

**People's Democratic Republic of Algeria**

**Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research**

**Hamma Lakhdar University of El-Oued**

**Faculty of Arts and Languages**

**Department of Arts and English Language**



**Gendered Expectations and Political Identity: Analysis of Feminine  
and Masculine Language Styles in U.S. Election Speeches**

**Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for  
Master's Degree in Literature and Civilization**

**Submitted by:**

BEN AICHA Khaoula

FOUROU Soumia

**Supervised by:**

**Dr. NESBA Kaouther**

**Board of Examiners:**

**Dr. YUCEF Kouider**

**President**

University of El-Oued

**Dr. NESBA Kaouther**

**Supervisor**

University of El-Oued

**Dr. HEZBRI Mouna**

**Examiner**

University of El-Oued

**Academic year: 2024/2025**

## **Dedication**

First of all, all praise be to Allah for all blessings, and praise be to God for achieving the goal and completing this dissertation. I dedicate my dissertation to:

My mother for her support,

My husband, my pillars of strength,

My children and to my sister, who always stand by me,

All my friends and to those who have been guiding and support me.

*“FOUROU Soumia”*

First of all, all praise be to Allah and praise be to Allah for reach to our goal.

This work is dedicated to: the source of my support, encouragement, love, and strength to my family, my parents, my husband, my family in law and my little son who always give me courage and hope.

*“BEN AICHA Khaoula”*

## **Acknowledgements**

In the name of Allah, The Most Gracious, the Most Merciful. We thank Almighty God for paving us the way to complete this work.

We would like to thank our supervisor, **Dr. NESBA Kaouther** for her guidance, support, scientific rigor, and hard work during the research process.

Our thanks and appreciations also go to English Department at The University of El Oued and to all our teachers who taught us over the tow last years.

Finally, our sincere thanks are extended to the jury members for their detailed reviews and evaluation of this research. We value your perspectives and input.

## **Abstract**

The current research aims to investigate how gendered language in U.S. elections discourses reflect and reinforce societal expectations about political identity through comparing feminine and masculine communication styles. This study uses a qualitative content analysis to examine textual data that taken from selected feminine and masculine political speeches. Additionally, this study applies textual framing analysis which examines the gender-based campaign speeches of Hillary Clinton, kamala Harris, Donald Trump and Joe Biden during the 2016 and 2020 in U.S. election. The results reveal that political candidates face distinct gendered expectations: women confront a double bind, perceived as inadequately authoritative when conforming to femininity or penalized as aggressive when embracing masculine traits. Conversely, male candidates operationalized gendered norms with greater flexibility. Trump's hyper-masculine rhetoric reinforced hegemonic masculine ideals, while Biden's measured empathy illustrated men's capacity to adopt compassionate traits without diminishing credibility. This reveals that entrenched inequities: men incorporate feminized communication styles without reputational cost, whereas women face backlash for deviating from prescribed roles. Limited to a specific timeframe and single national context, this analysis highlights systemic inequities in leadership access, emphasizing how rigid societal perceptions of gender perpetuate barriers to equitable political representation.

**Keywords:** Double bind, Gendered language, Hegemonic masculinity, Leadership representation, Political communication.

## List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

Abbreviation	Word/Phrase
U.S.	United States

## **List of Tables**

<b>Table 1.1</b> Key Characteristics of Gender Theory .....	9
<b>Table 1.2</b> Key Characteristics of Societal Role Theory .....	10
<b>Table 1.3</b> Key Concepts of Feminist Theory .....	15

## Table of Contents

Dedication .....	I
Acknowledgements .....	II
Abstract .....	III
List of Tables .....	IV
Table of Contents .....	VI
General Introduction .....	1

### **Chapter One: Gendered Language and Political Communication**

Introduction .....	8
1.1 Theoretical Foundations .....	8
1.1.1 Gender Theory and Social Role Theory .....	8
1.1.2 Political Communication and Framing Theory .....	11
1.1.2.1 Framing Theory and Gendered Expectations .....	12
1.1.2.2 Sociolinguistics and Genderlect Theory .....	12
1.1.2.3 Stereotype Content Model .....	13
1.1.2 Gender Schema Theory .....	13
1.1.2.1 Feminist Political Theory .....	14

1.1.3 Linguistic Relativity .....	16
1.2 Gender Language Styles .....	18
1.2.1 Feminine Language Styles .....	19
1.2.2 Masculine Language Styles .....	19
1.2.3 Intersectionality: Race, class, and Gender in Language Use .....	20
1.3 Gendered Expectations in Political Communication .....	21
1.3.1 Male Candidates and Gendered Language .....	22
1.3.2 Female Candidates and Gendered language .....	23
Conclusion .....	24

## **Chapter Two: Gendered Language Styles in U.S. Presidential Elections**

**(2016 & 2020)**

Introduction .....	25
2.1 Characteristics of Feminine Language Styles and Analysis .....	25
2.1.1 Communicative Language .....	25
2.1.2 Use of Personal Storytelling and Relational Language .....	26
2.1.3 Empathetic Communication .....	28
2.1.4 Strategic Implications .....	29
2.1.5 The Collaborative and Inclusive Framing .....	31
2.1.6 Focus on Social Issues and Community .....	33

2.2. Masculine Language Styles .....	36
2.2.1. Assertiveness .....	36
2.2.2. Authoritative Language .....	37
2.2.3 Competitive Language .....	39
2.2.4. Instrumental Focus .....	42
2.3. Comparative Study between Feminine Language Style and Masculine Language Style in U.S. Election Speeches .....	46
Conclusion .....	49
General Conclusion .....	50
References .....	52
Appendices .....	69
Appendix A. List of Male and Female Presidential Speeches .....	69
الملخص .....	61

# General Introduction

## 1. Background of the Study

In the past, political language was dominated by men, which made competition, direction, and assertion extremely valued. Male politicians emphasized power and authority in their speeches through the use of commanding rhetoric. This traditional gender style reinforced the idea that leadership was associated with dominance. Therefore, political discourse reflected masculine traits. When more women entered politics, they introduced new and different communication strategies that emphasized empathy and collaboration. Women politicians often focused on consensus-building and persuasion rather than combative language. Their styles challenged traditional values and influenced political discourse. However, this female style faced criticism because it deviated from expected gender norms.

Nowadays, both male and female politicians focus on balancing strength and reliability. Many male politicians have adopted more empathetic rhetoric, while female politicians have embraced assertion. However, gender still has its influence based on societal expectations. These codes in political language are very important because they reflect broader changes in gender roles and expectations in society (Eagly & Karau, 2002).

The growth of communication styles in politics demonstrates progress in leadership. However, gendered expectations remain a challenge, shaping how politicians are judged. There is a need for equal treatment of various leadership styles in political spaces through an understanding of these changes. Social expectations stereotyped men and women behaviors and speech. Women are often expected to be kind, nurturing, and empathetic, while men are traditionally seen as strong, decisive, and assertive. These expectations play a crucial role in

shaping political communications during election campaigns. Female candidates often reinforce teamwork, collaboration, and community-building to appeal to voters. In contrast, male candidates shape their leadership through strength, independence, and decisiveness, reinforcing traditional masculinity. This difference in strategy reflects both individual choices and broader societal pressures (Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993).

Jamieson (1995) suggests that women politicians face the "double bind," which means they are criticized for being too soft, while male politicians would be seen negatively for using authority in ways perceived as inappropriate for women. These biases affect how voters assess candidates' leadership. The impact of gender on political communication is important because it highlights the ways in which social norms shape leadership expectations. By challenging traditions, society can promote the idea that both men and women should be evaluated based on their policies and competencies rather than gender norms. Gender reshapes public perceptions of politicians and how they are judged. Societies impose different expectations on men and women. This makes the situation difficult for politicians to communicate in a way that pleases all components of society.

Women politicians face disadvantages due to the double bind, where they are excluded and marginalized from the political sphere. Male leaders criticize the language of women; they are perceived as weak if they speak softly and aggressive or unlikeable if they speak firmly. These reasons force women politicians to control their behavior and their style of communication. U.S. politics is dominated by men and masculinity, so when male politicians show too much emotion, they are seen as weak. As a result, they cannot discuss issues like psychological problems without being judged (Lakoff, 1975).

The media plays a crucial role in shaping the image of politicians. It shows that the appearance of political candidates affects voter expectations (Smith & Johnson, 2020). It often evaluates women politicians based on their outfits and hair while paying attention to the behavior and stance of male politicians (Lee & Kim, 2019). This comparison influences public expectations and views toward candidates. The style of politicians is very important in shaping voter perceptions. Women are viewed as emotional and gentle, while men are portrayed as strong, assertive, and confident, reinforcing the idea that men are more organized and strict (Garcia et al., 2021). These biases shift public attention away from political issues. Voter perception helps politicians conduct their election campaigns effectively within society (Thompson & Clark, 2023). Addressing these challenges promotes equality and evaluates politicians based on their abilities rather than their appearances (Adams, 2022).

Social and journalistic media play an effective role in U.S. elections by attracting, motivating, and convincing undecided voters. Politicians use social media to communicate with voters (Nguyen & Patel, 2021). In previous decades, women politicians were underrepresented due to double binds (Eagly & Carli, 2007). They were expected to be gentle, soft, and kind, and they were often perceived as unable to address all social problems beyond women's interests (Martin, 2018). While male candidates had opportunities to be leaders, they were sometimes criticized for being too aggressive (Harris & Wilson, 2020). The media portrays politicians in different ways, directly affecting voter perceptions (Baker & Finch, 2019). It focuses on the appearance and personality of women rather than their abilities, discouraging political motivation and reinforcing stereotypes (Doe & Carter, 2022). Demonstrating the challenges of gendered language fosters a more equitable political landscape and promotes equality (White & Green, 2021).

## **2. Statement of the Problem**

In U.S. politics, language is a powerful tool for shaping voter perceptions. It is influenced by gendered expectations that dictate the speech manner candidates should follow. Masculine language styles are associated with strong leadership whereas feminine language styles are undervalued or penalized. That creates a "double bind" for female politicians. As women in politics is growing, there is limited research on how gendered language styles influence political identity and voter behavior. Therefore, the present study addresses this issue by analyzing the use of feminine and masculine language styles in political speeches and exploring their impact on political identity and perceptions.

## **3. Research Questions**

1. How do male and female candidates in U.S. election discourse deal with gendered expectation?
2. How does gendered language shape the political identity?

## **4. Aims of Study**

The study aims to examine the differences between feminine and masculine styles in U.S. election speeches and how gendered expectations shape political rhetoric. It explores the influence of voter perception and its relation to political identity and language use. Additionally, the research investigates how the media impacts gendered communication norms in political discourse. The study also focuses on the changes in language styles used by female and male politicians over time.

## **5. Significance of Study**

This study contributes to feminist sociolinguistics, which focuses on the relationship between gender, style of language, and Identity during the election campaigns. It illustrates how political candidates, linked by gendered expectations, use communication strategies that can reinforce or disrupt societal norms. The findings can provide strategies for political candidates to use language more effectively to challenge restrictive gender norms and promote balanced equitable political discourse.

## **6. Research Methodology**

The present study follows a qualitative approach to carefully analyze female and male language in U.S. election speeches to highlight the impact of the gendered language on the voters.

### **6.1 Sampling**

The researchers selected a four of candidates representing different gender identities and political backgrounds. Female candidates include figures such as: Hillary Clinton, Kamala Harris. Male candidates include: Donald Trump, and Joe Biden. Each represents distinct political ideologies and communication styles. This selection allows for a comparison of how feminine and masculine language styles are employed across genders and political contexts. By including candidates from both major political parties and varying levels of office (presidential and congressional), the study captures a spectrum of communication strategies, which enables a deeper understanding of how gendered expectations shape political identity and voter perceptions in the electoral arena.

### **6.2 Corpus**

A list of videos related to the gendered expectation and political identity: analysis Feminine and masculine language style in U.S. election speeches a long with their respective publication dates and link for references has been provided as part of the study corpus. For clarity and ease of reference, the entire table has been shown in Appendix A.

### **6.3 Data Collection**

This study adopts a qualitative data analysis approach to examine gendered expectations and political identity in U.S. election speeches. Both male and female speeches serve as primary data sources. The research includes campaign speeches, debates, party conversations, and public addresses. The study focuses on specific election shifts in language and style over time, such as the 2016 U.S. presidential election between Kamala Harris and Hillary Clinton and the 2020 election between Joe Biden and Donald Trump, highlighting gendered expectations and political identity. Female candidates like Hillary Clinton (2016) and male candidates like Joe Biden and Donald Trump provide insights into similarities and differences in speeches.

### **6.4 Data Analysis**

The study applies an analytical framework grounded in feminist sociolinguistics and textual framing analysis. Content Analysis is a way of studying texts by organizing words, phrases, or ideas to find patterns and meanings (Krippendorff, 2018). In this study, content analysis will be used to find differences between feminine and masculine ways of speaking in U.S. election speeches. For example, feminine language might include words show working together like "we" or "together" of feelings like "care" or "support", while masculine language might focus on competition like "win" or "strong" or clear thinking like "plan" or "strategy"(Lakoff, 1975).

Textual Framing Analysis is a method rooted in communication studies, examine how discourse selectively highlights or obscures aspects of reality to shape meaning (Entman, 1993). This method is especially relevant for examining gender-based campaign speech, as it uncovers how politicians strategically utilize verbal structure to align with stereotypical expectations of femininity and masculinity. For this study, textual framing analysis was used on public addresses by Clinton, Harris, Trump, Biden during the 2016 and 2020 U.S. election.

The study will analyze speeches linked to gendered expectations. The study also considers how politician mix these different ways of speaking to connect with voters and deal with gender stereotypes. For example, female politicians may use both strong words and friendly language to avoid being seen as "to aggressive" (Lawless, 2015).

## **7. Structure of the Study**

This dissertation contains one theoretical chapter and one empirical chapter. The first chapter provides an overview of gendered language and political communication. It also provides theoretical framework and it explores gendered expectations in politics. The second chapter focuses on practical application and it discusses feminine language styles through communicative and relational Language, empathetic and compassionate tone, collaborative and framing tone, and focus on social issues and community. Similarly, it examines masculine language style via assertiveness, authoritative, competitive language, and instrumental focus and how the candidates use the language to align with gender norms in their political identities.

## **CHAPTER ONE:**

# **Gendered Language and Political Communication**

# Chapter One: Gendered Language and Political Communication

Introduction .....	8
1.1 Theoretical Foundations .....	8
1.1.1 Gender Theory and Social Role Theory .....	8
1.1.2 Political Communication and Framing Theory .....	11
1.1.2.1 Framing Theory and Gendered Expectations .....	12
1.1.2.2 Sociolinguistics and Genderlect Theory .....	12
1.1.2.3 Stereotype Content Model .....	13
1.1.2 Gender Schema Theory .....	13
1.1.2.1 Feminist Political Theory .....	14
1.1.3 Linguistic Relativity .....	16
1.2 Gender Language Styles .....	18
1.2.1 Feminine Language Styles .....	19
1.2.2 Masculine Language Styles .....	19
1.2.3 Intersectionality: Race, class, and Gender in Language Use .....	20
1.3 Gendered Expectations in Political Communication .....	21
1.3.1 Male Candidates and Gendered Language .....	22
1.3.2 Female Candidates and Gendered language .....	23
Conclusion .....	24

## **Introduction**

Language is a crucial tool in political communication. It shows the methods through which leaders present themselves and how they are understood by their public. In U.S. election speeches, candidates use language to influence social and cultural expectations, especially regarding gender. This chapter shows the role of gender expectations in shaping political language and identity. It explores key theoretical structures that help clarifying why political candidates use particular linguistic styles and their effects on voters' views. The chapter sheds the light on feminist linguistic theory, sociolinguistics, and political communication research to examine how language functions as both an expression of and a reaction to gender standards. Also, this chapter presents a comparative analysis of feminine and masculine language styles in U.S. election speeches by examining previous studies and theoretical viewpoints.

### **1.1 Theoretical Foundations**

The theoretical foundations of this dissertation present gendered and political identity through feminine and masculine language styles in U.S. elections. These theories provide frameworks, such as gender theory, political communication, and sociolinguistics, to investigate how gendered language styles influence political identity, voters' views, and electoral results.

#### **1.1.1 Gender Theory and Social Role Theory**

In *Social Role Theory*, Eagly (1987) claims that social views form gendered behaviors and communication styles. According to this theory, women are adopted communal traits (e.g., assertiveness, and dominance). These views affect political communication, where female candidates are under pressure and they may feel weak due to the social norms while male candidates pose masculine language where they feel strong to align with traditional norms.

**Table 1.1 Key Characteristics of Gender Theory**

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Description</b>
Social construction of Gender	Gender theory argues that gender is not only a biological characteristic but it is a social construct. It posits that gender roles, norms, and identities are constructed by cultural and historical forces (Butler, 1990).
Performative Nature of Gender	The idea that gender is presented through language, behavior and appearance is a key feature of gender theory. Butler (1990) argues that gender is performed and this is reinforced by societal expectations and practices.
Focus on Power and Inequality	This theory demonstrates how gender is mixed between power dynamics and social hierarchies. It focuses on how language challenges systems of oppression like patriarchy and heteronormativity (lorber, 1994).
Fluidity and diversity	Gender theory highlights that gender is not male or female but exists on a spectrum. It challenges the traditional norms of gender by experiencing non binary, genderqueer, and transgender individuals (West & Zimmerman 1987).

Gender theory conceives gender as dynamic and fluid format that it is constructed through social communication. It emphasizes on the idea that gender identity is shaped by social norms and views rather than biology. For example, in political context, the theory highlights how

women candidates show their femininity through language (e.g., using of collaborative rhetoric and empathetic) and showing their leadership competence through using language of masculinity (Eagly & Carly, 2007). This challenge leads to “double bind” where female candidates face problems and seen as competent and likable (Jamieson, 1995).

**Table 1.2. Key Characteristics of Societal Role Theory**

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Description</b>
Role-based Explanation of Gender Differences	It is developed by Alise Eagly in 1987. It argues that gender diversities in behavior and communication in the society are shaped by their traditional roles.
Role Congruity	It is a key concept in Social Role Theory which is associated with the connection between individual’s behavior and the expectations of the gender role.
Focus on Stereotypes and Expectations	This theory demonstrates that stereotypes are appeared clearly in the society. It focuses on how candidates are evaluated in the domain of politics (Eagly & Wood, 2012).
Evolutionary and Cultural Influences	While it highlights how biology forms the roles of gender in society and it primarily emphasizes on the way these roles reinforce the societal and cultural reasons over time (Eagly & Wood, 2012).

Social Theory conceives gender as a series of roles that are constructed by societal and cultural norms. It argues that women and men have different social roles (e.g., men as breadwinners and women as caregivers). Men use assertive and masculine language, while women adopt nurturing and empathetic language, including politics. Female candidates may be evaluated as aggressive when they use masculine language (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Both theories offer insights into how gendered language styles are evaluated in American elections. For example, Gender Theory shows how female candidates such as Hillary Clinton and Kamala Harris present gender through the lens of language, making balance between assertiveness and the warmth to navigate societal views (Lawrence & Rose, 2010; Tolley, 2021), While Social Role Theory illustrates how voters examine the candidate's behaviors and gendered stereotypes. To illustrate, Donald Trump is rewarded because he used dominant language, while female candidates are criticized for the same behavior (Eagly & Karau, 2002).

### **1.1.2 Political Communication and Framing Theory**

Political communication is a very important tool to interact with and influence the voters' views (Connell, 2005). Traditional gendered language plays a critical role in this process. It is associated with femininity (e.g., communal, empathetic and collaborative) and masculinity (e.g., assertive, competitive, and authoritative). Studies argue that voters face challenges for understanding certain linguistic styles used by male and female candidates (Schneider & Boss, 2019). For example, female candidates who use more masculine language may be seen as competent but lacking warmth, while those who adopt a feminine style may be perceived as likable and less authoritative (Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993).

### **1.1.2.1 Framing Theory and Gendered Expectations**

Framing theory offers illustrations for understanding how language affects political communication. It is associated with the process by which candidates focus on specific aspects of an identity to shape public perceptions (Entman, 1993). In the context of gendered expectations, framing theory demonstrates how media and election cycles play crucial role in creating narratives about candidates' language styles which is associated with their competences or the traditional gendered norms. For instance, female candidates may use strong and compassionate communication style to show their competence and warmth ( Druckman et al ,2010).

Gendered framing theory shows how gendered language styles in U.S. election influence voters decisions, electoral success, the evaluation of candidates based on stereotypes, and the challenges of the traditional norms. For example, in 2020, U.S. presidential election, Kamala Harris used both masculine and feminine languages styles to maintain reliability (Byston et al.,2021).

### **1.1.2.2 Sociolinguistics and Genderlect Theory**

Genderlect Theory provides insights and analyzes how gendered communication styles differ in public discourse (Tannen, 1990). According to Tannen (1990), men and women use language differently; females use language that supports connection, while males use language that fosters status. This theory is essential for analyzing political discourse and its impact on shaping political identity and electoral outcomes.

### **1.1.2.3 Stereotype Content Model**

The Stereotype Content Model explains how language style fosters stereotypes about warmth and competence. Male candidates use a masculine language style, which is perceived as strong, competent, and likable, while female candidates use a feminine language style, which is often seen as weak and less competent (Fiske et al., 2002). The Stereotype Content Model highlights the double bind faced by female candidates in U.S. elections.

### **1.1.2 Gender Schema Theory**

Gender Schema Theory was developed by Sandra Bem (1981). It offers a critical framework that demonstrates how societal views on gender roles affect communication styles. This theory guides people's perceptions, behaviors, and communication through schemas that shape individuals' interpretations of gender roles. In this dissertation, Gender Schema Theory serves as a tool to help individuals understand, explain, and analyze the impact of candidates' communication styles on voters and their attitudes.

Political candidates adopt language styles that have a strong influence on societal expectations and attitudes. Female candidates focus on communal and relational language that aligns with the feminine schema, while male candidates use authoritative and competitive language to conform to the masculine schema (Koenig et al., 2011). Additionally, female candidates' language emphasizes working in harmony and together for a better future, while male candidates adopt language that highlights strength and leadership, such as "making strict decisions to solve problems." These stylistic choices are shaped by candidates to align with voters' expectations.

Gender Schema Theory demonstrates how voters evaluate candidates through their communication styles. Voters use their own schemas to perceive candidates and often support those who conform to traditional gender roles while disregarding those who deviate (Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993). For example, a male candidate using a feminine style may be perceived as lacking warmth and competence, while a male candidate who adopts a feminine style may be seen as weak. These perceptions influence electoral outcomes and shape voters' attitudes toward candidates.

Gender Schema Theory highlights the challenges female candidates may face, such as the “double bind,” which influences their communication style. They must carefully balance assertive and collaborative language to avoid alienating voters. An assertive style may be perceived as “unlikable,” while a collaborative style may be evaluated as lacking leadership. The application of Gender Schema Theory in this dissertation emphasizes how gendered expectations shape political identity. Candidates’ communication styles serve as a strategic tool to influence societal expectations.

### **1.1.2.1 Feminist Political Theory**

Feminist Political Theory is a critical theory that analyses the societal power structures. It criticized the ancient theories that perpetuate gender inequality. This theory manifests different fields such as politics, society, culture and economy. Rhetoric, as an instrument of communication and interaction, plays a crucial role in shaping social identity.

This dissertation examines the discourse used in American elections. It focuses on the use of feminine and masculine language styles. Therefore, this study highlights how patriarchal structures show the inequalities in political representation and participation. For example, male

candidates use rhetoric which supports the traditional masculine ideals that show their strength, experience, and leadership (Jamieson, 1995).

On the other hand, female candidates employ the language that highlights their kindness, inclusivity and their effort to build social justice (Anderson & Sheeler, 2005). Additionally, when female candidates use masculine language style, they face problems such as “the unfeminine” (Huddy & Terkldsen ,1993). These diversities of views may lead women facing problems in navigating gendered expectations imposed by patriarchal structures.

**Table 1.3.**

**Key Concepts of Feminist Theory**

<b>Concept</b>	<b>Definition and Application</b>	<b>Key Scholars</b>
Patriarchy	This concept focuses on a social system in which men hold central power and dominance, particularly in political leadership roles. Feminist theory critiques patriarchy for perpetuating gender bias and neglecting women’s roles.	Lerner (1986)
Intersectionality	Intersectionality examines overlapping systems of discrimination or disadvantage. For example, Black female candidates may face both racism and sexism, which differ from the experiences of White female candidates. Through	Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989)

	the lens of intersectionality, we can understand how gendered language styles are shaped by multiple identity axes.	
Gender Performativity	Gender performativity highlights that gender is not a fixed identity but rather a series of repeated acts shaped by societal standards. In political discourse, candidates may reinforce or challenge gender norms through their linguistic styles.	Judith Butler's (1990)
The Public-Private Dichotomy	Feminist theorists critique the division between public affairs and personal issues, arguing that this separation has historically excluded women from leadership roles (Elshtain, 1981). In election discourse, this concept emerges when women are expected to balance their private and public roles.	Elshtain (1981)

*Note.* Adapted from key feminist theorists as cited in the table.

**1.1.3 Linguistic Relativity**

Linguistic relativity argues that language structure and vocabulary affects its speakers' interpretation and thinking (Whorf, 1956). This concept is very important for understanding how language reflects and reinforces gendered norms. Language is not a mere tool of communication; it is influenced by cultural values, power dynamics, and social hierarchies (Boroditsky, 2009).

Therefore, it shapes gendered expectations, through lexicon and grammar, and preserves gendered views, roles, and stereotypes.

English language lacks grammatical gender but reflects gender norms through gender roles. Additionally, occupational terms such as “fireman” or “stewardess” exclude women from these professions (Cameron, 2007). These linguistic challenges demonstrate how language affects gender standards in linguistic practices. The impact of language on gender views varies across languages, reinforcing gendered standards in society through gendered communication.

Women’s language is perceived as polite and tentative, while men’s language is seen as assertive and directive (Lakoff, 1975). These linguistic differences reflect societal power inequalities and reinforce gender stereotypes. For example, women who employ masculine language are often perceived as “unfeminine,” while men who use feminine language may be viewed as “unmasculine” (Tannen, 1990).

Language plays a crucial role in reinforcing gendered expectations and shaping individual self-presentation through metaphors and idiomatic expressions. For instance, phrases such as “man up” or “throw like a girl” associate masculinity with strength and femininity with weakness, which reinforce stereotypes (Boroditsky, 2009). Linguistic relativity has a significant impact on gendered standards and provides a valuable framework for understanding how language reinforces gender norms.

Political campaign has a strong connection with language to reinforce traditional gender roles. Male often uses masculine language which shows their strength and leadership, like “strong” , “decisive” or “commanding” (Brescoll,2016). On the other hand, female candidates

use feminine language that demonstrates their appearance, “compassionate”, “nurturing” or “well-dressed” (Brescoll ,2016).

These linguistic insights support the idea that man is the leader and the woman is marginalized in political affairs. The use of gendered language during the election campaign can affect the voter’s attitude, and perception. When women use masculine language like assertiveness, they may be seen as unlikable, this phenomenon known as the “double bind” (Eagly & Carli ,2007). This challenge can criticize female because the voters consider that leadership is associated with masculinity. Accordingly, voters can evaluate the candidate discourses through their language during the campaigns (Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993). For example, when female candidates use masculine language, the voters can see them as less capable to maintain traditional masculine affairs.

## **1.2 Gender Language Styles**

Gender language style reflects and reinforces societal standards. Candidates use different linguistic styles to convince the voters and affect their thoughts. For instance, male uses strict and assertive language during the election cycles, while female uses emotional and compassion language (Smith & Anderson, 2020). These biases in language perpetuate the gender stereotypes in politics. Moreover, gender language influences the policies discussions. For example, affairs which are linked with feminine fields like healthcare or education are framed in nurturing terms, while those associated with masculine fields like defense or economics used aggressive language (Johnson et al., 2019). This disparity demonstrates how voters evaluate the effectiveness of these policies based on gendered language.

The media has a crucial role in criticizing the gendered language. It is argued that media coverage of female candidates focuses on their physical appearance or personality traits. On the other hand, males are evaluated according to their position and qualifications (Taylor & Brown, 2021). These differences in coverage can affect negatively female candidate and neglect their talents and qualifications. In recent years, voters became aware about the outcomes of gendered language in elections which lead the candidate to use neutral language. In addition, societal biases shape the portrayal of candidates (Williams & Davis, 2022). Media needs great effort to ensure that language does not undermine the democratic process.

### **1.2.1 Feminine Language Styles**

Feminine Language Style in American elections refers to the way of communication which is linked to traditional feminine affairs such as empathy, collaboration, and relational communication. These styles show the emotional connection, inclusivity, and community – oriented approaches. In some situations, especially during the election cycles, males use the feminine language styles to connect with voters.

Feminine language styles are often evaluated by voters as less decisive than traditionally masculine styles, which can marginalize female candidates in political domains typically associated with dominance. However, the emphasis on empathy and collaboration in politics is helping to shift these perceptions.

### **1.2.2 Masculine Language Styles**

Masculine language style is linguistic communication of masculine social norms. It is seen as assertive, authoritative and competitive (Lakoff, 1975; Tannen, 1990). In political discourses, masculine language styles are used to demonstrate strength, leadership, and decisiveness that are

associated with the political dominance of male (Eagly & Karau, 2002). For examples, speeches from U.S. election can illustrate their application in political communication.

### **1.2.3 Intersectionality: Race, Class, and Gender in Language Use**

The concept of intersectionality is introduced by Kimberlè Crenshaw (1989). It presents an understanding of how overlapping social identities such as race, class, gender, and sexuality shape individual experiences and social structure from a critical perspective. Intersectionality, in the context of political communication, reveals the influence of how language is used by the interplay of other identities not only by gender. For example, Black female politicians often face many challenges from those white parallels. Their language is examined by prejudice with racialized stereotypes not only for its gendered qualities, such as "Angry Black woman" trope (Harris, 2011). Black women may feel pressure to speak in a way that is both confident and friendly to avoid judgment (Brown, 2014).

Similarly, the political language is shaped by class background and it plays significant role. Working-class candidates are expected to adopt "relatable" and informal linguistic style to connect with voters, while elite candidates may influence their education and socioeconomic status to project authority and expertise (Lakoff, 2000). For instance, a self-described democratic socialist by Bernie Sanders often reinforces economic inequality and renewal to working-class voters, reflecting his political identity and class background (Sanders, 2016). On contrary, candidates from noble background, such as Mitt Romeny, may adopt a more polished and formal rhetorical style to align with their understanding social status (Gramer, 2016).

The interchange of these identities creates a complex landscape for political candidates. For instance, Latina candidate can influence her rhetorical choices by traditional femininity and

cultural authenticity (Fraga et al., 2006). These overlapping pressures show why it is important to examine political language from different perspectives. This helps us to understand how power works in political discussions.

### **1.3 Gendered Expectations in Political Communication**

The term "Double Bind" is coined by Kathleen Jamieson (1995) which faces female political candidates to describe the conflicting expectations placed on women in leadership roles. On the one hand, women are expected to show traditionally feminine features, such as warmth, sympathy, and nurturing, to stand with societal gender norms. On the other hand, they must show traditionally masculine features, such as assertiveness, decisiveness, and strength, to be released as component of leaders. The contradictory expectation is created by this double bind: women need to be strong leaders but not so strong that they seem aggressive or lose their femininity (Eagly & Carli, 2017).

The media coverage of female candidates shows a clear the double bind. For example, during her 2016 presidential operation, Hillary Clinton her assertiveness was often formulated as overly dominant, while she was frequently criticized for her observed gap of warmth (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009). Equally, Sara Palin's 2008 gendered criticism of the vice-presidential campaign centered on her beauty and behavior rather than her policy beliefs (Lawerence & Rose, 2010). These examples demonstrate how female candidates are judged differently than their male counterparts, with their language and actions analyzed through a gendered perspective.

Moreover, the double bind is complicated by overlapping identities. For instance, Black women may be seen like naturally more assertive because of racial stereotypes, which worsen the difficulties they face when dealing with gendered expectations (Harris, 2011). Similarly,

LGBTQ+ female candidates may have difficulty reconciling cultural standards of femininity with stereotypes about their sexual orientation (Doan & Haider-Markel, 2010). These challenges underscore the needs for a more sophisticated understanding of gendered expectations in political communication.

### **1.3.1 Male Candidates and Gendered Language**

Whereas male candidates are usually granted more freedom in their language use, they are not unaffected from gendered expectation. Traditional perceptions of masculinity highlight traits such as strength, determination, and restraint, which may narrow the scope of appropriate linguistic styles for male leaders (Cannell, 2005). However, the growing focus on authenticity in political communication has prompted some male politicians to use traditionally feminine language in their speeches, such as displays of empathy or vulnerability (Fowler & Lawless, 2009). For example, Barack Obama's use of inclusive and compassionate speech during his presidential campaigns was frequently commended for its ability to connect with different audiences (Coe et al., 2013).

Despite this change, male candidates who use feminine language styles are in danger of being seen like powerless or effeminate, particularly in strongly divided political environments (Kimmel, 2012). This contradiction highlights the continued influence of old gender standards in determining political communication, even as social expectation shifts. Joe Biden's use of emotive language, such as his frequent references to personal grief and empathy, has been lauded and condemned, demonstrating the continual negotiation of gendered expectations in political speech (Smith, 2020).

Additionally, male candidates from marginalized racial or cultural origins may face extra challenges in order to align traditional notions of masculinity. For instance, Latino male candidates might be expected to convey a "macho" image to conform to cultural stereotypes, while also attracting a wider voter base (Franga et al., 2006). These overlapping expectations emphasize the complexity of gendered language in political discourse.

### **1.3.2 Female Candidates and Gendered language**

Female candidates in U.S. politics face double challenge which they use masculine language styles like assertiveness and competitiveness to counter stereotypes of frailty while preventing criticism for straying from feminine norms such as kindness and compassion, positions of authority have been long linked to male-association qualities like assertiveness (Eagly & Karau, 2002). To manage this conflict, women in politics merge dominate and nurturing tactics. Overlapping identities amplify these challenges. Black women like Maxine Waters encourage the "aggressive Black women" trope for blood speech (Harris; 2011). Latin contenders might alternate between English (to convey authority) and Spanish (to express culture closeness), as demonstrated in speeches by leaders like Joaquin Castro (Frang et al., 2006).

Media coverage worsens these gender-based assumptions. Women are unfairly condemned for delivery style like "yelling" and subjected to "trustworthiness reductions", as observed when Amy Klobuchar was ridiculed for policy knowledge that male politicians were applauded for (Fowler & Lawless, 2009). These expectations female candidates encounter in balancing power and charm.

## **Conclusion**

This chapter shows the complicated relationship between language, identity, and social expectation. Politicians choose their words by deep-rooted cultural norms that mean appropriate communication for both male and female. In history, leadership has been funded with traditionally masculine features such as authority, assertiveness, and directness. So, female politicians face a challenge of balancing between strength and warmth. It highlights the importance of understanding gendered language in politics to address representation, media bias, and public perceptions of leadership. It suggests that female politicians may struggle to gain equal recognition, while male politicians may be perceived as weak. deeper insights into cultural influences.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

# **Gendered Language Styles in U.S. Presidential Elections (2016 & 2020)**

## Chapter Two: Gendered Language Styles in U.S. Presidential Elections

(2016 & 2020)

Introduction .....	25
2.1 Characteristics of Feminine Language Styles and Analysis .....	25
2.1.1 Communicative Language .....	25
2.1.2 Use of Personal Storytelling and Relational Language .....	26
2.1.3 Empathetic Communication .....	28
2.1.4 Strategic Implications .....	29
2.1.5 The Collaborative and Inclusive Framing .....	31
2.1.6 Focus on Social Issues and Community .....	33
2.2. Masculine Language Styles .....	36
2.2.1. Assertiveness .....	36
2.2.2. Authoritative Language .....	37
2.2.3 Competitive Language .....	39
2.2.4. Instrumental Focus .....	42
2.3. Comparative Study between Feminine Language Style and Masculine Language Style in U.S. Election Speeches .....	46
Conclusion .....	49

## **Introduction**

This chapter examines how politicians in U.S. presidential elections employ language style traditionally linked with femininity and masculinity to shape their public identities. By analyzing discourses from the 2016 and 2020 campaigns, it focuses on the different strategies of female candidates like Kamala Harris and Hillary Clinton, and male politicians such as Donald Trump and Joe Biden.

### **2.1 Characteristics of Feminine Language Styles and Analysis**

By analyzing the public speeches of Kamala Harris and Hillary Clinton, one can sense a little towards connection, community, and the emotional aspect of language; this is basically the essence of what scholars call the 'feminine style' in political discourse (Campbell, 1989). This style sharply contrasts with more aggressive, individualistic communication strategies that have been touted as typical of male candidates (Banwart & McKinney, 2005).

#### **2.1.1 Communicative Language**

Communicative Language refers to use of language in exchange of ideas or even in the establishment of interpersonal relations (Grice, 1975). According to Grice, the smooth interaction of people would be accounted for by their observance of the following four maxims for effective communication: quality, quantity, relation, and manner. If speakers observe these maxims, then their ideas flow with minimal ambiguity in conversation.

Research in discourse analysis highlights that communicative language has some distinct features (Bavelas et al. 2000). The first of these characteristics refers to employing markers of information languages and coherence maintenance mechanisms (Bavelas et al., 2000). Second, it follows turns taking which pay respect to the implicit rules of exchange in a conversation.

Responses are both verbal and non-verbal cues that increase mutual understanding and enhance comprehension. All these features define what Habermas (1984) calls a discourse that is really oriented toward understanding rather than that which is manipulative or controlling.

### **2.1.2 Use of Personal Storytelling and Relational Language**

Social or relational language focuses on the interpersonal relationship between the speakers and not merely based on the transmission of information (Tannen, 1994). It is in this form of communication that Bühler (1934) describes the so-called conative function of language—the orientation toward influencing or affecting the behavior of the listener in such cases. It does not only communicate content, but relational language also communicates emotional, social, and contextual aspects of what goes on between speakers to maintain the ties of an interrelationship with each other. Lakoff (1975), thus, summed up the key features of relational language: First, a repeated frequency of personal pronouns (for example, "we," "us") to emphasize in-group solidarity. Second, using hedges and qualifiers (for example, "maybe," "perhaps") to avoid direct confrontation and maintain social harmony. Third, through passion markers and self-identifier (e.g., "I am so excited about...") specify emotions and personal positioning. Last but not least, include personal testimonies and common experiences. These linguistic devices play a role in creating rapport, mutual understanding, and interpersonal trust (Goleman, 2006). As it is shown in sociolinguistic studies, women tend to use relational language more often than men in informal and social contexts (Tannen, 1994; Cameron, 2008).

This is exemplified in Harris's victory speech in 2020, such as when she employed a personal story to engage voters emotionally. Early in her speech, Harris recalls, "*When [my mother] came here from India at 19, she may not have imagined this moment. But she believed so deeply in a moment like this being possible*" (Harris, 2020). This statement serves multiple

functions: it humanizes the speaker, creates emotional connection with immigrant communities, and situates her personal story within a broader collective narrative. Research indicates that personal narratives are ubiquitous in women's speeches since they are a form of resistance to gender-specific skepticism towards women's ability to lead.

Likewise, personal elements are used by Clinton in her speech to induce emotional connectivity. For instance, in her Democratic National Convention address in 2016, she shared, "*I think about [my mother] every day... how she survived being abandoned as a young girl*" (Clinton, 2016). These narratives demonstrate how women's candidates engage in what researchers called 'relational authenticity' relating to or resonating with others, but without giving up their authority.

Another significant dimension of women's political language is the use of joint pronouns rather than individualistic language. Harris' 2020 victory speech has many references where she says "*We must reject the framework of red versus blue*" (Harris, 2020), and "*We have the power to shape our future*" (Harris, 2020). This pattern is what students of gender talk about as the 'communal orientation' of women leaders as they are in contrast to the more traditionally masculinized style that focuses on the specific person's achievements.

Clinton follows the same style of all-inclusive claims. In her concession speech in 2016, she declared: "To all the women who put their faith in this campaign...nothing has made me prouder than to be your champion" (Clinton, 2016). By portraying herself as a collective leader, she navigates the 'double bind', which expects female leaders to be strong but cute.

The final examples involving Harris and Clinton are illustrative of emotional intelligence and empathy, particularly in relation to global crises. Harris reflects on the challenges of the

pandemic: *"I know that this has been a very tough time, perhaps the toughest over the past few months... but here is what I am saying: we have endured, and we will prevail"* (Harris, 2020). Her statement recognizes public fears especially those related to the political arena but inspires citizens with hope, a technique that has been shown to resonate effectively with audiences. Clinton similarly shows such emotional attunement as she speaks about issues that were moving to her in her 2016 Democratic National Convention Speech address: *"I've met parents who rely on food stamps... and they need a champion too"* (Clinton, 2016, 22:15). These emotional appeals strengthen the bond between candidate and electorate as they grow one step closer together by fostering 'affective connections' with voters.

### **2.1.3 Empathetic Communication**

The empathic and compassionate modes of interactions have been deemed as feminine by research in political communication, which has in turn fashioned the patterns of communication by women politicians and shaped the perception of audiences thereupon (Banwart & McKinney, 2005; Jamieson, 1995). These qualities emerge in particular linguistic and rhetorical strategies, which are labeled by scholars as the 'feminine style' of political discourse.

First, relational framing signifies a framework of language whereby the prominent themes of the personal, collective identity and shared struggle are invoked when female candidates communicate (Schneider & Bos, 2019). This strategy creates a sense of connection or solidary identification between the speaker and the audience.

Second, policy justification through narrative is used whereby female candidates are likely to frame policy discussions in terms of personal or emotional resonant stories. This narrative

approach personalizes the abstract nature of policy issues, making them more reliable to voters and enhancing the speaker's sympathy and accessibility (Lawrence & Rose, 2021).

Third, exposing vulnerability shows how women in political communication negotiate for an acceptable space within social norms which will enable them to display emotional sensitivity, a feature that conveys a privilege commonly afforded to women-run candidates. This approach, though culturally gendered, can give the female politician an image of authority that is not compromised by appearing authentic or relatable (Brescoll, 2016). These strategies reflect the other set of cultural expectations related to gender and leadership, which determine how female candidates campaign and how the public accepts them.

#### **2.1.4 Strategic Implications**

The use of compassionate rhetoric in political communication offers new opportunities and challenges. First, the style has been shown to mobilize female and young voters since research indicates that it resonates with communal and relational values (Schneider & Bos, 2019). Second, scholars claim that female candidates should balance what they term the 'struggle for authenticity' demonstrating strength and authority while exhibiting compassion. Some successful candidates have chosen to use integrated communication approaches, combining compassion with assertiveness and a more traditionally masculine style. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, for example, blends policy competency with emotional engagement in a hybrid style appealing to diverse voter bases (Lawrence & Rose, 2021).

Women candidates have argued in U.S. politics using empathetic and compassionate voices to interleave with cultural expectations of feminine discourse. This affects the building of emotional connections where voters' problems are acknowledged as being cared for that pertain

to trust and rapport-building strategies to the audience. As eloquently expressed by Kamala Harris during her speech after her victory in 2020, she said: "*I know times have been challenging, especially the last several months... the grief, sorrow, and pain. The worries and the struggles*" (Harris, 2020). In addressing these difficult emotions, Harris created "affective alignment" with her audience acknowledging their experience as a collective. Likewise, Hillary Clinton's speech of concession in 2016 had just such an expression of empathetic honesty in that, "*This is painful, and it will be for a long time*" responding with emotional transparency to her disappointed supporters (Clinton, 2016).

During the frame of policy formulation, it is compassionate effect, which mounts in intensification on healthcare reform as moral necessity: "*We will make sure our health care system is about caring for people, not profits*" (Harris, 2020). This quotes a communicative style by which information advocacy is justified and grounded on ethical and compassionate reasoning. Likewise, this is how Clinton coined education policy: "*Every child deserves the chance to live up to their God-given potential*" (Clinton, 2016), representing essentially policy concerns as extension forms of maternal care and social responsibility.

Another rhetorical strategy used to build a connection with the audience is the inclusion of personal narratives. For instance, Harris evoked family values by saying: "*My mother taught me that service to others gives life purpose and meaning*" (Harris, 2020); in fact, this would serve to reinforce relational authenticity; similarly in: "*I have spent my entire adult life fighting for children and families*" (Clinton, 2016). This was yet another counting of lifelong devotion to advocacy. Such narratives represent what Eagly and Carli (2007) defined as the "feminine leadership paradox": warm strength must be shown by women leaders to be considered credible and effective. Research suggests that the more compassionate storytelling that the speech has, the

more effective it is in increasing emotional resonance but also in overcoming skepticism among voters on female candidates' professional authority.

### **2.1.5 The Collaborative and Inclusive Framing**

Explicitly inclusive language in U.S. presidential election campaigns shines a contradictory light on gender-related norms with respect to candidate-voter communication. Studies show female candidates are more likely to emphasize inclusion and collaboration-based strategies and are often assessed by voters based on these language styles, which places an added burden on women to use co-operative and consensus-building rhetoric (Banwart & McKinney, 2005; Schneider & Bos, 2019).

Feminine political language emphasizes collective activities and joint decision-making. Female candidates often prefer first-person plural pronouns including "*we*," "*us*," "*our*," to mention a few, rather than the traditional first-person singular ones such as "*I*" and "*me*" They create the narratives of shared experiences and of collective achievements. For example, analyses of congressional campaign rhetoric show that women candidates use collective pronouns 27% more than their male counterparts, who tended to rely more often on singular pronouns (Lawrence & Rose, 2012). The same holds true for discussions about policy initiatives, with women presenting legislative projects as outcomes of joint efforts as opposed to their individual proposals.

Continuing voter reactions to collaborative strategies brings forth long-lasting persistent biases in gender political evaluations. While cooperative language makes female candidates more inclusive and friendly compared to their competition; it adversely influences perceptions of their leadership strength. Research suggest that candidates employing collaborative language are

seen as ‘consensus-oriented’ and ‘thoughtful’ without facing criticism on their decisiveness. This; however, gets aggravated at times of national emergencies since voters would generally be inclined towards unilateral, decisive rhetoric—terms characteristically associated with the masculine model.

As much inclusive framing offers advantages for political candidates, it can be a disadvantage at times. A cooperative strategy may construct a coalition towards a diverse range of voters and mobilize portions of marginalized communities, as mentioned in Schneider & Bos (2019). Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez has established a grassroots trend well through her completely inclusive language focusing on community action and collective achievement; inclusive framing includes an element of mobilizing marginalized sections and building diverse voter coalitions. On the contrary, female politicians are expected to maintain a rhetorical balance such that avoids appearing weak or indecisive, a standard that is less applicable to male candidates that much. Progressive women leaders have developed hybrid styles that mix inclusive framing with a traditional masculine display of assertiveness and decisiveness.

In their political communication, both Kamala Harris and Hillary Clinton employ a collaborative, inclusive, and emotionally stirring language to bind the audience together into a common humanitarian purpose. In her 2020 victory speech, Harris uses consistent pronouns emphasizing the plural word: *"While I may be the first woman in this office, I will not be the last because every little girl watching tonight sees that this is a country of possibilities"* (Harris, 2020). Her statement makes the path and call for future generations of young females to aspire to leadership roles more tangible, as she gracefully acknowledges her historic personal achievement. She further reinforces collaborative framing by sharing the honor of her victory with others: *"To the woman most responsible for my presence here today, Shyamala Gopalan Harris, who is*

*always in our hearts"* (Harris, 2020). Here, she frames leadership as a collective achievement, one that comes with familial and communal wisdom and foresight.

In her speech of concession that she delivered in 2016, Hillary Clinton also delivered on the promise unity and resilience as a collective: *"To all the women, especially the young women who put their faith in this campaign and in me, I want you to know that nothing has made me prouder than to be your champion"* (Clinton, 2016). The discourse of Clinton creates emotional attachments through affirmative statements like *"prouder than to be your champion"* which emphasize more solidarity than personal ambition. Moreover, she uses inclusive framing to emphasize mutual national interests: *"We must accept this result and look to the future. Donald Trump is going to be our president. We owe him an open mind and the chance to lead"* (Clinton, 2016). This reflects an essentially feminine communication pattern that requires national unity and eschews partisan conflicts.

#### **2.1.6 Focus on Social Issues and Community**

Feminine language in political cycles often focuses on social issue, community welfare, and collaborative leadership. Studies indicate that female candidates emphasize on the topics of health care, education and social justice which reflect the women's caregiving and communal well-being (Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993; Shneider & Bos ,2014). For example, in 2020 democratic primaries , Elizabeth Warren focuses on issues childcare and paid family leave, lying with feminine stereotypes that aligning women with nurturing roles.

Moreover, feminine political strategies often use collaborative and empathetic language, reinforcing social approach to governance. A research by Banwart and Mickinney (2005) indicates that female candidates employ pronouns like "we" and "us" focusing collective

achievements rather than linguistic success. This linguistic items associates with the feature of ‘relational leadership’ where females in politics support connections consensus (Eagly & Carli,2007). This political communication highlights social issues and cooperative policymaking, further shaping gendered expectations in election. However, this emphasis on social issues can lead to stereotypes that limit female candidates perceived talent in ‘masculine’ fields such as national security or economics (Brescoll & Okimoto, 2010). Nevertheless, the strategic employment of feminine language has proven to be effective in moving key voter principle, especially between women and developed societies (Dolan, 2014). As a result, the mobilization among gender language and political identity frequently influence electoral strategies and voter views in U.S. election.

In their political discourses, both Harris and Clinton focus on social issues, community building and collective wellbeing. Vice president Kamala Harris in her victory speech (2020) links the feminine language roots in political campaigning talks to the social issues, communal uplift, and collaborative leadership. Female candidates are more likely to raise issues such as healthcare, education, and social justice, which have an extensive and long-established debate about their caregiving roles and welfare of the community. For example, by prioritizing concerns like childcare and paid family leave during the 2020 Democratic primary campaign, Warren echoed the feminine stereotypes regarding nurturing responsibilities assigned to women.

Again, feminine political strategies also refer to using collaborative and empathetic language that will resonate with the presidency as a socially responsive one. Banwart and McKinney (2005) said that research on female candidates would tend to use the pronouns "we" and "us" that highlight the accomplishment regarding a collective rather than an individual. This ‘linguistic’ tendency holds with mandates of relational leadership whereby women political

leaders valued connections, empathy, and consensus (Eagly & Carli, 2007). Such kind of political communication styles raises social problems and brings in collaborative policy formation much more common; thus, developing further gender-related expectations in the context of elections.

Her success is intertwined with larger issues, especially concerning marginalized communities. In Harris's speech, she noted: *"We are not only celebrating tonight; we're also acknowledging the generations of women—Black women, Asian, White, Latina, Native American women—who paved the way for this moment"* (Harris, 2020). In this way, she names various racial and ethnic groupings, implying inclusivity and mediating personal narratives with collective societal struggles. Harris further states, *"When my mother came here from India at 19, she didn't quite imagine this moment—but she believed so deeply in an America where a moment like this is possible"* (Harris, 2020). This, in turn, personalizes issues of immigration and the American Dream, linking national policy conversations to lived realities in family life.

In line with her philosophy, Hillary Clinton frequently emphasizes on healthcare, education, and family welfare, framing them as public concerns rather than individual interests. In her 2016 Democratic National Convention speech, Clinton said: *"I've got mine, the rest of you are on your own. We believe we're stronger together," a counterpoint to individualism and masculine rhetoric in the tradition of "pull yourself up by your bootstraps."* Clinton also asserts collective values, stating, *"We must stand up for our values—for families, for diversity, for justice—and never stop working to make our country fairer and stronger"*. The phrase *"we must stand up"* is an invocation to a collective response and solidarity, which firmly rejects undercurrents of personal mastery and favors a vision of community-centered leadership.

## 2.2. Masculine Language Styles

### 2.2.1. Assertiveness

Forcefulness and brevity are the traits associated with masculine behaviour expected of a political campaign, which prescribes clarity, confidence, and authority. Male politicians avoid displaying uncertainty, using short, declarative sentences with emphatic language that suggest strength, when they say, "*I will*," which seems to make assertiveness a desirable masculine quality in socialization for leaders in general, and male leaders particularly (Holmes & Stubbe, 2015; Lakoff, 2014). Assertiveness, furthermore, is an expectant for U.S. election speeches, to instill confidence, assert one's dominion, and present the electorate with a clear, trustworthy view of the future. This engenders the perception of a candidate as strong, capable, and ready to lead—a prospect compliant with those valuing a strong and action-driven style of leadership.

The speeches of Trump have consistently been characterized as braggadocio and assertiveness with confident declarations and aggressive rhetoric. For instance, in his 2016 Republican National Convention address, he declared, "*I alone can fix it*" (Trump, 2016), positing himself as the exclusive cure. He used strong wording, such as "*We will build the wall*" (Trump, 2016) to re-authorize control. That style characterized Trump's rhetoric in 2020, such as when he said, "*We will make America greater than even before*" (Trump, 2020), thus combining certainty with reiteration to tighten the knot of the message. Trump would sometimes use aggressive language to denigrate his opponents, such as when he called Biden: "*Weak*" and "*A puppet*" (Trump, 2020) to broadcast on the basis of antagonism his perceived personal superiority. Such combative, offensive language show the image of being strong, uncompromising, and self-assured leader in the eyes of voters who consider decisiveness and control.

Biden's assertiveness was more restrained, blending compassion with determination. In his 2020 Democratic National Convention address, he declared, *"I will restore the soul of America"* (Biden, 2020) employing inclusive pronouns *"we"* to convey solidarity while affirming leadership. In contrast to Trump's combative style. Biden employed evidence-based affirmations: *"We can and will overcome this pandemic"*(Biden, 2020), combining conviction with concrete proposals. His 2020 victory address is featured by phrases such as *"This is the time to heal in America"* (Biden, 2020), presenting assertiveness as empathetic leadership. While less aggressive, Biden's discourse still reflected masculine-coded traits through firm promises like *"I will be a president for all America"*(Biden, 2020).

Both candidates employed assertiveness to align with masculine leadership norms, though their methods diverged. Trump's rhetoric leaned on exaggeration, self-promotion, and criticism, magnifying conventional 'alpha male' characteristics. Biden moderated assertiveness with inclusiveness, stressing unity over personal authority. These contrasts illustrate how gendered norms are adapted to political context: Trump's aggression resonated with audiences who favored decisive strength, whereas Biden's measured confidence appealed to those who valued stability and empathy.

### **2.2.2. Authoritative Language**

Authoritative language shows strong traits, like confidence and decisiveness, which are often linked to male leaders (Eagly & Karau, 2002). In politics, these ways of speaking help candidates seem strong and able to lead. However, when women use this kind of language, they may be judged for not acting warm or friendly enough (Brescoll, 2016). Key features of showing authority include:

- a. Imperative (e.g., "*We must act now*")
- b. Formal or technical terms (e.g., "*economic recovery plan*").
- c. Assertions of personal expertise (e.g., "*I alone can fix it*")

(Charteris-Black, 2005, p. 28-30)

Trump primarily relied on commands and generalized assertive statements in his speech to showcase his authority in 2016. For example, in his speech at the Republican National Convention in 2016, he mentioned, "*We will build a great wall on the southern border—and Mexico will pay for it*" (Trump, 2016). The word "build" acts as a strong directive, portraying Trump as someone who takes clear, decisive actions. The phrase, "*Mexico will pay*," implies his control over situations and shows that he can indeed force another country to comply. Trump's statement, "I alone," suggests his independence, placing him as the only man who can solve serious problems, in resonance with masculine stereotypes of heroic leadership. Trump's vocabulary remained with easy words with "*disaster*" and "*winning*," which made sense for normal people, adding another piece to the puzzle making him a strongman appealing to those voters who wanted bold leadership.

Moreover, in the course of campaigning for presidency in 2020, Trump constrained his authoritarian words to more traditional values defense. He said, "*We will defend our police, our military, and our flags!*" (Trump, 2020), which places him into the antigenic stereotype of protector displayed as in the strong masculine type. He further stated, "*I've done more for Black Americans than any president except Lincoln*" (Trump, 2020); thus, Trump aligns himself with Abraham Lincoln, one of the quintessential examples of using historical leverage to give credibility in the scheme of masculinity in political rhetoric.

Joe Biden in 2016, his speech at the Democratic National Convention Speech showed strong leadership. He said, "*We are America. Second to none*" (Biden, 2016). The phrase "*second none*" shows national confidence without focusing only on himself, showing shared and team-based kind of authority. Biden's 2020 speech also mixed strong language with care and understanding. For example, in his Democratic National Convention Speech, he said, "*We will control the pandemic*" (Biden, 2020). The word "*control*" shows strong decision-making, while using "*we*" makes it feel more like a team effort, softening the tone. He also used symbolic words: "*I will be an ally of the light, not the darkness*" (Biden, 2020). The contrast between "*light*" and "*darkness*" present him as moral leader, which appealed to voters looking for calm and steady guidance (Charteris-Black, 2005). Biden further used official terms like "*pandemic readiness*" and "*plan for economic recovery*" to show his background in government. Unlike Trump's plain words, Biden more professional language made him sounds like an experienced leader who knows how the system works.

Trump and Biden both used authoritative language to project leadership, but they did it in different ways. Trump's style centered on individualism and crisis (e.g., "*build the wall*"), matching hyper-masculine stereotypes of dominance, while Biden mixed authority with collective action (e.g., "*we will control*"), blending male traits with group-focused value. Both did not face any criticism for using this kind of strong language, showing the privilege male politicians have when using powerful speech styles.

### **2.2.3 Competitive Language**

To reflect characteristics associated with assertiveness, dominance, and aggressiveness—qualities often coded masculine and, by and large, appreciated in men as leaders (Eagly & Karau, 2002) — competitive linguistic styles apply such agentic traits. Political discourse tends to

project a picture of entirely tough and strong behavior, yet such behavior may create distance from voters if they are interpreted as painfully hostile. In contrast, openly competitive rhetoric from female candidates generally has the opposite effect; it draws the ire of critics because it does not fit social prescriptions of warmth and relational sensitivity (Brescoll, 2016). A feature of competitive political speech is the fact that it consists in direct personal attacks, metaphors for war, and framing politics as a zero-sum contest (Mudde, 2004).

Donald Trump's words in 2016 spent a lot of time calling people names and framing situations as win or lose, so he could represent himself as an outsider fighting the deep-rooted elite. For example, while speaking at the 2016 Republican National Convention, he said: *"Hillary Clinton has failed as secretary of state-- failed terribly"* (Trump, 2016). The repeated word "failed" acted to reduce Clinton's credibility as it builds Trump's self-image as a "winner"-decisive. This indicates a masculine rhetorical strategy in which power is exercised through verbal challenge because in diminishing someone else's standing, one's own gets stronger. Besides, Trump's pronouncement claiming, *"Americanism, not globalism, will be our credo"* (Trump, 2016) constructed a binary conflict whereby national love is set against foreign threats. This us-versus-them narrative simplified global problems into moralized contests to appeal to voters who think of leadership as going out and owning it.

Bafflingly, a number of competitions Trump himself raised in the 2020 campaign speeches to drive some people into defense rallies against Joe Biden. He described Biden as *"Sleepy Joe,"* an implied term with a hint of weak potency, and warned that the radical left would *"attempt to destroy America!"* (Trump, 2020). The term "destroy" is used to amplify the stakes as though they were in a survival struggle. Another example is when Trump announced, *"We are kicking China, beating Mexico-we're winning at everything!"* (Trump, 2020). Combative verbs such as

"beating" and "winning," through repetition, build up a hyper-masculine narrative in which political success consists of capturing and subjugating.

On the other hand, the speech by Joe Biden during the Democratic National Convention in 2016 was generally less combative and involved certain undertones of competition. He also drew a value comparison with respect to Trump while taking the side of Hillary Clinton: *"Hillary understands that America's strength comes from decency, not division"* (Biden, 2016). Notably, whereas not overtly mentioning Trump with negative intention, alluding to *"decency"* could be construed as holding Trump morally deficient.

In Biden's speech at the 2020 Democratic National Convention, he presented the election as moral and not one of personal vendetta. He referred to the contest as *"a battle for the soul of America"* (Biden, 2020), once more using conflict imagery to fit the campaign as a collective struggle against a national decline. After all of that, he made an indictment against Trump saying as shown in *"He failed to protect America. It's time to hold him accountable"* (Biden, 2020). In this case, Biden brought up this accusatory tone by much of using group orientation pronoun, "we" and policy that fails, instead of personal assault. This head-on approach is a combination of masculine bravado that provides membership responsibility, which reveals a balanced rhetorical action.

Competitive language was employed by both Trump and Biden, but in different ways. Trump's hyper-competitive style, with names like *"Crooked Hillary"* and phrases as "winning at everything," followed the tough-guy stereotype of control and power. He framed the politics as personal confrontations, appealing to those voters who appreciate boldness and decisiveness. In contrast, Biden tended to see competition as the moral act, indicating that *"we're in this together"* so as to provide for collective action instead of personal dueling. This view permitted Biden to

confront his opponents without diminishing or attacking them, thereby mixing muscle with community-oriented leadership.

Neither candidate encountered much censure for rough language, clearly showing the opportunities afforded by the masculine speech code for male politicians to evade any repercussions. Where Trump's contests tended to rupture, Biden's tended to mend, a subtle yet critical distinction in the framing of competitive language as either magnifying division or fostering solidarity. Such contrast illustrates the gender dynamics at play in political rhetoric, with male figures able to employ masculine language with impunity while female figures would find themselves under heavy scrutiny.

#### **2.2.4. Instrumental Focus**

Masculine language styles used instrumental goals through relational emotional tasks (Wood , 2009). They emphasize the outcomes and problems- solving. In political domain, they tend to focus on policy, achievement, economic and strategic plans while neglecting to build emotional connections with the voters. In politics, achievement, economic and strategic plans and neglects to build emotional connections with the voters. For male politicians, this kind of speeches reinforces their image as capable, while women may face backlash for appearing "unfeeling" (Eagly & Karau, 2002).

Donald Trump's language in the Republican National Convention of 2016 illustrated a distinct, transactional goal. He pledged to the audience, *"We will build a great wall on the southern border, and Mexico will pay for it!"* (Trump, 2016). The verb *"build"* presents an idea of leadership in a tangible, active project whereby responsibility for finances is assigned to Mexico; thus, it becomes measurable. Further, Trump stated, *"I will bring back our jobs from China,*

*Mexico, and Japan*" (Trump, 2016). The use of *"bring back"* takes a very complicated issue of global trade and makes it appear to be a simple trade-off to voters who want to hear simple, practical solutions. Trump's words in a campaign speech in 2020 were action-oriented: *"We built the greatest economy in history - 7 million new jobs before the pandemic!"* (Trump, 2020). The reference to *"7 million jobs"* quantified his success with numbers underscoring competence. Thus, he used the promise, *"We will cut funds to cities that anarchists!"* (Trump, 2020,), which converted public safety into a subject of decisive action rather than a nuanced social issue, emphasizing direct, punitive leadership.

Donald Trump delivered a speech at the 2016 Republican National Convention where he culminated with a sort of transactional language. He proclaimed, *"We will build a great wall on the southern border and Mexico will pay for it!"* (Trump, 2016). The verb *"build"* turns leadership into a concrete, hands-on project while attributing a financial liability to Mexico; so that, it can be measured at the end. Trump also said, *"I will bring back our jobs from China, Mexico and Japan"* (Trump, 2016). The phrase *"Bringing back"* reduces a complicated issue of global trade to a simple trade, appealing to voters wanting direct solutions. The action-oriented, action-focused message that Trump repeated in a 2020 campaign speech was: *"We built the greatest economy in history-7 million new jobs before the pandemic!"* (Trump, 2020). Quoting *"7 million jobs"* further quantified success using data, which also put an emphasis on skills. His statement *"We will cut funds to cities that anarchists!"* (Trump, 2020) similarly converted public safety into a matter of decisive action instead of a nuanced social issue, again underscoring direct, punitive leadership.

In visiting the Republican National Convention of 2016, Donald Trump offered a speech that clearly indicated a different kind of transactional goal. He told the audience, *"We will build a*

*great wall on the southern border, and Mexico will pay for it!"* (Trump, 2016). The verb *"build"* is like an action verb whereby leadership is seen as an actual project whereas the Mexico names the country holding a measurable outcome with regard to its financial liability. Moreover, Trump said, *"I will bring back our jobs from China, Mexico, and Japan"* (Trump, 2016). The phrase *"Bring back"* reduces a complex global trade to just a simple exchange; thus, appealing to voters who want to hear simple, practical answers.

While replicating the same action-oriented message in a campaign speech in 2020, Trump's statement dealt with bringing an evidence of economic achievement: *"We built the greatest economy in history-7 million new jobs before the pandemic!"* (Trump, 2020). "7 million jobs" was an evidence of his success and added weight to his competence using data as proof. So, he also used his promise, *"We will cut funds to cities that anarchists!"* (Trump, 2020), which only made public safety all the more a matter of hard action, rather than a nuanced social issue, yet again emphasizing direct, punitive leadership.

In fact, there was a contrast to the rhetoric voiced by Joe Biden in his 2016 Democratic National Convention address, which was used to practically frame the argument, he said: *"We need to spend \$1 trillion on infrastructure to create jobs"*. The verb *spends* positioned government funding as a kind of pragmatic solution and avoided any emotionally charged rhetoric. In the same vein, as his Democratic National Convention speech in 2020, this *"instrumental"* sounding language from Biden was inserted into the speech with communitarian appeals. He promised, *"We will be managing this pandemic with a national mask rule and free testing"* (Biden, 2020). *"Manage"* suggested actions taken in concrete terms while adding *"mask rule"* to define further the policy measures. Furthermore, Biden proposed economic initiatives: *"We're adding 5 million new factory jobs by moving supply chains back"* (Biden, 2020). Like

Trump, Biden also included numeric quantification ("*5 million*") to brighten practicality and measurable outcomes. However, he softened the individualistic tone by using collective pronouns like "*we'll*" to mix masculine instrumentalism with a broader, inclusive appeal.

The leaders of America, Trump and Biden, used instrumental language to claim their leadership in a significantly different manner from one another. Trump's discourse centered on what he called '*measurable successes*', referencing "*7 million jobs*" to promote a results-based model of leadership defined by quantifiable achievements. This approach works effectively with voters who favored achievement over empathetic appeal and who affirmed a strongman leadership model characterized by transactional, deal-focused strategies . Thus, the style that Biden took was hybrid. It blended goal-oriented promises such as "*5 million jobs*" with more inclusive team-based language such as "*We will*". Such strategy was reflective of a changing political world in which traits traditionally ascribed to feminine leadership, such as empathy and cooperation, were increasingly integrated into the rhetoric of male leaders.

In pursuing task-oriented speech goals, both candidates had no slack from the backlash that shows the kind of gendered privilege that men enjoy in political communication. Male politicians are often praised for focusing on results and authority, whereas women employing similar rhetorical strategies are labeled as unapproachable or cold by critics. This reveals the difference in double standards existing in political leadership as masculine-coded styles remain the assumed norm while feminine nuances have to be silenced or selectively adopted by male leaders.

### **2.3. Comparative Study between Feminine Language Style and Masculine Language Style in U.S. Election Speeches**

Political messages are reflected gendered speech norms which convey society's entrenched assumptions, impacting candidates' judgments of their personalities and communication with voters. Feminine political discourse is characterized by relational approaches, caring tones, collaborative framing, and agendas centered on social issues; stark contrasts to masculine assertiveness, authoritative language, competitive rhetoric, and instrumental purpose. This perceived divergence extends beyond stylistics; it reflects deep-rooted historical and cultural interpretations that align leadership with traits considered masculine, such as control and decisiveness, while relegating traits associated with femininity, like empathy and collaboration, to a secondary or complementary status.

The style of feminine language tends to lean towards becoming more inclusive and interpersonal where it is defined by collective achievements than personal leadership. Female politicians often use solidarity language, relying heavily on collective pronouns such as “*we*” and “*us*,” images of cooperative actions such as “*building together*,” to counter the hierarchical assumptions. Such initiative also conforms to stereotypes of communal women as nurturers and consensus builders . However, this kind of relational emphasis runs the risk of being regarded as too idealistic or too soft, particularly since combative language often dominates highly polarized political settings. Firmer action is often associated to masculinity that depends on reinforcing this connection, particularly through the use of simple, assertive verbs such as ‘*build*’ and ‘*control*’ to address even complex policy matters. Male politicians, as permitted and often overtly endorsed by societal norms, are able to command authority using a tone that threatens individual agency, underlining the ideas of strength and ability. This disparity manifests a well-established bias: the

feminine rhetorical forms tend to be criticized for their insistence on connection while masculine forms are celebrated for their demonstration of control.

Empathy and compassion, which stand at the center of feminine rhetoric, serve the function of humanizing political platforms while simultaneously rendering a conflicting burden on female candidates. Women are strategically navigating a narrow path between warmth and strength, constantly managing the perception of emotional excess lest they be seen as fragile or overly sensitive. To illustrate, empathic responses like *"I hear you"* are coupled with forceful statements about *"fighting"* for voters that combine community-like qualities with firm resolve. In contrast, male candidates are not subject to this dilemma. When they use that sort of language in a strong manner or reference to others (*"like Lincoln"*) or moral appeals (*"heal the soul"*), it is deemed to be natural leadership instead of egoism. The political discourse manifests different standards for men and women, where men's power is assumed to be inherent while women's power is challenged in its sincerity or aggression.

Governance is not just a question of ruling but is something that needs to be done collaboratively and participatively, a position that is made more pronounced by collaborative framing. The expressions of "stronger together" symbolize a sense of partnership and sharing responsibility, in opposition to masculine interpretations that see politics as zero-sum competition. However, this inclusive rhetoric often finds it hard to keep its ground in a highly adversarial context, where division and conflict language holds public-space hegemony. Images of competition often serve as metaphorical vessels (*like "battle" or "war"*) that reinforce masculine styles of communicating, whereas feminine discourse attempts to turn that competitive light into a collaborative endeavor aimed at achieving mutually beneficial outcomes. The patriarchal narrative of male aggressiveness is; thus, embedded in the discourse, whereby the

competitive tone becomes instrumentalized in overtly authoritative mannerism. As a result, where women act collaboratively, they risk being denigrated as subordinate, while men are often praised for being tough and strategic with competitive tactics.

Policy issues also show gender differences. Feminists' political discourse addresses various issues of social assistance, equity, and collective well-being-concerns, which are traditionally aligned with caregiving roles as well as women's social experiences, including harassment. Although these issues are important, they are frequently relegated as 'soft' because they do not sit as 'hard' policy areas as economic management and national security. Concrete, outcome-based targets; for example, the creation of jobs or policing, are often perceived as more practical and effective. Quantifiable goals, like "*five million jobs*," tend to enhance the perception of male competence, even if such claim does not have any substantive grounding under it. This emphasis on measurable effects aligns with agentic stereotype emphasizing goal-directed leadership and reinforces the belief that masculine means are by nature more serious or efficient.

The impacts of these gendered expectations are significant. Female candidates need to navigate a constrained rhetorical space, compelled to demonstrate both compassion and resilience, and frequently criticized for failing to meet either standard. Male candidates, in contrast, benefit from a broader range of acceptable communication strategies, allowing them to combine authority and relatability without facing equivalent scrutiny. Blended rhetorical approaches that integrate practical objectives with inclusive messaging are more readily available to male politicians, whose gender identity shields them the tensions and contradictions faced by their female counterparts. These dynamics reinforce structural inequalities in political communication, positioning masculine discourse as the default model of leadership, while framing feminine styles as supplementary, marginal, or exceptional.

## **Conclusion**

This chapter demonstrates that male and female candidates use different language styles in political discourses, men relied on authority, strength and personal achievement to assert leadership, and women focusing on empathy and shared experiences. Women face challenges to balance warmth with power, while men have more flexibility. These patterns support the idea that leadership is linked to masculinity which make it harder for feminine styles to be accepted.

## General Conclusion

This dissertation aimed at exploring how gendered language styles in U.S. election speeches reveal and uphold societal expectations about political identity, focusing on the interaction between feminine and masculine communication patterns through analyzing theoretical framework and practical examples from political campaigns.

The study addressed two central investigative questions. The first investigated how do female and male candidates in U.S. election discourse navigate gendered language shape political identity. The second inquired about how does gendered language shape political identity. The findings showed that candidates strategically match their language with gender norms to persuade votes, although these approaches are limited by firmly established stereotypes and power dynamics. The analysis demonstrated that candidates encounter distinct pressures based on gender. Female candidates, struggle with a double bind. They are criticized for being seen as either overly feminine (e.g., lacking authority) or overly masculine (e.g., seeming aggressive). For example, Hillary Clinton & 2016 addressed frequently combined assertiveness with communal language, aiming to balance capability and relatability.

However, media portrayals often condemned her manner as harsh, revealing societal biases against women who challenge traditional gender roles. On other hand, male candidates such as Donald Trump and Joe Biden employed masculine norms with greater ease. Trump extremely forceful speech reinforced male- dominated ideals or control, while Biden occasional use compassionate expressions illustrated how men in politics adopt qualities without sacrificing credibility. These strategies underscore how gendered expectations are uneven: men encounter fewer consequences when using feminine styles, whereas women risk negative reactions for stepping outside of expected roles. As with majority of studies, the design of the current research

is subject to some limitations. Firstly, this study is limited to specific particular period. Secondly, the research had a limited of candidates in one country due to the narrow scope of the thesis.

Ultimately, the study in hands recommends for future research could expand on this study by examining campaign speeches across various historical period (e.g., contrasting the 1990 with the 2020s) to investigate how gendered language styles change alongside societal developments. The candidate pool could have broadened to include a wider range of politicians (e.g., different genders, ethnic, backgrounds, parties, or leadership levels) to test the generalizability of the results. Comparative analysis of political discourse from different nation could also shed light on cultural factors influencing gendered rhetoric.

Additionally, scholars might explore different platforms (e.g., debates, social media) beyond traditional speeches, leverage artificial intelligence to process extensive data sets for subtle trends, conduct voter surveys to assess the influence of gendered language on public perception, and monitor changes in politician's language use over time to identify patterns related to experiences or audience expectations.

## References

- Banwart, M. C., & McKinney, M. S. (2005). A gendered influence in campaign debates? *Communication Studies*, 56(4), 353–373. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10510970500319494>
- Bauer, N. M. (2015). Emotional, sensitive, and unfit for office? Gender stereotype activation and support for female candidates. *Political Psychology*, 36(6), 691–708. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12186>
- Bavelas, J. B., Coates, L., & Johnson, T. (2000). Listeners as co-narrators. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(6), 941–952. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.6.941>
- Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review*, 88(4), 354–364. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.88.4.354>
- Biden, J. (2020, August 20). *Democratic National Convention speech* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wRgiCtBY6K8>
- Biden, J. (2020, November 7). *Victory speech* [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/pnmQr0WfSvo>
- Brescoll, V. L. (2016). Leading with their hearts? How gender stereotypes of emotion lead to biased evaluations of female leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(3), 415–428. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.02.005>
- Brescoll, V. L., & Okimoto, F. G. (2010). The price of power: Power seeking and backlash against female politicians. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36(7), 923–936. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167210371949>
- Brown, N. E. (2014). Political Participation of Women of Color: An Intersectional Analysis. *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy*, 35(4), 315–348. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1554477x.2014.955406>
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Taylor and Francis.

- Bystrom, D., Robertson, T., & Banwart, M. C. (2018). *Gender and political communication in the media: A comparative study of elections in Australia, the UK, and the USA*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cameron, D. (2007). *Feminism and Linguistic Theory*. In Palgrave Macmillan UK eBooks. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-22334-3>
- Cameron, D. (2008). *The myth of Mars and Venus: Do men and women really speak differently?* Oxford University Press.
- Campbell, K. K. (1989). *Man cannot speak for her: A critical study of early feminist rhetoric*. Greenwood Press.
- Carlin, D. B., & Winfrey, K. L. (2009). Have You Come a Long Way, Baby? Hillary Clinton, Sarah Palin, and Sexism in 2008 Campaign Coverage. *Communication Studies*, 60(4), 326–343. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10510970903109904>
- Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Clinton, H. (2016, July 28). *Democratic national convention speech* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CQt4KxUmnzw>
- Clinton, H. (2016, November 9). *Concession speech* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=okgaTVlvUwk>
- Connell, R. (2005). *Masculinities* (2nd ed.). University Of California Press. [https://lulfmi.lv/files/2020/Connell\\_Masculinities.pdf](https://lulfmi.lv/files/2020/Connell_Masculinities.pdf)
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). *On intersectionality: Essential writings*. New Press.

- Doan, A. E., & Haider-Markel, D. P. (2010). The Role of intersectional stereotypes on evaluations of gay and lesbian political candidates. *Politics & Gender*, 6(01), 63. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1743923x09990511>
- Dolan, K. (2014). Gender stereotypes, candidate evaluations, and voting for women candidates: What really matters? *Political Research Quarterly*, 67(1), 96–107. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912913487949>
- Dolan, K. (2014). *When does gender matter? Women candidates and gender stereotypes in American elections*. Oxford University Press.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior : A social-role interpretation*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). *Through the labyrinth: The truth about how women become leaders*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109(3), 573–598.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x>
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6), 878–902.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech acts* (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
- Harris, K. (2020, August 19). *Democratic national convention speech* [Transcript]. CNN. <https://www.cnn.com>

- Harris, K. (2020, November 7). *Victory speech* [Video]. YouTube. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ExPm\\_hJQYpQ](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ExPm_hJQYpQ)
- Harris-Perry, M. V. (2011). *Sister citizen : shame, stereotypes, and black women in America*. Yale University Press.
- Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, men and politeness*. Routledge.
- Holmes, J. (2008). *Gendered talk at work : constructing social identity through workplace interaction*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Huddy, L., & Terkildsen, N. (1993). Gender stereotypes and the perception of male and female candidates. *American Journal of Political Science*, 37(1), 119–147. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2111526>
- Jamieson, K. H. (1995). *Beyond the double bind : women and leadership*. Oxford University Press.
- Kimmel, M. S. (2012). *Manhood in America: a cultural history*. Oxford University Press.
- Koenig, A. M., Eagly, A. H., Mitchell, A. A., & Ristikari, T. (2011). Are leader stereotypes masculine? A meta-analysis of three research paradigms. *Psychological Bulletin*, 137(4), 616–642.
- Krippendorff, K. (2019). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Lakoff, G. (2000). *Moral politics how liberals and conservatives think* (pp. 3–37). Chicago London The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and woman's place*. Harper & Row.

Lakoff, R. (2004). Robin Tolmach Lakoff (2004). Language and woman 's place. Text and commentaries. Edited by Mary Bucholtz. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. xiv + 309. ISBN 0-19-5167570. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.1558/sols.v6i2.294>

Lawless, J. L. (2015). Female candidates and legislators. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 18(1), 349–366. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-020614-094613>

Lawrence, R. G., & Rose, M. (2010). *Hillary Clinton's race for the White House : gender politics and the media on the campaign trail*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Lerner, G. (1986). *The creation of patriarchy*. Oxford University Press.

Lorber, J. (2012). *Gender inequality*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Mudde, C. (2004). The populist zeitgeist. *Government and opposition*, 39(4), 541–563. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1477-7053.2004.00135.x>

Sanders, B. (2016). *Our revolution : a future to believe in*. Thomas Dunne Books, St. Martin's Press.

Schneider, M. C., & Bos, A. L. (2014). Measuring stereotypes of female politicians. *Political Psychology*, 35(2), 245–266. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12040>

Schneider, M. C., & Bos, A. L. (2019). The Application of social role theory to the study of gender in politics. *Political Psychology*, 40(S1), 173–213. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12573>

Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand*. HarperCollins.

Tannen, D. (1994). *Gender and discourse*. Oxford University Press.

Trump, D. (2016, July 21). *Republican national convention speech* [Video].  
YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F5XmFG3221s>

Trump, D. (2020, August 28). *Republican national convention speech* [Video].  
YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wRgiCtBY6K8>

## Appendices

### Appendix A. List of male and female presidential speeches

Title	Date	Link
1. Donald Trump at RNC. July 21, 2016. Republican National Convention. Cleveland, Ohio.	July 22,2016.	<a href="https://www.youtube.com/live/F5XmFG3221s?si=URZw1Ftpn-1tztMo">https://www.youtube.com/live/F5XmFG3221s?si=URZw1Ftpn-1tztMo</a>
2. President Donald Trump Full Acceptance Speech at 2020 Republican National Convention	August28,2020	<a href="https://youtu.be/RhL9iFkBaus?si=5--3ar8RnQTlpq3K">https://youtu.be/RhL9iFkBaus?si=5--3ar8RnQTlpq3K</a>
3. Vice President Joe Biden's Full 2016 Democratic National Convention Speech	28 July,2016	<a href="https://youtu.be/wRgiCtBY6K8?si=J4Yc3yQysv0cAKv8">https://youtu.be/wRgiCtBY6K8?si=J4Yc3yQysv0cAKv8</a>

<p>4. Joe Biden Acceptance Speech at 2020 Democratic National Convention</p>	<p>11 August,2020</p>	<p><a href="https://youtu.be/pnmQr0WfSvo?si=PCCRFyvesw4erop4">https://youtu.be/pnmQr0WfSvo?si= =PCCRFyvesw4erop4</a></p>
<p>5. Hillary Clinton speech in San Diego, CA on June 2, 2016   Hillary Clinton</p>	<p>June3 ,2016</p>	<p><a href="https://youtube.com/watch?v=CQt4KxUmnzw&amp;si=eU6M5PZ58WxQ5SJo">https://youtube.com/watch?v=CQt 4KxUmnzw&amp;si=eU6M5PZ 58WxQ5SJo</a></p>
<p>6. Full Speech: Hillary Clinton delivers DNC remarks, accepts nomination</p>	<p>July 3, 2016</p>	<p><a href="https://youtube.com/watch?v=okgaTVlvUwk&amp;si=LmdFWGIYINE0FvMf">https://youtube.com/watch?v=okg aTVlvUwk&amp;si=LmdFWGI YINE0FvMf</a></p>
<p>7. Watch Kamala Harris's full speech at the 2020 Democratic National convention</p>	<p>August 20, 2020</p>	<p><a href="https://youtube.com/watch?v=4wKnNGcKnDg&amp;si=1rFu9axnMqFWIsn7">https://youtube.com/watch?v=4w KnNGcKnDg&amp;si=1rFu9axn MqFWIsn7</a></p>

8 Vice President-Elect Kamala Harris Full Remarks	November 8, 2020	<a href="https://youtube.com/watch?v=vuG0VWERkII&amp;si=Ca4eoNc-aLN5vVrT">https://youtube.com/watch?v=vuG0VWERkII&amp;si=Ca4eoNc-aLN5vVrT</a>

## المخلص

إن هذا البحث سعى إلى استكشاف طريقة اللغة الجندرية في خطابات الانتخابات الأمريكية، وتعزيزها للتوقعات المجتمعية حول الماهية السياسية، وذلك من خلال مقارنة أساليب التواصل الأثوية والذكورية. إذ تستخدم هذه الدراسة تحليل المحتوى التوعوي لفحص البيانات النصية المأخوذة من خطابات سياسية أنثوية وذكورية مُنتقاة. وتطبق هذه الدراسة التحليل النصي النسوي الذي يدرس خطابات الحملات الانتخابية القائمة على النوع الاجتماعي لهيلاري كلينتون وكامالا هاريس ودونالد ترامب وجو بايدن خلال عامي 2016 و 2020 في الانتخابات الأمريكية. خلُصت النتائج إلى أن المرشحين السياسيين يواجهون توقعات جنسية متميزة: فتواجه النساء مشكلاً مزدوجاً، يُنظر إليهن على أنهن غير ذوات أهلية عند التوافق مع الأنوثة أو يُعاقبن على أنهن عدوانيات عند اكتساب السمات الذكورية. وعلى النقيض من ذلك، قام المرشحون الذكور بتفعيل المعايير الجنسية بشكل أكثر مرونة. لقد عزز خطاب ترامب المُعرق في الذكورة المثل الذكورية المهيمنة. في حين أظهر تعاطف بايندن المقصود قدرة الرجال على اكتساب السمات الرحيمة دون تقليل من مصداقيتهم. ويكشف هذا عن أوجه عدم المساواة المتجذرة؛ فالرجال يُزاوجون أساليب التواصل المؤنثة دون تكلفة تتعلق بسمعتهم، إلا أن النساء يواجهن ردود أفعال عنيفة بسبب انحرافهن عن الأدوار المقررة. ويقتصر هذا التحليل على إطار زمني محدد وسياق ثقافي واحد. ويركز على عدم المساواة المنهجية في الوصول إلى القيادة، مع التركيز على كيفية استمرارية الرؤى المجتمعية الصارمة حول النوع الاجتماعي للعوائق التي تحول دون التعبير السياسي العادل.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** الارتباط المزدوج، اللغة الجندرية، الذكورة المهيمنة، التمثيل القيادي، التواصل السياسي.