Gendered Rhetoric in the UN General Assembly?

The Rhetorical Styles of Male and Female Representatives of Sweden and the United States

By Marcus Åhagen & Johan Nilsson

UNIVERSITY WEST

Abstract

During the last few decades the academic re-gendering has reached the field of rhetorical discourse and differences of speech and rhetoric has been determined. Another gender shift has occurred during the last few decades in the appointments of foreign policy representatives, from being one of the last patriarchal strongholds the change towards equality has been remarkably swift. However, the norms of masculinity and formality within the sphere of foreign policy are still persistent. The first aim of this thesis was to determine if the rhetorical style of men and women differed even in a context heavily laden with norms, such as the UNGA. The secondary aim is based upon the concept of masculinity and femininity in culture, to determine if the gender of culture influenced the speaker's rhetorical style, even in the UNGA. This thesis generates its own theoretical framework from the works of rhetoric and linguistics to separate masculine and feminine rhetorical style. The method used is a qualitative textual analyze applied to transcribed speeches held by Swedish and U.S. representatives in UNGA. The analysis proved that there is a difference in rhetorical style between genders and culture, even in a context such as the UNGA, but only a small one.

Keywords: Rhetorical style, masculine, feminine, UNGA, gender of culture.

Acknowledgements

Table of Content

I. Introduction: Women in Foreign Policy and Rhetorical Tradition

Throughout history, the gender-gap in society has been persistent, women have been seen as inferior to men in many aspects of life, and have been denied independence (e.g. Lake et al 2000). While a discriminatory society may have been overlooked in the past due to normative beliefs and cultural characteristics, a rise in the 20th century of movements promoting equality created awareness on a global scale. The feminist movement gained momentum during the 1970s, leading to reproductive rights, paid parental leave, equal opportunity legislation and other advances in women's rights. While the worldwide trend is moving towards a more equal position for men and women, in all stages in life, differences as well as reluctance toward change still exists. The World Bank recently showed that women across the world continue to spend more hours per day than men on care and housework (World Bank 2012). In reflection of this, the gender pay-gap is still persistent, especially in the private sector.

Gender equality is in other words not a phenomena related to a specific area in life but rather present in multiple areas. In the political sector, the World Bank's World Development Report (2012: p.85) concludes, that even though the pattern shows a positive evolution, men still have a tendency of being validated over women. Additionally, it can be seen it the report that;

> "Few nations have legal restrictions for women to run for public office, yet the number of women holding parliamentary seats is very low, and progress in the last 15 years has been slow. In 1995, women accounted for about 10 percent of members of the lower or single houses of national parliaments, and in 2009, 17 percent."

During the previous century, the field of foreign policy and foreign affairs was particularly male dominated, with only rare cases of female involvement. The male dominance within the fields was present longer than in other public policy fields. While some might argue that women are less inclined to seek office within these fields, others have concluded that there have been several levels of barriers excluding women (e.g. Enloe 1990). The fields of foreign policy and foreign affairs have had masculinity as the norm. Men were seen as rational, honorable and as patriots, being the perfect fit to help the nation deal with the dangerous world of international politics (Enloe 1990). Gentlemen and great men were portrayed as exerting influence through masculinity, while gender equality was believed to have no real role in how foreign policy and foreign affairs were conducted. The lack of gender awareness

in the discourse of international politics determined masculinity as the norm and hindered women from entering.

However, in recent time there has been a dramatic change in this area, particularly in the western world, including Latin America where a pattern of appointing female candidates to diplomatic posts and the position of foreign minister has emerged, starting in the middle of the 1990s. In 1991 Margaretha af Ugglas was appointed foreign minister of Sweden, becoming the first female in the country to hold that office. Since Ugglas was appointed, the appointment pattern of foreign ministers has changed considerably, and in cases such as Sweden and the USA, one can hardly argue that women are still excluded from this area. More than half of the Swedish foreign ministers, five out of nine, have been women and in the USA, since Madeleine Albright was appointed in 1997, half of the secretaries of state have been women. Even though changing, the foreign policy sphere regarding women's representation still has a long way to go. An interest idea regarding greater extensive representation of women in foreign policy comes from University professor of Politics and International Affairs Anne-Marie Slaughter who has argued in the non-academic Foreign Policy Magazine that:

> If more women could juggle work and family successfully enough to allow them to remain on high-powered foreign policy career tracks, more women would be available for top foreign-policy jobs. And that could change the world far more than you think, from giving peace talk a better chance to making us better able to mobilize international coalitions to reordering what issues governments even choose to work on. (Slaughter 2012)

Scholars have concluded that differences between genders exists in speech (Mral 1999; Thelander 1986; Lunsford 1995; Stephens 2003). There is however, as we will describe in the following chapter, no scholarship exploring the potential presence of any gender differences in the traditionally male sphere of foreign policy. Regardless of the hierarchical position, maintaining or running for an office as representative of the nation, the dimension of masculinity and femininity in their rhetoric requires a fine balance as a representative and public servant. Regardless of the situation which they address, whether it is war rhetoric, initiation speech or in moment of crisis, there is a need for them to speak not only as individuals but also as voices of the institutions they are representing (Campbell and Jamieson 2008).

The United Nations General Assembly, UNGA, is a very unique setting where once a year the 193 member states meet from September to December. The UN official website calls it "… a

unique forum for multilateral discussion of the full spectrum of international issues covered by the Charter." The uniqueness of the UNGA is not, however, only centered on the forum as such but also the norms of the debate. While the official rules of the UNGA concerning language is fairly lax, the norms concerning formality and style is extensive. The above mentioned facts lead to the twofold purpose of out thesis:

- Do female foreign policy representatives adapt their speech to fit the norms of the institutions?
- Or do women speak differently even in the highly normative and masculinized institution of foreign policy?

In comparison to each other, the two countries cultures present different characteristics in relation to masculinity and femininity. This thesis operates under the idea that the differences in cultures, United States conservative, warfare, individualistic and professional prowess in relation to Sweden's peacekeeping, consensus seeking and collective concern, can be viewed as the United States culture being more masculine whereas Sweden's culture is more feminine. The foundation for this idea corresponds quite well with the workings of Hofstede (1998) who has concluded that there is a difference in the degree of masculinity between cultures. He categorized performance orientation and material success as masculinity whereas femininity was characterized by aspects such as nurturance, caring and quality of life. The findings in his study shows that Sweden ranked very low on the scale which indicates a feminine culture whereas USA received a high ranking which indicates a masculine culture.

Hofstede's findings support the initial claim regarding cultures. However, as the foreign policy sphere is strongly masculine, the individuals who deviate from these norms, such as women who displays a more masculine nature, would have to be taken into consideration. As such, a country's culture would not necessarily be in direct relation to its political sphere. The culture of a nation will of course influence the nation's institutions, but it will not necessarily correspond with the comparison of male/female rhetoric of the representative in the United Nations General Assembly. While the suggested claim earlier about the two countries cultures are merely a point of view, the findings which stems from the analysis cannot be viewed in direct contrast with it, as the foreign policy spheres norms might deviate from the overall societal culture. Instead, it is suggested that due to the masculine norms of the political sphere, both countries would display masculine degrees of rhetoric.

To answer the questions of whether there are differences in the rhetoric style of foreign policy representatives and whether the style varies between representatives of different cultures, this article will firstly summarize the previous research in the two fields, gender in foreign policy and gendered rhetoric, where the existing gap, absence of research concerning foreign policy representatives rhetoric, will be explored. The third chapter will construct an analytical tool to tell the two different styles of rhetoric apart and further develop the theoretical culture concept of masculine culture. The theory has emerged from the linguistic theories found in the workings of Mral (1999), Thelander (1986) and Tannen (1990). The fourth chapter will specify the aim of the thesis and pose three specific questions to be analyzed regarding the rhetoric style. In the fifth chapter the comparative design of the research, which results in our selection of cases, will be presented along with our choice of data to be analyzed following by the qualitative textual analysis method for the analysis along with a practical solution for the implementation of the analytical framework.

II. Previous Research on Gender Differences in Foreign Policy and in Rhetoric

The question of difference in rhetoric between male and female foreign policy representatives is a question that spans two research fields. The first research field considered is gender difference in foreign policy and, more explicitly, what recognized differences exist between men and women? Has this field of research addressed potential differences in the rhetorical aspects of foreign policy? The second field of research concerns differences in the political rhetoric between men and women. Many scholars have looked upon individual politicians' rhetoric, especially heads-of-states, presidents or national leaders, and to some extent foreign ministers. However, this field has yet to analyze differences in foreign policy representatives' rhetoric in relation to gender and relation to masculine and feminine style. Thus, this thesis seeks to contribute towards this literature by exploring if the rhetorical style of men and women, in a normative setting like the UN, differs.

Gender Differences in Foreign Policy

There is a vast amount of research considering gender differences in foreign policy (Nincic and Nincic 2002; Bendyna 1996; Fite et al 1990; Togeby 1994; Allison 2011; Shapiro and Mahajan 1986; McGlen and Sarkees 1993; Peterson and Runyan 1999; Holsti and Rosenau 1990; Enloe 1990). Some of this literature is a sub-set of the voting behavior field, a literature which has documented and analyzed differences in foreign policy views among voters, providing the term "gender gap" (Nincic and Nincic 2002; Bendyna 1996; Fite et al 1990; Togeby 1994; Allison 2011; Shapiro and Mahajan 1986). The scholars explore the phenomenon of a differing view on, among other things, military action in terms of national security among male and female voters. Women tend to have greater concerns for moral causes compared to men when considering opinions and voting behavior related to foreign policy (Shapiro and Mahajan 1986; Fite et al 1990; Togeby 1994). This reflects the common skepticism women have towards war, as opposed to men who have a tendency of valuing military superiority and power-relations (Bendyna 1996). Furthermore, women are more concerned with individuality while men rather focus on a broader picture, entities and nations as such (Nincic and Nincic 2002; Bendyna 1996; Fite et al 1990; Togeby 1994; Allison 2011; Shapiro and Mahajan 1986).

Another line of scholarship has focused on the foreign policy views of male and female policymakers (Koch and Fulton 2011; Fite et al1990; Togeby 1994; McGlen and Sarkees 1993). This line of scholarship has shown similar conclusions to those exploring voting-behavior, that female foreign policy-makers tend to be less inclined to use force in foreign policy than men. A general view among the scholars is also that women value relations in foreign policy to a greater extent than men, who regard power and hierarchical elements as a necessity (Koch and Fulton 2011; Fite et al 1990; Togeby 1994; McGlen and Sarkees 1993).

The field of foreign policy has identified various 'gender-gaps', that is, differing views among men and women in general. The scholars have concluded that both in public opinion and among policymakers, women are more concerned with moral causes, such as collateral damage under war, than men, who are power oriented and view the world hierarchically to a greater extent than women. Furthermore, the previous research states that women are more individualist in their approach to foreign policy as opposed to men who values the nation, or entities, as one.

In the existing scholarship, however there is no research on how male and female foreign policy representatives express themselves. This thesis seeks to analyze whether gender differences, which can be found in the foreign policy concerns among voters and policymakers, persist as rhetorical differences in the speech of foreign policy representatives. For instance, do men in this position express themselves in a hierarchical, expertise sense and do women express more intimacy and sameness, as suggested by the identifiable pattern in other aspects of foreign policy?

Gender Difference in Speech and Rhetoric

While gender difference in foreign policy is a fundamental pillar, which provides vital aspects of organizational structures along with individual and collective opinions, the field of gender difference in speech and rhetoric is equally important for our purposes. The question of the difference in rhetoric between men and women descends from the field of linguistics, which concerns the structure of language and its usage. There is a large body of scholarship, which focuses on gender differences in use of rhetoric, especially in conversational speech (e.g. Bradley 1981; Singh 2001; Hyde and Linn 1988; Holmes 1995). These scholars have concluded that differences among the genders are identifiable, although discussions have

emerged about which differences that are actually present. A study made by Singh (2001) concludes that men tended to be orally richer in conversational speech whereas Holmes (1995) points to the opposite, women have a tendency of having an advantage from early stages in life in aspects of linguistics capabilities, vocabulary, and conversational speech. Additionally, women prefer more dialogue and a less attacking style of rhetoric as opposed to men's monologues and dominating ways, although opinions about the extent and about which, more precisely, these differences are, vary (Mral 1999; Thelander 1986; Lunsford 1995; Stephens 2003). However, the general view among these scholars has been in line with the linguistic studies, that women have a tendency of presenting themselves as colloquial.

The question regarding causal explanation for differences in rhetoric is really two-pronged: is there a difference directly related to gender or do differences actually derive from feminist ideological commitments? This reflects two camps of scholars, those with a gender approach towards differences in masculine/feminine rhetoric (Mral 1999; Thelander 1986; Lunsford 1995; Stephens 2003) and on the other hand, authors concerned with feminist/non-feminist rhetoric (Campbell 1971; Bashevkin 2009; Bligh et al 2010; Johnson 2005; Gibson and Heyse 2010; Condit 1997; Dow and Tonn 1993; Martin 2004).

The research on rhetoric can be divided into two different groups, with the first group being the study and rhetorical evaluation of individual officials (Gibson and Heyse 2010; Bligh et al 2010; Fahey 2007; Martin 2004; Walsh 1998) and the second group of research which conducts studies on collectives' rhetoric rather than that of individuals, either to determine what contents that is feminine/feminist or to see if these groups use them (Mral 1999; Campbell 1971; Campbell 1989; Campbell 1989; Campbell 1994; Lunsford 1995; Manson-Sutherland and Sutcliffe 1999; Thelander 1986; Stephens 2003; Bashevkin 2009).

Our most central field, the studies concerning individual politicians' rhetorical usage, has been researched by a long line of scholars. However, the focus has mainly been directed towards the heads-of-states, presidents and national leaders or the candidates for this post (Campbell and Jamieson 2008; Zarefsky 2004; Mieder 2009; Bligh et al 2010; Gibson and Heyse 2010; Fahey 2007). However, these workings are generally made on specific segments of speeches, such as metaphor or argumentation analysis. While maintaining or running for this position, the dimension of masculinity and femininity in their rhetoric requires a fine balance as a representative and servant of the public. Regardless of the situation, which they address, whether it is war rhetoric, initiation speech or in moment of crisis, there is a need for

them to speak not only as individuals but also as voices of the institutions they are representing (Campbell and Jamieson 2008).

The literature concerning other institutions of politics is much smaller, and authors concerned with the rhetorical usage by foreign ministers, secretaries of state, or other foreign policy actors are few (Lippe and Väyrynen 2011; Pennington 2011). Comparisons between them and especially comparisons among women and men are even rarer. Lippe and Väyrynen's study concludes that a nation's ideology and relation of power in the world guides the foreign policy and in turn, the rhetoric. The United States of America express a more dominant and powerful style whereas smaller nations emphasize other regards to a higher extent, for instance humanitarian situations in war rhetoric (Lippe and Väyrynen 2011). The previous literature shows that a representative of the United States has to balance the conservative and liberal values whereas a representative from a liberal nation would have to display a compatible rhetorical style to liberalism. As a result, the rhetorical style in regards of masculine and feminine is closely connected to ideological position, as a masculine style is often more displayed in conservative nations whereas a feminine style is often more displayed in liberal countries (Lippe and Väyrynen 2011; Pennington 2011).

As such, the existing literature on individual politicians' rhetorical usage has yet to be concerned with different styles of male and female foreign policy representatives' rhetorical usage in relation to femininity and masculinity. As the foreign policy reflects nations ideas and values, the rhetorical style upon which these are realized are of particular interest. Providing research regarding gendered rhetoric would further explore the changes resulting from the entry of women which foreign policy has been exposed to over the last 20 years, from a male dominant field towards equal representation. Additionally, if men and women have different rhetorical styles, the foreign policy could be affected since masculine and feminine style has certain characteristic that greatly differs. In order to analyze political rhetorical differences a theoretical discussion will follow which explores and develops theory along with an analytical framework to highlight the differences of rhetoric style.

III. Theories on Masculine and Feminine Rhetoric Style

As shown in the previous chapter, there is a considerable lack of research regarding the rhetorical style by foreign policy representatives as well as a lack of research in the field of comparative gender analysis of rhetoric in the field of foreign policy. This chapter will develop an analytical framework to make the comparative gender analysis possible. Firstly, a working definition of rhetoric will be presented before a short discussion of rhetoric style. After a brief discussion of the impact of culture and social factors, we discuss and consolidate previous researchers' findings on the differences in masculine and feminine language. We use these findings to generate a framework for determining the gender style of a speaker. The conclusions will be summarized in an analytical framework at the end of the chapter.

In modern scholarship regarding rhetoric, there is no clear and universal definition of the concept rhetoric (Campbell and Huxman 2009). However, this thesis will work from the definition of rhetoric as language used with the purpose of persuasion, the speech of influence[1] (Leach 2000: p.207). Campbell and Huxman (2009) provide *The Seven Ps of Rhetoric*, a list of characteristics of rhetoric, Public, Propositional, Purposive, Problem solving, Pragmatic, Poetic, Powerful. As Campbell and Huxman (2009: p.2) say,

> A rhetorical perspective,[…], focuses on social truths, that is, on the kinds of truths created and tested by people in groups and influencing social and political decisions

In other words, rhetoric influences all day-to-day situations and the 'truths' reflect what people accept or agree with in society.

In her book <u>Talande Kvinnor,</u> Mral (1999) writes that the difference in masculine and feminine rhetoric is a choice between the typically 'male' contest and conflict style, and the typically 'female' discussion and consensus style. Men tend to adopt the male style and women tend to adopt the female style as a result of cultural expectations (Mral 1999). However, she refutes the existence of a universal timeless style of women, and concludes from her investigation of female speaker's styles that the female rhetoric tradition is as interchangeable as the male tradition has been, highly dependent on the temporal context. In her conclusion, however, she determines that there are some timeless differences, which separate male and female style of rhetoric despite the interchangeability of the rhetoric of both sexes. She focuses on two ways in which the rhetoric styles of men and women differs, it's the choices of speaker's *persona* and the degree of antagonism, verbal attacks which is present in the classical form of rhetoric (Mral 1999).

The choice of *persona* is highly dependent on the culture and the context of norms according to Mral (1999). The *personae* are the pictures of the rhethors displayed to the audience. Historically women had to break a barrier of prejudice to be able to speak publically which influenced them to choose *persona,* which strengthened the speaker's ethos, her credibility (Mral 1999). While men often display a persona, which enhances their authority, women often display personae which radiate solidarity and care, such as a mother or a teacher (Mral 1999). Mral (1999) concludes that a typically feminine style of rhetoric uses concrete, metaphoric and colloquial elements while the classical male rhetoric has been very competitive in nature. The male styled rhetoric is centered on the winning argument, besting one's opponent in a contest of argumentation and pervasion where triumph is achieved by the humiliation of the opponent (Mral 1999). Furthermore, she writes that the concept of contest is generally exclusively male and culturally constructed. This is most likely reason as to why women are more prone to pick the feminine styled rhetoric, less prone to antagonizing. The gender differences in norms, power relations and in experiences are also factors, which are reflected in the style of the speaker. Men are generally brought up to and are expected to compete while women are influenced by elements and expectations of nurturing (Mral 1999). Dialogue, attentiveness and compromises are often taught to women at a young age while young men are taught to compete for a place in society and to think strategically (Mral 1999).

Mral (1999) and others have identified 'male' and 'female' rhetorical styles. Below we will draw on several scholars to discuss four dimensions of male/female style. The first dimension is the balance between inclusion and confrontation, the second one is the relation and distance the speaker displays towards his/her audience, third is the displays of feeling and focus on fact, and fourth, the difference in priority in regards to dialogue and decision. The four dimensions are to be seen as *ideal types*. An ideal type is a point of reference, an extreme, not to be confused with the mean of a phenomenon. The idea of rhetoric styles as ideal types can be defined as a scale with masculine style at one side and feminine style at the other (Esaiasson, et al 2012:140). Each speaker will be definable by using the scale, and will most likely be more feminine or masculine styled, but it is theoretically possible to have a neutral style. The same will be true for the four categories, as presented below, while each speakers style can be measured in terms of the categories they will be placed on a scale, ranging for example from confrontation to inclusion, rather than being placed in either the category of confrontation *or* the category of inclusion. Below each of the four dimensions will be discussed separately.

Inclusion/confrontation

Inclusion is a dimension of feminine style where the speaker tries to identify with the audience as 'the same', while confrontation is a more excluding and aggressive relationship to the audience and other groups and a dimension of masculine style. Tannen (1990: 26) explains in a study on differences in conversation between men and women that women tend to view relations symmetrically, viewing themselves as similar to other people, while men view their relation to other people in a hierarchical fashion. This basic difference provides a basis for the tone of a conversation. The hierarchical mentality will be evident in rhetoric by the antagonistic attacks on opponents during the rhetoric segment, and also by use of excluding or conflict related language (Mral 2011: p.203). Thelander (1986: 162) conducted research on politically active men and women in Sweden and her findings show that women were less prone to address persons, or other speakers, in a negative sense than were men, e.g. women were proven less antagonistic in their rhetoric style. The antagonistic attacks are evident if the speaker mentions a person in a negative manner or if a country, region or organization is personified and given negative characteristics. Additionally, the speaker's usage of irony in relation to a person, organization, land or region would also be indications of antagonism. Antagonism is a clear indicator of the confrontation element of masculine style, along with excluding and conflict oriented language. Compared to other elements of components of style, antagonism, because of its traditional presence in the male rhetorical tradition and its proven absence from the female tradition, have a greater impact on style.

The Inclusion element of the feminine style of rhetoric will be evident by the undertone of symmetry, the similarities displayed (Tannen 1990: p. 27). The similarities will be displayed by language identifying the speaker with the audience of the speech directly or through a metaphor or group identity. One of the clearest indicators of inclusion will be inclusion of the audience by the speaker using the word we in a including fashion.

Relation/Distance

Relation is a dimension of feminine style, which is essentially the seeking of informal closeness, while Distance is a distancing of the speaker from the audience by formality. Relation implies seeking nearness in conversations towards the other person, providing the basis for informality, which is a typical feminine feature. Distance on the other hand implies the typical style of men, a distance is kept with formality and universal truths are presented to reach a solution independently. Tannen (1986:29) determines that the difference in balance between distance and relation is different depending on gender. Men tend to have a higher

degree of need for distance, which influences what is said and not said, and how it is said. The feminine, relation category, will be portrayed partly as the use of personal arguments, which uses specific, personal or life-like experiences to ground the speakers claim, making it easy to identify with and relate to. Mral (1999: 209) writes that a typical female feature in public context is expressions in a colloquial sense, also seen as relation.

The feminine style will be portrayed, along with specific or personal arguments as explained above, by informal language, which will be defined as either the use of personal pronouns such as 'I', 'you' or 'we' or when the speaker express their own opinion in a sense of 'I believe' or 'this concerns me'. Notably is that when the pronoun 'we' is used as in representation for the speakers country, or when the speaker include the audience in a matter, it is not seen as informal.

Formal language on the other hand is a combination of the lack of informal language, the use of conjectures and markers such as *therefore, accordingly* and *subsequently,* words which have classical roots and are rare in informal speech such as *concede* rather than *admit,* and a greater use of nouns than personal pronouns. Because the lack of informal elements is one indicator of informal language, the level of formality will increase as the level of informality decreases. The use of formal language is an active rhetorical distancing of the audience by the speaker and therefore is an indicator of masculine distance style.

Feeling/Fact

The feminine style of rhetoric tends to focus more on feeling than on fact while, the masculine style of speech, on the other hand, tends to focus on the transmitting of fact, often in a single direction, as a lecture (Tannen 1990: 124). The focus on fact and the use of impelling words is a particularly masculine rhetoric trait as opposed the typically feminine rhetoric trait of *feeling*. The presence of emotion, caring of feeling in rhetoric is often seen as a typically female attribute (Mral 2011: 12, Thelander 1986: 79, Tannen 1990: 26) which in the rhetorical setting will be portrayed by the use of 'personal' or 'close-to-home' examples, a phenomenon also supported by Campbell (1973). Another personal display of feelings in the rhetoric setting is a concrete expression of the emotion of the speaker by the speaker.

Dialogue/Decision

Dialogue dimension, a feminine feature, is characterized by invitations to discussion, often by using inclusive choice of words in order to consider the possible solutions of a problem, rather than presenting the RIGHT solution. For the reverse, decision dimension, which is a typical

male feature, the reaching of a solution is more significant and is often reached through decisive informing of the audience (Mral, 2011: p. 209). Tannen (1990) determines that between genders there is a difference of what a discussion should lead to. While a decision or a solution is the most important thing for a general male, a general woman tends to focus on the discussion itself as a way to build nearness and to understand the problem to its fullest before reaching a solution. A woman, she writes, uses conversations for acknowledgement, support and a tool to reach consensus to a greater extent than men, while ensuring the continued inclusion of her (Tannen 1986). Therefore, invitations to discussion are often more present when women speak, through inclusive language that initiates a discussion. A man on the other hand, according to the ideal, uses conversation in an informative sense to a greater extent by displaying knowledge in order to gain the center of attention, as explained above (Tannen 1986). The male feature is often seen by usage of a determinate language. In terms of rhetoric the two contrasting traits above results in a difference where women tend to appear to strive for consensus through thoroughly debating the issue, providing pro and con arguments to reach the best solution. Men, on the other hand, tend to imply expertise and inform the audience of the 'Truth' through one-sided argumentation, what action is the right one (Tannen 1990). Mral (1999:209) concludes that one of the most distinct female aspects of rhetoric is that they often prefer conversation to speeches, dialogue to monologue and discussion to decision. As a total contrast the decision element is evident by portraying of absolute solutions without any contemplation and no space for any real objection. The speaker portrays himself/herself as right and the bringer of a solution to the issue.

Analytical Framework: Male and Female Rhetorical styles

Below, a summary of the concepts discussed above with a few indicators is presented.

Table 1: Masculine and Feminine Rhetorical styles

Feminine Style	**Masculine style**
Inclusion	**Confrontation**
• *Including* metaphors, which transfer meaning of *similarities* and *group identity.* • *Including* words and terminology, which	• *Antagonism* against a person, nation or region etc. • *Conflict* oriented and/or *excluding* metaphors, such as *war metaphors*.

carries an undertone of *similarities* and *group identity*.

- *Conflict oriented and/or excluding* words and terminology, which implies a *distance* between the speaker and the audience/ opponent.

Relation

- Metaphors transferring meaning of *Informal relation*, for example metaphors of *family*.
- *Informal* words and terminology, with word-use such as *I, me, you, us* and *we.*

Independence

- Metaphors of distancing used by the speaker to distance him/herself from the audience/the opponent
- Formal and/or distancing words and terminology.

Feeling

- Specific expression of emotion
- The use of *informal*, close-to-home arguments.

Fact

- *Fact focused* words and terminology.
- Broad and *Universal* arguments.

Dialogue

- Dialogue metaphors transferring meaning of discussion and consensus as a goal.
- Dialogue words and terminology, such as *possibility*, *could* or *might.*

Decision

- Metaphors transferring meaning of a decision made.
- Words or terminology, which carries meaning of a decision made.

This theoretical tool will be used to determine which gender style a rhetor has. In the following two chapters the specific aim of the research will be presented along with a discussion of the practicalities regarding how the analysis will be conducted.

IV. Specified Aim and Research Question

The aim of this thesis is to compare and contrast rhetorical styles of female and male government representatives to the United Nations from Sweden and the US from 1990-present as well as comparing the results of the two different countries with each other. This will be achieved by attempting to answer two specific questions:

1. Is there a difference in the rhetorical style between male and female government representatives?
   - Does the rhetoric differ in terms of the rhetorical confrontation and/or inclusion between male and female speakers?
   - Does the rhetoric differ in terms of rhetorical distance and/or relation between male and female speakers?
   - Does the rhetoric differ in terms of the use of facts and/or emotion between male and female speakers?
   - Does the rhetoric differ in terms of using more decisive and/or more dialogical rhetoric between male and female speakers?

2. Do US foreign policy representatives (male and female) tend to use a more 'masculine' style than Swedish foreign policy representatives (male and female)?
3. Do Swedish foreign policy representatives (male and female) tend to use a more 'feminine' style than Swedish foreign policy representatives (male and female)?

V. Design and Methods: Comparative study of the U.S. and Sweden

Our study is essentially a descriptive study, exploring the rhetorical acts of foreign policy representatives of the U.S. and Sweden in relation to the masculine and feminine rhetorical style. The questions will be answered by using a qualitative textual analysis, applied to our two groups of data in two cases during the period from 1990 and onwards. In this chapter we will also critically discuss the data used.

Comparative Design: U.S. and Sweden

The design used is a comparative design where the comparison will be conducted in two stages. According to Bryman (2008:58) an analysis using comparative design will contain more substance than an analysis without a comparing element, a claim supported by Burnham, Lutz, Grant and Layton-Henry (2008). As the primary comparison, the rhetoric of male and female mission members to the UN will be compared through a focus on Sweden and the U.S. Secondly, a comparison of Sweden's and the U.S.'s results in the primary analysis will be conducted to determine if there is a difference in rhetorical style between Swedish and the U.S. representatives with a focus on the four dimensions presented in the analytical framework.

One important aspect of the comparative design is to be thorough with the selection of cases. Sweden and the USA are selected as cases due to two factors. Firstly, they are selected as similar cases in terms of both having women in leadership positions, in politics as well as in the private sector (UNDP 2007/8). Even though Sweden had 47.3% women in the parliament in 2007 while the U.S. only had 16.3%, in the private sector the U.S. had more women than Sweden: only 30% of senior officials and managers were women in Sweden while the U.S. had 42% (UNDP 2007/8:Table 29). Both countries furthermore have a strong anti-gender-discrimination legislation[2] and even if the make-up of where women have positions differs, women in power are not a foreign concept in either country. The cases are thereby similar and a similar result in terms of rhetorical differences between men and women is to be expected. The populations, from which the cases have been selected, will thereby be countries, which have significant number of women in their foreign policy institutions and have had female foreign ministers. The selection of cases where there is a relatively higher gender equality and

women empowerment will result in a critical case. The equality in each of the nations will have the effect of equal treatment in life, which will lead to the dissimilarities diminishing.

Secondly, as earlier presented in the introduction, the two cases cultures are diverse. In contrast to each other the United States appears as more masculine whereas Sweden appears as more feminine. As mentioned earlier, this idea complies firmly well with Geert Hofstede's work which categorizes different countries cultures according to masculinity where the United States ranked among the highest on the scale of masculinity while Sweden were placed among the lowest (Hofstede 1998). However, as the selected cases population deviates from the nation's broader culture, the assumption regarding culture along with the work of Hofstede should not be regarded as a foundation for the analysis. While the broad national culture could arguably influence the rhetorical style, the masculine nature of the foreign policy sphere makes it unlikely that the findings from the two cases will correspond with the nations broader cultures. Instead, due to the norms within the foreign policy sphere, the findings are expected to be rather masculine, both in terms of countries and gender.

The time period studied starts at 1990 up to the present day and will be studied as one period. The main reason for the selection of the time period is the presence of female foreign minister but also the relatively unchanging nature of the appointment pattern to the foreign minister post, from a gender standpoint. Having a comprehensive time period will also improve the reliability of the study as the number of representatives increase, as well as the data available for selection.

Data: Speeches at the UN

The data to be analyzed will consist of speeches by representatives from the two case-countries held at the United Nations in the General Assembly. A positive aspect of using the data through the UN and having a coherent sample of speeches is that the rhetorical context and the audiences of the speeches are, if not identical, very similar. These similarities will simplify the analysis (Leach 2000). The context of the UNGA consists of strong norms of what should be said and what level of civility and formality is expected. The context will result in the critical case becoming more critical, if there are differences found, they are likely everywhere, even where the norms of how one is supposed to speak are strong.

The data will consist of transcribed speeches, while rhetorical analyses were originally made on verbal utterances, in spoken form, it is, in the contemporary academia, very common with analyses of written transcripts or sources (Leach 2000). While the already transcribe speech limits the analysis in the way of how the different words gain emphasis and how segments of the speeches are delivered in regards to tone, the lack of any theoretical groundwork in regards to those factors and the individuality of the speakers justifies the transcribed speeches as the source data.

The data will be collected at the United Nations website where addresses made to the General Assembly are accessible in text format. The speeches of UN mission member representatives from the United States of America and Sweden, five men respectively five women from each country, will be analyzed. Individuals, who, in the forum of the UNGA, represent their country, will be referred to as a representative. From each of the representatives, an analysis will be conducted on two of their speeches addressed to the United Nations General assembly. The data will contain a great diversity of issues, from armed conflicts to welfare, which provides the greatest variation of themes possible. The selected speeches will be presented in a table at the beginning of the analysis.

Qualitative Textual Analysis

This thesis will use two separate elements from the methods of textual analysis: (1) metaphor analysis and (2) analysis of choice of words and terminology (Bergström and Boréus 2005; Liakopoulos 2000). Additionally, a qualitative quantitative content analysis will be conducted in order to consider words or terminology in its context. The analysis will thereby have its focal point on the surface of the rhetoric style rather than any deeper meaning or ideology, to be able to differentiate between styles (Bergström and Boréus 2005:264). Below, the two separate elements of textual analysis will be discussed. In the end of this chapter a table of questions will be presented as the basis for the analysis.

Metaphor analysis

A metaphor is defined as a language tool, which describes something which it is not, transferring meaning from one area to another in the mind of the audience (Boréus and Bergström 2005:265). An example of a metaphor could be 'the ship has sailed' to state that

one has missed an opportunity, which transfers the meaning of missed opportunities from a statement about seafaring to any other missed opportunities in whichever context the speaker uses it in. According to Boréus and Bergström (2005), some scholars have argued that metaphors are more than just superficial linguistic decorations, but rather how we use a metaphor constitutes how we understand a phenomenon, reflecting the cognitive pattern of the person using the metaphor. While the cognitive aspect of a metaphor is important to keep in mind while analyzing metaphors, this study of metaphors will be applied to the analytical framework developed in the theory chapter and used in a very limited fashion, not making any causal claims between rhetoric and psychology. The reason for studying metaphors is essentially, to be able to determine the style of the speaker.

Word and Terminology analysis

The study of words and terminology has similar uses as the study of metaphors. Words and terminology are social constructs and has a fundamental effect on how the world is perceived (Boréus and Bergström 2005: 281). However, as with the metaphorical analysis, the words and terminology analysis will not claim any causality between the rhetoric style and psychology, but will determine if there are words used which implies a rhetoric style. The choice of words reflects the style used, how something is said, rather than what is said. The basic principles used will be to determine if something could be rephrased without the elements indicating one style while keeping its core meaning.

Qualitative quantitative content analyze

To be able to support claims of 'more' or 'less' of one dimension or another there will be a need for quantitative content analyze. Quantitative content analyzes are useful when researching the frequency of a specific content of a speech or text (Esaiasson et al 2012:197). However, in the case of rhetorical style according to the analytical framework presented in the theory chapter a quantitative content analyze is not ideal to the task of analyzing the rhetorical style of a speaker. For instance, the use of the word 'we' can be either including or representative. Only when qualitatively observing the context of each word a useful analysis can be formed. The frequencies of each occurrence will be compared between groups and speeches to present the most useful conclusion.

How the method and theory will be used in combination

To be able to methodically analyze the speeches in text format, the first step is to concretize the research questions and analytical tool into simple questions, which will be posed to the text (Esaiasson, et al 2012: 210). Below, the analytical framework will be posted as questions, which will be put to the text in the following chapter.

1. Are there including style components present in the speech:
   - Are there metaphors transferring a meaning of inclusion and group identity?
   - Are there words and terminology indicating inclusion and group identity?
2. Are there confrontation style components present in the speech:
   - Are there antagonistic elements against a person, nation or area present?
   - Are there conflict oriented and/or excluding metaphors?
   - Are there conflict oriented and/or excluding words and terminology which implies a distance[3] between the speaker and the audience/opponent?
3. Are there relation style components present in the speech:
   - Are there metaphors transferring a meaning of informal relation present in the speech?
   - Are there informal words and terms present in the speech?
4. Are there Independence style components present in the speech:
   - Are there metaphors that transfer a meaning of distance between the speaker and the audience?
   - Are there formal words or formal terminology present in the speech?
5. Are there emotion present in the speech:
   - Are there specific expressions of personal emotion present in the speech?
   - Are there informal and/or close-to-home arguments present in the speech?
6. Is there a focus on fact in the speech:
   - Are there fact-focused words and terms present in the speech?
   - Are there broad and universal arguments present in the speech?
7. Are there components of dialogue style present in the speech:
   - Are there dialogue-based metaphors which transfer a meaning of dialogue and/or discussion present in the speech?

- Are there dialogue words and/or terminology in the speech?
8. Are there decision style elements present in the speech:
    - Are there metaphors, which transfer a meaning of decision in the speech?
    - Are there words and/or terminology, which carries meaning of a decision made?

The questions will help to determine, which style a foreign policy representative uses, a possible draw of a speech will be resolved by determining the overall style of the speech as a whole. The components of dimensions will be counted but only to such an extent as to be able to say if there is more or less of one dimension than another, and will be given in proportion to the length of the speech. The counting will also grant evidence to any claims made the rhetorical style of a group as a whole. Any questionable analytical conclusions will be discussed and argued in the analysis below.

VI. Analysis: The Difference between Male and Female Rhetoric

The United Nations is an international organization, which aims, through cooperation, create lasting world peace. It currently has 193 member states, woven into its organization of six principal organs. One of these principle organs of the UN is the General Assembly, which, as well as having functions like determining the budget of the UN and admission of new member states, is the main body of deliberation where all member states are represented.

The United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) is in an intense session every year between September and December and additional sessions throughout the year take place at need. The Assembly selects its own president and establishes its own Rules of Procedure. Even though the Rules of Procedure is fairly unspecific in how a speech is to be formed the norms of the UNGA are strong, especially in the realms of formality as evident in this chapter.

The data selected for the analysis presented in this chapter indicated a few interesting phenomena in of itself during its collection. When selecting data it became apparent, especially in the case of Sweden, which speeches by female foreign policy representatives tended to be fewer and shorter than the speeches held by men. This resulted in a wider spread in time period studied in the case of female representatives than in the case of male representatives. It also resulted in the female representatives selected generally being higher up in the hierarchy than the men, often being foreign ministers. In the case of Swedish female representatives it also paradoxically lead to longer speeches as there were no speeches at ideal length to select within the timeframe. In the conclusion chapter, following the analysis the potential effects of this will be discussed, and the possible causes of the results presented in this chapter.

This chapter will begin by presenting the speakers whose speech has been selected for analysis followed by a summary of the difference in rhetorical style, firstly between male and female representatives and secondly between the representatives of each nation. After which a presentation of each rhetorical style dimension will follow. Each part of the analysis will be primarily divided into male and female cases and then secondarily into the different nations.

The Speakers

The following tables consist of the 20 representatives, 10 from United States and 10 from Sweden with an equal distribution among gender, whose speeches have been selected for analysis. From each of the representatives, two speeches have been selected with the intention, if possible, of having a variety of topics. Along with the speakers full name is the year the speech was held, followed by a few words regarding the topic.

Table 2: Speakers from the United States

Vance T. McMahan 2008 Speech 1: Food crisis Speech 2: Almaty Programme of Action	Rose E. Gottemoeller 2011 Speech 1: Conference of Disarmament Speech 2: Disarmament and International Security
John Negroponte 2001-2003 Speech 1: Culturally-based conflict Speech 2: Africa's development	Cheryl Halpern 2008 Speech 1: Holocaust remembrance Speech 2: The Kimberley Process
Sichan Siv 2001-2005 Speech 1: Oceans and the Law of the sea Speech 2: Humanitarian assistance	Karen House 2008 Speech 1: Question of Palestine Speech 2: Disarmament and International Security
Zalmay Khalilzad 2008 Speech 1: Human rights Speech 2: Cooperation among organizations	Susan Rice 2009-2010 Speech 1: United States embargo against Cuba Speech 2: Global counter-terrorism strategy
John F. Sammis 2009-2011 Speech 1: Africa's development Speech 2: HIV/AIDS	Laura Kennedy 2011 Speech 1: Disarmament and International Security Speech 2: Disarmament and International Security

Table 3: Speakers from Sweden

Pierre Schori 2001-2003	Anna Lindh 2001-2002
Speech 1: United Nations reform	Speech 1: Global cooperation
Speech 2: Terrorism	Speech 2: Global cooperation
Anders Lidén 1998-2009	Lena Hjelm-Wallén 1997-1998
Speech 1: United Nations development	Speech 1: United Nations assessment of expenses
Speech 2: Prevention of armed conflict	Speech 2: United Nations reform
Magnus Hellgren 2009	Elisabeth Borsiin-Bonnier 2004-2005
Speech 1: Disarmament and International Security	Speech 1: Disarmament machinery
Speech 2: Disarmament and International Security	Speech 2: Disarmament and International Security
Per Örnéus 2009	Ulla Ström 2007
Speech 1: International Atomic Energy Agency report	Speech 1: HIV/AIDS
Speech 2: Vacancies in subsidiary organs	Speech 2: Indigenous people
Mårten Grunditz 2010-2011	Margareta af Ugglas 1991-1992
Speech 1: United Nations Charter	Speech 1: United Nations assessment of expenses
Speech 2: Humanitarian assistance	Speech 2: United Nations and Globalization

The difference in Rhetorical style between genders

The overall difference between male and female representatives rhetorical style were small but present. When focusing on the differences rather than the styles of the groups apart, female representatives have a more feminine style than male representatives. Important deviations from this result is the presence of antagonism, which were significantly higher in the case of female representatives and the fact that female representatives showed more emotion but also a greater tendency to emphasize fact.

The part of the analysis regarding the dimension of inclusion-confrontation the results were similar between the countries but differed in one interesting way. While the inclusive language was very similar to extent and form, the female foreign policy representatives were significantly more antagonistic in their style than the male representatives. While speeches by male representatives had only a few cases of antagonism the speeches held by female representatives contained antagonism in more than half of the cases.

Unlike the results of the inclusion-confrontation, the results of relation-distance were widely different between the countries resulting in the differences between men and women being inconclusive. Overall, however, the female representatives used relational language to a higher extent than the male ones, but used distance language with a similar frequency to male foreign policy representatives. The difference in relation-distance language would, however, been great if Sweden was the only case studied as they had a greater difference between their men and women representing their country.

The analysis of the speeches with a focus on the dimension of feeling-fact revealed that all speeches contained a fact focus to an extreme extent. However, when changing the criteria and observing an emphasis on fact, some small differences were found. Female representatives of both nations tended to emphasize fact and express emotion to a higher degree.

The difference in rhetorical style between male and female representatives in regards to the dimension of dialogue-decision revealed dissimilarity between the two genders rhetorical style. While both male and female representatives had a very decisive style, there were far more segments of dialogue in the speeches by females. The difference was also evident on the frequency of decisive segments, where female representatives used less decisive style than men.

The difference in Rhetorical style between the two cultures

The summarized style of the representatives of the two nations resulted in a very similar style. The representatives from both countries tended to use inclusive language rather than confrontational, fact focused styles rather than an emotional one, and decision based language rather than dialogue-based language. The biggest difference between the rhetorical styles of the two nations' representatives was to be found in the dimension of relation- independence. Sweden was found to be more relational, i.e. less formal, while the representatives from the U.S. were more formal in their rhetorical styles. Overall the U.S. representatives had a more masculine styled rhetoric with the exception of the dimension of dialogue-decision where the representatives from Sweden were more likely to use decisive language and less likely to use dialogue styled segments.

Inclusion – Confrontation

The style of inclusion and confrontation between male and female representatives from both countries were similar. Even though there are differences in the frequency of both dialogue and decision segments the overall style of representatives of both sexes were both to be considered inclusive. However, the differences determined were of an interesting nature. While both sexes had a high number of including segments, the female representatives' speeches contained far more segments of confrontation compared to male speeches where barely any were found.

The male representatives from both countries had a significantly inclusive based rhetorical style, although the Swedish male representatives displayed inclusive segments to a greater extent than male representatives from the U.S. The speeches held by representatives from Sweden had no segments of confrontation whereas only one of the male speakers of the United States displayed it. The findings of the both styles segments in total, when summarized, the two countries displayed 87 segments of including language and 1 segments of confronting language, which consisted of antagonism.

The male Swedish representatives had a relatively high level of inclusive style components[4] compared to confrontational components, as there was no confrontation style evident in the selected speeches made by male Swedish representatives. On the ideal type scale of inclusion and confrontation the male Swedish representatives clearly present a more inclusive based rhetorical style due to the complete lack of confrontational components as well as multiple inclusive segments. All but one of the Swedish male speakers displayed any including component in their speeches[5]. The most commonly component of inclusion found was the word 'we' which represented 27 segments out of 49 found in the speeches by Swedish male speakers.

> By signing the Charter of the United Nations **we have all** pledged to combine **our efforts** towards the shared goals of international peace and security, human rights, respect for international law, and economic and social advancement. Implicit in that pledge is the principle of **shared responsibility**. **If we are** to move beyond divisions to find **common solutions** to global problems, **every country** will need to assume its share of responsibility. (Grunditz1:36)

An example of a non-inclusive wording could have been to instead of using the wording: *By signing the Charter of the United Nations we have all pledged to combine our efforts towards the shared goals of international peace and security*. Use the wording: *By signing the Charter of the United Nations the member states have pledged to strive for international peace and*

security. This would have resulted in a less including, more neutral style. Though as seen below under the section relation-distance, even though the possible rewording above might seem neutral, it is actually masculine when viewed in light of the distance dimension.

It is important to emphasize when the word 'we' is concerned that there is a possibility of it being used as a non-inclusive word, for instance when referring to Sweden by using the word 'we'. This use of the word does not include the audience, but rather representing, and is therefore not deemed including. The three speeches by Swedish male representatives, which did not contain any inclusive components[6] were presentations of the positions of Sweden and the EU, which was likely the cause of the lack of inclusive components. The use of the word 'we' were always referring to either EU or Sweden and the focus of the speeches lay on the opinion of their country or organization rather than any direct relation to the UN.

The following speaker, The Swedish Ambassador to the United Nations Pierre Schori, displays another usage of inclusion components:

> **If we** wish the General Assembly to be a vigorous actor in the international political arena, **we** should take time to reflect on its modus operandi. **We in the Assembly** must ask ourselves whether the draft resolutions that we traditionally introduce – sometimes with very few changes from year to year – serve their intended purpose and reflect the current situation. (Schori1:9)

The use of the word 'we' repetitively is a common inclusion style component, found throughout the speeches of Swedish male representatives with only two exceptions[7]. This pattern of usage of the word 'we' is also present, similarly in the case of U.S. male representatives.

As with the speeches of male Swedish representatives the U.S. male representatives displayed a more inclusive style rather than a confronting one. There were only two speeches without any inclusive components[8] and only one speech with any confrontation components[9] Overall, there was 38 including segments present and only one confronting in the speeches by male U.S. representatives. The most commonly found component of inclusion was the word 'we', represented in 14 segments out of 38 in total. Below, similar to that of Swedish male representatives, the style of inclusive elements will be displayed in the quotation of United States representative Siv:

> The United States hopes the international community will fully endorse the resolutions before **us** today. We believe they contribute to progress on oceans issues and reflect the benefits to be gained from international cooperation in this vital sphere. (Siv1:18)

In the statement, Siv displays usage of the including language 'us' as to refer to the member states. It has been the secondly most found word in the speeches held by male representatives of the U.S. with eight segments out of 38 in total. Unlike the wording 'us', the following quote by the U.S. permanent representative to the United Nations John Negroponte displays the including component that are most frequently evident.

> **Our** ambitions for this dialogue should be great. In **our** globalized world, **we** should encourage, not hamper, the free flow of ideas. **We** should respect, not push aside, the values and beliefs of other cultures. **We** should cherish, not reject, the many manifestations of human diversity. The link between ignorance and violence cannot be ignored. (Negroponte1:3)

Negroponte emphasize the including wordings 'our' and 'we' in his statement. Whereas 'our' has been present to some extent in the speeches from the United States[10], the usage of 'we', as earlier stated, has been the most commonly found including word throughout the speeches held by male representatives of the United States[11] contained at least one an including version of the word 'we'. In this regard the speeches of male U.S. representatives were very similar to the speeches of Swedish male representatives.

The analysis regarding confronting style of language resulted in no findings of words or terminology in any of the speeches held by male U.S. representatives. Another confronting aspect, that was evident, was antagonism which, as stated in the theory section, is evident when a speaker mentions a person in a negative manner or if a country, region or organization is personified and given negative characteristics. Signs of antagonism were only found in one speech by a male. The following quote is the example of the only male speaker, the United States representative Khalilzad, who presented antagonistic elements in his speech.

> Regrettably, some Governments impose crippling constraints on the ability of their people to exercise their fundamental freedoms or deprive them of their rights altogether. Men and women who have done nothing more than attempt to act peacefully upon their rights now languish in jails and labour camps as prisoners of conscience. There are Governments that pressure civil society and the independent news media, including those who publish on the Internet, Governments that ignore the will of their citizens by conducting fraudulent elections or simply discarding election results, and Governments that use urgently needed humanitarian aid, including food and medical aid, as a political weapon. (Khalilzad1:17)

This segment is to be considered antagonistic because of the contempt towards the governments that strangle the fundamental freedoms of their people the speaker shows. Even though they are not mentioned by name, the antagonism is evident through his highlighting of

'some Governments' and 'there are Governments' in a negative sense. As should be repeated, Khalilzad is the only male speaker from the United States who presents antagonistic elements in his speech. In the case of Sweden, no antagonism was present. As will be shown below, the speeches of women in the U.S. and in Sweden contained a higher degree of antagonism.

The female representatives from both countries had an overall including based rhetorical style. In the case of Swedish female representatives however, the frequency of including segments were almost three times as common as in the speeches by female representatives from the U.S., although when considering the frequency with the length of the speeches, the result was fairly similar between the two. In regards to confronting style segments, the speeches held by female representatives from Sweden had segments of confrontation in nearly all the speeches whereas the female speakers of the United States only displayed it in half of their speeches. The total findings of both segments in the speeches by female representatives of the two countries were 104 segments of inclusive language and 25 segments of confrontational language.

As stated in the section above, the Swedish female representatives' speeches centered to a great extent on inclusive language rather than confrontational. All speeches except one displayed including elements, some with a high level of inclusive components whereas others had limited usage of such components, the different speakers used very different styles between their own speeches[12], which implies context and theme as being important factors. The findings of female Swedish representatives' speeches resulted in a less coherent style than that of Swedish male representatives' speeches. The most commonly found word of including language was 'we'. 50 out of 77 segments of including language of the Swedish female representatives' speeches contained the word 'we' and the majority of the speaker expressed themselves in that way[13]. The following quote by Foreign minister Lena Hjelm-Wallén exemplifies the common usage of the word 'we':

> Today's international environment is rife with contradictions. **We have** a globalized economy, but **we also have** a periphery unable to benefit, and left further and further behind. **We have** ever closer international cooperation, but **we also have** aggressive nationalism and xenophobia. **We have** growing support for democracy and human rights, but **we also have** atrocities and blatant disregard for international law. (Hjelm-Wallén2:23)

As the quotation above shows, there is a significant amount of inclusive language present in the speech. It is mostly evident through the inclusion of others and the mindset of the United

Nations as a unified entity towards the problems they are facing. To keep in mind however, the usage of the word "we" has two different forms, only one of which is including.

> The EU regrets that there are still a considerable number of States that have yet to bring into force Additional Protocols. **We** urge States that have not yet done so to sign and bring their respective safeguards agreements into force… (Örnéus1:6)

The quotation exemplifies when the male Swedish representative, the Minister of Foreign Affairs at the Department for Multilateral Development Cooperation Per Örnéus, portrays situations when the usage of 'we' is not considered as being used in an including sense. When the speaker presents his or her country's opinion or position in a matter, the selection of the word 'we' is representative rather than including.

Another example of a word, which is regarded as including depending on its context is shown in the following quote from Foreign minister Anna Lindh's speech. The word 'us' is very similar as the word 'we', that is, in a specific context it is regarded as including rather than representative for only the speakers country.

> The United Nations remains a unique global forum. It is the one organization **we can all equally** count on and turn to for security and development – as the safeguard of **our common future**. The United Nations needs to be strengthened, and it needs reform. **We need the United Nations**, and the **United Nations needs us**. (Lindh2:35)

While viewing the sentence: *We need the United Nations, and the United Nations needs us.* Exclusively the sentence could arguably be seen as representative. The usage of the term 'us' would in that case be regarded as representative rather than including. However, in its context as exemplified above it is used as inclusive style of language. The word 'us' was found in nine segments out of the 77 in total and were displayed in nearly half of the speeches held by Swedish female speakers[14].

Regarding the reverse concept, the confrontational style of language, the female representatives of Sweden used considerably more antagonistic elements than male speakers, eight of the Swedish female representatives' speeches contained segments of confrontation. 16 segments of confrontational language were found, including antagonism. Three female representatives of Sweden used antagonism as opposed to Swedish male speakers who displayed none[15]. An example is shown below from the Swedish speaker Lindh and her address regarding disarmament issues where she expresses that some countries had a responsibility as members to fulfill their obligation towards the United Nations:

> The Conference on Disarmament must start substantive work when it resumes its session early next year. **It is unacceptable that a few countries continue to block progress**. Sweden, Algeria, Belgium, Chile and Colombia recently presented a proposal for a programme of work that takes into consideration the interests of all parties. I urge China and the United States to actively work for a solution. (Lindh1:9)

In the statement the excluding and antagonistic elements are evident, creating an undertone of the others needs to reform or rethink in order to reach a solution to the matter which Lindh is giving voice to. In addition to Lindh there has been additional presence of antagonistic style in an address made by af Ugglas:

> In today's favourable climate for international cooperation, the Member States are giving to the United Nations a number of tasks that put heavy demands on resources. **It is highly ironic and unacceptable that the United Nations is still forced to conduct its operations under the shadow of a continuing financial crisis. It should be a question of honour for every Member State to fulfill its obligations under the Charter in a timely manner.** (Ugglas2:82)

Similar to Lindh's previous statement that it was unacceptable for some countries to block progress, af Ugglas presents similar antagonistic elements but also includes irony to lay even more emphasis on the issue. The following quote is another example from Lindh, who presents one of the few traces of confrontational words and terminology:

> Today we need to build coalitions and to join forces, not only against international terrorism, but also to **fight other global problems**. We need to **join forces in the fight for global justice**. (Lindh2:33)

While the subject of the speech provides a certain nature to the argumentation, the selections of words as 'must join forces' are indicators of confrontation style, while the 'we' signifies inclusion. Even though there are confrontational elements in the segment the inclusive elements are greater. Although present, the term 'join forces' and similar wordings are seldom used by Swedish representatives and it is only Lindh who expresses herself with confrontational words or terminology. The use of the term 'join forces' is a confrontational element as the wording implies the use of force, as opposed to the including style is displayed by Hjelm-Wallén in the following quote (Hjelm-Wallén1:35): "…we must strengthen **cooperation** to prevent armed conflict." The two quotes, as displayed, are close to identical in meaning, although the second quote by Hjelm-Wallén has a rather passive undertone when viewed in contrast with the quote by Lindh.

Additional confronting style of language is present when the speaker displays people, organizations or countries in a sense as 'them' rather than 'we'. The speaker identifies other actors and establishes a need for them to accomplish while upholding themselves as a front figure and decline their own need for action. It is however rare in the speeches as only 16 segments of confrontation was found, in comparison with the 77 inclusive segments. Hjelm-Wallén speech exemplifies such style regarding a reform of the United Nations:

> **Member States cannot shy away from their responsibility for the Organization**. United Nations reform is not a cost-cutting exercise, but one of rendering the Organization more effective. It cannot be reformed under the threat of political and financial crisis. No Member State has the right to set conditions for fulfilling Charter obligations. **All debtors must pay their assessed contribution in full, on time and without conditions**. (Hjelm-Wallén1:32)

Another typical confrontational way to formulate oneself is displayed by Ugglas in the following quote:

> However, **the United Nations** has the fundamental responsibility for the interpretation and application of international law. Enforcement measures remain a prerogative of the United Nations. (Ugglas1:92)

Even though Ugglas spoke as a representative of a member state of the United Nations, she used the United Nations as a separate entity to herself, the audience, and the member states. An inclusive way of speaking would instead be to emphasize 'we, the United Nations'.

In contrast with the speeches held by female representatives of Sweden, the U.S. female representatives' speeches contained far less elements of both inclusion and confrontation, roughly half of both types. The inclusive element was fairly common and the majority of the U.S. female speakers displayed inclusive language with only two exceptions[16]. The findings of including words in the case of U.S. female representatives were quite similar to the Swedish female representatives, with the most common word being 'we' with 14 segments found out of 27 in totals. While the composition of elements in the case of U.S. female representatives were very similar to that of Swedish female representatives, there were fewer elements overall.

Following is an example of one of the United States female speakers, the United States Department of State's Assistant Secretary for Arms Control, Verification, and Compliance Rose Gottemoeller, who use the commonly displayed word 'we' (Gottemoeller1:13): "But **we** should consider such proposals with our eyes wide open, realistic about the root cause of the

current deadlock is." A non-inclusive way to word the same sentiment could have been for example the following: *such proposals needs to be considered carefully, to understand the true root of the current deadlock*. Such a wording would, without including the listeners, give the same information and exhortation. While the elements of inclusion in Gottemoeller's speeches are less in number to the Swedish speeches, she displayed more inclusion than the other female representatives from her country with 15 segments of inclusion found.

Female US speaker Rice is another example of a female speaker who displays the inclusion styled rhetoric. The following quote displays one of her sections of inclusion style (Rice1:29): "As **we** discuss **our** differences on that subject, **we** must remember one important commonality."

In the previous quote, Rice displays two segments of inclusion by the wordings 'we' and 'our'. An example of a non-inclusive display could instead be formulated by stating: *As differences on that subject are discussed, we must remember one important commonality.* The alternative statement contains no including components while displaying the same information.

Regarding the confrontational style of language findings were rare with half of the female speakers of the U.S. displaying confronting components[17]. Furthermore, in contrast with the female speakers of Sweden where 16 segments of confrontation were found, only nine, including antagonism was found in the speeches by the U.S. female speakers. The most commonly found expressions of confrontation was antagonism and was displayed in four out of five speeches who displayed confronting language[18]. Usage of antagonism is exemplified below by U.S. representative to the UN Cheryl Halpern:

> Despite the adoption of resolution 60/7, it remains inexplicable that one of the Member States, Iran, continues to insist upon denying the truth of the Holocaust. As the United States has stated many times before, to deny the Holocaust is tantamount to approving the extermination of the Jewish people in particular, and to approving genocide in general. That is unacceptable and unconscionable. (Halpern1:30)

As the quotation above displays, Halpern shows her country's contempt in the subject and specifically targets Iran in her speech. However, the antagonistic elements are otherwise similar as she upholds the denying of the holocaust by Iran. Another female example of antagonism is presented from the speech by the U.S. representative to the UN Karen House:

> Each year, therefore, we are distressed and discouraged as the General Assembly unhelpfully devoted a disproportionate number of resolutions related to the Middle East. All of them are unbalanced by the explicit or implicit one-sided criticism of Israel. (House1:1)

House approach the subject with a specified confrontation to the General Assembly for their handling of resolutions related to the Middle East. These findings are particular interested due to the nature of antagonistic elements, as it's considered part of the confrontation category which is seen as a masculine style.

Relation – Distance

The analysis of relation-distance resulted in a distinct difference between the countries. The U.S. speakers, both men and women, displayed a distancing style of language whereas the Swedish female speaker displayed a relational style and Swedish men had an equal distribution of relational and distancing segments. This makes the difference between men and women inconclusive. The female and male representatives use distancing language in a similar frequency, although the female representatives displayed relational language to a higher degree than the male ones. By only choosing one case rather than two, a comparison in relation-distance language would be more simplistic as both countries had a greater difference, or distinct similarities, between their men and women representing their country.

The male representatives from both countries displayed a relatively low amount of relational based language. In the case of Swedish male representatives, the frequency of relation segments was similar to the frequency displayed by male representatives from the U.S.. In regards to distancing style segments, the speeches held by male representatives from Sweden contained few segments of distance whereas male speakers of the United States displayed it to a greater extent. The findings of the different segments in total of the two countries were 12 segments of relational language and 33 segments of distancing language.

The male representatives of Sweden displayed a nearly equal distribution among the two components. Six segments of relation were found, although only displayed by three speakers[19] whereas four speakers displayed neither relation nor distance[20]. The following quote is an example by a male speaker, the Swedish Ambassador to the United Nations Mårten Grunditz (Grunditz2:3), who presents relational style of language in a form of 'me'. "**Allow me now**, as a contribution to the debate of the General Assembly, to make a few remarks on behalf of the Government of India and Sweden."

As exemplified above, the informal language, which indicates relational style is evident when the speaker uses pronouns such as 'me' and 'I'. These two words represent the relational findings in the speeches as they together represent all findings of relational segments. A less informal way of expressing the previous sentence could instead be formulated as: *As a contribution to the debate of the General Assembly, a few remarks will now be made on behalf of the Government of India and Sweden.*

Another example of the usage of the pronoun 'I' is displayed in the following quote from Swedish male speaker Schori (Schori2:23): "**I** want to stress the importance of the establishment of the International Criminal Court." As the usage of pronoun is considered informal, an alternative way of formulating the statement could be: *The establishment of the International Criminal Court is of utmost importance.*

The reverse component, distancing style of language, has been identified by usage of formal words. As previously stated, only three male representatives of Sweden displayed formal language and only five segments was found. Following is an example of formality, displayed by male Swedish representative Grunditz (Grunditz1:37): "It is therefore of utmost importance that we continue to strengthen the humanitarian system as a whole, in particular OCHA." An alternative formulation of the sentence in order to present it as less formal could be displayed as: *I must stress the importance that we continue to strengthen the humanitarian system.* In the speech as a whole, Grunditz displayed the highest amount of distancing language in comparison to relation, three segments of distance as opposed to no segments of relation.

Another male Swedish speaker who displayed a formal style was Örnéus (Örnéus2:4): "As it is well known, the EU supports effective multilateralism and the central role of the United Nation therein. **Furthermore**, the…"By using the term furthermore Örnéus connected the two sentences by a conjecture as explained in the theory chapter.

As with the Swedish male speakers, the United States male representatives displayed similar usage of relational style of language but unlike Sweden a considerably extensive usage of distancing language was found. Six segments of relation were present as opposed to 28 segments of distance in the speeches by the U.S's. male representatives. In contrast with the Swedish male speaker, the U.S. speeches held by men contained nearly six times as much distancing language. Furthermore, only three speeches held by the US male representatives

featured relational segments[21] as opposed to eight speeches which featured segments of distance.

In the following quote Khalilzad (Khalilzad2:19) uses an informal style of language when he expresses his own opinion in a form of 'I would like': "For Afghanistan's success, **I would like** to underscore the importance of the role of the country's neighbors." As representatives of their nation, it is considered informal to uphold their own opinion rather than stating that it is their countries opinion.

As was discussed earlier, when the speaker uses pronouns such as 'I' or similar it is regarded as informal. Furthermore, when the speaker refers to their nation as 'my country' instead of emphasizing 'the United States' or similar, it is also as informal. An example of this is displayed in the speech by Siv (Siv2:15): "This year's hurricane season hit **my country** very hard."

As stated earlier, the representatives of the United States speak generally in a formal sense as the findings support: six segments of relation contra 28 segments of distance. Following is an example of a man who uses formal language, Negroponte (Negroponte1:3): "Culturally-based conflicts feed on prejudice, stereotypes, historical **animosities** and cynicism."

The word 'animosities' refers to a strong hostility towards something. As it is seldom used in common language, it is referred to as a formal word. In this context, the word 'hostility' would instead provide a more informal sense to the subject. Another example of a U.S. male speaker is displayed in the following quote by Siv:

> We have followed with equal interest recent discussions on reinforcing United Nations leadership for specific sectors of humanitarian activity – sectors that have historically suffered from **ad hoc** coordination and direction. (Siv2:15)

'Ad hoc' is uncommon in the day-to-day language and refers to a non-generalizable solution. As suggested earlier, words that are seldom used in contemporary language, with a more informal synonym, is considered as formal. The more informal way of describing a scenario would instead be to use the term 'overly specific', which would suit the sentences and provide a more informal tone to the conversation.

The female representatives from Sweden and the U.S. differed from one another in terms of relational or distancing style of language. In regards to relation style segments, the speeches held by female representatives from Sweden displayed a great amount of segments whereas

female speakers of the United States displayed it rarely, although when considering the frequency with the length of the speeches, the result was fairly similar between the two. The reverse concept, distance, was rarely displayed by Swedish female representatives, whereas the female speakers of the U.S. displayed a significant amount of distancing language. The findings of the different segments in total between the two countries were 37 elements of relational language and 44 segments of distancing language.

The female representatives of Sweden displayed a considerable amount of relational language. 27 segments of relation were found with only three speeches as exceptions to this[22] whereas two speeches contained no elements of relation or distance[23]. In contrast with the female speakers of the United States, the women representing Sweden displayed relational elements nearly three times as much. The following speech by Swedish female representative Ambassador Elisabeth Borsiin Bonnier (Borsiin1:16) displays the most common use of relational words: "**I** believe that we will see more intercontinental groupings like those in the future, because they are needed." Borsiin Bonnier speaks as if presenting her own opinion by usage of the pronoun 'I'. The usage of 'I' has been the most common relational word with 22 segments out of 27 in total. An alternative formulation would instead be displayed if the speakers' nation was mentioned: *The Swedish Government believes that more intercontinental groupings like those will appear in the future, because they are needed.*

Another component of relational style is displayed in the quotation of Af Ugglas regarding conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction:

> **It is my hope** that not only 1991, but the next few years also will be marked by the achievement of a more effective control of biological weapons, the speedy conclusion and implementation of the chemical weapons convention as well as the restricted transfer of conventional weapons (Ugglas2:77)

Much like Borsiin Bonnier, Af Ugglas speaks as if expressing her own opinion or hope. It is considered informal due to the expression in terms of their "own opinion", rather than presenting in terms of the countries of which they represent as seen in the address made by the male Swedish representative Schori (Schori1:9): "**Sweden would** like to underline its support for the Secretary-General's initiative to establish a panel of eminent personalities." Although not an instance of informal language, the example by Swedish male speaker Schori is not considered formal due to the nature of the speech – that they are expressing the country's concerns.

Another example of informal language is found in Deputy Permanent Representative of Sweden to the United Nations Ulla Ström's speech (Ström1:20) regarding the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS: "**But let me state** that this is not only about the United Nations." As evident in the quote, Ström uses an informal way of informing the audience, through the usage of 'me' as the provider of the knowledge.

The reverse component, distancing style of language, has seldom been present in the female representatives of Sweden's speeches. Six segments of distance were found and only present in three speeches[24]. An example of formal choice of word is displayed the following quote by the female representative of Sweden Borsiin Bonnier (Borsiin1:9): "But **lacunae** remain both on the legal side and on the implementation side." The word lacunae refers to a gap in the law text and in how the law is applied, an informal way to word the same sentiment in an informal way could have been to use the word 'gap'. Another such example of formal language is displayed in the following quote by Hjelm-Wallén (Hjelm-Wallén1:33): "Today, a majority of the Member States have **abolished** the death penalty or placed it under a **moratorium.**" While it could be argued that legal or technical terms should not be considered formal, the inability to use the words in normal conversation labels them as formal. Words such as 'removed' and 'suspended' could have replaced the words 'abolished' and 'moratorium' to construct a more informal wording of the statement.

The female representatives of the United States displayed a completely reversed style of language compared with the female Swedish representatives with a significant amount of distance elements and rarely any relational ones. Only 10 segments of relation were found, displayed in four speeches[25]. In the following quote, the female representative of the United States Gottemoeller (Gottemoeller1) displays informal usage of the pronoun 'I':

> **I will not** detail all of it here, but **I would like** to highlight a few successes because they stand in stark contrast to the continuing failure to begin negotiations on a priority objective – a ban on the production of fissile material for use in nuclear weapons. (Gottemoeller1:12)

As evident, Gottemoeller usage of the pronoun 'I' along with the display of her opinion is informal. As they are speaking on behalf of their nation in the General Assembly, a less informal way of presenting it would be to express it as 'The United States would like' or similar. Additional usage of informal language can be found in the speech by U.S. Special Representative for Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention Issues Laura Kennedy:

> Today, **I should like** to highlight some key opportunities for **my country** and the international community to work together to constrain the potential misuse of chemical and biological materials. (Kennedy1:11)

Kennedy usage of the pronoun 'I' along with speaking in terms of 'my country' refers to a relational style of language through the display of informality. As some findings of informality were presents, the speeches held by female representatives of the United States generally contained a majority of distancing language.

On the contrary to Sweden's female representatives who seldom displayed distancing language, the presence of distancing segment has been found 38 times in the speeches held by female representatives of the U.S., which is six times as many as in the case of Swedish female representatives. All but one of the speeches held by U.S. female representative contained elements of distance[26]. An example of a formal choice of word is displayed below in a quote by Kennedy:

> Nations around the world have made strides – sometimes individually, sometimes collaboratively – in strengthening measures to prevent, detect and respond to the threat posed by biological weapons, and the work we have done in Geneva has played an important **galvanizing** role. (Kennedy1:11)

The word 'galvanizing', simply put it, means strengthen. The choice of emphasizing the subject by including the verb 'galvanizing' creates a more formal sense to the sentence. A suggested informal style would instead be to simply leave it out, or using the word 'strengthening' as a substitute. An additional example of a female speaker who uses formal language to a great extent is presented in the quote by House:

> But it is impossible to see how supporting resolutions so detached from reality on the ground and so intrusive into the substance of sensitive, sustained negotiations will either **alleviate** that suffering or contribute to a solution. (House1:2)

House usage of the word 'alleviate' refers to reaching an easier and milder situation. Another way of displaying this but in a more informal sense would be to use words such as 'ease' in order to inform of the scenario. Thus, as the word 'alleviate' possess a more informal synonym, it is regarded as a formal style of speaking.

Feeling – Fact

The male representatives of both nations both focused on fact to an extreme degree, to such an extent to make the analysis fairly impossible. There were however a small difference where an emphasis on fact were concerned. The only male representative from U.S. to emphasize fact did so to a greater extent than the only male Swedish representative to do so. In regards to emotion showed, the male representatives showed a very limited degree of emotion. Male Swedish representatives had no occurrences of display of personal emotional display while U.S. males had two such occurrences from the same speaker.

The male representatives of Sweden did not display any personal emotion in their speeches in the UNGA. On the other hand, there was an extreme amount of factual language. The use of 'is', what is, was widely used by both groups of men in the analysis to an extreme degree. This is likely due to with the norms of the forum, the UNGA. The extreme amount of factual statements in both groups makes a conclusion drawn from any small variations vague and irrelevant.

There is however one group of fact focus indicators, the use of terms like 'fact is', emphasizing of fact, which only appeared a few times in the speeches held by male Swedish representatives. The following quote by Grunditz represents the only such occurrence in all of the speeches held by male Swedish representatives:

> **The fact** that protectionism has largely been kept at bay during the most severe recession since the 1930s is therefore a major achievement. (Grunditz1:37)

In the case of U.S. male representative there were only two occurrences of feeling displayed while fact was focused to a very large extent, as in the case of Swedish males. The first two quotes, originating in the same speech by Siv are two clear displays of personal feeling, the only occurrences in the case of U.S. male representatives:

> **I am pleased** to inform the Assembly that the Administration of President George W. Bush supports accession of the United States to the Convention. (Siv1:18)

The second quote, a few sections later in the same speech:

> It is therefore with **regret** that **I** must note the lack of such international cooperation or consensus regarding law of the sea issue in the United Nations Educational, Scientific and

Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage. (Siv1:18)

In both quotes Siv communicates his feeling on the message he delivers, making it a clear statement of feeling.

The U.S. male representatives, as in the case of Swedish males, presented a massive amount of factual 'is' language, making any analysis of that specific component of fact useless. There were, however, rare emphasize on fact such as 'fact is' as in the case of Swedish male representatives. The only male U.S. representative who displayed such clear factual terms were Negroponte, who did so in both his speeches. The three following quotes are present in the same speech (Negroponte1:2): "These are the darkest **facts** in our history" , and a few sections later the following two quotes, representing the last two clear cases of fact wording:

> They are principles woven into the fabric of our national experience, and they are principles upon which we believe a wise and effective dialogue among civilization can, **in fact**, be built. (Negroponte1:3)

And in one partition of the speech later: "So many tragedies have illuminated this **fact** for us" all these three examples describe a clear emphasis on fact, even though they are far from the only sections of fact focus. In his other selected speech Negroponte (Negroponte2:15) once again emphasizing fact by using the word 'fact': "The fact is that African countries have suffered too long from their relative isolation from the global economy."

The female representatives, as a coherent group of speakers tended to show both more emotion but also a higher degree of emphasis on fact. As we will see below, this has largely to do with the results of the Swedish female representatives. While the Swedish female representatives had a degree of both feeling and fact dimension components, the U.S. female representatives showed only a marginally higher tendency to display either than their male counterparts from the U.S.

As with all other groups of representatives, the Swedish female representatives focused fact to a large extent. As mentioned above, this is likely due to the context of the UNGA where a focus on fact is the norm. The emphasis on fact, as explained in the case of men above, has a significant presence in the speeches of Swedish female representatives. Three out of five female speakers displayed at least one emphasis on fact in one or more of their speeches. The result is to be considered a substantial difference compared to the results of men, where only one male speaker from each country displayed a similar emphasis on fact. Paradoxically,

Swedish female representatives also displayed emotion to a higher degree than any other group analyzed, with four emotional displays by three different speakers.

The first example of emotion is displayed by the Swedish foreign minister at the time of the speech af Ugglas. In the following quote (Ugglas2:72), af Ugglas displays personal emotion in a very potent way: "It is a **particular pleasure** for **me** to welcome three neighboring States as Members of the United nations" The use of the wording *particular pleasure* along with marking the emotion as personal makes the quote a good example of an emotional display as presented in the analytical framework. The following quote by Hjelm-Wallén (Hjelm-Wallén1:33) is, while very different in both subject and emotion, very similar in form: "Therefore, **I regret** that only four countries meet the United Nations aid target of 0.7 per cent of gross national income"

The same is true for the two following quotes by Lindh, the foreign minister at the time of her speech (Lindh1:8): "**I deeply regret** the two recent terrorist attacks in Israel" and "It fills **me** with **hope** that the United Nations has, **in fact**, entered this millennium with vigour and determination." (Lindh1:10). The second quote also displayed an emphasis on fact along with an emotional display, revealing components of both feeling and fact dimension. Earlier in the same speech Lindh displayed another emphasis on fact (Lindh1:7): "**In fact**, it is by ensuring global respect for international law, human rights and social justice that we take away much of the fertile ground of terrorism."

Borsiin Bonnier (Borsiin1:9) in the following quote presents another emphasis on fact by a Swedish female representative: "The **fact** that some citizens might break the law does not make the law less important" Borsiin Bonnier's quote, while using the word 'fact' is a rather weak example of an emphasizing of fact because the fact in question is not something she wishes to emphasize. However, the use of the word fact is not entirely necessary and therefore it is deemed as an indicator of fact focus. An alternative way to present the same sentiment without emphasizing fact, even though a fact focus would still be present, could be: *Even if there are citizens whom break the law, the importance of the law does not diminish.*

The last presented occurrence of emphasis on fact is presented in the following quote by af Ugglas (Ugglas1:88): "It is a **fact** that the massive flow of refugees which we see today are just as likely to be caused by human activities as by natural disaster" Rather than giving proof to her statement, af Ugglas emphasizes fact to ensure the truth of her statement.

As mentioned above the female representatives of the U.S. had a potent factual focus, as did all other analyzed groups. In contrast with the case of Sweden, where the difference in feeling/fact dimensions was great between genders, the case of U.S. presented more homogenous results. The results of the U.S. female representatives are quite similar to that of the male U.S. representatives, only two occurrences of personal emotional display and two sections of factual emphasis.

The first of the two displays of personal emotion is presented in a speech by Ambassador Laura Kennedy (Kennedy2:2) who in the following quote displays personal pleasure: " …which **I am delighted** to note will be held under the presidency of our Bulgarian colleague" A similar display was also found in a speech by Assistant Secretary of Arms Control Rose Gottemoeller who also conveys a feeling of pleasure:

> As my Russian colleague has already mentioned, **I am very pleased** that we will be joining together later in the session to present the joint briefing on our successful implementation of the New START Treaty. (Gottemoeller2:11)

Gottermoeller in her other speech selected for analysis present an emphasis on fact rather than another display of emotion:

> The activity proved to be productive, substantive and collegial, but this does not obscure the central **fact** that the Conference on Disarmament remains blocked and that we are no closer to FMCT negotiations today than we were two years ago… (Gottemoeller1:12)

The second occurrence of displays of emotion was presented by The U.S. ambassador to the UN Susan Rice (Rice1:20):"**In fact**, the United States is a major source of humanitarian assistance to the Cuban people and the largest provider of food to Cuba"

Dialogue – Decision

The style of dialogue and decision of male and female representatives were fairly similar. Even though there were differences in the frequency of both dialogue and decision segments the overall style of representatives of both sexes were both determined to be decision based. However, the differences were of an interesting nature, while both sexes had a high number of decision segments, the female representatives' speeches contained far more segments of dialogue.

The male representatives from both countries had an overall decision based rhetorical style. In the case of Swedish male representatives however, the frequency of decision segments were almost twice as high as in the speeches by male representatives from the U.S. In regards to dialogue style segments, the speeches held by representatives from both countries had segments of dialogue in roughly half their speeches. The findings of the different segments in total of the two countries were 84 segments of decisive language and only ten segments of dialogue language.

As summarized the section above, the style of Swedish male representatives were very centered on decision, rather than on dialogue. The most common decision styled segments contained the words 'should', 'must' or 'need'. 54 out of the 57 segments of decision language in the case of Swedish male representatives contained one of the three words. The segments of dialogue language were not as homogenous, and, in comparison with the decision segments were quite diverse.

The following quotes by male Swedish representatives display some of the types of dialogue style statements. The first one by Grunditz (Grunditz2:3) display an opinion of what should be done without impelling the actors to a specific action: "We **encourage** the international community and the United Nation to continue to enhance their accountability to…" The word encourage in this sentence displays a sentiment of motivation and support rather than an impelling of action. Grunditz displays the same sentiment later in the same speech with the following wording (Grunditz2:3): "We also **welcome efforts** under way to develop international accountability mechanisms within the United Nations system." As with the previous quote this wording displays support. A decision way to phrase the same actual meaning could be *we believe that the development of the international accountability mechanisms **must** continue* which would impel actors to action rather than display support and motivation.

As with the previous quotes, the following quote by Örnéus (Örneus2:5) displays a dialogue style element, with sentiments of what could be done rather than what should: "The savings, we believe, **could** be used to improve the quality of those documents and their distribution to Member States" In addition to the word 'could', the word 'believe' also signifies dialogue style, through the uncertainty of ones believes.

The use of the word 'need', a decisive word, sees common use in the speeches of the Swedish representatives. Both the terms 'must' and 'need' along with 'should' see frequent use by

male Swedish representatives in comparison with other decision language. The following example is taken from Grunditz (Grunditz1:38) who presents a need for action: "We **need** to increase the capacity of the United Nations to help countries in transition from war to lasting peace…"While a softer embodiment of the decisive style than the *must* wordings, the *need* wording carry with them a undertone of decision made, and a single course of action as a solution to the problem.

The last word, along with 'need' and 'must', which has an eminent presence in the decision style segments, is the word 'should'. The following quote, from Swedish male representative Schori (Schori2:24), is similar to the most common way to use the word 'should': "Efforts **should** also be redoubled to finalize negotiations on a comprehensive convention on international terrorism…" While the word 'should' is not as strongly decision language as 'must' or 'need' the resulting tone of the segment is still decisive. As revealed in the previous quote, it is apparent that, Schori views an increase in action as the RIGHT course of action rather than a suggested one, resulting in a decisive segment.

The following quote by Örnéus (Örnéus1:6), much as the previous quote, displays a softer wording of the decision sentiment: "We **urge** States that have not yet done so to sign and bring their respective safeguards agreements into force…" The word **urge** speaks of the speakers need to impel a specific action from the actors. It is similar to the use of the word 'should' in that regard.

In contrast with the Swedish male representatives, the US male representatives' speeches contained far less elements of dialogue, roughly half. While decision elements among the speeches by men in the U.S. case were quite common, there were only rare elements of dialogue present. In the decisive segments, in the case of male U.S. representatives' speeches, the two most common words, with absolute majority of two thirds, were 'must' and 'should' along with 'urge'. Similarly to the case of Swedish male representatives, the speeches of U.S. male representatives' segments of dialogue was less homogenous that the segments of decision, though it contained more usage of the word 'encourage' than any other dialogue related word.

The following quote by U.S. male speaker, the Deputy U.S. Representative to ECOSOC UN John Sammis presents one of the rare cases of dialogue style elements in the speeches of male representatives from the U.S.:

> We **encourage** all donor and recipient nations to support global malaria control efforts through appropriate financial contributions and stronger political commitment. (Sammis1:28)

The encouragement, while providing a solution does not impel the other actors to act, which results in a dialogue toned style. The same type of wording was used in another rare case of U.S. male representatives by the U.S. ambassador to the UN Sichan Siv who twice in his speech displays dialogue elements:

> I take this opportunity to **encourage** other nations that have not already done so to sign and accede to this Agreement. (Siv1:18)

And a few sections later (Siv1:18): "We **encourage** other Governments to do the same, if possible before the 2003 meeting of the FAO Committee on Fisheries." The three previous quotes embody the entirety of the dialogue elements of the selected speeches by U.S. male representatives. As displayed further down, the lack is not due to any extreme amount of decision elements but rather the overall lack of suggestions and defensiveness in the U.S. speeches.

The male representatives of the U.S. tend to use the word 'must' to a great extent. The following quote, by the U.S. ambassador to the UN Zalamay Khalilzad portrays a typical use of the word must:

> We **must** entrust our citizens with greater freedom so that they can use it to correct the injustices and violations that stand in the way of the realization of human rights for all. (Khalilzad1:17)

Another type is portrayed below in a quote by Negroponte (Negroponte1:3): "Our ambitions for this dialogue **should** be great." As explained previously, the word 'should' impel action on the part of the audience. The third and last common type of decision style element used by male U.S. representatives is the elements containing the word 'urge'. The following quote by Khalilzad displays the type in use:

> We **urge** Member States to respond to Afghan Government and United Nations appeals to avoid a worsening humanitarian situation this winter. (Khalilzad2:19)

Though the three previous quotes embody the three most common types of decision style segment wording there are other present in the selected speeches by male U.S. representatives, including the wording 'need to', 'call on' and 'cannot be'.

In comparison with the male representatives of both countries, the female representatives of both countries had a more dialogue-focused style. However, if the rhetorical style of the

female representatives was to be determined it would have a closer proximity to the ideal type of decision than that of dialogue. However, the female representatives displayed less decision segments and more dialogue segments than the male representatives did.

Similar to the Swedish male representatives, the female Swedish representatives' displays far more features of decision than dialogue. Though the female Swedish representatives appeared to display decision segments to a staggering degree initially, when adjusted for length of the speech they displayed less decision segments than male Swedish representatives. The presence of segments of dialogue was also higher in the Swedish female representatives' speeches. Only three out of ten speeches lacked any segments of dialogue, and five out of ten speeches had at least two such segments in the case of female Swedish representatives.

The most common style of dialogue style segments used by female Swedish representatives' use the word 'could'. The following quote by Borsiin Bonnier represents one such segment of dialogue language:

> We could also be a lot more flexible in utilizing the interrelationship and possible interaction between the various parts of the machinery and between different United Nations forums. (Borsiin1:10)

Even though the statement contains clear courses of action, which the General Assembly and the UN could act upon, Borsiin Bonnier only presents them as possible actions. While the above presented style of segment of dialogue is the most common there is other, though not as common. They often include words such as 'believe', which implies a consideration for the opinion of other people.

The following quote and the following sentence imply a course of action and is a clear display of a decision segment. Borsiin Bonnier (Borsiin2:5) goes on: "As an interim measure, the operational status of nuclear weapon systems **should be** reduced." It is clear from the style, that the speaker views their course of action as the correct one, as explained in the theory chapter. The following quote displays a different wording of the same style, using the word 'must'. Both the 'should' and the 'must' has a high presence in the Swedish representative's speeches. The following quote by Lindh displays an interesting point:

> We must provide hope of freedom for the oppressed, education for the illiterate, food for the hungry, health care for the sick and equality for women. (Lindh2:3)

While Lindh displays actions that must be done, and as if they are self-evident, they are a matter of ideology, resulting in an extreme statement of decision style.

The overall pattern of usage of decision and dialogue segments in the speeches of female U.S. representatives where slightly more tilted to the dialogue style than the style of Swedish female representatives. A higher degree of dialogue segments was found in the case of U.S. female representatives than in the case of Swedish female representatives though there were more speeches lacking dialogue segments over all. Only five out of ten speeches contained any dialogue segments, but when compared with Swedish female representatives and adjusting for the length of speeches, the overall usage of dialogue segments were higher. In the case of decision style segments, the U.S. female representatives' speeches contained roughly half the frequency of segments that the Swedish female representatives' speeches did. Remarkably there were also speeches with barely any dialogue or decision segments and two speeches entirely without any such segments.

The following quote by U.S. female representative Halpern displays a dialogue element also found in a speech by Rice:

> We **hope** that the Programme will continue to expand and provide the necessary resources to counter intolerance and hatred while promoting understanding and respect. (Halpern1:30)

While the word *hope* is used repetitively, it does not always signify a dialogue element. The sentences where it is used to convey a hope of an outcome rather than a hope for a specific action it is not deemed a dialogue element.

The following quote by Rice displays another dialogue style element:

> Positive measures **could** include liberating the hundreds of prisoners of conscience in Cuban jails, ratifying the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, reducing the excessive charges on remittances flowing into the country, demonstrating greater respect for freedom of speech, ending the practice of arresting political opponents on vague and arbitrary charges such as "social dangerousness" and permitting visits of United Nations rapporteurs on human rights and torture. (Rice1:20)

One significant feature of the previous quote is the nature of the actions, which Rice recommends to cube. Either of the actions could have been posted as a demand, using the word *must* but instead they are presented only as possibilities, indicating a dialogue style. The same type of statement is also displayed by Gottemoeller.

As with the previous type of dialogue elements, the following dialogue style element is also incorporated in Rice's speeches:

> We **believe** that any resolution commenting on the relationship between Cuba and the United States of America **should** reflect those constructive developments. (Rice1:19)

While the word 'should' is usually considered an element of decision style, in combination with 'we believe' it opens up for the refuting of the statement, making the whole sentence a dialogue style formulation. While there are more dialogue style elements in the female speeches than in the male speeches by U.S. representatives, there are still less than the decisive segments.

The following quote, also by Rice, displays the revered, decision element, in one of its forms:

> To make progress on this pillar, **we must** resolve legitimate grievances peacefully and strive to foster good governance, reduce poverty and corruption and improve education, health and basic services. (Rice2:19)

The quote is a fairly common representation of the use of decision style elements, though the fact that Rice, one of the most frequent users of dialogue style, said it, served to display the rarity of one side elements being exclusively used. In a less norm ruled setting it would likely be possible to find a speaker using an exclusively feminine, dialogue style. However in the UNGA, Rice's style is to be considered as a rather dialogue-based style.

The following quote, from another female U.S. representative, Kennedy, displays one of the more common types of decision styled elements used by female U.S. representatives in the selected speeches (Kennedy1:12): "This **should** include efforts to strengthen and improve BWC confidence-building measures…" As explained in the case of Sweden, the word 'should' signify a lesser demand for action, although still a demand, resulting in it being a decision element. Further on, in the same speech, Kennedy also displays a different type of decision element, the word 'must', which is also commonly used by female U.S. representatives:

> We **must** work together to support the great promise of the revolution in the life sciences, while taking steps to guard against misuse (Kennedy1:11)

The third type of decision style element is also found in the same speech by Kennedy (Kennedy1:12): "We **urge** all Members of the United Nations to join in this unequivocal rejection of the use of disease as a weapon." As with the previous quote the 'urge' element

have likewise been explained in the case of Sweden. It is a weak case of the speaker impelling the audience to action. However, the fact that it is an implement signifies it as a decision style element.

The speeches that lacked any segments of either dialogue or decision are an interesting case of style vacuum. Both speeches entirely lacking such segments where held by Ambassador House. The likely reason of the lacking of either decision or dialogue style in both the speeches is the form of the speeches. Rather than speeches they are statements of the position of the U.S, therefore neither demanding, encouraging nor suggesting actions to be taken by her peers.

VII. Conclusion: The Results of the Study and the Next Step

The purpose of the thesis were to see whether typical differences in speech between men and women could be found in a typically norm dominated sphere such as foreign policy. This thesis explored the question by establishing the specifics of the difference in speech between the genders and later comparing speeches held at the UN by male and female representatives of Sweden and the U.S:

- Do female foreign policy representatives display a style of language, which fit the norms of the institutions?
- Or do women speak differently even in the highly normative and masculinized institution of foreign policy?

In the analysis of the speeches, it became evident that there were only minor differences in speech between genders existed in the speeches held at the UN. The overall differences of men and women was generally of such a nature that was to be expected resulting in a conclusion that the differences in rhetorical style between men and women generally exists. Below, one major deviation of the results will be hypothetically. In regards to the question concerning the difference in style between cultures of different level of masculinity the result was similar to that of the differences in rhetorical style between genders of the speakers, small differences, but generally in the expected direction according to the theoretical tool. As with the differences in rhetorical styles between the genders, the differences in rhetorical style between the two nations contained small curiosities in result. As such, the female foreign policy representatives display a certain degree of feminine language although it is less than the traditional gender style difference, which could be a result of adapted speech in order to fit the norms of the institutions. However, any actual claims regarding this cannot be made.

One of the differences between the rhetorical style of men and women were that male representatives, tended to use a more formal style of speech than female representatives according to the overall findings. However, female representatives of the U.S. displayed more frequently formal language than the Swedish male representatives. The reason behind the conclusion regarding relation – distance was due to the great amount of relational segments found in the female representatives of Sweden's speeches.

Another difference was the absence of antagonism in male speeches whereas there was a significant presence in the speeches held by female representatives, which presents one of the most interesting results of this thesis. The fact that both Mral (1999) and Thelander (1986)

established a difference in the rate of antagonism, between men and women with the reverse relation has several possible explanations. The first explanation is related to the selection of data, the fact that women generally held fewer and shorter speeches at the UNGA resulted in speeches by women higher up in the hierarchy than the selected speeches held by men. People higher up in the hierarchy could be more inclined to antagonize than those with a less lofty position in the hierarchy.

Another possible explanation of the differences in the hierarchy could be the type of women attracted to a career in foreign policy is generally more aggressive and prone to antagonism than the typical type of men attracted to the foreign policy arena. The same type of aggressiveness might be found in speeches by men in spheres such as homeland security or defense. Another possible explanation is the possibility of the need for women to antagonize their opponents to be respected professionally to the same extent as a non-antagonistic man. This could be a result of the lingering fragments of the androcentric norms of the foreign policy sphere, norms deeming women as unfit to serve in politics due to their weak nature.

This thesis attempted to contribute towards the existing gap in the literature regarding a lack of research on foreign policy representatives' rhetorical style in relation to gender. The findings of this thesis, filling the gap, indicate that there is only a small difference between the genders, specifically that men used a more masculine style of language whereas women used a slightly feminine one. Further research, with other criteria's for the different elements are encouraged and could additionally enhance the findings of this thesis.

Future research could include a greater study of the rhetoric of the United Nations, from a greater temporal perspective to determine if the culture of rhetoric has changed during the last three decades. Another line of study could test the frequency and length of the speeches held at the UN in regards to gender to observe if there are any inequalities in that regard. This is due to an unproven hunch of this thesis authors, developed in the data gathering process, which female representatives at the UN tend to focus on short remarks, while male representatives hold longer addresses.

One political implication of our findings is that it is apparent that the masculine norms still dominate the area for foreign policy, as argued by Enloe (1990). The small difference that the entrance of women has resulted in, in regards to communication can have great effect on foreign policy and foreign affairs. This is due to the granting of personality to the fields of politics, making it accessible to ordinary citizens to participate and understand. The entrance

of the ordinary citizens will give the field a new twist of political ideas, moving the field of foreign policy away from the stark view of the world held by realists.

Another political implication of the results produced is the nullifying of a presumption. The presumption supported by Slaughter (2012) that the foreign policy sphere would, if enough women entered, change at a fundamental level and conflict would become rare or non-existent. The results regarding antagonism seem to indicate otherwise, that the entrance of women into the foreign policy sphere is unlikely to provide an instant solution to the problem of conflicts. However, as theorized above, there are many possible explanations, of which only three are presented here, to why women analyzed in this thesis were more prone to antagonism, leaving the implication less than certain.

VIII. Footnotes

1: Rhetoric stems from ancient Greece, with the first major work conducted by Aristotle. The word rhetoric itself consists of the meaning of art or skill of an experienced political/public speaker

2: United States, among other legislations, signed the Equal pay act of 1963. Sweden has anti-gender discrimination legislation such as Diskrimineringslagen (2008:567).

3: Other than formal language.

4: Only three out of ten speeches lacked any including components. Five out of ten speeches had five or more including components present. The following Speeches are presented in falling order of which contained the most inclusive elements, adjusted for length of speech: Grunditz2, Schori1, Lidén2, Schori2, Hellgren1, Örnéus2, Örnéus1, Hellgren2, Lidén1.

5: Örnéus2 contained no including components

6: Lidén1, Hellgren2 and, Örnéus1

7: Hellgren2 and Örnéus1 contained no segments of the word 'we'

8: McMahan2 and Sammis1 had no inclusive components

9: Khalilzad1 was the only male US speech with confrontational components

10: Half of the speeches displayed 'our'

11: 16 out of 38 including segments was displayed by the word 'we'

12: The following speeches are presented in falling order of which contained the most inclusive elements, adjusted for length of speech: Borsiin1, Ström1, Lindh2, Lindh1, Hjelm-Wallén2, Ugglas2, Borsiin2, Hjelm-Wallén1, Ugglas2 and Ström2.

13: All selected speeches by female Swedish representatives except for Ström2 contained including forms of the word 'we'.

14: The following speeches contained the including word 'us': Lindh1, Lindh2, Ugglas1, Ugglas2, Hjelm-Wallén2 and Borsiin1

15: Antagonism was present in the speeches Lindh1, Lindh2, Ugglas2 and Hjelm-Wallén2

16: The speeches House1 and Kennedy2 contained no including elements

17: Antagonism was present in the speeches House1, House2 Gottemoeller1, Rice1 and Halpern1

18: The speech Rice1 displayed no antagonism

19: Grunditz2, Lidén1 and Schori2 featured relational components

20: The following speeches displayed no elements of relation or distance: Hellgren2, Örnéus1, Schori1 and Lidén2

21: Siv1, Siv2 and Khalilzad2 featured relational components

22: No elements of relation was found in the following speeches: Lindh2, Ström2 and Borsiin2

23: The following speeches displayed no elements of relation or distance: Lindh2 and Borsiin2

24: The only Swedish female speeches displaying distancing elements was Hjelm-Wallén1, Borsiin1 and Ström2

25: The only US female speeches displaying relational elements was Gottemoeller1, Gottemoeller2, House1 and Kennedy1

26: The only US female speech with no distancing elements was Kennedy2

IX. Bibliography

Primary Sources

Sweden- Women

Borsiin1- Elisabeth Borsiin Bonnier in *United Nations record (A/C.1/60/PV.14),* 2005-10-18, New York. Page 9-11.

Borsiin2- Elisabeth Borsiin Bonnier in *United Nations record (A/C.1/59/PV.10),* 2004-10-18, New York. Page 5-6.

Hjelm-Wallén1- Lena Hjelm-Wallén in *United Nation record (A/53/PV.12)*, 1998-09-23. Page 32-35.

Hjelm-Wallén2- Lena Hjelm-Wallén in *United Nation record (A/52/PV10)*, 1997-09-24. Page 20-23.

Lindh1- Anna Lindh in *United Nations record (A/57/PV.16)*, 2002-09-19. Page 7-10.

Lindh2- Anna Lindh in *United Nations record (A/56/PV.50),* 2001-09-13.Page 32-35.

Ström1- Ulla Ström in *United Nations record (A/61/PV.98),* 2007-05-21. Page 20-21.

Ström2- Ulla Ström in *United Nations record (A/61/PV.107),* 2007-09-13. Page 24-25.

Ugglas1- Margareta af Ugglas in *United Nations record (A/47/PV.7),* 1992-09-30. Page 84-97.

Ugglas2- Margareta af Ugglas in *United Nations record (A/46/PV.29),* 1991-10-16. Page 71- 83.

Sweden- Men

Grunditz1- Mårten Grunditz in *United Nations record (A/65/PV.22),* 2010-09-28. page 36-39.

Grunditz2- Mårten Grunditz in *United Nations record (A/66/PV.85)*, 2011-12-14. Page 2-4.

Hellgren1- Magnus Hellgren in *United Nations record (A/C.1/64/PV.18),* 2009-10-23. Page 1-2.

Hellgren2- Magnus Hellgren in *United Nations record (A/C.1/64/PV.19),* 2009-10-27. Page 7-8.

Lidén1- Anders Lidén in *United Nations record (A/53/PV.41),* 1998-10-21. Page 22-23.

Lidén2- Anders Lidén in *United Nations record (A/63/PV.105),* 2009-09-14. Page 18-19.

Schori1- Pierre Schori in *United Nations record (A/58/PV.26),* 2003-10-07. Page 9-10.

Schori2- Pierre Schori in *United Nations record (A/56/PV.16),* 2001-10-03. Page 22-24.

Örnéus1- Per Örnéus in *United Nations record (A/64/PV.33)*, 2009-11-02. Page 5-6.

Örnéus2- Per Örnéus in *United Nations record (A/64/PV.48),* 2009-11-19. Page 4-5.

USA- Women

Gottemoeller1- Rose Gottemoeller in *United Nations record (A/65/PV.113)*, 2011-07-27. Page 12-13.

Gottemoeller2- Rose Gottemoeller in *United Nations record (A/C.1/66/PV.4)*, 2011-10-04. Page 11-13.

Halpern1-Cheryl Halpern in *United Nations record (A/63/PV.37),* 2008-11-03. Page 29-30.

Halpern2- Cheryl Halpern in *United Nations record (A/63/PV.67),* 2008-12-11. Page 14-15.

House1- Karen House in *United Nations record (A/63/PV.60)*, 2008-11-26. Page 1-2.

House2- Karen House in *United Nations record (A/C.1/63/PV.12),* 2008-10-20. Page 3-4

Kennedy1- Laura Kennedy in *United Nations record (A/C.1/66/PV.13)*, 2011-10-17. Page 10-12.

Kennedy2 –Laura Kennedy in *United Nations record (A/C.1/66/PV.15),* 2011-10-18. Page 2-3.

Rice1- Susan Rice in *United Nations record (A/64/PV.27),* 2009-10-28. Page 19-20.

Rice2- Susan Rice in *United Nations record (A/64/PV.116),* 2010-09-08 . Page 19-20.

USA- Men

Khalilzad1- Zalamay Khalilzad in *United Nations record (A/63/PV.65),* 2008-12-10. Page 16-17.

Khalilzad2- Zalamay Khalilzad in *United Nations record (A/63/PV.42)*, 2008-11-10. Page 19-20.

McMahan1- Vance McMahan in *United Nations record (A/62/PV.113)*, 2008-07-18. Page 22-23.

McMahan2- Vance McMahan in *United Nations record (A/63/PV.19)*, 2008-10-03. Page 8-9.

Negroponte1- John Negroponte in *United Nations record (A/56/PV.43),* 2001-11-09. Page 1-3.

Negroponte2- John Negroponte in *United Nations record (A/58/PV.32),* 2003-10-15. Page 15-16.

Sammis1- John Sammis in *United Nations record (A/66/PV.32),* 2011-10-11. Page 26-28.

Sammis2- John Sammis in *United Nations record (A/63/PV.89),*2009-06-16. Page 8-9.

Siv1- Sichan Siv in *United Nations record (A/56/PV.65),*2001-11-27. Page 17-19.

Siv2- Sichan Siv in *United Nations record (A/60/PV.51),* 2005-11-15. Page 14-16.

Secondary Sources

Non-academic Sources

Slaughter, Anne-Marie (2012) "Why Family Is a Foreign-Policy Issue" in *Foreign Policy Magazine* December 2012.

Academic Sources

Allison, Rachel (2011). "Race, Gender and Attitudes towards war in Chicago. An Intersectional Analysis" *Sociological Forum* 26(3): 668-691.

Bashevkin, Sylvia (2009). "Party Talk: Assessing the Feminist Rhetoric of Women Leadership Candidates in Canada" *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 42(2): 345-362.

Bergström, Göran & Boréus, Kristina (2005) "Lingvistisk textanalys" in *Textens mening och makt*, Göran Bergström & Kristina Boréus, ed. Lund: Studentlitteratur AB, 263-305.

Bergström, Göran & Boréus, Kristina (2005) "Argumentationsanalys" in *Textens mening och makt*, Göran Bergström & Kristina Boréus, ed. Lund: Studentlitteratur AB, 89-149.

Bendyna, Mary E, Finucane, Tamara. (1996) "Gender differences in public attitudes toward the Gulf War: A test of competing hypothesis" *Social Science Journal* 33(1): 1-22.

Bligh Michelle & Merolla Jennifer & Schroedel Jean Reith & Gonzalez Randall (2010) "Finding her voice:Hillary Clinton's rhetoric in the 2008 presidential campaign" *Women's Studies* 39: 823-850

Bradley, Patricia Hayes (1981) "The folk-linguistics of women's speech: An empirical examination" *Communication Monographs* 48(1): 73-90.

Bryman, Alan (2008). *Social Research Methods*, 3rd edition. New York: Oxford University Press

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs & , Jamieson, Kathleen Hall (2008). *Presidents creating the Presidency*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs & Huxman, Susan Schultz (2009). *The Rhetorical Act, Thinking, Speaking & Writing Critically*, 3rd edition. Belmont. Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs (1989). *Man cannot Speak for Her, Volume I, A Critical study of Early Feminist Rhetoric.* Westport. Praeger Publisher.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs (1989). *Man cannot Speak for Her, Volume II, Key texts of the Early Feminists.*Westport. Praeger Publisher.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs (1994). *Women Public Speakers in the United States, 1925-1993, A Bio-critical Sourcebook*. Westport. Greenwood press.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs (1999[1971]) "The rhetoric of women's liberation: An oxymoron" *Communication Studies* 50(2):125-137.

Condit, Celeste M (1997) "In Praise of Eloquent Diversity: Gender and Rhetoric as Public Persuasion" *Women's Studies in Communication* 20(2): 91-116.

Dow, Bonnie J. & Tonn, Mari Boor (1993) "Feminine style" and political judgment in the rhetoric of Ann Richards" *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 79(3): 286-302.

Enloe, Cynthia (1990) *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International* Politics.University of California Press.

Esaiasson, Peter & Gilljam, Mikael & Oscarsson, Henrik & Wängnerud, Lena (2012) *Metodpraktikan.* Stockholm. Norstedts Juridik.

Fahey, Anna Cornelia (2007) "French and Feminine: Hegemonic Masculinityand the Emasculation of John Kerry in the 2004 Presidential Race" *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 24(2): 132-150.

Fite, David & Genest, Marc & Wilcox, Clyde (1990) "Gender Difference in Foreign Policy Attitudes, a Longitudinal Analysis" *American Politics Quarterly* 18(4): 492-513.

Gibson, Katie L & Heyse, Amy L (2010) "The Difference Between a Hockey Mom and a Pit Bull: Sarah Palin's Faux Maternal Persona and Performance of Hegemonic Masculinity at the 2008 Republican National Convention" *Communication Quarterly* 58(3): 235-256.

Holmes, Janet (1995). *Women, men, and politeness*. New York. Longman

Holsti, Ole R & Rosenau, James N (1990) "The structure of Foreign Policy Attitudes among American Leaders" *Journal of politics* 52: 94-125.

House.gov (2012) "Women Representatives and Senators by State and Territory, 1917–Present", United States of America House of Representatives Official Website. Available from http://history.house.gov/Exhibitions-and-Publications/WIC/Historical-Data/Women-Representatives-and-Senators-by-State-and-Territory/ (accessed on April 5, 2013).

Hyde, Janet S & Linn, Marcia C (1988) "Gender Differences in Verbal Ability: A Meta-Analysis" *Psychological Bulletin* 104(1): 53-69.

Hofstede, Geert (1998) *Masculinity and Femininity: The Taboo Dimension of National Cultures*. Thousand Oaks, California, USA : SAGE Publications, Inc.

Johnson, Danette I (2005) "Feminine style in presidential debate discourse, 1960–2000" *Communication Quarterly* 53(1): 3-20.

Koch, Michael T & Fulton, Sarah A (2011) "In the Defense of Women: Gender, Office Holding, and National Security Policy in Established Democracies" *Journal of Politics* 73(1): 1-16.

Lake, Marilyn & Holmes, Katie & Grimshaw, Patricia (2000). "Introduction" in *Women's Rights and Human Rights.* Patricia Grimshaw, Katie Holmes and Marilyn Lake, ed. Gordonsville: PALEGRAVE MACMILLAN.

Leach, Joan (2000). "Rhetorical Analysis" in *Qualitative Researching with text, Image and Sound*, Martin W. Bauer and George Gaskell, ed. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Lunsford, Andrea A.(1995). *Reclaiming Rhetorica, Women in the Rhetorical Tradition*. Pittsburgh. Pittsburgh University Press.

Manson-Sutherland, Christine & Sutcliffe, Rebecca (1999) *The Changing Tradition, Women in the History of Rhetoric*. Calgary. University of Calgary Press.

Martin, Diane .M (2004): *Balancing on the political high wire: The role of humor in the rhetoric of Ann Richards*, Southern Communication Journal, 69(4): 273-288.

McGlen, Nancy E. and Meredith Reid Sarkees (2001) "Foreign Policy Decision Makers: The Impact of Gender" in *The Impact of Women in Public Office*, Susan J. Carroll, ed. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 117-48.

Mieder, Wolfgang (2009). *Barack Obama's Proverbial Rhetoric*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing

Mral, Brigitte (1999). *Talande kvinnor, Kvinnliga retoriker från Aspasia till Ellen Key*. Nora. Bokförlaget Nya Doxa.

Mral, Brigitte (2011). *Talande kvinnor, Kvinnliga retoriker från Aspasia till Ellen Key*. 2nd ed. Nora. Bokförlaget Nya Doxa.

Nincic Miroslav & Nincic Donna J (2002) "Race, Gender, and War" *Journal of Peace Research* 39(5): 547-568.

Pennington, Dorthy (2011) "The "Rhetorical Condition" as Mediator in the Response of Africa Americans to Perceptions of Terrorism: Condoleezza Rice as Symbol" *Howard Journal of Communication* 22(2): 123-139.

Peterson, Spike V & Runyan, Anne Sisson (1999) *Global Gender Issues*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Statistiska Central Byrån (2012) "Publikation om jämnställdhet", Central Bureau of Statistics in Sweden. Available from http://www.scb.se/statistik/_publikationer/LE0001_2012K01_TI_07_A05TI1201.pdf (accessed on April 5, 2013).

Shapiro, Robert Y & Mahajan, Harpreet (1986) "Gender Difference in Policy Preferences: A summary of Trends from the 1960s to the 1980s" *The Public Opinion Quaterly* 50(1): 42-61.

Singh, Sameer (2001) "A Pilot Study on Gender Differences in Conversational Speech on Lexical Richness Measures" *Lit Linguist Computing* 16(3): 251-264.

Stephens, Jane (2003) "The Rhetoric of Women's Leadership: Language, Memory and Imagination*" Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies* 9(3): 45-60.

Tannen, Deborah (1986/1994) *Det var inte så jag menade!*. Norge: AiT Trondheim AS. [Original Title: *That's not what I meant!]*

Tannen, Deborah (1990/1993) *Du begriper ju ingenting*. Norge: AiT Trondheim AS. [Original Title: *You just don't understand*]

Thelander, Kerstin (1986). *Politikerspråk i Könsperspektiv*. Liber förlag. Malmö

Togeby, Lise (1994) "The gender gap in foreign policy attitudes" *Journal of Peace Research* 31(4): 375-392.

Von der Lippe, Berit & Väyrynen, Tarja (2011) "Co-opting feminist voice for the war on terror: Laura Bush meets Nordic feminism" *European Journal of Women's studies* 18(1): 19-33.

Walsh, Clare (1998) "Gender and mediatized political discourse: a case study of press coverage of Margaret Beckett's campaign for the Labour leadership in 1994" *Language and Literature* 7(3): 199-214.

World Bank (2012) "Gender equality and development" in *World Development Report 2012*

Zarefsky, David (2004). "George W. Bush Discovers Rhetoric" in *The Ethos of Rhetoric*, Michael J. Hyde, ed. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press.