

New World Leadership:

Jacinda Ardern Through the Leadership Trait Analysis Framework

Mauricio Mandujano Manriquez

Monterrey Institute of Technology and Higher Education

M.L. Robert Harmsen, Instructor

3 May 2019

Within International Relations scholarship, foreign policy analysis has always been a quintessential aspect for understanding the international system and the basis for unveiling state behavior. At the foundations of IR, there was a ‘great debate’ between realism and idealism seeking to describe state behavior. Prominent realist theorist E.H. Carr, elaborated on a state-centered self-help International System explanation, which postulated the survival of the state through power acquisition (Weber, 2001:14; Piang-Phanpravit, 2010). On the other hand, idealism can be traced back to Woodrow Wilson’s advocacy for the league of nations, which posits humans as intrinsically good, where the anarchical system will drive cooperation through institutions like the contemporary United Nations (Weber, 2001:67).

Both currents of thought sought to provide prescriptive and descriptive modeling for the workings in the International Arena. However, for most of the 20th Century realism dominated the debate, furthering its explicative power by a permutation to ‘structural realism’ or (neo) realism; as Waltz will account self-help state behavior to the existing structures in the international system and it may or may not be inherently human behavior (Weber, 2001:20; Waltz, 1959:159). During the Cold War, neorealism seemed to provide an accurate description of the International, however, the fall of the Berlin Wall came to challenge its dominance and allowed Fukuyama’s *The End of History?*, as an idealist permutation to neoliberalism, to rise as the new interpreting paradigm (Fukuyama, 1989). Neoliberalism championed liberal democracy and capitalism as the ordering principles of society and posed the ultimate state of human political evolution in the façade of “liberal democratic governments”, where peoples’ interests follow upward to the government and they are reflected at the international level, and cooperation amongst states will ultimately win (Weber, 2001:20) Alas, this was short-lived as 9/11 demonstrated the fragility of the leader of the ‘free world’ and liberal democracies.

Consequently, constructivist and critical theorists such as Alexander Wendt and Robert W. Cox gained prominence by providing alternative accounts to understand the nature of the international system, state behavior and of course foreign policy. Constructivism bridges neorealism and neoliberalism by saying that “Anarchy is what states make of it” providing individual agency for change (Weber, 2001:64; Went, 1992). Yet, it fails to provide a prescriptive framework of analysis. Ultimately, foreign policy analysis is no longer subjugated to grand theories and ordering principles of the international, it is rather viewed as a more dynamic complex understanding through interdisciplinary approaches.

Two of the main approaches employed today for conducting foreign policy analysis are the Putnam’s ‘two-level game’ and the rational actor model (RAM). The two-level game theory argues that foreign policy is shaped by the intertwining forces of the domestic and the international (Putnam, 1988:428). In other words, “At the domestic level, a multitude of actors with different interests – including politicians, bureaucrats, organized interests, think tanks, NGOs, and voters – interact within domestic political institutions like parliaments and ministries to deliberate and determine a country’s foreign policy choices” (Conceição-Heldt, 2017:5). Thereof, to understand foreign policy one must look at the domestic and their interrelations at different levels or dimensions. Meanwhile, RAM assumes actors to “employ purposive action” “consistent preferences” and transitivity in their choices, to have preferred outcomes over the others (Mintz & DeRouen, 2010:58). This model holds strong as the most plausible for universal explaining of foreign policy, but it also has many shortcomings as it does not consider bounded rationality, in-group biases, and stupidity in humans.

For this reason, one alternative way of foreign policy analysis is Margaret Hermann’s Leadership Trait Analysis (LTA). Hermann’s framework provides nuance as it focuses on

assessing individual leadership style instead of assessing the state as a separate unitary actor (Hermann, 2001:4). In turn, LTA posits attention to individual human behavior understood in its particular context to assess decision-making processes borrowing from psychology, communication, sociology, data science, and more disciplines. Through this perspective, one can analyze FP through the individual traits of a leader in the international arena.

Therefore, this paper aims to assess Jacinda Ardern's leadership style through Hermann's LTA framework providing nuance to New Zealand's state behavior in the International arena under Ardern's leadership. This assessment consists of three parts. First, I describe Herman's Leadership Trait Analysis framework. Second, I elaborate on Jacinda Ardern through the LAT framework. Third, I elucidate how Arden's LTA confers New Zealand's Foreign Policy and the shortcomings encountered.

Leadership Trait Analysis Framework

Leadership Trait Analysis (LTA) is a statistical framework that analyzes spontaneous speeches, interviews, and questions answered by a political leader to identify what type of leadership she/he has. It focuses on answering three big questions, (A) "How do leaders react to political constraints in their environment – do they respect or challenge such constraints?"; B "How open are leaders to incoming information – do they selectively use information or are they open to information directing their response?"; C "What are the leaders' reasons for seeking their positions – are they driven by an internal focus of attention within themselves or by the relationships that can be formed with salient constituents?" (Hermann, 2001:5) (*see chart 1*).

Leadership Style as a Function of Responsiveness to Constraints, Openness to Information, and Motivation

Responsiveness to Constraints	Openness to Information	Motivation	
		Problem Focus	Motivation Focus
Challenges Constraints	Closed to Information	<i>Expansionistic</i> (Focus is on expanding one’s power and influence).	<i>Evangelistic</i> (Focus I on persuading others to accept one’s message and join one’s cause)
Challenges Constraints	Open to Information	<i>Incremental</i> (Focus is on maintaining one’s maneuverability and flexibility while avoiding the obstacles that continually try to limit both)	<i>Charismatic</i> (Focus is on achieving one’s agenda by engaging others in the process and persuading them to act)
Respect Constraints	Closed to Information	<i>Directive</i> (Focus is on personally guiding policy along paths consistent with one’s own views while still working within the norms and rules of one’s position)	<i>Consultative</i> (Focus is on monitoring the important others will support, or not actively oppose, what one wants to do in a particular situation)
Respects Constraints	Open to Information	<i>Reactive</i> (Focus is on assessing what is possible in the current situation given nature of the problem and considering what important constituencies will allow)	<i>Accommodative</i> (Focus is on reconciling differences and building consensus, empowering others and sharing accountability in the process)

Chart 1 Challenge Constraints, Openness to Information and Character Chart, (CCOIC Chart) from Hermann 2001

The CCOIC chart above provides a detailed description of the eight possible leadership styles. However, to construct any profile and answer questions A, B, and C, seven specific traits must be assessed are, (1) Belief he/she can control events, (2) Need for power, (3) Conceptual

Complexity, (4) Self Confidence, (5) Task Orientation, (6) Distrust, and (7) In-group bias (Hermann, 2001:10). Respectively, each of these seven traits fit under one of the three main questions that must be addressed for determining leadership style. Under question A, referring to challenging constraints, you find (1) belief she/he can control events and (2) need for power. In question B, openness to information, you find (3) conceptual complexity and (4) self-confidence. Lastly, question C, motivation, you find (5) task orientation, (6) distrust in others and (7) in-group bias (Hermann, 2001:13-31). These seven traits are assessed based on statistical text analysis determined by the number of times specific words, phrases, or parts of speech are used. Upon this assessment, each trait is assigned a value of either low, high, or average (Hermann, 2001:11).

When assigning a value to each trait, either high, low or average, it is necessary to have a baseline or reference case for comparison. For this, Hermann has as a baseline, 122 profiles of political leaders among which 87 were heads of states, from “a range of positions in governments in countries in the Middle East, Africa, the former Soviet Union, and western industrialized democracies” (Hermann, 2001:11). Upon this assessment, Hermann presents her results in a chart of potential comparison groups showing the mean, low, and high values of each trait with standard deviation to classify them (*see chart 2*) (Hermann, 2001:33).

Potential Comparison Groups

Personality Traits	87 Heads of State	122 Political Leaders
Belief Can Control Events	Mean = 0.44 Low < 0.30 High > 0.58	Mean = 0.45 Low < 0.33 High > 0.57
Need for Power	Mean = 0.50 Low < 0.37 High > 0.62	Mean = 0.50 Low < 0.38 High > 0.62
Self-Confidence	Mean = 0.62 Low < 0.44 High > 0.81	Mean = 0.57 Low < 0.34 High > 0.80
Conceptual Complexity	Mean = 0.44 Low < 0.32 High > 0.56	Mean = 0.45 Low < 0.32 High > 0.58
Task Focus	Mean = 0.59 Low < 0.32 High > 0.71	Mean = 0.62 Low < 0.48 High > 0.76
Ingroup Bias	Mean = 0.42 Low < 0.32 High > 0.53	Mean = 0.43 Low < 0.34 High > 0.53
Distrust of Others	Mean = 0.41 Low < 0.25 High > 0.56	Mean = 0.38 Low < 0.20 High > 0.56

Chart 2 Baseline for profile comparison from Hermann 2001

Moreover, in this work, I conducted the Hermann's LTA through a cloud software called *ProfilerPlus.org* created by Social Science Automation. This software counts the corresponding phrases, words or part of speech for each of the seven traits. In the following paragraphs, I elaborate more succinctly how each trait values are calculated according to Hermann's framework.

Question A reactions to constraints.

Leaders’ Reactions to Constraints

Need for power

Score on Belief Can Control Events	Low	High
Low	<i>Respect</i> constraints; work within such parameters toward goals; compromise and consensus building important.	<i>Challenge</i> constraints but less successful in doing so because too direct and open use of power; less able to read how to manipulate people and settings behind the scenes to have desired influence.
High	<i>Challenge</i> constraints but more comfortable doing so in an indirect fashion-behind the scenes; good at being “power behind the throne” where can pull strings but are less accountable for results.	<i>Challenge</i> constraints; are skillful in both direct and indirect influence; know what they want and take charge to see it happens.

Chart 3 Reactions to Constraints in Hermann 2001

Need for power coding schemes.

When coding for ‘need for power’ you must focus on verbs which propose an action “[...]attempting to establish, maintain, or restore his or her power[...]” (Hermann, 2001:15). These are verbs which propose or engages in a strong, forceful actions; give advice when not solicited; “attempts to regulate the behavior of another person or group”; “tries to persuade, bribe, or argue for the sake of doing it”; “endeavors to impress or gain fame with an action”; or “is concerned with his or her reputation or position” (Hermann, 2001:14). To compute this, I divide the number of words reflecting High power (HP) by the sum of words reflecting High (HP) and Low power (LP) illustrated in the following equation.

$$Need\ for\ Power = \frac{HP}{HP+LP}$$

Belief she/he can control events coding schemes.

This trait refers to the self-asserted notion that one can control to a given extent. Hermann refers to the “degree of control [...] there is a perception that individuals, groups, organizations, and governments can influence what happens” (2001:13). When coding for this trait divide the number of words reflecting High control (IC) by the sum of words reflecting High (IC) and Low control (EC) illustrated in the following equation.

$$\text{Belief in Control Over Events} = \frac{IC}{IC+EC}$$

Question B openness to information.

Rules for Determining Openness to Information

Scores on Conceptual Complexity & Self Confidence			Openness to Contextual Information
Conceptual Complexity	>	Self-Confidence	Open
Self-Confidence Complexity	>	Conceptual Complexity	Closed
Self-Confidence Complexity	&	Conceptual Complexity	Open
Both High Self-Confidence Complexity	&	Conceptual Complexity	Closed
Both Low			

Chart 4 Openness to information from Hermann 2001

Conceptual complexity coding schemes.

According to Hermann’s LTA, “Conceptual complexity is the degree of differentiation which an individual show in describing or discussing other people, places, policies, ideas, or

things” (2001:22). A less conceptually complex individual “tends to classify objects and ideas into good-bad, black-white, either-or dimensions”; While a more conceptually complex one makes a more moderate assessment (Hermann, 2001:22). When coding for this trait I will look at two variables (1) amount of words used either reflecting high or low conceptual complexity, where high complexity refers to words such as “approximately, possibility, trend” or low conceptual complexity such as “absolutely, without a doubt, certainly, and irreversible, bad, good” (Hermann, 2001:22). And word length (2), according to Lewis “Complexity as a function of word length in terms of number of phonemes” (Lewis, 2016:43). This calculation is done by calculating High Complexity (HC) divided by the number of words of High (HC) and Low Complexity (LC).

$$\text{Conceptual Complexity} = \frac{HC}{HC + LC}$$

Self-confidence coding schemes.

For Hermann, this trait focuses on the pronouns “my,” “myself,” “I,” “me,” and “mine” this connotes the self-perceived importance in addressing any matter (2001:21). Referring to “How speakers interject these pronouns into their speech, how important do they see themselves as being to what is happening?” (Hermann, 2001:21). For this I will compute, High Self-confidence (HS) divided by the number of words of High (HS) and Low Self-confidence (LS) analyzed.

$$\text{Self confidence} = \frac{HS}{HS + LS}$$

Question C Motivation.**Rules for Assessing Motivation for Seeking Office**

Score on Task Focus	Motivation for Seeking Office
High	Problem
Moderate	Both Problem & Relationship Depending on the Context
Low	Relationship

Chart 5 Assessing Motivation from Hermann 2001

Task Focus coding schemes.

Leaders and politicians around the world have been recognized as performing two distinct functions in groups. One is focusing on the problem-solving approach while the other focuses on building relationships (Hermann, 2001:24). According to Hermann, “leaders who emphasize the problem, moving the group forward toward a goal is their principal purpose for assuming leadership” meanwhile “those who emphasize group maintenance and establishing relationships, keeping the loyalty of constituents and morale high are the central functions of leadership” (Hermann, 2001: 25). When coding for this trait, I focus on ‘instrumental activity’ (HT) and words reflecting ‘concern for another’s feelings, desires, and satisfaction’ (LT). Some task-oriented words are “accomplishment, achieve(ment), plan, position, proposal, recommendation, tactic ” (Hermann, 2001:26). While some group maintaining task are, “appreciation, amnesty, collaboration, disappoint(ment), forgive(ness), harm, liberation, suffering” (Hermann, 2001:26).

$$Task\ Focus = \frac{HT}{HT + LT}$$

Motivation Toward the World

Ingroup Bias	Distrust of Others	
	Low	High
Low	World is not a threatening place; conflicts are perceived as a context-specific and are reacted to on a case-by-case basis; leaders recognize that their country, like many others, has to deal with certain constraints what one can do and call for flexibility response; moreover, there are certain international arenas where cooperation with others is both possible and feasible. <i>(Focus is on taking advantage of opportunities and building relationships)</i>	World is perceived as conflict-prone, but because other countries are view as having constraints on what they can do, some flexibility in response is possible; leaders, however, must vigilantly monitor developments in the international arena and prudently prepare to contain and adversary’s actions while still pursuing their countries’ interests. <i>(Focus is one taking advantage of opportunities and building relationships while remaining vigilant)</i>
High	While the international system is a zero-sum game, leaders view that it is bounded by a specified set of international norms; even so, adversaries are perceived as inherently threatening and confrontation is viewed to be ongoing as leaders work to limit threat and enhance their countries’ capabilities and relative status. <i>(Focus is on dealing with threats and solving problems even though some situations may appear to offer opportunities.)</i>	International politics is centered around a set of adversaries that are viewed as “evil” and intent on spreading ideology or extending their power at the expense of others; leaders perceive that they have a moral imperative to confront these adversaries; as a result, they are likely to engage in highly aggressive behavior. <i>(Focus is on eliminating potential threats and problems.)</i>

Chart 6 Motivation toward the world in Hermann 2001.

This trait tells us whether s driven by the threats or problems he or she perceives in the world or by the opportunities to form cooperative relationships more focused on protecting their own kind leaders are the more threats they are likely to perceive in the environment and the more focused they will be on confronting those responsible. Leaders who are not so intense in this desire

are capable of seeing the possibilities for win-win agreements and building relationships in international politics since the world is viewed not as a threatening place.

Distrust in Others coding schemes.

Distrust of others refers to “a general feeling of doubt, uneasiness, misgiving, and wariness about others” continuously suspecting about the hidden motives and actions of others distrusting them. I further look if the leader “distrust, doubt, have misgivings about, feel uneasy about, or feel wary about what these persons or groups are doing?” and what are his/her perceptions about it (Hermann, 2001:30). When coding for this trait I focus on nouns and noun phrases about people whom they do not identify. For computing this it is the amount of High distrust divided by High and Low distrust phrases.

$$\text{Distrust in others} = \frac{HD}{HD + LD}$$

Ingroup Bias coding schemes.

Ingroup Bias refers to how the leader’s perception of its country’s role in the world concerning other States. By believing so there is an “emphasis on the importance of maintaining ingroup culture and status” (Hermann, 2001:29). When coding for this trait, I look at “the modifiers used favorably (e.g., ‘great,’ ‘peace-loving,’ progressive,’ ‘successful,’ ‘prosperous’), if leaders suggest “suggest strength (e.g., ‘powerful,’ ‘capable,’ ‘made great advances,’ ‘has boundless resources’)” or if they assert the maintaining of the “group honor and identity (e.g., ‘need to defend firmly our borders’, ‘must maintain our own interpretation’, ‘decide our own policies’ (Hermann, 2001:29). These aforementioned adjectives refer to High ingroup bias (HB) while opposite ones are computed for Low ingroup Bias (LB).

$$\text{Ingroup Bias} = \frac{HB}{HB + LB}$$

New Zealand's Prime Minister as a case of study.

Earlier in 2019, Jacinda Ardern, New Zealand's prime minister, was put on the International spotlight amid the unfolding of the Christchurch mass shooting by a white supremacist. After condemning the attack as an act of terrorism in her domestic address, Ardern has been continuously praised by the international community. Ardern implicitly associated this attack to Islamic extremism in her address when she said that, "the world has been stuck in a vicious cycle of extremism breeding extremism and it must end"; she added, "In the days that have followed the **terrorist attack** on the 15th of March, we have often found ourselves without words" (Ardern, 2019 [emphasis added]). Denouncing an existing necessity to enact gun laws within New Zealand through bipartisan cooperation to effectively eradicate this problem. These words were days later reaffirmed with the banning "all "military-style" semi-automatics, assault rifles and high capacity magazines" (Deboush, 2019). Unsurprisingly, these legislative actions were highly contrasted by news networks within the United States recalling multiple shootings that occurred since the Columbine Massacre.

Previously, Ardern had already received international focus when she took her recently born baby to a United Nations General Assembly address in September 2018. Such actions taken by the prime minister arrived at the international arena as a reaffirming symbol of women empowerment. In sum, individual actions and characteristics of Jacinda Ardern hence provide insight into her personality and the way she will conduct NZ foreign policy during her term in office.

In order to employ the Leadership Trait Analysis framework in the case of Jacinda Ardern, I gathered fifty diverse primary sources ranging from interviews, to speeches, debates, oral questions, among others. The timeframe was from early 2008 until April 2019 (*See chart 7*). The

majority of them were either spontaneous (27) or unexpected (16). These sources were oral questions answered at the Hansard debates or press interviews. I also decided to include 12 prepared sources speeches for the general senate or for international institutions because they will also contribute to unveil leadership style. Moreover, these texts were also classified into six different categories where politics and social were the largest themes making up 38 of the total analyzed texts. Lastly, most texts ranged from 200-999 words having 31 of the total texts analyzed.

Classification of Sources Assessed for J. Ardern LTA 2008-2019

50 Primary Sources	Spontaneous 27	Economics	> 100 words
		5	2
	Unexpected 16	Social	100-199 words
		19	8
		Politics	200-499 words
		19	14
Prepared 12	International	500-999 words	
	2	17	
	Personal	1000-1999 words	
		3	6
		Other	2000+ words
		2	3

Chart 7 Jacinda Ardern sources employed self-made.

Upon this categorization of the texts, each source was individually assessed either High, Low, or Mean for each of the seven traits to build up the general quantitative trait assessment for Jacinda Ardern. The general results can be seen in the chart below (*see chart 8*). Complementary to this quantitative analysis obtained from *Profilerplus.org*, in this section, I extracted qualitative insights from the analyzed texts for each of the seven traits to elucidate the established trait coefficient evaluations.

Jacinda Ardern's Seven Traits Results

Challenge constraints	Belief Can Control Events	0.3003 Low	Respects
	Need for power	0.2005 Low	
Openness to information	Conceptual Complexity	0.6081 High	Open
	Self Confidence	0.3768 Low	
Motivation	<i>Motivation for Seeking Office</i>		Both Problem & Relationship
	Task Orientation	0.6556 Mean	Depending on the Context
	<i>Motivation Toward the World</i>		Focus is on taking advantage of opportunities and building relationships
	Distrust	0.1853 Low	
	In-group bias	0.0799 Low	

Chart 8 Individual trait assessment from sources analyzed, self-made.

A) Challenge constraints.*Arden's belief can control events*

On this trait, she was rated low with a 0.30 compared to the political leaders mean at 0.45. Individual ratings from the texts only five were ranked higher than the 0.45 primarily from General debate reports or oral questions. Source 2013 October 23rd General debate was the highest at 0.66. Here, Ardern was advocating for crime and job loss prevention, with an emphasis in the screen industry in NZ arguing that “The crime of it all is that it is entirely preventable, but this out-of-touch Government is sitting on the sidelines while this absolutely critical industry is decimated” (New Zealand Parliament, 2013:14195). However, the great majority of texts (27) ranked below 0.33. The lowest being at 0.08 from a 2012 General Debate, where she attributed unemployment

to the increased inaction taken by the Minister of Social Development, stating that, “if they cannot improve the economy, all they can change is social security, and that is the injustice of all of this” (New Zealand Parliament, 2012b). In essence, Ardern believes she can control events to a low degree if not aided by other government bodies to address social, economic and political issues.

Ardern's need for power

On this trait, she was rated low with 0.20 of average well below the 0.50 mean from political leaders. From all texts, none of them were above 0.50, only two, the Oral questions from Dec 19th, 2017 and an interview from Feb. 2012, were rated at this coefficient. During the oral questions, Ardern reaffirmed the necessity to have Kiwi Build homes, “homes that would otherwise not have been built had it not been for the intervention of the Government” (New Zealand Parliament, 2017:726). Yet, the majority of them, 40 to be exact, were between 0.38 and 0. During the March 13th, 2019 Oral Questions, rated at 0, Ardern made subtle insinuations about ‘ministerial capacity’ arguing that, “I do not agree with the insinuation there that the member has made; however, the Minister, obviously, was speaking in a ministerial capacity” (New Zealand Parliament, 2019a). Overall, these statistical metrics indicate that Ardern does not have a strong need for power.

Cross analyzing the need for power and belief can control events I located Ardern at low-low meaning. That she will, “**Respect constraints**; work within such parameters toward goals; compromise and consensus-building important” (Hermann, 2001).

B) Openness to information.*Conceptual Complexity*

On conceptual complexity Ardern was coefficient was 0.60 indicating a High Conceptual Complexity. Out of the 50 texts analyzed 28 of them were rated above 0.58 and only 2 were rated as low (below 0.32). The lowest rated was Oral Questions from 2019 April 10th, where Ardern made a couple of bold claims about government inaction oversimplifying housing issues. She noted that “We know that when it comes to rent, supply is the biggest issue that we face, and we have had to start not from a standing start but, because of that last Government's inaction, we have had to try and rebuild what has been an absolute crisis situation” (New Zealand Parliament, 2019b). Meanwhile, her 2018 November 11th speech at the Armistice Day Ceremony was rated at 0.87, having the highest coefficient, where she denounced industrial warfare, she stated, “Today we remember all the lives changed by the First World War. We consider the families across New Zealand that faced an uncertain future without loved ones in a world indelibly altered by the horrors of industrial, modern warfare” (Scoopnews, 2019). This denotes New Zealand’s prime minister is high in conceptual complexity.

Self-Confidence

On Self-confidence, Ardern overall rating was rated low at 0.30 well below 0.80 high and 0.57 mean. Out of the fifty sources, only two were rated above the mean 0.57 each with 0.66 respectively, while the remaining ones rated as low as zero. From the only two high rated ones, source 2009 March 13th Oral Questions, where she strongly refers to her stance, saying “No [...] I've already shared in public my view on those comments. I have said that I considered them ill-advised” (New Zealand Parliament, 2009). Conversely, most of the texts analyzed show low self-

confidence such as the 2012 General debate address where she converged her opinion in a broader sense, stating that, “We looked at the numbers yesterday. Based on the numbers Labour had available to us at the time, because the Ministry of Social Development releases slightly sporadic numbers to us [...]” (New Zealand Parliament, 2012a:3424). Clearly showing a strong sense of responsibility and cooperative action.

Looking at the interrelation between conceptual complexity raking *very high* and having self-confidence at *low*, Conceptual Complexity > Self-Confidence, Jacinda Ardern is ***Open to contextual information.***

C) Motivation.

Task Focus

In this trait, Jacinda Ardern scored 0.65 which falls into the mean category below 0.72 High and above 0.48. In 20 of the 50 texts analyzed she scored High contrary to just 9 scoring Low. The lowest rated was the 2019 April 10th Oral Questions, scored at 0.25. During the session Ardern, sought to maintain group while discussing rental prices, acknowledging “Yes, we have an issue with rental prices in New Zealand. I accept that. What I do not accept is the member's assertion that it isn't about supply—it is” (New Zealand Parliament, 2019). Though differing in opinion, she recognized the value of collaboration. Conversely, one of the highest scored text on task orientation was the 2012 June 27th General Debate where she addressed the inefficacy of government actions to foster job opportunities, stating that “In Labour we are all for accountability. We are all for aspiration, but targets without a plan are absolutely meaningless” and “the Government has left a stark gap in between as to how it is going to achieve that” (New Zealand Parliament, 2012b). Demonstrating an objective-based mentality diminishing, group maintenance.

However, the majority of texts oscillated at the mean such as the 2014 May 21st Budget Debate scored at 0.62. There, Ardern emphasized the people's needs, arguing that "That is what this Budget should have been about. The things that people are worried about are really simple, basic needs" and reaffirming "We will introduce a capital gains tax so that our tax system is fairer and we will move away from a housing market that is dominated by speculators" (Ardern, 2014:18181). This is a clear emphasis on building relationships with task-oriented focus. This positions Ardern at *Moderate* on task focus, meaning Both Problem & Relationship Depending on the Context.

Distrust

In distrust, Jacinda Ardern scored a low 0.18 Low compared to the mean of 0.38 and high of 0.56 from the political leaders. From all 50 sources, only 1 was rated as high distrust at 0.6 contrasting to 8 sources oscillating in-between while the great majority, 41, were rated as low. Interestingly enough the only source rated as high with 0.6 was her address after the Christchurch Attack March 15th, 2019. During her address, Ardern strongly denounced the attackers as "people who I would describe as having extremist views that have absolutely no place in New Zealand and, in fact, have no place in the world" (Britton, 2019). The rating on her speech came unsurprising, given that the Christchurch attack was the worst mass shooting in New Zealand's history. Moreover, one of the lowest-rated assessments was the 2018 January 30th Obituaries rated at 0. There, she highlighted the commotion regarding former politician Jim Anderton highlighting that "He was motivated by his profound sense of compassion for people, from his belief that the dignity of people mattered the most" (New Zealand Parliament, 2018). Overall, Jacinda raked low in distrust of others demonstrating trust in others.

In-group bias

On the last trait, Ardern was also rated as Low with her 0.0799. From all the seven traits analyzed this was the lowest of all as it is extremely below the 0.43 Mean and the 0.53 High from political leaders. Interestingly enough all 50 texts were rated as low, with the highest rated text barely scoring 0.33. This text was also the 2018 January 30th Obituaries. Ardern accentuated the role of Anderton positioning New Zealand at the world forefront when she stated that, “He[Anderton] was a man before his time, a true progressive. He was at the forefront of anti-nuclear policy and of the anti-racism movement during the Springbok tour in the early 1980s and was committed to social justice” (New Zealand Parliament, 2018). However, Ardern’s general tone is of low in-group bias. A clear example is her 2015 August 27th Third Readings, where she admitted “It is a regret, therefore, for the Labour Party, that we are unable to support this legislation. And there was a point where we thought it might have been possible. We supported the bill as it was introduced into Parliament”; while discussing a piece of legislation she still confers the unity of the parliament without denouncing external enemies or through politics of othering. This positions Ardern at extremely Low in ingroup bias reinforcing her conceptual complexity by not oversimplifying issues.

Cross analyzing in-group bias and distrust, both scoring low, means that Ardern views the world, not a threatening place and conflicts are perceived as context-specific while recognizing New Zealand’s constraints with many areas of cooperation at the International level. According to Hermann’s framework, her “*Focus is on taking advantage of opportunities and building relationships*” (2001). Further cross analyzing results from task focus *Moderate* and those from Motivation toward the world *Low-Low* (both in in-group bias and distrust). It can be said that Jacinda Ardern can be *Reactive* or *Accommodative*. Aspects which will be later elaborated in the final section.

Conclusion

Having scored and analyzed all seven traits from Hermann's framework it is possible to now move towards the leadership style classification or CCOIC chart. Based on the assessment Ardern stands on the last row of the CCOIC chart as she, *Respects Constraints* and is *Open to Information* while being either *Reactive* or *Accommodative*.

Respect constraints entail that Ardern will work within current parameters to achieve desired goals where compromise and consensus are paramount. Essentially Ardern will abide by the current international framework when conducting foreign policy. Looking ahead at New Zealand issues, any controversies regarding territorial or sea shelf, Exclusive economic zones and other potential claims will most likely be addressed through already established mechanisms of international law by UNCLOS. Meanwhile, Ardern is open to incoming information acknowledging the complexity of issues and the broad spectrum of things. It is unlikely that NZ foreign policy will take unplanned actions. This was exemplified after the Christchurch Massacre since the proper enactment of the implementation bill on the banning of assault weapons and high capacity magazines came after a month of discussion and review. Lastly, Ardern can be either reactive or accommodative. Reactive, by focusing on what can be done in a present situation considering the causes of the problem and what is allowed by constituents, as in the case of Christchurch. Accommodative, focusing on reconciling, consensus building, empowering others and sharing accountability, as in the case of the general debate on the housing and market speculator problem. Overall, under Jacinda's leadership, this serves as an indicative tool for what kind of foreign policy will New Zealand conduct and what can be expected from it.

It is worth noting that this is not a holistic, nor comprehending analysis but it builds upon an already established methodology of content analysis further enhanced by qualitative insight

from the sources analyzed. Additionally, given the further categorizing of sources, complementary analysis based on word count, topic and date could be performed to find deviation on stances across trait scores. Illustrating trends or shifts on individual trait scores could provide nuance to the aggregate scores previously described. In brief, this assessment on Jacinda Ardern provides insight into her persona and the leadership style while grounded knowledge for future research.

Works-Cited

- Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing (Abridged Eds.). *Allyn and Bacon*. Boston: MA. Retrieved from https://www.apu.edu/live_data/files/333/blooms_taxonomy_action_verbs.pdf
- Ardern, J. (2019). Jacinda Ardern's full Christchurch speech: 'Let us be the nation we believe ourselves to be' [Video File]. *Guardian News*. Retrieved from, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/mar/29/jacinda-arderns-speech-at-christchurch-memorial-full-transcript>
- Britton, B.(2019). New Zealand PM full speech: 'This can only be described as a terrorist attack'. CNN. Retrieved on April 17, 2019 from, <https://edition.cnn.com/2019/03/15/asia/new-zealand-jacinda-ardern-full-statement-intl/index.html>
- Conceição-Heldt, E & Mello, P. (2017). Two-Level Games in Foreign Policy Analysis. Research Gate. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315698803_Two-Level_Games_in_Foreign_Policy_Analysis
- Deboush, C. (2019). How New Zealand Was Able to Change Its Gun Laws Within Days of the Christchurch Killings. *Furtune*. Retrieved from <http://fortune.com/2019/03/21/new-zealand-new-gun-laws/>
- Fukuyama, F. (1989). *The end of History?*. The National Interest. Retrieved from, https://www.embl.de/aboutus/science_society/discussion/discussion_2006/ref1-22june06.pdf
- Hermann, M. (2001). Assessing leadership style: a trait analysis. *Social Science Automation*. Retrieved from, <https://socialscience.net/docs/LTA.pdf>

Levine, N. & Young, D., M. (2014) Leadership Trait Analysis and Threat Assessment with Profiler Plus. *Proceedings of ILC 2014 on 8th International Lisp Conference*, Montreal, QC, Canada — August 14 - 17, 2014. Association for Computing Machinery.

New Zealand Parliament. (2009). 3. Question No. 3—Prime Minister. Retrieved on April 16, 2019 from
https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/hansarddebates/rhr/document/49HansS_20090518_0001015/ardern-jacinda

New Zealand Parliament. (2012a). Jacinda Ardern: General Debate. Read Hansard Debates. Vol. 681 P. 3424. Retrieved on April 17, 2019 from,
https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/hansarddebates/rhr/document/50HansS_20120627_00000821/ardern-jacinda-general-debate

New Zealand Parliament. (2012b). Read Hansard Reports Jacinda Ardern. Retrieved on April 17, 2019 from, https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/hansarddebates/rhr/document/50HansS_20120614_00000112/ardern-jacinda-questions-for-oral-answer-questions

New Zealand Parliament. (2013). Jacinda Ardern: General Debate. Read Hansard Reports. Vol. 694 P. 14195. Retrieved on April 17, 2019 from,
https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/hansarddebates/rhr/document/50HansS_20131023_00000836/ardern-jacinda-general-debate

New Zealand Parliament. (2015). Jacinda Ardern: Budget Debate. Read Hansard Reports Vol. 708 P. 6289. Retrieved on April 17, 2019 from,
https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/hansarddebates/rhr/document/51HansS_20150827_00001187/ardern-jacinda-third-readings

New Zealand Parliament. (2017). KiwiBuild, Tax Rates, and Winter Energy PaymentRead

Hansard Reports: Volume 726. New Zealand Parliament. Retrieved on April 16, 2019 from, https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/hansard-debates/rhr/combined/hansd_20171219_20171219

New Zealand Parliament. (2018). Jacinda Ardern: Obituaries — Hon James Patrick (Jim)

Anderton CNZM & Gail Helen McIntosh. Read Hansard Reports. Retrieved on April 17, 2019 from, https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/hansard-debates/rhr/document/HansS_20180130_050625000/ardern-jacinda

New Zealand Parliament. (2019a). 3. Question No. 3—Prime Minister. Retrieved on April 16, 2019 from

https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/hansarddebates/rhr/document/49HansS_20090518_00001015/ardern-jacinda

New Zealand Parliament. (2019). Oral Questions — Questions to Ministers: Question No. 1—

Prime Minister. Retrieved on April 27, 2019 from,

https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/hansarddebates/rhr/combined/HansDeb_20190410_20190410_04

Piang-Phanprasit, P. (2010) How convincing is E. H. Carr's critique of utopianism?. *E-*

International Relations Students. Retrieved from, https://www.e-ir.info/2010/06/09/how-convincing-is-e-h-carr%E2%80%99s-critique-of-utopianism/#_ftn2

Putnam, R. (1988). Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games.

International Organization, 42 (3). 427-460.

Scoop: Independent News (2019). Speech: Ardern - Armistice Day National Ceremony 2018.

Scoop: Independent News. Retrieved on April 17, 2019 from,

<http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PA1811/S00119/speech-ardern-armistice-day-national-ceremony-2018.htm>

Waltz, K. N. (1959). *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Weber, C. (2001). *International Relations Theory: A Critical Introduction*. Routledge: London.

Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics. *International Organization*, 46(2), 391-425. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2706858>

Appendix A

Leadership Trait Analysis	<p>Coding schemes for Leadership Trait Analysis, Margaret G. Hermann's seven traits used in the assessment of leadership style: belief in ability to control events, need for power, conceptual complexity, self-confidence, task orientation, distrust, and in-group bias.</p> <p>Spanish language coding schemes are provided courtesy of M. Consuelo Thiers.</p> <p>Unless otherwise requested, the LTA Classic coding scheme will be provided. This is the reference version for most academic research.</p>
Belief in Control Over Events	<p>Degree of control the author perceives over the situations the author is in; there is a perception that individuals, groups, organizations and governments can influence what happens. Coding for belief in control over events focuses on verbs. It is assumed that when people take responsibility for planning or initiating an action, they believe that they have some control over what happens. Action proposed or taken by the author or a group with whom he or she identifies indicates belief in control over events.</p>
Conceptual Complexity	<p>Degree of differentiation which the author shows in describing or discussing other people, places, policies, ideas, or things. Coding for conceptual complexity focuses on particular words that suggest the author can see different dimensions in the environment and words that indicate the author sees only a few categories along which to classify objects and ideas. Examples of words that are suggestive of high conceptual complexity include: approximately, possibility, trend, and for example. Examples of words that are suggestive of of low conceptual complexity include: absolutely, without a doubt, certainly, and irreversible.</p>
Distrust	<p>Wariness about others or the degree of the author's inclination to suspect the motives and actions of others. Coding for distrust focuses on references persons other than the leader and to groups other than those with whom the leader identifies that convey distrust, doubt, misgivings or concern about what these persons or groups are doing.</p>
In-Group Bias	<p>A view of the world in which one's own group (social, political, ethnic, etc) holds center stage, is perceived as the best, and/or there are strong emotional attachments to this in-group. Coding for in-group bias focuses on words or phrases referring to the author's own group that: are favorable (for example, "great," "peace-loving,"</p>

	<p>progressive,” “successful,” “prosperous”); suggest strength (for example, “powerful,” “capable,” “made great advances,” “has boundless resources”); or indicate the need to maintain group honor and identity (for example, “need to defend firmly our borders,” “must maintain our own interpretation,” “decide our own policies”).</p>
Need for Power	<p>Degree of author's concern for establishing, maintaining, or restoring one's power or, in other words, the desire to control, influence, or have an impact on other persons or groups. Coding for need for power focuses on verbs where the author (1) proposes or engages in a strong, forceful action such as an assault or attack, a verbal threat, an accusation, or a reprimand; (2) gives advice or assistance when it is not solicited; (3) attempts to regulate the behavior of another person or group; (4) tries to persuade, bribe, or argue with someone else so long as the concern is not to reach agreement or avoid disagreement; (5) endeavors to impress or gain fame with an action; or (6) is concerned with his or her reputation or position.</p>
Self-Confidence	<p>The author's sense of self-importance, or image of his or her ability to cope adequately with objects and persons in the environment. Coding for self-confidence focuses on the pronouns “my,” “myself,” “I,” “me,” and “mine.” When the use of the pronoun reflects that the speaker: is instigating an activity (for example, “I am going to . . .,” “That is my plan of action”), should be viewed as an authority figure on this issue (for example, “If it were up to me . . .,” “Let me explain what we mean”), or is the recipient of a positive response from another person or group (for example, “You flatter me with your praise,” “My position was accepted”) self-confidence is indicated.</p>
Task Orientation	<p>The author's relative emphasis on interactions with others when dealing problems as opposed to focusing on the feelings and needs of relevant and important constituents. Coding for task orientation, attention focuses on words that indicate work on a task or instrumental activity as well as words that center around concern for another's feelings, desires, and satisfaction. For example, accomplishment, achieve(ment), plan, position, proposal, recommendation, and tactic are task-oriented, whilst appreciation, amnesty, collaboration, disappoint(ment), forgive(ness), harm, liberation, suffering are group maintenance words.</p>

Appendix B

Jacinda Ardern Individual Sources Results																					
Filename	H D	L D	DIS	H T	LT	TAS K	IC	E C	BAC E	H B	LB	IGB	HS	LS	SC	HC	L C	CC	H P	LP	PWR
2008_12_1 6	12	36	0.25	36	30	0.545 5	26	92	0.220 3	4	28	0.125	30	10 6	0.220 6	83	45	0.648 4	22	87	0.201 8
2009_03_1 3	0	5	0	12	8	0.6	9	19	0.321 4	0	5	0	16	12	0.571 4	19	12	0.612 9	4	24	0.142 9
2010_09_3 0	1	1	0.5	16	6	0.727 3	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	10	4	0.714 3	0	2	0
2011_02_1 1	1	4	0.2	28	2	0.933 3	2	20	0.090 9	1	20	0.047 6	2	3	0.4	35	16	0.686 3	5	17	0.227 3
2011_03_2 2	0	1	0	7	1	0.875	0	4	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	4	1	0.8	0	4	0
2011_06_1 0	0	2	0	1	2	0.333 3	0	0	999	0	0	999	0	0	999	7	6	0.538 5	0	0	999
2011_07_0 5	0	0	999	3	2	0.6	0	0	999	0	1	0	0	0	999	4	0	1	0	0	999
2011_07_1 2	0	2	0	2	1	0.666 7	0	0	999	0	0	999	0	0	999	4	0	1	0	0	999
2011_07_1 4	0	1	0	6	7	0.461 5	2	1	0.666 7	0	0	999	0	4	0	8	1	0.888 9	0	3	0
2011_11_1 6	1	1	0.5	17	7	0.708 3	12	15	0.444 4	1	16	0.058 8	11	2	0.846 2	9	6	0.6	3	23	0.115 4

2012_06_0 4	0	0	999	10	3	0.769 2	0	0	999	0	0	999	0	0	999	3	2	0.6	0	0	999
2012_06_1 9	2	2	0.5	10	3	0.769 2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	999	4	1	0.8	0	1	0
2012_06_2 7	0	6	0	28	10	0.736 8	3	17	0.15	1	14	0.066 7	2	3	0.4	32	13	0.711 1	7	11	0.388 9
2012_07_1 4	0	0	999	10	3	0.769 2	0	0	999	0	0	999	0	0	999	3	2	0.6	0	0	999
2012_08_2 3	0	1	0	2	3	0.4	2	6	0.25	0	4	0	3	4	0.428 6	8	2	0.8	0	8	0
2012_11_1 4	2	2	0.5	27	5	0.843 8	1	11	0.083 3	0	4	0	3	5	0.375	27	26	0.509 4	1	11	0.083 3
2013_03_2 0	1	8	0.111 1	20	12	0.625	6	24	0.2	2	22	0.083 3	6	2	0.75	31	26	0.543 9	6	24	0.2
2013_05_2 9	6	7	0.461 5	21	16	0.567 6	11	29	0.275	2	42	0.045 5	2	2	0.5	50	50	0.5	3	34	0.081 1
2013_10_2 3	1	2	0.333 3	18	2	0.9	8	11	0.421 1	2	15	0.117 6	1	5	0.166 7	28	21	0.571 4	4	12	0.25
2014_05_0 7	2	10	0.166 7	19	8	0.703 7	10	23	0.303	7	24	0.225 8	3	3	0.5	30	26	0.535 7	5	27	0.156 2
2014_05_2 1	4	4	0.5	34	20	0.629 6	15	31	0.326 1	3	37	0.075	5	4	0.555 6	63	47	0.572 7	10	34	0.227 3
2014_05_2 7	7	13	0.35	31	23	0.574 1	12	41	0.226 4	1	42	0.023 3	13	19	0.406 2	75	35	0.681 8	8	45	0.150 9

2015_05_0 7	1	1	0.5	9	1	0.9	0	0	999	0	0	999	0	0	999	6	3	0.666 7	0	0	999
2015_08_2 7	1	20	0.047 6	16	22	0.421 1	10	15	0.4	0	19	0	3	12	0.2	19	15	0.558 8	6	18	0.25
2015_09_2 3	0	0	999	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	999	1	1	0.5	4	0	1	1	1	0.5
2016_03_0 9	0	16	0	12	2	0.857 1	0	0	999	0	0	999	0	0	999	4	3	0.571 4	0	0	999
2016_03_1 6	0	6	0	2	4	0.333 3	0	0	999	0	0	999	0	0	999	6	0	1	0	0	999
2016_06_2 9	2	11	0.153 8	14	11	0.56	9	8	0.529 4	0	14	0	2	3	0.4	36	25	0.590 2	6	11	0.352 9
2017_03_2 3	1	6	0.142 9	3	2	0.6	3	4	0.428 6	0	8	0	0	2	0	5	7	0.416 7	3	3	0.5
2017_04_1 2	1	8	0.111 1	16	12	0.571 4	9	16	0.36	4	27	0.129	3	6	0.333 3	26	16	0.619	4	18	0.181 8
2017_05_1 3	2	2	0.5	3	1	0.75	7	16	0.304 3	0	1	0	6	22	0.214 3	13	18	0.419 4	7	15	0.318 2
2017_05_3 0	5	15	0.25	25	9	0.735 3	9	37	0.195 7	2	42	0.045 5	7	5	0.583 3	62	43	0.590 5	7	38	0.155 6
2017_08_0 1	1	5	0.166 7	9	3	0.75	5	5	0.5	0	0	999	6	7	0.461 5	29	4	0.878 8	2	8	0.2
2017_08_1 2	2	13	0.133 3	16	5	0.761 9	3	12	0.2	4	18	0.181 8	2	4	0.333 3	26	23	0.530 6	2	14	0.125

2017_12_1 9	0	0	999	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	999	1	1	0.5	4	0	1	1	1	0.5
2017_12_2 0	3	6	0.333 3	10	5	0.666 7	8	20	0.285 7	2	12	0.142 9	9	7	0.562 5	18	16	0.529 4	0	27	0
2018_01_3 0	0	22	0	14	4	0.777 8	2	7	0.222 2	2	4	0.333 3	2	4	0.333 3	16	13	0.551 7	2	7	0.222 2
2018_02_2 1	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	999	1	0	1	2	3	0.4	0	1	0
2018_03_2 7	0	7	0	17	8	0.68	13	14	0.481 5	0	1	0	10	17	0.370 4	25	11	0.694 4	10	17	0.370 4
2018_04_0 3	0	2	0	2	2	0.5	2	1	0.666 7	0	2	0	1	1	0.5	7	2	0.777 8	1	2	0.333 3
2018_05_0 1	0	4	0	2	5	0.285 7	1	7	0.125	0	3	0	2	5	0.285 7	3	4	0.428 6	3	5	0.375
2018_06_1 4	3	14	0.176 5	25	23	0.520 8	37	10	0.266 2	4	48	0.076 9	45	65	0.409 1	131	53	0.712	16	11	0.121 2
2018_11_0 3	1	17	0.055 6	73	22	0.768 4	57	87	0.395 8	7	11	0.058 3	15	18	0.454 5	84	75	0.528 3	43	95	0.311 6
2018_11_1 1	1	5	0.166 7	9	11	0.45	4	15	0.210 5	5	18	0.217 4	4	0	1	18	13	0.580 6	6	13	0.315 8
2019_03_1 3	0	5	0	12	8	0.6	9	19	0.321 4	0	5	0	16	12	0.571 4	19	12	0.612 9	4	24	0.142 9
2019_03_1 5	4	2	0.666 7	7	13	0.35	11	17	0.392 9	2	23	0.08	3	6	0.333 3	23	17	0.575	5	25	0.166 7

2019_03_2 3	0	8	0	29	9	0.763 2	19	37	0.339 3	1	33	0.029 4	12	16	0.428 6	34	29	0.539 7	11	40	0.215 7
2019_04_1 0a	1	2	0.333 3	1	3	0.25	8	10	0.444 4	0	9	0	0	10	0	1	5	0.166 7	4	14	0.222 2
2019_04_1 0b	3	12	0.2	20	10	0.666 7	22	65	0.252 9	7	48	0.127 3	18	28	0.391 3	64	27	0.703 3	17	69	0.197 7
2019_04_1 9	1	2	0.333 3	1	3	0.25	8	10	0.444 4	0	9	0	0	10	0	1	5	0.166 7	4	14	0.222 2
Total	73	32 1	0.185 3	70 8	37 2	0.655 6	37 6	87 6	0.300 3	64	73 7	0.079 9	26 6	44 0	0.376 8	122 1	78 7	0.608 1	24 2	96 5	0.200 5

Listed as BACE in result file; IC = Internal Control; EC = External Control.
 Listed as PWR in result file; HP = High Power; LP = Low Power.
 Listed as SC in result file; HS = High Self Confidence; LS = Low Self Confidence.
 Listed as CC in result file; HC = High Conceptual Complexity; LC = Low Conceptual Complexity.
 Listed as TASK in result file; HT = High Task; LT = Low Task.
 Listed as IGB in result file; HB = High Bias; LB = Low Bias.
 Listed as DIS in result file; HD = High Distrust; LD = Low Distrust.

Appendix C

Complete List of Categorized Sources				
Source ID	Spontaneity	Themes	Sources	Word Length
2008_12_16	Prepared	Politics: Personal	Maiden Statements	2339
2009_05_13	Spontaneous	Economics: Budget	Oral Questions	551
2010_09_30	Prepared	Social: Employment	Parliament Statements	302
2011_02_11	Prepared	Social: Unemployment	General Debate	818
2011_03_22	Spontaneous	Social: Employment	Oral Questions	209
2011_06_08	Spontaneous	Social: Employment	Oral Questions	173
2011_07_05	Spontaneous	Economics: Budget	Oral Questions	100
2011_07_12	Spontaneous	Social: Employment	Oral Questions	165
2011_07_14	Spontaneous	Social: Employment	Oral Questions	166
2011_11_16	Spontaneous	Public Policy: government inaction	Oral Questions	351
2012_06_14	Spontaneous	Politics: Welfare	Oral Questions	217
2012_06_19	Spontaneous	Social: Youth Development	Oral Questions	219
2012_06_27	Prepared	Economic: Growth & welfare	General Debate	763
2012_07_14	Spontaneous	Politics: Salaries	Oral Questions	246
2012_08_23	Prepared	Law: Film & Music industry	General Debate	211
2012_11_14	Unexpected	Social: Unemployment	General Debate	800
2013_03_20	Unexpected	Social: Unemployment	General Debate	869
2013_05_29	Unexpected	Social: Child poverty	General Debate	1548

2013_10_23	Unexpected	Public Policy: Employment	General Debate	813
2014_05_07	Unexpected	Public Policy: Budget	General Debate	784
2014_05_21	Unexpected	Public Policy: Budget	General Debate	1712
2014_05_27	Prepared	Public Policy: Justice system	Third Readings	1622
2015_05_19	Spontaneous	Social: Child Poverty	Oral Questions	178
2015_08_27	Prepared	Social: Food Security	Third Readings	782
2015_09_23	Spontaneous	Politics: Flag referendum	Oral Questions	172
2016_03_09	Spontaneous	Public Policy: Business	Oral Questions	229
2016_03_16	Spontaneous	Economic: Diversification	Oral Questions	147
2016_06_29	Unexpected	Economic: Wealth disparity	General Debate	792
2017_03_23	Spontaneous	International: London Terrorist attacks	Motions	262
2017_04_10	Unexpected	Politics: Leadership	General Debate	788
2017_05_13	Prepared	Politics: Maiden Speech	Congress Speech	382
2017_05_30	Spontaneous	Public Policy: Budget	Budget Debate	1678
2017_08_01	Spontaneous	Personal	TV Interview	268
2017_08_12	Prepared	Public Policy: Enterprises	General Debate	737
2017_12_19	Spontaneous	Economics: Tax rates	Oral Questions	368
2017_12_20	Spontaneous	Social: Child Education	Oral Questions	521
2018_01_30	Prepared	Politics: obituaries	Obituaries	545
2018_02_21	Spontaneous	Social: Unleash Space	Interview	62

2018_03_27	Spontaneous	Politics: Park maintenance	Oral Questions	622
2018_04_03	Spontaneous	Social: Refugees	Oral Questions	110
2018_05_01	Unexpected	International: Nobility	Congratulatory Message	335
2018_06_14	Spontaneous	Personal	Podcast Interview	2286
2018_11_03	Spontaneous	Politics: Elections	TV Interview	2692
2018_11_11	Unexpected	Politics: Armistice	Speech	615
2019_01_23	Spontaneous	Personal	Interview	42
2019_03_13	Spontaneous	Politics: Ministerial Affairs	Oral Questions	541
2019_03_15	Prepared	Social: Post Christchurch attack	Speech	671
2019_04_10 a	Spontaneous	Social: Rental Costs	Oral Questions	1117
2019_04_10 b	Prepared	Social: Firearms prohibition	Third Readings	1441
2019_04_19	Prepared	Social: Christ Church address	Ministerial Address	220