



**Universiteit Leiden**

**Most Frequently Used Gendered Metaphors in**

**British Political Discourse**

**(Based on the Discourse Analysis of four British Prime Ministers)**

**MA Thesis**

Name:	Sopio Totibadze
Student Number:	s1888420
Supervisor:	Dr. A.A. Foster
Second reader:	Dr. A.G. Dorst
Date:	12 June 2017
University:	Leiden University
Specialiation:	English Language and Linguistics

## **Table of Contents**

<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>Chapter 1: Theoretical Framework</b> .....	5
1.1. Metaphor .....	5
1.2. Conceptual Metaphor Theory.....	6
1.3. Metaphors in Politics.....	8
1.4. Metaphors in Politics and Gender .....	12
<b>Chapter 2: Methodology and Identification of Metaphors</b> .....	17
2.1. Methods of data selection.....	17
2.2. Steps for metaphor identification. ....	19
<b>Chapter 3: Data, Results and Analysis</b> .....	21
3.1. Introduction .....	21
3.2. Data and Results.....	21
3.3. Analysis of James Callaghan’s Selected Speeches.....	23
3.4. Analysis of Margaret Thatcher’s Selected Speeches.....	27
3.5. Analysis of David Cameron’s Selected Speeches .....	30
3.6. Analysis of Theresa May’s Selected Speeches.....	34
3.7. Discussion .....	36
3.8. Summary of the Chapter.....	41
<b>Chapter 4: Conclusions and Suggestions for Future Research</b> .....	42
4.1. Conclusions .....	42
4.2. Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research.....	44
<b>References</b> .....	45

*“The greatest thing by far is to have a command of metaphor.*

*This alone cannot be imparted by another;*

*it is the mark of genius, for to make good metaphors implies an eye for resemblances”*

*- Aristotle, c. 335 BC*

## Introduction

Public spheres like politics and the media consider the ability to communicate ideas properly and persuasively to be crucial for successful communication. While nowadays trust in the media has become a more difficult commodity to gain than ever, political leaders face the need to employ special linguistic or non-linguistic tools in their speeches, in order to achieve their ultimate goal - that is to build trust in and gain empathy with their possible voters. As claimed by Charteris-Black (2014), rhetoric remains to be the indivisible part of politics. In addition, only thoroughly planned and chosen words that fit the speaker's needs together with refined and corresponding body language can ensure both the success of the delivered speech and, most importantly, the positive effect on the target audience. Charteris-Black also reflects back on Aristotelian and Platonic traditions, which, according to him, still survive and are deeply interwoven with the public spheres, including politics. He defines rhetoric as the arts of presenting the truth in a way that persuades the audience and meets the needs of the speakers. Moreover, the branch of rhetoric that is employed in politics is considered to be deliberative, placing an emphasis on attracting the voters and aiming at the future benefits of the speaker (2014).

Based on this, it is often suggested by linguists that language can offer invaluable insight into the intentions and, even more, can construct a psychological portrait of a speaker. Nowadays, due to its high importance, immense attention is drawn to the role of the gender in the speechmaking process, as linguists often claim that men and women command language differently. More precisely, whilst women see the act of speaking as a means of establishing personal relationships, men use language as a tool to obtain and convey information (Holmes, 1995). In addition, a handful of researchers interested in gender studies claim that female and male speaking styles also vary because of the social attitudes towards the masculine and feminine roles in the society (Crespi, 2003; Merchant, 2012). For instance, in a public space like politics, men are considered to be more dominant, therefore, the masculine way of speaking (such as being assertive, competitive, aggressive, interruptive, confrontational, direct, autonomous, dominating, task-oriented (Holmes, 2006)) is largely considered

to be an appropriate style. On the contrary, women are believed to be naturally empathetic, less prone to interruptions, more skilled in turn-taking, polite and less confrontational or direct. Unlike men, they tend to use powerless speech forms like tag questions, hedges, apologies, forms of politeness, etc. (Mills, 2003). Not surprisingly, women seem to be negatively assessed, and are claimed to sound unconvincing whilst using feminine speech strategies in a male dominant sphere. Therefore, despite the undesirable nature of masculine speech strategies, women tend to opt for them when exposed to the male dominated public spaces.

One of the ways to successfully communicate a hidden message is by employing powerful stylistic devices, for instance, tropes like allusion, allegory, irony, metonymy, and metaphors. Metaphor has already been exercising the minds of great philosophers and linguists for centuries. According to Charteris-Black, Aristotle in *Poetics* proposes the definition of metaphor as something that consists in giving the thing a name that belongs to something else. Thus, metaphor is used to link two notions that are not usually considered as related or which do not naturally evoke each other positively. Therefore, one of the most prominent features of metaphor is that on the basis of one idea, notion or thought, the listener can explore the limitless ways of understanding another notion that is not obviously connected to it (2014). Strikingly, the role of metaphor and other stylistic devices as effective persuasive tools in politics have been known for a long time too. For instance, it is believed that metaphors make it easier for people to “grasp the meaning of political events and feel a part of the process” (Mio, 1997, p. 130). In addition, metaphors are parts of the prevailing notions of information-processing models of public knowledge of politics. However, contemplating the significance of metaphor for political discourse, Mio admits the equivocal and contradictory character of the studies aiming at exploring this issue. Interestingly, the author advises future scholars to focus on the situations in which metaphors are effective which would lead to hiding some aspects of political discourse whilst revealing many of its interesting moments (1997).

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) suggest that metaphors play a colossal role in our everyday lives. Based on their research, the shape of a human's brain is structured in a way that people think through metaphors, stressing the approach that a metaphor is not simply a trope or a linguistic device, but a core conceptual part of human brain. Therefore, it is not surprising that scientists (Charteris-Black, Chilton, Lakoff, etc.) suggest that metaphors take up a vast amount of attention in political rhetoric as the speakers try to trigger emotional associations in their listeners and possible voters by carefully selected words. However, it is important to be aware of the fact that a wide cultural and background knowledge is required in order to properly decode the metaphor suggested by the speaker.

Additionally, in her insightful study of discourse and gender, Koller explores the way metaphor positions men and women and how it can evoke socio-cognitive representations of gender social domains (Koller, 2004). On the other hand, as the previous studies have shown (Shaw, 2002; Jones, 2016; Rusieshvili-Cartledge, 2017), women tend to use more masculine ways of speaking when it comes to public spheres like politics. Therefore, there still remains a significant gap when it comes to the usage of metaphors by female and male politicians and this sparked the interest to investigate whether the two sexes reveal gender-specific differences when employing metaphors in their narrative or they actually follow the tendency of opting for a more masculine way of speaking. In this specific case, it is interesting to explore whether female politicians choose the metaphors that are most commonly employed by males.

The relevance of this research lies in the fact that it aims to contribute to the existing research in the field and, at the same time, add new data to already known facts about this issue. Specifically, the paper investigates whether female politicians show the same trend as men when employing metaphors in their speech. More precisely, the paper will focus on two main research questions (1) whether politician women reveal the same pattern of choice when employing metaphors as their male counterparts, and later (2) will investigate whether there are gender-related differences between the sets of metaphors chosen by male and female politicians. Finally, the thesis will determine the probable reasons behind the choice of metaphors by female politicians to investigate the increase of masculinity in their speech. To achieve answers to the above-mentioned research avenues speeches

delivered by four British Prime Ministers (two female and two male) will be explored and metaphors employed by them will be compared and contrasted. Metaphors will be identified with the help of MIP and MIPVU (Chapter 2) and grouped according to their belonging to a certain source domain. Finally, metaphors will be analysed according to which gender they belong to (feminine or masculine) and whether there is a tendency emerging regarding the preference of certain gendered metaphors as employed by female and male politicians.

The following chapter will review and discuss the important researches in the field to build up the theoretical background (Chapter 1). First chapter will be followed by the methodology employed in the research, including the way of identifying metaphors (Chapter 2). Results of the research will be presented in the third chapter followed by analysis of the data and discussions. The conclusions of the thesis will be presented in the final, fourth chapter, followed by the references.

## Chapter 1: Theoretical Framework

### 1.1. Metaphor

Metaphor was first described by Aristotle in his work *Poetics* (350 BC) where he suggested that “the greatest thing by far is to have a command of metaphor. This alone cannot be imparted by another; it is the mark of genius, for to make good metaphors implies an eye for resemblances” (Butcher, 1895, p.87). Regardless of the fact that Aristotle does not offer a definition in his work, his proposition pinpoints the first central idea about metaphor: “the words have the potential to ‘belong’ to different things” (Charteris-Black, 2014, p. 160).

Richards in *Philosophy of Rhetoric* characterizes metaphor as a tool for expressing ideas in a gracious way that would add power to the utterance. Moreover, he assumes that no one can utter three sentences together without using a metaphor at least once (1979, p. 90). This way, the author tries to place an emphasis on the importance of the trope which enables the speakers to conceive and express elaborate ideas. Richards, willing to lay forward a better definition and provide a proper place for metaphor rather than a trope in traditional Rhetoric, proposes that metaphor can give a listener two ideas for one. However, the main trick is to be able to decode how these two ideas are connected to each other and what their entirety gives the listener. Moreover, this author also differentiates between two equally paramount halves of metaphor “tenor” and “vehicle”, the terms that still remain to be of the utmost importance in modern theory. Richards calls tenor “an underlying idea”, which is realized by vehicle or, in other words, by “what it resembles” (1979).

In 1993, the classical/traditional theory of metaphor was heavily criticized by Lakoff. More precisely, the linguist does not agree with the classical definition of the word “metaphor” that means the “poetic linguistic expression where one or more words for a concept are used outside of its nominal conventional meaning to express a ‘similar’ concept” (Lakoff, 1993, p.1). Whilst the traditional theory of metaphor denies the importance of metaphor in a cognitive space and excludes it from the conceptual theory, Lakoff claims that while metaphor is indeed a part of the literary language, it is not limited to it. Moreover, its mappings, according to the linguist, apply not only to poetic expressions



but also to ordinary everyday language too. As a result, metaphor, by cross-domain mapping, is absolutely core to the ordinary language and literary metaphor cannot be studied unless approached as an extension of the study of everyday metaphor (1993).

## 1.2. Conceptual Metaphor Theory

Even after decades, Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980) still remains as the central theoretical framework when it comes to the study of metaphor. Lakoff and Johnson, echoing previous researches, put forward the groundbreaking theory of conceptual metaphors that strengthens the approach that there is much more to metaphor than just “a device of poetic imagination” (1980, p. 1). More precisely, it is an indivisible part of the human brain and conceptual system and is prevalent in everyday life. Even more, metaphors are not only essential for properly communicating ideas, but our brains are structured in a way that we think through the metaphorical language:

...metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature... If we are right in suggesting that our conceptual system is largely metaphorical, then the way we think, what we experience, and what we do every day is very much a matter of metaphor. (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p. 3)

According to the theory, language, being an important source of evidence of our conceptual system, gives these authors the right to claim that the conceptual system is metaphorical in nature and it shapes and defines our everyday realities, including how we perceive the world around us and how we relate to other people. Therefore, even the most mundane details of our lives are simply a matter of metaphor. For instance, Lakoff and Johnson successfully point out that metaphors structure our thoughts and perceive the world around us by giving an example of metaphors ARGUMENT IS WAR and LOVE IS A JOURNEY. The authors argue that metaphors are so prevalent in our everyday lives, thoughts or actions that we fail to pay attention to how strongly intertwined they are in the language - we may talk about arguments in terms of war without being aware that we are using, for example, a war or a journey metaphor.

He *shot down* all my arguments.

He *attacked every weak point* in my argument.

I've never *won* an argument with him.

We're *at a crossroads*.

I don't think this relationship is *going anywhere*.

(Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, pp. 4, 44)

With the examples ARGUMENT IS WAR and LOVE IS A JOURNEY the authors illustrate how people can talk about love in terms of journey or argument as if it was a war and conclude that the essence of metaphor lies in understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). The understanding of one term (domain) through another, however, is based on certain sets of correspondences, also known as mappings, between the source and target domains (Kövecses, 2010). Moreover, as suggested by Lakoff, metaphor (that was previously known as *a cross-domain mapping in the conceptual system*) can be easily understood as “a mapping from a source domain to a target domain” (1993, p.5). In the aforementioned examples, source domains or, in other words, the underlying ideas of metaphor, are those typical of war and journey. On the other hand, the target domains, also known as the concepts they denote, belong to the domains of argument and love, respectively. Further, Lakoff suggests that metaphors in our experiences are mostly based on correspondences, according to which “entities in the domain of love (e.g., the lovers, their common goals, their difficulties, the love relationship, etc.) correspond systematically to entities in the domain of a journey (the travelers, the vehicle, destinations, etc.)” (1993, p. 5), which makes the process of encoding and decoding of metaphors less challenging. However, in order to properly understand a metaphor, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) propose that one should start by finding the coherent string of entailments between the source and target domains. More precisely, if it is suggested that TIME IS MONEY it entails that TIME IS A LIMITED RESOURCE that, for its part, entails that TIME IS A VALUABLE COMODITY (p.11). In addition, it is also explored that linguistic metaphors occur when words for source domain concepts are used for target domain concepts via metaphoric mappings.

In *Metaphors We Live By* (1980), Lakoff and Johnson put forward three types of conceptual metaphors: orientational, ontological and structural. In fact, according to the authors, when “one concept is metaphorically structured in terms of another” (p. 14) metaphor is structural in nature. On the other

hand, when metaphor does not “structure one concept in terms of another, but instead organizes a whole system of concepts with respect to one another” (p. 14), metaphor is orientational. As for ontological metaphor, it is a type of metaphor in which something physical and specific is discussed through ideas, emotions, or activities, in other words, abstract entities. Interestingly, the aforementioned three types quite often overlap.

I'm <i>going to pieces</i> . (THE MIND IS A BRITTLE OBJECT)	ontological metaphor (1980, p. 28)
I'm feeling <i>up</i> (HAPPY IS UP)	orientational metaphor (1980, p. 15)
You disagree? Okay, <i>shoot!</i> (ARGUMENT IS WAR)	structural metaphor (1980, p. 4)

Additionally, the human brain has the ability to allow the person to focus on one aspect of the concept (“highlighting”), and disregard (“hiding”) another. This ability to highlight one metaphorical concept and hide another can be explained by the “conduit metaphor” (Reddy, 1979). Conceptual metaphor theory looks at communication as a complex conduit metaphor, which entails that the speaker puts ideas (objects) into words (containers) and sends them to a listener.

IDEAS ARE OBJECTS.	It's hard to <i>get</i> that idea <i>across</i> to him.
LINGUISTIC EXPRESSIONS ARE CONTAINERS.	I <i>gave</i> you that idea.
COMMUNICATION IS SENDING.	Your reasons <i>came through</i> to us.

(Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, pp.10, 11).

Thus, despite the fact that sometimes it is challenging to discover a hidden metaphor or even successfully see that there is one, with the help of conduit metaphors (e.g., the idea that there exist meanings independent of people) it is once again proved that metaphors are strongly interwoven with our conceptual system and exactly due to the metaphorical structuring that we perceive the world the way we do. However, most importantly, the way we perceive the world is structured by how we decode the metaphors.

### 1.3. Metaphors in Politics

As claimed by Charteris-Black, metaphor is essential and at the same time highly sufficient in politics, being based on the emotional and sub-conscious associations, when uttered it calls up on the cultural

or historical background knowledge of the listener. Implying the fact that the target audience is part of the culture and aware of the historical past of the country, correctly chosen metaphorical mapping can trigger emotional response and persuade the possible voters towards the goodwill of the politician (2014). Therefore, when correctly used, metaphor can be a powerful device in politics.

Ottati (2014) in his work “The Metaphorical Framing Model: Political Communication and Public Opinion” studied the importance of metaphor in politics from the psychological point of view and designed the Metaphorical Framing Model. Interestingly, this model can be successfully applied to numerous domains, including politics. It should be noted that this theory is inspired by and based on the Conceptual Metaphor Theory suggested by Lakoff and Johnson (1980; 1993). The main aim of the Metaphorical Framing Model is to provide the effects on the target audience triggered by the usage of metaphor. According to the author, the model includes two stages of processing metaphor: activation and application. The first stage focuses on the activation of a so-called root metaphor, while the latter concentrates on correctly applying the metaphor to the situation, thus decoding it. According to the Metaphorical Framing Model, a “root metaphor” is activated when the target and the vehicle are linked in the mind of the recipient of the message. To illustrate the claim, Ottati brings an example ‘Operation Desert Storm is a football game’, which, in the target listener activates an underlying metaphor WAR IS A FOOTBALL GAME, therefore, the latent conceptual metaphor, hence the term “root metaphor”. Moreover, the activation of the aforementioned root metaphor can be achieved by employing five strategies: (1) metaphor is directly stated in a speech; (2) employing ‘surface utterances’, which imply, although not directly mention the root metaphor. Despite this, the hidden message is still perceived and understood by the recipients; (3) by ‘incidental’ metaphorical utterances, which are not even part of the topic, regardless are more powerful than the previous strategies. The author specifies the third strategy by an example of the essay about the USA that is mapped on to the frame of a physical body. This metaphorical mapping negatively influenced the feelings of the readers towards the immigration (avoiding contamination of the body); (4) when the target and the vehicle are incidentally implied, without explaining a connection between the two. For instance, the metaphor WAR IS A FOOTBALL GAME can be artificially evoked while watching the TV show where the

news about a war is directly followed by a football game; and (5) individual differences, which are caused by the different experiences of the listeners.

Thus, according to the author, in accordance with the Conceptual Metaphor Theory, Framing Model is one of the powerful instruments that can control society's attitudes towards the speakers/politicians (Ottati, 2014).

Exactly what is the purpose of metaphors when employed in a political discourse? Charteris-Black (2014), apart from aesthetic values that contribute to the overall coherence of the text, lists the persuasive purposes of metaphor in political speeches. The list also includes factors like gaining attention and obtaining trust of the recipients of the message; discussing and evaluating the current tendencies in politics and sometimes juxtaposing with the values of their opponents; winning the votes of the electorate by taking control of their emotions or presenting the problems in such a way that it supports the argument raised by the speaker.

Interestingly, Lakoff & Johnson (1980) also put an emphasis on the importance of highlighting and hiding certain aspects of metaphor when trying out the persuasive type of speech in politics.

Specifically, according to the authors, metaphors have the power to "define reality" or even redefine it by creating a coherent chain of entailments that stresses some features, but ignores others. The notion is explained and illustrated with the statement by President Carter "energy crisis... is the moral equivalent of war" where the President created the whole new network of implications of energy in terms of war, among which are 'plotting new strategy', 'gathering intelligence', etc. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 156).

In addition, Nicholas Howe (1988), while reviewing the use of metaphors in American political discourse, claims that being "deeply rooted in American culture" (p.87) metaphors are used to create a "common ground of experience and beliefs" (p. 88) between the target audience and the speaker, which inevitably results in positive emotions between the two. Moreover, he proposes two categories that metaphors fall into when analyzing political discourse, the first being the ones used for persuasive purposes, while the second is comprised of the jargon commonly used in the field (Howe, 1988).

In spite of the fact that the frequent usage of this or that metaphor is very dependent on the current processes and the issues of the day, there are still several of them that keep their constancy. Chilton

(2004), when analyzing political discourse, claims that political concepts usually include conceptual metaphors of JOURNEY, like coming to a crossroads, moving ahead towards a better future, overcoming obstacles on the way, etc. Besides, according to the previous studies (Howe, 1988; Mio, 1997) metaphors of WARFARE, SPORT, NATURE, VIOLENCE and FAMILY are also repeatedly used in the political discourse. The popularity of SPORT metaphors can be explained by the positive mappings connected to it, e.g., TEAM, which helps the speaker create a bond between the voters and the political party and establishes the sense of a group or team. Furthermore, the aforementioned metaphor gives the politician a possibility to innocuously speak about winning and defeating the competitors, thus, other parties, scoring against them or hitting home runs. Therefore, by employing SPORT metaphors, especially those connected to the TEAM make the electorate believe that they themselves are actively involved in a campaign and are the important members of the team (Howe, 1988). WAR metaphors also let the leaders gain the victory and defeat the adversary, however, as Mio points out, these metaphors are strongly male in nature and exclude women (1997). However, unlike WAR metaphors, which, as mentioned above, usually entail winning over others, FAMILY metaphors often occur in the context of creating the sense of family and bringing people together (Ottati, 2014).

Interestingly, metaphors are not only used while describing certain political situations, but are also perfect devices in the process of sketching the image of a political leader, in order to strengthen or weaken their public image in society. For instance, calling Margaret Thatcher ‘The Iron Lady’ underlies her iron-like character, which for its part presents her strong personality - unusual for a woman. Gendered metaphors connected to Hillary Clinton sometimes help her to revise positively her role in society (Madonna), or, on the contrary, destroy her femininity and image (Witch, Bitch). However, some metaphors place her in a “double bind” (Unruly Woman) and it is up to the recipient’s attitude how it is decoded (Lim, 2009).

Thus, metaphor as an indivisible part of public speaking remains to be the core device in persuasive speech. Apart from giving the text a holistic touch and coherence, when properly encoded/decoded, it enables the speaker/listener to enhance the experience. Metaphor is key to both gaining attention and obtaining trust. Even more, it enables a speaker to stir and take control over people’s emotions and

direct them in favour of their team. While, at first glance, skilled and clever politicians might seem to use familiar, even easy language and common metaphors, in reality they establish a common ground and set of values with their audience, which in the end can be a powerful, even dangerous commodity for the opponents (Charteris- Black, 2014).

#### **1.4. Metaphors in Politics and Gender**

Although the twenty-first century brought about a number of changes regarding the way we think and perceive the world, gender-driven differences still remain to be striking. In spite of the fact that in most countries women are officially considered equal to men, the reality is still far from the ideal. Moreover, even though most parts of the world side with gender equality, even such democratic countries as the USA and the UK struggle with the controversial views regarding women's roles and functions in society. While democratic countries all over the world constantly advocate for gender equality, females are still underpaid compared to their male counterparts (Mills, 2003). Further, many researches and sociological surveys continuously state that the social roles of women remain considerably different from those of men. Even more, in some cultures women are still seen as solely child minders and housewives, while men are conceived as breadwinners (Naskidashvili, 2011; Philip, 2009). Interestingly, nowadays women constantly challenge the stereotypical views about which professions are more suitable for them and sign up for the jobs that might seem to be more "acceptable" for their counterparts (Tannen, 1992). However, while doing so, in order to fit in certain standards and stereotypes accepted by their culture, they start adjusting to more masculine speech strategies and try to even sound like them (Holmes, 2006; Rusieshvili-Cartledge, 2017). Unsurprisingly, this yields mixed and controversial feelings in society. For instance, women in politics, which is certainly a male dominated space, are heavily criticized both for being a woman and for trying not to be one. For instance, Peggy Noonan (2007) famously notes about Hillary Clinton that she 'doesn't have to prove she is a man, she has to prove she is a woman. Her problem is not her sex, as she and her campaign pretend. That she is a woman is a boon to her, a source of latent power. But to make it work, she has to *seem to be* like a woman' (Lim, 2009, p.259). As is known, Margaret Thatcher had to undergo a

“linguistic makeover” which included lowering the pitch of her voice, flattening her accent and delivering her speeches more slowly than in her usual manner (Jones, 2016). Interestingly, this transformation seemed to be a must as it was (and still is) believed that nobody could “get far with a feminine style” in politics (Karkowitz, Mendelberg, 2014). Furthermore, linguistic evaluation of political speeches delivered by Hillary Clinton (who can be considered to be the latest important female figure of recent American politics) reveals that her manner of talking, as well that of delivering political speeches has changed from that of a caring First Lady’s into a woman’s talking like a man in order to present herself to her possible followers as a more convincing and worthy leader (Jones, 2016). While politician women try to please the gender-prejudiced public (which undoubtedly is an extremely difficult thing to do) and, at the same time, do their job, they create numerous opportunities for linguists to analyze their speeches and determine the socio-stylistic reasons behind their linguistic choices.

While it is speculated that men and women perceive the world differently and use language accordingly (Holmes, 1995), researchers use language as a tool to determine the contrast between the two. Nowadays, when the political platform is being heavily “invaded” by women, interest in the analysis of their political speeches is increasing proportionally and, in fact, a lot of linguists (e.g., Lakoff, Charteris-Black, and Chilton) have channeled their work to analyze political discourse. As already mentioned on numerous occasions, metaphor in the political speech-making process plays rather a significant role. Therefore, some gender related researches (Lim, 2009; Semino & Koller, 2009; Tenorio, 2009, etc.) are conducted to investigate the probable gender marked differences when politicians employ metaphors in their speeches. However, results are strikingly heterogeneous and keep generating mixed pictures. Dissimilar results in the studies of metaphors used by female and male politicians were explained differently. Some linguists argue that metaphors might not really be gender-marked and the differences or similarities in the choices depend on the political course of the party and their objectives, as well as the target audience (Koller & Semino, 2009). Lakoff, on his part, divides the political platform into two: the Republican Party and the Democrats and describes them through a FAMILY metaphor. According to him, the Republicans remind him of a “Strict Father” with



the dominant male figure at the head of the family, whereas the Democrats are more like a “Nurturant Parent”, where both parents are seen as equals. As Lakoff points out, the choice of the direction of the political party determines the employment of this or that metaphors in the discourse (1995). The comparative study of Irish female and male country leaders, on the other hand, proves that there is an obvious interference of gender when it comes to the choice of metaphors (Tenorio, 2009). Analyzing the British Parliamentary debates, Charteris-Black (2009) observes that experience can be considered as a salient factor when using metaphors, consequently suggesting, based on the collected quantitative data, that males tend to use more metaphors than females and inexperienced women politicians try to avoid employing them in their speech. Furthermore, Charteris-Black singles out an obvious trend of female politicians avoiding the usage of HEALTH metaphors in their speech. When it comes to structural, more precisely spatial metaphors, linguists suggest that sex difference indeed plays a role. This claim can be very easily proved by allowing the rightness of the postulate that men and women show culture-specific and cognitive differences. Specifically, according to the authors, the biological sex determines how the two genders undergo spatial experience, letting them hypothesize and later prove that the difference is visible in the usage of metaphors too (Stefanowitsch and Goschler, 2009).

Despite the fact that the linguists cannot univocally state that gender is a salient factor when analyzing metaphors, they cannot disagree with the fact that most of the languages are not inherently gender neutral and this might be visible through metaphors too (Mio, 1997; Baider and Gesuato, 2003; Philip, 2009). Specifically, so-called feminine metaphors connote the ideas that are primarily connected to the function of a woman in a domestic space/ family or a society, such as a child bearer, mother or a homemaker. Consequently, feminine metaphors include NURTURING (cooking, feeding, etc.) and other notions that as a cliché are associated with femininity (Friedman, 1987; Philip, 2009). On the other hand, masculine metaphors are comprised of the notions denoting historic roles ascribed to men, among which are HUNTING, WAR and, nowadays SPORT, operating machinery and using tools (Flannery, 2001).

As seen, most famous metaphors occurring in the political discourse (WAR, SPORT) are masculine in nature and show a high tendency to discriminate and exclude women (Mio, 1997), once again

strengthening the argument that politics is a male-driven sphere and when part of it, women subconsciously or consciously use the metaphors that are associated with power and winning, rather than stressing their maternity and nurturing side of their essence. This way they avoid placing an emphasis on an empathetic side of a feminine character and stress their strong, man-like one in order to achieve political power.

Interestingly, as defined by Geert Hofstede (1991) in his cultural dimension framework (6-D Model), gender-marked values are not biologically latent or inborn in a person. However, they are subtly programmed into us from the very beginning of our existence. In addition, the gender-marked values that are consciously (by instructing them) or subconsciously (by demonstrating the patterns of sex-roles acceptable for the community) encouraged and reinforced by parents and transferred to their children strongly vary from culture to culture and are highly dependent on what behavior is considered as appropriate for boys and for girls in the society to which they belong. Hofstede presupposes that the division of sex-roles dates back to the prehistoric era, when the first sex role patterns were developed. According to these patterns men had to hunt and protect women, while females were expected to bear children and then stay close to their infants to breastfeed and take care of them. Consequently, this pattern of behavior, with the passage of time, resulted in women being more associated with home, nurturing and taking care of children, whereas men, less attached to the family, thus freer to go out, became more dominant in social space in almost every society.

Hofstede, who groups cultures into feminine and masculine, claims that different cultures can display a different index of masculinity/femininity and the gender-roles are correspondingly adjusted. For instance, more masculine cultures connote that both women and men hold tougher values, learn to be ambitious, competitive or assertive. On the other hand, the members of the feminine culture have more tender values. Thus, as suggested by the author, men in feminine cultures hold more feminine values than women in masculine cultures.

According to the data proposed by Hofstede, the United Kingdom, which is selected in this thesis for exploration, scores quite high (66/100) in the masculinity index (MAS). Therefore, British culture is

claimed to be more masculine in nature rather than feminine. This score implies that both men and women are more focused on achievement and are driven by success and competition. In addition, women are more commonly accepted in man-driven workspaces, for instance in the subculture of politics.

Therefore, belonging to a masculine culture, the United Kingdom allows me to postulate that the results of the comparative study of discourse of both gender groups, two male and two female British Prime Ministers, are likely to be more characteristic of masculine speech strategies than feminine. Therefore, as I presuppose, the most frequently surfaced metaphors will be from the domain that are inherently connected to the functions of a male member of society.

## **Chapter 2: Methodology and Identification of Metaphors**

### **2.1. Methods of Data Selection**

The comparative study of speeches delivered by James Callaghan, Margaret Thatcher, David Cameron and Theresa May has been conducted to investigate (1) which domains of metaphors are mostly employed by them and (2) whether these metaphors are more characteristic of feminine or masculine type of speech. The analyzed corpus consists of about 37,000 words and is divided between the two female and two male PMs of the UK. The previous researches revealed that metaphors can be gender-marked, i.e. feminine or masculine. Their belonging to this or that gender, however, is determined by the nature of the tenor. More precisely, if the notion mapped to the metaphor is originally ascribed to the male sphere, the metaphor conformably is labeled as masculine (Mio, 1997; Flannery, 2001; Baider & Gesuato, 2003; Philip, 2009; Friedman, 1987). The abovementioned grouping of metaphors based on gender is used in this study as a starting point to determine to which gender the political speeches of James Callaghan, Margaret Thatcher, David Cameron and Theresa May are more characteristic of: male or female.

In addition, a handful of researches prove that the trend of transmitting gender-biased views starts at a very early stage of a person's life. This is predominantly visible in the educational system, where books are substantially gender-compromised (Abbott & Wallace, 1997). Interestingly, the thorough analytical study of books implemented in schools show that there is a significantly visible imbalanced impression of the roles of men and women in the community. Even more, men usually are associated with more engaging and active activities, while females commonly show the tendency to be more related to passive acts. This perception is gradually reflected in the shaping of the worldview of a person and, consequently, is mirrored in the language use (Abbott & Wallace, 1997). Therefore, in the cases of the metaphors that are neither considered to be feminine nor masculine in nature, situations that metaphors describe, are further analyzed into being more passive or active. Specifically, the situations connected to the state or once lacking the agency are grouped as characteristic of female

speech, whereas the situations connected to activity are considered as representatives of the male speech.

The UK was chosen as a country of the survey for the following reasons: First, it has a high masculinity index in his categorization of cultures by Hofstede (1991). In addition, the country practices democracy and, at first glance, there is no need of women mimicking male speech peculiarities. Further, throughout its history the UK has given birth to and still is producing influential female figures in politics. More importantly, the data are in English and easily accessible due to the country's political transparency.

Due to the fact that Britain (so far) has only had two female Prime Ministers, Margaret Thatcher and Theresa May, they were chosen for the research. However, in order to ensure the homogeneity of the political issues and speeches, as well as the similar historical context, the preceding male Prime Ministers of the female PMs, thus James Callaghan and David Cameron, were chosen for comparison.

Additionally, political speeches delivered by the Prime Ministers are divided into three major parts: early career (before becoming the PM); middle career (after becoming the PM) and late career. Due to the reason that Theresa May has not been in the office for a long time, regrettably, in her case, the late career is impossible to analyse. As well as this, speeches delivered by the PMs are thematically selected. More precisely, speeches refer to more or less similar issues. This approach ensures that in all explored cases metaphors are determined by the similar topics, consequently making the research data more homogenous. Metaphors are manually identified with the help of MIPVU (Steen *et al.*, 2010) and MIP (Pragglejaz Group, 2007) (See chapter 2.2) and correspondingly analyzed.

Thus, this thesis examines the metaphors that are labeled by the researchers as masculine or feminine by nature. In case of difficulty in determining whether a metaphor is gender-marked or not, the figure of speech is further analyzed into denoting active or passive situations. Metaphors in the thematically chosen speeches are first identified and manually counted with the help of metaphor identifying manual, then analyzed and grouped in the consequent gender-marked groups. This allows for the

further discussion and later enables me to make a conclusion arguing whether these politicians' choice of metaphors is more characteristic of masculine or feminine discourse.

The following sub-chapter discusses the manual for identifying metaphor-related words suggested by the Pragglejaz Group (2007) and Steen *et al.* (2010).

## **2.2. Steps for Metaphor Identification.**

Identifying metaphors can be quite challenging as, at first sight, they are not always easily spotted in the text. Metaphor identification procedure (MIP) starts with analyzing words and phrases carefully and afterwards, deciding what can be considered as a metaphor in the given context. The Pragglejaz group, as a team of metaphor scholars, has created “an explicit, reliable, and flexible method for identifying metaphorically used words in a spoken and written language” (2007, p. 2). Though the group recognizes that words and phrases can vary in the degree of expressing metaphoric language, they suggest the procedure, as argued by the scholars, can reliably determine whether words in the context are metaphorical or not. The Macmillan Dictionary Online was used by the Pragglejaz group as a primary reference to evaluate whether the word is used metaphorically or not. The basic MIP comprises of four steps below:

1. Read the entire text–discourse to establish a general understanding of the meaning.
2. Determine the lexical units in the text-discourse.
3. (a) For each lexical unit in the text, establish its meaning in context, that is, how it applies to an entity, relation, or attribute in the situation evoked by the text (contextual meaning). Take into account what comes before and after the lexical unit.
  - (b) For each lexical unit, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context. For our purposes, basic meanings tend to be
    - More specific; what they evoke is easier to imagine, see, hear, feel, smell, and taste.
    - Related to bodily action.
    - More precise (as opposed to vague)
    - Historically older.
 Basic meanings are not necessarily the most frequent meanings of the lexical unit.
  - (c) If the lexical unit has a more basic current–contemporary meaning in other contexts than the given context, decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it.
4. If yes, mark the lexical unit as metaphorical. (Pragglejaz, 2007, p. 3).

Steen *et al.*, based on Pragglejaz group procedure, suggests MIPVU: A manual for identifying metaphor –related words that aims to “identify all lexical units in the discourse that can be related to cross-domain mappings in conceptual structure rather than only metaphorically used words, as is the case in MIP” (2010, p. 102). MIPVU is considered to be an ameliorated version of MIP as it incorporates additional points in the process of metaphor identification:

1. Find metaphor-related words (MRWs) by examining the text on a word-by-word basis.
2. When a word is used indirectly and that use may potentially be explained by some form of cross-domain mapping from a more basic meaning of that word, mark the word as metaphorically used (MRW: indirect).
3. When a word is used directly and its use may potentially be explained by some form of cross-domain mapping to a more basic referent or topic in the text, mark the word as direct metaphor (MRW: direct).
4. When words are used for the purpose of lexico-grammatical substitution, such as third person personal pronouns, or when ellipsis occurs where words may be seen as missing, as in some forms of co-ordination, and when a direct or indirect meaning is conveyed by those substitutions or ellipses that may potentially be explained by some form of cross-domain mapping from a more basic meaning, referent, or topic, insert a code for implicit metaphor (MRW: implicit).
5. When a word functions as a signal that a cross-domain mapping may be at play, mark it as a metaphor flag (MFlag).
6. When a word is a new-formation coined by the author, examine the distinct words that are its independent parts according to steps 2 through 5 (Steen *et al.*, 2010, pp. 103 - 104).

In order to illustrate aforementioned procedures in practice, they will be applied below to analyses the following phrase in the speech by Barak Obama’s farewell address 2017: “And we have shown that our economy doesn’t have to be a *zero-sum game*. Last year, incomes rose for all races, all age groups, for men and for women”.

- 1) In the phrase Obama describes America’s economy by comparing it to sports/ a game.
- 2) According to Macmillan Dictionary Online the basic meaning of a *zero-sum game* is “a situation in which one person can win only what another person loses” and are practiced in both game and economic theory.
- 3) Contextual meaning and basic meaning are in accordance, as Obama uses the phrase while mapping it to its one of the common usages- economy, therefore, “mapped to a more basic referent or topic in the text (MRW: direct)” (Steen *et al.*, 2010).
- 4) Therefore, the phrase is metaphorical in nature, evoking the metaphor ECONOMY IS A GAME in the audience.
- 5) As sports/game metaphors in politics are quite recurrent and are also commonly used in everyday language (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980), the aforementioned metaphor used by Obama is conventional in nature.

## Chapter 3: Data, Results and Analysis

### 3.1. Introduction

This chapter reviews data and results of the selected speeches of each of the four British Prime Ministers, accompanied by analysis of the speeches of the British Prime Ministers' selected for comparison and later discussion. Following the overall aims of the thesis, special attention is paid to some of the most frequently employed metaphors and their pragmatic functions.

### 3.2. Data and Results

The comparative study of four British Prime Ministers' discourse is based on a corpus of 36,628 words (Table 1-2). The data were evenly split between male (18,552) and female (18,076) politicians. In addition, the speeches were selected to cover more or less similar topics concerning education, inflation, crime and current issues. After manually identifying metaphors with the help of MIP and MIPVU, 598 metaphors in total surfaced from various domains.

Table 1. General description of the data

	Men	Women
Corpus Size/ Number of Words	18,552	18,076
Number of Metaphors	284	314
Metaphor Density (per 1,000 words)	15.3	17.4
Metaphor Density (%)	1.53	1.74

Table 2. Number of metaphors per Prime Minister

	James Callaghan	Margaret Thatcher	David Cameron	Theresa May
Corpus Size	10,455	9,933	8,097	8,143
Number of Metaphors	148	202	136	112
Metaphor Density (per 1,000 words)	14.15	20.3	16.7	13.75
Metaphor Density (%)	1.41	2.03	1.67	1.37



As shown in Tables 1 and 2, on the basis of the speeches selected for the study, Margaret Thatcher uses the highest number of metaphors in her discourse, specifically, 20.3 metaphors per 1,000 words in total (2.03%). Theresa May employs the least number of metaphors, more precisely, 13.75 per 1,000 words (1.37%). As for James Callaghan and David Cameron, both male Prime Ministers exploit approximately the same number of metaphors, 14.15 (1.41%) and 16.7 (1.67%), respectively. Interestingly, in difference to the previous study in this field by Charteris-Black (2009) that suggests that British women politicians, unlike men, avoid using metaphors in their narrative (see Chapter 1), according to this research, Margaret Thatcher uses the highest number of metaphors out of the four selected British Prime Ministers. On the other hand, Theresa May strengthens Charteris-Black's results as she indeed uses a significantly lower number of metaphors compared to male politicians selected for the study.

Table 3. Summary of most frequently used metaphors in the selected speeches.

Source Domain	Callaghan	Thatcher	Cameron	May
War	20	29	19	13
Journey	30	25	32	34
Health	8	15	3	0
Sport	6	1	2	0
Total	64	70	50	47

Table 3 describes the most frequently surfaced metaphors in the selected speeches by four British Prime Ministers. Specifically, the analysis of the data has revealed that the most commonly employed metaphors come from the domain of WAR, JOURNEY, HEALTH and SPORT that, for their part, are considered to be masculine in nature. Interestingly, May usually follows the results put forward by Charteris-Black (2009) and uses the least amount of WAR metaphors (13) and does not employ any HEALTH or SPORT metaphors. However, quite surprisingly, she has the highest score regarding the usage of JOURNEY metaphors (34). On the other hand, Thatcher repeatedly exploits WAR and HEALTH metaphors and, in fact, scores the highest in this respect - 29 and 15, respectively. Callaghan mostly opts for JOURNEY metaphors and uses the most amount of SPORT metaphors (6) compared to other Prime Ministers, whereas Cameron does not reveal any preference for a particular type of metaphor and employs, more or less, all of them.

### 3.3. Analysis of James Callaghan's Selected Speeches

The first speech by Callaghan examined in this study is taken from his early career, before he became Prime Minister. This maiden speech was made in the House of Commons on 20 August 1945. In his discussion Callaghan talked about America's victory in the Pacific war and the further political relations of the UK with Japan. More precisely, he discussed the issue of the course which could be more profitable for Britain to take. Obviously, Callaghan did not trust the "semi-divine" monarch of Japan, who secretly exchanged messages with Hitler and Mussolini and thus opposed the British cause. In the end, Callaghan's hoped for peace that could be brought about by negotiations between China and Russia and suggested finding new people in South- East Asia to deal with, if they wanted their policy to be successful.

Table 4. Source domain and metaphors in the maiden speech by James Callaghan.

Source Domain	Metaphor examples
Journey	willing to leap across hundreds of miles of ocean;
Health	... will give headaches to the Empires of Britain and of the Dutch and to France;
Nature/ Sea	The rising tide of Japanese aggression has passed its summit and the waters are beginning to recede, we shall find that the configuration of the landscape has changed;  Throughout the whole of Asia there are new problems and new landmarks arising;

The second speech by James Callaghan from his middle career (already Prime Minister) was delivered on 18 October 1976 in which he discussed the extension of Ruskin College and suggested giving a 'second chance' to adults who had missed the opportunity to study or develop their skills at an earlier age. Due to the fact that Ruskin College had already raised successful and talented students who occupied important positions, Callaghan thought that extending it could only be celebratory. The Prime Minister believed in the power of a good education and suggested strategies to improve the national curriculum. Besides, he stressed the trend of girls abandoning science schools and commented on the importance of attracting the students to different fields of science in order to let them fully nurture their skills despite their gender. Finally, he concluded that with the help of massive resources

already spared for education and with the goodwill of people and the government, Ruskin College could be seen as the institution that would “house and protect the ideals and vision of the founders”.

Table 5. Source domain and metaphors in Ruskin College speech.

Source Domain	Metaphor Examples
<b>Sport</b>	We must aim for something better;  credit must go to a number of organizations;
<b>Health</b>	There has been a massive injection of resources into education;
<b>Journey</b>	A steady flow of students still coming forward;  Are we aiming in the right direction in these matters?
<b>Family</b>	So I do not hesitate to discuss how these endowments should be nurtured;
<b>War</b>	We all know those who claim to defend standards but who in reality are simply seeking to defend old privileges and inequalities;
<b>Various</b>	Partnership will continue to flourish and prosper;  A child's personality to let it flower in its fullest possible way;

The final speech selected for this study by James Callaghan was held in Brighton in 1977. In his speech, the Prime Minister covered the topics of racism and unemployment and the importance of a safe home and education. Callaghan stated that unemployment had caused even more problems concerning racial discriminations. However, he promised that his Labour Party would continue to fight against inflation and unemployment by encouraging education and creating safe homes, from where, he believed, started the proper development of a child. Together with his party, Callaghan launched several campaigns and injected money in the financial system of the country in order to finally triumph over unemployment that, from his point of view, had become endemic.

Table 6. Source domain and metaphors in Leader's Speech, 1977.

Source Domain	Metaphor Examples
<b>War</b>	The Labour Party will fight an independent party with our own programme;  Used in the battle to create jobs;  This should help to lessen the pressure on the wages front;  The defeat of inflation remains the Government's number one priority;
<b>Health</b>	A shipbuilding industry which is suffering in every country from the world economic depression;

	<p>Inflation stoked up in the pipeline that choked both-economic growth and new investment;</p> <p>Unemployment has become endemic;</p> <p>It has suffered too much, despite the two separate injections of £100 million since then;</p>
<b>Journey</b>	<p>They lash out in all directions; lead them further along the road to disaster; We have brought the country through the bad times: now let us carry it forward into the better times;</p> <p>and the end of that road is that Britain becomes uncompetitive once more, I can't prevent Britain from following that road;</p>
<b>Auction</b>	<p>If education, health, pensions and the rest are to be bought in the market place by the highest bidder...;</p> <p>auctioned to the highest bidder grants;</p>

Overall, in the above selected speeches James Callaghan reviewed the political situation in Britain and suggested ways to solve the issues and outlined the road for the country to take for a brighter future. A close examination of his narrative shows a number of strategic uses of metaphors. From this point of view, interestingly, several recurrent cases of metaphors surfaced, among which are JOURNEY, WAR and HEALTH metaphors. All the above mentioned metaphors, as suggested by previous researchers (Charteris-Black, 2009; Charteris-Black, 2014; Semino, 2002; Koller and Semino, 2009), prove to be frequently employed in British political discourse.

According to Charteris-Black (2004) journeys are generally considered to be pleasant and desirable. However, a person moving towards the final destination often faces obstacles. James Callaghan, while exploiting the topic in his speech, uses different strategies to transfer his values and views to his listeners. More specifically, as seen from the data, he mostly employed positive, empowering JOURNEY metaphors to talk about the negative experience Britain was undergoing under his and his party's leadership (1), whilst he chose to employ negative JOURNEY metaphors to discuss contrastive views of his opponents or adversaries (2). In this way, metaphors become successful pragmatic strategies which contrast Callaghan's and his opponents' views:

- (1) We have brought the country through the bad times: now let us carry it forward into the better times.
- (2) British imperialism are chasing shadows.

In these examples, Britain can be visualized as a powerful vehicle (perhaps a ship) steered by a strong and experienced captain and his team through bad times and on its way to ‘the better times’ which, according to this optimistic speech, are yet to come.

WAR metaphors are mostly exploited to describe the struggle and constant fight for restoring the desirable situation in the country. As the economic situation of the period was characterized by soaring levels of unemployment and alarming inflation of the pound sterling, the “battles” that Callaghan usually “fights” by his speeches concern the social and economic front lines. By relying on metaphors, the Prime Minister puts an emphasis on how difficult the process of “battle” can be, but, on the other hand, he also aims to persuade his audience into believing how sweet and rewarding success would be if (and when) the political course he suggests was carried out.

This should help to lessen the pressure on the wages front.

According to the data, HEALTH metaphors are also quite frequently employed in Callaghan’s speech. He uses them in such a way that presents him as a doctor who relieves the patient’s pain:

There has been a massive injection of resources into education.

On the other hand, Callaghan succeeds in portraying his adversaries / opponents as the reasons for the illness, pain or disease Britain is suffering from, thus putting the blame on them for the state the country is in:

A fierce resurgent nationalism is to be detected throughout the whole of the Netherlands East Indies, throughout Indo-China and Malaya, certainly in Burma and this will give headaches to the Empires of Britain and of the Dutch and to France.

Finally, being deeply concerned with the social inequality, Callaghan introduces the metaphor LIFE IS AN AUCTION and promises to fight against the social injustices so that the poor and the underprivileged could also bid the highest when education, health and pensions were called:

If education, health, pensions and the rest are to be bought in the market place by the highest bidder then the few will enjoy the good life.

The society where these things [education, employment, healthcare] are a right of every citizen and not simply auctioned to the highest bidder grants the greatest extension of our historic freedom...

Thus, as can be seen from this analysis, Callaghan, in his discourse, successfully employs different types of metaphors that are used to influence the listener's attitudes, even values and beliefs and commands them in such a way to trigger the positive emotions in his audience (Charteris- Black, 2005). This way he persuades his followers by his goodwill and righteousness of the path chosen by himself and his party.

### 3.4. Analysis of Margaret Thatcher's Selected Speeches

Margaret Thatcher in her speech delivered to Finchley Conservatives on 23 January 1959, opposed Marxist views. For example, she accused the Russians of abusing the word "public" as, according to her, their policies or "public properties" were anything but public. Margaret Thatcher also commented on her nickname dubbed by the Soviets "the Iron Lady of the West" contrasting it to her waved hair and red chiffon dress. The future first female Prime Minister indeed seemed impressed with the metaphor as it obviously underlined her character.

Table 7. Source domain and metaphors in Speech to Finchley Conservatives, 1959.

Source Domain	Metaphor Examples
War	We're waging a battle on many fronts; The war is a true war of words, where meanings get lost in a mist of revolutionary fantasy; In other words, that so-called freedom fighter is a man who helps to destroy freedom.
Journey	Their money going down the drain at a rate of a million pounds a day.
Various	Decisions taken behind closed doors; Keep the company on its toes;

In her famous speech "The lady is not for turning" delivered to the Conservative Conference on 10 October 1980, Margaret Thatcher rejected the proposition to change her ways of political and economic rule. In her speech, the Prime Minister also covered the topics concerning the ways of solving inflation and unemployment issues as well as the problems connected to the ownership of homes that had gradually been improving under her government. The Iron Lady admitted that she had

no immediate power to ease the problem, however, in the long run, with careful and realistic planning, the country would be back on the track of recovery and previous glory.

Table 8. Source domain and metaphors in the Speech “The lady is not for turning”, 1980.

Source Domain	Metaphor Examples
<b>War</b>	Inflation destroys nations and societies as surely as invading armies do; Meanwhile we are not heedless of the hardships and worries that accompany the conquest of inflation.
<b>Journey</b>	All of that money has got us nowhere but it still has to come from somewhere.  We have no wish to seek a free ride at the expense of our Allies. We will play our full part.
<b>Health</b>	Without a healthy economy we cannot have a healthy society. Without a healthy society the economy will not stay healthy for long;  There are many things to be done to set this nation on the road to recovery, and I do not mean economic recovery alone, but a new independence of spirit and zest for achievement

Margaret Thatcher in her speech delivered on 9 October 1987 reviewed the chances of being elected again for the third time, suggesting that British society had been and always would be conservative in nature. She, third time already, set the plan for a better future for Britain. She talked about reforming the educational system that would be benefited by everybody. In the reform, the greatest part would be played by the government that would change the national curriculum across the country and ensure that no one was cheated on their opportunities. On the contrary, it was teacher’s responsibility to help every child to find their desires and let them channel in the right direction. In addition, Margaret Thatcher briefly reviewed the problem of so called “inner cities”, the infrastructure of the country. According to her, the country’s infrastructure had been damaged by changing the community structure in the cities. As well as this, children, left without playgrounds and protected spaces, were robbed of their childhood and safety. The Prime Minister also set out the goals to prevent crime and make it dip even further than in her previous times in the office. These policies, in the end, would help the country to recover and would speed up the process of becoming a stronger nation.

Table 9. Source domain and metaphors in Speech by Margaret Thatcher, 1987.

Source Domain	Metaphor Examples
<b>War</b>	There was our election victory in June. We’ve always put its defeat at the top of our agenda. For it’s a battle which never ends.

<b>Journey</b>	I have reminded you where the great political adventure began and where it has led. But is this where we pitch our tents?  And we are now about to take two dramatic steps forward in extending choice in education;
<b>Water/ Sea</b>	The tide of crime.
<b>Sport</b>	To compete successfully in tomorrow's world—against Japan, Germany and the United States.

An extended study of Margaret Thatcher's selected speeches shows the pattern of discussing the social problems with certain metaphors. For instance, the most problematic issues of that time, unemployment and inflation, are most commonly seen as enemies, thus are mapped on to the domain of WAR metaphors:

Inflation destroys nations and societies as surely as invading armies do.

Meanwhile we are not heedless of the hardships and worries that accompany the conquest of inflation. Margaret Thatcher, apart from connecting social problems to enemies, also employs WAR metaphors to review the winnings against her adversaries:

There was our election victory in June.

Therefore, she links the frame of elections to the field of WAR metaphors that carry a wide range of implications, among which are as follows: POLITICAL OPPONENTS ARE ENEMIES, ELECTIONS ARE WAR, etc.

An ample use of journey metaphors suggests that Margaret Thatcher, as other British politicians, sees the process of reforming educational, economic and social problems as adventures and journeys, implying that it leads to better places and the process is challenging but rewarding at the same time:

I have reminded you where the great political adventure began and where it has led. But is this where we pitch our tents?

We have no wish to seek a free ride at the expense of our Allies. We will play our full part.



However, the issues the country is facing and need to be tackled immediately are most frequently linked to negative JOURNEY metaphors. Margaret Thatcher indicates the need for rapid reaction to remove the problem. In addition, negative metaphors are usually used if the problem is by no means caused by her or her party. In this way she stresses the unforgivable nature of the condition and suggests that changes are needed:

The steel industry was nationalised some years ago in the public interest—yet the only interest now left to the public is in witnessing the depressing spectacle of their money going down the drain at a rate of a million pounds a day.

Metaphors drawn from the domain of HEALTH usually create an image of a spreading disease or illness. Nevertheless, the Conservative party and the Prime Minister are there to ease the pain and help the country or society undergo the medical treatment:

There are many things to be done to set this nation on the road to recovery, and I do not mean economic recovery alone, but a new independence of spirit and zest for achievement.

Without a healthy economy we cannot have a healthy society. Without a healthy society the economy will not stay healthy for long.

### **3.5. Analysis of David Cameron's Selected Speeches**

In his speech delivered on the 8 October 2009, David Cameron pointed out the problems the country was facing under the government of the Labour party. He pinpointed the main issues, among which were the inflation of the British pound sterling, the system of education, ecological problems that needed to be dealt with immediately and the pension scheme that needed to be changed. He then outlined the policies that his party would launch in the case of winning the general election. These policies included fighting poverty in the country, rebuilding a broken economy and mending other social problems. According to him, the strength of the country came first from the families, communities and then from the government. So, assuming he would win the election and become the Prime Minister, David Cameron promised that he would reform society in such a way that, based on its strength, the community - and not the politicians - would govern the country.

Table 10. Source domain and metaphors in the speech by David Cameron.

Source Domain	Metaphor Examples
<b>War</b>	If we win the election, we will have to confront Labour's debt crisis, deal with it, and take the country with us;  Labour still have the arrogance to think that they are the ones who will fight poverty and deprivation;
<b>Journey</b>	So yes, there is a steep climb ahead. But I tell you this. The view from the summit will be worth it;  Our task is to lead Britain in a completely different direction;
<b>Sport</b>	We could have come to Manchester this week and played it safe. But that's not what this party is about and it's certainly not what I'm about;
<b>Nature/ Sea</b>	When I stood on that stage in Blackpool four years ago it wasn't just to head up this party, sit around and wait for the tide to turn. It was to lead this party and change it, so together we could turn the tide;
<b>Health</b>	Send economic recovery in its tracks;  Self-belief is infectious and I want it to spread again throughout our country especially through the poorest places where Labour let hope fade away;
<b>Building</b>	The problems we face are big and urgent. Rebuilding our broken economy because unless we do, our children will be saddled with debt for decades to come;  Fixing our broken politics because unless we do, we will never reform public services never see the strong, powerful citizens who will build the responsible society that we all want to see;

The second speech was held on 11 May 2010 in front of Downing Street N10. In his first speech as a Prime Minister, David Cameron payed tribute to the previous prime minister for his dedicated service and briefly discussed the aims of his hung parliament. Despite the fact that Parliament was divided in views, Cameron promised that they would all work hard on differences and fight for the “common good for the national interest”. The Prime Minister believed that his government would be able to overcome the economic problems left behind by the previous government and would manage to build a responsible and strong society.

Table 11. Source domain and metaphors in the first speech as PM by David Cameron.

Source Domain	Metaphor Examples
<b>Journey</b>	We must take everyone through with us on some of the difficult decisions we have ahead;
<b>War</b>	And I think the service our country needs right now is to face up to our really big challenges, to confront our problems to take difficult decisions;
<b>Building</b>	One of the tasks that we clearly have is to rebuild trust in

	<p>our political system;</p> <p>I want us to build an economy that rewards work. I want us to build a society with stronger families and stronger communities;</p>
--	--

The last, the resignation speech by David Cameron was delivered on 24 June 2016 shortly after the Brexit. Cameron congratulated people on their plan for leaving the EU, despite he himself being against it. He was grateful and honoured to have been able to serve the country he admired so much. However, in the national interest, he thought it was for the best if he resigned and let his party members in the Leave campaign take over the country's steering wheel.

Table 12. Source domain and metaphors in the last speech as PM by David Cameron.

Source Domain	Metaphor Examples
<b>Journey</b>	<p>But the British people have made a very clear decision to take a different path, and as such, I think the country requires fresh leadership to take it in this direction;</p> <p>Although leaving Europe was not the path I recommended, I am the first to praise our incredible strengths;</p>
<b>War</b>	<p>I've fought this campaign in the only way I know how - which is to say directly and passionately what I think and feel, head, heart and soul. I held nothing back;</p>
<b>Nature/Sea</b>	<p>I will do everything I can as Prime Minister to steady the ship over the coming weeks and months, but I do not think it would be right for me to try to be the captain that steers our country to its next destination.</p>

As clearly visible from the tables, David Cameron, like other British politicians, tends to use a significant number of WAR, JOURNEY, and BUILDING metaphors to gain persuasive power over his audience.

WAR metaphors employed by Cameron usually refer to winning the elections against his opponents, partly due to the nature of the selected speeches. In addition, by stressing the fact that the campaigns or elections can be fought (and won or lost), thus they are war, Cameron maps the concept of his opponents onto the frame of the enemy, making winning the elections or successful campaigns even more noble and glorious:

If we win the election, we will have to confront Labour's debt crisis, deal with it, and take the country with us.

I've fought this campaign in the only way I know how - which is to say directly and passionately what I think and feel, head, heart and soul. I held nothing back.

Employing JOURNEY metaphors, David Cameron emphasises that he and his party played the role of leaders and guided the nation through difficult times. Especially essential in this process is the right plan (policy) that is put forward by his team and promises to return the country on the right track to the success. By employing powerful metaphors, he attracts his listeners' attention to the rewarding and beautiful view they would see from the summit if they followed him (and his party):

So yes, there is a steep climb ahead. But I tell you this. The view from the summit will be worth it.

We must take everyone through with us on some of the difficult decisions we have ahead.

However, in his resignation speech, Cameron points out that Britain has chosen a different path from its leader/ guide, which he respects and praises:

But the British people have made a very clear decision to take a different path, and as such, I think the country requires fresh leadership to take it in this direction;

Although leaving Europe was not the path I recommended, I am the first to praise our incredible strengths;

Interestingly, representing himself as the captain of the ship, especially in the country that throughout its history was famous for the strongest navy in the world, heightens the emotional effect on the British audience:

I will do everything I can as Prime Minister to steady the ship over the coming weeks and months, but I do not think it would be right for me to try to be the captain that steers our country to its next destination.

It is also interesting to note that the metaphor of Britain viewed as a ship, which was implicit in Callaghan's speech becomes explicit in Cameron's speech as he visualizes himself as a captain steering Britain seen as a ship.

Together with the metaphors discussed above, David Cameron employs metaphors connected to the building the future, the better country and greater Britain with more responsible society.

### 3.6. Analysis of Theresa May's Selected Speeches

In 2015 Theresa May as Home Secretary discussed the problems connected to terrorism and immigration. More precisely, she condemned terrorism and showed the support for those who need the shelter. However, she also took into consideration the national interest and the security of her people. Therefore, she suggested the bill that would aim to help people in need fleeing to Britain for shelter, but those who were illegally staying within the borders after their visa expired would be dealt with promptly and firmly. This, in the end, would undoubtedly result in more places for those in need and more security for the citizens.

Table 13. Source domain and metaphors in the speech by Theresa May.

Source Domain	Metaphor Examples
<b>Journey</b>	The police put themselves in harm's way to keep us all safe, dealing with dangerous situations;  These people are fleeing a civil war;
<b>War</b>	A country that has so often been at the forefront of economic and social change – will step up to a new leadership role as the strongest and most forceful advocate for business;

Her first speech as a Prime Minister on 13 July 2016, Theresa May thanked the previous Prime Minister, David Cameron for his dedicated service to the country. In addition, she outlined the goals of what kind of Britain people should expect when under her government - greater, better, driven by the national interest and not of privileged few, uncompromising for those who are a threat to the country.

Table 14. Source domain and metaphors in the first speech by Theresa May as a Prime Minister.

Source Domain	Metaphor Examples
<b>Journey</b>	The Government I lead will be driven, not by the interests of the privileged few, but by yours;  David Cameron has led a one nation government, and it is in that spirit that I also plan to lead;
<b>War</b>	Fighting against the burning injustice;
<b>Building</b>	We will build a better Britain; To shape a brighter future;

Theresa May commented on Brexit on 17 January 2017. She explained the reasons behind the choice of the nation to leave the EU and stated that the country, despite leaving the union, still remained part of Europe and would help other members in times of need and great danger. She also confirmed that there would be no immediate changes in the way Europeans can travel within the UK and she hoped for the same privileges for the citizens of Britain travelling abroad.

Table 15. Source domain and metaphors in the speech on Brexit by Theresa May.

<b>Source Domain</b>	<b>Metaphor Examples</b>
<b>Journey</b>	[people] with their eyes open: accepting that the road ahead will be uncertain at times; but believing that it leads towards a brighter future for their children- and their grandchildren too;  June the 23rd was not the moment Britain chose to step back from the world. It was the moment we chose to build a truly Global Britain;
<b>Building</b>	We will build a stronger economy;

Theresa May discussed the terrorist attack that took place on 22 March 2017 in the heart of London. She paid tribute to people who had lost their lives defending the country and stated that terrorists would not get what they wanted and Britain would go on living the way it used to, Parliament would meet, people would go to work and tourists would continue their visit to this country. This way, the UK would defy the terrorism and would move the other way, ‘to a brighter future’.

Table 16. Source domain and metaphors in the speech on terrorist attack by Theresa May.

<b>Source Domain</b>	<b>Metaphor Examples</b>
<b>Journey</b>	Once again today, these exceptional men and women ran towards the danger even as they encouraged others to move the other way;  Voices of hate and evil to drive us apart;  ...to shy away from taking such a path, they fixed their eyes on that brighter future;
<b>Building</b>	[Britain] a country that gets out into the world to build relationships with old friends and new allies alike;  We chose to build a truly Global Britain;

Theresa May, unlike other politicians in this study, uses only a limited number of metaphors of WAR or JOURNEY. More interestingly, in the selected four speeches, May does not employ any HEALTH or SPORT metaphors. Her restricted use of the figure of speech might echo Charteris-Black's research suggesting that politician women tend to use fewer metaphors and the number decreases even further if the years of experience in the field are less (2009).

Nevertheless, when employing JOURNEY metaphors, May usually follows the previously set pattern of Prime Ministers and describes the road Britain will lead under her government:

[People] with their eyes open: accepting that the road ahead will be uncertain at times; but believing that it leads towards a brighter future for their children- and their grandchildren too.

June the 23rd was not the moment Britain chose to step back from the world. It was the moment we chose to build a truly Global Britain;

Interestingly, when analyzing her narrative, it is striking that she uses many metaphors connected to BUILDING, especially when discussing Britain's future relationships with other countries or British economics:

Britain a country that gets out into the world to build relationships with old friends and new allies alike.

We chose to build a truly Global Britain.

We will build a stronger economy.

### **3.7. Discussion**

The close discourse analysis reveals that the conceptual metaphors that usually underlie speeches delivered by the four politicians are drawn from the domain of WAR and JOURNEY. It is worth mentioning that the WAR metaphors frequently, but not always occur, with the preposition *for* rather than *against*. In other words, when the leaders discuss problematic issues the country is facing and they need the policies to be positively seen and evaluated by the nation, they activate WAR metaphors followed by preposition *for*. Thus, they create the sense of something worth fighting for, such as families, country, or freedom. On the other hand, using WAR metaphors together with the preposition

*against* generates negative connotations, for instance, things that threaten Britain's independence, or even the national survival, therefore it needs to be dealt with immediately:

If you risk your life to fight for your country, we will honour you (David Cameron).

And that's why we are now taking still tougher action against knives and against guns (Margaret Thatcher).

In addition, metaphor usage in the selected speeches largely depends on the contrasts where the opponents (in the case of James Callaghan, the Labour party, in other cases the Conservative party) or social and economic problems are regularly seen as the enemies, competitors, cause of infections, threat and obstacles on the road, whereas they themselves and their parties appear to be the defenders of the country, healers or providers of adequate guidance on the road. Therefore, the contrasts based on metaphors are seen as crucial and serve the purpose of heightening the difference between the competitor parties.

Though being rarely presented in the speeches, some interesting metaphors, apart from the SEA and AUCTION metaphors discussed in the previous chapter, have emerged from the analysis and are worth mentioning. More specifically, Cameron and May, in their speeches, mention a conventional metaphor 'beacon of hope' that is either mapped on to Parliament or Britain:

Let Britain be a beacon of hope (May)

Our parliament used to be a beacon to the world (David Cameron).

As argued by Charteris-Black (2014), the aforementioned metaphor is quite commonly employed in political discourse and serves the purpose of "social aspiration". More precisely, a beacon, according to the Macmillan Dictionary, is "a bright light or fire that shines in the dark and is used as a signal to warn people against danger or to show them the way". Therefore, when mapping Britain or the British Parliament onto the frame of a beacon, it activates the implications of fire (warmth, hope, purifying), light (seeing, knowing) and up (health, happiness). Thus, being a beacon to the world, Britain is presented in the role of the enlightener and provider of hope to the world.



Other striking metaphors that have been observed in the speeches are the MASTER and SERVANT/SLAVE metaphors:

To become the master of events and never again to be their slave (Callaghan).

The politicians are always their servant and never their masters (Cameron).

This country which I am privileged to serve... (Thatcher).

Apart from evoking sentimental feelings linked to imperial Britain that was one of the dominant powers in the world (Charteris-Black, 2005), the MASTER-SERVANT metaphor puts an emphasis on the power of people in the process of governing the country that, for its part, creates the sense of stewardship and of being involved in the governance of the country. As a result, people feel part of the political process. Further, the nation is perceived as the master, whilst the politicians are the servants/slaves serving their country. With this persuasive and powerful metaphor, people are tricked into believing that they have the power, when in reality, politicians are the ones who really govern the country.

The FAMILY metaphor is seldom employed in the speeches selected for this research. In fact, only Callaghan and Thatcher use such metaphors in their narrative and, interestingly, with two polar connotations:

What a wise parent would wish for their children, so the state must wish for all its children (Callaghan).

Inflation is the parent of unemployment (Thatcher).

On the one hand, Callaghan uses family metaphor in a positive way, suggesting that the country/ the government is a parent, whereas the nation is the child. In this way he activates a very productive string of entailments, such as home, warmth, protection and persuades his listeners into his compassion towards his nation. On the other hand, Thatcher connotes the negative associations of a parent as it is seen as the bearer and deliverer of the social problems that is spreading across Britain.

As for the HEALTH metaphors, they are scarcely scattered throughout the speeches. Moreover, they are not at all employed in Theresa May's speeches, which agrees with Charteris-Black's conclusion

that women try to avoid health metaphors in their discourse (2009). However, the HEALTH metaphors that have surfaced in this research usually are comprised of the word 'recovery'. Moreover, Callaghan believes that "unemployment has become endemic", whereas Cameron suggests that "self-belief is infectious" and needs to be spread in the country.

To return to the main research question of this thesis, more precisely, whether the selected Prime Ministers of the UK employ more masculine metaphors or feminine, it has been previously claimed (as mentioned in the previous chapters) that metaphors from the source domain of WAR, SPORT and BUILDING are overtly masculine, therefore, undoubtedly belong to the more masculine speech types, than female.

HEALTH metaphors in this research are also grouped as masculine due to its historical context. More precisely, according to Bowman (2002), medicine has a long history of discriminating women from the sphere. The first record of an official document was registered as early as 1421, when King Henry V signed the petition that banned women from practicing medicine and females were only seen as midwives that were too "dirty and debasing" for men (Fidell, 1980). However, in the nineteenth century men took over those positions, including gynecology that led to even further discrimination of women in medicine. Even now, though there are successful female physicians and doctors in the field, medicine still remains to be mainly a male-driven space (Bowman, 2002). Subsequently, as medicine is historically ascribed to be the profession for men rather than women, this paper treats HEALTH metaphors as representatives of more masculine than female speech.

As for the metaphors drawn from JOURNEY domain, that do not have consistent mapping of a certain gender, in order to determine whether they are more indicative of masculinity or femininity, the verbs and situations that metaphors describe are further grouped into ones denoting more active (masculine) or passive (feminine) settings (see Chapter 2). More precisely, those situations that have obvious agent fulfilling the action are treated as more characteristic of masculinity, whereas when the agent is absent, it is suggested to be more feminine in nature. Consequently, when the speaker presents himself/herself as the one leading the road, the action is handled as masculine. On the contrary, there are cases when,

while describing a journey, the speaker states that they are following a certain road. As the process of following (and not leading) is a passive act, such metaphors are considered to be more feminine in nature.

Table 17a. Amount of most frequently used masculine and feminine journey metaphors

Journey Metaphors	James Callaghan	Margaret Thatcher	David Cameron	Theresa May
<b>Lead the road/ the nation</b>	+	+	+	+
<b>Move forward/ different directions</b>	+	-	+	+
<b>Bring forward (the change)</b>	+	+	+	-
<b>Bring the country through the bad times</b>	+	-	+	-
<b>go down the road</b>	+	+	+	+
<b>Take a course/ go that way</b>	-	+	+	+
Total amount of masculine journey metaphors	21	19	19	22
<b>Total amount of feminine journey metaphors</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>

Table 17b. Total amount of most frequently used feminine and masculine metaphors

Metaphors	James Callaghan	Margaret Thatcher	David Cameron	Theresa May
Masculine	55	64	37	35
Feminine	12	7	13	12

Table 17a reveals the most frequently exploited masculine metaphors in the speeches delivered by the four British PMs (+ is inserted in the corresponding cells if the JOURNEY metaphors are present in the speeches. Accordingly, - is inserted if the metaphor is absent from the selected speeches). Clearly, these metaphors are active in nature and often denote the process of leading the road or the nation, bringing people towards or through better times, thus, taking a sort of course. As for feminine metaphors that are rarely but still used in their narrative, are usually comprised of words that lack agency, such as a leap that the mankind has witnessed, a climb, a first/final step, or enemies and

problems that lie ahead. These words and phrases denote passive situations and, therefore, belong to the group of feminine metaphors.

I think its best days still lie ahead and I believe deeply in public service.

Yes it will be a steep climb. But the view from the summit will be worth it.

Yes, we have to put our faith in technologies. But that is not a giant leap. Just around the corner are new green technologies, unimaginable a decade ago, that can change the way we live, travel, work.

Table 17b further reveals that with regard to the number of metaphors drawn from the masculine and feminine source domains, masculine metaphors noticeably exceed the metaphors considered more feminine in nature. Strikingly, Thatcher is the one who uses the largest amount of masculine and least amount of feminine metaphors. In addition, apart from 9 feminine JOURNEY metaphors, and one FAMILY metaphor discussed above, Callaghan is the only PM in this research who employs 2 more feminine, more precisely FLOWER metaphors (hence number 12 in the table):

Industrial relations are human relations. They flourish best on a basis of mutual understanding, mutual respect and mutual recognition of rights and responsibilities.

...partnership will continue to flourish and prosper.

### **3.8. Summary of the Chapter**

This chapter discussed and analyzed the most repeatedly exploited metaphors in the narratives by the four British Prime Ministers. The analysed data drawn from the selected speeches revealed an obvious inclination towards certain metaphors in their narrative. More specifically, metaphors mostly came from the source domain of WAR, SPORT, HEALTH, and JOURNEY. Most importantly, the explicit messages conveyed by the aforementioned figure of speech also showed homogeneity as they usually covered the same topics throughout the text. Later in the chapter, metaphors were further divided into feminine or masculine metaphors in order to examine the increase of masculinity in female speeches and compare it to the narrations delivered by men politicians. The categorization implemented in the research has revealed that women indeed used more masculine metaphors in their speeches, than feminine.

## **Chapter 4: Conclusions and Suggestions for Future Research**

### **4.1. Conclusions**

The spoken word in politics plays a crucial role and is employed extensively by politicians while persuading people to believe in the advantages of their leadership. Metaphors, being one of the prominent figures of speech, fulfill the linguistic purpose of “stirring up” people’s emotional and psychological systems and therefore help the politicians to better express their ideas and win the hearts of their voters. Moreover, metaphors can influence our attitudes and even values by transmitting negative or positive associations to “a metaphor’s target” with the help of “various source words” (Charteris-Black, 2011). Thus, if exploited properly, metaphors can be dangerous “tools” at certain politicians’ disposal.

Based upon the assumption that previously more attention was paid to both general analysis of political discourse and studying the implications of metaphors exploited in narrative structures, this thesis focuses on investigating gendered metaphors employed by politicians in their speeches selected for this study. More specifically, the thesis aimed at answering the following questions: (1) which metaphors are most commonly employed in British political discourse and (2) whether the most frequently used metaphors are more characteristic of female or male speech style, or in other words, whether the speeches indeed contain more female or masculine metaphors. Two female British Prime Ministers’ speeches were selected for the speech analysis and their two preceding male Prime Ministers’ speeches were employed as a basis for comparison. Metaphors were identified with the help of MIP and MIPVU manuals (See Chapter 2). Later they were grouped according to (1) their source domains and (2) belonging to either masculine or feminine style. Taking into consideration that it is highly challenging to decide which of the gender metaphors are more characteristic, several points were taken into account. First, exploration of previous researches (Mio, 1997; Flannery, 2001; Philip, 2009; Friedman, 1987) in the field which were taken as a starting point revealed that WAR, SPORT, and BUILDING metaphors were classed as masculine based due to their historical associations with men-dominated space. By the same token, HEALTH metaphors, based on the acceptance of the fact that medicine has a long history of discriminating women from the field, were also considered to be

representatives of masculine speech. Secondly, metaphors associated with family, flowers and nurturing, on the other hand, were classed as feminine. Finally, some metaphors, specifically JOURNEY metaphors, that were difficult to assign to a certain gender, were further analysed. More precisely, JOURNEY metaphors denoting actions and active situations were treated as masculine. On the contrary, the JOURNEY metaphors connoting passivity in the action and lacking the agency were grouped as feminine metaphors.

The collected data analysis highlighted that the selected British Prime Ministers indeed exploit a number of metaphors in their discourse. Most frequently used metaphors turned out to be connected to WAR, HEALTH, BUILDING and JOURNEY, whereas FAMILY metaphors were extremely rare. It is undoubtedly important to mention that the most commonly used metaphors that surfaced from the comparative study came from the source domains that are suggested by the researchers to be habitual for masculine speech strategies (Mio, 1997; Flannery, 2001; Philip, 2009; Friedman, 1987).

Surprisingly, some of the analysis generates controversial pictures regarding the previous scholarship exploring similar issues. For instance, analysis of Margaret Thatcher's narrative provides a counter evidence of a case study by Charteris-Black (2009) of British Parliamentary Debates which suggests that women tend to avoid using metaphors in their speeches, especially HEALTH metaphors. In fact, as was revealed by this research, Thatcher uses the highest number of metaphors (20.3 per 1,000 words, 2.03%) and also, the highest number of HEALTH metaphors (15). On the other hand, the analysis of May's speeches reveals that she does not employ any HEALTH metaphors and generally tends to use the lowest number of metaphors (13.75 per 1,000 words, 1.37%).

Interestingly, the reasons behind the choices made by female politicians regarding exploiting more masculine metaphors, rather than female ones can be twofold. First, as already mentioned above, in the light of Hofstede's classification of cultures (1991), Great Britain scores high regarding the rate of masculinity. Thus, women in Britain must have more masculine values mirrored in their manner and way of speaking. It can also be assumed that because of being representatives of a masculine society, this trait is so deeply embedded in their nature, that women might not even be aware of their

masculine linguistic choices and speech strategies. Secondly, despite the fact that Britain recognizes equality and women are not being differentiated or discriminated based on their gender, some professions still remain to be male-driven. Undoubtedly, politics is one of them. Therefore, women (consciously or unconsciously) try to adjust their narration accordingly, so they are not oppressed due to gender prejudices and can become successful in their professional career (Jones, 2016). Thus, linguistic choices made by female political figures classed as 'natural' for men, can be highly conditioned by the social attitudes towards their gender and women's roles accepted in society and may be considered to be one of the means of constructing their identity.

#### **4.2. Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research**

Despite the fact that the thesis answered two main research questions pinpointed above, some limitations still emerged during the research. Because of the restricted time allotment, the study was constrained to the analysis of only four British politicians' discourse and the corpus comprised of a certain number of words. The analysis of more speeches per politician may well have yielded different results, either strengthening the conclusions of the thesis or weakening them. Conclusively, this study was limited to British politicians, whereas political discourse characteristics might vary in different countries.

Therefore, it would be interesting in the future to investigate political discourse focusing on gender-marked usage of metaphors among men and women across different cultures. In this respect, it would be especially advisable to base the study on Hofstede's classification of cultures and explore the trends of employing metaphors in political narratives by male and female politicians belonging to different societies and cultures. On the other hand, it would also be interesting to study what kind of metaphors are employed by men and women from both feminine and masculine cultures in various types of discourse not restricted to political narrative. All this would provide more relevant data, create a more extensive ground for comparison and would yield more comprehensive results.

## References

- Abbott, P., & Wallace, C. (1997). *An introduction to sociology: Feminist perspectives* (2nd ed.). London [etc.]: Routledge.
- Baider, F. H., Gesuato, S. (2003). Masculinist Metaphors, Feminist research. *Metaphorik.de* 5. 6-35.
- Bowman, M. A., Frank, E., Allen, D. I. (2002). *Women in Medicine: Career and Life Management*. New York: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Butcher, S. H., & Aristotle. (1895). *Aristotle's theory of poetry and fine art: With a critical text and translation of the poetics*. London: Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2009) Metaphor and gender in British parliamentary debates. In Ahrens, K., ed. *Politics, Gender and Conceptual Metaphor*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 139-165.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Basingstoke [etc.]: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2014). *Analysing political speeches: Rhetoric, discourse and metaphor*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Crespi, I. (2003). *Gender socialization within the family: A study on adolescents and their parents in Great Britain*. Department of Sociology Catholic University of Milan.



- Fidell, L. S. (1980). Sex Role Stereotypes and the American Physician. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 34(3), 313-330.
- Flannery, M.C. 2001. 'Quilting: a Feminist Metaphor for Scientific Inquiry'. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7: 628-45.
- Friedman, S. (1987). Creativity and the Childbirth Metaphor: Gender Difference in Literary Discourse. *Feminist Studies*, 13(1), 49-82. doi:10.2307/3177835
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London [etc.]: McGraw-Hill.
- Holmes, J., (1995). *Women, men and politeness*. London: Longman.
- Holmes, J., (2006). *Gendered Talk at Work: Constructing Gender Identity through Workplace Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Howe, N. (1988). Metaphor in Contemporary American Political Discourse. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 3(2), 87-104.
- Jones, J.J. (2016). 'Talk "Like a Man": The Linguistic Styles of Hillary Clinton, 1992-2013', *Perspectives on Politics*, 14(3), pp. 625-642
- Karpowitz, C., & Mendelberg, T. (2014). *The Silent Sex: Gender, Deliberation, and Institutions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt7zvffd>
- Koller, V. (2004). *Metaphor and Gender in Business Media Discourse*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kövecses Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A practical introduction* (2nd edition). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago [etc.]: University of

Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. (1993). The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. In Andrew Ortony (Ed.),

*Metaphor and Thought* (second edition), Cambridge: At the University Press.

Lakoff, G. (1995). Metaphor, Morality, and Politics, or, Why Conservatives Have Left

Liberals in the Dust. *Social Research*, 62 (2), 177-213.

Lim, Elvin T. (2009). Gendered Metaphors of Women in Power: the Case of Hillary Clinton

as Madonna, Unruly Woman, Bitch and Witch. In Ahrens, K., ed. *Politics, Gender and Conceptual Metaphors*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 224-269.

Merchant, Karima, (2012). "How Men and Women Differ: Gender Differences in

Communication Styles, Influence Tactics, and Leadership Styles" *CMC Senior Theses. Paper 513*. Retrieved from [http://scholarship.claremont.edu/cmc\\_theses/513](http://scholarship.claremont.edu/cmc_theses/513)

Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Mio, J. (1997). Metaphor and Politics. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 12(2), 113-133.

Naskidashvili, M. (2011). *How does Gender Determine Roles and Behaviors of Women in*

*and outside of Georgian Families?* Caucasus Research Resource Centers (report). Retrieved from <http://crrccenters.org/store/files/Reports>

Noonan, Peggy. 2007. 'Sex and the Presidency: Being a Woman is Mrs. Clinton's Biggest

Asset – and She's Trying to Seem Like One. *The Wall Street Journal*, 19 October 2007, <http://opinionjournal.com/columnists/pnoonan/?id=110010751>

Ottatti, V., Renstrom, R., Price, E. (2014). The metaphorical framing model: Political

communication and public opinion. Landau, Mark (Ed); Robinson, Michael D. (Ed); Meier, Brian P. (Ed). *The power of metaphor: Examining its influence on social life*. (pp. 179-202).

Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association, viii, pp. 301.

- Philip, G. (2009). *Non una donna in politica, ma una donna politica: Women's Political Language in an Italian Context*. In Ahrens, K., ed. *Politics, Gender and Conceptual Metaphors*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 83- 111.
- Pragglejaz Group. (2007). MIP: A Method for Identifying Metaphorically Used Words in Discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22 (1), 1-39.
- Reddy, M. (1993). The conduit metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and Thought* (pp. 164-201). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, I. (1979). *The philosophy of rhetoric* (Repr. ed., The Mary Flexner lectures on the Humanities; 3 040238865). London [etc.]: Oxford University Press.
- Rusieshvili-Cartledge, M. (2017). Face-attack in Georgian political discourse. Using examples from TV debates between female politicians during the pre-election campaign for the Parliamentary elections of 2012. In *Impoliteness in Media Discourse*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.
- Semino, E., Koller, V. (2009). Metaphor, Politics and Gender: a Case Study from Italy. In Ahrens, K., ed. *Politics, Gender and Conceptual Metaphors*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 9-35.
- Shaw, S. (2002). *Language and gender in political debates in the House of Commons*. PhD thesis, Institute of Education, University of London.
- Steen GJ, Dors AG, Herrmann JB, Kaal AA, Krennmayr T, Pasma T. (2010). *A method for linguistic metaphor identification*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Stefanowitsch, A., Goschler, J. (2009). Sex Differences in the Usage of Spatial Metaphors: a Case Study of Political Language. In Ahrens, K., ed. *Politics, Gender and Conceptual Metaphors*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 166-183.

Tannen, D. (1992). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. London: Virago press

Tenorio, E. H. (2009). The Metaphorical Construction of Ireland. In Ahrens, K., ed. *Politics, Gender and Conceptual Metaphors*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 112-136.