

## APPENDIX A: LINGUISTIC FRAMEWORK

**Table 3.1.2.1: Gendered Aesthetic<sup>1</sup> Practices**

Adaptation from Alreck (1994); Tantillo *et al* (1995, cited in Grohmann *et al*, 2012); Veg's (2007) adaptation from other studies (Badinter, 1992 ; Maffesoli, 1990, 1993 ; Alreck, 1994; Bourdieu, 1998; Palan et al, 1999 ; Tissier-Desbordes et Kimmel, 2002 ; Vigarello, 2004) and Moss (2009: 172).

Aspect		Feminine	Masculine	
Visual	Colour	Light, pastel	Dark, dense	
		Use of many & brighter colours	Use of few & darker colours	
		Pink	Blue	
	Pattern	Blended or natural	Solid, geometry	
	Lines	Curved	Straight	
	Graphic	Dimension	2 -D	3 - D
		Movement	Stationary objects	Moving objects
	Aesthetic effort	Detail	Lack of detail	
	Shape of the bottle	Round, curved	Straight, sharply angular	
	Size of the bottle	Smaller	Larger	
		Slim	Broad	
	Typography	Weight <sup>2</sup>	less heavy & compressed	heavy & compressed
		Flourish <sup>3</sup>	<i>Serif</i> type font	<i>Sans serif</i> type font
Others		Italic	Straight	
		Irregular	Regular	
	Unconventional	Conventional		
	'Childlike'	'naïve'/ simple		
Tactile	Surface	Smooth	Rough	
	Material	Soft, pliable	Hard	
	Weight	Lighter	Heavier	

<sup>1</sup> This refers to the two dimensions of brand identity, i.e. aesthetic and ethic invariants, which the *former* portrays *recognizable/perceivable signifier* of the brand (Floch, 1995; Roux & Floch, 1996, cited in Veg, 2007).

<sup>2</sup> According to Grohmann *et al* (2012), increased weight 'enhances ruggedness and competence' (392), whilst decreased 'signals sincerity, excitement and sophistication' (392); and increased weight enhances 'prominence but diminish natural' (390).

<sup>3</sup> *Flourish* refers to with or without (*sans*) *serifs* (Henderson *et al*, 2004), small lines trailing from the edge of letters. According to Tantillo *et al* (1995), *serif* type fonts (e.g. Times New Roman) were seen as "elegant, charming, emotional, distinct, beautiful and interesting", whilst *sans serif* type fonts (e.g. Helvetica) were perceived as "manly, powerful, smart, upper-class, readable and louder" (cited in Grohmann *et al*, 2012: 390).

**Table 3.1.2.2: Gendered Ethical<sup>4</sup> Practices**

Adaptation from Alreck (1994: 8); Woodward (2004: 46); Veg (2007, adaptation from Badinter, 1992 ; Maffesoli, 1990, 1993 ; Alreck, 1994; Bourdieu, 1998; Palan et al, 1999 ; Tissier-Desbordes et Kimmel, 2002 ; Vigarello, 2004); Brannon (1985, cited in Kilmartin, 2007); Kilmartin (2007); Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem, 1974; Choi & Fuqua, 2003; Choi, Fuqua, & Newman, 2008, cited in Choi, Fuqua, & Newman, 2009); Harisson’s (2008: 56) summary on Brod, 1987; Carrigan, Connell, & Lee, 1987; Connell, 1992, 1995; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Williams & Best (1990, cited in Rose *et al*, 2012, pp. 592); Wood (2013); Beaglaioich, Sarma, & Morrison (2013, pp. 18, summary on Branon & Juni, 1984; Connell, 2005; Levant et al., 2007; Levant, 2011; Mahalik *et al.*, 2003); Grohmann (2009, cited in cited in Wu, Klink, & Guo, 2013)

Aspect	Feminine	Masculine
<b>Ethic Value</b>	Appearance (attractiveness)	Accomplishment (work)
	Seduction/Aesthetic/ Sensuality	Expertise/ technological skills/ Intellect/Efficiency/ Performance/ rationality
	Gentleness/ Tenderness/ softness	Power/ Control/ Strength /Instrumental
	Expressive-Communal/ Interpersonal Sensitivity/ Dependence	Autonomy/ self-sufficiency/ Freedom/ Independence
	Emotional Expressiveness	Emotional detachment
	Objectivity	Subjectivity
<b>Behaviour/ Traits</b>	Weak, vulnerable	Robust, strong, tough, stoic
	Dependent	Independent/ self-reliant
	Subordinate	Dominant
	Uncompetitive	Competitive
	Emotional/ Expressive (affectionate, compassionate, sympathetic)	Unemotional/ inexpressive/ Restrictive emotional expression
	Submissive	Aggressive
	Understanding, gentle	Forceful/ assertive
	Polite	Crude
	Passive	Active
	Timid	Brave
	Sensitive, caring	Insensitive
	Unadventurous	Adventurous
	Femininity	Antifemininity, virility

<sup>4</sup> This refers to the two dimensions of brand identity, i.e. aesthetic and ethic invariance, which the *latter* are the *intangible signifieds that are ‘the brand’s vision of the world’*, i.e. ‘its personality and philosophy’ (Floch, 1995; Roux & Floch, 1996, cited in Veg, 2007). In this case, the *personality* refers to masculinity or femininity, whilst the *philosophy* refers to how a male or a female should behave. This aligns with Goffman’s (1983, cited in Lorber, 1994: 118) concept of gender as “Felicity’s Condition”. Nevertheless, while marketing research focus more on the symbolic meaning of perceivable signs (mainly visual, i.e. image), this linguistic study includes the representation of the words, e.g. *word choice*.

**Table 3.1.2.2: Gendered Ethical Practices (Continued)**

Aspect	Feminine	Masculine
<b>Activities</b>  <i>Feminine</i> (Alreck, 1998:8) & <i>Masculine</i> (Kilmartin, 2007: 4 – 5)	1. Nurturing (put home and family first) 2. Raise the children 3. Look after the home 4. ‘May work/ other interests and commitment ‘as long as they are secondary’. (Alreck, 1994:8)	1. Earns money 2. Initiates sex 3. Solves problems 4. Gets the job done 5. Takes control 6. Takes physical risks 7. Takes action 8. Enjoy masculine activities (e.g. hunting, sports, drinking)
<b>Role</b>	Housewife Mother/wife Lady	Athlete (active) Professional (successful) Working man (breadwinner) Father/ Husband Buddy Playboy Leader (dominant)
<b>Territory</b>	Indoor	Outdoor

**Table 3.1.2.3: Gendered Grooming Practices**

Adaptation from Wolf (2002); Jaya Rane Shanmugam (2002); Chandler (2007: 143); Harrison (2008: 64); McIntyre (2011); Chand & Chaudhary (2012); Wood (2013: 150); McNeill & Douglas (2011)

Aspect		Feminine	Masculine
<b>Ideal Body Image</b>	<b>Facial complexion</b>	Fair	Dark / tanned
		Youth (soft & smooth), Dislike signs of aging	-
		Flawless/ Perfect	
	<b>Body Structure</b>	Slim, thin	Good “musculature” (buff & muscular)
Tall		-	
<b>Role/ Function</b>		Object of contemplation	Object of Action
<b>Rationale</b>		Luxury/ self-indulgence	Utilitarian (Need & Function)

**Table 3.1.2.4: Gendered Conversational<sup>5</sup> Practices**

Adaptation from Tannen (1986, 1991 & 1995), cited in Talbot (2010: 92); Mulac (2006); Murphy & Zorn (1996); Wood, Christiansen, Hebl, & Rothgerber (1997), cited in Wood (2013: 132); Holmes & Stubbe (2003), cited in Rusling (2010: 393); Wood (2013: 129- 133).

<b>Aspect</b>	<b>Feminine</b>	<b>Masculine</b>
<b>Conversational Style</b> (Tannen, 1986, 1991, 1995, cited in Talbot, 2010: 92)	Sympathy	Problem-solving
	Rapport	Report
	Listening	Lecturing
	Private	Public
	Connection	Status
	Supportive	Oppositional
	Intimacy	Independence
Holmes & Stubbe (2003, cited in Rusling, 2009-2010, pp. 393),  with additions from Wood, 2013: 132 (in brackets).	Indirect (Unassertive)	Direct (Assertive/authoritative)
	Conciliatory	Confrontational (forceful)
	Facilitative	Competitive
	Collaborative	Autonomous
	Minor contribution in public	Dominates public talking time
	Supportive feedback	Aggressive interruption
	Person/ process oriented	Task/ outcome oriented
<b>Functions</b>  (Wood, 2013: 129 - 133)	Affectively oriented	Referentially oriented
	Foster connections	Accomplish concrete goals
	Establish equality	Exert control and status
<b>Aim</b>  (Wood, 2013: 129 - 133)	Demonstrate support & understanding	Preserve independence
	To establish & maintain relationship with others	To prove oneself & negotiate prestige

<sup>5</sup> This aspect is not (or rarely) included in the marketing studies on packaging design and discourse. It refers largely to the *linguistic style* used.