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Abstract

This study examines the way former Prime Minister Stephen Harper addresses men and women in his speeches, and how this political rhetoric can manipulate media messaging. We performed a content analysis of individuals mentioned in a sample of Stephen Harper’s 2015 speeches using seven coding categories: Name, Age, Sex, Occupation, Title Used, Speech Mentions, and Total Mentions. The research design follows a sequential explanatory style, supplementing quantitative findings with qualitative analysis. We hypothesize that Harper’s speeches contribute to the unfair representation of women in politics by continuing the patriarchal cultural practice of overlooking, belittling, or ignoring female accomplishments; this translates to unfair treatment (i.e. stereotyping, under- or mis-representation) of women in mainstream media. This research is a continuation of Dr. Peter Ryan’s research on Harper’s speeches from 2004–2014, and contributes to this previous research by shedding light upon the relationship between gender and politics in Canada. The results of the current study show that there is a disparity in the way that Stephen Harper referenced men and women: not only are women mentioned less frequently, but they are also less likely to be the focus of the speech and to be given a formal title. The literature supports the notion that this disparity inevitably results in a distorted representation of women in media.
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Introduction

Between January and July 2015, Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper delivered 59 public addresses – an unusually high number, even for an election year. Speeches and public addresses can be a useful way for politicians to communicate directly with their populace: campaigns, budget announcements, ceremonies, and staff changes may all be occasion for a politician to deliver a speech before an audience.

One pervasive type of bias in political communication is gender bias. Bias and discrimination against women in the Canadian political sphere has been studied in the past, but rarely in relation to Canadian political speeches. This type of bias may serve to perpetuate the already heavy gender imbalance in Canadian politics; under Harper’s Conservatives, women comprised less than one-quarter of elected representatives to the House of Commons (Guppy & Luongo, 2015, p. 250), and Canadian women still face many barriers to accessing political, social, and economic power.

Our hypothesis is that the subtextual messaging in Prime Minister Harper’s speeches contributes to the unfair representation of women in politics by continuing the patriarchal cultural practice of overlooking, belittling, or ignoring female accomplishments, or by using subordinating language when addressing female individuals compared to male individuals.

Though seemingly innocuous, word choice can have a heavy influence on thoughts, beliefs, and behaviour, and is a worthy subject of study for this reason. As Maggio, Steinem, and Morgan (2014a) point out: "Power belongs to those who do the naming, which is why naming is one of the most critical issues for fairness and accuracy in language" (para. 1).

Therefore, we pose the following research questions: In Prime Minister Harper’s 2015 speeches, is there a discrepancy between the way men and women are addressed? If there is a discrepancy, does this merely reflect the reality in Canada that men are more likely to occupy political office? Or does the evidence demonstrate gender bias?

Limitations

The data set is limited to the 59 speeches given by PM Harper from January to July 2015, meaning that the results are useful in analyzing only this particular time period. Harper is the only subject of study, so we cannot generalize the results to Liberal or NDP politicians or even necessarily to other Conservatives. This sample was selected as it comprised the most recent year available for analysis, and the results will eventually be included in the larger 2004 to 2015 database in the next phase of a larger project conducted by Ryan (2015).

Literature Review

Overall, the literature demonstrates that women are underrepresented in Canadian politics and that this phenomenon is a direct consequence of the prevalence of male bias in the political system. The literature also demonstrates
the prevalence of microaggressive behaviours in the workplace, which may have the effect of discouraging female participation in politics. In the mass media, women in politics are often represented in terms of harmful stereotypes (Collins, 2011), and greater representation of women in politics will not automatically translate to gains elsewhere in the gender equality movement.

**Gender in Canadian Politics**

Thomas and Bodet (2013) demonstrated that women are less likely to run for political nomination than men. Even when they do run, women are far more likely than men to run in unwinnable constituencies where they act as a sort of "sacrificial lamb" for the party. Men more often run in ridings where winning is likely and where their chances of getting re-elected remain high from election to election.

Guppy's and Luongo's (2015) analysis of gender trends in politics suggested that the gender equity movement in Canada has "stalled" (p. 241). With less than one quarter of House seats occupied by women in 2014, Canada’s parliament was ranked 61st in the world for gender equality in federal politics (p. 250). If Guppy and Luongo are correct in their interpretation, this means that the path to gender parity has not progressed on a uniform upward trajectory in the past several decades, but has hit a plateau. This also means that subtle differences in word choice when the Prime Minister addresses women are significant, since these may be reflective of the gender equity movement’s general failure to advance.

Hostility toward the gender equity movement is often subtle. Basford, Offermann, and Behrend (2013) studied perceived microaggressions directed at women in the workplace. The study examined the opinions of 150 undergraduate students in regards to written examples of gender microaggressions in the workplace (p. 343). Basford et al. defined the term "gender microaggressions" as "intentional or unintentional actions or behaviors that exclude, demean, insult, oppress, or otherwise express hostility or indifference towards women" (p. 341). The study found that both men and women perceived gender microaggressions, but women were significantly more likely to notice the subtler instances of gender microaggressions (p. 345). The study suggested that the differences in perception may stem from women having more experience being on the receiving end of microaggressions. Thus, a man may be more likely to unconsciously engage in microaggressive behaviour because he is less skilled at detecting it. The differences in titling based on gender might be considered a form of microaggression if they are exclusionary or indicate hostility or indifference (p. 341). Most of the participants in Basford et al.’s study agreed that microaggressions towards women will result in "more negative work outcomes" (p. 346), since they might cause women to be less able or less motivated to perform well in the workplace. The negative effects of microaggressions are significant, especially in a political work environment.

---

1 Since Justin Trudeau’s Liberals took office, this has changed: 88 women were elected into parliament in October 2015, bringing the percentage of women up to 26% and ranking Canada 50th in the world (Anderssen, 2015, para. 2).
environment in which women are underrepresented (Guppy & Luongo, 2015, p. 250). Microaggressive behaviour in Prime Minister Harper’s speeches could be partially due to male politicians’ lower sensitivity to subtler forms of discrimination.

Kittilson and Fridkin (2008) examined the media representation of female and male candidates in Canada, Australia, and the United States and found that candidates were often represented in terms of "long-standing gender stereotypes" (p. 385). Print news tended to link female candidates to issues that were considered to be "feminine" (e.g.: child and elderly care), while men were linked to issues that were considered to be more "masculine" (e.g.: the economy, taxes, and foreign affairs; pp. 382-383). The study supports the idea that women in politics are represented in terms of gendered stereotypes by the media. Kittilson and Fridkin also note that "higher numbers of women in office will not automatically translate into more gender-neutral coverage" (p. 386).

The most recent available study on the relationship between gender and titling was from Pauwels (1996), who explored the difference in linguistics regarding men and women. Pauwels found that women are normally titled by their marital status while men are not, and addressing men and women is often an asymmetrical practice in factors such as formality, intimacy, age, and power (p. 253). Pauwels also stated that "asymmetrical power relations between the sexes lead to non-reciprocal forms of address" (p. 256). This phenomenon has been found in work situations where men are more comfortable addressing women in less formal terms even if the man is in a lower position of power, but women are less likely to address men in an informal manner even if the woman is in a position of higher power than the man. Pauwels’ findings indicate that it may be likely for Harper to address women in less formal terms than he would address a man.

Tiessen and Carrier (2015) used interview research to study the shift that occurred under the Harper Conservative government from the commonplace use of the term "gender equality" to the phrase that supplanted it in most political rhetoric: "equality between women and men" (p. 95). There is a difference in meaning between the two phrases: "Equality between women and men" suggests that both genders are entitled to the same rights, resources and opportunities, while "gender equality" implies the fact that simply because equal opportunity exist for each gender, this does not necessarily translate to equality (p. 96). The interviews revealed that "gender equality" was viewed "by elected officials to be more liberal than they were ready to accept, and that to promote gender equality would mean promoting homosexuality, gender identity and feminist agendas that support abortion" (p. 105). If the speeches under examination in the current study contain significant differences between the ways in which men and women are addressed, it may harken back to this significant change in terms discussed by Tiessen and Carrier.

Finally, Ryan’s (2015) examination of Prime Ministers’ speeches identified trends in by-name mentions; he calls these speeches "a key informational object that can be used to represent the living agenda for a government’s lifespan," explaining that the prime minister’s speeches represent a "historical record of the articulation of power in Canada" (p. 3). According to Ryan, power relationships can be communicated in who the
Prime Minister mentions and—perhaps more significantly—who he does not. Ryan’s database catalogues every individual person mentioned by name in Harper’s speeches as well as important signifiers about them (such as age, sex, political affiliation, etc.). The database created by Ryan will provide the information needed to conduct this analysis.

**Role of the Media**

No political discourse exists in a vacuum. Since a heavy majority of politicians in Canada are male (Guppy & Luongo, 2015) and this majority is carried into media newsrooms (Women’s Media Center, 2015), messages pass through a double lens of male perspective before being presented to a general audience.

Since our hypothesis states that mentions in the prime minister’s speeches will carry a heavy male bias, it may also be useful to see whether this hypothesis holds true in media channels such as newspapers. Shor, van de Rijt, Miltsov, Kulkarni, and Skiena (2015) found that "the more mentions a person receives today [in a newspaper], the larger the chances that this person is a man" (p. 968). Men who are mentioned in the news are often of high power and mentioned thousands of times; women are not mentioned to the same degree. This imbalance is partially derived from a gender imbalance present in "newspaper policies, newsroom culture, and male-dominated editorial board" (p. 977). Our hypothesis suggests that Harper mentions women less frequently in his speeches than men; the study by Shor et al. supports this hypothesis. Shor et al. also found that "40 percent of all newspaper coverage goes to only 1 percent of the names" (p. 968).

However, the sheer amount of coverage received by each gender is not the only indicator of power. McIntosh (2013) emphasized the importance of considering quality of coverage as well as quantity (p. 101). Thus, context must be considered in conjunction with the quantity of mentions. And, as many have pointed out, the quality of coverage of women in the media is plagued by adherence to archaic gender role stereotypes (Collins, 2011). For example, women are typically portrayed in hypersexual or subordinated roles (Collins, 2011, pp. 293–294). McIntosh (2013) found that women are more likely to be represented in relationship roles (p. 295). We could expect to see this sort of trend in Harper’s speeches.

Media narratives rarely challenge the status quo and serve primarily to maintain existing structures of power (McIntosh, 2013, p. 99), meaning that if bias is present in political discourse, that bias is likely to be transferred to various media channels. Due to this sustained bias, even when women hold power, they must often do so "covertly:" As the names mentioned in the prime minister’s speeches represent an "articulation of power in Canada" (Ryan, 2015, p. 3), the finding that women receive fewer formal titles than men despite the fact that women are gaining in numbers in Canadian power structures could be a reflection of the "covert" nature of feminine political power, a trend that is only perpetuated by dominant media narratives.

It is worth mentioning that Harper’s government was known for imposing strict rules on media representatives at events (including speeches) in an
effort to control media messages (Agnes Welch, 2015; Patten, 2006). The control that Harper’s government exerted over media messaging may translate to the preservation of any biases present in Harper’s own political discourse as it is transmitted to the public.

**Contributions of the Current Study**

Although a number of studies have used Prime Minister speeches as units of analysis in understanding Canadian political discourse (see Cairns, 2008a; Cairns, 2008b), none of these have broached the topic of gender equality. It is this gap in the literature that this current study aims to fill. The assumptions of this study are (1) by-name mentions in Stephen Harper’s speeches are a viable measure of power dynamics in Canadian politics, (2) the use of formal titles or honorifics indicates respect or esteem, and (3) the values espoused by the Prime Minister and expressed in his speeches may be considered a reflection of the values of the Canadian government as an entity and, by extension, Canadian society at large. As women suffer from a lack of proportionate representation in Canadian politics as well as negative or distorted representation in the media, an examination of Prime Minister speeches may give us a clearer idea of the underlying causes of these injustices.

**Methodology**

We used mixed methods and content analysis for this study. The sample included the 59 speeches given by Harper from January to July of 2015. We used five coding categories as they recorded by-name mentions during the analysis: gender, age, and occupation of the person, as well as the number of speech mentions (i.e.: the total mentions received by the individual in a particular speech), and number of total mentions (i.e.: the total mentions received by the individual throughout the entire data set). These categories were derived from the model of Ryan’s (2015) previous work on the PM speeches from 2004 to 2014.

This analysis follows a sequential explanatory style, which is characterized by the collection of quantitative data followed by the qualitative interpretation of that data through discourse analysis. We first recorded the number of times Harper addressed men and women and the terms of address he used according to the five coding categories. Once the data had been recorded, it was used to derive any common trends or patterns. After gathering quantitative data, a double blind peer review was performed to ensure that the data interpretation was consistent.
Treatment of Data

Summary of data gathering process.

1) We retrieved the 59 speeches for analysis, whose original source was the public online database Archive.org.
2) Each researcher recorded all mentions of an individual’s name.
3) Each name was organized by the speech in which it was mentioned, and the date, event, type, location, and topic of the speech were noted. Information regarding the occupation, age, sex, title, speech mentions, and total mentions of the addressee were recorded; when absent from the speech, this information was sometimes found by performing additional background research on the addressee.
4) Using a random number generator, we re-assigned five PM speeches to each researcher (twenty speeches total). In a double-blind peer review, the work was revised to ensure its accuracy.
5) The data was then compiled and analyzed to identify any apparent trends or anomalies. Quantitative statistical analysis was combined with qualitative discourse analysis to derive results.

Exclusion criteria. During the content analysis process, it was necessary to apply certain criteria to determine which instances qualified as a "mention" and which should be excluded from the research. The following are examples of instances in which a person’s name was counted and included in the database:

- First name and/or last name mentions.
- Multiple variations of a person’s name (e.g.: Kim OR Kimberly; Mrs. Smith OR Dr. Smith).
- Instances where a person was not mentioned directly by name but in which it was apparent who the referent was (e.g.: "Mr. President" when referring to the president of Russia).

A mention was **not counted** and **excluded** from the database in the following circumstances:

- The person was not mentioned directly by name **and** the identity of the referent was unclear.
- The mention referred to a group of people (e.g.: "The MacKay family").

In cases where information about a referent, such as sex, age, or occupation, was not provided in the speech and could not be confirmed with supplementary research, researchers indicated that this information either could not be found or was unconfirmed.

If a person’s identity could not be confirmed either by information provided in the speeches or by supplementary research, information was not assumed. Missing information was excluded from the research.
Results

Quantitative Results

**Overview.** This pie chart indicates the percentage of unique, individual men and women that were mentioned in Stephen Harper’s 2015 speeches (Figure 1).

![Figure 1. Total Individuals Mentioned by Gender](image)

This pie chart indicates the *total number of mentions* that each gender received in all of the 2015 Stephen Harper speeches (Figure 2).

![Figure 2. Total Mentions by Gender](image)

Figures 1 and 2 show that there is a clear disparity in the number of mentions given to each gender. While 26% of the individual people mentioned in Prime Minister Harper’s speeches were female, women comprised only 19% of total mentions. This is roughly consistent with the percentage of female Conservative MPs, which was 17% between 2011 and 2015 (Cool, 2013). However, women’s share of mentions is much lower than the total percentage of female MPs in the House of Commons at this time, which was 25%, as well as the percentage of female cabinet ministers, which was 31% (Guppy & Luongo, 2015, p. 250). This means that the share of mentions which women received was not proportionate to the level of female representation in federal Canadian politics. It also means that male referents...
were more likely to be mentioned multiple times than female referents, with male referents being mentioned an average of 2.5 times and women averaging just 1.6 mentions each.

Figure 3 represents the number of mentions men and women received respectively. The number of mentions are indicated on the bar graph, and the bar chart indicates percentage share of the mentions.

**Figure 3. The Total Mentions of Men and Women by Speech Topic in Stephen Harper’s 2015 Speeches**

As shown in Figure 3, the speech topic that represented the most equal ratio of men to women is "Crime" (8:7). The speech which harbored the majority of the female mentions under this category was titled "PM Delivers Remarks at the 30th Anniversary Celebration for the Canadian Centre for Child Protection." The topic of the speech is considered feminine (Kittilson and Fridkin, 2008, p. 382), and females had one fewer mention than males, representing the closest to an even distribution of mentions found throughout the speeches. The smallest proportion of female mentions occurred under the topic of "Military," where women accounted for only 4.9% of the mentions. By topic, the highest number of women were mentioned in economy-related speeches at 26 mentions, accounting for 31.3% of the total.

**Titles and Honourifics.** We categorized title types with the following criteria: "Political" included titles such as President, MP, and Prime Minister; "Military" included titles such as Colonel, Commander, and Sergeant; "Casual" included titles such as Mr. or Mrs.; "Royal" included titles such as King, Your Highness, or Princess; "Professional" included titles such as CEO, Dr., or Professor; "Other" included titles which did not fit into any of the aforementioned categories; finally, "None" included mentions in which no title was given.
The distribution of title types in Figure 4 and Figure 5 shows that women were 13% more likely than men to not be given any category of title when referred to by the Prime Minister. Women were less likely to be given a title in every category, save for "Other" and "Professional." To determine the significance of this disparity, we performed a goodness-of-fit test; the results are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1. The Goodness-of-fit Test on the Mentions by Title Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>Critical $\chi^2$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>138.12</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>25.14</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>80.52</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Chi-square test was performed on each of the title categories in order to see whether there was a significant difference in the amount of titling men and women received. The \( \chi^2 \) value of political titles (138.12) is greater than the \( \chi^2 \) critical value (3.84); this indicates that the probability of the results being a result of chance alone is less than 5%. There were only two categories of mentions that indicated a greater than 5% probability that the frequencies are not a result of only chance: "Professional" and "Other." Neither of these two categories had a large number of data points. There were 7 total mentions in the "Professional" category, and 3 total mentions in the "Other" category. The \( \chi^2 \) value of military titles (25.14) is greater than the \( \chi^2 \) critical value of 3.84; this indicates that the probability of the results being a result of chance alone is less than 5%.

There is a trend of having a less than 5% probability that the frequencies were due to chance alone. Men had significantly more mentions than women in the majority of the categories.

**Qualitative Results: Discourse Analysis**

Although the argument may be made that the apparent trend of excluding women from political speeches may simply be a reflection of the proportion of women compared to men who are involved in politics, closer analysis reveals flaws in this conclusion.

There are several explanations for the disparity. One is that, when women were mentioned by Prime Minister Harper, it was often as part of a list of names and they were rarely the topic or the focus of his speech. For example, during a bridge naming ceremony, Stephen Harper said, "I'm delighted to be here, joined by Governor Snyder, who has been a great partner on everything we've been doing on this project, and also members of the Howe family, Murray, Marty, Colleen" (Harper, 2015a). Although a female referent was mentioned in this passage, it was a male governor who was the subject of the address; thus, the mention made to Governor Snyder might be considered as having more weight than the mention of "Colleen." Female Liberal MP Raynell Andreychuk also received a mention in this way:

Thank you once again for your warm welcome here, not just to me but to all of my colleagues, my parliamentary colleagues, Ted Opitz, Raynell Andreychuk, James Bezan, Wladyslaw Lizon, and to the delegation of the Ukrainian-Canadian community that’s also with me (Harper, 2015d).

Andreychuk was mentioned briefly here in a list of names of male Members of Parliament. Chancellor Angela Merkel received a similar mention in an address at the G-7 Schloss Elmau Summit: "Finally, I want to note that I had the opportunity to have good bilateral meetings with Prime Minister Cameron, Presidents Juncker and Tusk, Chancellor Merkel and President Buhari" (Harper, 2015e). This type of address was seen frequently throughout many different speeches:
I want to offer my greetings to the Premier of Manitoba, Premier Selinger, to Mayor Bowman, to representatives of all other levels of governments … the honourable Peter MacKay … the honourable Shelly Glover, the Honourable Candice Bergen, Larry Maguire, Joyce Bateman, James Bezan, Joy Smith, Lawrence Toet, and Senator Plett, and … the Honourable Stockwell Day (Harper, 2015h).

This excerpt was taken from Harper’s speech on the topic of child protection and intervention, the speech with the highest proportion of female mentions (which may be expected, since child protection would normally be coded as a "feminine" speech topic). The women in this excerpt were given formal titles, but once again they were not the main focus of the speech in the way that men were in most other situations.

Women were also frequently discussed only in terms of their relationship with men. Prime Minister Harper often briefly addressed the family or significant other of the (usually male) person being honoured or acknowledged. In these cases, the PM would include women in his speeches only because of their relationship with the addressee. On numerous occasions, the woman mentioned was Harper’s own wife, Laureen Harper, nearly always in a similar fashion to this excerpt: "Commanders and crew, Laureen and I thank you all for your very warm hospitality" (Harper, 2015i). Harper briefly mentioned his wife’s name in so many speeches that Laureen Harper accounted for approximately ten per cent of total female mentions (11 out of the 105 times Harper referred to a woman by name), artificially inflating the total. This type of passing mention extended to women of other families as well. On one occasion, Harper addressed the wife of a family friend in this way: "And Mister Fawcett’s [sic] wife was Mrs. Fawcett, Gertrude Fawcett, whose ... unfortunately whose maiden name I do not know ..." (Harper, 2015b). Mrs. Fawcett, like many of the women who warranted a mention in Mr. Harper’s speeches, was mentioned in terms of her relationship to a man, Mr. Fawcett. In another address, Peter McKay was the subject of a ceremonial speech and was mentioned 38 times; his wife and mother were mentioned twice and once, respectively: "Well thank you very much everyone. Peter, Nazanin, family, mother MacKay" (Harper, 2015c).

Gendered asymmetry in titling was also noted in many of the speeches. During Harper’s Canada Day speech in Ottawa, he opened the speech thusly: "Governor General and Sharon Johnston, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen" (Harper, 2015g). David Johnston was greeted with a title but his wife Sharon was not, despite the fact that Sharon Johnston is not only the spouse of a governor general but also a physical and occupational therapist and could be correctly addressed as "Dr." or "Her Excellency." Harper’s decision to asymmetrically title the couple seems awkward and unnatural, analogous to addressing a married couple as "Mr. and Jane Smith."

In yet another instance, General Thomas Lawson was the subject of a ceremonial speech in which he was thanked for his years of service as Chief of Defense Staff. The Prime Minister thanked Kelly Lawson, Thomas’s wife, for "loaning" her husband to the service of the government: "Kelly, I
also want to thank you for loaning Tom to us for all of these years …" Harper, 2015f). This finding bears further examination: as Maggio, Steinem, and Morgan (2014b) points out, "One of the most sexist maneuvers in the language has been the identification of women by their connections to husband, son, or father" (para. 1), so it is worth considering whether this trend in the prime minister’s speeches may be construed as sexist behaviour by Maggio et al.’s definition.

**Conclusion**

It is clear from this research that gender-based disparities of power and influence continue to exist in Canadian politics. A clear answer to the main research question "In Prime Minister Harper’s 2015 speeches, is there a discrepancy between the way he addresses men and the way he addresses women?" was identified through the content analysis.

The quantitative data indicates that women are mentioned significantly less frequently than men in most speech topics. Women were mentioned most frequently in speeches with traditionally "feminine" topics, while men were mentioned in speeches with "masculine" topics.

Not only were women mentioned less often than men, but the data also demonstrates that women were less likely to be given a formal title by the Prime Minister. The goodness-of-fit test indicated it is unlikely that this phenomenon is due to chance alone. We deduce that other causes of this phenomenon must be at work.

What the quantitative results alone do not accurately show is the context and circumstances in which women are discussed in the speeches. When mentioned, women are rarely the focus of a speech, and are more often mentioned as an item in a list or in terms of their relationship with men.

As we have seen, the media serves only to perpetuate the problematic discourse outlined here. Women are consistently mentioned less frequently than men in news media, and are portrayed in sexual or subordinated roles, or they are described only in terms of their relationship to men. If we hope to improve the quality and quantity of media coverage of women, we should start by addressing the inequalities inherent in our political discourse. Changes within the political discourse will translate to changes in societal attitudes, resulting in a more equal representation of women in politics, media, and other spheres.

**Recommendations**

For future research, it would be useful to extend this analysis and apply it to other, self-proclaimed "progressive" prime ministers, to see if there are any significant differences in the results. The speeches of Prime Minister Justin Trudeau would be a particularly useful subject of analysis, because Trudeau has made gender parity a platform issue of his party and is the first prime minister in Canada’s history to appoint a gender-balanced Cabinet.
Further research would help to reveal whether Trudeau’s gender equality ideals are reflected in the content of his speeches.

Further research should also be performed at the provincial level to see whether the trends identified in this paper are applicable only to federal government. Particular attention ought to be paid to the public addresses of female premiers in order to discover whether the gender of the speaker makes a difference in the content of her speeches.

Finally, a significant dimension which we were not able to consider during this research was whether trends hinging on diversity factors other than gender (e.g., age, race, political affiliation) are apparent in the data. We noticed that a high percentage of the men and women mentioned were caucasian and middle-aged (the median age was 53); it would be interesting to consider whether this observation holds up under closer analysis, and whether particular diversity characteristics such as age or ethnicity are significant considerations.

Harper’s speeches represent a microcosm of a larger issue of sex discrimination in Canadian politics. They demonstrate how much work there is yet to be done in ensuring that Canadian politicians fairly represent all of their constituents, regardless of gender.
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