOBM: <i>Journal of Organizational Behaviour Management</i>
AE: <i>Applied Economics</i>	JVB: <i>Journal of Vocational Behaviour</i>
AP: <i>American Psychologist</i>	LE: <i>Labour Economics</i>
CPA: <i>Critical Perspectives on Accounting</i>	LQ: <i>The Leadership Quarterly</i>
EL: <i>Economics Letters</i>	OD: <i>Organizational Dynamics</i>
GC: <i>Gender and Competition</i>	PAR: <i>Public Administration Review</i>
GM: <i>Gender Medicine</i>	PRR: <i>Public Relations Review</i>
HR: <i>Human Relations</i>	PS: <i>Political Studies</i>
HRMR: <i>Human Resources Management Reviews</i>	PSP: <i>Political Science and Politics</i>
IJHM: <i>International Journal of Hospitality Management</i>	QREF: <i>The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance</i>
IM: <i>Information and Management</i>	RRPE: <i>Review of Radical Political Economics</i>
JAE: <i>Journal of Asian Economics</i>	SIJ: <i>Service Industries Journal</i>
JAP: <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>	SMJ: <i>Strategic Management Journal</i>
JCE: <i>Journal of Comparative Economics</i>	SR: <i>The Sociological Review</i>
JEEA: <i>Journal of the European Economic Association</i>	SSJ: <i>The Social Science Journal</i>
JLE: <i>Journal of Labour Economics</i>	SSR: <i>Social Science Research</i>
JM: <i>Journal of Management</i>	ST: <i>Sociologie du Travail</i>
	WSIF: <i>Women's Studies International Forum</i>
<i>ENCYCLOPAEDIAS</i> <sup>4</sup>	
GC1: <i>Reference for Business: Business Encyclopaedia 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.</i> : <a href="http://www.referenceforbusiness.com/encyclopedia/For-Gol/Glass-Ceiling.html">http://www.referenceforbusiness.com/encyclopedia/For-Gol/Glass-Ceiling.html</a>	
GC2: <i>Encyclopaedia of Management</i> : <a href="http://www.enotes.com/management-encyclopedia/women-minorities-management">http://www.enotes.com/management-encyclopedia/women-minorities-management</a>	
GC3: <a href="http://www.reference.com">www.reference.com</a>	
GC4: <i>Feminism and Women's Studies</i> : <a href="http://feminism.eserver.org/the-glass-ceiling.txt">http://feminism.eserver.org/the-glass-ceiling.txt</a>	
GC5: <i>Wikipedia</i> : <a href="http://www.wikipedia.com">www.wikipedia.com</a>	
GC6: C.E. Van Horn, H.A. Schaffner (eds), <i>Work in America. An Encyclopaedia of History, Policy and Society</i> : <a href="http://books.google.it/books?">http://books.google.it/books?</a>	
GC7: E.W. Chen (ed.), <i>Encyclopaedia of Asian American Issues Today, Volume 1</i> : <a href="http://books.google.it/books?">http://books.google.it/books?</a>	

<sup>4</sup> Surprisingly, *glass ceiling* is not recorded in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* ([www.Britannica.com](http://www.Britannica.com)).

GC8: E.M. Trauth (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Gender and information Technology. IGI Global, Disseminator of Knowledge. The Glass ceiling in IT*  
 ONLINE DICTIONARIES/GLOSSARIES: G11-G15: 15 definitions from specialist websites, including the Washington Post Politics Glossary  
 DICTIONARIES:  
*Oxford English Dictionary* online, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. and later additions: [www.oed.com](http://www.oed.com)  
*MacMillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners* (MEDAL): [www.macmillan.com](http://www.macmillan.com)  
*Cambridge Advanced Learners Dictionary* (CALD): [www.cambridge.com](http://www.cambridge.com)  
 QUALITY PRESS: *The Economist* (1996-2010): [www.economist.com](http://www.economist.com): 8 texts  
 MISCELLANEOUS: MISC: British Library, Electronic Resources at the British Library: <http://www.bl.uk/collections/wider/eresource.html#E>

### ITALIAN

RESEARCH ARTICLES: 30 RAs from edited volumes searched through Google Libri: [books.google.it/advanced\\_book\\_search](http://books.google.it/advanced_book_search)  
 DICTIONARIES:  
*Lo Zingarelli 2011*: [www.zanichelli.dizionari.it](http://www.zanichelli.dizionari.it)  
*Il Ragazzini 2011*: [www.zanichelli.dizionari.it](http://www.zanichelli.dizionari.it)  
 ENCYCLOPAEDIAS: 0 hits  
 TEXTBOOKS: 2 of 15 textbooks: IT1, IT2  
 QUALITY PRESS: *Il Sole 24 ORE* (1996-2010): [www.sole24ore.it](http://www.sole24ore.it): S241-S2416

## 2.2. Methodology

The assumption behind the study was that expert members of a community of discourse (Swales 1990) and a community of practice (Wenger 1998) have individual conceptualizations of specific notions, which, however, meet and overlap to a large extent (cf. e.g. Engberg 2009). *The Economist* and *Il Sole 24 ORE* address professionals and educated readers, i.e. expert members of the community of practice. Definitions and/or meaning descriptions are only expected to be used where *glass ceiling* has not entered current usage. New N-N compounds, Adams (2001) argues, have a labelling function. They count as the short for a longer, defining expression which is regularly found in the immediately preceding or following linguistic co-text.

Dictionary definitions assist the knowledge-oriented needs of their intended users; they provide facts, i.e. uncontroversial information. In extensive encyclopaedic entries and selected passages from introductory textbooks, definitions and meaning descriptions provide ample domain coverage in order to help non-expert members of the discourse community, i.e. marginal and peripheral participants, build a broad and relatively comprehensive (however partial) conceptualization. By contrast, RAs (peer-to-peer communication) bank on the domain expert's specialized

conceptualization of *glass ceiling*, a general term which applies to multiple subfields and a word in general language, with specialist meanings in various disciplines. The RA writer may use definitions, comments and meaning descriptions to foreground one or more selected elements in the content domain of *glass ceiling*, he/she may define and operationalize the variable *glass ceiling* as an indicator to test models and hypotheses in the Methodology section, or he/she may reconceptualize the term against the background of data analysis in the Conclusions.

In order to trace the development of specific conceptualizations for *glass ceiling*, the Italian calque and its loan translations, we center our attention on expository texts, meaning descriptions, and comments (i.e. segments providing information, cf. Wiegand 1992) on the semantics and use of *glass ceiling*, explanatory sequences, specialist explanations, and specialist detail. Broadly speaking, while selecting degree of detail and type and amount of cognitive-propositional, procedural, and episodic information, they variously help the reader build (partial) conceptualizations on the basis of underlying image schemas, non-situational frames and situational scenarios.

We address the issue from a cross-disciplinary perspective. Given different uses and corpus discrepancies, however, we differentiate our analysis of the two sub-corpora slightly. We first decided to deal with the meaning description of *glass ceiling* given in general dictionaries, with special attention to the information provided by the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED). The meaning predictability of *glass ceiling* is first discussed within the Theory of Meaning Predictability (Štekauer 2005). Explicit definitions, meaning representations and encyclopaedic information come from the set of extended concordance lines and, when appropriate, from the source texts (mainly synopses) returned calling up the Viewer function of the *WordSmith Tools* software (Scott 2010 [1997]). They are used to address conceptual motivation in *glass ceiling* and related word-formations. To this purpose we integrate insights from Dobrovol'skij and Piirainen's (2005) categorization of different types of knowledge, and Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff 1987; Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 1999). Touching upon the linguistic clues to focus on the semantic relations and schemes establishing between words in expository texts and using additional data from wordlists and concordances, we characterize *glass ceiling* as a cultural keyword first, and then relate it to other cultural keywords (Williams 1983 [1976]; Stubbs 2001), and key terms in sociology (e.g. *social mobility*). Second, in Section 4 we discuss the mechanism of (re-)conceptualization, motivation, sense extension and conceptual narrowing of the Italian calque and its loan translations, with

an eye to related terms, and the role they play in (re-)shaping the vocabulary of Italian culture.

### 2.3. Framework of analysis

The advantage of this integrated approach rests on the reflection it will offer on the formal and semantic properties of *glass ceiling* as a cultural keyword, related compounds, and their calques and loan translations in Italian.<sup>5</sup>

Although much research has been carried out on the description and theoretical modelling of compounding,<sup>6</sup> Štekauer's (2005) *Theory of Meaning Predictability* of context-free naming units (MPT) deserves pride of place as the first coherent and systematic analysis of the issue across word-formation types. Word formation (Štekauer 2005) starts with the act of *naming* (i.e. identifying and categorizing) an object of the *extra-linguistic reality* according to the naming needs of a limited number of members of a given *speech community*. At a *conceptual level*, *logical predicates* (*noemes*) and the most general *conceptual categories* combine so as to reflect the actual (usually prototypical, in the sense of Rosch 1978) features of the object. Conceptual categories comprise Substance, Action (Action proper, Process, State), Quality, and Concomitant circumstance (e.g. Manner, Time, Place).

By contrast, the *Word-Formation Component* accounts for actual word-coinages via productive and regular *Word Formation Rules* applying at the semantic, onomasiological, onomatological and phonological levels. Individual logical predicates are mapped from the conceptual to the semantic level of the linguistic sign via *semes* (semantic markers) which constitute the semantic structure of the linguistic sign. At an *onomasiological level*, a distinction can be made between the *onomasiological base* (head, *determinatum*) and *onomasiological mark*, which, if complex, consists of *determining* and *determined constituent*.

Based on the criterion of which constituents of the *onomasiological structure* are linguistically expressed at an *onomatological* (or *morphematic*) level via the *Form-to-Meaning-Assignment Principle*, five *Onomasiological Types* (OTs) can be identified: OT I: *piano* [Object] *play* [Action] – *er* [Agent]; OT II: *teach* [Action] – *er* [Agent]; OT III: *honey* [Object]

---

<sup>5</sup> For the purposes of this paper, we define a *compound* as “a lexeme containing two or more potential stems [and, therefore,] at least two roots” (Bauer 1983: 28).

<sup>6</sup> See Lieber and Štekauer (2009) for a thorough review of theoretical linguistic and psycholinguistic research on compounding.

(Action) *bee* [Agent]; OT IV: *lion heart* [(Substance) Pattern] – *ed* [Quality]; OT V: *show* [Action → Substance].

OT III and OT V are less predictable than OT I, OT II and OT IV, where the relation between constituents does not engender multiple potential interpretations. Factors which variously interact with OT in order to increase meaning predictability of context-free naming units are: single, strong predictable reading; productivity and unambiguous interpretation of the underlying word-formation type; productivity and unambiguous interpretation of the morphological type; a combination of prototypical semes (Level 4 - Level 4 combination) across word constituents as against general and classificatory, or idiosyncratic semes (Level 2 and Level 3, and Level 5 semes, respectively); reference to permanent cross-constituent relations; interpretation based on analogy-based schemes; knowledge of the meaning of the motivating words and world-knowledge.

The language user's linguistic, conceptual and world knowledge, as well as feature prototypicality within a category, analogy based scheme/template, and stable relations, are all notions extensively investigated and put to use in Cognitive Linguistic investigations into the processes of compound formation and understanding.<sup>7</sup>

In Cognitive Grammar, word formations are composite units or constructions in which two or more components integrate on the basis of semantic and phonological relations (Langacker 1987: *valency* relations) between their respective substructures. Within Cognitive Linguistics, *Conceptual Metaphor Theory*, the theory of metaphor proposed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 1999; Lakoff 1987), can provide *post-hoc* explanations for the valence relations (Štekauer 2005: correspondence relations) established between components (Štekauer 2005: semes) within word formations. Conceptual Metaphor Theory sees metaphors as cognitive mappings of one conceptual domain onto another, rather than as a mere linguistic phenomenon. In turn, metonymies map one conceptual category onto another within the same conceptual domain or more specific frame in the same idealized cognitive model (ICM). A *domain* is broadly defined as any kind of conception or realm of experience in conceptual space serving as the conceptual basis of linguistic meaning (Langacker 2008: 45). An ICM (Lakoff 1987) is a cognitive structure, which is idealized for the purposes of understanding and reasoning and has the function to represent reality from a certain perspective. ICMs designate any concept construed on the basis of our world knowledge. They comprise *non-operational models*, which provide propositional knowledge

---

<sup>7</sup> See Heyvaert (2009) for an introduction to Cognitive Linguistics approaches to compounding.

organized in sets of predicate-argument relationships (*frames*), image-schematic pre-conceptual topological representations (*image schemas*), and *operational models* (*metaphor* and *metonymy*), which operate on frames and image schemas. Metaphorical expressions are based on an analogy schema, i.e. analogy between source domain and target domain. Most importantly, within Conceptual Blending theories (Fauconnier and Turner 2002),<sup>8</sup> conceptual metaphor can be seen as a type of *conceptual blending*, in which the two input spaces are the source and target domain of the metaphor.

### 3. Formal and semantic properties of English *glass-ceiling* (effect)

*Glass ceiling* has two senses, which correspond to two different morphological constructs. As an endocentric subordinate compound, it instantiates the head-complement *of* relation, used in automobile industry, architecture, arts, painting, construction, or technology. As a *metonymic exocentric compound*, it is based on an analogy schema (or metaphorical relational schema). A CHARACTERISTIC PROPERTY is used to denote a CATEGORY not explicitly mentioned in the compound, whereby *glass ceiling* (1) stands for *glass-ceiling effect* or *glass-ceiling phenomenon* (2):

- (1) This means that, in Spain, there is a *glass ceiling* for the more educated, while for the less educated there is not. (AE1)
- (2) Similar to Whites and Blacks this indicates a *glass ceiling effect*, where women who managed to climb to the top are experiencing the highest wage disparity. (SSR2)

---

<sup>8</sup> *Conceptual Blending* theories (e.g. Fauconnier and Turner 2002) incorporate Conceptual Metaphor Theory. Its fixed, generic domains are replaced by schematic and specific knowledge dynamically structured in the language user's partial, specific mental spaces, i.e. partial representations of elements (discourse entities) and frames (relations between elements) of any given scenario. Conceptual Blending theories view word formation and the interpretation of the underlying semantic motivation in terms of the language user's online language processing: elements within contextually relevant *source inputs* (SIs) are activated on the basis of long-term supra- and extralinguistic knowledge, they (can) evoke common abstract schemas and images in the *generic space* (GS) and yield a *blended space*, or *blend* (Fauconnier and Turner 2002), which accommodates the selected elements from the SI(s) and can elaborate new meanings (*emergent structure*) (Cacchiani, in press).

More specifically, the exocentric compound *glass ceiling* identifies a form of discrimination which affects women first and foremost and, second, members of ethnic minorities, as is variously recorded under the corresponding entries in MEDAL (3), CALD (4) and OED (5):

- (3) *glass ceiling* NOUN – COUNTABLE  
 an unfair system that prevents some people, especially women, from reaching the most senior positions in a company or organization. (MEDAL)
- (4) *glass ceiling* NOUN  
 a point after which you cannot go, usually in improving your position at work.  
*Various reasons are given for the apparent glass ceiling women hit in many professions.* (CALD)
- (5) *glass-ceiling* (GLASS, *n.*<sup>1</sup>, addition series 1997)  
 Add: [IV.] [16.] GLASS-CEILING orig. U.S., an unofficial unacknowledged barrier to personal advancement, esp. of a woman or a member of an ethnic minority in employment. Also *transf.* (OED)

*Glass ceiling* distributes its meaning between ‘*glass*’ and ‘*ceiling*’. The (predictable) semantic shift of *glass-ceiling* from *glazed ceiling / roof* to ‘*unofficial and unacknowledged barrier to personal advancement*’ is expected to result from knowledge of the literal meaning of *glass* and *ceiling*, that is, from the knowledge of relevant aspects of artefacts (Dobrovolskij and Piirainen 2005: *knowledge of material culture*) (italics and inverted commas in 6a and 6b, adapted from Cacchiani 2008):

- (6a) *ceiling, ceiling, vbl. n.*:  
 [...] II. *concr.*  
 5. a. *esp.* The ‘*undercovering*’ of a roof or floor, ‘*concealing*’ the timbers; ‘*the plaster top of a room*’.  
 6. d.: ‘*an upper limit (to quantity, prices, expenditure, etc.), a maximum*’.  
 7. *Comb.*, mostly *attrib.*, as *ceiling-board* [...]. (OED)
- (6b) GLASS, *n.*<sup>1</sup>:  
 I. as a substance.  
 1. a ‘*substance, in its ordinary forms transparent, lustrous, hard, and brittle*’, [...]  
 3. b. *esp.* as used in horticulture for greenhouses, frames, etc. Hence, greenhouses, etc., collectively.  
 7. A ‘*pane of glass*’, esp. the window of a coach, etc.; the plate of glass covering a picture; a glazed frame or case (e.g. for the ‘*protection*’ of plants).  
 IV. *attrib.* and *comb.*  
 14. *simple attrib.*, passing into quasi-*adj.* a. ‘*Made of glass*’. [...]

15. general comb.: [...] c. *similative*, as *glass-clear* (cf. OE *glæs-hluttur*), *-coloured*, *-green*, *-grey*, *-hard* adjs.; also *glass-like* adj. and adv. (OED)

The metaphorical reading of *glass ceiling* activates the ‘transparent’ and ‘hard’ zones (as against ‘concealing’ something) for ‘glass’, and ‘undercovering of a roof’ plus ‘upper limit’ for ‘ceiling’. Within Štekauer’s (2005) Meaning Predictability Theory, the interpretation of *glass ceiling* is thus based on correspondence relations between the ‘hard’, ‘transparent’ features for ‘glass’ (onomasiological mark), and the ‘upper interior surface’ features ‘of a room’ or building used for ‘covering’ for ‘ceiling’ (onomasiological base).

In the most predictable context-free interpretation of *glass ceiling*, the onomasiological mark and onomasiological base combine in ‘*the overhead inside glass lining of a room*’, based on a composition relation.<sup>9</sup> The conceptual bridge between the literal and figurative reading of *glass ceiling* and the semantic shift from type of *ceiling made of glass* to ‘unofficial’ and ‘unacknowledged barrier to personal advancement’, however, can be amply motivated and predictable only against the relevant cultural and world knowledge.

### 3.1. English *glass ceiling*: Motivation

To specify what makes *glass ceiling* conceptually possible, this section offers a corpus-based, qualitative analysis of definitions, meaning descriptions and comments on the semantics and use of *glass ceiling*, specialist explanations and specialist detail in encyclopaedic entries, in manually selected extended concordance lines and in source texts.

As mentioned above, conceptual metonymy and conceptual metaphor interact in *glass ceiling*, an exocentric compound.<sup>10</sup> Within Conceptual

---

<sup>9</sup> Onomasiological mark: *glass*: Some levels: 1 – SUBSTANCE; 2 – [Inanimate]; 3 – [Construction Material] [Having Texture] [Having Colour]; 4 – [Solid] [Strong] [Transparent].

Onomasiological base: *ceiling*: Some levels: 1 – SUBSTANCE; 2 – [Inanimate]; 3 – [Surface]; 4 – [Upper interior surface of a room or building]; [For covering].

Context-free interpretation: WF type: [Stative (= Material) – (State) – Patient]; Level 4 – Level 4 combination: the overhead inside glass lining of a room, based on the composition relation (Cacchiani, in press, revised).

<sup>10</sup> To put it with Benczes (2006), *glass ceiling* qualifies as a creative compound with metaphorical profile determinant, metaphorical modifier and metaphorical relation between the two. The emergent signification results from context-bound conceptual integration.



Metaphor Theory (Cacchiani 2008), *glass ceiling* finds its motivation in the orientational metaphors UP-DOWN and the Career ICM: SUCCESSFUL IS UP versus UNSUCCESSFUL IS DOWN; HAVING A CAREER IS UP. Associated metaphors comprise DIFFICULTIES ARE IMPEDIMENTS TO MOTION, which links with superordinate concepts such as FORCE and CONTROL and motivates conceptualizing *glass ceiling* as a limit, barrier, obstruction and impediment, and a strong negative force controlling and keeping down women and other minorities, e.g. (7) and (8):

- (7) Heard enough about the *glass ceiling* – the force that allegedly prevents women from occupying top jobs? (MISC\_Forbes1)
- (8) *Glass ceiling* is the term used to describe barriers that prevent women and minorities from advancing to management positions in corporations and organizations. (GC1a)

Negative connotations also attach to *ceiling* in connection with its use for metaphors of anger. As extensively argued by Dobrovol'skij and Piirainen (2005: 189-192, quoted in Cacchiani 2008), *ceiling* counts as an element of the HOUSE frame, which is variously used in Indo-European languages and in the Western world in general to express not only anger (English: *to hit the ceiling*, German: *an die Decke gehen* [to jump to the ceiling]), but also boredom and depression (German: *jmdm. fällt die Decke auf dem Kopf* [the ceiling falls down on one's head]).

Conceptual metaphors and knowledge of material culture account for collocations such as *to bump into / hit the glass ceiling, to break / crack / crash through / smash / splinter the glass ceiling, or the glass ceiling is shatterproof* versus *the glass ceiling is in pieces*.

Next to *glass ceiling*, other compounds have been created on the basis of the same knowledge of material culture, knowledge of artefacts, and image mappings:

- Compounds that name related types of discrimination: *sticky floor*, coined to describe women's low wage and wealth gap; *greenhouse effect*, or the positive discrimination towards women on sexist grounds (i.e., the *reverse glass ceiling*); *glass floor*, or the "force that, independent of women's income, seems to keep their share of total wealth up to – and beyond – male levels" (MISC\_Forbes1). In other words, *glass floor* (Cacchiani 2008, revised) covers the discriminations suffered by male graduates who find it harder than their female counterparts to get a highly-paid, permanent job due to the potential pro-female bias of men and women in power who would rather hire young women (and attractive young women in the case of male directors) (CG5a).
- Compounds used to identify the extent of discrimination, such as *concrete ceiling* (GC5a). Based on knowledge of material culture and artefacts

(unlike glass, concrete structures are not brittle and transparent, and have a very high compressive strength), *concrete ceiling* describes a socio-economic barrier which is created by race and gender. The resulting phenomenon, faced by minority women, is much stronger than the *glass ceiling*.

- Compounds which name causes and effects or highlight selected complementary aspects of the *glass ceiling* phenomenon: the *glass wall* naturally limits upward advancement by means of restricting the lateral mobility necessary for gaining relevant corporate experience (GC1a); *glass cliff* selects a different property of *glass* and points to the precarious situation of women and members of minorities in the top ranks, e.g. women executives; *sticky ladder* is “a term used to describe women’s struggle to reach the top of the corporate ladder” (GC3a); the *glass-bridge* effect establishes “institutionalized mechanisms to encourage women and other minorities to find ways to traverse professional hurdles that can feel as threatening as crossing a visual cliff” (PSP1).
- Compounds that highlight discriminations in specific sectors: *celluloid ceiling*, which describes statistical under-representation of women in creative positions in Hollywood (GC3a, GC5a); *rose-coloured glass ceiling*, which refers to female prostitutes investing on porn websites (Cacchiani 2008).
- Compounds pointing to other domains of application: the *other glass ceiling* (Cacchiani 2008), or the unequal distribution of work at home.

### 3.2. *Glass ceiling* as a cultural keyword

The *glass-ceiling effect* is described as *unfair discrimination* (both access discrimination and discrimination on the job) which affects the socio-economic status of women, ethnic minorities, persons with disabilities (HRMB2), single mothers (GM1), as well as gay Tories in the UK Parliament (MISC\_Independent1), in the context of norms, rules, and values to which they do not accommodate easily, and of socio-demographic and socio-cultural stereotypes. One example is (9), which voices the currently prevailing opinion on career women (here, media women) as against career men, and reflects gender stereotyping of work: jobs are either male or female, and women are promptly associated with the cultural keyword ‘family’ (Williams 1983 [1976]: 131-134; Stubbs 2001):

- (9) She can report from a war zone or the lobby: but *punditry is for guys*, and *letting her edit is always ‘a gamble’*. [...] Media woman is invariably described as *pushy and ambitious*, *qualities deemed reprehensible in her*, although entirely natural to her male colleagues.

(MISC\_NewStatesman1) (emphasis added, adapted from Cacchiani 2008)

Restricting the discussion to women, breaking through the glass ceiling would amount to renegotiating the sociocultural values encoded in keywords such as ‘work’, ‘job’ and ‘career’, which are traditionally associated with paid job and promotion for men, and ‘family’ and ‘home’, traditionally associated with women (‘family’, Williams 1983 [1976]). The debate on the *glass ceiling* clearly raises issues of gender ‘equality’ (Williams 1983 [1976]: 117-119) against the background of tacit gender assumptions which maintain the divide between family roles and the imbalance between paid and unpaid work in family life (the *other glass ceiling*) (cf. Cacchiani 2008).

Table 2 shows the top 104 content words and relevant function words in encyclopaedic entries, which give a broad, uncontroversial overview of the *glass-ceiling* phenomenon. Its purpose is to bring to the fore the extent to which *glass ceiling* interacts with other culturally significant keywords.

**Table 2: *Encyclopaedias* [wordlist 1 (F)].**

N	Word*	Freq.	%	N	Word	Freq.	%
1	WOMEN	422	2.17	53	POWER	19	0.1
2	CEILING	169	0.87	54	PROGRESS	19	0.1
3	GLASS	164	0.84	55	ROLES	19	0.1
4	MEN	95	0.49	56	WAGE gap	19	0.1
5	MINORITIES	61	0.31	57	wage GAP	17	0.09
6	COMMISSION	56	0.29	58	GOVERNMENT	17	0.09
7	MANAGEMENT	53	0.27	59	HARASSMENT	17	0.09
8	GENDER discrimination	51	0.26	60	OCCUPATIONS	17	0.09
9	POSITIONS	46	0.24	61	DOMINATED	16	0.08
10	LABOR	42	0.22	62	HIGHER	16	0.08
11	equal PAY	41	0.21	63	INCREASE	16	0.08
12	CORPORATE	39	0.2	64	LOWER earnings, rates	16	0.08
13	DISCRIMINATION	39	0.2	65	SOCIAL ladder	16	0.08
14	ADVANCEMENT	38	0.2	66	CAREERS	16	0.08
15	BARRIERS	38	0.2	67	WORKERS	15	0.08
16	FEMALE	37	0.19	68	CHILDREN	15	0.08
17	JOBS	37	0.19	69	DOL	15	0.08
18	REPORT	36	0.18	70	lower EARNINGS	15	0.08
19	EQUAL opportunity, pay, rights	34	0.17	71	affirmative ACTION	14	0.07
20	LESS	34	0.17	72	AFFIRMATIVE action	14	0.07
21	MALE	34	0.17	73	ASIAN	14	0.07

N	Word*	Freq.	%	N	Word	Freq.	%
22	<u>TOP</u> level	33	0.17	74	<u>CHILD</u>	14	0.07
23	top <u>LEVEL</u>	32	0.16	75	<u>CORPORATIONS</u>	14	0.07
24	<u>AMERICAN</u>	31	0.16	76	<u>EDUCATION</u>	14	0.07
25	<u>LAW</u>	30	0.15	77	<u>INITIATIVE</u>	14	0.07
26	<u>SEXUAL</u> discrimination	30	0.15	78	<u>PRESIDENT</u>	14	0.07
27	<u>WOMEN'S</u>	29	0.15	79	<u>SEX</u>	14	0.07
28	<u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	28	0.14	80	<u>UP</u>	14	0.07
29	<u>BUSINESS</u>	27	0.14	81	<u>BARRIER</u>	13	0.07
30	<u>BUSINESSES</u>	27	0.14	82	<u>BOARD</u>	13	0.07
31	<u>EMPLOYMENT</u>	26	0.13	83	<u>CARE</u>	13	0.07
32	<u>EMPLOYEES</u>	25	0.13	84	<u>GROUPS</u>	13	0.07
33	same, equal <u>RIGHTS</u>	25	0.13	85	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	13	0.07
34	<u>SAME</u> rights	25	0.13	86	<u>OWNED</u>	13	0.07
35	<u>WHITE</u> males	25	0.13	87	<u>PROFESSIONS</u>	13	0.07
36	<u>MALES</u>	24	0.12	88	<u>PROMOTION</u>	13	0.07
37	<u>WOMAN</u>	21	0.11	89	<u>DIVERSITY</u>	12	0.06
38	<u>WORKFORCE</u>	24	0.12	90	<u>EMPLOYED</u>	12	0.06
39	<u>COMPANIES</u>	22	0.11	91	<u>GROWTH</u>	12	0.06
40	<u>FAMILY</u>	22	0.11	92	<u>MANAGERS</u>	12	0.06
41	<u>LAWS</u>	22	0.11	93	equal <u>OPPORTUNITY</u>	12	0.06
42	<u>MINORITY</u>	22	0.11	94	<u>SUPPORT</u>	12	0.06
43	<u>ROLE</u>	22	0.11	95	<u>EMPLOYEE</u>	11	0.06
44	<u>EMPLOYERS</u>	21	0.11	96	<u>HUSBAND</u>	11	0.06
45	<u>WORKING</u> minority, force	21	0.11	97	social <u>LADDER</u>	11	0.06
46	<u>WORKPLACE</u>	21	0.11	98	<u>LEVELS</u>	11	0.06
47	<u>JOB</u>	20	0.1	99	<u>OPPORTUNITIES</u>	11	0.06
48	<u>LEADERSHIP</u>	20	0.1	100	<u>SIMILAR</u>	11	0.06
49	<u>MEMBERS</u>	20	0.1	101	<u>SOCIETY</u>	11	0.06
50	<u>DIFFERENCES</u>	19	0.1	102	<u>WIFE</u>	11	0.06
51	<u>EXECUTIVE</u>	19	0.1	103	<u>AFRICAN</u>	10	0.05
52	working, labor <u>FORCE</u>	19	0.1	104	<u>AMERICANS</u>	10	0.05

\* Lower case is used for frequent collocates.

Based on extended analysis of the corresponding concordance lines, comments can be made on the table and, interestingly, on the way the words in the list relate to roles, values and stereotypes for men and women, as well as to relations between men and women in the workplace and in family life.

Single underlining is used for 'woman' ('women', 'woman', 'female') and all the tokens that combine with the roles, values and stereotypes traditionally associated with 'women' / 'woman': 'child', 'children',

'family', 'care', 'wife', 'husband'. 'Women' ranks first in the wordlist (422 hits), far outnumbering 'minorities' (61 hits). This suggests that while research on the *glass ceiling* is mainly concerned with 'gender discrimination', other types of discriminations are discussed. As a matter of fact, women are on a par with other minorities (dashed underlining), which comprise 'Asian' and 'African minorities', as against 'white males'.

Double underlining is used for words traditionally associated with roles, values and stereotypes for 'man'. 'Men' and 'male' associate with 'management', 'advancement', 'employers', 'leadership', 'executive', 'education', 'president', 'up', 'board', 'top level', 'business', 'employment', 'power', 'progress', 'professions', 'promotion', 'employed', 'managers'.

The *glass-ceiling effect* describes impediments ('barriers', 'discrimination') to the mobility of minority individuals between different levels. 'Labor', 'wage gap', and 'workforce' go hand in glove with 'working minorities' (italics). There are different levels of inequality, severity or closedness. The *Second Glass Ceiling Report* was released in November 1995 and addresses inequities faced by women, non-white women (as against 'white males') and ethnic minorities (e.g. the *expatriate glass ceiling*). It was a strategic plan working towards equality and equal opportunities (bold, italics in the table) for all minorities.

Additional evidence comes from expository passages from RAs. The *glass-ceiling effect* is understood as an unofficial unacknowledged barrier to personal advancement (12). While it is especially used of women, and gender plays a major role in its conceptualization (10), other factors are also taken into account, including class discrimination, ethnic and racial inequalities (11: '*class and race processes as well as gender processes*')

- (10) By the *glass ceiling* approach, administration is thought to be, in principle, independent of gender. But there are underlying connections between modern states and the gender system. A large body of research shows how state agencies and policies regulate the lives of women, both in the family and in the public realm (Borchorst 1999; Mikanagi 2000), and this research has widened to include the gendered lives of men (Scourfield and Drakeford 2002). (PAR2)
- (11) the common outcome of these inequality processes in the rich industrial nations of the North is that the persons at the top of most organizations are likely to be white men; they are very privileged and have great class power compared with most other people in the organization. The processes of exclusion that constitute a *glass ceiling* are class and race processes as well as gender processes. Most studies of the production of class, gender and racial inequalities in organizations have focused on one or another of these categories,

rarely attempting to study them as complex, mutually reinforcing or contradicting processes. (ST1)

- (12) These results provide evidence that the family structure and *glass ceiling* hypotheses do not overlap in their prediction of turnover intentions. The indicator of family structure (number of children), and of the *glass ceiling* (career opportunity), continued to be significant in this summary model. Each contributed unique variance to the prediction of turnover intentions. The predictors accounted for all but 1% of the variance that sex contributed to the prediction of turnover intentions. (JVB1)

In (12), *glass ceiling* stands in a semantic relation, accounted by the cause-effect schema,<sup>11</sup> to ‘*family structure (number of children)*’ and ‘*turnover intentions*’ (both ‘*family structure*’ and the *glass ceiling* are shown to contribute ‘*unique variance to the prediction of turnover intentions*’ (12)). The same schema accounts for ‘sex’ and ‘*turnover intentions*’, while an identity (‘X is a Y’) relation (or identification schema based on equivalence between trajector and landmark) holds between *glass ceiling* and ‘*career opportunity*’. Administration and *gender* should not overlap, as brought to the fore by the identification schema which accounts for ‘*by the glass ceiling approach administration is thought to be, in principle, independent of gender*’ (10). However, ‘*state agencies and policies regulate the lives of women (controller-controlled schema), both in the family and in the public realm*’. Research on the *glass ceiling* also includes the ‘*gendered lives of men*’, which thus stand in a partitive (‘X is part of Y’) relation to the *glass ceiling* and in a similarity (‘X is similar to Y’) relation (covered by the identification schema) to the lives of women, their antonym (accounted for by the opposition schema, understood here in a broad sense, so that it can account for different types of exclusion and opposition relations): the lives of men and women are both ‘*gendered*’ (identification schema) and controlled (controller-controlled schema) by ‘*state agencies and policies*’. In supply-side explanations of the *glass ceiling* this is accounted for in terms of ‘*important attribute differences between men and women*’ (cause-effect schema):

- (13) are often referred to as “supply-side” theories and address ability and motivation factors that are thought to distinguish between male and female managers: Supply-side explanations for the *glass-ceiling* all argue that, on average, there are important attribute differences

---

<sup>11</sup> See Ruiz de Mendoza (1996) and Ruiz de Mendoza and Otaol (1999) for a more complete account of the classification of relational arcs of conceptual schemas.