Values in international political speeches: Investigating their production, content, media coverage, and impact

Waheed, M.

Citation for published version (APA):

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.
CHAPTER 1

Values in U.N. Speeches: Understanding the Speechwriters’ Perspectives

This article has been accepted for publication in the International Communication Gazette.

Abstract

The presence of values in politically charged speeches delivered by mediating organizations such as the United Nations (UN) contributes towards the attainment of world peace. This study investigated factors that contribute towards the inclusion of values in political speeches written for the delivery of UN representatives to audiences of developed and developing countries. Semi structured interviews were conducted on 13 current and former, full time and part time speechwriters at the UN headquarters in New York. We found the UN’s values to be the most important factor, followed by the audiences’ demographics, audiences’ country of origin (i.e., developed or developing countries), and finally, the speechwriters’ values. Additionally, we found more similarities than differences in terms of the values included into speeches written for audiences of developed and developing countries. However, different styles were usually used to express the values.
Introduction

The role of mediating organizations such as the United Nations (UN) is necessary in a world with conflicts within and between countries. It serves world leaders a platform for peaceful dialogues (UN at a Glance, 2012). Many politically charged speeches delivered by UN representatives as well as other world leaders receive extensive media coverage. In Communication Studies, there is generally ample research focusing on the effect of media towards public opinion (see Donsbach & Traugott, 2008). However, there is scarce literature concerning factors that contribute towards the crafting of political messages that receives media coverage.

To bridge this research gap, we aim to investigate factors that contribute towards the inclusion of values in political speeches written for the delivery of UN representatives to audiences of developed and developing countries. We contend that there are many factors involved, but, in this study, we look into those that we believe play the key role: The audiences, the speechwriters, and the organization.

Values are a main focus in this study because they shape the motivation of speech contents. Furthermore, one of the main purposes of the UN is to attain world peace (UN at a Glance, 2012), which we argue is communicated through the advocacy of values. According to Schwartz (1992), values are desirable goals people strive to attain because they guide the evaluation of actions, policies, people, and events. Furthermore, they are at the core of every culture which can be observed by people through their practices (Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv, & Sanders, 1990).

Culture is another important concept in our study because the UN speeches are directed toward audiences from various countries with different cultures. There are diverse ways to define different cultures around the world such as collectivist versus individualistic (Triandis, 2001; Triandis, McCusker, & Hui, 1990), Eastern versus Western (Sanchez-Burks, Lee, Choi, Nisbett, Zhao & Koo, 2003). Our study distinguishes different cultures by comparing those of developed and developing countries. The United Nations Development Program, Human Development Report’s (2010) index classifies countries into 4 categories: very high, high, medium, and low human development. We consider countries with very high
and high human development indexes to be developed countries while those from medium and low human development indexes to be developing ones.

To achieve our aim, we apply the concept of Schwartz’s (1992) Basic Human Values (BHV) and Person Organization Fit (P-O fit). The BHV was chosen because it is recognized by all cultures around the world (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz, Melech, Lehmann, Burgess, Harris, & Owens, 2001). Simultaneously, the concept of P-O fit was chosen because scholars have found that it is a contributing factor towards a person’s eminence in an organization (Bretz & Judge, 1994; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001). Since speechwriters are advocates for the ideas of the organization that they work for, we believe that combining Schwartz’s BHV concept with the P-O fit provides a good platform for understanding the values speechwriters include into political speeches.

The key contribution of this study is that it is one of the first few that examine the factors involved in literary efforts of mediating organizations such as the UN towards attaining world peace using a systematic empirical approach. It also contributes to existing literature in the following ways: First, studies on speechwriting or speechwriters are usually conducted on people involved in party politics or Presidential speeches (Bruss & Lawrence, 2010; Medhurst, 1987; Vauhg & Villalobos, 2006). This is one of the first studies which investigate the process of speechwriting among UN staff who do not write on party politics, but on political issues from a UN standpoint. It enables us to better understand the inclusion of values in political speeches by examining a context specific situation where there is scarce literature available. Second, previous studies on speechwriting were conducted through the analysis of one person (Bruss & Lawrence, 2010), one topic (Medhurst, 1987), or one speech (Vauhg & Villalobos, 2006). This study examines speechwriting through systematic empirical analysis that is strengthened by analyzing the responses of more than one person.

Value Similarities and Differences

Understanding the nature of values has received much attention from scholars over the years (e.g., Morris, 1956; Allport, Vernon, & Lindzey, 1960; Kluckhohn & Strodtebeck, 1961; Rokeach, 1973). Most of these studies faced the problem of classifying the contents of values. Rokeach (1973) was one of the first to define the contents of values and his value survey was
widely used for measuring personal and social values. The selection of his values was said to be an intuitive one. Building upon previous research, Schwartz addressed the problem. His concept of values is based on quantitative empirical research which posits that there are ten values which are recognized by all cultures around the world (Schwartz 1992; Schwartz, Melech, Lehmann, Burgess, Harris, & Owens, 2001). They are: Power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, and security.¹ These values have been applied to test diverse groups such as between religious affiliations and political orientations (Devos, Spini, & Schwartz, 2002), cultural groups of developed and developing countries (Waheed, Schuck, de Vreese, & Neijens, 2011).

Schwartz and Bardi (1997) found value differences in their study between Eastern and western European countries. Although the countries were geographically close to one another, the different political systems and level of development resulted in different value priorities. One of their findings instigated that countries which were under communist regimes were more likely to attribute importance toward values concerning conservatism and hierarchy. Later, Schwartz and Bardi (2001) conducted another study in 13 nations and found a widespread consensus regarding the hierarchical order of values. “Benevolence”, “self-direction”, and “universalism” were most important. While “power”, “tradition”, and “stimulation” were least important. They posit that the value similarity implies the existence of basic, knowable principles in human societies.

A more recent study concerning values in speeches of leaders from developed and developing countries found that there were more differences than similarities in the usage of values (Waheed et al., 2011). Although it was found that “benevolence,” “universalism,” “stimulation,” “self-direction,” and “achievement” were most present in all speeches, “universalism” and “benevolence” were most present in speeches from developed countries, while “stimulation” and “self-direction” in speeches from developing countries. Besides that, speeches also differed in terms of tones attached to words expressing the values.

Given the varied findings, it remains unclear whether nations around the world hold similar or different values. Our study will not focus on the presence or absence of each value. Instead, we focus on the perception of the UN speechwriters toward the general similarities or
differences in the values included into the political speeches that are written for different audiences. Our research questions read:

RQ1: Are there differences in the values included into the UN political speeches that are written for audiences of developed and developing countries?

RQ2: Are there differences in the style used to express those values included in the UN political speeches that are written for audiences of developed and developing countries?

According to Grice and Skinner (2007), in public speaking, it is important to analyze specific situations such as the type of audience, occasion, physical environment, time, etc. We believe that their proposition can be linked to the types of values which are included in a speech due to different demographics of the audiences. For instance, the type of audience who are present for an event in a Zimbabwean village to learn more about the importance of clean water is expected to be different from those who attend an event on women’s rights at the UN headquarters (UNHQ) in New York. Hence, we pose the following research question:

RQ3: To what extent do the audiences’ demographics affect the values included into political speeches?

Value Fit in the Organizational Context

Besides the audiences, understanding the values held by the speechwriters and how they relate to the values of the organization could also be insightful for studying value inclusion in the speeches he or she writes. People usually feel strongly about their values and defend them in various ways including emotional reactions when their values are fulfilled, challenged, or frustrated (Rokeach, 1973, 1979). Considering the central function of values in people’s lives, we are inclined to think that it transcend into all areas of life, including their career. Feather (1990, 1992) asserts that the strength of a person’s values may determine the amount of effort and the length of time he or she puts into an activity. If the cultural values of
a person are congruent with those of the organization they work for, then the performance of that organization should be greatly enhanced (Boxx, Odom, & Dunn, 1991).

The compatibility between a person’s and an organization’s values can be explained by the concept of Person-Organization fit (P-O fit). The P-O fit plays a role in how people choose organizations (Saks & Ashforth, 1997) and how employers choose applicants (Kristof-Brown, 2000). Once in the organization, the P-O fit has been found to be positively related to people’s job satisfaction, organizational commitment (Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001) and career success (Bretz & Judge, 1994). According to Kristof (1996), it occurs when the organization and the individual contribute to the fulfillment of needs of the other or the organization and the individual share similar characteristics.

Based on previous research, we consider speechwriters to share similar values with the organization they work for. In addition, since speechwriters have the responsibility of advocating the values of their organization to the masses, it is inevitable for them to have perceived identification with the organization and its causes. Thus, in this study, speechwriters should hold similar values to the UN regardless of their different cultural backgrounds. Considering the fusion of values between the speechwriters and the organization, we then question to what extent they influence the inclusion of values in political speeches. Therefore, our research question reads:

**RQ4: To what extent do the speechwriters’ and the UN’s values affect the inclusion of values in political speeches?**

**Method**

**Sample**

To investigate the research questions, we interviewed speechwriters at the UN headquarters (UNHQ) in New York. The UNHQ is a very international organization which consists of staff members from all over the world. This made it possible to find speechwriters from various cultural backgrounds who write speeches for audiences from developed and developing countries. Furthermore, this sample of speechwriters writes English language speeches on political issues.
At the UNHQ, there are both full time and part time speechwriters. Full time speechwriters work at the speechwriting unit at the office of the Secretary General. Their main responsibility is to write speeches for the Secretary General (SG) and Deputy Secretary General (DSG). Part time speechwriters work at various different departments (e.g., Department of Public Affairs (DPA), Department of Public Information (DPI). They produce anything from main points and speech drafts for full time speechwriters, to full speeches for the Under Secretary Generals (USG) or their immediate bosses. Part time speechwriters are responsible for various other tasks besides speechwriting in their departments (e.g., event management, advising). In this study, we do not make a distinction between the responses of part time and full time speechwriters.

**Procedure**

In depth semi structured interviews were conducted at the UNHQ between September and November 2010. This structure was chosen because it allowed sufficient flexibility within the pre-set questions. An interview guide was designed along the lines of our research questions with Schwartz’s (1992) concept of values as a guideline (see Appendix 1).

Following an initial contact with a speechwriter, snowball sampling permitted us to interview 13 former and current speechwriters. Seven of them were from developed countries and six from developing ones. The length of the interviews ranged from 27 to 65 minutes (see Table 1.1).

Prior to the interviews, speechwriters were informed regarding the nature of this study. More specifically, they were informed that the interview would consist of questions concerning four main areas: their personal values, the process of speechwriting, challenges faced as a speechwriter, and writing adaptation according to different audiences. The pre-interview information was relayed via e-mail.

In the interview, questions pertaining to personal values were phrased as “your guiding principle in life” and “goals that you would like to achieve in life”. The formulation of these phrases was adapted from Schwartz’s (1994) definition of values where he defined them as desirable trans situational goals varying in importance that serve as guiding principles in the life of a person or other social entity. The list of BHV was never mentioned before or
during the interview. This was to prevent any priming effect that may influence the interviewees’ responses on this topic.

**Table 1.1**: List of Speechwriters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Capacity as speechwriter</th>
<th>Length of interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speechwriter 1</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>Current-part time</td>
<td>32 min. 31 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speechwriter 2</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>Former-full time</td>
<td>47 min. 20 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speechwriter 3</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>Former-part time</td>
<td>65 min. 28 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speechwriter 4</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>Current-full time</td>
<td>27 min. 36 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speechwriter 5</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>Current-full time</td>
<td>42 min. 6 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speechwriter 6</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>Former-part time</td>
<td>47 min. 7 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speechwriter 7</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>Current-full time</td>
<td>43 min. 6 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speechwriter 8</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Former-full time</td>
<td>37 min. 20 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speechwriter 9</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Current-part time</td>
<td>31 min. 51 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speechwriter 10</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Current-part time</td>
<td>61 min. 36 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speechwriter 11</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Current-part time</td>
<td>54 min. 0 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speechwriter 12</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Current-part time</td>
<td>35 min. 46 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speechwriter 13</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Current-part time</td>
<td>57 min. 55 sec.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data analysis**

Interviews were first recorded, and then fully transcribed. Next, a coding agenda for qualitative analysis was created according to a structure suggested by Mayring (2000) (see Appendix 2 for the excerpt). The coding agenda contained explicit categories, sub categories, definitions, examples, and coding rules. Some categories and sub categories were created deductively. This means that they were created and defined by using research questions as guidelines before commencing in-depth analysis of the transcripts (Fereday & Muir-Cochlain, 2006). For example, we expected that the responses to our question on the process of speechwriting would be an important theme that would be highly relevant to answering the research questions. Therefore, we created a category called ‘the process of speechwriting’. Following this, we brainstormed on other themes that would be relevant to this category such as ‘steps of speechwriting’, ‘governing factors’, etc. These related themes were considered the sub categories.

In this study, some categories were also created inductively. This means that they were generated through careful reading and re-reading of the data to identify emerging themes that
can be categories for analysis (Rice & Ezzy, 1999). For example, after examining the transcripts, we found the theme ‘voice of speech giver’ to be dominant whenever the speechwriters explained about the ‘process of speechwriting’. Therefore, we added this as a subcategory.

After the coding agenda was created, the transcribed text was imported into the qualitative data analysis software package MaxQDA and the codes were entered into the program following the categories and subcategories in the coding scheme. Subsequently, the coding was conducted. This means that segments of texts were extracted according to their applicability of fulfilling the research questions. This was the standard coding procedure for all of the categories except one.

The category ‘values’ was an exception because it required the transformation of relevant responses into the Schwartz’s (1992) values. For this category, the first step was to identify responses which consisted of the interviewees’ personal goals, values, beliefs, principles. Next, the coder had to identify the Schwartz’s values in their responses (see appendix 2, category number 4.1). Through this procedure, we were able to see which values are held by the speechwriters and discover any differences that may exist.

Results

The speechwriters are not labeled by names, but by numbers in order to maintain their anonymity. Speechwriters 1 to 7 are from developed countries, while speechwriters 8 to 13 are from developing countries.

Value Similarities and Differences

RQ1 asked whether there are differences in the values included into the UN political speeches that are written for audiences of developed and developing countries. We found that the most popular response from speechwriters was “The values included into political speeches for audiences of developed and developing countries were similar to one another”. Speechwriter 9 said, “The values would be the same, which is to promote development and better lives”. This was attributed to the UN’s purpose of carrying a standardized global message to bring about agreement between countries. Speechwriter 7 offered the explanation
that “The UN makes a universal appeal for commonality, cooperation, mutual understanding so you can’t say one thing to one audience and another thing to another”. “Even when advocating a certain stance, the UN is claimed to always maintain its neutrality when doing so” (speechwriter 13).

However, some speechwriters provided responses that were the complete opposite. This smaller group of speechwriters believed that there are large differences between the two types of countries in terms of values that are inserted in the speeches. “There is 100% difference when writing for an audience from a developed country compared to a developing country” (speechwriter 12). This group of speechwriters advocated that the differences were caused with the need to empathize with the audience of where the speech is delivered. “Developed countries have different values and things they hold dear. If you talk about poverty in a developed world, it’s going to be different from the developing world because the poor people know it in a very real sense” (speechwriter 11).

Based on these responses, the answer to RQ1 is: There are both similarities and differences in the values included into the UN political speeches written for audiences of developed and developing countries. However, it is a more popular notion among the speechwriters that there are more similarities than differences.

**Value Expression**

RQ2 asked whether there are differences in the style used to express those values included in the UN political speeches that are written for audiences of developed and developing countries. Many speechwriters stated that it is necessary to understand a certain cultural group’s preferences when writing a speech. For instance, speechwriter 8 stated that, “The cultural context would differ and would ideally be biased towards both the country’s history and personalities”. In a half joking manner, speechwriter 6 explained cultural differences and their sensitivities by saying, “Tooting your own horn is good in one culture, but it’s frowned upon elsewhere”.

Some speechwriters also provided explanations of differences in detail. For example, speechwriter 6 said,
I think it’s very apparent if you go to a very different culture, let’s say in Asia, that certain things mean a lot to the audience. Like humility, quietness, not so much of a competitive spirit. I think it will be very awkward if you come with a ‘gung ho’ kind of attitude when they are in a very different set up.

Speechwriter 13 explicitly mentioned that different cultures appreciate different techniques of writing. This speechwriter further elaborates, “When the USG is addressing an African audience, I will use language that will excite solidarity (...) If I was writing for a European or American audience, it tends to be more sanitized, direct, more to the point” (speechwriter 13).

Despite the general agreement on the differences in the style used to express the values, some speechwriters also clarified that the differences should not be too big. Speechwriter 7 said, “We carry a universal message, so, too much tailoring (...) it (the speech) doesn’t stand up politically or intellectually”. Similarly, speechwriter 4 noted, “I think we are usually aiming for a world audience, so it shouldn’t make a big difference. But we usually try to include reference to the location when we write”.

The collective responses from the speechwriters indicate that the answer to RQ 2 is: Generally, there are differences in the style used to express those values included in the UN political speeches that are written for audiences of developed and developing countries. However, the differences should not be too large in order to preserve the universal message of the UN.

Value Expression and Value Presence

There is reason to believe that the differences in the style that values are expressed in the political speeches may affect the values itself. For example, referring to the statement of speechwriter 13, “When the USG is addressing an African audience, I will use language that will excite solidarity (...) If I was writing for a European or American audience, it tends to be more sanitized, direct, more to the point”. The two speeches may very well have the same motivation (e.g., educating the audience on the dangers of HIV). However, exciting an audience to invoke solidarity (e.g., by providing cultural examples that are relatable to the audience) already launches a different set of values compared to a more clinical approach. In
this example, using culture specific examples can be related to values such as tradition and conformity. Meanwhile, the more clinical approach does not necessarily relate to those same values. Here is another example: Speechwriter 7 who first stated that “There isn’t much of a difference between writing for developed and developing countries” also say:

There are different angles to a story (…) In a developed country, we would say why it’s important to care about poor people. For developing countries we’re going to signal to them that we know that the international trading system is rigged by the powerful countries.

The different angle may alter the values in the message relayed. In this example, talking about the importance of helping poor people can be related to values such as universalism and benevolence. Meanwhile, the latter part of this statement relates to the value of power. By this, we bring attention to the inevitability of different styles of values expression to affect the values included into political speeches tailored for delivery to audiences of developed and developing countries. Consequently, this questions the validity of the responses from majority of speechwriters who stated that values are similar when writing for speeches for the audiences of the two types of cultures.

**Audiences’ Demographics**

RQ3 asked to what extent the audiences’ demographics affect the values included into political speeches. Some speechwriters say that knowing the event scenario is important before writing the speech. Speechwriter 8 said, “The speech depends on where he (the SG) is travelling to, which meeting is he addressing, what events are happening in the location of the UN conference, what UN meeting is taking place, who has given him the honor”. This basic information is said to provide the understanding of the cultural ambiance, the type of audience present, and what type of messages that will resonate with them (speechwriter 11). This is in line with our earlier argument that the audiences’ demographics are a contributing factor towards the types of values which will be included into the speech.
Majority of speechwriters mentioned the importance of knowing the audiences’ demographics (e.g., their knowledge levels, sex, economic situation, ethnicity, etc.). Speechwriter 7 says, “Speechwriting changes from audience to audience (…) A think tank audience is different than students (…) than NGOs (…) than member states (…) than diplomats”. This basic information alone is believed to contribute a substantial amount towards the writing of the speech. Speechwriter 6 noted that “If you have a very clued in academic audience who have studied the subject, then obviously the tone will be far more intricate (and vice versa)

The demographics of the audience affirms the cultural ambiance of the event which guides the speechwriter what and how to write. Speechwriter 11 said, “In Australia, we had indigenous people. So, the issues we touched on were indigenous health because it’s a big thing there”. Cultural difference can also extend beyond geographical locations. Speechwriter 11 also made it pronounced that the message would also be different between other cultural groups such as one that is more predominantly male compared to female, or those from different income groups.

Offering a different perspective, speechwriter 5 suggests that their writing should be tailored to as wide a demographic group as possible. “You always have two audiences (…) whoever is in the room (…) and the global audience. We try not to write something that won’t be understood by the broadest possible audience.”

Interestingly, one speechwriter instigates that the audiences’ demographics are a bigger contributing factor toward the inclusion of values into speeches that the audiences’ country of origin (i.e., developed or developing).

It has nothing to do with rich or poor countries (…) If we are writing for an audience of think tanks, we would be telling them to give assistance. If we’re talking to audience from receiving countries, we’ll talk about policy (speechwriter 1).

In sum, our answer to RQ3 is: The audiences’ demographics are an important contributing factor towards the inclusion of values in political speeches. It was even suggested that it is more important than the audiences’ country of origin.
Organization’s and Speechwriters’ Values

RQ4 asked to what extent the speechwriters’ and the UN’s values affect the inclusion of values in political speeches. Our finding supports the earlier assumption made that speechwriters hold similar values to the UN regardless of their different cultural backgrounds. Almost all the speechwriters believe that their personal values are the same as those of the UN’s. According to speechwriter 13, “There’s a bleeding of the personal and the professional”. “People may bring their own personal values because of their cultural background, but there is an underlying agreement” (speechwriter 11). In addition, most of them also believe that their values are generally in agreement with the speech giver’s values. “You may like or dislike a person, but the values are not completely different when it comes to the speech” (speechwriter 1).

To further understand the type of values meant by the speechwriters, we looked into their responses concerning their personal values. Most of them placed importance in the values of achievement, universalism, benevolence, and tradition. The value of achievement was most often related to their career. Due to being an employee of the UN, this was usually related to doing good for others and the world. Hence, the value of achievement was inevitably linked to the values of benevolence and universalism.

My main goal in life is to teach someone else to do something better, whether it is to become a better journalist, to become a better writer and if I’m able to do that, that’s an achievement, that is success for me (speechwriter 11).

Meanwhile, the value of tradition was usually related to family. “I want to be a good husband, I want to be a good father” (speechwriter 7). “I’d like to have family and kids” (speechwriter 9). In general, we found no polarization in the values held by speechwriters from both developed and developing countries.

Speechwriters and the inclusion of their values. Speechwriting involves many different people from the time a directive is issued to produce a speech till the time it is delivered to the audience. To understand the extent to which the speechwriter plays a role in
this process and is able to include their own values in the process, we have to understand the larger picture of how the speeches are produced. “The nature of the job is like an assembly line (...) so the nature of the job is also very collaborative” (speechwriter 7). Through the interviews, it was clear that there are several identifiable steps in the process of speechwriting: Information gathering, writing, and editing. Each step involved other people besides the speechwriters.

**Information gathering.** Speechwriters at the UN have to produce speeches on a wide range of topics (e.g., trade, debt, transfer of technology, maternal mortality, etc.). As it is quite impossible for anyone to be an expert in all these topics, the speechwriters frequently seek information from other UN staff of substantive offices depending on the topic of the speech and the offices’ area of expertise (e.g., Economic and Social Commission for Asia Pacific for speeches in Thailand). “It’s regularly done at the UN that you ask substantive areas to give you a one page of all the points they want included in a speech” (speechwriter 6). In addition to this, some speechwriters do some research themselves. Speechwriter 12 says “I will research myself about the conference, and then I get a sense of what the issues are”. Speechwriter 11, who works with speechwriter 12 also stated, “I always like to look at commentaries from ordinary people to see what they’re saying (about an issue)”. A couple of speechwriters also indicated that brainstorming with other colleagues sometimes occur in this step. “In cases where the SG delivers a speech in different places and organizations, we gather people in a room and ask ‘what should we say? What’s on everybody’s mind right now?’” (speechwriter 7).

**Writing and editing.** Once sufficient information has been gathered and consolidated, the writing takes place. When the writing is completed, the speechwriter will send the draft to other UN staff members for a review. Most speechwriters send the draft back to the UN staff who provided them with the input. According to speechwriter 5, speeches written by the full time speechwriters at the SG’s office would normally have their drafts subjected to internal peer review (of the speechwriting unit). After they receive the comments, they come up with the final draft which will then be submitted to the SG for his review.
In sum, although there are other people involved in the speechwriting process, but, the responsibility of the speechwriter is one of the largest. The speechwriter is not only a writer, but also a manager. His or her role include gathering information from substantive officers, conducting own research on the topic, writing the speech, incorporating the speech giver’s voice in the speech, gathering comments and suggestions, and re-packaging the speech for delivery. Therefore, we believe that there is a high possibility for their own values to be included into the political speeches at any point of this process.

The UN and the inclusion of its values. Most speechwriters believe that the UN has universal values which are agreeable to anyone. Speechwriter 7 says, “It’s hard not to have UN values. Look at what we’re talking about. Mutual respect, equal rights, human dignity, tolerance, I mean no one can argue with those values”. This causes us to believe that such an organization would have their values upheld in their charter, policies, principles, etc. After all, an organization cannot advocate values without incorporating them in all aspects of their being.

Some speechwriters strongly believe that the organization’s policies are a driving component in how a speech is written. “It’s the knowledge and familiarity with what the UN stands for (...) that is what informs the tone and parameters of the speech” (speechwriter 12). Others say that it is inevitable to have the UN’s policies as a guiding factor. “It’s like second nature (policies of the organization), you write it, you’re already conforming to those policies and certain political information” (speechwriter 10). One speechwriter noted that it’s not only a component, but policy is in fact the content of the speech itself. “I am always writing about policy (...) that’s 90% of what I write about” (speechwriter 1).

A few also mentioned that besides the UN’s policies, its issues of priority also play a role in how a speech is shaped. Speechwriter 7 says, “Certainly all UN related issues are of importance to us. But we also came up (by way of consultation with other departments) with what would be the SG’s priorities in 2010 (...) that serves as a template for the year”. Speechwriter 13 made an interesting statement when he said that it is the office’s mandate that is most important of all. “What is most important is the mandate of the office (...) it is to
advocate and raise challenges facing least developed countries (…) that trumps everything, my values, or anything else.”

We believe that the UN’s values are projected through all of its features (e.g., policies, mandates, etc.). Since the speechwriters testified that these features are indeed vital in the shaping of political speeches, we conclude that the UN’s values play a vital role in the inclusion of values into political speeches. It was suggested that it is even more vital than any other factors.

Combining all the responses, our answer to RQ4 is: There is a probability for the speechwriters’ personal values to be included into the political speeches. However, the UN’s values are confirmed to be included and were suggested to be the most important contributing factor of all.

Discussion
The main aim of this study was to investigate the factors involved in the inclusion of values in political speeches written for the delivery of UN representatives to audiences of developed and developing countries. Our analysis for RQ1 found that while there were both similarities and differences in the values included into the UN political speeches written for audiences of different cultures, there was a popular notion among the speechwriters that there were more similarities than differences. This is not in line with the findings of Waheed et al. (2011). Instead, it leaned more towards the finding of Schwartz and Bardi (2001) which implied that value similarities points towards the existence of basic, knowable principles in human societies.

Our analysis for RQ2 found that while there were generally differences in the style used to express those values included in the UN political speeches that are written for audiences of developed and developing countries, but, the differences should not be too large in order to preserve the universal message of the UN. The analysis for RQ2 revealed that the style of value expression may change the values altogether. We find this interesting as previous studies applying the Schwartz BHV (e.g., Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz et al. 2001; Schwartz & Bardi, 1997, 2001; Waheed et al., 2011) hardly ever mentioned the vulnerability of values or the effect of tone on values.
Our analysis for RQ3 found that the audiences’ demographics are an important contributing factor towards the inclusion of values in political speeches. This confirms the need for speechwriters to analyze specific situations such as the type of audience, occasion, physical environment, time, etc., as advocated by Grice and Skinner (2007). Interestingly, it was also suggested that knowing the audiences’ demographics is more important than the audiences’ country of origin (i.e. developed or developing countries). We probably overestimated the differences of values included into political speeches based on the audiences’ country of origin and underestimated the fact that while cultural differences play a role in how speeches are written, there are also similar types of groups of people in every culture (e.g., there are highly educated people in developed and developing countries, there are women who fight for equality in both types of countries, etc.). Both differences between and within cultures contribute toward the inclusion of values in political speeches. In addition, it is also possible to argue that the audiences’ country of origin could also be considered a demographic.

Our analysis for RQ4 supports the concept of P-O fit. It was found that speechwriters do share similar values with the organization they work for regardless of their cultural backgrounds. This congruency most likely guided how the speechwriters choose the UN, and vice versa. This supports the finding of Saks and Ashforth (1997) as well as Kristof-Brown (2000). Also, despite the possibility for the speechwriters’ personal values to be included into the political speeches, the speechwriters explicitly mentioned that the UN’s values are the most vital factor in the shaping of political speeches.

Additionally, we find it interesting that although the speechwriters originated from different cultures, but, their personal values were similar to one another, as well as to the speech givers’. This could be because the UN staff is composed mostly of cosmopolitans. Cosmopolitans are members of various communities ranging from local to global (Appiah, 1996). This is a plausible explanation because most if not all of the UN speechwriters have had the opportunity of travelling extensively on their job which enables them to a more global oriented world view. Furthermore, they all have worked at the UN (which is possibly not located in their country of origin) for a substantial amount of time where they have to work with people from all over the world on a daily basis. Hence, it is highly likely that they
perceive themselves not only as citizens of their countries of origin, but as citizens of the world.

In a nutshell, we found that the UN’s values to be the most dominating factor in the inclusion of values in political speeches. Next in line are the audiences’ demographics, followed by the audiences’ country of origin. It was implied that the speechwriters’ values was the least important factor of all (in comparison to the other three factors). In fact, the inclusion of the speechwriters’ values was not specifically mentioned by the speechwriters. Instead, many of them stated that they hold the same values as the UN. Based on this and also on our analysis that speechwriters play large role in the speechwriting process, we speculate that they have the opportunity to include their own values into the speeches.

Overall, our study has contributed to and expanded on the existing body of knowledge concerning values and speechwriting in the following ways: First, we explored the factors involved in the inclusion of values in political speeches written for the delivery of UN representatives to audiences of developed and developing countries. Our study is one of the first that does not focus on Presidential speeches or party politics, but on political speeches of a mediating organization. Second, we found that beyond the typical organizational setting, the concept of Schwartz’s (1992) values is also applicable in the context of value inclusion in political speeches. Third, the results of our analysis are based on empirical analysis with 13 speechwriters which enabled us to observe the effects of organizational fit in a more thorough manner compared to other studies that used the more popular analysis of one speech, one speechwriter, or one speech topic. Finally, we were able to identify the factors according to their level of importance. On a larger scale, our study has informed us on the contributing factors of value inclusion into political speeches of mediating organizations such as the UN towards attaining world peace.

Like other studies, this too has a couple of caveats: First, the limited number of interviews conducted may not be representative of the general population of speechwriters at the UN. Second, the speechwriters interviewed were not specifically political speechwriters, but rather speechwriters who write on UN issues which have political consequences. A few speechwriters cautiously clarified that they do not write for political leaders, but for public figures who speak on political issues. Therefore, it is important to note that our finding may
be relevant only for the specific case of the UN and its speechwriters which may not relatable to other political speechwriters.

More scholarship is required concerning values, speeches, speechwriters, and speechwriting before concrete conclusions can be made on how values come to be included in political speeches. In the light of research expansion of this topic, we suggest the following: First it would be beneficial to interview speechwriters of politicians using the same topic guide for comparison purposes. Second, a content analysis of values in the news coverage of political speeches should also be conducted in order study what values interest journalists. Third, we need to explore the way in which political speeches contribute to forming people’s opinion on political actors and issues that fuels or connects different perceptions among different cultures and societies.
Notes

1 The definition for the ten values by Schwartz and Boehnke (2004): “Power” refers to social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources. “Achievement” refers to personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards. “Hedonism” refers to pleasure or sensuous gratification for oneself. “Stimulation” refers to excitement, novelty and challenge in life. “Self-Direction” refers to independent thought and action – choosing, creating, exploring. “Universalism” refers to understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature. “Benevolence” refers to preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact. “Tradition” refers to respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide. “Conformity” refers to restraint of actions, inclinations and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms. “Security” refers to safety, harmony, and stability of society, of relationships, and of self.
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Appendix 1

Table 1.A1: Interview Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Guiding Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.0 General Questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Self-related</td>
<td>Could you tell me some things about yourself? (e.g., where are you from, family, education background).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Work related</td>
<td>How long have you been a speechwriter? (in total, at the UN).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• How/Why did you become a speechwriter?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What is the nature of your current job?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What are your main responsibilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• How much control do you have in what you do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Are there strict rules you must obey?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Are you allowed to be creative?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Would you consider this job to be a flexible one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What interests you most about speechwriting?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Do you have a specific goal which you strive to achieve in life?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What are your guiding principles in life?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Are some more/less important that others?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Do you think your principles one way or the other plays a role in your work (i.e.: speechwriting)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.0 People involved in Speechwriting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Process of speechwriting</td>
<td>Could you please tell us something about the process of speechwriting?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Who gives out the instruction for you to write a speech?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Is the content provided or do you come up with it yourself?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VALUES IN UN SPEECHES

2.2 Delivery by Politician

- Are you tempted to add more than what you actually do write?
- Who proof reads the speeches and certify them fit for delivery?
- Are there changes after the proof reading?
- If yes, it is usually because of conflicting values, style based, content based, or other reasons?
- Do you agree with the changes? (yes/no…why?)

2.2 Delivery by Politician

- Do you watch or listen to the politician reading the speech which you wrote?
- Is the speech delivered exactly as written or do politicians change things?
- If there are changes by the politician, is it usually the content or personal values or change in words due to speaking style?

3.0 Role of Speechwriter

3.1 Extent of Influence

- Are you satisfied with the speeches you write? (if yes/no…why?)
- Do they reflect your personal values in one way or the other? (if yes/no…why?)
- What governs your writing the most (e.g. own values, policies, guidelines, others?)

3.2 Challenges

- Do you consider speechwriting a challenging job?
- What are the challenges you face?
- How do you overcome them?
- Are there conflicts between your own values and the values which you are expected to insert into the speeches?

4.0 Writing Adaptation

4.1 Politician

- Who have you written speeches for?
• Who do you currently write for?
• Do you perceive yourself to have different personal values from the politicians who you write for?
• Do you adapt your writing based on who you write for? (in terms of value, tone, general style?)

4.2 Audience

• Do the politicians you write for have different types of audiences? (e.g. local/international audiences)
• Do they deliver speeches in different locations? (e.g. local/overseas)
• If yes, does this affect the speeches you write?
• Does this effect values which you insert into the speeches?

5.0 Others

Is there anything else you would like to add pertaining to values in speeches?
Appendix 2

Table 1.A2: Excerpt of Coding Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Coding Rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Background</td>
<td>Country of origin, family, education, perceived cultural identity.</td>
<td>“I am originally from Morocco, I went to university in Guyana, I have a lower class honors in Public Relations.”</td>
<td>Explicit reference to personal background, excluding previous jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Schwartz’s values in speechwriter’s personal values</td>
<td>Step 1: Locate the responses to the questions what is your goal in life/ what is your principle.</td>
<td>“I want to make the world a better place”</td>
<td>Explicit reference to personal goals, values, beliefs, principles. This includes family goals and/or work goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1 Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2 Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.3 Hedonism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.4 Stimulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.5 Self-Direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.6 Universalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.7 Benevolence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.8 Tradition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.9 Conformity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.10 Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 Process of Speechwriting

RQ2

6.1 Steps

The process the speechwriters go through when producing a speech. From beginning till end.

“There’s no specific step really. It comes as it comes. Sometimes we receive input from other offices, sometimes we seek out info on the internet. Sometimes I write in advance, sometimes I write better at the 11th hour. It all depends.”

“Writing speeches is like an assembly line. First, I get the order, then I get the content from substantive departments, then I do additional research on the internet, and I sit down and pump it out in a couple of hours.”

Explicit mention of the process. They may not clearly say step 1, 2, or 3. But in general, a description of how they come to produce a speech.

6.2 Governing factors

Factors which play a role in the crafting of a speech. Could be UN policy, theme of event, language flair, substance received from other departments on the issue, the type of audience, etc.

“The policy of the unit comes above all else. There’s a reason why we have been established as a unit, and we have to make that into a message to inform people about what we do and how we can help.”

Explicit reference to the governing factors that shape the speech.
6.3 Voice

Approaches towards the production of the speech. Some are sensitive toward the voice of the speech giver, while others personalize the speech to their own styles.

“I take into account the speech giver’s voice in a speech. If the way I am writing is too aggressive, I think it's not him at all, so I must tailor the speech also according to his voice. It has to sound like it comes from him, not someone else’s words in his mouth.”

“Sometimes when people read or listen to speeches I write, they’ll come to me and say oh, that was so you.”

Explicit mention of speech giver’s voice, style, approach and /or explicit mention of own personal style and approach in a speech.

8.0 Audience Adaptation

8.1 Variety of audiences

Whether or not the speeches written are delivered to many different types of audiences.

“Oh yes, he delivers speeches all over the world. Sometimes here in new York, but also many other places.”

Explicit references to the multiple types of audiences.

8.2 Difference in writing for different audiences

Tailoring the speeches according to the type of audiences they have to address.

“The speeches are delivered to different types of audiences. Different in terms of socio demographic, high income low income. Difference in gender, male

Explicit reference to the tailoring of the speech and the type of audience. There should be no comparison between audiences of different countries.
and female. All sorts of audiences. It all makes a difference."

8.3 Difference in writing for developed or developing country audiences

Tailoring the speech according to audiences from developed and developing countries.

“It’s not the values because the content is the same. But the language is different.”

“There’s no difference. It shouldn’t be a difference.”

“We highlight issues that are more pertinent in the specific countries. Like in Pakistan, the floods, in Libya, a gentle warning to the government.”

Explicit reference to tailoring speeches for audiences from developed and developing countries.