

4

Gender versus Politics: When Conceptual Models Collide in the US Senate

Kathleen Ahrens* and Sophia Yat Mei Lee**

*Hong Kong Baptist University and National Taiwan University

**The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

4.1 Introduction

One of the main purposes of political speeches is to persuade others of one's opinion. Nowhere is this more apparent than on the floor of a democratically elected legislative body, where legislators gain floor time to convince others of the validity of their points of view. One method political leaders employ to this end, either consciously or unconsciously, involves incorporating appropriate conceptual metaphors into their speeches. Recent work has focused on the analysis of metaphors used by presidents and prime ministers (Charteris-Black 2004, 2005, 2007, Chilton and Ilyin 1993, Lu and Ahrens 2008, Semino and Masci 1996). However, less attention has been spent on political leaders at the next level of statesmanship: the senators, cabinet ministers and members of parliament, an area which several chapters in this volume now address (Chs 5, 7–9 and 12). In this chapter, we examine the use of lexemes associated with two conceptual metaphor models in US senatorial speech from 2000 to early 2007 in order to determine if gender, political party affiliation, or a combination of both gender and party in the US Senate influences the conceptual models invoked by the senators. We find that as a group, senators do not invoke a particular conceptual model on the basis of gender. Instead, the conceptual model most often invoked across all groups is the model that Lakoff (1996/2002) postulates to be associated with the Democratic political party.

4.2 Conceptual models used in American politics

Lakoff (1996/2002) postulates that the American political system is based on a conceptual model of a family and that the two modern US

political parties, the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, have their own particular version of this general model. Each version reflects the conceptual world view of that political party which is, in turn, postulated to be based on the moral values which that party holds. For example, Lakoff (1996/2002) argues that the Republican Party utilizes the Strict Father (SF) model, which is based on a traditional nuclear family where the father has the primary responsibility to support and protect the family. The primary metaphors for this model are *MORALITY IS STRENGTH* and *MORALITY IS AUTHORITY*. Within the conceptual metaphor theory (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, Kövecses 2002), a more abstract concept is understood in terms of a more concrete concept (relatively speaking). Thus, in the previous case, *MORALITY* is the abstract concept in the target domain understood in terms of a more concrete source domain, such as *STRENGTH*.¹

Lakoff (1996/2002) postulates that the Republican Party in America bases its values on this model and that Republicans primarily use metaphors (such as *MORALITY IS STRENGTH*) which support this model. Some policy entailments that arise from this particular world view include the idea that self-discipline and self-denial allow one to build moral strength and that there is a moral authority and moral order in the family, and by extension in the social and political universe.

The alternative model, the Nurturant Parent (NP) model, is postulated by Lakoff (1996/2002) to be used primarily by the Democrats. The NP model is based on a family where responsibility is shared among family members, and there is mutual caring and support given to all family members. The primary metaphors for this model are *MORALITY IS NURTURANCE* and *MORALITY IS EMPATHY*. Thus, according to Lakoff, both political parties acknowledge and incorporate the primacy of the family into their political models. However, the Republicans use the family model to emphasise that strength and authority are the primary responsibilities of a family leader (and by extension, a political leader), while Democrats use the model to emphasise that nurturance and empathy are the primary characteristics of a family or political leader.

In addition to differing in terms of underlying assumptions of a family and their extensions to the political world, these models differ with respect to women's roles in the moral order. In the SF model, men are considered to have moral authority over women, while in the NP model, neither men nor women have moral authority over the other gender (Lakoff 1996/2002). This fact may explain the 'party' gap: that is, Democratic women held double the number of seats of their Republican counterparts in 2007 (50 versus 21 House members, 11 versus 5 senators,

and 6 versus 3 governors).² This could be argued to be the case precisely because the moral value system of the Democrats supports women as leaders. Yet, there still are female Republican leaders at the highest levels of government in the United States. These women do, de facto, have authority over the men and women in their state. They are the voice of representation for the men and women in their state. Given that the conceptual models give rise to different ways of viewing women's roles, does being part of the Republican Party mean that these female leaders incorporate the MORALITY IS STRENGTH conceptual model into their world view?

In order to answer the above question, we need to first address what it means to incorporate a conceptual model into one's world view. One possible way of evaluating this issue is to determine what conceptual metaphors are used by speakers and then determine if these metaphors are part of the proposed conceptual model. For example, as Charteris-Black (2005) points out, Republican president George W. Bush uses many moral accounting metaphors, which are considered to be part of the SF model (Lakoff 1996/2002). However, Charteris-Black did not specifically investigate whether Republicans and Democrats used one model (that is, NP or SF) more than the other.

To look at the literature on the hypotheses generated by the Lakovian family model, we need to turn to Cienki (2004, 2005a, b) and Ahrens (Forthcoming). Cienki (2004, 2005a, b) examines conceptual metaphor use of George W. Bush (Republican) and Al Gore (Democrat) in the televised debates before the US Election in the year 2000. In Cienki's (2005a) paper, he found that the verbal gestures used by the two candidates supported the model, although the data were sparse. However, none of Cienki's papers demonstrated support for the consistent use of verbal metaphors which exemplified the conceptual metaphors proposed in Lakoff's models. Cienki (2005b) notes that since direct evidence for the validity of the proposed model is lacking (that is, evidence based on verbal metaphors), it might be necessary to come up with a new methodology that tests non-metaphorical entailments. Ahrens (Forthcoming) suggests such an approach by investigating whether there are different frequency patterns in presidential usage for lexemes relating to 'strength/authority' (in the SF model) and 'nurture/ empathy' (in the NP model). To test this hypothesis, corpora from online sources, including the State of the Union Addresses for American presidents from 1980 to 2006 and radio addresses for the same period, were created. Indeed, the data demonstrate that Reagan, a Republican, used more lexemes related to the SF model, while the Democrat Bill Clinton

used more lexemes related to the NP model. In this chapter, we take a similar approach by looking at the pattern of lexeme usage by Democratic and Republican senators with respect to the terms related to the SF and NP conceptual models.

4.3 Lexeme selection

Following Ahrens (Forthcoming), we employed a similar methodology to create a corpus of speeches and examine the frequency of lexical use of words associated with the SF and NP models. The choice of relevant lexemes was determined by using WordNet 3.0 (<http://wordnet.princeton.edu/>), an online lexical reference system in which nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs are organised into synonym sets, each representing one underlying concept. The appropriate sense in WordNet was then selected for each of the following four words: *strength* and *authority* (the top two source domains for the SF model) and *nurture* and *empathy* (the top two source domains for the NP model). Next, concrete nouns and verbs (underlined below in (1)–(4)) were selected from the WordNet definitions and direct hypernyms. After they were selected, we then discussed and discarded any verb or noun that was considered either too polysemous or too vague to be useful in the analysis (indicated with shading in (1)–(4)).

- (1) Selected sense and its direct hypernym for 'strength':
Selected sense: (n) force, forcefulness, strength (physical energy or intensity)
Direct hypernym: (n) intensity, intensiveness³ (high level or degree; the property of being intense)
- (2) Selected sense and its direct hypernym for 'authority':
Selected sense: (n) authority, authorization, authorisation, potency, dominance, say-so (the power or right to give orders or make decisions)
Direct hypernym: (n) control (power to direct or determine)
- (3) Selected sense and its direct hypernym for 'nurture':
Selected sense: (n) nurture (physical and emotional care and nourishment)
Direct hypernym: (n) care, attention, aid, tending (the work of providing treatment for or attending to someone or something)

- (4) Selected sense and its direct hyponym for 'empathy'
Selected sense: (n) empathy (understanding and entering into another's feelings)
Direct hyponym: (n) sympathy, fellow feeling (sharing the feelings of others (especially feelings of sorrow or anguish))

Nouns were searched for in both singular and plural word forms as well as in verb form if the lexeme was categorically ambiguous, as ambiguities would exist for plural nouns and the third person singular verb form. In addition, verbs were searched for in present tense (first and third person), past tense and past participle forms. All lexemes and associated word forms are listed in Appendix 4.1.

4.4 Corpora design

The corpora we used were created from the US Senate floor speeches available in html text on the official government websites of male and female US senators (that is, name.senate.gov). All floor speeches were downloaded to text files. Next all headers and introductory remarks made by someone other than the senator were removed.

The list of senators included in the corpora are given in Table 4.1, along with the gender, the political party, the state the senator is from, the number of words in each corpus and the time frame of the speeches included in the corpus.

The time period under consideration includes the very end of Bill Clinton's presidential administration (for Senator Kennedy and Senator Kerry's speeches), with the majority of senatorial speeches taking place during the administration of G. W. Bush, the forty-third president of the United States. The last speeches were taken in May 2007 (for Senator McCain). These speeches were given during a time of relative prosperity (that is, they were gathered before the financial crisis of 2008), but they also occurred during the time that America was engaged in a 'war on terror' in Afghanistan and Iraq. In the year 2000, the Republicans had a slim control of the Senate, until one of their members defected to the Democrats, at which point in time it came under Democratic control. This lasted only until the elections of 2002, and then the Republicans remained in control until the elections of 2006, at which point the Democrats regained control, mostly on the basis of Americans' dissatisfaction with the fact that America was still at war (or even went to war in the first place), or dissatisfaction with the way the war was progressing. Thus, during the time period under study, Republicans held control of the Senate for the majority of the time.

Table 4.1 Information about US Senate corpora

Politician	Gender	Party	State	Corpus size (number of words)	Time frame
Dianne Feinstein	Female	Democrat	California	52,787	1/2006-4/2007
Barbara Boxer	Female	Democrat	California	19,896	3/2005-9/2006
Hillary Clinton	Female	Democrat	New York	74,196	2/2001-2/2007
Barack Hussein Obama	Male	Democrat	Illinois	46,606	2/2005-1/2007
Edward Moore Kennedy	Male	Democrat	Massachusetts	127,427	5/2000-2/2002
John Kerry	Male	Democrat	Massachusetts	47,354	3/2000-4/2007
Elizabeth Dole	Female	Republican	North Carolina	41,790	2/2003-1/2007
Kay Bailey Hutchinson	Female	Republican	Texas	124,026	1/2005-4/2007
Lisa Murkowski	Female	Republican	Alaska	1,480	11/2005
John McCain	Male	Republican	Arizona	16,965	1/2005-5/2007
Lindsey Graham	Male	Republican	South Carolina	30,069	2/2004-9/2005
Lamar Alexander	Male	Republican	Tennessee	171,437	2/2003-4/2007

In terms of the protocol in the US Senate, debate takes place in an orderly manner, unlike in the House of Commons, discussed in Charters-Black's chapter (this volume). The first rule of debating (taken from the Standing Rules of the Senate at <http://rules.senate.gov/senaterules/rule19.php>) highlights the formality of the discourse of debate on the Senate floor:

When a Senator desires to speak, he shall rise and address the Presiding Officer, and shall not proceed until he is recognized, and the Presiding Officer shall recognize the Senator who shall first address him. No Senator shall interrupt another Senator in debate without

his consent, and to obtain such consent he shall first address the Presiding Officer, and no Senator shall speak more than twice upon any one question in debate on the same legislative day without leave of the Senate, which shall be determined without debate.

Thus, the US Senate allows a speaking environment where a prepared position on a given topic is presented to persuade their fellow senators to vote in a particular way. These speeches are recorded in the Congressional Record, which is made available to the public in libraries and online (<http://thomas.loc.gov>), and nowadays many floor speeches appear on the websites of the senators themselves. In this study, we took the floor speeches that were listed on each senator's own official website, and not those listed in the Congressional Record. We did this because we assume that the senator is making available the floor speeches that they consider most important. For example, although Diane Feinstein gave many floor speeches in June 2006 (as seen on <http://thomas.loc.gov>), she only listed two on her own official website (<http://feinstein.state.gov>): 'Democratic Women's Checklist for Change: Stem Cell Research' (28 June 2006), and 'Statement on the Flag Protection Amendment' (27 June 2006).

To sum up our hypotheses before we move on to the data analyses, if ideology is the overriding factor, male and female Republican senators will have comparable levels of usage of both SF lexemes (high) and NP lexemes (low) in their Senate floor speeches, while Democratic male and female senators will have the opposite pattern. This finding would be the strongest support for Lakoff's proposal that Republicans and Democrats have different views of morality as expressed in different conceptual models. However, if gender overrides ideology, then we may find that women senators of both parties have a high usage of NP lexemes, and a low usage of SF lexemes. To foreshadow our findings, what we will show below is that neither of these predictions holds. Instead, we find that the NP lexemes are used most often in the speeches of all senators: male, female, Democrat and Republican.

4.5 Data analyses

For the data analysis, we calculated the total token count and normalised that to the number of total tokens per 10,000 words to analyse the overall pattern of usage. The frequency of use of NP and SF lexemes for four groups (Democratic female, Democratic male, Republican female, Republican male) was then compared with the overall frequency of use in the British National Corpus (BNC) using the z-statistic.⁴ The first

three groups all use NP and SF lexemes *more* frequently than is found in the BNC ($p < .001$), while the Republican males use NP lexemes less frequently than in the BNC ($p < .001$), with no difference in frequency of use for SF lexemes as compared with the frequency of occurrence in the BNC ($p = .208$). Thus, the first three groups utilize both SF and NP lexemes in their speeches more often than expected, while the male Republicans use NP lexemes less frequently than expected and SF lexemes only as frequently as expected.

In addition, in order to follow up the research hypotheses mentioned above, a direct comparison is made between the proportion of SF and NP lexemes used by the groups under study: (1) males versus females; (2) Democrats versus Republicans; (3) female Democrats versus female Republicans; (4) male Democrats versus male Republicans; (5) male Democrats versus female Democrats; and (6) male Republicans versus female Republicans.

Table 4.2 shows the comparisons of NP versus SF lexemes among different groups. As the ratio of frequencies of NP lexemes and SF lexemes in corpus is .614 (200,265/326,418) rather than 1, we test whether the ratio in a group's speech is different from .614 statistically.⁵ As can be seen from Table 4.2, both male and female senators used significantly more NP lexemes than SF lexemes relative to the corpus ($z = 4.915$,

Table 4.2 Comparisons of NP versus SF lexemes (raw frequency) as contrasted by different groups

Group	Total NP lexemes	Total SF lexemes	Corpora size	z	p
Male	1,017	1,345	439,858	4.915	.001
Female	1,052	1,416	314,175	4.603	.001
Democrats	1,321	1,823	368,266	4.521	.001
Republicans	748	938	385,767	5.199	.001
Female Democrats	520	758	146,879	1.936	.026
Female Republicans	532	658	167,296	4.595	.001
Male Democrats	801	1,065	221,387	4.258	.001
Male Republicans	216	280	218,471	2.466	.007

$p < .001$; $z = 4.603$, $p < .001$, respectively).⁶ Democrats and Republicans both used significantly more NP lexemes than SF lexemes relative to the corpus ($z = 4.521$, $p < .001$; $z = 5.199$, $p < .001$, respectively). In addition, both female Democrats and Republicans used significantly more NP lexemes as compared with SF lexemes ($z = 1.936$, $p < .026$; $z = 4.595$, $p < .001$, respectively). Moreover, when we compare the floor speeches of male Democrats and male Republicans, we find that both groups use more NP lexemes than SF lexemes ($z = 4.258$, $p < .001$; $z = 2.466$, $p < .007$, respectively). Male and female Democrats also used significantly more NP lexemes than SF lexemes ($z = 4.258$, $p < .001$; $z = 1.936$, $p < .026$, respectively). Lastly, male and female Republicans used significantly more NP lexemes than SF lexemes ($z = 2.466$, $p < .007$; $z = 4.595$, $p < .001$, respectively).

These findings do not accord with the predictions of the Lakovian model (1996/2002), or with previous findings (Ahrens, forthcoming). One reason for this may be that the model is simply wrong, or that some key lexemes or key collocations are skewing the results, or that it is not appropriate to use this type of analysis on groups, as the results become diluted across individuals. In order to explore the latter two possibilities, we will compare the two most frequent collocational patterns for males and females, as well as Democrats and Republicans, and then we will examine the lexeme usage of three senators that went on to vie for the 2008 presidential election: Hillary Clinton, Barack Obama and John McCain.

4.6 Most frequent lexemes and their collocational patterns

After we searched for each word form individually using Wordsmith 3.0, we entered the number of tokens found into an Excel file, and totalled the number of word forms for each lexeme. We found that two lexemes predominated in each group we looked at. We then examined the collocational patterns for the top two lexemes, by looking at one to five positions to the left of the keyword, as well as one to five positions to the right of the keyword. After examining all these patterns, it was found that the collocational patterns one word to the left of the keywords had systematic differences (see Appendix 4.2), except for the keyword 'provide'.⁷

4.6.1 Male vs female

In terms of NP lexemes, both male and female senators used 'care' and 'provide' most often (males = 7.25 tokens per 10,000 words and 9.03 tokens per 10,000 words respectively; females = 9.42 and 13.3 tokens

per 10,000 words respectively).⁸ In terms of NP lexemes, 'health care' is the top collocational pattern for 'care' in its nominal form for both men and women (male = 4.48 and female = 3.41). In fact, 'health care' accounts for one-third of the female uses of 'care' (that is, 107 out of 296 instances) and two-thirds of the usages of 'care' for men (197 out of 319 instances). The fact that the issue of 'health care' received priority in Senate floor discussion for the time period under analysis may be one reason for the predominance of NP over SF lexemes. Yet, it is also necessary to see how 'health care' is used in context to determine if the speaker is arguing for or against it or has a neutral stance; that is, to determine if the use of 'health care' should be categorised as an NP lexeme. In fact, when the data are examined more closely, it can be difficult to interpret. Almost every senator is for 'health care' as an abstract concept (which would seem to be in line with our coarse-grained method of counting it as an instance of a lexeme being used in the NP model), but the devil is in the detail: who deserves it, who pays for it and who administers the health care programme (that is, the government or private insurance companies). Thus, depending on the level of discrimination one would like to see, it may be that the current frequency-based lexical analysis is too coarse-grained to get at the differences between how men and women are using language.

In terms of SF lexemes, both groups used 'force' (male = 5.18 and female = 6.37) and 'right' (male = 11.34 and female = 17.67) most often. Moreover, when we look at the collocational patterns of men and women for one word to the left of the keyword (L1), we find that both men and women have 'air force' (male = 0.18 and female = 0.44) as the top collocating pattern for the nominal use of 'force' in the singular form.⁹ For the nominal plural form of 'right', the top two L1 collocational patterns for men and women are 'voting rights' (male = 0.7 and female = 1.15) and 'civil rights' (male = 1.14 and female = 0.92). Thus, we can conclude that in terms of a broad comparison between men and women senators, there is no obvious difference in terms of their lexical usage of items or collocational patterns for the lexemes examined from the NP and SF models.

4.6.2 Democrats vs Republicans

Similarly to the male vs female comparison, both Democrats and Republicans used 'care' (Democrats = 10.21 and Republicans = 6.2) and 'provide' (Democrats = 14.77 and Republicans = 7.02) most often in terms of NP lexemes, and both political parties used 'force' (Democrats = 7.47 and Republicans = 3.97) and 'right' (Democrats = 19.14 and Republicans = 9.05) most often in terms of SF lexemes.

In terms of the collocational patterns, we notice that there is a similarity in frequency patterns between Democrats and Republicans. For the NP lexemes, 'health care' is the top collocational pattern for 'care' in its nominal form for both political parties (Democrats = 2.06 and Republicans = 0.16). In terms of SF lexemes, we find that both Democrats and Republicans have 'air force' (Democrats = 0.08 and Republicans = 0.49), 'task force' (Democrats = 0.11 and Republicans = 0.16), 'police force' (Democrats = 0.05 and Republicans = 0.08) and 'military force' (Democrats = 0.22 and Republicans = 0.05) in the top five collocating patterns for 'force' in its nominal singular form. The top three collocational patterns for the nominal plural form of 'right' include 'voting rights' (Democrats = 1.68 and Republicans = 0.13) and 'civil rights' (Democrats = 2.06 and Republicans = 0.08).

However, there is an interesting difference in the frequency of usage of the top three patterns for 'rights', as Democrats use 'civil rights' and 'voting rights' much more frequently than their Republican counterparts. For example, if we look at 'voting rights' it is mentioned only five times by Republicans, all by the same senator, Senator Graham, in the two exchanges in Examples (5) and (6):

(5) When it comes to *voting rights*, as I understand – and we talked a lot about it, and we probably know more than all of us ever dreamed we would know about the *Voting Rights Act* – that you were implementing a policy of President Reagan that wanted to pass the *Voting Rights Act* in its form that you received it. Is that correct? (Graham, 13 Sept. 2005)

(6) We talked about the *Voting Rights Act*. Proportionality test in the Reagan administration's view was changing the *Voting Rights Act* to create its own harm. Is that correct? (Graham, 14 Sept. 2005)

In these exchanges, Senator Graham is not indicating support for voting rights; he is merely inquiring about the details of the act itself.

Democrats, on the other hand, discuss voting rights extensively (62 times overall), and in doing so, show clear support for the concept of voting rights for all citizens, as Examples (7)–(9) demonstrate:

(7) I don't believe we can permit these provisions to expire and leave the next generation of Americans without full protection of their *voting rights*. That is why I am very proud to be a

cosponsor of the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, Coretta Scott King, and Cesar E. Chavez *Voting Rights Act* Reauthorization and Amendment Act of 2006. (Feinstein, 20 July 2006)

(8) Mr. President, I have fought hard to support the *voting rights* of the disenfranchised voter. (Clinton, 16 Oct. 2002)

(9) The memory of Selma still lives on in the spirit of the *Voting Rights Act*. Since that day, the *Voting Rights Act* has been a critical tool in ensuring that all Americans not only have the right to vote, but the right to have their vote counted. (Obama, 20 July 2006)

In the above examples, all three senators are arguing for support of the right of all American citizens to vote without impediment. This inclusivity is a central tenet of the Democratic Party, and of the NP model, which Lakoff suggests (1996/2002) involves the fair distribution of nurture, that is, the fair distribution of rights that an individual needs to grow and participate in society.

The above account of Democrats and Republicans suggests that there is no significant difference between the two groups regarding which SF and NP lexemes or collocational patterns occur most frequently in the Senate speeches. Moreover, both Democrats and Republicans use NP lexemes more than SF lexemes, suggesting that the NP model might be considered a prevalent way of conceptualising in the US Senate, which suggests that the model proposed by Lakoff (1996/2002) regarding how Democrats and Republicans view the world does not receive straightforward support from a lexical frequency pattern analysis. However, this may be because the supra-individual analysis hides individual patterns of speech, an issue to which we turn below.

4.7 Frequency patterns and collocational patterns of Clinton, Obama and McCain

In what follows, a particular contrast is drawn below between Senator Barack Obama and Senator Hillary Clinton, as they were the two leading contenders for the Democratic Party nomination for president in 2008. A contrast is also drawn between Senator Obama and Senator McCain as they ended up being the respective nominees of the Democratic and Republican parties in that same election.¹⁰

Table 4.3 Comparisons of NP versus SF lexemes (raw frequency) as contrasted between Obama, Hillary Clinton and McCain

Political party	Total NP lexemes	Total SF lexemes	Corpora size	z	p
Obama	151	291	46,606	-1.706	.044
H. Clinton	354	390	74,196	5.128	.001
McCain	50	85	16,965	-0.237	.406

For the comparison between Obama and Hillary Clinton, we find in Table 4.3 that Obama used more SF lexemes than NP lexemes ($z = -1.706$, $p < .044$), but this difference does not reach significance. Clinton, on the other hand, used more NP lexemes ($z = 5.128$, $p < .001$). Thus, Clinton is following the overall pattern to use more NP than SF lexemes, while Obama does not. Interestingly, they selected the same subgroup of items in both NP and SF categories. They used 'care' (Obama = 8.58 and Clinton = 17.93) and 'provide' (Obama = 11.16 and Clinton = 16.17) most often in terms of NP lexemes. Unlike the general trend of the choice of SF lexemes as discussed in the previous sections, they both used 'right' (Obama = 29.4 and Clinton = 22.64) and 'decision' (Obama = 8.15 and Clinton = 6.47) most often in terms of SF lexemes.

In contrast to Clinton and similarly to Obama, there was no significant difference for NP and SF usage for McCain ($z = -0.237$, $p < .406$). McCain's collocations patterned differently from those of Obama and Clinton as he used 'provide' and 'understand' (11.2 and 6.48, respectively) most often in terms of NP lexemes, and 'force' and 'right' (11.79 and 11.20, respectively) in terms of SF lexemes. In terms of frequency patterns, both Obama and McCain used more SF than NP lexemes, and although this difference was not significant, it was different from the overall pattern found for other senators and for Clinton. Thus, it is important to contrast the findings for individual senators with the groups as a whole in order to see where each senator stands in terms of lexical choice in relation to his or her colleagues.

4.8 Discussion

Several findings emerge from this study, but several caveats remain. First, based on frequency comparisons with BNC usage, Republican male senators show a different pattern from the other three groups (who use both SF and NP lexemes more frequently than is found in the

BNC). With respect to the lexemes under study, male Republicans do not employ the SF lexemes more often than would be seen in terms of average frequency. This is unexpected, given the hypotheses proposed by Lakoff (1996/2002) that Republicans employ an SF world view. At the same time, it is not surprising that they employ NP lexemes less frequently than the average, as that does fit in with Lakoff's proposal that the NP conceptual model is not part of the Republican world view. However, the fact remains that they do not use either SF or NP lexemes more than would be expected given their frequency of occurrence in the BNC, which indicates that as a group they are the most conservative in their lexical use.

In terms of directly comparing frequency of use of NP and SF lexemes, we find that, across the board, NP terms are used more frequently than SF terms for all groups. This is unexpected in light of the fact that, as mentioned above, Republicans controlled the Senate (and had a Republican in Presidential Office) for the majority of time for the period under study. One might therefore assume that the paradigm that would be invoked most often would involve the Republican world view, even by those who may not hold that world view. However, that is not what we see in these results. In addition, the 'collision' we find between gender and the conceptual metaphor models posed for American politics by Lakoff (1996/2002) is not the one we expected, as we postulated that perhaps Republican women senators might invoke the SF model, which assumes that men have power over women. Instead, we find that all groups are using lexemes associated with the NP model, a model that assumes shared power and responsibility between the two genders. Thus, the 'collision' comes from the fact that male Republican senators are using lexemes associated with the NP model more than with the SF model (but see also the caveats given below with regard to the strength of this finding).

This finding can be contrasted with previous findings on lexical frequency patterns found for the four US presidents since 1980 (Ahrens, forthcoming), which demonstrated that Bill Clinton and Reagan, in particular, used expressions that dovetailed with the conceptual model associated with their respective political parties. The presidents were talking to the American people on issues that they selected themselves in the State of the Union addresses and radio addresses (and were not related to specific bills that needed to be passed, as on the Senate floor). This aspect certainly differs from the types of speeches that are given in the Senate. But what is interesting to note is that Hillary Clinton does pattern differently from Obama on the Senate floor, while Obama and McCain pattern similarly, and they became the two presidential

candidates (for the Democratic and Republican Party respectively) in the 2008 election, with Obama winning the election. It seems from the analysis done above and previously (Ahrens, forthcoming) that more information can be gained from an analysis of lexical frequency patterns at the individual level, as opposed to looking at a particular cultural group.¹²

However, this study has several limitations which preclude arguing categorically that the NP model pervades and makes up the language of the Senate. First, given the number of examples involved, we were unable to examine if the sense of the word matched the sense that is associated with the particular conceptual model. For example, 'right' can also be used in the sense of 'turn right at the corner'. This sense would not reflect an SF world view, and would lead to a different interpretation of our findings. Although we printed out and looked over all the instances under discussion, and we did not feel that this was a serious area of concern, it is still an area that could be improved on in future research.

Second, not all lexemes that we looked at were used to the same extent. 'Provide' and 'care' were the top two choices for NP lexemes, while 'force' and 'right' were the top two choices for all groups for SF lexemes. This is to be expected, of course, since the words were not chosen as exemplars of lexemes that would necessarily be used in the Senate speeches, but instead were selected following empirically constrained and replicable steps based on linguistic criteria. However, the fact remains that the results we discussed above rely to a large extent on a narrow set of lexemes within the original list of possible items. In addition, it should also be noted that the discussion on the Senate floor takes place in a rarefied atmosphere with a narrow and predefined audience, which could be one reason why the lexical frequency patterns we see here are so similar across groups. This might also be the reason that the phrase 'health care' occurs so often, as it is an issue that has been discussed frequently by the senators during this time period. Thus, the nature of what is discussed in the Senate may be skewing the results toward the NP model, and is an issue that needs to be examined in further studies.

Third, we were unable to more than cursorily examine how lexemes were used in a particular context. That is, the frequently used lexemes were above appear in proper noun usage (that is, as in 'Air Force' and 'Civil/Voting Rights') or in fixed phrases (that is, 'care' often appears in the phrase 'health care'). This is potentially cause for concern, especially if the usage is not in line with the conceptual model it is associated with, as we saw with the discrepancies in frequency of use of 'civil

rights' and 'voting rights'. It is hoped that future studies will be able to look more closely at the use in context (in addition to overall frequency and collocational patterns) so that a more accurate and detailed analysis can be obtained.

To sum up the current findings, it can be concluded that there are no differences in lexical usage with respect to the NP and SF models for male and female senators, as the frequency and collocational patterns are very similar and examination of individual usages shows no particular patterns. Democratic and Republican senators, however, show one interesting frequency of use difference with respect to collocation, as in the case of how 'rights' is used in context. In addition, our findings demonstrate that the Lakovian hypothesis that Democrats hold an NP model world view of government and Republicans hold an SF model world view of government does not find support from a lexical frequency pattern analysis of lexemes associated with these two models based on speeches from the Senate floor. The analysis of individual senators, however, seems to be somewhat more promising in that each senator can be contrasted with their overall group, which has the potential to shed light on how a senator aligns with or differs from the patterns found in his or her own party.

4.9 Conclusion

The line of research on lexical frequency patterns taken in this chapter can be viewed as an extension of recent work on political conceptual metaphor use, which focused on identifying metaphorical expressions (Cienki 2005a, Charteris-Black 2004, 2005) within corpora.¹³ However, as Cienki (2005a) notes, often linguistic metaphorical expressions are too few on which to base a conclusion. The study herein is designed to overcome to some extent this particular difficulty, while retaining the capability to test conceptual models. This chapter proposes that one such way to do so is to identify the source domain involved in the conceptual metaphor, select the appropriate sense from WordNet, and then select the keywords from the selected sense and its hypernyms and search for those lexemes (in all word forms) in the corpora.

In addition, the findings in this chapter suggest that it may be more productive to examine these patterns of use at the individual (versus group) level, and that collocational patterns should be investigated, as should (ideally) each example found, in order to ascertain that the keyword has been used in that particular context in a way that agrees with the conceptual model that it is associated with. This latter goal is

ambitious (and fraught with difficulties about what it means to 'agree with' a conceptual model). Nonetheless, it would be beneficial to integrate aspects of corpus- and frequency-based analyses with aspects of textual and discourse analyses in order to have a richer understanding of both language use and meaning.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge the support from the National Science Council (grant number: NSC-96-2411-J-002-069-MY3). We would also like to thank Crystal Hsin-Shao Chang, Paul You-Jun Chang, Chung-Ping Cheng, Justine Sheng-Hsiu Chiu, Siaw-Fong Chung, Ren-Feng Duann, Shu-Ping Gong, Katarzyna Proctor, Louis Wei-Lun Lu and Sherry Wu, for their help, comments and suggestions on earlier drafts of this chapter. Any errors remain ours.

Appendix 4.1 List of word-forms used

Lexemes associated with the SF model

Authority (authorities)
 Authorization (authorisation)
 Control (controls, controlled, controlling)
 Decision (decisions)
 Determine (determines, determined, determining)
 Direct (directs, directed, directing)
 Dominance
 Force (forces, forced, forcing)
 Forcefulness
 Intensity
 Order (orders, ordered, ordering)
 Potency
 Power (powers)
 Right (rights)
 Strength (strengths)

Lexemes associated with the NP model

Aid (aids, aided, aiding)
 Anguish (anguishes, anguished, anguishing)
 Attention
 Care (cares, cared, caring)
 Empathy

Feeling (feelings)
 Nourishment (nourishments)
 Nurture
 Provide (provides, provided, providing)
 Share (shares, shared, sharing)
 Sorrow (sorrows)
 Sympathy (sympathies)
 Tend (tends, tended, tending)
 Treatment (treatments)
 Understand (understands, understood, understanding)

Appendix 4.2 Collocational patterns across different groups

	<i>Force (F1)</i>	<i>Rights</i>	<i>Care</i>
Female			
Corpus size	(14) air force	(36) voting rights	(107) health care
314,175	(8) military force/ task force	(29) civil rights	(23) take care
	(3) use force	(18) the rights	(17) the care
Male			
Corpus size	(8) air force	(50) civil rights	(197) health care
439,858	(4) a/police force	(31) voting rights	(15) child care
	(3) and/full/ the force	(22) the rights	(8) medical/ take care
Democrats			
Corpus size	(8) military force	(76) civil rights	(180) health care
368,266	(4) a/task/ use force	(62) voting rights	(21) child care
	(3) air/and/ the force	(35) the rights	(20) take care
Republicans			
Corpus size	(19) air force	(5) minority/the/ voting rights	(124) health care
385,767	(6) task force	(3) abortion/civil/ property rights	(12) medical care
	(4) full force	(2) their rights	(11) take care

Notes

- 1 Source domains often are experientially based, that is, we know the concept of strength through our own body's relative ability to lift heavy objects (Lakoff and Johnson 1999).
- 2 The US Senate and the US House of Representatives are part of the US Congress. Senators and representatives are chosen directly by a one-person,

one-vote balloting system. There are 100 senators (two per state) who serve staggered six-year terms, so that approximately one-third of the Senate is elected every two years. The House and the Senate equally share in the legislative process, although the US Constitution gives the Senate the sole power to ratify treaties and approve major presidential appointments.

3 Intensity was also excluded as it was considered very similar to 'intensity' in meaning but much less frequently used, and was not found in our corpus.

4 More information about the British National Corpus can be found at <http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/>. Unfortunately, no corpus of a similar size (100 million words) can be found for American English, so we used the BNC to determine the frequency of each word form in this general corpus before comparing it to the frequency of the word form in the senatorial corpus gathered for this study.

5 As Professor Cheng Chung-Ding (personal communication, 12 Jan. 2009) notes, if one wants to compare proportions of two kinds of lexemes, say A1, A2, in one's speech, the proportion of A1 ($p1$) and the proportion of A2 ($p2$) cannot be compared directly because frequencies of lexemes differ in corpus. However, this can be dealt with by testing the ratios of frequencies based on the result of Scott and Seber (1983). For example, if the ratio of frequencies of two kinds of lexemes in corpus is a constant, say a , in other words, $p1/p2 = a$ in corpus, then what is at issue is whether the ratio in one's speech is higher than the ratio in corpus. So the null hypothesis can be set as $p1 = a * p2$, or equivalently, $p1 - a * p2 = 0$. Thus, what is being compared is the difference between $p1$ and $a * p2$ rather than the difference between $p1$ and $p2$. If the null hypothesis is rejected, and $p1 - a * p2 < 0$, it means that this person or group says more A2 lexemes than A1 lexemes relative to the corpus. If the null hypothesis is rejected, and $p1 - a * p2 > 0$, the person or group says more A1 lexemes than A2 lexemes relative to the corpus.

6 The alpha level for significance is set at .05 when comparing groups.

7 It might be that no clear collocation pattern emerged for 'provide' either in the L1 window or any other window examined for any group because it can only occur as a verb, while 'care' and 'force' and 'right' all occur in both verbal and nominal forms, and the nominal forms is where we found collocational patterns occurring.

8 All remaining numbers referring to collocational frequencies indicate the number of total tokens per 10,000 words, and are raw frequencies.

9 Figures for the top three collocational patterns of 'force', 'rights' and 'care' can be found in Appendix 4.2.

10 Note that the discussion below is based on speeches given in the Senate, and not on the campaign speeches of these candidates, which would be an interesting area of comparison for future study.

11 As the statistical tests here are exploratory, the issue of inflated Type 1 error should be taken into account. The Bonferroni correction was used when comparing the proportion of SF and NP lexemes used in the individual's speech. Thus, in Table 4.3, the alpha level is set at $.05/3 = .017$.

12 See Steen (1994), Gibbs (1999) and Cienki (2005a) for further discussion of this notion of whether metaphorical models should be posited at the 'supra-individual' level.

13 Work on lexical frequency patterns in general in political language can also be found in Ahrens (2006), Hart et al. (2005) and Lim (2002, 2008).

References

- Ahrens, K. 2006. 'Using a Small Corpus to Test Linguistic Hypotheses: Evaluating "People" in the State of the Union Addresses'. *International Journal of Computational Linguistics and Chinese Language Processing*, 11(4): 377-92.
- Ahrens, K. Forthcoming. 'Examining Conceptual Worldviews through Lexical Frequency Patterns: a Case Study of US Presidential Speeches', in Hans-Joerg Schmid (ed.) *Windows to the Mind: Applications of Cognitive Linguistics Series*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Charteris-Black, J. 2004. *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black, J. 2005. *Politicians and Rhetoric: the Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black, J. 2007. *The Communication of Leadership: the Design of Leadership Style*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Chilton, P. and M. Ilyin. 1993. 'Metaphor in Political Discourse: the Case of the "Common European House"'. *Discourse and Society*, 4(1): 7-31.
- Cienki, A. 2004. 'Bush's and Gore's Language and Gestures in the 2000 US Presidential Debates: a Test Case for Two Models of Metaphors'. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 3(3): 409-40.
- Cienki, A. 2005a. 'Metaphor in the "Strict Father" and "Nurturant Parent" Cognitive Models: Theoretical Issues Raised in an Empirical Study'. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 16(2): 279-312.
- Cienki, A. 2005b. 'The Metaphorical Use of Family Terms versus Other Nouns in Political Debates' in Lagerwert, Luuk, Wilbert Spooen and Liesbeth Degand (eds) *Identifying Information and Tenor in Texts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 27-39.
- Gibbs, R. 1999. 'Taking Metaphor out of our Heads and Putting it into the Cultural World', in Raymond Gibbs and Gerard Steen (eds) *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 145-66.
- Hart, R., S. Jarvis, W. Jennings, and D. Smith-Howell. 2005. *Political Keywords: Using Language that Uses Us*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kövecses, Z. 2002. *Metaphor: a Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff, G. 1996/2002. *Moral Politics: What Conservatives Know that Liberals Don't*. [2nd edn published as *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*]. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson. 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh: the Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lim, E. 2002. 'Five Trends in Presidential Rhetoric: Analysis of Rhetoric from George Washington to Bill Clinton'. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 328-66.
- Lim, E. 2008. *The Anti-Intellectual Presidency: the Decline of Presidential Rhetoric from George Washington to George W. Bush*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Lu, L. and K. Ahrens. 2008. 'Ideological Influences on BUILDING metaphors in Taiwanese Presidential Speeches'. *Discourse and Society*, 19(3): 383–408.
- Scott, A. J. and G. A. Seber. 1983. 'Difference of Proportions from the Same Survey'. *The American Statistician*, 37: 319–20.
- Semino, E. and M. Masci. 1996. 'Politics is Football: Metaphor in the Discourse of Silvio Berlusconi in Italy'. *Discourse & Society*, 7(2).
- Steen, G. 1994. *Understanding Metaphor in Literature*. New York/London: Longman.

5

Non una donna in politica, ma una donna politica: Women's Political Language in an Italian Context

Gill Philip

Bologna University

5.1 Background

Politics in Italy is a complicated business. There is a bewildering number of parties representing every possible hue of the political spectrum. New parties spring up almost yearly – some fielding only one candidate – and coalitions are formed and dissolved with remarkable ease. Stemming from this situation is a widespread interest in the politicians themselves, and the ways in which they negotiate, pontificate and manipulate through language. No Italian political figure is better documented in this respect than Silvio Berlusconi, who has exploited his background in the mass media to the full. His adoption of football metaphors (Semino and Masci 1996) was one of a number of successful rhetorical strategies which, by appealing to the wider populace, won him the first of his three premier-ships. Similar strategies were adopted the second time, attracting a greater number of in-depth linguistic studies (see, for example, Amadori 2002; see also Bolasco et al. 2006 for a quantitative analysis); however, his third successful election campaign in 2008 was characterised by a remarkable absence of such rhetoric and a shift towards the more sober political style of the elder statesman.

While there can be no doubt that Berlusconi's persuasive language has provided linguists with ample material for study, tracing the rhetoric of one politician alone overshadows the changes in politics and society which have taken place over the past decade and a half. Italy's importance as a global economic power is now well established, and its politics are therefore of interest and relevance beyond its borders; and while many Italians hold to traditional roles and values, the once clearly delineated gender roles of man as breadwinner and woman as homemaker are