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Abstract

The aim of this study was to investigate both the differences and similarities in the use of values in speeches of political leaders from developed and developing countries. A content analysis was conducted on 48 political speeches of six female leaders. Applying the list of Basic Human Values, it was discovered that ‘benevolence,’ ‘universalism,’ ‘stimulation,’ ‘self-direction,’ and ‘achievement’ were consistently most prevalent in all the speeches. Despite this similarity, ‘universalism’ and ‘benevolence’ were most prevalent in the speeches of political leaders from developed countries while ‘stimulation’ and ‘self-direction’ were most prevalent in the speeches of political leaders from developing countries. In addition, speeches differed in the tones attached to the values. More specifically, the tone attached to ‘stimulation’ was less negative in the speeches of political leaders from developed countries while the tone attached to ‘achievement’ was more positive in the speeches of political leaders from developing countries. This study finds that there are more differences than similarities in values inserted into the political speeches of leaders from developed and developing countries.

Keywords: values, political speeches, developed and developing countries
More Different Than Similar: Values in Political Speeches of Leaders From Developed and Developing Countries

This study aims to discover both the differences and similarities in the use of values in speeches of political leaders from developed and developing countries. Values are desirable goals people strive to attain (Schwartz, 1992). They guide the evaluation of actions, policies, people, and events. Values and cultures have a close relationship with one another. Values are at the core of every culture which can be observed by people through their practices (Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayy, & Sanders, 1990). People of the same culture tend to have similar values (Hofstede, 1983), while people of different cultures have different values (Barna, 1994). Developed and developing countries are considered to have different cultures. Developed countries are economically richer and are associated with individualistic cultures (Hofstede, 1983; Matsumoto, 1990), while developing countries are economically poorer and are associated with collectivist cultures (Hofstede, 1983). To achieve the aim of this study, comparisons will be made between developed and developing countries using the list of Basic Human Values (BHV) from Schwartz (1992). The BHV inventory focuses on 10 values which are recognized by all cultures around the world (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz, Melech, Lehmann, Burgess, Harris, & Owens, 2001). Previous research implies that a portion of these values are more typical for developed countries compared to developing countries (Schwartz & Bardi, 1997; Schwartz & Saggie, 2000).

This study is important for two main reasons. First, it contributes to the existing body of knowledge concerning BHV. Previous studies on BHV were conducted mainly in the context of organizations (Schwartz & Bardi, 1997; Schwartz & Saggie, 2000; Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). This study attempts to diversify the knowledge concerning values by studying political speeches, and by placing equal importance on both differences as well as similarities of two different
cultures. Political speeches have been chosen for this study because most of the time political leaders speak as representatives of governments, or nations (Schäffner, 1996). Hence, we may expect that the values in their speeches reflect the values in their countries (Kluckhohn, 1951; Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz, 1992). Second, this study also contributes to the realm of international relations. Discovering differences and similarities in the use of values in political speeches from different cultures could aid in the understanding of why a country may take a certain stance on a certain issue. In the long run, this could guide countries in fostering cooperative relationships or partnerships, which can be politically, socially, and economically beneficial.

**Theoretical Framework**

*Basic Human Values*

The BHV inventory is relevant for the aim of this study because it provides 10 types of values which are applicable in all countries across the world (Schwartz, 1992). Having values which are broadly applicable is important because this is a comparative study between different countries and cultures. The 10 types of values are: power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self direction, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, and security. For the definition of each value see Table 1. Schwartz (1992) organizes the ten values into a circular arrangement (see Figure 1). The circle is divided into four dimensions which represent different underlying motivations: ‘self enhancement’ (represents power, achievement, and hedonism), ‘openness to change’ (represents hedonism, stimulation, and self direction), ‘self transcendence’ (represents universalism, and benevolence), and ‘conservation’ (tradition, conformity, and security).

Hedonism belongs to two dimensions; ‘self enhancement’ and ‘openness to change.’

[Table 1 about here]

[Figure about 1 here]
According to Schwartz and Boehnke (2004), the closer any values are to each other in the circle, the more similar their underlying motivation. Likewise, the more distant any type of value from each other in the circle, the more dissimilar their underlying motivation. This means that underlying motivations which are adjacent to one another overlap, but that the underlying motivation which are placed further from one another are antagonistic. Schwartz (1992, 1994) posits that the ten value types are organized in two orthogonal bipolar dimensions. This means that the underlying motivation of values in the dimension of ‘openness to change’ is opposite to the values in the dimension ‘conservation.’ Likewise, the underlying motivation of values in the dimension of ‘self-transcendence’ is opposite to the values in the dimension of ‘self-enhancement.’

*Cultural Differences in Values between Developed and Developing Countries*

The BHV covers similarities (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001) as well as differences (Schwartz & Bardi, 1997; Schwartz & Saggio, 2000) in values between cultures. Similarities exist because there are basic value requirements across cultures which explain, coordinate, and rationalize peoples’ behavior. Schwartz and Bardi (2001) found that there is a general consensus regarding the hierarchical order of values between nations. They justify their findings by stating that similarities in values exist between different cultures because values possess an adaptive function and also it is human nature to adapt to these values as a way of maintaining functional societies. Schwartz, et al. (2001) adds that similarities exist because of universal requirements with which all individuals and societies must cope. In other words, consensus can be achieved between different societies.

Previous research has stressed that there are differences in culture between developed and developing countries (Cox, Lobel, & McLeod, 1991; Hofstede, 1983; Matsumoto, 1990; Shane,
Schwartz and Bardi (1997) conducted a study between nine Eastern European countries and 12 Western European countries. They discovered that there were differences in priorities of values between the two regions which have different political systems and level of development (some of these countries had experienced communist rule, while others had not). Certainly this does not mean that the cultures of all developed countries are the same or the cultures of all developing countries are the same. Jaeger (1991) states that although developing countries have certain characteristics (e.g. high on uncertainty avoidance, collectivists, etc); these are just overall trends which might not be applicable for every developing country in every dimension. For example, there are definitely cultural differences between Belgium and Brunei although they are both developed countries, just as there are cultural differences between Swaziland and Iraq although they are both developing countries. However, this paper uses the level of development of countries as an overarching concept for delineating different cultures.

Our predictions can be solidified by the findings of Schwartz and Saggie (2000) who conducted a study concerning value structures and societal consensus across 42 nations. They discovered that development and democratization correlated positively with the importance of the underlying motivational values of ‘openness’ and ‘self-transcendence’ but negatively with the importance of ‘conservation’ and ‘self-enhancement.’ Based on these findings, the following predictions are made:

H1 (a): The values from the dimensions of ‘openness to change’ and ‘self-transcendence’ are more prevalent in the speeches of political leaders from developed countries compared to speeches of political leaders from developing countries.
H1 (b): The values from the dimensions of ‘self enhancement’ and ‘conservation’ are more prevalent in the speeches of political leaders from developing countries compared to speeches of political leaders from developed countries.

Since previous research has indicated that developed countries are economically richer than developing countries (Hofstede, 1983; Matsumoto, 1990), we assume that challenges faced by the two cultures are different. Due to this, there is a possibility that the tone attached to the use of values also differ. Tone in this study is equated to valence, which is a dimension of emotional response that represents positive or negative feelings (Bolls, Lang, & Potter, 2001; Lang, 1995). It could also refer to attractiveness or aversion of a subject in a specific context (Feather, 1995).

This study tests the differences in tone attached to the use of values in speeches between political leaders from developed and developing countries. Shane (1993) posits that developed nations are more innovative compared to developing nations. Innovation can be associated with the dimension of ‘openness to change’ (see Table 1). In addition to that, Mahler (2004) posits that high group incomes benefit from globalization while low group incomes suffer from it. Globalization can also be linked to the dimension of ‘openness to change.’ Bringing these two arguments together, and in line with the predictions made in H1 (a) (where values in the dimension of openness to change is predicted to be more present in the speeches of political leaders from developed countries), it can be assumed that political leaders from developed countries favor the values in the ‘openness to change’ dimension. Hence, we expect that these leaders speak positively about these values. On the other hand, Hofstede (1983) found that collectivist or cultures of developing countries function with larger power distance. This implies that social superiority and esteem are important. In addition to that, post-modernists argue that
labeling countries as developed or developing, implicitly or explicitly implies the inferiority of the developing countries, and may relate to the control over them by developed countries (Sumner & Tribe, 2008). Following this, it is assumed that developing countries tend to generally respect any entity with power and high levels of achievement. In line with the predictions of H1 (b), which state that values from the dimension of ‘self-enhancement’ are more present in the speeches of political leaders from developing countries, we expect that they speak positively about these values. Based on these reasoning, the following predictions are made:

H2 (a): Speeches of political leaders from developed countries incorporate values from the dimension of ‘openness to change’ in a more positive tone compared to speeches of political leaders from developing countries.

H2 (b): Speeches of political leaders from developing countries incorporate values from the dimension of ‘self-enhancement’ in a more positive tone compared to speeches of political leaders from developed countries.

Method

Operationalization

To investigate the hypotheses, political speeches of six female political leaders were chosen. Three of the political speeches were from female political leaders of developed countries and three from female political leaders of developing countries. It is beneficial to use political speeches as a material to study values because they play an important role in communicating a country’s effort to bring about understanding for its nation’s ideas, ideals, culture, national goals and current policies (Tuch, 1990). Based on the assumption that speeches are like narratives and discourse, political speeches contain the culture and values of a politician’s country. This is supported by Van Dijk (1994) who asserts that analyzing discourse is a way of analyzing culture.
Schöffner (1996) adds to this by stating that political speeches are historically and culturally determined because politicians deliver speeches representative of governments, or nations.

In order to keep as many variables constant as possible, only the speeches of female political leaders were chosen for this study. There did not seem to be a particular geographic region which had more female political leaders compared to others (Adler, 1996). Asia, the Middle East, the Americas, Africa, and Europe all have had female political leaders in the highest position of their governments. Therefore, there are no differences between developed and developing countries in electing female Prime Ministers or Presidents. Speeches of the six female political leaders which were chosen are: Angela Merkel (current Chancellor of Germany), Chandrika Kumaratunga (former President of Sri Lanka), Ellen Johnson Sirleaf (current President of Liberia), Gloria Macapagal Arroyo (current President of the Philippines), Marry McAleese (current President of Ireland), and Tarja Halonen (current President of Finland).

These female political leaders are chosen based on two reasons. First, they hold the most powerful position in their country which allows their speeches to be publicly accessible. Second, the thematic scopes of their speeches are comparable considering their position as head of their respective countries.

Among the six female political leaders, three of them represent developed countries (Germany, Ireland, and Finland), while the other three represent developing countries (Sri Lanka, Liberia, and the Philippines). According to Sumner and Tribe (2008), different international development agencies have different groupings of countries. According to the World Bank (2008), countries were grouped based on GNI per capita.¹ Based on the groupings, Germany, Ireland, and Finland are classified as high-income economies and considered developed
countries, while Sri Lanka and the Philippines are classified as lower middle income economies and Liberia as a low income economy, and are considered developing countries.

*Sample*

A content analysis was conducted on 48 speeches. The speeches were delivered at various different occasions. This included symposiums, conferences, summits, forums, assembly for an association, bilateral agreement meetings, invitational events, and parliamentary speeches. In addition to that, these speeches were delivered in very diverse locations such as France, Germany, Belgium, Japan, Ethiopia, England, Israel, Nepal, Malaysia, Pakistan, the United States of America, Bangladesh, China, Spain, Sweden, Egypt, the Philippines, Greece, Laos, Chile, Liberia, Tanzania, Latvia, Ireland, India, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and Luxembourg.

The first criterion set was for the speeches to be in either in English or to be readily translated into English. The second criterion was that the speeches must be delivered after September 11, 2001. This date was chosen as a cut off point because there is a possibility that due to the terrorist attacks in the United States of America, the usage of language and thematic scope or emphasis would be different when comparing speeches delivered before, with the ones delivered after this date. The third criterion was that the speeches had to be about international relations and involve at least one other country. The minimum number of speeches fulfilling these criteria of any of the female political leaders looked at in this study was 8 (President of the Philippines, Gloria Macapagal Arroyo). Based on this, eight speeches were chosen for each female political leader to assure comparability. For the other female political leaders, these speeches were chosen according to the length. An average speech contains a rough estimate of 2500 words. Speeches which are closest to the average length were chosen. Most of the speeches were found on the female political leaders’ presidential, prime ministerial, or chancellor website.
If a speech which fulfilled the criteria, and was listed on the website, but for some reason was not accessible, then a Google search was conducted in order to retrieve the speech from elsewhere.

Procedure

For the analysis of the speeches a codebook was developed containing specific guidelines of how to extract specific information from the speeches. The first part of the codebook describes how to extract general information concerning the speech. The general information includes: name of the female political leader, date of when the speech was delivered, day of when the speech was delivered, representation of the speech, i.e. who is the female political leader speaking on behalf of, occasion of the speech (e.g. parliamentary speech, symposium, invitational, etc), location of where the speech took place, and country most affected by the speech i.e. which entity was the speech directed toward. All these information can be found either from the heading, title, or first few paragraphs of the speech. The general information was written on a coding sheet.

After filling in the codes regarding the general information, the actual speech was coded on a number of variables. A speech was first separated into individual sentences. The numbers of words were then counted for each sentence. All words were counted. Some words were separated by a dash (-), e.g. twenty-five, secretary-general, etc. These were counted as two words. Abbreviations were counted as one word, e.g. UN, NATO, ASEAN, etc. However, when they were mentioned in full, they were counted according to the exact number of words. E.g. North Atlantic Treaty Organization was counted as four words.

A key variable in the coding of speeches was the presence of values. This was based on the definition of value in the codebook. Value was defined as 1) something which guides principles in people’s lives, and 2) aids people to decide what can be considered to be
appropriate behavior. The coding of values is based on individual sentences as an individual unit of analysis.

A second key variable in the coding of speeches was Schwartz’s (1992) 10 types of values. The coder had to decide which of the 10 values were present in each sentence. This coding decision was independent of prior knowledge concerning the female political leader or the incidence discussed in the sentence. Each sentence was read twice by the coder. During this process, the coder refers to the definitions of each value. The definition of each value also lists ‘single values’ which are associated with the value. These ‘single values’ are typed into an online thesaurus (www.thesaurus.com) to obtain a wider range of words which can be associated with the value. All these words are then combined into a small booklet or ‘mini dictionary.’ If a certain word was listed twice with two or more assigned values, the coder had to refer to the definition provided in the codebook. If the coder was unable to make a differentiation, then all the assigned values were coded. If a certain related word was not listed in the ‘mini dictionary,’ then a word association had to be done in order to make a connection of that particular word with another word in the list.

Tone was also a variable coded in the speeches. Tone here refers to the positivity or negativity of a sentence. This was measured on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being very positive, and 5 being very negative. The tone of the sentence was decided from the target object’s point of view. For example: ‘The government of Ghana has a lot to improve on based on last years’ progress report.’ The reference point in this case is Ghana. In the case of this sentence, the tone of the sentence is negative because the government of Ghana has underperformed.
Inter-Coder Reliability

In order to assess the reliability of the coding, an inter-coder reliability test was conducted between two coders involved in the present study. The coders trained extensively before coding the material for the reliability test. According to Neuendorf (2002), at least 10% of the sample must be coded by the coders for an inter-coder reliability test to be considered reliable. For this study, 6 speeches (12.5% of the overall sample) were coded by both coders. For this, one speech was selected randomly from each female political leader. According to Landis and Koch (1977), inter-coder reliability should be above .60 (Cohen’s Kappa) in order to indicate a substantial agreement. Overall, the inter-coder reliability test indicated satisfactory reliability. Inter-coder reliability was conducted on tone, whether any value(s) was present in a sentence, and on the individual types of values present. Cohen’s kappa for tone was $k = .72$. Cohen’s kappa for whether or not a/any value(s) was present in a sentence was $k = .72$. The reliability for each of the ten motivational values was reaching from $k = .75$ for the values of hedonism and security, to $k = .61$ for values of self-direction, universalism, benevolence, and tradition.

Results

Similarities and Differences in Priority of Values

Hypotheses 1 (a) and (b) test the similarities and differences in value prevalence of speeches between political leaders from developed and developing countries. It was predicted that values from the dimensions of ‘openness to change’ and ‘self-transcendence’ are more prevalent in the speeches of female political leaders from developed countries compared to developing countries. In addition to that, the values from the dimensions of ‘self-enhancement’ and ‘conservation’ are more prevalent in the speeches of political leaders from developing countries compared to developed countries. The results show that the top four values mentioned in the speeches of
political leaders from developed countries consisting of $N = 2,935$ values were: benevolence (30.2%), universalism (28.9%), stimulation (24.2%), and self-direction (22.8%) (see Table 2). Referring to the BHV inventory (see Figure 1), benevolence and universalism are both within the dimension of “self-transcendence,” while stimulation and self-direction are both within the dimension of “openness to change.” The top four values mentioned in the speeches of political leaders from developing countries consisting of $N = 2,481$ values were: stimulation (29.5%), self-direction (28.4%), benevolence (24.5%), and universalism (24.1%) (see Table 2). According to the list of BHV (see Figure 1), stimulation and self-direction are both within the dimension of ‘openness to change’ while benevolence and universalism are both within the dimension of ‘self-transcendence.’

[Table 2 about here]

Although the top four values were the same for both developed and developing countries, Pearson-Chi Square tests showed significant differences: political leaders from developed countries more frequently used the values of benevolence (30.2% versus 24.5%), $\chi^2(1, N = 5416) = 22.26, p < .001$, and universalism (28.9% versus 24.1%), $\chi^2(1, N = 5416) = 15.49, p < .001$. Political leaders from developing countries more frequently used the values of stimulation (29.5% versus 24.2%), $\chi^2(1, N = 5416) = 19.43, p < .001$, and self-direction (28.4% versus 22.8%), $\chi^2(1, N = 5416) = 21.86, p < .001$ (see table 2). Some values were generally less prevalent in the political speeches. However, Pearson-Chi Square tests showed significant differences: political leaders from developing countries more frequently used the values of conformity (2.5% versus 1.7%), $\chi^2(1, N = 5416) = 5.02, p < .05$, and security (5.2% versus 1.8%), $\chi^2(1, N = 5416) = 46.81, p < .001$. Overall, results from the analysis show a significant difference in the prevalence of the values used between speeches of political leaders from
developed and developing countries. In conclusion, H1(a) was supported and H1(b) was not supported.

**Similarities and Differences in the Tones of Values**

Hypothesis 2 (a) and (b) tests the similarities and differences in the tones attached to the values between speeches of political leaders from developed and developing countries. It was predicted that speeches of political leaders from developed countries incorporate values from the dimension of ‘openness to change’ in a more positive tone compared to speeches of political leaders from developing countries. Speeches of political leaders from developing countries incorporate the values from the dimension of ‘self-enhancement’ in a more positive tone compared to speeches of political leaders from developed countries. An independent sample t-test showed that the tone attached to the value of self-direction was more positive in speeches of political leaders from developed countries ($M = 1.70$, $SD = .80$) compared to speeches of political leaders from developing countries ($M = 1.58$, $SD = .96$), $t(706) = 1.80$, $p < .10$. The result yielded tentative support for the prediction of H2 (a). Also, the tone attached to the value of stimulation was neutral (both positive and negative tones are present in the sentence at equal amount) in speeches of political leaders from developed countries ($M = .00$, $SD = 1.67$), and more negative for speeches of political leaders from developing countries ($M = -.53$, $SD = 1.63$), $t(983) = 5.05, p < .001$ (see table 3). Overall, H2 (a) was supported.

[Table 3 about here]

The independent $t$-test also showed that the tone attached to the value of power was more positive tone in speeches of political leaders from developed countries ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 1.43$) compared to speeches of political leaders from developing countries ($M = 1.43$, $SD = .98$). However, this difference was not significant, $t(6) = 1.55$, $p > .05$. Therefore, the result was not
consistent with the prediction of H2 (b). The tone attached to the value of achievement was more positive in speeches of political leaders from developing countries \((M = 1.95, SD = .29)\) compared to speeches of political leaders from developed countries \((M = 1.89, SD = .46)\), \(t(592) = -2.02, p < .05\) (see Table 3). This result yielded support for the prediction of H2 (b). Overall, H2 (b) was partially supported.

**Discussion**

This study aimed to discover both differences and similarities in the use of values in speeches of political leaders from developed and developing countries. It was found that there is a similarity in value prevalence: benevolence, universalism, stimulation, self-direction, and achievement. This supports a study of Schwartz and Bardi (2001) which found that certain values are consistently more important than others across societies. This shows that similarities exist between cultures for certain values because values represent universal requirements of human existence (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987). However, this is not in line with the finding of Schwartz and Saggie (2000) which states that development correlates negatively with the values in the dimensions of ‘conservation’ and ‘self-enhancement.’ In other words, values in these dimensions were typically values associated with developing countries. Instead, the values from the dimensions of ‘openness to change’ and ‘self-transcendence’ (which are typically values for developed countries) were found to be more prevalent in the speeches of political leaders from developing countries. This could be explained with modernization theory which claims that, as societies industrialize and develop economically, similar institutional features emerge (Inkeles, 1975; Levy, 1966; Meyer, Boli-Bennet, & Chase Dunn 1975; Yang, 1988). People become modern by incorporating the values implicit in the institutions of industrialized societies into their personal value system.
Although there were similarities in the prioritized values, the rank order of the values was not the same showing cultural differences. Values in the dimension of ‘self-transcendence’ were found to be most prevalent in the speeches of political leaders from developed countries while the values from the dimension of ‘openness to change’ were found to be most prevalent in the speeches of female political leaders from developing countries.

Security and conformity which are both from the dimension of ‘conservation’ were significantly higher in the speeches of political leaders from developing countries. This implies that although ‘conservation’ was not used very often in either culture, speeches of political leaders from developing countries still placed more importance on the values of conformity and security.

As predicted, differences in tone attached to the use of certain values were found in speeches of female political leaders from both developed and developing countries. The tone attached to the use of value stimulation was less negative in speeches of political leaders from developed countries. On the other hand, achievement was used more positively in speeches of political leaders from developing countries. A likely explanation for this finding is that although developed and developing countries are concerned about cooperation to make their respective regions better places to live in, the challenges are probably more severe for people in the developing countries due to lack of funding, expertise, etc (Lustig & Mc Leod, 1997).

Looking at the definition of the value achievement (see Table 1), it implies that the greater the challenge, the greater the sense of achievement. This also contributes to the explanation of why political leaders from developing countries refer to the value of stimulation in a more negative tone compared to political leaders from developed countries. This could be because developing countries encounter so much hardship (Lustig & Mc Leod, 1997), that many
setbacks are encountered while trying to make improvements, thus, causing them to express the value of stimulation in a more negative tone.

Generally, this study has extended and contributed to the theory of BHV in the following ways: first, this study differs from previous studies because it is based on a content analysis of political speeches whereas previous studies used surveys in organizational settings. This shows that the Schwartz’s (1992) BHV can be applied also with a different research method and in a different context. Second, the prevalence of values in speeches of political leaders from developing countries seems to have deviated from the predictions of previous research. It is found that the values in the speeches of political leaders from developing countries are similar to the speeches of female political leaders from developed countries. This could provide some interesting insights for BHV. Overall, the results of this study suggest that while there have been both similarities and differences in the use of values of speeches of political leaders from developed and developing countries, there were more differences than similarities.

Limitations

There were several technical challenges faced during the coding process of this study. First, in the coding procedure, the entire speech was divided into individual sentences. Due to this, the context of a sentence is lost. However, this could not be avoided because it would be difficult or too subjective to come up with a definition of a sentence according to the context of the sentences. Second, some presidential websites provide speeches which were translated from the original language into English. There is a possibility that the meaning of the sentence could get lost in translation. Third, there are certain contexts which were difficult to code. This includes sentences which contain humor, sarcasm, criticism, advice, stories from the past, and rhetorical questions. Fourth, there is an unavoidable subjectivity when coding values in speeches because
to a certain extend there are bound to be differences in coders perceptions towards the sentences, and towards the values in them. This make values in speeches difficult to code. Furthermore, guidelines and examples concerning the coding of values in speeches are scarce since most studies concerning BHV were conducted by using surveys in organizations. Finally, the theme of the speeches, and the number of speeches found for each political leader were also limitations to this study. It proved to be a challenge to find speech banks with English speeches concerning international relations.

Besides technical challenges, it is also important to note that the $N$ for the values of power and hedonism were exceptionally smaller compared to the $N$ of other values. It is difficult to decide whether these values are generally scarce in speeches or just in these 48 speeches. Furthermore, this causes inaccuracies when drawing conclusions of whether there are significant differences in these values between the two cultures.

Despite the limitations, this present study yields support for BHV. It was found that there were baseline similarities between political speeches of developed and developing countries. Despite the similarities, there were evident cultural differences resulting from the study where values from the dimension of ‘self-transcendence’ was most prevalent in speeches of political leaders from developed countries while values from the dimension of ‘openness to change’ was most prevalent in the speeches of political leaders from developing countries. While the notion of ‘difference’ supports previous studies on the theory of BHV (Schwartz & Bardi, 1997; Schwartz & Saggie, 2000), it is not typical for the values in the dimension of ‘openness to change’ and ‘self-transcendence’ to be prevalent in the speeches of political leaders from developing countries. There were also differences in the tone of how certain values were
expressed. This notion of ‘difference’ supports the previous studies on BHV (Schwartz & Bardi, 1997; Schwartz & Saggio, 2000).

There are several ways of expanding this research in the future. First, since it was difficult to find speech banks in English, in the future a content analysis on political speeches in other languages should be conducted. Second, it would be better to have more leaders from different countries for comparison. Third, different themes of speeches such as election campaign speeches and inauguration speeches would also be interesting to study. In addition to these expansion ideas, it would be interesting to investigate values that are highlighted in the news coverage on the same speeches as in this study. Then, a comparison can be made between the values in the speeches and values in the news coverage of the speeches. This can show how journalists select information from political speeches for news reporting.
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Endnotes

1 Low income is when the income is US$975 or less, lower middle income is when the income per capita is between US$976-US$3,855, upper middle income is when the income per capita is between US$3,856-US$11,905, and high income is when the income per capita is US$11,906 or more.

2 When separating the sentences, headlines, salutations, numbers (indicating the number of points, or bullets) were deleted. Sentences in foreign languages were not included for coding. If more than half of the sentence was in English, and the sentence was still comprehensible, then the sentence was included for coding. The definition of a sentence for this study was developed through observation and ‘trial and error’ process experienced by the coder. A sentence was defined according to the following: 1) a sentence typically begins with a capital alphabet, and ends with a period (.). 2) If a sentence contains a colon (:), semi colon (;), or a dash (-), then that sentence will be separated after any of the three signs till the period (.). If these signs appear more than once in a sentence, then the sentence will be separated after these signs as many times as they appear. For example, “60 years of Israel - 60 years of magnificent work by people struggling to build a nation under difficult circumstances.” Although this looks like one long sentence; it is actually two sentences according to this study’s definition of sentence. Sentence 1 is: “60 years of Israel-” Sentence 2 is: “60 years of magnificent work by people struggling to build a nation under difficult circumstances.” 3) The (-) sign is usually used in two instances. The first instance is when it is a substitute of a colon (;) or a semi colon (;) in which the sentence will have to be separated into two or more sentences. The second instance is when the dash (-) is
used in compound words such as butter-fly, twenty-five, secretary-general, etc. In this instance, the sentence does not have to be separated into two or more sentences.

3 The Cohen’s kappa for each of the 10 values are as follow: power, $k = .71$, achievement, $k = .62$, hedonism, $k = .75$, stimulation = .62, self direction, $k = .61$, universalism, $k = .61$, benevolence, $k = .61$, tradition, $k = .61$, conformity, $k = .64$, security $k = .75$. 
Table 1

*Definitions of the 10 Motivational Values*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Value</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources (authority, social power, wealth, preserving my public image).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards (ambitious, successful, capable, influential).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>Pleasure or sensuous gratification for oneself (pleasure, enjoying life, self-indulgent).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>Excitement, novelty and challenge, in life (daring, a varied life, an exciting life).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Direction</td>
<td>Independent thought and action – choosing, creating, exploring (creativity, freedom, independent, choosing own goals, curious).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>Understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature (equality, social justice, wisdom, broadminded, protecting the environment, unity with nature, a world of beauty).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>Preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact (helpful, honest, forgiving, loyal, responsible). Respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide (devout, respect for tradition, humble, moderate).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Conformity  Restraint of actions, inclinations and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms (self-discipline, politeness, honoring parents and elders, obedience).

Security  Safety, harmony, and stability of society, of relationships, and of self (family security, national security, social order, clean, reciprocation of favors).


Table 2
Presence of Values in the Speeches of Female Political Leaders from Developed and Developing Countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Developed (%)</th>
<th>Developing (%)</th>
<th>Pearson $\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>30.20</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>22.26***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>28.90</td>
<td>24.10</td>
<td>15.49***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Direction</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>28.40</td>
<td>21.86***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>19.43***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>18.70</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>46.81***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 2935$ $N = 2481$

Note: The percentages are representative of the frequency that each value is present in the speeches. For example: “Power” is 0.60% present among all the other values present in the sentences of developed countries. This means 99.40% of the time, “power” is not present among all the other values in the sentences of developed countries.

* $p<.05$, *** $p < .001$. 
Table 3
*Tone for Values in Speeches of Female Political Leaders from Developed and Developing Countries.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.81)</td>
<td>(1.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalism</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.78)</td>
<td>(.71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Direction</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.82*</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>5.05***</td>
<td>983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.67)</td>
<td>(1.63)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.15)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>-2.02*</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td>(.29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.98)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.75)</td>
<td>(1.64)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.27)</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 2813. Standard deviations appear in parentheses below means.*

These results are based on the condition that only one value is present per sentence.

* †p < .10, * p < .05, *** p < .001.*
Figure 1: Theoretical model of relations among 10 motivational types of values.
