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Abstract

Gender differences in language have been extensively investigated by sociolinguists since the 1960s. This paper aimed to study gender differences in the personal pronouns usage on the corpus of the 113th United States Congress. All uninterrupted speeches (672 by women and 3,655 by men) whose transcripts were downloaded from the official repository Thomas were analyzed with the text analysis software Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count calculating the degree to which the politicians use personal pronouns. In addition, the computational analysis results were further analyzed with the software for statistical analysis SPSS. The quantitative analysis results pointed to minor statistically significant gender differences in the personal pronouns usage. However, the qualitative analysis showed more subtle gender differences pointing to linguistic changes in stereotypization.

Keywords: congressional speeches; gender differences; LIWC; SPSS; personal pronouns

1. Introduction

Language is one of the most important means of humans’ expression of thoughts. Guided by thoughts, choices people make in the forms of expression can be paralleled to their perception of things from the real world and consequently the way they express themselves about those things. Hence, two people may be speaking about the same thing with their descriptions being
utterly unrelated. To put it differently, linguistic choices may be a diagnostic of people’s both overt and covert feelings about things from the real world.

Identified as the struggle for power and imposing one’s ideas, politics is the field naturally occupied by men whose personality traits (strength, knowledgeability, assertiveness, directness) are a prototype for it (Huddy and Terkildsen, 1993; Kahn, 1996). Thus, the fact that the number of men in politics still prevails comes as no surprise. Even in the modern era, women are still under-represented in politics. Additionally, when running for office, women tend to hold lesser value offices that include education, environment, social and health care services. To put it differently, women get to hold offices not that rigorously associated with masculinity traits. Voters associate women candidates with solidarity issues (education, children, the elderly, social affairs, health care and the environment), while men candidates are associated with business, economy, military and agriculture (Leeper, 1991; Huddy and Terkildsen, 1993). Furthermore, when women run for office in one of men’s sectors, they will be prejudiced and receive less votes (Dolan, 2008). Moreover, if voters reject stereotypes and trust women to hold offices in men’s sectors, they will be depoliticized, womanized and maternalized by media (Bengoechea, 2011). Therefore, entering the world of politics – the world that has always been claimed by men – causes certain changes for women. They need to acquire some of men’s personality traits, which might initiate other changes including the linguistic ones.

2. Theoretical background

There are four main stages of gender studies in language. Built upon Jespersen’s (1922) characterization of men’s language as a standard making women’s language inferior, Robin Lakoff (1975) introduced the deficit model claiming that the social pressure influences women to ‘talk like ladies’ which makes their speech powerless compared to men’s. Being extensively criticized for unsystematic observations and introspective generalizations, Lakoff inspired numerous research. Simultaneously, Zimmerman and West (1975) developed the dominance approach where men’s more powerful society position is realized in mixed-sex conversational interaction, especially in interruptions and floor apportionment. As a response, researchers started working on reassessing women’s language by looking for its strengths which led to a development of the cultural difference approach first proposed by Maltz and Borker (1982). They believed that members of different cultures have different communication assumptions and rules which might result in miscommunication. Miscommunication between men and women may arise as a result of them being raised in different peer groups. This approach was further popularized by Deborah
Tannen (1986; 1990) who views men’s and women’s language as equally valid with differences arising solely out of a different cultural socialization process; yet, completely failing to recognize the power relationship between men and women. The fourth stage of gender research in language are anti-essentialist approaches such as ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1967), discursive psychology (Potter and Wetherall, 1987), social constructionism (Shotter and Gergen, 1994), conversation analysis (Sacks, 1992), among others, which share the notion that gender is not an essential individual trait but something one ‘does’.

Eventually, researchers decided to carry out research into more specific areas like in public contexts where men’s speech has been characterized as competitive and argumentative in comparison to cooperative and facilitative women’s speech (Coates, 1989; Holmes, 1992). More precisely, research (James and Clarke, 1992; Karpowitz and Mendelberg, 2014) suggest that in public contexts men tend to occupy the floor longer than women, thus being more assertive which might be explained with interactional norms being the male norms (Gal, 1991; Tannen, 1997) creating the idea of gendered spaces (Freed, 1996). Research (Dahlerup, 1988; Webster, 1990; McElhinny, 1998) also show that women adopt masculine strategies when in predominately male fields – politics being one of them.

3. Methodology

This paper aimed to analyze differences in linguistic expressions of the male and female politicians from the 113th American Congress. The reason for selecting the 113th Congress was the fact that, at the time of conducting research, it was the last completed one (lasted from 2013 until 2015) and it had the highest recorded number of female participants. More precisely, it was composed of 103 women and 450 men. As a bicameral legislature, the United States Congress is composed of two chambers, namely the House of Representatives and the Senate. As shown in Figure 1, the House of Representatives was composed of 64 women Democrats, 146 men Democrats, 20 women Republicans and 220 men Republicans. Furthermore, the Senate was composed of 16 women Democrats, 41 men Democrats, four women Republicans and 42 men Republicans.

The speech transcripts were downloaded from the official record of the proceedings and debates of the United States Congress Thomas found at http://thomas.loc.gov/home/thomas.php. All uninterrupted speeches were included in the corpus which was composed of 3,655 speeches; 672 made by women and 2,983 by men. The speeches were analyzed with a well-recognized and independently rated software Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (hereinafter LIWC) which analyzes a corpus on a word basis and categorizes each word in 70 different categories ranging from word count, long words, parts of
speech to words related to different current concerns such as money, religion, achievement, etc. The numerical LIWC results were uploaded in the program for statistical analysis SPSS which was used to perform the Mann-Whitney nonparametric test because the tests of normality pointed to data not being normally distributed.

The paper pursued the following specific objectives:

1. to inspect if there is a statistically significant difference between the male and the female politicians in the usage of personal pronouns;
2. to determine which of the two respective groups use a specific pronoun more than another group;
3. applying a CDA approach, to inspect contextual usages of pronouns and record potential gender differences;
4. to interpret the results by providing underlying reasons for gender differences and similarities in the usage of pronouns.

Due to numerous research in the field, we hypothesize that the female politicians will use personal pronouns more than their male counterparts because of the social nature of pronouns, which is frequently associated with women. We also believe that the male politicians will more use the pronoun I thus showing authority and independence and the female politicians will more use the pronoun we constructing collective identity. Furthermore, the female politicians might use ‘intimate you’ compared to ‘critical you’ more used by the
male politicians. Finally, there may be no gender differences in the use of the pronoun they with both groups using it to negatively present someone who does not affiliate to their group.

4. Analysis and discussion

In the following subsections, each personal pronoun will be elaborated on and compared with previous analytical research results. This way of organizing paragraphs rather than including it in the theoretical background section is more efficient because our data classified in several subsections can be more clearly compared to analytical results of other researchers.

4.1 Pronouns

Serious analyses of the relationship between gender and the pronouns usage emerged in the late twentieth century. Research on corpus linguistics (Biber et al., 1998), machine learning approach in identifying authorship (Koppel et al., 2002; Werlen, 2015), dating advertisements (Schultz, 2013) and argumentative essays written by university students (Ishikawa, 2015) found that women used pronouns in general more frequently than men.

More recent studies reported changes in the pronouns usage. In 2012, Andersson examined personal pronouns in editors’ letters. The analysis showed that male editors used pronouns more than female editors supporting the idea that men showed more involvement with their readers. In addition, Congresswomen using fewer pronouns than Congressmen was reported as the most significant gender difference by Yu (2013) attributing it to a formal setting. Furthermore, Jones (2015) was especially interested in Hillary Clinton’s pronouns change over 21 years in politics. She chose five significant career periods: (1) pre-candidate years (1992–1999); (2) first campaign (2000); (3) Senate years (2001–2007); (4) campaign for the Democratic president nomination (2008); and (5) Secretary of State years (2009–2013). The LIWC analysis showed decline in the pronouns usage: 18.63%, 17.40%, 17.36%, 18.16%, and 16.32% respectively indicating a linguistic shift and a trend of employing a masculine style over time.

Prior studies that have noted the gender differences in the pronouns usage reported women’s higher usage of the category. More recent studies have found a significant change with men using pronouns more, i.e. there is a tendency of decline in women using it. Our Mann-Whitney results ($U = 12661.5$, $Z = -2.297$, $p = 0.022$, two-tailed) confirmed that the men ($M = 205.79$) used all pronouns significantly more than the women ($M = 175.63$). According to Pennebaker (2013: 169), pronouns, by their very nature, track the relationship between a speaker and a listener/audience. Most pronouns are very social
telling us that a speaker is referring to and is aware of other human beings. Our results are consistent with the ones done by Andersson (2012), Yu (2013) and Jones (2015). The pronouns usage is naturally related to function words. They further support the idea of the women adjusting their speaking style to the formality of a political setting by using more masculine speech style, while simultaneously the men were changing their style by employing feminine features thus being more socially oriented. The results of the category which included all pronouns might point to potential gender differences in the usage of specific pronouns, i.e. the male politicians have proven to use more pronouns than the female politicians, which may point to the men creating an image of other-oriented people compared to task-focused female politicians.

4.1.1. Personal pronouns

Early examples of research (Mulac and Lundell, 1986; Mulac et al., 1988) into gender differences of the use of personal pronouns indicated women as higher users of the entire category. Sociolinguistic universal of women using linguistics devices to stress the solidarity between a speaker and a listener proposed by Holmes in 1993 was confirmed by Argamon et al. (2003) who proved that female writers used personal pronouns when referring to a listener/reader, while male writers had a tendency of using generic pronouns, i.e. female writers’ language pointed to a greater personalization of the text.

Personal pronouns are crucial for political speeches analysis because they give a sense of whom a speaker identifies himself with. The results obtained from a Mann-Whitney test ($U = 13536.5$, $Z = −1.416$, $p = 0.157$, two-tailed) showed no significant difference in the personal pronouns usage between the men and women. The results do not support the aforementioned findings in various discourses; however, they do support Yu’s (2013) finding of female legislators using fewer personal pronouns. In addition, they support our hypothesis of the tendency the female legislators show regarding the use of masculine speech characteristics in a predominately men field.

4.1.1.1. Pronoun I. A great deal of previous research into political speeches has focused on the usage of specific pronouns. According to Karapetjana (2011), the way politicians speak was part of their personality; therefore, pronominal choices are crucial to study. Several research have studied the personal pronoun I usage from the perspective of gender. Brownlow et al.’s (2003) research of linguistic behavior of men and women in unscripted televised interviews found than women used the pronoun I more than men thus being more self-focused. This was at odds with Larner’s (2009), Andersson’s (2012), Mulac et al.’s (2013) and Ahmad and Mehmood’s (2015) studies which found that men used the pronoun I at a higher rate than women in order to exhibit dominance.
When studying linguistic practices in a traditionally male field, other variables have to be taken into consideration while interpreting results. Arustamyan’s (2014) study on Hillary Clinton’s language found the frequent use of the pronoun I which was interpreted as Clinton’s, and extended to all women in politics, attempt to separate herself from others and present herself as an independent and accomplished politician. Hakansson (2012) did a comparative study of eight annual speeches in the State of the Union. Four speeches were given by George Bush and four by Barack Obama during their presidency. The two politicians were chosen because of having completely different opinions on political issues with the aim of studying their pronominal choices. The qualitative research results on the pronoun I illustrated Bush and Obama using completely different rhetorical strategies. More precisely, Bush used the first-person singular pronoun to express his strong opinion of an issue showing no care in other people’s opinion on the subject. Furthermore, taking credits for things he did not or will not do personally, he created an image of a powerful and decisive politician. In comparison, Obama expressed his personal wishes, feelings and compassion for the nation making his speeches more intimate. To paraphrase, Bush’s use of the pronoun I was more masculine, while Obama’s was more feminine.

We conducted the Mann-Whitney test to check if there were any gender differences in the use of the pronoun I. The results (\(U = 14677, Z = -0.268, p = 0.789\), two-tailed) showed no significant difference in the usage. Since the most frequent hedge phrases contain the pronoun I (I think, I believe, I mean), we decided to search for them and calculate their use percentage. As can be seen from Table 1, the women and men identically used the hedge phrases.

**Table 1:** Percentage of hedge phrases use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Token</th>
<th>Number of the token occurrences in the women’s speeches</th>
<th>Percentage of the token with respect to the total number of I occurrences in the women’s speeches</th>
<th>Number of the token occurrences in the men’s speeches</th>
<th>Percentage of the token with respect to the total number of I occurrences in the men’s speeches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of I tokens</td>
<td>4,433</td>
<td>23,570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I mean</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total % of the hedge I phrases</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Furthermore, while we were compiling the corpus, we realized that the politicians used structures phrases for addressing and greeting Congress. Table 2 lists the most frequent structured phrases.

Table 2: Formulaic phrases of addressing Congress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Token</th>
<th>Number of the token occurrences in the women’s speeches</th>
<th>Percentage of the token with respect to the total number of I occurrences in the women’s speeches</th>
<th>Number of the token occurrences in the men’s speeches</th>
<th>Percentage of the token with respect to the total number of I occurrences in the men’s speeches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I thank</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I come to the floor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish to honor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to recognize</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rise</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I recognize</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I commend</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I yield</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask unanimous consent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I urge</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total % of using formal addressing phrases</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.72</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results showed that both the men and women used formulaic expressions to address Congress. However, 17.30% of women’s I occurrences was related to formulaic addressing compared to men’s 12.72%. It is, therefore, possible that the women used the pronoun I more formally than the men.

Furthermore, we were inspired by Hakansson’s (2012) research which proved that despite being used equally in terms of the number of occurrences, the two politicians used the pronoun I to convey different messages and create different political profiles. So, we decided to take a look at the sample of speeches given by the women (1–3) and men (4–6) and selected the most frequent types of examples for comparison. The sample was done in two steps; once we
detected every *I* pronoun using a Word search function, we investigated every third page the pronoun was found on.

1. *I* have visited Guantanamo, which is a secure detention facility where people are treated humanely, kept very securely, but not on USA soil. (Kelly Ayotte, Senate – March 12, 2013; Terrorists trials)

2. *I* just returned from a trip, Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, visiting some former Soviet bloc nations to talk about their response to the aggressive illegal actions of Russia and what is happening to reset the table in the former Soviet bloc nations. (Michele Bachmann, House of Representatives – April 28, 2014; Israeli-Palestinian conflict)

3. *I* still remember getting into college. *I* still remember back then – and *I* graduated from high school in 1978 – that it was 10,000 dollars a year to go to the college *I* went to. *I* remember my dad thinking: ‘I can't afford this.’ (Amy Klobuchar, Senate – May 7, 2014; Student loan debt)

As demonstrated in examples 1 and 2, the women reported their personal experience; however, the experience was strictly job-related. Example 3 was different. However, one needs to read the entire speech not to draw a wrong conclusion. The reason why this politician shared her personal experience served a purpose of introducing a new bill.

4. Finally, *I* want to say that it has been a great pleasure to work with Michael. *I* am a pretty good Republican, he's a pretty good Democrat, but that does not make any difference. (Lamar Alexander, Senate – July 9, 2014; Financial aid simplification and transparency Act)

5. *I* met with every general and colonel *I* could find. (Lamar Alexander, Senate – April 23, 2014; Fishing barriers)

6. Williams-Sonoma has stores in Tennessee, but *I* ordered mine online. *I* don’t do this very much so *I* am not the best online purchaser who is around. But *I* looked up the catalog number, punched a few buttons on my computer, and *I* ordered my ice cream ingredients. (James P. McGovern, House of Representatives – February 26, 2013; Marketplace Fairness Act)

The men in examples 4 and 5 shared their professional experience; though differently than the women. The women stated that they had visited a place or met with someone putting further emphasis on the event or a reason for visit. In comparison, the men emphasized their role or importance in the event. Further, example 6 illustrated a man sharing his private experience thus letting his colleagues and the audience meet him privately.
In addition to the personal pronoun I, LIWC I category consists of the possessive adjective my. We searched for the most frequent my + X occurrences and calculated their use percentage demonstrated in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Token</th>
<th>Number of the token occurrences in the women's speeches</th>
<th>Percentage of the token with respect to the total number of my occurrences in the women's speeches</th>
<th>Number of the token occurrences in the men's speeches</th>
<th>Percentage of the token with respect to the total number of my occurrences in the men's speeches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total My + X</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>8,674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My colleagues</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>20.74</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>11.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My son</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My daughter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My husband/wife</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My father/dad</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mother/mom</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friend</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My dear + X</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My fellow + X</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total My + colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total My + family members</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total My + friends</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total numbers of occurrences showed that while there were no greater differences in mentioning family members (women 3.76%; men 3.82%) and friends (women 2.59%; men 3.06%), the women mentioned their colleagues (20.74%) more than the men did (11.27%). In addition to being more formal, the women were more supportive of their colleagues building an atmosphere of collegiality and cooperation. However, these results are not in accord with the ones reported by Schwartz et al. (2013) who, using the open-vocabulary technique, found that men used possessive adjective my, usually accompanied by wife or girlfriend, more than women used my husband and boyfriend.

Generally in political speeches, the pronoun I can be used by the speaker to convey his opinion, show authority, compassion with the audience and to
narrate a story (Bramley, 2001). Another function is to create a relationship because using I personalize the speech. The disadvantage is the issue of subjectivity which makes some speakers avoid using it (Pennycook, 1993). Based on the quantitative results of our analysis, we believe a more critical, context-based approach should be used. The sample we analyzed applying a Critical Discourse Analysis approach clearly demonstrated gender differences in the pronoun usage. Sharing public rather than private experiences, the female politicians used the pronoun I to separate themselves from the audience and group/party affiliation and establish themselves as independent and accomplished politicians, which is consistent with Arustamyan's (2014) findings. The male politicians, on the other hand, did not feel the need to establish themselves because they might have already done it or they possibly believed that their right for establishment had been granted with the election. Therefore, by sharing their personal experiences, male politicians used the pronoun I to create relationships and build a rapport. Furthermore, the results proved that both the men and women used formulaic expressions to address Congress. Yet, the women did it more often. The majority of speeches given by the women started with an explanation or motivation for the speech, while the men occasionally skipped that part and started a speech using In medias res technique, hence the difference. Abiding the pre-established setting rules, the women might have shown a more serious approach in performing a job. This idea is further supported by the results of My + X occurrences where we showed that the women made significantly more references to colleagues than to their family members or friends. It seems possible than the women saw serving in Congress merely as performing a job and if that was the case, following the rules, not exceeding mention family members and friends or sharing private experience sounded like a reasonable choice.

4.1.1.2. Pronoun we. Study of the first-person plural pronoun has been of great interest to researchers who deal with the analysis of political speeches. The previous research on the usage of the pronoun we in political interviews coined an expression of an institutional identity (Wilson, 1990; Sacks, 1992). The researchers found that politicians, regardless of gender, used the pronoun we to identify themselves with the party they represented. The research was further extended by Janet Holmes (1993) who found that women used inclusive pronouns (we, us, our) more than men with the aim to invite addressees into conversation. Her research supported the findings of Harness Goodwin (1980) who believed that feminine language incorporating more inclusive pronouns than masculine language stemmed from women’s views of collaboration and leveling the status of all participants in communication thus forging a common identity. The idea was supported by Skarpol Kaml’s research.
on Ann Richards’ rhetoric. To compare, Pennebaker and Lay’s (2002) findings on mayor Rudolph Giuliani’s language during crises revealed that, in addition to a marker of a group identity, politicians tended to use the pronoun we as a sign of emotional distancing.

Contrary to the previous findings reporting that women use the pronoun we at a higher rate than men, our Mann-Whitney analysis showed no significant difference ($U = 13,980, Z = -0.970, p = 0.332$, two-tailed) in the pronoun we usage. Closer calculation showed that the subject pronoun we made 0.98% of both the men’s and women’s total vocabulary, object pronoun us made 0.59% of the men’s and 0.70% of women’s, while possessive adjective our made 0.17% of the men’s and 0.8% of women’s vocabulary. According to the statistical data, we can conclude that the men and women used the first-person plural pronoun the same rate wise.

Additionally, we were interested in the ways the politicians used the pronoun, hence we applied a Critical Discourse Analysis method on a sample of texts. The sample was done as with the pronoun I; first we detected every we pronoun using a Word search function and then analyzed every third page the pronoun was found on. We were able to identify six contexts in which the pronoun we was used.

7. It is not only that we are providing coverage; we are providing access to care, so we can reduce low birth weight babies in our community. We are improving those numbers daily because of the Affordable Care Act. (Benjamin Cardin, Senate – May 12, 2014; Affordable Care Act)

8. We need to fix our broken tax system, and what better time than Tax Day to highlight this need? (Deb Fisher, Senate – April 15, 2013; Tax day)

Examples 7 (man) and 8 (woman) served the politicians to create an institutional identity speaking on behalf of Congress. However, there is a subtle gender difference. While the men usually stressed what Congress had done or is doing currently, the women were more future-oriented, i.e. what Congress has to do. To put it differently, the men constructed an image of an active Congress, while the women focused on limitations and emphasized the need for further actions.

9. That is why we Republicans are going to maintain our focus where it belongs – on the people we represent and on the issues that truly matter to them because our constituents understand that ObamaCare is about so much more than a Web site. (Mitch McConnell, Senate – December 16, 2013; Health care reform)
10. *We* do not miss our deadlines, and this year, *we* did it. I know that the White House did their Sweet 16 bracket before they did their budget, but *we* were still pleased to see that they were willing to participate in that process. (Marsh Blackburn, House of Representatives, September 28, 2013; Protecting the financial solvency of the United States)

Another type of the institutional identity is when expressing party affiliation illustrated in examples 9 (man) and 10 (woman). The men occasionally (eight times in total; four by each party) wanted to stress their affiliation by naming the party explicitly. The women, on the other hand, never mentioned their party in the *we + party* construction. Simultaneously with the party unity, the women even more frequently wanted to stress politicians as a whole unity as exemplified in 11.

11. *This* ought not to be a Republican issue or a Democratic issue. *It* ought not to be a woman's issue. *It* is an issue that should bother all of us when *we* cannot stand together and help those who have been victims of domestic violence. If *we* can't do that as a minimum, *we* really aren't doing our job, *we* really aren't doing service to people. (Lisa Murkowski, Senate – February 28, 2013; Violence against women reauthorization Act)

The third type of the institutional identity is presenting a state as in 12 and 13.

12. My State of South Dakota is a good example. *We* have balanced our budget very year since 1889. *We* have zero personal income tax, zero corporate income tax, and *we* have a very well-trained, hard-working, educated workforce. (John Thune, Senate – March 27, 2014; Midterm elections)

13. The people of my State have a disagreement. *We* are very fearful about climate change. So *we* are also worried about the health impact of the tar sands. (Barbara Boxer, Senate – September 18, 2014; Keystone pipeline)

As illustrated in the examples, both the men (12) and the women (13) identified themselves with the people they represented. However, when presenting an issue or an activity done in a particular state, using the pronoun *we*, the women kept their collective identity more than the men who frequently used passive constructions thus isolating themselves.

The fourth type is identifying with various committees they served on such as in examples 14 and 15.
14. What we found out, through our committee hearings of the committee I am privileged to chair, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, is that a lot of employers in this country are not abiding by some of the provisions of the Equal Pay Act. (Tom Harkin, Senate – April 8, 2014; Equal pay day)

15. We will continue in the Armed Services Committee to make sure the reforms that have been passed are implemented, that commanders are held accountable for a climate of zero tolerance within their units, and that victims of sexual assault are treated with dignity and respect and know they will be supported if they come forward to report. (Kelly Ayotte, Senate – March 10, 2014; Victims protection Act)

Both the male (14) and female (15) politicians reported findings and future intentions on behalf of committees they were a part of. In those kind of cases, they rarely expressed their personal opinion on a subject. In other examples not reported in this paper, if in a chair positions, both the male and female politicians stressed it thus emphasizing their importance or, as they often humbly put it, their privilege.

16. We all acknowledge the progress that our great country has made on civil rights and voting rights issues. Over time, we as a Nation have indeed grown to be more perfect – and more inclusive in some ways – than just a few generations ago. (Richard Durbin, Senate, June 27, 2013; Voting rights Act)

17. Those who have suffered discrimination have paid the greatest price for this lack of legal protection. But ultimately we all pay a price. If our coworkers cannot be themselves in the workplace, they certainly cannot be their best selves. (Barbara Boxer, Senate – November 6, 2013; Employment non-discrimination Act)

Another type, though relatively rarely used, was politicians identifying themselves with the entire nation as in 16 and 17. Even though the tone in two examples (positive and approving by the man in 16 and worrying by the woman in 17) differ, we cannot claim this applied to male and female politicians in general since we found only a couple of such examples.

18. And why have we abandoned our goal to stop uranium enrichment? Because the Iranian negotiating team has told us they would never tolerate an end to their long, expensive path to an enrichment industry. (Daniel Coats, Senate – February 27, 2014; Iran)

19. Our agreement should absolutely make sure we are given access to their military facilities so we can stop them from their programs where
they are working on weaponization of nuclear materials. (Kelly Ayotte, Senate – February 26, 2014; Iran)

Finally the last type of the collective identity stemmed from *we* versus *they* dichotomy exemplified in 18 (man) and 19 (woman). In establishing the *we* and *they* dichotomy, the politicians created favorable pictures of the unity they presented and simultaneously attributed negative characteristics to the groups they opposed in some way. The dichotomy was usually established to justify the groups’ previous or future actions.

To summarize, the statistical analysis pointed to no significant difference between the men and women on using the pronoun *we* and its variants whose usage always invokes a collective identity. However, critically analyzing our corpus, we managed to identify six types of contexts the pronoun *we* was used by the politicians with subtle gender differences. The most prominent use of *we* was for the politicians to construct institutional identity (Wilson, 1990; Sacks, 1992). The institutional identity was realized as the entire nation, politicians serving in Congress in general, states they represented, parties they were affiliated to and committees they served on. In creating a collective identity, the men emphasized their previous and current successful actions, while the women were more future-oriented. Furthermore, the men were more party-oriented explicitly mentioning it, while the women were more recorded to identify themselves with the state they represented. According to these examples, we propose an idea that women identified themselves with people who had chosen them and whom they represented, while men valued political programs of their party, hence their identification choice.

One type of institutional identity subtly differed from the others and that was the *we and them* dichotomy. The dichotomy was used with the purpose of sharing responsibility and collectivity preceded or followed by a controversial decision-making, which supports Jones and Stilwell Peccie’s (2004), Karapetjana’s (2011) and Al-Faki’s (2014) ideas.

Given the public setting of politics, politicians created both public facets of themselves, reflected in relationships and interactions with the audience, and collective using group reference and identification. They worked on creating a picture of self as part of a positive collective identity. Our analysis has proved that a mere counting of *we* occurrences is irrelevant and not informative. Politicians’ artful navigation through wanted identities by using the pronoun *we* with the aim of achieving a range of effects is to be studied.

4.1.1.3. Pronoun you. Several studies have so far dealt with gender differences in the use of the second-person pronoun *you*. They have mostly directed their attention into analyzing women’s language in predominately male fields. Kuo
(2003) videotaped televised sports in Taiwan and analyzed gender differences in female and male sports reporters use. The study showed that male sports reporters, regardless of the speaker’s role, used the second-person pronoun more than female reporters. The higher rate usage of the pronoun you was also recorded in Friginal’s (2009) call centers study; however, it was interpreted with men’s directness and more specific requests supporting the hypotheses of Harness Goodwin (1980) who believed that the pronoun you creates hierarchy and enforces authority and Mulac et al. (1988) who believed it subordinates the audience.

In comparison, a recent newspaper columns study by Ahmad and Mehmood (2015) recorded that women used the pronoun you more than men verifying Ruijuan’s (2010) conclusion that the pronoun you, together with the pronoun we, reduces the distance between a writer and masses. In a study on presidential speeches, Larner (2009) found that male politicians used the masculine rhetoric and exclusive pronouns (I and you) in Acceptance Speeches whose main purpose is for a politician to prove his expertise and leadership competences, while the feminine rhetoric and inclusive pronouns (we and us) were used in Inaugural Addresses aimed to unify people.

Similar to the aforementioned studies, the Mann-Whitney test showed a significant difference (\( U = 12,524, Z = -2.446, p = 0.014, \) two-tailed) in the pronoun you use. The mean ranks of the men (\( M = 206.26 \)) and women’s use (\( M = 174.28 \)) pointed to the men using the pronoun more than the women. The statistical data may lead to a conclusion that the male politicians were more direct than their female counterparts. Furthermore, a simple Word search function registered 4,380 occurrences in the men’s and 762 in the women's speeches. Once we were provided with specific speeches and contexts of the pronoun, we critically examined every third page the pronoun was recorded on. We were interested in the purposes of the pronoun use both between and within the groups of the male and female politicians and selected only a few examples for illustration.

The most recorded type of the pronoun use was a generic one presented in 20 and 21.

20. Mr. Speaker, the policy was you get paid for killing and/or scalping Native American Indians. And if you kill an Indian boy, you get paid 50 pounds. If you get a scalp of an Indian, you also get paid 40 pounds. (Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, House of Representatives – June 27, 2013; ‘Redskin’ offensive to Native Americans)

21. Economic principles don’t care if you are a family, a business, or a country. If you borrow more than you can pay back, you go bankrupt. (Mo Brooks, House of Representatives – October 23, 2013; Financial responsibility: the battle resumes in 2014)
Both the female (20) and male (21) politicians used the generic meaning of the pronoun you constructing experiences shared by everyone and invoking a sense of what is typical. In such contexts, speakers talked impersonally giving the audience a choice of recognizing themselves in the situations.

The second and third most frequent types of you differed between the two groups. The second most frequent type used by the women was the ‘critical you’, while the men’s was the ‘intimate you’. First, we will elaborate on the ‘critical you’ exemplified in 22–25.

22. Why do the Republicans keep objecting to this bill? You cannot, with a straight face, tell me you truly care about our foreign personnel when you stand in the way of S. 1386, a bill to provide for enhanced security, a bill that is bipartisan, a bill that came out of the committee on which I serve, Foreign Relations. (Barbara Boxer, Senate – May 20, 2014; Benghazi)

23. I know what you are doing, and the American people know what you are doing. You are using this legislation in your constant effort to discredit President Obama and set the stage for a despicable impeachment proceeding should you hold the majority in the House and gain the majority in the Senate. (G. K. Butterfield, House of Representatives – July 29, 2014; Institutional litigation is unprecedented)

In the examples, the female (22) and male (23) politicians criticized actions of the opposing party related to the image of collective identity and the we and you dichotomy with the latter one necessarily being given negative attributes. The next subgroup of the ‘critical you’ is exemplified in 24 (woman) and 25 (man).

24. You know what, Mr. President? It has everything to do with the budget because of the amount of growth that is taking place in this program. (Marsha Blackburn, House of Representatives – October 2, 2013; Government shutdown)

25. At one time, Mr. President, you had the White House and you had the House and you had the Senate, and yet you did not even try to get this stuff done. (James Inhofe, Senate – January 22, 2013; Climate change)

When disagreeing with the presiding officer in Congress, neither the female nor male politicians hesitated in speaking their mind. Hence, they showed they were equal in spite of the presiding’s higher congressional status and power. Further, the presiding’s gender played no role in being criticized. Moreover, in none of the examples a criticized presiding officer was a woman.
In terms of the number of examples, the difference between the male and female politicians was in the ‘intimate you’ usage in 26 (woman) and 27 (man).

26. HR 1797 provides commonsense protections for unborn children who feel pain just as *you* and I do. (Virginia Foxx, House of Representatives – June 18, 2014; The pain capable unborn child protection Act)

27. As many of *you* know, I own a small business. I understand what it’s like to work hard in trying to build a business from the ground up. (Kerry Bentivolio, House of Representatives – February 27, 2013; Protecting small businesses)

While the female politician presupposed the audience’s general feelings of pain and used it as shared experience, the male politician did a step further and shared a fact from his personal/business life. Moreover, he emphasized the existence of a more personal relationship with his colleagues partially removing the barriers between private and public life.

Additionally, we wanted to support our findings of the women using ‘critical you’ more than the men with the analysis of *you + modal verb* occurrences listed in Table 4.

**Table 4: List of *You + modal verb* occurrences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Token</th>
<th>Number of the token occurrences in the women’s speeches</th>
<th>Percentage of the token with respect to the total number of <em>you</em> occurrences in the women’s speeches</th>
<th>Number of the token occurrences in the men’s speeches</th>
<th>Percentage of the token with respect to the total number of <em>you</em> occurrences in the men’s speeches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You should/ought to</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You should not</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You may/might</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>6.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You cannot</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have to</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You need to</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You must</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of <em>you</em> occurrences</strong></td>
<td><strong>762</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,380</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 4, the women and men did not differ in giving pieces of advice or expressing possibilities. However, when expressing necessity or requirement of something by using cannot, need to and must, the data showed that the women expressed their stronger opinion more than the men, which supports our previous findings of the women being more critical in an attempt to strengthen their authority.

To sum up, the statistical analysis pointed to a significant difference in the pronoun you use with the male politicians using it at a higher rate than their female counterparts such as in Kuo’s (2003) and Yu’s (2013) study. Further Critical Discourse Analysis showed differences in the purposes of the pronoun usage. While both the male and female politicians used ‘generic you’ at the same rate to construct universal typical experience, they significantly differed in ‘critical you’ and ‘intimate you’. The research recorded that the women used more ‘critical you’ enforcing authority and subordinating both the opposing party and a male presiding officer thus confirming the hypothesis of Harness Goodwin (1980) and Mulac et al. (1988). The men, on the other hand, used more ‘intimate you’ thereby confirming Chafe’s (1982) and Tannen’s (1989) correlation between the pronoun you, emotional involvement and connectedness. The follow-up analysis of the modal verbs use supported our CDA findings with the women being more critical than the men. It further supports our idea that the women employed more masculine speech style to prove themselves and assert their authority, while the men used strategies to create an image of people-oriented politicians.

4.1.1.4. Pronoun he/she. Recent studies have investigated gender differences in the usage of the third-person singular pronoun he and she. Despite studying different discourses, they have reported the same results. In the studies of gender writer’s profiling by Koppel et al. (2002) and Argamon et al. (2003), female writers’ use of the pronoun he/she was recorded as a very strong indicator of a feminine writing style. Herring and Paolillo’s (2006) weblogs analysis on female and male preferential linguistic features confirmed the third-person singular pronoun as a female linguistic feature as well as Yu’s (2013) and Friginal’s (2009) study interpreting them with women’s preference for more involvement and active participation during an interaction. The only study which did not confirm these results is Ahmad and Mehmood’s (2015). They found that the occurrences of the pronoun he was higher in male columns writers, whereas the pronoun she had a higher occurrence in female column authors.

Unlike the previous studies reporting gender differences in the pronoun he/she usage, our Mann-Whitney results pointed to no significant difference (U = 13,245.5, Z = −1.712, p = 0.087, two-tailed) between the male and female politicians in the pronoun use. Interestingly, however, both the male and female
politicians talked about male persons more. Precisely, the male politicians used the pronoun *he* 9,561 and the pronoun *she* 2,956 times. In comparison, we recorded 1,391 occurrences of the pronoun *he* and 780 of *she* in the female politicians’ speeches.

The third-personal singular pronoun *he/she* is a marker to suggest that a speaker is socially engaged and others-oriented. We were unable to replicate the previous studies (Koppel *et al.*, 2002; Argamon *et al.*, 2003; Herring and Paolillo, 2006; Friginal, 2009; Yu, 2013) findings of women, who are stereotypically more socially aware, referring to other people more than men. Further, when referring to other people, both the men and women concentrated on men giving them more public attention. From a functional perspective suggested by Halliday (1994), no significant difference in other-orientation implied that both groups presented things in a relational way with the subgroups violating Biber *et al*.’s (1998) idea of women’s involved and men’s informational style. The findings are in line with our hypothesis that the women used more masculine rhetoric.

4.1.1.5. Pronoun *they*. Gender differences in the pronoun *they* usage have not received a lot of attention by researchers. One recent study that dealt with the pronoun by comparing biological and sociological models was Bell *et al*.’s (2006). In the light of both models, the researchers predicted for women to use more social words (among which they studied the pronoun *they*) because women are nurturing and preserve social connections. However, their corpus analysis showed no significant differences in the pronoun *they* use.

Our own corpus analysis confirmed Bell *et al*.’s (2006) findings. The Mann-Whitney test recorded no significant gender difference in the pronoun *they* usage ($U = 14,283.5, Z = −0.664, p = 0.507$, two-tailed). Therefore, we can conclude that the politicians referred to other people using the pronoun *they* at the same rate. Further, we recorded 11,812 occurrences of the pronoun *they* by the men and 1,994 by the women. Selecting every third page the pronoun was found on, we critically examined the contexts of the usage and found several types which we will elaborate on.

Based on the *we* and *they* dichotomy, the politicians used the pronoun *they* to distinguish themselves, both as individuals and members of a group, from others. Contrary to expectations, others were not necessarily given negative connotations. Moreover, we found that the speakers mentioned others in positive, negative and neutral contexts.

28. I think the Founders were right. The Founders in the Constitution outlined the duties of our respective branches of government. *They* enu-
merated them. People will talk about enumerated powers. They made those powers very few for the Federal Government. They emphasized that with the 10th Amendment. (Virginia Foxx, House of Representatives – October 2, 2013; 10th Amendment of the Constitution)

29. I am grateful to Senators Wyden and Murkowski for the bipartisan energy they have crafted on the committee and for the positive tone they have set. (Christopher Coons, Senate – September 12, 2013; Energy savings)

Examples 28 (woman) and 29 (man) showed that others were mentioned in a positive context. By expressing her opinion, the female politician gave the Founders credit for their actions. The Senators from example 29 were also recognized for their actions. One would suggest to check the speaker’s party affilition because if he was in the same party as the Senators, that would be an explanation for the positive comments. The only reason why we did not check it was the fact that Senators Wyden and Murkowski affiliated with different parties; therefore, while recognizing his party colleague, the speaker also recognized the party opponent.

More frequent were examples of the oppositional relationship between a speaker and other group of people. Here we also found two subtypes with both of them being more recorded in the women’s speeches.

30. We were very disappointed, quite frankly, when they said they would not move to the conference table with us until we agreed to a tax increase. That is what they want – an agreement to a tax increase in this kind of economy and with about 8 percent unemployment and with 20 million Americans either un or underemployed? They want more taxes – more control over people’s lives? (Marsha Blackburn, House of Representatives – September 28, 2013; Protecting the financial solvency of the United States)

31. Our friends on the other side of the aisle say they want to vote on a so-called clean CR. They insist that we ignore the voices of millions of our constituents who are flooding our offices with calls asking for protection from ObamaCare. (Andy Barr, House of Representatives – October 3, 2013; Government shutdown)

In examples 30 and 31, they referred to the opposing party whose actions were criticized by the speakers. The female politician in 30 started with reported speech and continued with strong accusations of the opposing party’s wishes the same as the male politician in 31 who introduced the pronoun they by euphemizing opponents and using a spatial metaphor.
32. We need to make sure they stop enrichment and put a stop on the Arak plutonium reactor and weaponization program. (Kelly Ayotte, Senate – February 26, 2014; Iran)

33. There is nothing more essential than stopping Iran's nuclear program. In order to do that, we need more sanctions. Why? Because every day they develop ways to get around the existing sanctions program. That is why we need to do a bit more as they are undoing what we already have in place. (Bras Sherman, House of Representatives – October 4, 2013; Keeping tough Iranian sanctions in place)

Another set of oppositional relationship examples is in 32 and 33 where both the female and male politician invited their political colleagues and opponents to even stronger unity in order to fight their communal enemy – someone who is not them. Additionally, we and they dichotomy was further highlighted by the repetition of we which made them even more distant. Needless to say, both subtypes were based on a collective identity.

Occasionally, the politicians referred to others neutrally; they did not favorably or negatively evaluate them. Such were the cases when they did not belong to the same group as a speaker but differed from the general public.

34. The health care law wasn't about substitute teachers, but they are the ones feeling the negative side effects and they are the ones seeing smaller paychecks. (John Barrasso, Senate – April 30, 2014; Health care)

35. Journalists are in prison solely because they were doing investigative journalism, human rights activists are in prison just because they felt it was necessary to speak out about the injustice in their society, and there are people who have been arrested, harassed or tortured because they disagree with the government and the judicial system of that country is unable to deal with those types of issues. (Benjamin Cardin, Senate – December 8, 2014; Profiling)

In such cases, as in 34 and 35, both the female and male politicians expressed concerns about underprivileged or discriminated groups thus showing their concern for others.

Finally, the last contextual type of the pronoun they was a generic one, i.e. the politicians used it to make generalizations about categories of people exemplified in 36 and 37.

36. Millions of Americans’ insurance plans have been canceled; they have lost access to their doctors and hospitals. (Diane Black, House of Representatives – November 13, 2014; Obamacare architect)
37. Republicans are going to continue to talk good patient-centered reforms, reforms that get patients across the country the care they need from a doctor they choose and at a lower cost. (John Barrasso, Senate – September 16, 2014; Health care)

Unlike with the neutral subtype where the politicians expressed concerns about specific subgroups, the female (36) and male (37) politicians used the generic they pronoun to show they cared for the entire nation.

In conclusion, we confirmed Bell et al.’s (2006) findings of no statistically significant gender difference on the usage of they pronoun. The politicians used the pronoun they as a resource to identify a group they did not belong to. The generic and neutral contexts were used to show emotions of concern for selected subgroups or the entire nation. The positive context was used as an agreement or approval of someone else’s actions even if those referred to an opponent. As a continuum of we and they dichotomy, the negative context emphasized the collective identity in criticizing both the opponent party and foreign nations’ political actions the examples of which were recorded at a higher rate in women’s speeches thus further supporting our ‘critical you’ findings.

5. Conclusions

This study investigated gender differences in the use of personal pronouns on the corpus of congressional speeches. More precisely, we chose the 113th United States Congress because it had the highest recorded number of female participants. Downloading uninterrupted speeches transcripts from the official repository Thomas, we compiled a corpus of 672 speeches made by the female and 3,655 by the male politicians. The corpus was first analyzed with the text analysis software LIWC which calculated the degree to which each politician used personal pronouns. The numerical results were uploaded in the program for statistical analysis SPSS where we performed the nonparametric Mann-Whitney test aiming to examine which group of the politicians used each of the personal pronouns more and whether the differences were statistically significant. Overall, our analysis showed that gender differences were not so statistically significant, i.e. the male and female politicians used personal pronouns similarly rate-wise. More precisely, the statistical analysis pointed that only the overall category of pronouns and the pronoun you were significantly more used by the male politicians, i.e. personal pronouns, pronoun I, we, he/she and they were used equally rate-wise.

However, the CDA analysis pointed to more relevant gender differences. Specifically, the female politicians were proven to address Congress in more
formulaic way. They reduced private experiences and family and friends references to a minimal level thus being more formal and job-oriented. Also, it seems possible that the female politicians did not want to be perceived through their personal connections trying to separate and establish themselves as independent politicians more than their male counterparts. Furthermore, while both the male and female politicians expressed their different affiliations, the women affiliated themselves more with people they represented, while the men stressed political programs. Counter-stereotypically, the female politicians were more critical of one’s actions, whereas the male politicians shared their personal experiences in order to create more intimate relationship with the audience. Additionally, both groups were equally other-oriented with more references to men thus giving them larger public space.

We made several hypotheses based on numerous research done in the field of gender and language in different discourses. Since the majority of the hypotheses were proven incorrect, we can conclude that hypotheses should be made with respect to characteristics of a studied setting not grounding it solely on previous research done in difference discourses. To summarize, since politics is a setting that has traditionally been dominated by men, linguistic parallelism with masculine expressions was a natural process. Our study showed a clear tendency of the female politicians adjusting their linguistic behavior to a setting, on the one, and adopting more masculine linguistic expressions on the other hand.
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