

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка
Навчально-науковий інститут філології
Кафедра англійської філології та міжкультурної комунікації

GENDER FACTOR IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Кваліфікаційна робота
освітнього рівня «магістр»
студентки 2 курсу магістратури,
спеціальності
«Сучасна англійська комунікація
та переклад і дві західноєвропейські мови»
галузь знань 03 – гуманітарні науки
спеціальність 035 «Філологія»
Шиліної Анни Вадимівни

науковий керівник:
д.філол.н., проф.
Бєлова А. Д.

«Допущено до захисту»

Протокол засідання кафедри англійської філології
та міжкультурної комунікації

Протокол № 8 від 18.04.2023

Завідувач кафедри _____ проф. Бєлова А.Д.

КИЇВ-2023

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
CHAPTER I. THEORETICAL ASPECTS OF STUDYING THE GENDER FACTOR IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE	6
1.1. Discourse studies in the 21st century	6
1.2 Gender factor in politics and political discourse	18
1.3 Gender stereotypes in political discourse	27
CONCLUSION TO THE FIRST CHAPTER.....	33
CHAPTER II. GENDER FACTOR IN ELECTIONEERING DISCOURSE.....	35
2.1 Multimodal analysis of the political performances of candidates for the post of President of the USA.....	35
2.1.1 Multimodal analysis of Hillary Clinton's speeches as candidate for the post of the President of the United States	38
2.1.2 Multimodal analysis of Joe Biden’s speeches as candidate for the post of the President of the United States	45
2.2 Consequences of the impact of the gender factor on election results	52
CONCLUSION TO THE SECOND CHAPTER	55
CHAPTER III. GENDER SENSITIVITY IN THE POLITICIANS SPEECHES	57
3.1 The content of gender-sensitive speeches: main aspects, peculiarities of construction.....	57
3.2 Rhetorical analysis of the speeches of candidates for the post of President of the USA	59
3.2.1 Hillary Clinton's rhetoric during the 2016 US presidential election campaign.....	61
3.2.2 Joe Biden’s rhetoric during the 2019 US presidential election campaign	68
CONCLUSION TO THE THIRD CHAPTER	76
CONCLUSION.....	78
REFERENCES	85
SUPPORTING MATERIALS	94

INTRODUCTION

Our speech styles differ according to many criteria, for example: age, upbringing, education, character and gender. Women and men are completely different, this is manifested in many aspects, in the processes of thinking, behavior, etc. Communication and speech are not excluded from this list. Men and women communicate differently, in a manner specific to each gender.

Relevance of the research topic. The relevance of the gender factor in political discourse in the 21st century remains highly significant. While significant steps have been made towards achieving gender equality and reducing gender disparities, there are still numerous challenges that remain unresolved.

One of the key aspects of the gender factor in politics is the representation of women at various levels of decision-making. In many countries of the world, there are gender quotas, which are state gender policies aimed at increasing the number of women in politics and in leadership positions for a sufficient level of representation in politics. Despite women constituting approximately half of the population, their representation in political leadership, parliaments, and government positions remains insufficient. This creates unequal opportunities for women to influence political processes and policy-making, highlighting the imperfections of democratic systems.

Furthermore, the gender factor influences political agendas and priorities themselves. Women and men often have different needs and interests, and incorporating a gender perspective can lead to a wider range of political decisions that account for these differences. For instance, issues related to healthcare, violence against women, pay equity, and childcare are key areas that require attention in politics.

The gender factor is also important in understanding social stereotypes and norms that impact political culture. Gender-based discrimination can result in unequal opportunities for political participation and restrict women's freedom of expression and engagement in politics.

Today, various social movements for gender equality are gaining popularity, and the growing awareness of the importance of gender equality demonstrates that the topic of the gender factor in political discourse is dynamic and actively discussed in society.

The gender factor plays one of the key roles in political discourse. Gender significantly affects the language and rhetoric used in political communication. The language and rhetoric used in political discourse can reflect and reinforce gender biases and stereotypes, as well as contribute to influence on women and other groups represented in the political environment. It provides insights into how gendered language, framing, and narratives shape public perception and influence political decision-making. This understanding is crucial for addressing and challenging discriminatory practices and promoting gender equality in politics.

Therefore, the relevance of the gender factor in political discourse in the 21st century is undeniable. Further research, discussion, and work on this topic are crucial for achieving a just and equal society.

The object of research is gender as a phenomenon in the field of political discourse.

The subject of research is the study of the emergence, development and transformation of the gender factor in political discourse as a premeditation for achieving political goals during elections.

The purpose of the thesis is to determine the influence of the gender factor on the political speeches of politicians and election results.

The purpose of the thesis involves the following tasks:

- analyze the content of the problem in the scientific literature;
- conduct an empirical research of a defined problem;
- formulate the conclusions of the theoretical and empirical research.

The methodological and theoretical basis of the study was made up of:

Research methods: analysis of scientific literature on the research problem, multimodal analysis of political speeches, rhetorical analysis of political speeches.

The practical significance of the thesis holds by informing policy formulation, promoting gender-balanced political representation, raising awareness, shaping media practices, and enhancing gender sensitivity through education. It contributes to the advancement of gender equality and the creation of more inclusive and equitable political systems.

The novelty of the thesis consists in the use of multimodal analysis techniques, examining not only the linguistic aspects but also the visual, auditory, and non-verbal elements of political speeches.

CHAPTER I. THEORETICAL ASPECTS OF STUDYING THE GENDER FACTOR IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

1.1. Discourse studies in the 21st century

Many scientists made a great contribution to the development of discourse studies.

Discourse studies have undergone significant evolution over the years, as scholars from various disciplines have sought to understand the complexities of language use in different contexts.

The origins of discourse studies can be traced back to the work of linguists and philosophers in the early 20th century, such as Ferdinand de Saussure, who emphasized the importance of context in understanding language use.

In the 1960s and 1970s, sociolinguists began to study how language use varies according to social factors such as class, gender, and ethnicity. This led to a greater focus on language in use, rather than just language structure.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) emerged from “critical linguistics” developed by Roger Fowler in the 1970s. CDA emphasizes the power relations and social inequality that are embedded in language use and seeks to expose the underlying ideologies that shape discourse. CDA is particularly concerned with analyzing how language is used to reproduce or challenge power structures in society.

CDA has its roots in linguistics, sociology, and social psychology, and is influenced by critical theory and post-structuralism. CDA views discourse as a social practice, and sees language as a tool that can be used to maintain or challenge power relations in society.

CDA looks at how discourse is shaped by social and political factors, such as power relations, social norms, and historical and cultural contexts, it aims to identify the ways in which power is exercised through discourse, and how language use reflects and reinforces social inequalities and seeks to uncover how discourse can be used to challenge power relations and promote social change.

Critical Discourse Analysis, as the approach has developed through the contributions of many scholars from various disciplines, such as Norman Fairclough who is often credited with developing the three-dimensional framework for analyzing discourse, which looks at text, discourse practice, and social practice. This approach has been influential in the development of CDA.

Michel Foucault, French philosopher and social theorist discovered the relationship between power, knowledge and discourse. In his book “The archeology of knowledge” (1969) he shared his theory of discursive formations and their place in the generation of knowledge. He pointed out that knowledge is not discovered, but rather created through discourse. He emphasized the ways in which power is embedded in the ways we think and talk about the world, and how it shapes our understanding of reality. For Foucault, language is not just a neutral means of communication, but is rather a site of struggle and contestation over the meaning and interpretation of social phenomena. CDA builds on these insights by emphasizing the ways in which language is used to construct and maintain power relations in society. His insights into the relationship between power, knowledge, and discourse have provided a framework for understanding the ways in which language is used to construct and maintain power relations in society, and have opened up new avenues for exploring the social and political dimensions of language use.

The critical discourse analysis as a network of scholars appeared in the early 1990s, thanks to a small meeting of Teun van Dijk, Norman Fairclough, Gunther Kress, Theo van Leeuwen and Ruth Wodak in January 1991 in Amsterdam, where scientists had a discussion about theories and methods of Discourse Analysis in case of CDA. The beginning of the critical discourse analysis network is considered to be a launching of Van Dijk’s journal “Discourse and Society” (1990).

Ruth Wodak made a great contribution to the development of CDA. Ruth Wodak paid a lot of attention to studying and developing the Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA) which closely deals with CDA. The dialectical relationship between context and meaning-making is the primary focus of the DHA. According to Wodak,

the discourse-historical approach makes an effort to incorporate the vast amount of information that is currently known about historical data and the context of the social and political areas in which discursive events are embedded. [14]

She covers the CDA and DHA cases in her works, such as “The Discourse-Historical Approach” (1996), thanks to this article, we understand the main concepts and methods of DHA its importance in case of analysis of historical and social discourse context; “Language, Power and Ideology” (1999) here in this book Ruth Wodak with Michael Meyer describe the theory and methodology of critical discourse analysis; “Discourse and Racism: European Perspectives” (2001) co-edited with Martin Reisigl. This book demonstrates how discursive techniques like stereotypes, emotions and manipulation usage are employed to create racist ideologies and highlights the need of comprehending the historical and social context of these discourses; “The Discourse of Politics in Action: Politics as Usual” (2009), in co-authorship with Paul Chilton, this book covers a fundamental analysis of political discourse in different countries. It looks at how political actors use language to create and uphold power structures and demonstrates how critical discourse analysis techniques may be used to analyze political speech; “Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis” (2013) here, Wodak in co-authorship with Meyer provides an overview of the methodology of critical discourse analysis, with a particular focus on the DHA. She covers topics such as the analysis of intertextuality, the study of genre, and the importance of context in discourse analysis, and provides examples of how the DHA can be applied to the analysis of various types of discourse; in “The Politics of Fear: What Right-Wing Populist Discourses Mean” (2015) Wodak with the help of DHA application analyzes what kind of techniques right-wing populist movements apply, also she gave examples from other European countries and the US; “Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism” (2017) covers the ways in which racism and antisemitism are created and maintained in case of discursive practices.

In case of identity and bias, Wodak's work has concentrated on the ways in which language is utilized to establish and reproduce power relations in society. She has demonstrated how discursive behaviors can intensify existing power relations and contribute to the marginalization of particular groups. These behaviors include the employment of stereotypes and the manipulation of emotions.

In particular, Ruth Wodak has used CDA to analyze political discourse related to racism, populism, and nationalism. She has demonstrated how certain ideologies and power relations may be constructed and maintained through the use of political discourses, as well as how they can be disputed and challenged via the use of alternative discourses.

Teun A. van Dijk has been influential in the development of CDA through his work on the relationship between discourse and power, and his emphasis on the role of social cognition in shaping discourse.

Teun van Dijk plays one of the key roles in the development of Critical discourse analysis. He has a great influence in the field of analysis of social cognition, group identity, relationship between language and power. His book "Discourse and Power" (1993) is considered fundamental in the field of CDA because it covers theoretical and methodological aspects of the approach. Van Dijk describes discourse as a key point of power that plays a central role in shaping social identities and relations. According to Teun van Dijk "Critical Discourse analysis is a type of discourse analysis research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in social and political contexts" [58, p 352].

His books "Discourse and Context" (2008), "Society and Discourse" (2009), "Discourse and Knowledge" (2014) and articles "Ideology and discourse analysis" (2006), "Discourse and power" (2017), "Discourse and manipulation" (2006), "Discourse, power and access" (2013), "The discourse, cognition, society framework" (2022), "(Anti)racist discourse" (2023), all these works are aimed at researching the discourse in various aspects.

A British linguist and a leading figure in the field of CDA Norman Fairclough made a great contribution to the study of language and power, language and ideology, and the relationship between language and social change. His three-dimensional model of discourse analysis made a great influence in the field of critical discourse studies. Fairclough's model for CDA introduced in his book "Language and Power" (1989) consists three interrelated processes of analysis tied to three interrelated dimensions of discourse:

1. The object of analysis (including verbal, visual or verbal and visual texts).
2. The processes by means of which the object is produced and received (writing/ speaking/designing and reading/listening/viewing) by human subjects.
3. The socio-historical conditions which govern these processes.

Each of these dimensions requires a different kind of analysis:

1. text analysis (description);
2. processing analysis (interpretation);
3. social analysis (explanation).

His works such as: "Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language" (2013), "Political discourse analysis: A Method for advanced students" (2013), "Critical discourse analysis and critical policy studies" (2013), "Discourse and contemporary social change" (2007) and other scientific works made a great influence on CDA and discourse analysis in general.

Gunther Kress was a prominent scientist who played a significant role in the field of Critical discourse analysis and multimodality. His scientific works, such as "Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design" (1996) introduced the concept of visual grammar, which describes the guidelines and practices that control how visual elements like color, composition, and perspective are used to convey meaning through images. He demonstrates how visual and linguistic modes of communication interact in multimodal texts and how visual grammar can be analyzed using linguistic concepts like syntax and semantics; "Multimodality: A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication" (2009) introduce a theoretical framework for

analyzing multimodal communication, explains the place of social semiotics in understanding how various modes of communication are used to build a meaning in discourse; “Critical Discourse Analysis and Social Change” (2010) in co-authorship with Theo van Leeuwen, Kress discussed the function of CDA in fostering social change and highlights the significance of examining discourse's multimodal issues in order to comprehend power relations and social inequality. He argued that multimodal analysis can offer insights into alternative discourses that pose a threat to the status quo as well as reveal the processes by which dominant discourses are created and upheld. His contribution in the field of CDA has helped to increase understanding of how meaning is constructed and contested in discourse, especially in relation to the interaction between a great number of modes of communication.

With the rise of digital media in the 1990s and 2000s, there has been a growing interest in studying communication that involves not just language but also visual, auditory, and other modes of representation. The rise of multimodality and multimodal discourse analysis (MDA) refers to the increasing recognition of the importance of analyzing communication that uses multiple modes or channels, such as language, images, sound, and gestures. The concept of multimodality has become more prominent in the 21st century due to the increased use of digital media, which allows for the integration of various modes of communication.

One of the key drivers of the development of multimodality in discourse has been the widespread adoption of digital technologies, which have made it easier than ever to create and share multimodal content. With the advent of digital cameras, smartphones, and social media platforms, anyone can create and share a wide range of multimodal content, from videos and photos to podcasts and blog posts.

In addition to technological advancements, changes in communication practices have also played a role in the development of multimodality in discourse. As communication becomes increasingly globalized and diverse, individuals are turning to multimodal forms of communication to express themselves in ways that transcend linguistic and cultural barriers.

As we mentioned earlier Gunter Kress made a great contribution to the study of multimodality and he is one of the leading scholars in this field. Scientists such as Theo van Leeuwen, Jay Lemke, Charles Goodwin, Michael Halliday etc. also made a big influence in the field of multimodality and multimodal discourse analysis.

Michael Halliday is well known linguist and the founder of systemic functional linguistics (SFL) and developer of the concept of multimodal text analysis which is called “social semiotic approach” (1970s) and has been later developed as the theory of multimodal sign-making (Kress/van Leeuwen, 2001; Leeuwen, 2005; Kress, 2010).

Theo van Leeuwen in his book “Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis” (2008) demonstrates a new approach to CDA that emphasizes the importance of social practice and the multimodal nature of communication. “Multimodality: A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication” (2014) presents an overview of van Leeuwen's approach to multimodality, and shows a list of case studies that illustrate the application of this approach in various domains. "The Routledge Handbook of Multimodal Analysis" (2014) in co-edition with Carey Jewitt provides an overview of the field of multimodal analysis, and includes contributions from leading scholars in the field.

Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis (FCDA) was first presented by Michelle Lazar in 1980 and has since been used to critique the gender-based disparities in discourse. Through this concept, Third Wave feminism aimed to highlight how feminist language is embedded in conversation. FCDA challenges the patriarchal system and traditional social roles, focusing on marginalized women and the stereotypes surrounding them. It delves into the relationship between gender, power, knowledge, and often addresses racism and sexism found in everyday discourse. Furthermore, this approach works to make power dynamics between men and women more explicit while examining any discourses which are gendered in nature. FCDA is related to Critical Discourse Analysis as they both employ critical perspectives and approaches to analysis when it comes to textual or spoken conversations. Michelle M. Lazar was one of the pioneers within this field and edited a book which pooled

together different theories concerning the need for a feminist approach to CDA. Lazar (2005) argues that, in modern day society, there is an immediate requirement for an academic discipline completely devoted to gendered discourses due to gender being an especially problematic concept in relation to sexuality and identity.

Within the 21st century, multimodality has gotten to be progressively imperative in a wide run of areas, counting communication, media studies, education, and design. The expansion of digital innovations and social media platforms has made it easier than ever before to create and share multimodal content, and this has driven to a developing interest in multimodality as a field of study.

One key development in multimodality within the 21st century has been the expanding focus on digital and online communication. With the rise of social media platforms, people are now using a wide range of modes to communicate with each other, including text, pictures, video, and audio. This has made new opportunities for research on how these different modes work together to form meaning in digital communication.

Another vital trend in multimodality within the 21st century is the developing recognition of the significance of design in creating effective multimodal communication. Designers presently use a wide range of modes to form everything from websites to advertisements to educational materials, and there's a growing focus on how to use these modes in an integrated and effective way.

The development of Corpus Linguistics dates back to the early 1960s when the first modern, electronically readable, corpus The Brown Corpus of Standard American English (1961) appeared. It consists of one million words from different American English texts which were splitted in different proportions from 15 different text categories.

The creation of the International Corpus of English (ICE) in the 1990s left a great influence on the development of Corpus Linguistics. The key role in the establishment and development of the ICE project played Sidney Greenbaum and Randolph Quirk, both of whom were prominent British linguists and experts in the

field of corpus linguistics. The project was initiated by a group of linguists from different countries who were interested in creating a corpus of English that would reflect the linguistic diversity of the language as it is used in different parts of the world. The first version of ICE, known as ICE-GB (International Corpus of English - Great Britain) (1995) consists of approximately one million words of spoken and written English from different spheres and it represents the language of contemporary Great Britain. Later, other versions of the corpus were developed: ICE-Canada, ICE-Singapore, ICE-India.

Today ICE comprises 27 national components: nine as “core Englishes” such as Australia, Canada, Great Britain and Ireland and eighteen as “new Englishes”: Jamaica, Nigeria, Singapore and the Philippines. It has its new version called “ICE-2” which has a focus on corpora of new English, it includes texts from a wide range of genres and registers also it has an extremely large corpus, which helps with research of a wide range of linguistic phenomena.

In the 21st century ICE is a well-known project all over the world. It has its web version called “ICEonline” developed by Hans Martin Lehmann and Gerold Schneider, now ICEonline provides online access to nine completed and a further six partially-completed ICE-corpora. ICEonline has a lot of benefits, users can customize their search parameters, save and export search results, it allows to search specific linguistic features, such as syntactic patterns, lexical items, etc and one more benefit is its availability, each stakeholder can use ICEonline for free.

With the growth of digital technologies and the availability of large, digital corpora of texts and speech, Corpus Linguistics has become an increasingly powerful and accessible tool for studying language use and variation in different contexts.

Overall, Corpus Linguistics has become an essential tool for linguists interested in the empirical study of language, and its popularity is likely to continue to grow in the coming years as more digital corpora become available and new techniques for analyzing and visualizing linguistic data are developed.

Interest and involvement in political discourse dates back to ancient Greece and Rome and is still relevant today. Different scholars including linguists, discourse analysts develop this field of science and now form a separate list of publications which are focused on political discourse, they are “Journal of Language and Politics”, “Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society and Culture” which are edited by Ruth Wodak and Paul Chilton. "Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse" (2002) edited by Paul Chilton and Christina Schaffner is considered to be an introduction to the field and includes methodological surveys in this field. Searle, Grice, Brown & Levinson, Habermas, Bakhtin, Halliday made a number of researches aimed at studying political discourse from different scientific points. Teun van Dijk in his book “What is political analysis” (1998) explains that political discourse's meaning and forms are connected to the political context, but not directly. Rather, this connection is mediated by the participants' interpretations of the communicative and interactive environment, formed from their beliefs, views, and ideologies.

Social media has revolutionized political discourse in the 21st century, providing people with a new platform to express their opinions on politics and engage in conversations with others. This shift towards online engagement on social media platforms such as Twitter and Facebook has allowed individuals to connect with others who hold similar views or have different perspectives, allowing for more diverse discussions. Bute and Rao (2016) suggest that social media enhances communication efficiency and expediency since its users experience comfort while disseminating certain facts. Zappavigna considers that social media is multi-faceted, but its primary purpose is to share experiences in an instant (2012).

Druckman and Parkin (2005) argued that the more editorials that are shared politically, the greater impact it could have on voters if there are no other news sources for them to rely on. Mutz and Martin (2001) found that when there is a lack of information sources available to consumers or users, those who are less attentive to politics are easily swayed by partisan information due to their lower cognitive development.

Nguyen (2011) noted that Twitter has the potential to increase the exposure of alternative news sources and polarize the inattentive public in an emergent way. He claimed that through Twitter, users have two primary functions: social networking and exposure to political discourse. Small (2011) found that not only politicians utilize Twitter for sharing information about upcoming events, voicing opinions, and representing ideologies but all individuals who use it also become affected by the type of discourse generated on the microblogging platform regarding their pre-existing ideological beliefs in relation to a certain political or social context. Moreover, Shah and Yazdani (2011) stated that hashtags commonly attract internet users so they can debate their political beliefs and worldviews using various perspectives provided from one single issue. Hashtags thus tend to relate back to mass media news and often address matters discussed in mainstream media (Bruns & Burgess, 2011).

In general, Political discourse in the 21st century has been shaped by a number of factors, including advances in technology, globalization, and changing social and cultural norms.

Polarization has been on the rise around the world, with people becoming more divided in terms of their ideologies, and less willing to reach agreements. This phenomenon has been partly fuelled by the advancement of social media and resultant easy access to tailored news reports. Populist movements have cropped up in many countries too, stemming from worries about inequality, globalization, and immigration; they usually reject established parties or institutions and address people directly. Advancements in tech have changed political discourse for the better by making it easier to communicate with citizens. Globalization has made it simpler for everyone to exchange ideas and info without borders, resulting in a heightened understanding of global affairs and new prospects for international collaboration. Additionally, identity politics has become a major part of political dynamics in numerous countries; people are banding together based on shared identities such as race, gender or sexuality which helps previously marginalized demographics achieve visibility and representation - but this understandably generates tension as well.

Overall, political discourse in the 21st century is characterized by rapid change and complexity, with new technologies and social trends constantly reshaping the way people think about politics and engage with each other.

1.2 Gender factor in politics and political discourse

The division of the concepts of sex and gender, which reflects the differentiation of individuals by physiological and psychological characteristics are important in political discourse. Sex is defined as a set of biological characteristics of an individual, and gender as a combination of socio-psycholinguistic features. Gender, thus, defines three groups of characteristics: biological sex, gender role stereotypes that are typical for a particular society, and manifestations of these roles within the framework of the rules and psycholinguistic norms proposed by society. It is worth noting that gender plays a significant role in people's lives, and not sex, since the skills and abilities needed in modern everyday life do not depend on the biological differences between men and women.

The impact of gender on politics runs deep; historically, patriarchal systems have created an uneven playing field where males dominate leadership positions while females struggle to break this monumental system.

According to the “Woman in politics: 2023” map, created by the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) and UN Women, which presents new data for women in executive positions and national parliaments as of 1 January 2023, women serve as Heads of State in 17/151 (11.3%) countries and Heads of Government in 19/193 (9.8%) countries. There are only 13 countries in which women hold 50 percent or more of the positions of Cabinet Ministers leading policy areas, where Albania is in first place with 8/12 (66.7%) women who are Cabinet Ministers. Data show that women are underrepresented at all levels of decision-making worldwide.

As we can see, the presence of women in politics is quite low, but despite this, even such results are a high indicator for women all over the world, because until recently the issue of gender factor and representation of women in politics did not exist at all.

As we remember from history, one of the most powerful impulses or the “first wave of feminism” for the development of the first political rights of women was the

women's suffrage movement in the middle of the 19th century. In 1869, the National Woman Suffrage Association was founded, which later merged with another suffrage group to become the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA). We need to mention that the US women's rights movements involved a lot of African American women suffragists who also were fighting for women's rights. However, African American women did not receive enough support from white women in the matter of their right to vote, so they decided to continue their fight separately. Women achieved the passage of the 19th Amendment to the US Constitution, which granted them the right to vote. The Amendment was passed by Congress in 1919 and ratified by the requisite number of states in 1920. It was a first step for gender equality on the political arena. However, the suffrage movement did not achieve full gender equality, discrimination and inequalities based on gender, race, class, and other factors persisted and continue to exist in the modern world. This movement spread to other countries, such as the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia and New Zealand.

Women were focused on achieving representation in governments and Elizabeth McCombs became the first woman to be elected to the New Zealand Parliament in 1893, this year women gained the right to vote in parliamentary elections, New Zealand was the first country to grant this right.

Constance Markievicz was the first woman in the UK elected to the House of Commons in 1918. However, she did not take her seat in protest against British rule in Ireland. The first woman to take her seat in the House of Commons was Nancy Astor in 1919.

In 1916, Montana elected Jeannette Rankin to the House of Representatives, making her the first woman to hold national office in the US and only in 1933, Hattie Caraway became the first woman elected to the US Senate.

Only in 1968, Shirley Chisholm became the first African American woman elected to the US Congress and in 1972 she became the first woman and African American to run for president on a major party ticket.

Each woman in the suffrage movement played a significant role in the development and fighting for the women's right to vote, but the most famous representatives are Susan B. Anthony who was a co-founder of the National Woman Suffrage Association (NWSA) (1869), her colleague Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Alice Paul who was a founder of the National Woman's Party, African American Sojourner Truth who is famous for her "Ain't I a Woman" speech at the Women's Rights Convention in Akron, Ohio (1851), Lucy Stone, the founder of the American Woman Suffrage Association (1869), Emmeline Pankhurst, the founder of the Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU) (1903), Sylvia Pankhurst who founded the East London Federation of Suffragettes and others.

The next stage or the "Second-wave feminism" took place from the early 1960s through the late 1980s. Second-wave feminism achieved a number of goals, including the passage of the Equal Pay Act (1963) that was signed by John F. Kennedy. The main aim of this law was to abolish wage disparities based on sex and made it illegal for employers to pay women lower wages than men for the same work. Another important decision in the US was the establishment of the National Organization for Women (NOW) (1966). The main goal of the organization was to work towards achieving full equality for women in all areas of American life. Nowadays, NOW has increased its main tasks and besides fighting for women rights supports policies which address the needs of marginalized communities, including women of color, LGBTQ+ individuals and people with disabilities. Also, NOW contributed to the legalization of abortion in the US (1973). In general, second-wave feminism was more radical and militant than the first wave. It was focussing on equal rights not only in politics but on all spheres of life.

The third-wave feminism which began in the early 1990s, unlike the previous two, was more inclusive and focused on the rights of women from various races, sexual orientations and cultural backgrounds. Third-wave feminism paid attention to all aspects of life, including education, employment, media representation, issues of sexuality, reproductive rights, violence against women and politics. Third-wave

feminism emphasizes intersectionality, which recognizes that gender is just one part of a person's identity and that issues related to race, class, sexuality, and other factors intersect with gender to affect women's experiences.

As we can see, women's fight for their rights and equality in politics is a fairly new phenomenon. Despite the fact that a little more than a century has passed since women achieved the right to vote in elections, politics has changed and continues to change in the direction of gender equality.

Fourth-wave feminism is generally dated from the early 2010s to the present. There are certain parallels between the third-wave feminism, including the emphasis on the rights of LGBTQ+ people and women's empowerment. Yet, it also promotes body positivity and trans inclusivity. The growth of social media and its development in activism is the key distinction between the fourth-wave and its predecessors.

Going back to the process of developing the level of female representation in politics, it is worth mentioning the topic of gender quotas. Researchers from Stockholm University with the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) made a series of workshops for non-governmental organizations which took place in various countries. The reports, *The Implementation of Quotas (2003-2007)* that were obtained as a result of conducting these workshops served as an early collection of discourse quotas. In 1997 The Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) created a database on women's political representation worldwide. The *Gender Quota Database (2003)* maintained by IDEA contains information on various types of gender quotas, such as legislative quotas, candidate quotas, voluntary quotas and provides information which deals with promotion of gender equality in politics and other areas. This database covers more than 190 countries and territories and provides information on implementation gender quotas. It also shares data on the number of women in political leadership positions, such as parliamentary and cabinet ministers. Tripp and Kang (2008) demonstrate how the number of countries that adopted gender quotas increased from 1985-2006. The first book which includes the first global study on gender quotas in politics of scholars from various countries of the world is "Women,

Quotas and Politics” (2006) edited by Drude Dahlerup. According to Gender Quota Database the most widespread types of gender quotas are: reserved seats, legal candidate quotas and political party quotas. The first type of quota regulates the number of women elected, the second and third forms a set of minimum number of female candidates, in the legal candidate quotas it is a legal requirement in the political party quotas is a measure written into the status of the political party.

The UN Women which was created in 2010 by the United Nations General Assembly also focuses on women’s representation on the political arena and is mandated to promote women’s rights, in economic, social, humanitarian fields. UN Women supports women in their political careers by organizing trainings, activities and initiatives such as: Women's Leadership and Political Participation, Gender-Responsive Budgeting, Women and Local Government, Gender and Elections.

As we already know, women got the right to vote in elections starting in 1920. According to the results of voting, women and men have tended to vote in similar ways until the 1980 presidential election where Ronald Reagan achieved eight percent fewer votes from women than men. The next year, the president of the National Organization for Women (NOW) used for the first time the term “gender gap” (1981). It should be noted that in 1976 there was a small gender gap, where women supported Carter more than men, but this fact did not get media attention.

In 1996 during the presidential election the term “*Soccer Mom*” was used by E. J. Dionne in *The Washington Post*. He used the term to describe potential female voters, like overburdened middle-class women who drive their kids to scout school and soccer. Key aspects of Clinton’s presidential campaign were school uniforms and curfews for teenagers. Dole proposed the tax cut, which would allow women to stay at home with their children rather than work. In fact, both candidates did not focus on female demands such as liberation of access to abortion, healthcare of concerns on sexual harassment. But in comparison with Dole, Clinton paid more attention to women's concerns, he referred to women in his speeches and he even suggested God

might be a woman. In fact 54% of women voted for Clinton and 38% for Dole in the presidential election in 1996.

In fact, female voters prefer to vote for Democrats rather than Republicans in the US. We can name several reasons why women tend to vote more for Democrats:

1. Democratic Party follows a more supportive policy in case of women, it pays attention to reproductive rights, healthcare, equal pay. Democrats tend to support access to contraception and abortion, while Republicans follow the opposite point of view on these cases.
2. Social welfare programs, LGBTQ+ rights and support for marginalized communities, immigration reform are priorities for Democratic Party.
3. Diversity and inclusion is higher in the Democratic Party. Democrats are more likely to have women and people of color running for office, which can be more appealing to female voters who value representation.

Some female voters do not support the Republican Party because of the rhetoric and behavior of some representatives of this party. The brightest example is the accusation of former President Donald Trump because of his derogatory comments about women and minorities, which could have influenced female voters' opinion of the Republican Party. Nevertheless, it is very important to avoid overgeneralizing about the political views of any particular group of voters, because not all women vote the same way and it exists a great number of factors that influence voting behavior.

In the case of political discourse, gender has a significant impact on its development. Different language tools are used by male and female politicians in order to make the message understandable to the listeners. In general, political power has been considered a masculine field. However, today women's role in political activity is very important and deserves more attention. Male and female speech analysis provides an opportunity to investigate the striking differences in gendered communication. Gender studies gained popularity in the late 20th century as a reaction to the first wave of feminism, the suffrage movement.

The exploration of dominant gender portrayals in political rhetoric has been extensively studied in past research. Jeff Hearn (2004) emphasizes that men have a prevailing structural and interpersonal influence in most aspects of life, as demonstrated by the historical correlation between masculinity and political discourse. Politicians must thus maintain self-representations of a masculine archetype within their personal dialogue due to centuries of male domination in politics. This observation is corroborated by Aalberg and Jenssen (2007) who found through their research that male politicians are perceived as more knowledgeable, trustworthy, and persuasive than female politicians - especially among male voters. Furthermore, Rosenwasser and Dean (1989) established that people tend to view political positions as masculine, leading to greater preference for male candidates over female candidates. Dittmar (2015) argued that election campaign teams employ gender stereotypes to promote the worthiness of male candidates running for elite offices. Fahey (2007) investigated how masculinity affects political campaigns, citing an example where George W. Bush attempted to belittle his competitor John Kerry by feminizing him so as to make him less appealing to American voters. Khan and Blair (2013) described how Bill Clinton's patriarchal figure benefitted Barack Obama instead of supporting Hilary Clinton's candidacy for the Democratic Party's nomination during the 2008 presidential elections.

As Chilton and Schaffner (1997) highlight, language plays a crucial role in political discourse because it serves specific strategic functions such as coercion, delegitimization or misrepresentation which can sway opinions one way or another. It is through persuasive techniques used within speeches or debates where politicians attempt to influence their audience's perception towards certain policies reflecting changes influenced by politics but also shaped by culture patterns.

In contemporary societies, the gender gap in political participation and representation has been an ongoing issue that hinders effective democratic processes. As Larner (2009) points out, this discrepancy not only affects women's rights but also limits the diversity of perspectives that could be heard in political discourse. Despite

significant progress made over the years towards equal representation of both genders in politics, a gender imbalance still exists in many countries worldwide. Through sociolinguistic and political communication analysis, researchers have observed differences between masculine and feminine rhetoric used by different genders throughout history (Larner, 2009). Such differences are indicative of social norms regarding acceptable speech for each gender that may impact their ability to participate effectively in political debates. The implications of this phenomenon go beyond just equality; it can lead to inadequate policy-making as certain important viewpoints are excluded from consideration due to unequal representation. Therefore, addressing the gender gap is crucial for ensuring fair and diverse representation across all levels of government decision making bodies.

The Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) (1974) which was developed by American psychologist Sandra Bem is a widely used psychological tool that measures the degree to which an individual's personality and behavior are masculine, feminine, or androgynous. BSRI is also directed to examine gender differences in language use and to explore the relationship between language and gender roles. In case of discourse studies, Bem Sex-Role Inventory has been used particularly in analyzing gender differences in political communication and the role of gender in political campaigns. The researchers Karen Tracy, Karla Mantilla, Lisa M. Corrigan and others from Women's Media Center (WMC) made a research "The Status of Women in US Media 2017". They used BSRI to investigate the role of gender in the 2016 US presidential campaign. The researchers found that Hillary Clinton, the first female presidential candidate nominated by a major party in the US, was subjected to more negative media coverage than her male counterpart, Donald Trump. The study also found that Clinton was more likely to be criticized for violating traditional gender roles, such as being too aggressive or ambitious. Researchers did not use the BSRI as a primary research tool, rather relied on media analysis and discourse analysis to examine gender in the campaign coverage. Overall, the use of the SRI in political discourse has contributed to

a better understanding of how gender influences political communication and the experiences of political candidates.

The findings of Żemojtel-Piotrowska et al. (2017) suggest that people's perceptions of male and female politicians differ when scandals are involved. In particular, the study showed that men were not judged as harshly as women in such situations - with the latter's competence being affected, in addition to their morality. It appears then, that the public may be more judgemental towards female politicians than male politicians.

The role of gender in political discourse is an important and complex issue that has been the subject of much discussion and debate. Gender refers to the social and cultural expectations associated with being male or female, and these expectations can influence how individuals participate in and are perceived in political contexts.

In many societies, gender roles and expectations have historically limited women's participation in politics. Women have faced barriers to running for office, receiving equal pay, and accessing positions of power.

Research has shown that women often face different types of challenges and barriers than men when it comes to participating in politics.

Furthermore, gender can also influence the way that political issues are discussed and debated.

Overall, the role of gender in political discourse is an important and complex issue, and it is essential to consider how gender shapes political participation, representation, and policy debates.

1.3 Gender stereotypes in political discourse

For many years, politics has been a predominantly male-oriented field; the role of women was disregarded and overlooked. As such, male representatives were more influential than female ones in the public political arena. However, with the emergence of the different women movements, women gained more clout and captured the attention of audiences in the political sphere. Subsequently, female participation in political discourse has significantly transformed how we perceive politics today. (Sivric, Marijana, 2014)

Gender stereotypes are closely related to evaluations and influence the formation of expectations regarding the behavior of representatives of one gender or another. When an individual's actual behavior does not match or contradicts the expectations of a society, the behavior is characterized as "wrong" by representatives of this society, and such behavior is condemned. These expectations also apply to the verbal behavior of individuals. Thus, the social behavioral standards of men and women will leave a mark on the communicative behavior of individuals.

Stereotypes are frequently used as a quick and easy source of information in our daily lives. Due to our inability to obtain complete information about everything, we tend to rely on standard and simplified ideas. Therefore, when assessing political candidates, voters may use gender, along with other demographic traits and political affiliation, as a "shortcut" to determine a politician's qualities.

In case of voting, we use to focus on a term "gender schema", which was proposed by Markus et al. (1982). Its main idea of the term is to refer to individuals' self-schemas regarding gender identity rather than social beliefs regarding gender. In fact, Bem (1981) was the first to introduce the gender schema theory, emphasizing how it has a connection with an individual's gender identity. Fiske and Taylor (1991) pointed out that these schemas collect notions about gender categories in our memory. In case of politics, this means voters have an instinctive understanding about traits, behavior, etc of male and female politicians based on their gender (Sanbonmatsu

2002). Since most people are aware of their own gender and can identify with it, it is likely many voters will prefer politicians from their own gender group and identify with their messaging style.

There is still no consensus on whether gender stereotypes affect voting behavior, but some studies point towards it having an indirect influence (Kahn 1996, McDermott 1997, Dolan 1998, Sanbonmatsu 2002). A theory proposed by Matland states that female representatives are often thought of as more liberal than they actually are and that voters may also have preferences for one gender over the other based on stereotypes related to issue competence and personal traits. As we see, nowadays female politicians are actively breaking gender stereotypes and are engaged in affairs that are considered exclusively male, for example, women are ministers of defense, heads of governments, countries, etc. The most iconic example of breaking gender stereotypes in political discourse and politics is Margaret Thatcher, the former Prime Minister of the United Kingdom (1979-1990). Margaret Thatcher became the first woman prime minister in the UK and held this post for three terms. She was the complete opposite of femininity, it concerned her political views, statements, behavior in politics, for which she received the nickname "Iron Lady". In case of linguistics, especially phonetics, her pitch should be noted. If we compare the pitch of Margaret Thatcher's voice at the beginning of her political career and as the prime minister, it will turn out that the pitch of her voice has dropped significantly. After analyzing the audio recordings it emerges that she achieved a reduction in pitch of 46 Hz, a figure which is almost half the average difference in pitch between male and female voices. A study conducted by Klofstad (2012) of all 435 U.S. House elections showed that voice pitch correlated with electoral outcomes: both male and female candidates with lower voices were significantly more likely to win. For example, candidates who had a lower voice than their opponents were 13 percent more likely to win office and garnered an average of 4 percent more of the vote share.

Despite progress in women's representation in politics, these stereotypes continue to pervade the media and influence public opinion. Historically, women who

enter the political sphere are subject to a barrage of sexist and demeaning comments that undermine their abilities as leaders. This has resulted in a lack of female representation within government institutions around the world. However, while attention has been paid to overt forms of sexism in recent years, subtler patterns of discrimination still persist. The media plays a significant role in promoting and perpetuating gender stereotypes in political discourse, framing candidates and issues in a way that reinforces traditional gender roles and expectations.

In addition to prominent portrayals of gender that pertain to a politician's gender, political discourse may also incorporate gender-based stereotypes that bolster political positions and choices. Messerschmidt (2010) noted, distinct forms of masculinity were disguised in the political language employed by both Bush presidents during their wars against Iraq. The justification for the wars against Saddam Hussein's regime was supported through the deployment of hegemonic masculinity and emphasized femininity, acting as rhetorical tools that aligned with the presidents' resolve to instigate a state of war.

As Chilton and Schaffner suggest, language is a strategic tool for politicians to persuade their audience and promote their ideas. However, when it comes to the representation of women in political discourse, this strategic use becomes problematic. Women's voices are often marginalized or silenced completely from important conversations that impact society as a whole. This lack of representation perpetuates gender inequality by reinforcing stereotypes about women's abilities and roles in society. Research shows that they are often subjected to negative characterizations based on their appearance, personality traits, or family background rather than being judged on merit alone (Huddy et al., 2005). These representations contribute to undermining women's credibility as leaders and reinforce enduring stereotypes about femininity limits leadership effectiveness.

Gender stereotypes in political discourse have long been a subject of concern for those seeking to promote gender equality. These stereotypes perpetuate harmful ideas about masculinity and femininity, limiting the range of acceptable behaviors for both

men and women in leadership roles. According to Alberg and Jenssen's (2007) study on gender stereotyping of political candidates, people tend to view male politicians as more knowledgeable, trustworthy, and convincing than their female counterparts - even when they present the same speech verbatim.

Print and broadcast media commonly use and propagate gender stereotypes when depicting female politicians. Furthermore, media coverage of female politicians can be both explicitly sexist, as well as implicitly discriminatory. Reports have revealed that female MPs are provided with less speaking time than their male counterparts (Hooghe et al. 2015). At the same time, media focus on issues such as female political leaders' clothing choices are given more attention than that of their male counterparts. For instance, an extensive guide to Theresa May's favorite brands appeared in the Telegraph, while this kind of question would not ordinarily be posed to the former Prime Ministers David Cameron or Tony Blair. In 2008, German Chancellor Angela Merkel's choice of clothing for a gala event has even resulted in headlines in the Daily Mail claiming it to be her 'weapons of mass destruction'. Female political leaders' domestic life is also placed under scrutiny, with women politicians including New Zealand Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern being asked frequently how they manage their political duties while also acting as wives and mothers - something men politicians are rarely if ever asked about.

The studies of gender stereotypes in politics and media, particularly concerning the portrayal of female politicians, is rooted in the stark contrast in language used to describe male and female politicians (Anderson, Diabah, & Mensa, 2011). Several studies have delved into the naming conventions and referential attributes utilized to depict female politicians as opposed to their male counterparts (e.g. Barnes & Larrivee, 2011; O'Grady, 2011). A noteworthy investigation by Gidengil and Everitt (2003) revealed that both male and female politicians' reported speeches were mediated through masculine standards of political reporting.

The media's portrayal of political discourse has a significant impact on gender stereotypes. Traditional gender roles and expectations are reinforced through the

framing of candidates and issues, perpetuating harmful biases (Petrogiannis and Freidenvall, 2022). This construction of dominant representations can have severe implications as it serves to justify austerity measures with negative consequences for society. These portrayals not only affect how people view politicians but also shape public opinion on topics related to gender equity. It is crucial to acknowledge that this issue goes beyond just politics; it affects all aspects of society. The media serves as a platform where these biases are amplified, leading to further marginalization of already oppressed groups.

Previous studies about media coverage of female politicians mostly focused on the US. Miller, Peake and Boulton (2010) observed 6,000 newspaper articles from 25 newspapers, reporting on Hillary Clinton during the 2008 presidential election primaries. It's worth noting that she was able to break through the "coverage barrier" which had been a challenge for other American female politicians before her. The amount of press she received was greater than her fellow candidates, and there was a balance between typical female-related topics such as her appearance and more serious facets concerning her candidacy. However, Clinton's past still had a major influence on how the media represented her, with a ready-made negative tone that was based on outdated gender stereotypes.

Nee and De Maio (2019) conducted a study examining 780 memes and doctored images about Clinton during the 2016 presidential election. They found that most of these images depicted her in a negative light, using physical traits such as weakness and unattractiveness, anti-feminine traits like dishonesty and lack of trustworthiness, and traits like authoritarianism and incompetence - all of which are often associated with female politicians. As a result, Clinton was portrayed in accordance with negative female stereotypes, which ultimately limited her chances of being elected.

The media can popularize gender stereotypes in politics through various means - such as concentrating on the physical appearance of female politicians rather than their position on issues, using gendered language to describe men and women, perpetuating double standards by holding women to different criteria than men, and

underrepresenting women and other minority groups in political coverage. All these contribute to creating a biased image of political leaders. Journalists and media outlets should be conscious of these stereotypes and strive for more equitable representation in coverage.

Despite the consistent fight of women for rights and equality, gender stereotypes continue to have a great influence on a large number of aspects, including politics, women are still the objects of unconstructive criticism that is not related to their professional qualities.

CONCLUSION TO THE FIRST CHAPTER

The study of discourse has become increasingly popular in recent decades, as scholars seek to understand how language is used to shape our understanding of the world around us.

One of the key ideas in discourse studies is the notion that language is not simply a tool for communication, but also a means of power and control. Language is used to shape, attitudes, behaviors, and to construct social identities and relationships.

Another important direction in discourse studies is the study of language use in specific contexts, such as political discourse, media discourse, etc. Scholars in this field seek to understand how language is used to construct and maintain power relationships within these contexts, and how language use can be used to challenge dominant ideologies and power structures.

Overall, the development of discourse studies has been driven by a desire to understand how language use shapes our understanding of the world. As such, discourse studies is a dynamic and constantly evolving field that draws on a wide range of disciplines, including linguistics, sociology, anthropology, and psychology.

Gender has been a significant factor in the political realm, affecting both the representation of women in political positions and the way political discourse is conducted. Historically, women have been underrepresented in politics, and their voices and concerns have been overshadowed by men. However, in recent decades, there has been a growing movement towards gender equality in politics, with more women being elected to political positions and advocating for policies that address gender-based issues.

Despite this progress, gender biases and stereotypes continue to influence political discourse. Women are often subject to sexism and discrimination in political campaigns and debates, which can affect their chances of winning elections. Additionally, women's perspectives and experiences may be overlooked or dismissed in political discussions, further perpetuating gender inequalities.

Women candidates are still more likely to be portrayed in relation to their family and personal lives rather than their qualifications, experience and policy positions. They are also more likely to be criticized for being "too aggressive" or "not feminine enough" if they display leadership qualities commonly associated with male politicians. These stereotypes foster an environment where women are seen as less capable leaders and decision-makers. Moreover, women candidates are still more likely to be discussed in terms of their appearance rather than the substance of their campaigns. All of these stereotypes send a subtle but powerful message that women do not belong in the highest levels of political leadership.

The gender factor is one of the key topics in the discursive studies, as evidenced by a large number of scientific works related to this topic and society's request for equal rights for women and men.

CHAPTER II. GENDER FACTOR IN ELECTIONEERING DISCOURSE

2.1 Multimodal analysis of the political performances of candidates for the post of President of the USA

In modern politics, political speeches and performances have become increasingly important in shaping public opinion and swaying voters. As such, the use of multimodal analysis in analyzing the political performances of candidates for the post of President has become crucial. Multimodal analysis involves analyzing the use of language, visuals, and sound in political discourse to understand how different modes of communication work together to create meaning and influence the audience.

By analyzing the language used in politicians' speeches, including rhetorical devices such as repetition, metaphor, and appeals to emotion, we can gain insight into how candidates aim to sway their audience. Additionally, multimodal analysis allows us to examine the visual and audio elements of political performances, such as facial expressions, body language, tone of voice, and the use of music and sound effects. These elements contribute to the overall impact of the performance and can be analyzed to better understand how the candidate seeks to connect with their audience and convey their message. It is important to note that the effectiveness of a candidate's communication is not solely dependent on the individual modes of communication, but also on how they are used in combination with one another.

Multimodality can have a significant influence on voters during a presidential election by enhancing communication and connecting with voters on multiple levels.

Multimodality allows political campaigns to evoke emotions and create a deeper emotional connection with voters. Through the use of visuals, music, speeches, and personal stories, campaigns can tap into voters' emotions, such as hope, empathy, and inspiration. Emotional appeals can be persuasive and can influence voter attitudes and behaviors.

Multimodality allows campaigns to shape a candidate's persona and image through different modes of communication. The use of imagery, videos, and personal

anecdotes can help establish a candidate's relatability, authenticity, and trustworthiness. This can influence voters' perceptions of the candidate's character and qualifications.

Multimodality enables campaigns to cater to the needs and preferences of diverse audiences. Different individuals have different communication styles and preferences, and by employing a range of modalities, campaigns can reach and resonate with a broader spectrum of voters. This can increase the chances of connecting with voters who may respond more favorably to specific modes of communication.

Multimodality is particularly relevant in the context of social media, which has become a powerful platform for political campaigns. Social media platforms allow campaigns to share multimedia content, including images, videos, and live streams, which can be easily shared and have the potential to reach a vast audience. This can amplify the impact of multimodal communication and facilitate engagement and interaction with voters.

Multimodality allows campaigns to communicate more effectively, connect with voters on multiple levels, and ultimately influence their attitudes and decisions during a presidential election.

In the case of multimodality, announcement candidacy videos for the post of president has a big influence on how the election campaign will be conducted and to some extent affects the results of the election. All modes of communication which are used in the video create a first impression and on and outline the main aspects of the candidate's presidential campaign.

Presidential campaign announcement speeches are an integral part of American politics. They are the first public statements made by candidates announcing their intentions for the presidency. These speeches are carefully crafted to appeal to the electorate and set the tone for the entire campaign. These speeches are also significant because they signal the formal beginning of the campaign, and the candidate's message

and strategy are usually defined in these speeches. The speeches also aim to establish the candidate's credibility and to create a connection with the voters.

The final speeches of candidates after an election, regardless of whether they won or not, hold great importance and impact on the candidates and the audience.

The final speech provides a moment of closure and transition for the candidate and their supporters. It signals the end of the campaign and acknowledges the outcome of the election. This allows the candidate and their team to mentally and emotionally shift gears and begin the process of moving forward.

After a contentious election, the final speech offers an opportunity for the candidate to promote unity and healing. They can extend gratitude to their supporters, acknowledge the efforts of their campaign team, and emphasize the need for coming together as a nation, regardless of political differences. This can help bridge divides and foster a sense of collective purpose.

The final speech allows the candidate to reaffirm their values and goals, even if they did not win the election. They can remind their supporters and the wider audience of the principles and policies they championed, reinforcing their commitment to those causes. This helps to keep their message alive and maintain momentum for future advocacy.

How candidates handle their final speeches, particularly in the case of defeat, can demonstrate their dignity, and leadership qualities. It is an opportunity for them to model resilience, humility, and a commitment to democratic values. This can leave an impression on the public and contribute to their reputation as a statesperson.

2.1.1 Multimodal analysis of Hillary Clinton's speeches as candidate for the post of the President of the United States

As of 2021, a total of 10 women have formally declared their candidacy for President of the United States, representing various political parties. These women are: Victoria Woodhull (1872) the representative of Equal Rights Party, Belva Lockwood (1884) from Equal Rights Party, Margaret Chase Smith (1964) the member of the Republican Party, Shirley Chisholm (1972) from the Democratic Party, Ellen McCormack (1976 and 1980) from the Right to Life Party, Lenora Fulani (1988) from the New Alliance Party, Elizabeth Dole (2000) the member of the Republican Party, Carol Moseley Braun (2004) from the Democratic Party, Hillary Clinton (2008 and 2016) from the Democratic Party and Kamala Harris (2020) the member of the Democratic Party.

In fact, neither Hillary Clinton nor any of these women have been elected as the President of the United States, and as of April 2023, no woman has yet been elected to this position.

At the time of announcing her candidacy for the post of president, Hillary Clinton already had extensive experience in politics.

Hillary Clinton served as First Lady during the presidency of her husband, Bill Clinton, from 1993 to 2001. She played an active role in policy initiatives, particularly in healthcare reform, but also made a contribution in development and protecting of children's rights and women's empowerment.

In 2000, Hillary Clinton was elected as the U.S. Senator from New York, becoming the first woman to represent the state in the Senate. She was reelected in 2006.

In 2009, Hillary Clinton was appointed by President Barack Obama as Secretary of State, making her the third woman to hold that position.

In our research, we analyzed three Hillary Clinton videos: a short video where she announces her candidacy for the position of the President of the United States, a

video of the official start of her participation in the presidential elections as a candidate of the Democratic Party, and a video after the defeat in the elections in 2016.

Hillary Clinton announced her candidacy for the 2016 United States presidential election on April 12, 2015. She made the announcement through a video message posted on her campaign website and social media accounts. This video is a great example of using video, audio, linguistic and nonverbal modes.

In the case of visual mode, the video used visuals to convey information and evoke emotions in the viewers. It featured images of everyday Americans going about their lives, interspersed with shots of Clinton meeting with voters and speaking at rallies. These visuals were meant to convey a sense of optimism and hope for the future. The people in the video represent different races, nationalities, ages, and sexual orientations. These people also covered a list of the main aspects of what Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign was aimed at, such as economic issues, diversity, inclusion, education, etc.

The audio mode is also presented in the video. The video used music and sound effects to create an emotional impact on the viewers. The music was uplifting and inspiring, meant to convey a sense of energy and enthusiasm. Sound effects were also used to punctuate certain points in the video, such as the sound of a door closing to emphasize Clinton's commitment to fighting for working families.

Clinton's voiceover provided the primary linguistic mode of the video. Her message was clear and concise, with a focus on the topics of unity, inclusiveness, and progress. She used simple, direct language to connect with voters and emphasize her commitment to their needs.

In the case of nonverbal mode, Clinton's body language and facial expressions conveyed a message in the video. She appeared confident and energetic, with a warm smile and engaging eye contact. Her gestures were natural and expressive, conveying a sense of connection with her audience.

At the end of the video we observed Clinton's logo for the presidential campaign with text "Hillary for America" which was the official name of Hillary

Clinton's presidential campaign organization during the 2016 U.S. presidential election. In the case of linguistic mode the use of the word 'America' in the slogan appeals to the patriotic sentiment of the American people and emphasizes the idea that the campaign is about the entire country, not just one individual.

Hillary Clinton's logo for the 2016 Presidential Campaign was a blue “H” with a red arrow pointing right through it. The use of blue and red in the logo is significant as they are the primary colors of the American flag. Blue is associated with trust, stability, and security, which are all qualities that Hillary Clinton wanted to convey to voters. Red, on the other hand, represents passion, strength, and energy. The arrow in the logo represents progress, direction, and purpose. The rightward movement of the arrow symbolizes Clinton’s vision for the country - a forward-looking and progressive agenda that would take America towards a better future.

On June 13, 2015, Clinton delivered her announcement speech that she officially launched her campaign. Clinton chose a backdrop of the Roosevelt Island Four Freedoms Park, where President Roosevelt made his famous “Four Freedoms”. In the case of visual mode emphasized her commitment to the values of freedom, democracy, and opportunity. Clinton also wore a blue pantsuit, the blue color is associated with the Democratic Party, which was her party affiliation. The stage was in the shape of Clinton’s logo, a blue letter H with a red horizontal arrow.

In case of nonverbal mode Clinton's gestures and body language were an important part of her performance. She used hand gestures to emphasize her points and to connect with the audience. She also made eye contact with members of the audience, which conveyed a sense of intimacy and connection.

Hillary Clinton used a number of rhetorical devices to persuade, connect emotionally, make her messages memorable, simplify complex issues, enhance public speaking skills, and establish her political identity.

She used emotive language to appeal to the emotions of her audience. She used phrases and jokes which evoked a sense of resilience and optimism, appealing to the audience's emotions by portraying a positive outlook amid challenges, for instance

“Quiet determination and a deep-seated hopefulness”[84]. “Everyday Americans need a champion, and I want to be that champion” [84] By positioning herself as the “champion” for everyday Americans, Clinton taps into the audience's desire for representation, recognition, and support, invoking a sense of empowerment and reassurance. “And one additional advantage: You’re won’t see my hair turn white in the White House. I’ve been coloring it for years!” [84]

Clinton employs parallelism by using similar sentence structures and patterns, such as “It's your time,” “your cause,” and “your campaign,” to create a rhythmic and persuasive effect.

Clinton used inclusive language by using words like “we,” “our,” and “us,” aiming to connect with her audience and create a sense of shared purpose and unity.

Clinton shares personal stories throughout her speech to humanize herself and establish a connection with the audience. “I've seen it in the lives of so many people I've met throughout our country” [84]; “When I think about why I'm doing this, I think about my mother” [84] This technique helps her present a relatable image and demonstrate her understanding of the challenges faced by everyday Americans.

Clinton references American values such as hard work, equality, and opportunity. By aligning herself with these values, she seeks to resonate with the audience and position herself as a candidate who can uphold and advance these ideals. “We have to build an America where everyone who works hard can rise just as high as their talents and their dreams take them” [84]; “You brought our country back. Now it's time, your time, to secure the gains and move ahead. And you know what? America can't succeed unless you succeed” [84]

Hillary Clinton's Campaign Launch Speech adheres to a conventional structure often utilized in political speeches. The speech begins with an introductory section that establishes the context and tone of the speech. Clinton acknowledges the difficulties faced by ordinary citizens and emphasizes her dedication to fighting for their interests.

As the speech progresses, Clinton shifts towards discussing her personal and political journey, emphasizing her achievements and experiences. Although the speech

does not follow a straightforward narrative structure, Clinton incorporates gender-related themes throughout the speech, weaving them into various sections.

Clinton acknowledges the historic nature of her presidential candidacy as a woman, but emphasizes that her aim is to represent all Americans. Clinton recognized the significance of her candidacy as a woman running for the presidency, stating, “I may not be the youngest candidate in this race, but I will be the youngest woman president in the history of the United States.” [84] By emphasizing her gender and the historic nature of her candidacy, Clinton highlighted the gender factor in her speech. She addresses gender-related issues by highlighting her mother's challenges as a working-class woman and emphasizes the importance of women's empowerment and gender equality. Clinton also advocates for policies that promote equal opportunities for women and highlights her commitment to issues such as affordable healthcare, reproductive rights, and paid family leave. By including these gender-related themes in her speech, Clinton aims to connect with women and position herself as a champion for their rights and equal opportunity.

The main issue of Clinton's speech can be characterized as her commitment to fighting for the interests of everyday Americans, addressing economic disparities, and promoting inclusive policies. Gender aspects were a component of her message, reflecting her stance on gender equality and women's empowerment, but they were not the singular focus or the primary driving force of the speech.

Hillary Clinton's concession speech after the 2016 presidential election is a powerful example of multimodal communication. Clinton delivered her speech at the New Yorker Hotel in midtown Manhattan the day after the election. She spoke in front of a simple backdrop featuring the USA flags. Hillary Clinton was accompanied by her husband, former US President Bill Clinton, daughter Chelsea Clinton and her husband. Clinton's running mate Tim Kane and his wife were also present on the stage. Hillary Clinton was dressed in a classic black suit with a blue collar, and her husband Bill Clinton wore a blue tie, as you know, blue is associated with the Democratic Party. The audience sitting in the hall was represented by people of different ages, including

children, of different genders and races. During Hillary Clinton's speech, the camera also filmed the audience, mostly people were upset, one of the women was wiping away tears, the reason for this was probably Clinton's defeat. However, the audience still smiled and supported Hillary Clinton.

In the case of audio mode, there were no music during the speech. After Tim Kane invited Hillary Clinton to the stage, the audience gave her a standing ovation for one minute and fifteen seconds, and in total, during the entire performance, the audience applauded 15 times.

In terms of non verbal mode, Hillary Clinton stood tall, with her shoulders back and arms at her side, projecting confidence and strength despite the loss. She made direct eye contact with the audience and used hand gestures to emphasize key points of her speech.

Clinton used a mix of formal and informal language during her speech. She employed repetition to emphasize unity and resilience. She repeated the phrase “Our constitutional democracy” [83] multiple times to underscore the importance of preserving democratic values and institutions.

Clinton used several metaphors in her speech, such as “Our constitutional democracy demands our participation, not just every four years, but all the time” [83] and “Our campaign was never about one person or even one election.”[83]

Clinton used metaphor to frame her loss in a hopeful way. She said the election results represented “the culmination of many months of effort” but also “the beginning of a long journey.” [83] This journey metaphor frames her loss as just one step on a larger path forward for the country.

In her Concession Speech, Hillary Clinton used emotive language to evoke emotions and connect with her audience. “This is painful, and it will be for a long time.” [83]. Clinton acknowledges the emotional impact of the election outcome and acknowledges the disappointment and pain felt by her supporters. “I know how disappointed you feel, because I feel it too.”[83]. By expressing her shared emotions, Clinton creates a sense of empathy and understanding.

Clinton used antithesis to contrast opposing ideas for emphasis. For example, she stated, “Our constitutional democracy enshrines the peaceful transfer of power. And we don't just respect that. We cherish it.”[83] This contrast between “peaceful transfer of power” and “we don't just respect that, we cherish it” highlights the importance and value of democratic principles.

The speech followed a narrative arc that encompassed various elements, including gratitude, unity, resilience, and a call to action. In the opening of her speech, Clinton acknowledged the significance of her candidacy as a woman running for president. She stated, “And to all the little girls who are watching this, never doubt that you are valuable and powerful and deserving of every chance and opportunity in the world.” [83] This acknowledgement recognizes the impact her candidacy had on inspiring young girls and emphasizes the importance of gender equality.

In her speech, she acknowledged the pain and disappointment that she and her supporters felt, while also expressing a commitment to the democratic process and a peaceful transition of power. The primary focus of the speech was on unity, resilience, and moving forward as a nation, despite the electoral outcome. Clinton emphasized the need to come together, to continue fighting for the values they believed in, and to support the newly elected president for the betterment of the country. While gender-related aspects were touched upon, the central issue of the speech revolved around the election result and the importance of unity in the face of adversity.

2.1.2 Multimodal analysis of Joe Biden's speeches as candidate for the post of the President of the United States

Joe Biden had an extensive career in politics spanning several decades. He began his political career in 1970 when he was elected to the New Castle County Council in Delaware. After that, at the age of 29 he became one of the youngest individuals ever elected to the United States Senate, representing Delaware.

Biden served as a U.S. Senator from Delaware from 1973 to 2009, making him one of the longest-serving senators in U.S. history. In 2008, Biden was chosen as the running mate of Democratic presidential nominee Barack Obama. They won the election, and Biden assumed office as Vice President of the United States.

To conduct a multimodal analysis, we took the following videos of Joe Biden: a short video about his participation in the presidential elections, a video where he officially announces the beginning of his campaign for the post of the president of the United States and a speech after the victory.

Joe Biden announced his candidacy for the post of the 46th president of the United States on April 25, 2019. He posted the video announcement on his social networks.

Visually, the video begins with a slow zoom out from Biden standing in front of the window. Biden maintains eye contact with the camera throughout, establishing a sense of sincerity and connection with viewers. Biden quotes the Declaration of Independence, and this quote appears on the screen. The video with Biden changes to images of Americans with Nazi and Confederate flags. And then there are shots of neo-Nazis marching with torches, then a shot is shown with a poster that says "VA Students Act Against White Supremacy" and then shots of a fight between protesters. Then Biden appears again. He quoted himself and the quote and the text of the article appeared on the screen again. Later, black and white footage of the Statue of Liberty appears, followed by a black and white photo of American women campaigning for women's suffrage, followed by a black and white video of the landing of American

troops and the raising of the national flag, followed by footage of marches where people hold placards “We shall overcome”. All these visuals are related to certain historical events of the USA.

Biden speaks in a calm yet confident tone that conveys his experience and gravitas. His speech is deliberate and measured, with pauses in between phrases for emphasis, the video also makes use of powerful audio elements, including a stirring soundtrack. The soundtrack also changes as the image changes, sometimes becoming more disturbing, then returning to a calm.

In his announcement speech, Joe Biden acknowledges Charlottesville's historical significance and emphasizes the ideals of equality and unalienable rights. He highlights the Unite the Right rally in 2017, condemning the white supremacists and their actions. Biden critiques President Trump's response, arguing that his remarks failed to unequivocally denounce racism. He declares a battle for the soul of the nation, pledging to protect American values and democracy. Biden portrays America as an idea of hope, dignity, and equal opportunity. He calls on people to remember and act, emphasizing the importance of preserving American values through the upcoming election.

Joe Biden's logo for his presidential campaign in 2019 is a combination of text and visual elements, making it a multimodal design. The logo consists of the word “Biden” written in bold blue letters, with a red swoosh underneath it.

The use of the color blue in the logo is significant as it is the color of the Democratic Party. The bold and uppercase font used for the word "Biden" gives a sense of strength and power. The red swoosh underneath the text is an abstract visual representation of the American flag.

The combination of the text and visual elements in Biden's logo creates a cohesive design that effectively communicates his message and values. The bold, uppercase text and the use of the color blue convey a sense of strength and stability, while the red swoosh brings in a sense of progress and patriotism.

On May 18, 2019 in Philadelphia, Joe Biden officially launched campaign for President. In the case of the visual, Joe Biden was on stage, with the United States flag behind him and two screens with his campaign logo. Also, behind him stood people in blue T-shirts clapping a certain rhythm, in general, the rest of the audience had posters with the Biden campaign logo. He was dressed in a classic suit and glasses.

Joe Biden's speech was accompanied by constant applause from the audience, there was no separate sound accompaniment.

In the case of non verbal modes, when Biden came on stage he took off his jacket and threw it into the crowd and took off his glasses. It is important to note that before Joe Biden's speech, his wife Jill appeared on stage, she had her speech and announced her husband, they met on the stage and had a kiss and hug.

During his speech, he made use of various nonverbal cues that displayed his intentions and emotions.

Biden's facial expressions were one of the most noticeable nonverbal cues he displayed. He smiled frequently and maintained eye contact with the audience, which conveyed his confidence and connection to the people. He also displayed a serious expression when talking about issues affecting the country, which showed his commitment to solving them.

Biden's body language also revealed his intentions and emotions. He used hand gestures to emphasize his points, which made his speech more engaging. He also leaned forward towards the audience, which showed his eagerness to connect with them.

Biden's tone of voice was another nonverbal cue he used to convey his message. He spoke with conviction and passion, which made his speech more impactful. He also adjusted his tone of voice when talking about different issues, which showed his understanding of their significance.

Overall, Biden's nonverbal cues during his campaign launch conveyed his confidence, commitment, and connection to the people. They made his speech more engaging and impactful, and showed his potential as a strong presidential candidate.

Joe Biden used a number of rhetorical devices which....

Biden's mention of his wife Jill using a personal anecdote "Everyone knows that Jill is a Philadelphia girl. She loves the city, I do too." [88] and their shared love for the city serves as a personal anecdote, aiming to establish a connection with the audience and create a sense of familiarity.

Biden's statement that Philadelphia will be "...written on my heart..." [88] when he dies employs hyperbole to emphasize his deep connection and affection for the city.

Biden directly addresses the audience, using phrases like "Folks" and "Pick up your phone" to engage them and create a sense of direct connection.

Biden used emotional language, such as "protect," "stop fighting," "hope," and "fight for it," to evoke an emotional response from the audience and rally support for the speaker's positions.

The rhetorical questions posed, such as "Are we a nation that believes there is a moral privilege...?" [88] and "Will you let that happen?" [88], engage the audience and prompt reflection, reinforcing the speaker's arguments.

Throughout the speech, Biden touched on several key issues, including healthcare, education, and climate change. He also touched on the importance of unity and the need for Americans to come together to solve the country's problems. Biden emphasized the importance of working together and finding common ground.

Regarding gender-related themes, Biden made a point to highlight his support for women's rights and gender equality. He acknowledged the challenges that women face in society and the workplace and promised to work towards ensuring that women have equal opportunities and equal pay.

Biden also spoke about the importance of women's reproductive rights and the need to protect them. He emphasized his commitment to protecting *Roe v. Wade*, the landmark Supreme Court decision that protects a woman's right to choose.

On November 7, 2020, Joe Biden delivered his victory speech after being elected as the 46th President of the United States. The speech was delivered in Wilmington, Delaware, and was a mix of verbal, visual, and gestural modalities.

The visual mode was used effectively in the speech. Biden stood in front of a large American flag, which served as a visual representation of his message of patriotism and love for the country. Additionally the stage was lit in blue, which is considered the color of the Democratic Party.

According to the non verbal mode, his facial expressions and body language conveyed his emotions and sincerity, adding to the overall impact of the speech, the gestural mode was also present in the speech. Biden used hand gestures to emphasize his points and to connect with the audience. He also used gestures to express his gratitude and to acknowledge the hard work of his campaign team.

Joe Biden's victory speech was a momentous occasion that showcased his remarkable oratory skills. The speech was an exemplary display of how rhetorical devices can be effectively used to convey a powerful message.

In his speech, Biden used anaphora. He used the phrase "I will" repeatedly to emphasize his vision for the country. For instance, he said, "I will be a president for all Americans,"[89]; "I will work hard for those who didn't vote for me," [89]; and "I will be a president who seeks not to divide but to unify." [89]

Biden used antithesis to highlight the difference between his approach and that of his opponent. He said, "I will be a president who represents all Americans, not just the ones who voted for me. I will work hard for those who didn't vote for me, as hard as I will for those who did." [89]

Biden used parallelism to emphasize the importance of unity and working together. For instance, he said, "Let this grim era of demonization in America begin to end here and now. The refusal of Democrats and Republicans to cooperate with one another is not due to some mysterious force beyond our control. It's a decision, a choice we make." [89]

During the speech, Biden used hyperbole to underscore the challenges facing the country and the urgent need for action. "We are in a battle for the soul of this nation. And the only way we can win is by coming together." [89]; "There's never been anything we've been not able to do when we've done it together." [89]

Biden uses inclusive language extensively, highlighting the diversity of the American people and his desire to represent and work for all citizens. He mentions various demographic groups, including Democrats, Republicans, independents, and individuals from different races, ethnicities, religions, and sexual orientations. This inclusive language aims to foster unity and emphasize the shared values and aspirations of the nation.

Throughout the speech, Biden emphasizes the importance of unity and cooperation. He calls for an end to the divisive rhetoric and urges Americans to see each other as fellow citizens rather than enemies. By positioning himself as an American president who will work for the interests of all, regardless of political affiliation, he seeks to bridge the divide and promote a sense of national unity.

Biden acknowledged and celebrates the presence and contributions of women throughout his speech. He specifically mentions his wife, Jill, highlighting her role as a military mom and educator. He also praises Kamala Harris as the first woman, first Black woman, and first woman of South Asian descent to be elected as Vice President. This recognition of women's achievements and contributions emphasizes the importance of gender equality.

He used inclusive language throughout the speech, addressing both male and female audiences. He refers to "my sisters-in-law, my sister, Valerie," highlighting the women in his family. He also emphasizes the broad coalition that supported his campaign, mentioning various groups "Democrats, Republicans, independents, progressives, moderates, conservatives, young, old, urban, suburban, rural, gay, straight, transgender, white, Latino, Asian, Native American." [89] This inclusive language signals a commitment to unity and recognizing the diversity of the American population, including gender diversity.

Overall, Joe Biden's victory speech had a unifying and reassuring impact on the American people, aiming to restore confidence in the government, reaffirm American values, address pressing issues, and inspire hope at home and abroad. Its impact

extended beyond the immediate moment, setting the tone for the beginning of his presidency and the aspirations of his administration.

2.2 Consequences of the impact of the gender factor on election results

The 2016 presidential election saw Hillary Clinton come very close to becoming the first female president of the United States. However, she ultimately lost to Donald Trump in what proved to be an upset victory. There are many factors that contributed to Clinton's loss, but the gender factor and its impact on voter perceptions played one of the most important roles.

Hillary Clinton's candidacy as the first female major-party nominee for president in the United States was a significant milestone. It highlighted the progress made in gender equality and made a new step in the development of the American politics. Many people saw her campaign as an opportunity to elect the first female president, which added a layer of historical importance to the election.

One consequence of the impact of the gender factor on the election results was the perpetuation of gender-based stereotypes. Clinton was scrutinized more heavily than her male counterparts, and her behavior was often criticized as being too aggressive or too emotional. This perpetuated the stereotype that women are not fit for leadership roles. The election results highlighted the continued presence of sexism and misogyny in American society. The fact that a highly qualified female candidate lost to a male candidate with no political experience suggests that gender bias played a role in the election outcome.

In contrast to gender stereotypes and bias Clinton's candidacy inspired and empowered women across the country. Her campaign served as a rallying point for women who aspired to achieve higher political positions and shattered barriers. Many women saw her as a symbol of hope and progress and actively supported her campaign.

It is important to note that the impact of the gender factor on Clinton's election results is complex and multifaceted. Various factors, such as political ideology, policy positions, external events, also influenced the outcome of the election.

It is also worth noting that the topic of women's rights and other marginalized groups was one of the key ones, but Hillary Clinton focused more on issues of national security, economy. Given the fact that Hillary Clinton constantly faced gender stereotypes and bias during the campaign, the emphasis on gender was reduced, because in our opinion Hillary Clinton and the team understood that "excessive" attention to the topic of women's rights and other marginalized population groups could lead to even worse results.

In contrast to Hillary Clinton, Joe Biden placed great emphasis on women rights, African Americans, representatives of the LGBTQ+ community and other marginalized population groups.

The gender factor played a significant role in Joe Biden's election by garnering support from women voters. Women constitute a significant portion of the electorate, and their support influenced election outcomes. Biden's campaign made efforts to appeal to women by emphasizing gender equality, reproductive rights, and addressing issues such as sexual assault and harassment. Consequently, his policies and messaging have resonated with women voters, contributing to his victory.

Women voters tended to favor Biden more compared to men. According to exit polls, Biden won the votes of women by 13 percentage points more than Donald Trump. This gender gap was higher than the one for Hillary Clinton in 2016.

The gender factor can also be seen in the voting patterns of men and women. Historically, there has been a gender gap in voting preferences, with women tending to vote more for Democratic candidates than men. In the 2020 election, this trend continued, with women generally showing stronger support for Biden compared to men.

Another important aspect of the gender factor in Biden's election was the selection of Kamala Harris as his running mate. Harris made history as the first woman of color to be nominated for vice president by a major party. This choice not only energized and mobilized female voters but also highlighted Biden's commitment to

diversity and inclusivity. Harris's presence on the ticket likely influenced the election results positively, particularly among women and minority communities.

CONCLUSION TO THE SECOND CHAPTER

Multimodality plays a crucial role in political speeches, offering various benefits and enhancing the effectiveness of communication. The effective use of multimodality in political speeches is crucial for politicians to connect with their audience and persuade them to support their ideas and policies. By using multiple modes of communication, politicians can cater to the needs of different individuals and increase their chances of getting their message across. In addition, multimodality in political speeches can enhance the credibility of the speaker. When politicians use visual aids or gestures to support their arguments, it can help to reinforce their message and make it more memorable for the audience. Moreover, the use of multimodality in political speeches can also help to create an emotional connection with the audience.

The video about the announcement of one's candidacy for the post of president is of particular importance in the general presidential campaign. This is the first short statement, where the candidate has to make a first impression on the voters and interest them in his candidacy.

The official announcement speech for the post of president has no less influence on the further course of the presidential campaign, multimodality plays an important role in the further development of the presidential campaign. After all, the candidate is addressing a live audience and must make the best impression on potential voters.

The final speech serves as a summary of the entire presidential campaign and also plays an important role in shaping the image of the candidate. It does not matter whether the candidate wins or loses, he or she must show appreciation to his or her audience, demonstrate confidence and responsibility.

Having conducted a multimodal analysis of the speeches of Hillary Clinton and Joe Biden, we came to the conclusion that the gender factor serves as an important aspect in the process of the presidential campaign and in the election results. Both candidates were more experienced and had a lot of political experience compared to their opponent Donald Trump. However, in the case of Hillary Clinton, gender

stereotypes and prejudices had an impact on the results of the elections and to some extent served as the reason for her defeat. Despite this, the candidacy of Hillary Clinton for the post of president of the United States had a great impact on the further development of the influence and involvement of women in politics. Gender equality and the fight for women's rights for other marginalized groups was one of the main areas of Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign, but it was not in the first place.

Joe Biden has focused on supporting and working with women and other marginalized groups. Gender equality policies, Kamala Harris' candidacy for vice president, and other issues of rights and freedoms for women and marginalized groups had a major impact on the election results.

So, in conclusion, we can say that the gender factor plays an important role in political discourse. Great experience in politics cannot always have a great influence on the course of elections. Instead, gender stereotypes and bias have a large impact on election results till nowadays. Society and voters are increasingly concerned about issues of gender equality, the rights and freedoms of marginalized populations and women, so policies aimed at supporting these people can play a key role in election results.

CHAPTER III. GENDER SENSITIVITY IN THE POLITICIANS SPEECHES

3.1 The content of gender-sensitive speeches: main aspects, peculiarities of construction

The term "gender sensitivity" emerged in the field of gender studies and feminist discourse over several decades, but it is challenging to highlight an exact date or person responsible for its creation. This term gained its popularity particularly during the second wave of feminism. While the exact origins of the term may be difficult to trace, it has become widely used and accepted as a way to describe the understanding, awareness, and responsiveness to the ways in which gender impacts individuals and society. Gender sensitivity has since been embraced by various organizations, institutions, and advocates as a guiding principle for promoting gender equality and inclusivity. The concept of gender sensitivity developed alongside the broader understanding of gender as a social construct and the recognition of the need to address gender biases and inequalities.

A number of nongovernmental and governmental organizations such as the UN has created guidelines, policies, and initiatives aimed at developing gender sensitivity within their work and encouraging member states to adopt gender-sensitive approaches in their policies and programs, European Parliament and other institutions have adopted multilingual guidelines on gender-neutral language and supported other initiatives.

Gender-sensitive political speeches are those delivered by political leaders, politicians, or activists that address problems such as gender equality, women's rights, and the promotion of inclusive policies and practices. These speeches attempt to promote awareness, advocate for change, and rally support for gender equality in politics.

Gender-sensitive political speeches are instrumental in driving policy change, promoting gender equality, and challenging societal norms. These speeches go beyond

mere rhetoric and aim to address systemic gender inequalities, advocate for inclusive policies, and empower marginalized genders.

A gender-sensitive political speech often includes such elements as promotion of inclusive policies, for example advocating for laws and initiatives that address gender disparities in education, healthcare, employment, and social welfare. The speech may also focus on promoting women's political participation and leadership roles. Another key element is addressing gender inequalities, the speech acknowledges and examines societal structural gender disparities such as the gender wage gap, gender-based violence, unequal political representation, and limited access to resources and opportunities. It emphasizes the need of resolving these concerns and calls for meaningful steps toward gender equality. Challenging gender stereotypes is considered to be another one key element of gender-sensitive speech. The speech challenges and confronts gender stereotypes, biases, and discriminatory practices that limit individuals' potential based on their gender. It encourages a shift in societal attitudes and norms, promoting the idea that all genders should have equal opportunities and rights. The next element is empowering marginalized genders including women, non-binary individuals, and transgender individuals by describing the experiences of individuals and advocating for policies that address their specific needs and challenges. Another key element is recognition of the importance of grassroots movements, feminist organizations, and civil society in driving change and advancing gender equality. One more element of gender-sensitive speech is to inspire the action. It may call for individuals, organizations, and governments to take responsibility for advancing gender equality and to be accountable for their commitments and actions. The usage of gender-neutral terms and other inclusive language, attention for using proper pronouns when the individual's gender is unknown or non-binary, these aspects are important in gender-sensitive speeches.

3.2 Rhetorical analysis of the speeches of candidates for the post of President of the USA

The study of rhetoric originated in ancient Greece, where philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle explored the principles and techniques of persuasive communication. Aristotle's work, particularly his treatise "Rhetoric," laid the foundation for rhetorical analysis by examining the strategies, devices, and appeals used in persuasive discourse. The rhetorical triangle or the concepts of pathos, logos and ethos were introduced in Aristotle's "Rhetoric".

According to Aristotle, a speaker's ability to convince an audience is determined by how successfully the speaker appeals to the audience in three areas: logos, ethos, and pathos. When these appeals are considered together, they create what later rhetoricians have found as the rhetorical triangle.

Pathos aims to elicit specific feelings or reactions in the audience by appealing to the emotions. In order to establish an emotional connection with the audience, it involves employing vivid language, compelling imagery. By engaging the audience's feelings, speakers can draw in their compassion, sympathy, or empathy influencing their attitudes and decision-making.

Logos refers to an argument's logical appeal. It involves supporting the speaker's claims and persuading the audience through reasoning, evidence, facts, and logical consistency. In order to persuade the audience of the speaker's position's validity, logos uses logical reasoning, the presentation of evidence, and the construction of a well-structured argument.

The speaker's credibility, character, and ethical appeal are all referred to as ethos. To win over the audience's trust, this requires establishing the speaker's expertise, reliability, and moral standing. Ethos can be shown through the speaker's capabilities, notoriety, or individual encounters, as well as their utilization of moral contentions and requests to shared values.

The use of these three elements—pathos, logos, and ethos—in a speech to influence and persuade the audience is the focus of effective rhetorical analysis.

3.2.1 Hillary Clinton's rhetoric during the 2016 US presidential election campaign

For conducting the rhetorical analysis we took three Hillary Clinton's performances during the United States presidential debates held on September 26, 2016, October 9, 2016 and October 19, 2016.

Pathos, according to Aristotle, is the act of stirring up emotion in the audience in order to get them to make the desired decision. In this case, Hilary Clinton used various means of influencing the audience.

Clinton has used personal stories in her speeches to make an emotional connection with the audience. She appealed to the audience's emotions and created empathy by sharing relatable experiences: "I wish my mother could have been with us longer. I wish she could have seen Chelsea become a mother herself. I wish she could have met Charlotte." [82]; " I started off as a young lawyer working against discrimination against African-American children...I worked to make sure that kids with disabilities could get a public education..." [90]

The use of uplifting and motivational language evokes positive emotions and creates a sense of hope and inspiration. Clinton used powerful and emotive words to encourage optimism and convey her vision for the future. " I want us to heal our country and bring it together." [82]; "I think if we work together, if we overcome the divisiveness that sometimes sets Americans against one another and instead we make some big goals and I've set forth some big goals, getting the economy to work for everyone, not just those at the top." [90]; "...I will defend women's rights to make their own healthcare decisions. " [92]

Aligning with the audience's values and aspirations is an effective way to elicit an emotional response. Clinton emphasized values such as equality, justice, inclusivity, or opportunity to create an emotional connection with the audience: "We have to restore trust. We have to work with the police. We have to make sure they respect the communities and the communities respect them. " [82] "We need to have

more second-chance programs.” [82]; “We need American Muslims to be part of our eyes and ears on our front lawns. I’ve worked with a lot of Muslim groups around America. ” [90]; “When I was secretary of state, I went around the world advocating for our country, but also advocating for women’s rights to make sure that women had a decent chance to have a better life...” [90]; “one of my favorite jobs in politics was down in south Texas registering Latino citizens to be able to vote” [90]

Speaking to the shared experiences and challenges faced by the audience, Clinton emphasized the importance of unity and collective action. By fostering a sense of togetherness and common purpose, she tap into the audience's emotions and desire for a better future. “I meet these people all the time and they tell me what a difference having that insurance meant to them and their families.” [82]

As we mentioned above, logos is used to appeal to logic, reason, and evidence to support the speaker's arguments and proposals.

She presented a comprehensive economic plan, discussing her strategies for education “...making college debt-free so more young people can get their education” [82]; economic growth, and addressing income inequality: “ I will not raise taxes on anyone making \$250,000 or less. I also will not add a penny to the debt.” [92]

Clinton utilized facts, statistics, and data to support her arguments and demonstrate the need for her proposed policies. This involved presenting data on topics such as education outcomes, the state of the economy, migration “...nine million people lost their jobs. Five million people lost their homes. And \$13 trillion in family wealth was wiped out.”[82]; “...we have 33,000 people a year who die from guns.” [90]; “We have 11 million undocumented people. They have 4 million American citizen children. 15 million people.” [92]

Given Clinton's experience as a former U.S. Senator, she highlighted her legislative record to establish credibility and demonstrate her ability to navigate the complexities of policymaking. This include referencing bills she sponsored or important legislative achievements: “When I was in the Senate, I had a number of trade deals that came before me, and I held them all to the same test...Some of them I

voted for.” [82]; “When I was secretary of state, we actually increased American exports globally 30 percent. We increased them to China 50 percent. So I know how to really work to get new jobs and to get exports that helped to create more new jobs.” [82]; “...when I was a senator, I did vote to close corporate loopholes.” [90]; “children have safer medicines because I was able to pass a law” [90]

Clinton used comparative analysis to contrast her policy positions with those of her opponent. By highlighting differences and articulating why her approach is more effective or beneficial, she appealed to the audience's sense of logic and reasoning “Independent experts have looked at what I’ve proposed and looked at what Donald’s proposed...if his tax plan, which would blow up the debt by over \$5 trillion and would in some instances disadvantage middle-class families compared to the wealthy, were to go into effect, we would lose 3.5 million jobs and maybe have another recession...They’ve looked at my plans and they’ve said, OK, if we can do this, and I intend to get it done, we will have 10 million more new jobs...” [82]; “He (Donald Trump) started his business with \$14 million, borrowed from his father, and he really believes that the more you help wealthy people, the better off we’ll be and that everything will work out from there...I have a different experience...And so what I believe is the more we can do for the middle class, the more we can invest in you, your education, your skills, your future...” [82]

As we already know, ethos centers around laying out the speaker's believability, reliability, and moral person.

Clinton emphasized her extensive experience and qualifications as a basis for her credibility. She highlighted her previous roles as First Lady, U.S. Senator, and Secretary of State, showcasing her knowledge, leadership skills, and understanding of the political landscape: “Eight million kids every year have health insurance because when I was first lady I worked with Democrats and Republicans to create the children’s health insurance program. Hundreds of thousands of kids now have a chance to be adopted because I worked to change our adoption and foster care system.” [90]

Clinton referenced her accomplishments and achievements throughout her career. She included her legislative successes, diplomatic achievements, advocacy work, all aimed at building a perception of competence and effectiveness

She used testimonials and endorsements from respected individuals or organizations to enhance her ethos. By referencing the support she received from influential figures, she strengthened her credibility and appeal to authority. “He (Bernie Sanders) is supporting me 100% because we talked about what we wanted to do.” [90]; “I am reminded of what my friend Michelle Obama advised us all. When they go low, you go high.” [90]

Clinton emphasized her commitment to transparency and openness in her campaign. By promoting her willingness to engage with voters, listen to their concerns, and provide honest and straightforward answers, she built a perception of authenticity and trustworthiness: “I’ve heard from so many of you about the difficult choices you face and the stresses that you’re under.” [82]; “I heard from lots of teachers and parents about some of our concerns about some of the things being said and done in this campaign.”[90]; “I have met with women who have, toward the end of their pregnancy, get the worst news one could get. That their health is in jeopardy if they continue to carry to term. Or that something terrible has happened or just been discovered about the pregnancy.” [92]; “...I was thinking about a young girl I met here in Las Vegas, Carla who is very worried that her parents might be deported because she was born in this country but they were not.”

She also refers to her personal link to the future, stressing her background and dedication to creating a better nation for generations to come: “Today is my granddaughter’s second birthday, so I think about this a lot.” [82].

During the presidential debates between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump, Hillary Clinton employed various rhetorical devices to enhance the persuasiveness of her arguments.

During the debates Clinton used such metaphors and metaphorical word combinations: trumped-up trickle-down economics, this metaphorical phrase uses the

word trumped-up to criticize and dismiss the concept of trickle-down economics. It suggests that the economic theory is falsely presented or exaggerated; to deploy a half a billion more solar panels, where deploy used to liken the action of installing solar panels to a strategic deployment in a military context; breaking that glass ceiling refers to the symbolic barrier that prevents women from reaching top positions or achieving equal opportunities. "Putin is playing a really tough, long game here." The metaphor compares Putin's actions to a strategic game, suggesting a complex and calculated approach. "We need to make America the clean energy superpower of the 21st century." The metaphor of a clean energy superpower positions the United States as a dominant and influential force in renewable and sustainable energy technologies.

Alliterations, such as: "Clean, renewable energy" with the repeated e sound; "Fight for the future" with repeated "f" "A better, fairer, more inclusive America" with repeated r. Alliteration can be an effective rhetorical device that adds emphasis, rhythm, and memorability to a speech.

She used anaphora to emphasize key points or create a sense of momentum in her speech: "I want us..."; "But I believe, along with me, the vast majority of Americans believe that we are stronger together. We believe in the rule of law. We believe in a government of, by, and for the people." [90], in this phrase we believe is repeated to highlight shared beliefs and values.

"The kind of plan that Donald has put forth would be trickle-down economics all over again." [82] By characterizing Donald's plan as trickle-down economics all over again, Clinton uses hyperbole to strongly criticize and emphasize her opposition to his proposed economic policies. "It's just awfully good that someone with the temperament of Donald Trump is not in charge of the law in our country." [90] In this statement, Clinton uses hyperbole to express her concern over Trump's temperament and to suggest that his personality is unfit for such a significant responsibility.

Both the first, second and third Hillary Clinton's speeches on debates are considered to be gender-sensitive.

Clinton frequently raised issues related to gender equality, including equal pay, women's rights, reproductive health care, and women's empowerment. By discussing these issues, she demonstrated an awareness of existing gender challenges and inequalities and demonstrated a gender-sensitive approach.

She defended policies and initiatives aimed at strengthening women's rights and promoting gender equality. This advocacy included support for equal pay, affordable childcare and access to reproductive health care. By campaigning on these issues, Clinton demonstrated her own commitment to addressing gender inequalities and promoting gender sensitivity.

Clinton often shared personal stories and experiences as a woman in the political and public sphere. By highlighting these experiences, she acknowledged the challenges and biases faced by women from different backgrounds, contributing to a more nuanced understanding of gender issues and promoting empathy and understanding.

Clinton used inclusive language that recognized and addressed various gender identities and experiences. She emphasized the importance of supporting families, including diverse family structures, and advocating for the rights and inclusion of marginalized groups, such as the LGBT community.

According to an SurveyMonkey poll a majority of likely voters who watched the first debate, or at least followed the coverage, said that Hillary Clinton won. Fifty-two percent of those polled thought Clinton won, while twenty-one considered Trump as a winner and twenty-six percent found there were no winners.

The winner of the second debate was Hillary Clinton with forty-four percent of likely voters who watched the debate.

The results of SurveyMonkey poll showed, that the winner of the third debate became Hillary Clinton with forty-seven percent, while thirty-seven percent of voters considered Trump as a winner.

The role of gender in the context of Hillary Clinton's speeches during the debates with Donald Trump in 2016 includes a number of aspects. Clinton's speeches

likely involved navigating the challenges of balancing assertiveness and likability. As a woman in a traditionally male-dominated sphere, she employed strategic communication techniques to counter gender bias and establish her credibility. This includes emphasizing her experience, knowledge, and policy expertise while also projecting empathy and relatability.

Throughout the debates, Clinton faced gender-based attacks from her opponent. These attacks often sought to undermine her credibility, competence, and trustworthiness based on gendered assumptions. Clinton's responses to these attacks have aimed to counter such narratives, assert her qualifications, and reinforce her ability to lead effectively.

Gender is just one aspect of a person's identity, and Clinton's speeches also addressed other dimensions such as race, class, and experience. Intersectionality played a role in shaping her arguments and framing her policy proposals, acknowledging the diverse experiences and challenges faced by different groups within the population.

3.2.2 Joe Biden's rhetoric during the 2019 US presidential election campaign

We took two full videos of the debate between Joe Biden and Donald Trump for conducting the rhetorical analysis, the number of videos is determined by the fact that one of the three debates did not take place because Trump had COVID-19 and refused to participate in the debate online. Accordingly, only two debates between Biden and Trump were held in the USA. The third video we chose is Biden introduces Kamala Harris.

Joe Biden displayed empathy for certain people, using emotional language, sharing own stories. “How many of you got up this morning and had an empty chair at the kitchen table because someone died of COVID?” [81]; “There are millions of people out there who are on the front lines. And we owe them, we owe them.” [91] The statement appeals to the emotions of the audience by evoking a sense of loss and personal tragedy related to the COVID-19 pandemic. “You folks living in Scranton and Claymont and all the small towns and working-class towns in America, how well are you doing?” [81] This question is intended to resonate emotionally with the working-class audience, appealing to their sense of struggle and economic hardship. Sharing a personal tragedy and experience, Biden appeals to his own character and demonstrates empathy, potentially establishing trust and relatability with the audience: “I understand what it's like to be a single parent. When my wife and daughter died, my two sons, I'm a single parent.” [81] Biden's mention of personal loss and the emotional toll of losing a loved one may elicit empathy and sadness from the audience: “People are learning to die with it. You folks home will have an empty chair at the kitchen table this morning. That man or wife going to bed tonight and reaching over to try to touch their— out of habit where their wife or husband was, is gone. Learning to live with it?” [91]

Biden used motivational language, which evoked positive emotions and made people feel inspired. “It's about your dignity. It's about your healthcare. It's about being

able to make sure that you have an even shot at getting ahead.” [81]; “We're going to choose hope over fear. We're going to choose science over fiction. We're going to choose unity over division. And we're going to choose a better future for ourselves, our families, and for our great country.” [91] He points on unity and inclusivity, encouraging the audience to come together as Americans and work towards common goals: “I'm running as a proud Democrat, but I'm going to be an American president. I'm going to take care of those who voted against me as well as those who voted for me” [91]

Lining up with the audience's values and aspirations is a compelling method for getting an emotional reaction. Biden emphasized the value of equality and the idea that everyone should have an equal chance to succeed: “We have to make sure that every American, regardless of race, ethnicity, background, has an opportunity to build a better life.” [81]; “We're going to be in a situation where we actually allow people to breathe.” [81] “I'm going to do is president of the United States is call together, an entire group of people at the White House. Well, everything from the civil rights groups, to the police officers, to police chiefs, and we're going to work this out. ” [81]

Biden spoke to the shared experiences and challenges faced by the audience during the first debate. “I understand what it's like to be in the position of having to get a document, and it's not there.” [81], he shares a personal experience, Biden establishes a connection with individuals who have faced similar challenges, emphasizing his understanding of their struggles. He promotes a sense of togetherness, emphasizing that progress can be achieved through collective efforts: “We're all in this together. We can get it done if we just step up.” [81]

As we mentioned above, logos refers to the use of logic, reasoning, and evidence to support an argument or appeal to the audience's sense of rationality.

He outlined specific policy proposals and initiatives to address various issues. He presented a comprehensive economic plan, discussing his strategies for job creation: “”, education, economic growth: “ I'm gonna make the, the corporate tax 28%, shouldn't be 21%. ” [81]; “I'm gonna create an economic climate that, in fact, is

going to be not only tax incentives for people to invest, but also make sure we're going to retrain, repurpose, and get done the four million buildings and two million homes that need to be made sure they're weatherized in good shape”, [81] COVID-19 case; “We're in a situation where there are a thousand deaths a day now. Over 70,000 new cases per day. Compared to what's happening in Europe, as the New England Medical Journal said, they're starting from a very low rate, we're starting from a very high rate.” [89], healthcare and the Affordable Care Act: “What I'm gonna do is pass Obamacare with a public option. Become Bidencare. The public option is an option that says that if you, in fact, do not have the wherewithal, if you qualify for Medicaid and you do not have the wherewithal in your state to get Medicaid, you automatically are enrolled, providing competition for insurance companies” [91], climate change and clean energy: “We're gonna build 500,000 charging stations on all of the highways we're gonna be building in the future” [91]; “We can get to net-zero energy production by 2035, not only not costing people jobs, creating jobs.”[91]

Biden presents statistical evidence to support his claim about the decrease in violent crime during his previous administration, appealing to the audience's sense of reason and factual information: “The fact of the matter is, violent crime went down 17%, 15%, in our administration.” [81] In light of the rising number of COVID-19 cases and deaths, Biden uses logic to question the justification for opening the country, implying the need for caution and considerations regarding public health: “Why is he insisting that we go forward and open when you have almost half the states in America with a significant increase in COVID cases and COVID deaths?” [81]

Joe Biden did highlight his legislative record to establish credibility and demonstrate his ability to navigate the complexities of policymaking based on his previous experience. By emphasizing his track record, Biden aimed to showcase his expertise and competence in crafting and implementing effective policies. “And we went into recession. I was asked to fix it. I was asked to bring it back. We were able to have an economic recovery that created the jobs you're talking about.” [81]; “We brought back, I was asked to bring back, Chrysler and General Motors. We brought

them back right here in the state of Ohio and Michigan. ” [81]; “ I am a former Vice President. I've made it clear, I've made it clear in my public statements that the violence should be prosecuted. [81]”; “During our administration Recovery Act I was able to bring down the cost of renewable energy to cheaper than, or as cheap as coal, and gas, and oil.” [81]

By highlighting the differences between his own stances and those of his opponent, Biden aimed to emphasize his own policy priorities and present himself as a distinct alternative. “...the tax code that made him, put him in a position that he pays less tax to the school teacher, make them, the money a school teacher makes. Is because of...He says he's smart because he can take advantage of the tax code. And he does take advantage of the tax code, but that's why I'm going to eliminate the Trump tax cuts. And we're going to eliminate those tax cuts and make sure that we invest in the people who, in fact, need the help.” [81]; “...Wall Street firms point out that my economic plan would create 7 million more jobs than his in four years...” [81].

Ethos refers to the use of credibility, trustworthiness, and personal character to persuade an audience.

Biden emphasized his commitment to transparency and openness in his campaign: “I have released all of my tax returns. Twenty-two years. Go look at them. Twenty-two years of my tax returns.” [81]; “I have not taken a penny from any foreign source ever in my life.” [91]

“Look, the future lies in who can, in fact, get things done.” [81] Biden implies that his focus on achieving tangible results reflects his dedication to shaping a better future.

Biden emphasized on truthfulness and accountability: “We have to make sure that we are being transparent. We have to provide information. And again, we have to make sure we're in a situation where we're being accurate.”[91]

During the first and final presidential debate, Joe Biden utilized several rhetorical devices to make his arguments and communicate effectively.

We can observe a metaphorical comparison of the idea of the COVID-19 pandemic disappearing and injecting bleach into one's arm, by highlighting what Biden perceived as baseless and dangerous suggestions made by his opponent, Donald Trump: "This is the same man who told you, by Easter, this would be gone away, by the warm weather, it'd be gone, miraculous, like a miracle. And by the way, maybe you could inject some bleach in your arm, and that would take care of it." [81]

Rhetorical question: "What is on the ballot here is the character of this country. Decency, honor, respect." [81]; "What do you say to the American people who are fearful that the cost of college, sending their daughter or son to school, is so high that they can't afford it?" [91];

Antithesis: "He's been totally irresponsible the way in which he has handled the social distancing and people wearing masks, basically encouraged them not to." [81]

Simile: "He says that we're learning to live with it. People are learning to die with it." [81]

Personification: "Take a look what New York has done in terms of turning the..." [91];

Parallelism: "And he will not be able to stop the virus from getting in. But he's been totally irresponsible in the way in which he has handled the social distancing, the people wearing masks, basically encouraged them not to." [91]

Joe Biden's speech announcing Kamala Harris as his running mate utilizes several rhetorical strategies to effectively communicate his message and persuade his audience.

Biden establishes his credibility and trustworthiness by emphasizing his serious approach to the decision-making process and the importance of the moment for the nation. He highlights his experience and the privilege of meeting talented women leaders, portraying himself as someone who values diverse perspectives and qualifications.

Biden appeals to the emotions of the audience by expressing excitement and portraying the announcement as a great day for their campaign and for America. He

acknowledges the limitations imposed by social distancing but tries to maintain a sense of connection and enthusiasm.

The speech incorporates logical reasoning by framing the upcoming election as an inflection point in the nation's history. Biden argues that the choice made in November will have long-lasting consequences for the future of America. He emphasizes the qualifications of Kamala Harris and highlights her accomplishments in various roles, such as attorney general and senator, to support his decision.

Biden employs repetition for emphasis and to create a rhythmic flow in his speech. Notably, he repeats the phrase “a great day” and the word “choice” to underscore the significance of the announcement and the careful consideration behind his selection.

He uses inclusive language throughout the speech, referring to his campaign as “our campaign” and inviting listeners to join him. He emphasizes the importance of working families, immigrants, and marginalized communities, aiming to build a sense of unity and collective responsibility.

Biden uses parallel structure to create a balanced and rhythmic effect. For instance, he says, “She’s smart, she’s tough, she’s experienced, she’s a proven fighter” to list qualities of Kamala Harris. [87]

Biden employs anaphora in his speech. For instance, he says, “We have a public health crisis... We have an economic crisis... We have a racial justice crisis,” [87] to emphasize the challenges facing the country.

He uses metaphors to make his points more vivid and relatable. For example, he says, “We’re going to build back better” [87] to convey the idea of rebuilding the country stronger than before.

In his speech, Biden uses gender-sensitive rhetoric. Biden recognizes the qualifications and leadership of the women he met, emphasizing their capabilities and breaking stereotypes: “I had the incredible privilege of meeting and spending a good deal of time with a group of talented women leaders, all of whom are qualified to be president.”[87] “Her story is America’s story, different from mine in many particulars,

but also not so different in the essentials.”[87] - Biden acknowledges the diversity of experiences, including gender, and highlights the commonalities that bind Americans together. “Today, just maybe, they’re seeing themselves for the first time in a new way, as the stuff of presidents and vice presidents.” [87]- Biden acknowledges the impact of having Kamala Harris as the first woman vice presidential nominee and the potential inspiration it can provide to young girls.

Joe Biden's speech during the first debate did touch on gender-sensitive issues. While the debate covered a wide range of topics, Biden did address issues that have particular relevance to healthcare, especially the importance of protecting and expanding the Affordable Care Act, which covers women's health services, such as contraception coverage and preventive care.

Biden defended women's access to reproductive healthcare, including the right to choose. He also mentioned the necessity to provide paid family and medical leave, as well as affordable childcare options, which are issues that disproportionately affect women and their participation in the workforce.

During the final debate, Biden has consistently advocated for equal pay for equal work, highlighting the gender pay gap as an issue to address. Biden touched on the issue of violence against women, highlighting his work on the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) and the need to address domestic violence and sexual assault. He emphasized the importance of believing survivors and holding perpetrators accountable.

In both debates, Joe Biden demonstrated an inclusive approach by addressing the concerns and experiences of individuals of all genders. He used inclusive language such as we, us, and the American people to encompass a diverse range of identities and perspectives.

Biden's rhetoric aimed to resonate with women voters by addressing their concerns and promoting policies that would benefit them. He emphasized issues such as equal pay, women's healthcare, and reproductive rights, which are important to many women. By addressing these issues, Biden sought to highlight his support for

gender equality and position himself as a candidate who would advocate for women's rights.

He used the gender factor to draw a contrast between himself and Trump. He criticized Trump's derogatory comments about women and his controversial policies related to women's issues. By highlighting these differences, Biden sought to position himself as a candidate who would be more respectful, inclusive, and supportive of women's rights.

Biden's rhetoric on the gender factor aligned with his broader progressive agenda. By addressing gender equality and women's rights, he aimed to appeal to progressive voters who prioritize these issues. This messaging also sought to position Biden as a candidate who would push for progressive policies and reforms on gender-related matters.

Biden frequently mentioned his intention to nominate a woman as his running mate, highlighting his commitment to representation and inclusion. This move aimed to demonstrate that he valued women's voices and leadership. He sought to appeal to women voters and underscore his commitment to breaking barriers and promoting diversity.

CONCLUSION TO THE THIRD CHAPTER

Gender-sensitive political speeches act as catalysts for policy change. They bring attention to gender-specific issues and advocate for legislative reforms that promote gender equality. Gender-sensitive political speeches address issues such as the gender pay gap, gender-based violence, access to healthcare, reproductive rights, and women's representation in leadership roles.

The speeches of Hillary Clinton and Joe Biden included the vast majority of elements of gender sensitivity. They covered issues of health care, education, reproductive rights, issues of violence, discrimination, etc.

In the context of Hillary Clinton's speeches during the 2016 debates with Donald Trump, the role of gender encompassed several important factors. Clinton navigated the challenge of balancing assertiveness and likability as a woman in a male-dominated sphere. She strategically employed communication techniques to counter gender bias and establish her credibility, emphasizing her experience, knowledge, and political expertise while also projecting empathy and relatability. Clinton faced gender-based attacks from her opponent, aiming to undermine her credibility based on gendered assumptions. In response, she countered these narratives, asserted her qualifications, and reinforced her leadership ability. Clinton's speeches also addressed other dimensions of identity such as race, class, and experience, recognizing intersectionality and the diverse experiences and challenges faced by different groups within the population.

While Biden's rhetoric during the debates aimed to resonate with women voters by addressing their concerns and promoting policies for their benefit, including equal pay, women's healthcare, and reproductive rights. He contrasted himself with Trump, criticizing his derogatory comments about women and controversial policies. This positioned Biden as respectful, inclusive, and supportive of women's rights. His gender-focused messaging aligned with his broader progressive agenda, appealing to progressive voters and positioning him as a candidate pushing for gender equality.

Biden's mention of nominating a woman as his running mate emphasized his commitment to representation, inclusion, breaking barriers, and promoting diversity.

It can be considered that Hillary Clinton emphasized gender issues to a lesser extent during the debates compared to Biden. While Clinton's campaign in 2016 marked a historic moment as she became the first female major-party presidential nominee, her focus during the debates was more diverse, encompassing a wide range of policy issues.

While Clinton did address gender-related topics, such as pay equity and women's healthcare, her campaign primarily emphasized her experience, qualifications, and policy positions across various domains, including the economy, national security, and social issues. She sought to appeal to a broad base of voters and showcase her comprehensive understanding of policy matters.

In contrast, Biden's rhetoric in the debates with Trump placed a stronger emphasis on gender issues. He frequently highlighted women's rights, representation, and equality, and explicitly mentioned his intention to nominate a woman as his running mate. His campaign messaging consistently addressed gender-related topics, resonating with women voters and positioning himself as an advocate for their rights.

While both candidates acknowledged gender-related issues during their respective campaigns, Biden's rhetoric in the debates appeared to give greater prominence to gender issues compared to Clinton's approach in 2016.

CONCLUSION

In recent years, scholars have increasingly focused on the study of discourse, aiming to comprehend how language is utilized to influence our perception of the world. This field of study emphasizes that language is not merely a tool for communication but also a means of exerting power and control. It is employed to shape attitudes, behaviors, and to construct social identities and relationships. Research in this area has also delved into the study of language use in specific contexts such as political or media discourse. The objective of this research is to understand how language is employed to establish and maintain power relationships within these contexts and how language can be used to challenge dominant ideologies and power structures.

The study of discourse is an ever-evolving and dynamic field that draws from a wide range of disciplines such as sociology, psychology, anthropology, and linguistics. Within the political realm, gender has been a significant factor that affects both the representation of women in political positions and the way political discourse is conducted. Women have been historically underrepresented in politics, and their voices and concerns have been overshadowed by men. However, in recent years, there has been a growing movement towards gender equality in politics, with more women being elected to political positions and advocating for policies that address gender-based issues.

Despite progress, gender biases and stereotypes continue to influence political discourse. Women are often subjected to sexism and discrimination in political campaigns and debates, which can affect their chances of winning elections. Furthermore, women's perspectives and experiences may be overlooked or dismissed in political discussions, further perpetuating gender inequalities.

Women candidates are often portrayed in relation to their family and personal lives rather than their qualifications, experience, and policy positions. They are also more likely to be criticized for being "too aggressive" or "not feminine enough" if they

display leadership qualities commonly associated with male politicians. These stereotypes foster an environment where women are seen as less capable leaders and decision-makers. Moreover, women candidates are still more likely to be discussed in terms of their appearance rather than the substance of their campaigns. All of these stereotypes send a subtle but powerful message that women do not belong in the highest levels of political leadership.

The gender factor is one of the key topics in discursive studies, as evidenced by a plethora of scientific works related to this subject and society's demand for equal rights for women and men.

Multimodality is crucial in political speeches as it offers various advantages and enhances communication effectiveness. Politicians need to effectively utilize multimodality to connect with their audience and persuade them to support their ideas and policies. By employing multiple modes of communication, politicians can cater to the diverse needs of individuals and increase the likelihood of delivering their message successfully. Furthermore, multimodality in political speeches helps to enhance the speaker's credibility. The use of visual aids or gestures by politicians reinforces their arguments, making them more memorable for the audience. Additionally, multimodality fosters an emotional connection with the audience.

The video announcing one's candidacy for the presidency holds significant importance during the general presidential campaign. This brief statement allows the candidate to make a first impression on voters and generate interest in their candidacy.

The official announcement speech for the presidency also holds substantial influence on the course of the presidential campaign. Multimodality plays a critical role in the campaign's further development, as the candidate addresses a live audience and must make a favorable impression on potential voters.

The final speech serves as a summary of the entire presidential campaign and is instrumental in shaping the candidate's image. Regardless of winning or losing, the candidate must express appreciation to the audience, demonstrate confidence, and exhibit responsibility.

After conducting a multimodal analysis of speeches by Hillary Clinton and Joe Biden, we have concluded that gender serves as an important aspect in the presidential campaign and election results. Both candidates possessed more experience and political background compared to their opponent Donald Trump. However, in the case of Hillary Clinton, gender stereotypes and biases influenced the election outcome and partially contributed to her defeat. Nevertheless, Clinton's candidacy for the U.S. presidency greatly impacted the further development of women's involvement and influence in politics. Gender equality and advocating for women's rights, as well as other marginalized groups, constituted a key focus of Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign, albeit not the primary one.

Joe Biden prioritized supporting and collaborating with women and other marginalized groups. Gender equality policies, the candidacy of Kamala Harris for vice president, and other issues concerning rights and freedoms for women and marginalized groups significantly influenced the election results.

Gender factor plays a significant role in political discourse. Extensive political experience does not always exert a substantial influence on election outcomes. Instead, gender stereotypes and biases continue to have a considerable impact on the results. Society and voters are increasingly concerned about gender equality issues, the rights and freedoms of marginalized populations and women. Therefore, policies aimed at supporting these individuals can play a pivotal role in determining election results.

Gender sensitive political speeches play a crucial role in promoting policy change and advocating for gender equality. Such speeches bring attention to issues that are specific to gender and call for legislative reforms that address them. Some of these issues include the gender pay gap, gender-based violence, access to healthcare, reproductive rights, and women's representation in leadership positions.

The gender factor played an important role in Hillary Clinton's results in the 2016 presidential election. While many factors contributed to Clinton's loss, her gender was undeniably a disadvantage.

Clinton faced implicit and explicit gender bias throughout the campaign. She was subjected to disparaging remarks about her appearance, tone of voice, and demeanor that male candidates rarely encounter. The double standard was evident in the way her personality traits were evaluated differently based on her gender. Her assertiveness and confidence were seen as off-putting rather than leadership qualities by some.

Clinton's campaign also had to deal with the "likability" challenge that confronts many high-achieving women. She struggled to appear both competent and warm, as voters expected her to conform to traditional feminine traits as well as demonstrate leadership skills. This balancing act proved difficult and took attention away from discussing policies and issues.

The rhetoric from her opponents also played a role. The implication that Clinton was relying on her gender, rather than qualifications, to garner votes activated latent gender biases among some voters. It fit into the pre-existing narrative that women who seek positions of power do not deserve them.

Ultimately, while Clinton's loss cannot be attributed solely to gender bias, there is evidence that implicit and explicit sexism among some voters influenced the outcome of the election. The "glass ceiling" proved resilient in 2016. Moving forward, candidates, the media, and voters will need to become more aware of gender biases in order to pave the way for more women to achieve the highest levels of political leadership.

Gender played an important role in the outcome of the 2020 US presidential election, especially in shaping the candidacy and campaign of Joe Biden. As the first female vice president and a former presidential candidate herself, Kamala Harris's selection as Biden's running mate was historic and aimed to mobilize women voters. Biden also campaigned on a platform that sought to appeal to women, pledging to address issues like equal pay, childcare, and reproductive rights.

The emphasis on gender issues in Biden's campaign helped him differentiate himself from his opponent, Donald Trump. Trump had faced criticism throughout his

presidency for his derogatory comments about women and controversial policies on reproductive rights and gender equality. By contrasting himself with Trump's track record, Biden positioned himself as a candidate respectful of women's rights and as an advocate for gender equality.

The gender-focused messaging, combined with broader progressive policies, appealed to a wide range of voters, including women, young people, and progressive-leaning individuals. Biden's emphasis on gender-related issues contributed to his support among these demographics, helping him secure their votes and ultimately influencing the election outcome.

Nevertheless, Biden ultimately won a higher proportion of the women's vote compared to Hillary Clinton in 2016. Several factors contributed to this outcome. First, many women were motivated to vote against Donald Trump following controversies over his treatment of women. Second, suburban women voters, a key demographic in swing states, tended to favor Biden over Trump on issues like the pandemic response and racial justice.

Biden's selection of Harris, who made history as the first female vice president and first Black vice president, suggests the campaign recognized the importance of gender as an issue that helped motivate voters.

Clinton's rhetoric during the 2016 election encompassed a wide range of policy issues, including the economy, national security, and social matters. While she addressed gender-related topics such as pay equity and women's healthcare, her campaign primarily emphasized her experience, qualifications, and policy positions across various domains. In contrast, Biden's rhetoric in the 2020 election placed a stronger emphasis on gender issues. He frequently highlighted women's rights, representation, and equality, aligning his messaging with his broader progressive agenda.

Clinton's communication style was often perceived as more formal and focused on policy details. She projected a sense of knowledge, expertise, and preparedness. In contrast, Biden's communication style was characterized by a more conversational and

empathetic approach. He sought to connect with voters on an emotional level, often sharing personal stories and displaying empathy towards their concerns.

Clinton's gender played a significant role in shaping her rhetoric during the 2016 election. She faced the challenge of navigating gender biases and stereotypes, balancing assertiveness and likability, and countering gendered attacks. Biden's rhetoric in 2020 also acknowledged gender dynamics but from a different perspective. He emphasized women's rights, representation, and equality as part of his broader platform, positioning himself as an advocate for gender equality and leveraging his messaging to resonate with women voters.

The historical context of each election influenced the candidates' rhetoric. Clinton's candidacy in 2016 marked a historic moment as the first female major-party presidential nominee, adding an extra layer of significance to her messaging. In contrast, Biden's campaign in 2020 focused on contrasting his approach with that of the incumbent, Donald Trump, and offering a vision of unity and healing in a politically divided climate.

The issue of the gender factor in politics and political discourse is still extremely relevant. Despite the large number of social movements that support gender equality, famous people and politicians who advocate for women and their rights, for various international programs to support women and their representativeness in politics, women still remain in the minority in the political arena. Our research has shown that the gender factor affects both politicians and voters.

Women politicians continue to face gender stereotypes and bias and have to prove their expertise much longer and harder than men, their views and political strategies, rhetoric are subject to heavy criticism. We believe that gender stereotypes and prejudices have the main influence on the low representation of women in politics.

The gender factor affects voters in several ways. Some voters may be biased and influenced by gender stereotypes. Gender-sensitive rhetoric plays an important role in the political process and influences voters, the issues raised by female politicians in

their speeches, namely: gender equality, combating violence, reproductive policy, inclusiveness, etc., concern the majority of voters.

We believe that the research conducted by us will serve as a basis for further studies of the influence of the gender factor in political discourse, because the topic of gender equality is still relevant and needs further study and promotion.

REFERENCES

1. Aalberg, T., & Jenssen, A. T. (2007). Gender stereotyping of political candidates. *Nordicom Review*, 28(1), 17–32. doi:10.1515/nor-2017-0198 (URL: <https://sciendo.com/article/10.1515/nor-2017-0198>)
2. Anderson, J. A., Diabah, G., & Mensa, P. A. (2011). Powerful women in powerless language: Media misrepresentation of African women in politics (the case of Liberia). *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 2509e2518.
3. Barnes, J., & Larrivee, P. (2011). Arlette Laguiller: Does the mainstay of the French political far-left enjoy linguistic parity with her male counterparts? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(10), 2501e2508
4. BERNIS NANCY DEGENERATING THE PROBLEM AND GENDERING THE BLAME Political Discourse on Women and Violence URL: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/089124301015002006>
5. BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online Campbell, Rosie (2016) Representing women voters: the role of the Gender Gap and the response of political parties. *Party Politics* 22 (5), pp. 587-597. ISSN 1354-0688. Downloaded from: <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/13792/>
6. Blommaert, Jan. (2019), "Political discourse in post-digital societies" (URL: https://www.tilburguniversity.edu/sites/default/files/download/TPCS_236-Blommaert.pdf)
7. Clinton H. Women's rights are human rights. URL: [Http://www.famousquotes.me.uk/speeches/Hillary-Clinton/](http://www.famousquotes.me.uk/speeches/Hillary-Clinton/)
8. Chilton Paul, Christina Schäffner, *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2002

9. Chilton Paul, *Analysing Political Discourse Theory and practice*, This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2004, 226 p
10. Comer, Joseph. *Discourses of Global Queer Mobility and the Mediatization of Equality*. Taylor & Francis, 2022, 266p
11. *Critical Discourse Analysis Analyzing the Beauty Advertisement Discourse: Dove's Campaign for Real Beauty* (URL: <https://www.discourse-analysis.de/media/pdfs/Hoepfner%202006%20Dove.pdf>)
12. Cuttica, Cesare, Mahlberg, Gaby (editor). *Patriarchal Moments*, Bloomsbury Academic, London, 2015, 256 p
13. Dittmar, K. (2015). *Navigating gendered terrain: Stereotypes and Strategy in political campaigns*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press
14. DISCOURSE- HISTORICAL APPROACH TO CRITICAL DISCOURSE STUDIES: THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS, BASIC CHARACTERISTICS AND ANALYTICAL TOOLS, André Cocou DATONDJI, Franck AMOUSOU. *RILALE Vol.2 N°1*, Février 2019, 70-80
15. Dolan Julie, Melissa M. Deckman, Michele L. Swers. *Women and Politics: Paths to Power and Political Influence*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2020
16. Georgina Waylen. *The Oxford Handbook of Gender and Politics*, OUP USA, 2003
17. Elleström Lars, *Beyond Media Borders, Volume 1 Intermedial Relations among Multimodal Media*, Springer Nature, 2021 (URL: https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/20.500.12657/42926/1/2021_Book_BeyondMediaBordersVolume1.pdf)
18. Elleström Lars, *Beyond Media Borders, Volume 2 Intermedial Relations among Multimodal Media*, Springer Nature, 2021 (URL:

https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/20.500.12657/42925/1/2021_Book_BeyondMediaBordersVolume2.pdf)

19. Eder, Franz. Chapter 32 Discourse Network Analysis. Taylor & Francis Universität Innsbruck, 2023, 21p
20. Gillard J. & Okonjo-Iweala N. (2020) Women and Leadership: Real Lives, Real Lessons. Penguin Random House. <https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=YBkSEAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq>
21. Gyamera Vera. The Interface: Language, Gender and Power (URL: <https://sciendo.com/pdf/10.14746/jgp.2019.11.004>)
22. Jahedi Maryam. An Overview of Focal Approaches of Critical Discourse Analysis. International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies ISSN 2202-9478 Vol. 2 No. 4; October 2014 URL: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1149526.pdf>
23. Junka-Aikio, Laura. Chapter 19 Toxic speech, political self-Indigenization and the ethics and politics of critique, Taylor & Francis, 2022, 19 p
24. Fahey, A. C. (2007). French and feminine: Hegemonic masculinity and the emasculation of John Kerry in the 2004 presidential race. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 24(2), 132–150. doi:10.1080/07393180701262743
25. Fairclough Norman. Language and Power, Routledge 2014. 274 p
26. Fairclough Isabela, Norman Fairclough. Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students. London: Routledge. 2012, 266 p
27. Franck Amoussoul , Ayodele A. Allagbe. Principles, Theories and Approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)* Volume 6, Issue 1, January 2018, PP 11-18

28. Fung, Courtney J., Gehrman, Björn, Madenyika, Rachel F. Tower, Jason G. (editor). *New Paths and Policies towards Conflict Prevention*, Taylor & Francis, 2021, 144 p
29. Neha Saluja, Dr N. Thilaka. *WOMEN LEADERS AND DIGITAL COMMUNICATION: GENDER STEREOTYPING OF FEMALE POLITICIANS ON TWITTER*, *Journal of Content, Community & Communication* Vol. 13 Year 7, June – 2021, 227-241p
30. NDAMBUKI JACINTA, HILARY JANKS. *Political Discourses, Women's Voices: Mismatches in Representation. Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*, 2010 URL: https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/journals/cadaad/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Volume-4_Ndambuki_Janks.pdf
31. Lakoff R. (2003) *Language, Gender, and Politics: Putting "Women" and "Power" in the Same Sentence*. In J. Holmes and M. Meyerhoff (eds.), *The Handbook of Language and Gender*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 161-178.
32. Larner, Lindsay R., "The Role of Feminine Rhetoric in Male Presidential Discourse: Achieving Speech Purpose" 01 May 2009. CUREJ: College Undergraduate Research Electronic Journal, University of Pennsylvania, <https://repository.upenn.edu/curej/102>
33. *Language and Woman's Place* Author(s): Robin Lakoff Source: *Language in Society*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (Apr., 1973), pp. 45-80 Published by: Cambridge University Press Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4166707>
34. Leeuwen, Theo van (2008) *Discourse & Practice. New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*. Oxford Studies in Sociolinguistics.
35. Lemay-Hebert, Nicolas, Visoka, Gezim. *Normalization in World Politics*, University of Michigan Press, 2022

36. Leypoldt, Günter, Berg, Manfred (editor). Authority and Trust in US Culture and Society, transcript Verlag, Bielefeld, 2021, 282 p
37. Montejo-Ráez, Arturo, Jiménez-Zafra, Salud María. Current Approaches and Applications in Natural Language Processing. MDPI Books, Basel, 2022, 476 p
38. METHODS OF CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS, editor Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer. SAGE Publications London · Thousand Oaks · New Delhi, 2001, 200p
39. Messina, J.P. (editor). New Directions in the Ethics and Politics of Speech, Taylor & Francis, 2023, 162 p
40. MICHEL FOUCAULT. THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF KNOWLEDGE AND THE DISCOURSE ON LANGUAGE, PANTHEON BOOKS, NEW YORK, 1971, 239 p
41. Messerschmidt, J. (2010). Hegemonic masculinities and camouflaged politics: Unmasking the Bush dynasty and its war against Iraq. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
42. Messina, J.P. (editor). New Directions in the Ethics and Politics of Speech, Taylor & Francis, 2023, 162 p
43. Haas Adelaide, Male and Female Spoken Language Differences: Stereotypes and Evidence. Psychological Bulletin 1979, Vol. 86, No. 3, 615-626 URL: http://www.communicationcache.com/uploads/1/0/8/8/10887248/male_and_female_spoken_language_differences-_stereotypes_and_evidence.pdf
44. Hearn, J. (2004). From hegemonic masculinity to the hegemony of men. Feminist Theory, 5(1), 49–72.
45. Hutchby, SAGE Research Methods Foundations URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336458644_Conversation_Analysis

46. Holmes Janet and Miriam Meyerhoff, *The Handbook of Language and Gender*, Blackwell Publishing, 2003
47. O'Connor K. (2010) *Gender and Women's Leadership: A Reference Handbook*. SAGE.
<https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=zkuocXgg5jgC&printsec=frontcover&dq>
48. O'Gorman E. (2020) *Tacitus' History of Politically Effective Speech: Truth to Power*. Bloomsbury.
<https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=YBTuDwAAQBAJ&pg=PA111&dq>
49. O'Grady, G. (2011). The unfolded imagining of Segolene Royal. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 2489e2500
50. *Political Science in the 21st Century: Report of the Task Force on Political Science in the 21st Century*", American Political Science URL:
https://www.apsanet.org/portals/54/Files/Task%20Force%20Reports/TF_21st%20Century_AllPgs_webres90.pdf
51. Philip LeVine and Ron Scollon, Editors. *DISCOURSE AND TECHNOLOGY Multimodal Discourse Analysis*, Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C, 2004, 229 p
52. Rosenwasser, S. M., & Dean, N. G. (1989). Gender role and political office: Effects of perceived masculinity/femininity of candidate and political office. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 13(1), 77–85.
53. Rudman L.A. & Glick P. (2008) *The Social Psychology of Gender: How Power and Intimacy Shape Gender Relations*. The Guilford Press.
<https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=i13H6d1rgLMC&printsec=frontcover&dq>
54. Sanbonmatsu Kira. *Women's Underrepresentation in the U.S. Congress*. 2020 by the American Academy of Arts & Sciences Published under a

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license
https://doi.org/10.1162/DAED_a_01772

55. Spallaccia Beatrice. It's a Man's World (Wide Web). A Critical Analysis of Online Misogyny and Hate Speech. Bononia University Press. 2020, 232 p.
56. Shaw Sylvia Women, Language and Politics. University of Westminster, 2020
57. Sei Jin Ko, Melody S. Sadler, and Adam D. Galinsky. The Sound of Power: Conveying and Detecting Hierarchical Rank Through Voice
 URL: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0956797614553009>
58. Susan H. Delagrange. Technologies of wonder : rhetorical practice in a digital world. Utah State University Press/ Computers and Composition Digital Press, 2011
59. Sullet-Nylander, Françoise, Bernal, MariaPremat, Christophe, Roitman, Malin. Political Discourses at the Extremes Expressions of Populism in Romance Speaking Countries. Stockholm University Press, Stockholm, 2019, 356 p
60. Syrový, Daniel (editor). Discourses on Nations and Identities, De Gruyter, Berlin/Boston, 2021, 603 p
61. Talbot M. (1998) Language and Gender (1st ed.). Polity
62. Tan, Sabine (editor) E, Marissa (editor). Discourses, Modes, Media and Meaning in an Era of Pandemic A Multimodal Discourse Analysis Approach, Taylor & Francis, 2022, 292 p
63. Taras, David, Davis, Richard (editor). Electoral Campaigns, Media, and the New World of Digital Politics, University of Michigan Press, 2022, 330 p
64. TEUN A. VAN DIJK. 18 Critical Discourse Analysis. URL: <https://discourses.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/Teun-A.-van-Dijk-2001-Critical-discourse-analysis.pdf>

65. Teun A. van Dijk. *Discourse and manipulation*, *Discourse & Society* Copyright © 2006 SAGE Publications (London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi) <http://das.sagepub.com> Vol 17(3): 359–383
66. Teun A. van Dijk. *Society and Discourse How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk*, Cambridge University Press, 2009, 277 p
67. TEUN A. VAN DIJK. *Discourse Studies and Education*. URL: <https://discourses.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/Teun-A.-van-Dijk-1981-Discourse-studies-and-education.pdf>
68. THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE U.S. MEDIA 2017 URL: https://womensmediacenter.com/assets/site/reports/10c550d19ef9f3688f_mlbres2jd.pdf
69. Tripp, Aili Mari and Kang, Alice, "The Global Impact of Quotas: On the Fast Track to Increased Female Legislative Representation" (2008). Faculty Publications: Political Science. 41. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/poliscifacpub/41>
70. *Texts and Practices. Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edited by Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard and Malcolm Coulthard, Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2003.
71. TORIL AALBERG & ANDERS TODAL JENSSEN, *Gender Stereotyping of Political Candidates An Experimental Study of Political Communication*, *Nordicom Review* 28 (2007) 1, pp. 17-32
72. Valls, Aida Gibert, Karina. *Women in Artificial intelligence (AI)*. MDPI - Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute, Basel, 2022, 332 p.
73. Van Dijk, T.A. (1998). What is political discourse analysis? In: Blommaert, J. & Bulcaen, Ch.(eds.), *Political Linguistics*. Amsterdam, pp. 124-142.
74. Vasileios Petrogiannis & Lenita Freidenvall (2022): *Political rhetoric, identities, and dominant gender representations: hegemonic masculinity*

- in service of pro-austerity rhetoric in Greek political discourse, NORMA, URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/18902138.2022.2026109>
75. Włodarczyk, Matylda, Tyrkkö, Jukka, Adamczyk, Elżbieta. Chapter 1 Intersections of Modalities from Medieval to Modern Times. Taylor & Francis, 2023, 16 p.
76. WILSON JOHN. Political Discourse URL: https://www.blackwellpublishing.com/content/bpl_images/content_store/WWW_Content/9780631205951/020.pdf
77. Wodak Ruth. GENDER AND DISCOURSE. SAGE Publications, 1997
78. Wodak Ruth, CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS URL: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Ruth-Wodak/publication/238105100_DCA_-_Critical_Discourse_Analysis/links/0a85e535bc18f09787000000/DCA-Critical-Discourse-Analysis.pdf
79. Wodak Ruth. Critical Discourse Analysis: Overview, challenges, and perspectives 1 URL: <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/9783110214420.627/html?lang=en>
80. Wodak Ruth. Gender and Language: Cultural Concerns URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275838816_Gender_and_Discourse

SUPPORTING MATERIALS

81. First presidential debate in full: Trump vs Biden URL:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CweqW7Pzxz8&t=1s>
82. Full video: Trump-Clinton presidential debate URL:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s7gDXtRS0jo&list=PLAT3xx4sYqLF9IZ5eio1NnS7o8LQAbDgr&index=6&t=1453s>
83. Hillary Clinton FULL Concession Speech URL:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=khK9fIgoNjQ&list=PLAT3xx4sYqLF9IZ5eio1NnS7o8LQAbDgr&index=2&t=150s>
84. Hillary Clinton Presidential Campaign Announcement Full Speech URL:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZgGPMrLHRy0>
85. Hillary Clinton's 2016 Presidential Campaign Announcement URL:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N708P-A45D0&list=PLAT3xx4sYqLF9IZ5eio1NnS7o8LQAbDgr&index=5&t=7s>
86. Joe Biden For President: America Is An Idea URL:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VbOU2fTg6cI&list=PLAT3xx4sYqLF9IZ5eio1NnS7o8LQAbDgr&index=8>
87. Joe Biden Introduces Sen. Kamala Harris (D-CA) As Running Mate URL:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ymyY7jez0rM>
88. Joe Biden Officially Launches Campaign for President URL:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FaN-PfLW1Q&list=PLAT3xx4sYqLF9IZ5eio1NnS7o8LQAbDgr&index=3&t=565s>
89. President-elect Joe Biden's victory speech in full URL:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1AfNYztas2c&list=PLAT3xx4sYqLF9IZ5eio1NnS7o8LQAbDgr&index=4>
90. The Second Presidential Debate: Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump URL:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qlaum72JNRA>

91. Trump v Biden: The Final Debate URL:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yGPfKkjDIts>

92. Watch Live: The Final Presidential Debate URL:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ye0Xblp_Nb0