Wesleyan University The Honors College

Hillary Clinton's Turbulent Run for The White House: Media Bias or Campaign Gaffe?

By

Meghan Larywon
Class of 2011

A thesis submitted to the
Faculty of Wesleyan University
in Partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Bachelor of Arts
With Departmental Honors in Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies

Middletown, Connecticut April, 2011

CONTENTS

I. Introduction 3

II. Reviewing The Literature: From Media Bias and "Double Binds" to Gender Strategy 10

The Role of the Media
Double Binds and Gendered Strategy

III. Research Methodology 22

Assessing Gender Strategy
Assessing Media Bias
Data

IV. Unearthing the Gender Strategies Hidden Within the 2008 Democratic Primary: Did Gender "Matter?" 31

Findings and Analysis
Discussion and Concluding Remarks

V. Correspondence between Paid and Free Media: Biased or Not?

Naming/Titles
Issues
Personality/Character Traits
Husbands and Children: The Frightening Case of the Ambitious Woman
Caveat Regarding Tonal Bias and Horse-Race Coverage
Summary and Concluding Remarks

VI. Conclusion 54

VII. Data Summary 78

VIII. Appendix: Videostyle Coding Scheme 83

IX. Bibliography 87

I. Introduction

"One can surely point to numerous problems with the Clinton campaign…Perhaps some of these…factors…mattered as much or more than the need to counter gender stereotypes or sexism in the media…Gender was not the only thing that mattered, but yes, gender did matter" (Carroll 2009: 17-18).

In 2008, the United States of America experienced a groundbreaking electoral year for women. America witnessed the rise of its first truly viable high-profile female candidate, Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton, for presidential nomination in the Democratic Primary (Nelson 2010). What made this development even more noteworthy was the fact that no vice presidential or gubernatorial candidate[1] was running (Nelson 2010). Instead, the candidates consisted of a former NYC mayor and a cluster of senatorial candidates. In the midst of a turbulent Bush presidency, the culmination of two overseas wars, a growing budget deficit, and the onset of an unexpected economic collapse, the lack of an incumbent vice-presidential or gubernatorial candidate placed the nomination up for grabs, increasing the likelihood that Senator Clinton would emerge as the front-runner and possibly be nominated the first formal female presidential candidate in United States history. While Senator McCain speedily captured the Republican nomination, the outcome of the Democratic primary remained a question mark as Senator Hillary Clinton, a white woman, and Senator Barack Obama, an African American man, advanced to the final stages of the primary competition. Although Barack Obama ultimately acquired the nomination,

---

[1] Historically, governorships have acted as an important channel for candidates to the presidency, likely because their records of executive leadership provide them with an appearance of greater expertise as regards the position of the President (Nelson 2010: 7-8).

the 2008 Democratic primary campaign would be documented as one of the closest in American history, with Senator Clinton tailing Senator Obama by only 50 delegates (Lawrence 2009: 193). In the aftermath, the historic status of the candidates concomitant with the incredibly close nature of the contest spurred an onslaught of questions regarding media bias, particularly as it related to the sexual and racial politics of the race. In a similar vein, the focus of this study is predominantly concerned with the validity of assertions regarding negatively gendered coverage of Senator Clinton during the 2008 Democratic Primary.

Historically, white men have monopolized control of the political arena. As a consequence, the historical legacies and traditions surrounding executive office construct it as a fundamentally "masculine" space, establishing male traits and imagery as a precondition to executive rule (Carroll 2006). While women have witnessed minor advances into the legislative arena, to this day, a female has never held the office of the President of the United States. Furthermore, although female bids for executive office are not unprecedented, Senator Clinton represented the first truly viable—competitive—female bid for the presidency in American history; she *is* the first woman to ever *win* a presidential primary (Traister 2009: 108). Additionally, in contrast to previous female contenders for Presidential nomination, Senator Clinton's campaign was unique in the fact that she overcame many of the widely established institutional hurdles to female success, namely low name recognition and insufficient financial support (Lawrence 2010: 75). As a former "First Lady" and a two-term senator, she had vast experience within the political arena, was well known, and was able to mobilize significant support and resources for her campaign

(Lawrence 2010: 75-77). While these characteristics situated Senator Clinton as the initial front-runner, her competitive position within the race also ensured that questions revolving around gender would emerge along the campaign trail.

Concerns regarding traditional gender boundaries and obstacles to success became especially prevalent in discussions of media coverage of the Clinton campaign. While Senator Clinton had managed to overcome many of the typical hindrances to female involvement in the political arena, one particularly important resource for perceived candidate viability, media coverage, did not portend nearly as optimistic possibilities for her success. Evidence suggests that Senator Clinton, in comparison with her opponents, received disproportionate news coverage regarding character, appearance, and fulfillment of traditional gender roles—such as wife and mother (Miller et al. 2010: 178). Furthermore, the structure and theme of coverage, regarding horse-race coverage (coverage focused on candidate's campaign tactics and standing in the polls), tone, candidate evaluations, and character traits was often disproportionately and negatively gendered in ways that undoubtedly constrained the Clinton campaign (Lawrence 2010). There is little question that Senator Obama was a moving orator, who successfully mobilized the grassroots through new media, whilst employing a skillful campaign strategy that eventually brought him success. Nevertheless, the presence of a notable media bias in coverage of Senator Clinton's campaign, confirmed by multiple studies, likely contributed to her defeat and possibly discouraged future female candidacies, particularly within the Democratic Party (Lawrence 2009, Murray 2010, Goren and Uscinski 2010, Miller, Peake and Boulton 2010).

However, in response to these types of allegations, many elites have cried foul, asserting that coverage of Senator Clinton's campaign was not a product of "perceived" gender biases but rather a consequence of an ill-advised campaign strategy. According to Albert Hunt, "Gender no longer is a big deal in American elections…There are two basic reasons [Hillary Clinton]…failed: Barack Obama is a sensational candidate…whose campaign…out strategized Clinton…and Clinton…picked the wrong people and adopted the wrong strategy" (2008). According to Doris Kearns Goodwin, the presidential historian, Senator Clinton's campaign failed due to "strategic, tactical things that have nothing to do with her being a woman" (Kantor 2008). In fact, she goes on to assert, "being a woman…was not a detriment and if anything it was a help" (Lawless 2009:72). In tandem, a great deal of literature has emerged discussing Senator Clinton's faulty campaign tactics ranging from her inconsistent "gender strategy," her campaign message, her failure to utilize new media as effectively as her opponent, to her primary and caucus strategies (Lawrence 2009, Faucheux 2008). While Clinton's campaign certainly made strategic errors, acknowledging these errors does not discount the evidence of gendered media bias. However, if certain strategic errors, particularly as it relates to candidate positioning and gender strategies, fostered gendered media coverage, then arguments discounting media bias may have some merit, indicating that a gendered media bias is less prevalent than suggested by analyses of media bias on Senator Clinton's campaign.

Unfortunately, none of the studies of Senator Clinton's campaign have provided a thorough investigation into how Senator Clinton sought to position herself

and construct her image via paid media, i.e. political advertisements. Paid media, specifically advertisements paid for by the candidate, are unique in that the message presentation and image of the candidate are entirely under the control of the candidate (Kaid and Johnston 2001), providing unique access to the undiluted message of the candidate's campaign. In contrast, campaign analyses of the Democratic Primary have tended to base their conclusions on study of campaign events, independent observation of the developing campaigns, sound-bites from members of the Clinton campaign, and often, the news media's assessments of the Clinton campaign, which, if biased, would provide an unreliable source. Campaign events, such as debates and rallies, undoubtedly play an important role in constructing the image of a candidate. However, campaign events are often limited to smaller audiences. Paid media has the capability of reaching much larger numbers of voters in a single broadcast and has become increasingly important in modern campaigns (Kaid and Johnston 2001: 1), as is illustrated by the fact that in 2008, $2.6 billion dollars—"the highest amount ever in a presidential election year"—was spent on political advertising (Seelye 2008). Hence, looking solely at independent/free media's observations of a developing campaign's events overlooks a fundamental aspect and insight into candidate's strategic presentations.

Thus, the object of this research seeks to provide a thorough examination of all the campaign advertisements produced by Senator Obama and Senator Clinton during the 2008 Democratic Primary, in an effort to offer greater understanding into the campaign strategies utilized by the candidates, particularly in terms of image and message presentation. Furthermore, this study should provide insight regarding

questions about "gendered" strategies of candidates as they pertain to campaigns for presidential office. While this study is subject to certain limitations due to the very historic nature of this individual campaign and the scope of the analysis (specifically, the fact that the study examines the contest for party nomination as opposed to the general election campaign), it presents an important opportunity to compare the campaign strategies of male and female candidates at the relatively unexplored—largely due to lack of female candidates—presidential level. Furthermore, the fact that the competition under study is the Democratic Party nomination allows for elimination of effects related to partisan affiliation while the open seat status of the race—characterized by the notable lack of an incumbent or vice presidential candidate—discounts the possibility of outside effects related to candidate status. These conditions facilitate effective isolation of the effect of gender on campaign strategy, providing an excellent opportunity to better understand the impact of gender in this particular case and in the larger arena of political campaigns.

In addition, analysis of political advertisements and campaign strategy will allow this study to assess the accuracy of claims of media bias in the 2008 election. Television advertising fulfills an important role in competitive electoral campaigns. It serves as a direct line of communication to the voters, imparting valuable information regarding a candidate's message and, possibly, stimulates greater information seeking and turnout for and about the candidates (Goldstein & Friedman 2002). The resonance of a candidate's message, however, is reliant on press coverage; "gender differences in press treatment can have electoral consequences" (Kahn 2003: 482).

In other words, free media plays an important role in conveying candidate

messages and information to voters. Inconsistencies in media coverage of campaign messages have the ability to disproportionately advantage one candidate over another. If Clinton's campaign messages and image framing are consistent with the journalistic frames and media coverage of the campaign, then the argument that "perceptions" of media bias are merely products of campaign flaws will have greater validity. However, if there is evidence of discrepancy between Senator Clinton's campaign presentation and the transmission of those campaign messages and images via press coverage, then the prevalence of a gendered media bias will be further evident.

Thus, the research questions are the following: Assessing political advertisements of the candidates and desired candidate positioning, what strategies and images did the candidates employ? How are these campaign strategies for presidential office consistent with the literature on gendered campaign strategies in terms of verbal and nonverbal content of political advertisements—what gendered strategies were evident? And lastly, was media coverage consistent with candidate positioning in political advertising for Senator Clinton?

II. Reviewing The Literature: From Media Bias and "Double Binds" to Gender Strategy

The Role of the Media

Historically, men have dominated political life. Consequently, critical leadership qualifications and character traits by which candidates are evaluated are gendered. "Masculine" traits—characterized as assertiveness, strength, confidence, toughness, and competence—are seen as necessary prerequisites for political office. Female candidates have a much harder time convincing the population at large that they possess these traits (Huddy and Terkildsen 1993). While some positive "female" traits, such as compassion and warmth, can and do enter the political discourse, often in relation to social policy issues, these sorts of character traits are often looked upon as having secondary importance in determining leadership capabilities (Huddy and Terkildsen 1993). The constraints that these types of gendered expectations place on female candidates become increasingly more stringent as they run for higher levels of office. This is observed most visibly in evaluations of candidacies for executive office, where issue competency on international issues, such as foreign policy, military and defense (often deemed "masculine" areas of expertise) becomes increasingly important (Huddy and Terkildson 1993).

Furthermore, in electoral competitions the press serves as the "great mentioner" (Carroll and Fox 2010: 13). The press facilitates the democratic process by providing presumably credible information to the public so that they can make reasoned decisions in choosing elected officials to represent them. Without ample press coverage, candidates remain unknown to the public and thereby suffer a serious

disadvantage. Furthermore, the ways in which the press chooses to cover candidates can have a significant impact on public perceptions of candidate viability (measures of electoral strength and likelihood of success) and leadership capacity, which in turn influences voters' decisions to support particular candidates (Aubin, Haak, and Mangini 2007: 118). Unfortunately, as a consequence of ingrained cultural associations linking the presidency with constructs of masculinity, candidates are often evaluated through the lens of normative gendered expectations of appropriate "presidential" behavior (Kahn 1994). Correlation of "masculine" images and traits with presidential character in the media inevitably favors male contenders, whilst simultaneously diminishing the legitimacy and viability of female candidates.

While the study of media bias as an additional constraint to the electoral success of female candidates is relatively new compared to institutional and "pipeline" explanations for the lack of female legislators, a burgeoning literature has emerged in recent decades to explore and study these claims. The literature tends to divide media coverage into two categories by which to assess bias—quantity of coverage and quality of coverage (Kahn 1994). Quantity of coverage addresses the question of whether male and female contenders receive disproportionate amounts of news coverage. In this case, unequal distribution of coverage to male and female contenders might reflect journalists' personal gender biases; if reporters perceive female candidates to be less fit for office or less viable—less competitive—they might consider female candidates to be less newsworthy (Kahn, K. F. 1994: 160). This engenders a vicious cycle: inconsistent news coverage diminishes the visibility of female candidates, resulting in lower rates of name recognition and fewer

opportunities to mobilize fundraising and electoral support, reproducing the status quo whereby women are systematically excluded from the political arena. These inconsistencies in coverage have historically exhibited themselves via discrepancies in total *amount* of coverage, as well as allocation of horserace, issue, and image coverage (Kahn 1993).

On the other hand, discrepancies in quality or substance of news coverage act as another means by which to disadvantage women in their runs for political office. Quality of coverage encompasses focus on "soft" news—characterized by its focus on "drama, sensationalism, human interest themes, and personalities"—in comparison with "hard"—policy/issue based—news coverage (Baumgartner 2006: 341). Due to the gendered nature of the executive, it is important for female candidates to receive issue/policy-based coverage so that they are able to demonstrate their expertise and qualifications for the position. Quality of coverage can also be compromised as a consequence of negative tone in different types of coverage, whether it be image, issue or horserace-based. The literature suggests that female candidates are particularly subject to *negative* horse-race framing, in which they are depicted as the loser, lowering perceptions of viability, which, in turn, reinforces negative representations of the female candidate as weak and/or ill-prepared for office (Lawrence 2009 and Semetko 2007).

Gendered media framing, which comprises media coverage that deliberately concentrates and calls attention to the candidate's gender, also diminishes the quality of coverage. Explicit gender bias often exhibits itself via focus on traditional gender roles, ascription of stereotypically "gendered" or negative character traits, and greater

attention to appearance (Lawrence 2010). This sort of media coverage is particularly prevalent in framing of female candidates' appearance, emotions, "first woman" discourse, naming, and realization of gendered roles, such as wife and mother (Lawrence 2010; Murray 2010). Furthermore, gendered framing of candidates often culminates in a journalistic "meta-narrative" regarding the character of the candidate that consistently shapes coverage of the campaign in potentially negative ways (Lawrence 2009: 57-58). In the context of executive office, these media trends that focus attention on "feminine" attributes, in notably negative ways, at the expense of substantive policy issues, may serve as a reminder that women are historically outsiders to presidential politics and discredit them in the process.

While early analyses of media trends provide evidence of gendered media bias via discrepancies in both quantity and quality of coverage of female candidates (Kahn 1994), more recent analyses indicate evolution towards more equitable coverage. Jalalzai's study of senatorial and gubernatorial candidates running for election between 1992 and 2000 indicates that female senatorial candidates did not receive less total quantity of coverage than their male counterparts. In fact, it appeared that in some cases women were actually receiving more coverage; perhaps, because they appeared to be more of a novelty (Jalazai 2006: 617). Furthermore, no notable discrepancies were found in regards to allocation of horse-race coverage or issue attention. It is important to note, however, that Jalazai's study did not focus on tone, appearance, discussion of family matters, or questions of negative coverage; hence, progress towards greater *quality* of coverage was not fully addressed. Nevertheless, this study does provide evidence that a gendered media bias has become less

palpable, perhaps leading to more "gender-balanced" news coverage (Jalazai 2006).

However, many of these studies of media bias have been restricted to analysis of lower levels of political offices as a consequence of the lack of prospective female candidates for the Presidency. Recent development of studies assessing media coverage of female Presidential candidates, Elizabeth Dole and Hillary Clinton, illustrates that a gendered media bias remains prevalent in coverage of presidential campaigns. Analysis of Elizabeth Dole's bid for the Republican Presidential Nomination revealed that Dole received inadequate amounts of coverage, less in-depth coverage than her male opponent, and more coverage focused on her personality traits and gender than on substantive policy issues (Heldman 2005: 331). Furthermore, she received a great deal of negative coverage, particularly in regards to horserace coverage and coverage of traditional gender roles and personality characteristics (Heldman 2005). Thus, as recently as the year 2000, there is evidence that female Presidential candidates suffer from negatively gendered media bias in areas of both quality and quantity.

Interestingly, however, following a similar trajectory to that of the development of more equitable media coverage in senatorial and gubernatorial campaigns, analysis of media coverage surrounding Senator Clinton's campaign suggests improvement, at least as regards quantity of coverage. Unlike Dole, Senator Clinton was not subject to inadequate amounts of news coverage (Lawrence 2010). Nevertheless, it is too soon for unrestrained optimism. Various studies and media analyses of the 2008 election indicate that Senator Clinton received disproportionate levels of negatively gendered coverage in comparison to her male opponents.

Negative coverage regarding personality traits, fulfillment of traditional gender roles, horserace coverage, character scripts, and discrepancies in naming dominated media coverage of the Clinton campaign (Lawrence 2009, Goren and Uscinski 2010, Miller et al. 2010). Within the arena of presidential politics, where associations with masculine traits are more predominant and trends towards soft news and candidate-centered coverage dominate, the need for substantive policy and positive image coverage may arguably be greater for female candidates than in runs for lower levels of office. Thus, the trends in media coverage of Senator Clinton's campaign likely placed her at a notable disadvantage.

Double Binds and Gendered Strategy

Gender stereotypes and "gendered" media biases force female candidates to navigate between exhibiting accepted "feminine" characteristics and conventionally "masculine" prerequisites of leadership. In other words, female candidates must highlight "masculine" candidate traits that emphasize their leadership capacity and expertise in "masculine" policy areas if they want to be viewed as competitive contenders (Lawrence 2010). However, in doing so, women run the risk of appearing insufficiently feminine, incurring penalty for failing to uphold established gender roles. This forces prospective female candidates to walk a delicate path between "masculine" and "feminine" behavior that restricts campaign choices, culminating in what some scholars refer to as the "double bind" (Jamieson 1995, Carroll 2010: 59, Lawrence 2010, Murray 2010). Gendered media framing and stereotypes produce a wide variety of double binds such as "femininity/competence," change/experience,"

"old/young," "independence/dependence," etc. (Lawrence 2009).

In order to overcome the hurdles imposed by these sorts of binds, the literature suggests that female candidates will employ explicit gender strategies. It is suggested that female candidates might embrace one of two approaches based upon either equality or difference feminism (Lawrence 2010: 38-39). The "equality" tactic seeks to recast the female candidate in male terms, placing an emphasis on essential "male" candidate traits—tough, competent, experienced, assertive—that are correlated with effective executive leadership (Lawrence 2010: 39, Huddy and Terkildsen 1993: 512). In contrast, the "difference" tactic encompasses using "positively framed sex stereotypes" and "feminine" appeals to emphasize positive "feminine" characteristics, thereby using gender to the advantage of the candidate (Lawrence 2010: 39). Hence, whereas the "equality" tactic aims to overlook differences associated with gender, the "difference" tactic (commonly referred to as "running as a woman") explicitly acknowledges and attempts to use gender stereotypes to the advantage of the candidate.

Empirical studies illustrate that the "Running as A Woman" strategy holds undeniable benefits for female candidates. In a resonance model of campaigns—where campaigns are understood to be "evolving and interactive information environments" most persuasive when they capitalize on voters' "prior predispositions"—women would presumably be able to campaign most effectively when they appeal to embedded gender stereotypes (Iyengar et al. 1997: 79). Iyengar et al. found that female candidates received the greatest number of positive ratings when they focused explicitly on "women's" issues (1997: 88). In addition, Hitchon

and Chang's experimental study indicates that voters are more likely to recall ad information regarding female candidates when it appears within a family setting while information related to male candidates is more resonant when it appears within the backdrop of images of campaign activities (1995: 430). Thus, both studies indicate that women might be able to campaign more effectively when they appeal to embedded gender stereotypes and accepted gender roles.

However, while gender stereotypes might prove advantageous in certain contextual situations, in a post-9/11 environment where international security and "war-related issues" are increasingly important, these sorts of stereotypes can actively work against women, particularly as they run for higher levels of office, such as the Presidency (Lawless 2004). Despite the fact that women are rated most favorably when they exhibit appropriate "feminine" qualities, as a consequence of associations of political qualifications and prominent issues with "masculine" traits, female candidates are more likely to be viewed negatively when they exhibit feminine attributes (Lawless 2004). These findings suggest that gendered strategies will not be as simplistic as theory on "difference" and "equality" feminism suppose; it seems largely unlikely that female candidates would choose to embrace either tactic fully. Rather, it seems more reasonable to expect female candidates to try to strike different balances between these two competing gender strategies in order to overcome double binds and appeal to competing gender expectations.

The literature on campaigns provides support for the assumption that gender strategies often utilize components of *both* equality and difference feminism. In "Gender Differences in Campaign Messages" Kahn indicates that female candidates

are slightly more likely to emphasize both policy matters and male traits than their male opponents. This is illustrative of an “equality” tactic, with female candidates possibly choosing to over-emphasize policy matters and “male” characteristics to overcome gender stereotypes related to their ability to lead (Kahn 1993). However, female candidates were also significantly more likely to discuss social programs and social issues (“feminine” issues) while male candidates were more likely to discuss economic issues related to taxes and the budget (“masculine” issues) (Kahn 1993: 489-490). This finding is suggestive of a “difference” feminism tactic; female candidates appear more likely to discuss policy matters regarding “feminine” issues where they are assumed to have greater expertise. Thus, early research provides evidence that female candidates use both equality and difference tactics simultaneously where they feel these approaches might best benefit them.

Later studies re-affirm these findings, suggesting that female candidates consistently utilize a mixture of gendered strategies. In Bystrom’s analysis of candidate “videostyle”—“the ways in which political candidates present themselves to voters through their television advertising” (2004: 10)—she finds female "videostyle" associated with more “feminine issues, balance of masculine and feminine image traits, blend of “feminine” style and challenger appeals, a smiling facial expression, and formal dress” (2004: 45). Bystrom’s findings would seem to suggest that female candidates do choose to make certain “feminine” appeals suggestive of a “difference” tactic. However, female candidates also use a mix of masculine image traits, illustrating once more an emphasis on “equality” tactics as well. The decision of female candidates to smile and wear formal dress more

frequently than their male opponents most clearly exhibits this use of mixed gendered appeals as it suggests that female candidates feel the pressures of mediating between the “double bind” to appear simultaneously friendly and professional. Thus, this indicates that female candidates are likely to utilize campaign tactics relevant to both “difference” and “equality” feminism.

Similarly, Bystrom’s examination of male “videostyle” indicates that male candidates also utilize a mixture of gendered appeals. Bystrom associates male "videostyle" with “a balance of masculine and feminine issues and images, blend of feminine style and incumbent appeals, inclusion of family, serious facial expression and casual dress” (2004: 45). Particularly interesting within these findings is that they indicate that male candidates also employ “feminine appeals” and place arguably greater emphasis on their gender by including their families in more of their campaign spots. Furthermore, while these findings indicate some broader gender-related differences in male “videostyle”, such as use of incumbent appeals, serious facial expression, and casual dress, it is important to note that male “videostyle” like female “videostyle is similarly characterized by a mixture of masculine and feminine appeals and images. Thus, it is evident that both male and female candidates utilize gendered appeals, integrating components of both “masculine” *and* “feminine” styles into their overarching campaign strategies.

These findings suggest caution in assuming that women, as a group, emphasize a singular or common “feminine” gender strategy. Rather, it may be that propositions regarding gender strategy are overstated. It is important to acknowledge that although female candidates do emphasize some “feminine” strategies, they often

choose to simultaneously emphasize "masculine" traits and strategies as well (Bystrom 2004, Sapiro 2009). Moreover, the evidence suggests that female candidates do not necessarily adopt an explicitly distinct "equality" or "difference" strategy but rather one that encompasses and mediates between characteristics of both. Thus, it is reasonable to expect that Senator Clinton's campaign would have behaved in a similar manner, adopting common feminine strategies, whilst emphasizing masculine traits and strategies as well.

Yet, in light of the national policy concerns and "masculine" characteristics associated with executive office, some have argued that Senator Clinton may have been compelled to adopt an explicit "equality" strategy at the expense of a "difference" strategy. Furthermore, it has been suggested that at closely contested points in the race, Senator Clinton shifted uncomfortably from one strategy to the other, compromising the resonance of her campaign messages (Lawrence 2009). Ascertaining whether she chose to run on an equality platform, to "run as a woman," or whether she inconsistently and haphazardly shifted emphasis from one strategy to the other will be important in determining the pervasiveness of media bias and the impact of potentially flawed gender strategy on media coverage. Thus, analysis of political advertisements released during the 2008 Democratic Primary will provide insight not only into the reality of these assertions but also into the gendered dynamics of political office at the Presidential level.

Perceptions of explicit gender strategy may be more a product of media bias than any significant differences in style of male and female candidates. This study recognizes and references documented differences in campaign strategies within the

literature for comparison purposes to determine whether Senator Clinton did, in fact, employ an overtly distinct gender strategy and to assess whether her gender strategy was consistent with common trends regarding women who run for political office. However, it is important to note that all of the studies concerning gender strategy, employed for comparison purposes, are confined to analysis of Congressional elections. Although comprehensive analyses of Presidential style have been conducted, due to a lack of viable female candidates "feminine" gender does not factor into these studies (Kaid and Johnston 2001). It is entirely possible that in presidential elections, where the races are more candidate-focused, gender stereotyping might be more prevalent and as a consequence gendered appeals more prominent. On the other hand, due to the high-intensity of publicity surrounding the presidency, gendered appeals might be less prominent so as not to garner negative media attention. Hence, this study anticipates a reasonable degree of deviation from gender-related trends isolated within the literature.

In sum, this paper examines campaign advertisements of Senator Clinton and Senator Obama in order to determine their dominant campaign strategies and compare them with established trends related to Presidential and gendered "videostyles" within the literature. By bridging Bystrom's format for determining gendered appeals with Kaid and Johnston's construct of Presidential "videostyle," it is expected that this study will yield considerable insight into the gender strategy utilized by Senator Clinton, ultimately allowing for better assessment of gendered media bias during the 2008 Democratic Presidential Primary campaign.

III. Research Methodology

Patterns of behavior evident in candidate "videostyle" are important because they reveal great insight into "'how literal meaning should be taken, interpreted, filtered, or understood'" (Kaid and Johnston 2000: 26). In other words, underlying the immediate surface presentation of a candidate's campaign advertisements, patterns of behavior in advertisements provide a direct link to the unfiltered strategies and campaign messages of a candidate. Thus, the first and primary task of this study lies in analyzing the divergent "videostyles" of Senator Obama and Senator Clinton via assessment of the campaign advertisements released by the candidates from the start of the Presidential Primaries up until June 5, 2008, when Senator Clinton officially conceded victory to Senator Obama (Nagourney and Zeleny 2008). Having established and analyzed the dominant trends in the gendered strategies of the two candidates, this study then turns to a comparison of dominant trends in media coverage and campaign advertisements in order to assess the prevalence of gendered media bias during the campaign.

Assessing Gender Strategy

To assess the strategies inherent in the content of these ads, I base my research design on the categories derived from Kaid and Johnston's construct of Presidential "videostyle" and merge it with Bystrom's techniques of distinguishing "gendered" appeals. The two categories of "videostyle" which I extrapolate to investigate questions related to "gendered" campaign strategy are "nonverbal" and "verbal" content. Issue and image content of the ads characterize "verbal content." "Verbal

content" also encompasses evaluations as to whether an ad is positive or negative, different types of attacks, types of political positions espoused, and the language employed in an ad (Kaid and Johnston 2000: 27-28). "Nonverbal content," on the other hand, acts as a complement to "verbal content" as it can "repeat, contradict, substitute, complement, accent and regulate verbal behavior" (Kaid and Johnston 2000: 28). "Nonverbal" cues include body movement and gestures, physical characteristics, settings, and attire (Kaid and Johnson 2000: 29). For a complete list of all the characteristics and categories within "nonverbal" and "verbal content, coded for and utilized in this study to determine the "gendered" strategies of Senator Obama and Senator Clinton, please consult the Appendix attached at the end of this document.

Based upon the assumption that Senator Clinton employed a gender strategy consistent with the dominant trends established in the literature, I posit the following hypotheses regarding Senator Clinton's "videostyle." My initial hypotheses concern the character of the verbal content of the campaign spots surveyed. Verbal content includes type and structure of appeals made, appeal strategies, issue emphasis, image emphasis, and candidate name or title used (Bystrom 2004).

Regarding discussion of candidate name or title utilized, there is no previous data upon which to base my assumptions. This is a unique category that I have added in order to respond to assertions that Senator Clinton was unfairly prejudiced by more informal discussions of her title by free media. Ascertaining whether or not Senator Clinton chose to emphasize certain titles will aid in assessing media bias and free media's discussion of her candidacy. I assume that both candidates, Senator Clinton

and Senator Obama, would have desired to emphasize the legitimacy of their candidacies by appealing to more formal titles. My hypothesis is as follows:

H1: Both Senator Clinton and Senator Obama utilized their full name—first and last—or their surnames most frequently in their ads.

In regards to structure and style of appeals, the literature provides limited evidence of substantial differences between male and female candidates (Sapiro 2009, Bystrom 2004). According to recent studies, there is little empirical evidence to suggest that female candidates feature more negative appeals or attacks than their male opponents (Bystrom 2004, Sapiro 2009). Moreover, research suggests that male and female candidates often employ both "feminine" and "masculine" strategies (Bystrom 2004).

However, female candidates were more likely to utilize a greater proportion of "feminine" strategies compared to their male counterparts (Bystrom 2004). "Feminine" appeals include stylistic techniques associated with rhetoric common to the private sphere while "masculine" appeals include techniques associated with rhetoric common to the public sphere (Bystrom 2004: 13). "Feminine" speech strategies incorporate use of strategies such as "personal tone," "relies on personal experience," "invites audience participation," "addresses the audience as peers," and "identifying with the experience of others" (Bystrom 2004:13). In contrast, "masculine" appeal strategies involve "use of expert authorities," "affirmations of expertise" and "use of statistics" (Bystrom 2004: 13).

In addition, female candidates were slightly more likely to employ challenger appeals, than incumbent appeals; this is likely a product of the fact that women have

historically been outsiders to the political arena. Hence, my hypotheses are the following:

H2: Senator Clinton did not employ a greater number of negative advertisements than Senator Obama.

H3: Senator Clinton was more likely to use feminine strategies—personal tone, addressing viewers as peers, relying on personal experiences, identifying with the experiences of others, etc.—than Senator Obama.

H4: Senator Clinton was more likely to employ a strategy characteristic of a challenger, attacking the record of her opponent more frequently, while Senator Obama is more likely to utilize the incumbent strategy of emphasizing one's own accomplishments (Bystrom 2004).

In regards to issue emphasis, the literature suggests that male and female candidates are both more likely to emphasize issues rather than images in the majority of their ads (Bystrom 2004: 36). Yet, while both focused on a number of similar issues, female candidates tend to place more emphasis on the economy, health care, and issues of social justice—often deemed "women's issues"—whereas male candidates tend to focus more on crime and cutting welfare (Bystrom 2004: 36). Thus, I hypothesize the following.

H5: Both Senator Clinton and Senator Obama emphasized issues more frequently than images.

H6: Senator Clinton emphasizes issues more often than Senator Obama.

H7: Senator Clinton placed more emphasis on "feminine" issues than Senator Obama.

As regards image emphasis, research indicates that few differences are found in emphasis of general character traits (Bystrom 2004). However, while both male and female candidates emphasized "masculine" traits—such as performance, leadership, and aggressiveness—female candidates emphasized toughness and strength more frequently than their male opponents (Bystrom 2004: 42). Furthermore, while both male and female candidate stressed female traits such as honesty and integrity, male candidates were more likely than female candidates to emphasize "feminine" traits of sensitivity and understanding (Bystrom 2004: 36). This finding is interesting in that it suggests that both men and women strategically use gendered appeals to overcompensate for gender stereotypes. Lastly, evidence yields that men are more likely to stress their experience in politics, likely indicative of an insider-outsider duality since women remain a minority in the political arena (Bystrom 2004: 36). I hypothesize the following.

H8: Hillary Clinton is more likely to emphasize masculine character traits of toughness and strength than Senator Obama.

H9: Senator Obama is more likely to emphasize "feminine" traits of sensitivity and understanding and the "masculine" trait of experience.

The second aspect of "videostyle" I address in this paper is nonverbal content. Again, according to the literature, no large-scale differences were found. However, male candidates were more likely to cast their families in their ads, whereas female candidates were more likely to cast children who were not their own—indicative of the fact that topics regarding the fulfillment of traditional gender roles often act as a liability for women who run for political office (Bystrom 2004: 37). In addition,

regarding speaker of the ad, while both male and female candidates were more likely to employ a male dominant speaker, female candidates tended to speak themselves more often than male candidates (Bystrom 2004: 37). Additionally, female candidates were more likely to dress in formal attire than in casual clothing and to smile, while male candidates wore more serious expressions (Bystom 2004: 37-38). However, in regards to other categories, such as demographic groups pictured in the ads, measures of eye contact, and setting, little difference was found between male and female candidates. Thus, my hypotheses are as follows:

H10: Senator Clinton is more likely to feature ads without her family than Senator Obama

H11: Senator Clinton is more likely to include children who are not her own in her campaign spots.

H12: Senator Clinton speaks more frequently in her ads than Senator Obama.

H13: Senator Clinton is more likely to smile in her ads than Senator Obama.

H14: Senator Clinton and Senator Obama employ similar amounts of eye contact in their advertisements.

H15: Senator Clinton is more likely to dress in formal attire than Senator Obama.

H16: Senator Clinton and Senator Obama utilize similar locales for the setting of their ads.

H17: Senator Clinton and Senator Obama feature demographic groups with a similar frequency.

Assessing Media Bias

After determining the dominant trends in each candidate's campaign strategy, I turn to the secondary focus/question of this study: having established the dominant gender strategies in Senator Obama and Senator Clinton's campaigns, does news coverage—"free media"—fairly and equally echo the topics and images presented by the different candidates via "paid media?"

Differences in campaign strategies of male and female candidates are only one important aspect of determining the way gender influences political campaigns. While these strategies undoubtedly play an important role in shaping candidate's message and affecting electoral outcomes, the resonance of these messages is ultimately dependent upon "free media's" expression of those messages. According to Kahn, "comparing the content of spot advertisements with the coverage of the candidates in the news can help determine whether the candidates' messages are being mirrored by the news media" (1993: 482). For the purposes of my study, this should also provide insight into the question as to whether or not either candidate received a positive bias from the media and whether or not there was evidence of a negatively gendered bias towards Senator Clinton. Furthermore, it will provide insight into the claims as to whether or not gendered news coverage was more a product of an erroneous gender strategy or if it was in fact simply an indication of a gender biased news media. If "free media's" candidate presentation mirrors candidate presentation in "paid media" then one could reasonably infer that negatively gendered news coverage was partly a product of flawed gender strategies and that a "gender bias" in news media was not as prevalent as previously assumed. However, a

significant disconnect between the messages and candidate narratives in "paid media" and "free media" would provide additional support for charges of gendered bias.

In order to determine whether or not there was a correspondence between "free media" and "paid media" in coverage of Senator Clinton's campaign, I utilize the data regarding campaign strategy accumulated from our study of campaign spots and compare it to data from reliable secondary sources regarding the dominant trends in news media coverage of Senator Obama and Senator Clinton. I base my method of analysis off of Kahn's 1993 study of correspondence between "free media" and "paid media" in senatorial campaigns. In her study, Kahn looked specifically at the coverage of issues and character traits in order to determine whether or not news coverage effectively mirrored candidate messages. This study maintains Kahn's model, assessing whether or not the issues and candidate traits emphasized in news media were the same ones emphasized in candidate spots. In addition, this study adds two other measures of bias, the first involves a comparison of discussion of family in paid and free media, and the second involves naming. Some studies that emerged in the aftermath of the 2008 Presidential election have indicated that Clinton experienced a significant media bias in discussion of family matters and in the form of naming—arguing that members of the news media frequently referred to Clinton in a more informal, less professional manner than her competitors (Lawrence 2010, Goren and Uscinski 2010). By establishing what Senator Clinton chose to emphasize in her political ads and comparing this to the way media correspondents referred to her in news stories, this study will determine whether or not the family and naming bias were sole products of gender bias or partly a consequence of gender strategy.

Thus, in summation, this study will look to four aspects to determine correspondence between "paid" and "freed" media: issues, character traits, discussion of personal issues/family, and naming.

Data

Access to the campaign advertisements under examination was made available through the Wisconsin Advertising Project, which maintained a comprehensive record of every ad broadcast on national and cable television networks in the nation's top 75 media markets during the Presidential campaign. Each ad has a unique digital fingerprint that allows it to be recorded and documented as soon as it airs. The advertisements under examination are presented in a storyboard format, which consists of a layout of individual snapshots of the ad, with the text provided underneath each image. This database allows the study to overcome traditional limitations associated with trying to acquire a secure sample of ads released during Presidential campaigns. Furthermore, since the question this research seeks to address involves only the intended personal presentation of each candidate, this study examines only those ads released by the candidate or the relevant committee sponsored by the candidate. The ads produced by independent groups are not examined. I ultimately coded for a total of 105 ads for Senator Clinton and a total of 104 ads for Senator Obama.

IV. Unearthing the Gender Strategies Hidden Within the 2008 Democratic Primary: Did Gender "Matter?"

Findings and Analysis

The findings of this study are summarized and listed in Table 1, attached at the end of this document. The results were calculated by taking the total number of each of the strategic appeals in each category and dividing it by the total number of ads coded for. The only place where I deviated from this method was in the section on negative appeals: for the dominant purpose and style of attacks, I also divided the total number of each specific type of negative appeal by the total number of negative appeals so as to gage the frequency of those strategies within the percentage of negative appeals. As regards all the other relevant categories, the percentages listed in each category refer to the percentage of ads, out of the total number of ads, which exhibited the strategy or characteristic under examination.

H1: What's in a Name?

The first hypothesis concerns candidate titles/names employed in the ads. I assumed that both candidates would feature either their full name or their surnames with greatest frequency. My findings provide support for this hypothesis. Both candidates were most likely to use formal titles in their ads. All of Senator Clinton's ads made at least one reference to her entire name, Hillary Clinton, while a small percentage (1.9%) also made reference to her as Clinton. Similarly, all of Senator Obama's ads made reference to his entire name, Barack Obama, while his surname, Obama, was used concurrently in 13.46% of the ads surveyed. Senator Clinton's less

frequent usage of the title Clinton is likely explained by the unique circumstances surrounding her campaign; specifically, the fact that her husband, Bill Clinton, was a former President. Perhaps, her reluctance to use the title Clinton was indicative of a greater effort to distinguish herself from her husband.

However, while both candidates made more frequent use of formal titles, Senator Clinton's ads were significantly more likely to utilize informal titles. Whereas Senator Obama used only formal titles in his ads, Senator Clinton also made frequent use of informal titles such as Hillary (20.95%), Hillary Rodham Clinton (1.9%), and Mrs. Clinton (1.9%). This trend is notable because it suggests that Senator Clinton encouraged reference to her candidacy in more informal language. This reality may have had an impact on free media's use of titles when discussing Senator Clinton. Thus, while the hypothesis is affirmed by the fact that both candidates made use of more formal titles, it is partially negated by Senator Clinton's notable use of informal names.

H2: Attack!

The second hypothesis examines use of negative appeals. I suggested that both candidates would utilize a similar number of negative appeals. My data reveals that both candidates did, in fact, employ "candidate-positive" appeals for the vast majority of their ads. Furthermore, although Senator Clinton utilized a slightly larger percentage of negative appeals (12.38%) than Senator Obama (8.25%), the difference is not very significant. In terms of type of appeal, all of Senator Clinton's negative appeals consisted of contrast ads (ads contrasting negative characteristics of opponent

with positive characteristics of candidate), while 87.5% of Obama's negative appeals were contrast ads, and the remaining ads were "opponent-negative" (full negative opponent-focused ads). In addition, it is important to note that Senator Obama frequently featured negative references to the Washington establishment and past policies, which were not included in this category because they did not reference particular administrations or governmental parties. This trend is addressed later in the strategic appeals section under reference to "dissatisfaction with government." Thus, while Senator Clinton utilized a slightly greater number of negative ads, the difference does not seem significant enough to warrant serious attention especially since upon further breakdown of the negative appeals section, the frequency with which they used "direct attacks against an opponent" in their ads was very similar in number (Clinton: 9.52%, Obama: 6.73%).

The literature has been mixed with regards to gendered trends in use of negative appeals; earlier studies recorded that female candidates were more likely to use negative attacks (Bystrom 2005), while more recent studies find little or no differences in use of negative appeals between male and female candidates (Kahn 1993 and Sapiro 2009). The findings in this study appear to be largely consistent with more recent trends in the literature. Both Senator Obama and Senator Clinton overwhelmingly used "candidate-positive" ads. While Senator Clinton did employ slightly more negative appeals, the difference—4.13%—is marginal. Furthermore, the difference in use of "direct attacks" was only 2.79%. However, this does suggest that female candidates do not necessarily feel bound by traditional gendered assumptions that might restrict them from attacking for fear of appearing "unfeminine." The slight

inclination of female candidate towards attacking could be a product of a challenger strategy adopted by female candidates as a consequence of their conventional exclusion from the political arena. Nevertheless, the marginal difference in frequency of use of negative advertisements urges caution in drawing overly hasty conclusions regarding connections between use of negative advertisements and gender.

In terms of type and style of the negative ads, there were some interesting differences between Senator Obama and Senator Clinton. While Senator Clinton's negative appeals featured a "direct attack against another politician" 76.2% of the time, Senator Obama featured a direct attack in his negative appeals 87.5% of the time. Senator Clinton's remaining negative ads consisted of partisan attacks 7.69% of the time and "general indirect attacks against government and other parties" 15.38% of the time. In contrast, Senator Obama's remaining negative appeals consisted of "indirect/implicit attacks without specific mention of the object of attack" (12.5%). The dominant strategy of Senator Clinton's attacks involved use of negative association with the object of attack's issue stands (46.15%), past performance in offices/positions (38.46%), group affiliations (15.38%), and personal character (7.62%). The dominant strategy of Senator Obama's attacks involved negative association with the opponent's personal characteristics (50%), and issue stands (75%). In addition, 62.5% of Senator Obama's negative appeals utilized negative labels.

Thus, while a "direct attack on their opponent's" issue stands was the preferred method of attack by both candidates, Senator Clinton was significantly more likely to attack on the basis of her opponent's issue stands, past performance, or

affiliations, while half of Senator Obama's attacks made mention of his opponent's personal characteristics and 62.5% of his ads made use of negative labels. This denies conventional assumptions within the literature, which suggest that female candidates are more likely to employ attacks on personal characteristics with use of negative labels (Bystrom 2005: 40). Perhaps, at the presidential level, female candidates might be more likely to focus on issue stands due to the news media's greater focus on "soft news;" in other words, perhaps female candidates strive to highlight their issue competency with greater frequency as they run for higher office. Or, there is the possibility that gender-related trends found within the literature are better explained by greater numbers of female candidates of challenger status than by gender. Within this race, Senator Clinton, in comparison with Senator Obama, exhibited characteristics more common of an incumbent due to her longer years of experience in the political arena; thus, it may have been more advantageous for her to focus on issues and past political experience. Similarly, Senator Obama's use of typically "feminine" challenger strategies—characterized by use of personal attacks—may have been a reflection of his more limited experience in the political arena. Moreover, these findings suggests that Senator Obama did not fear a backlash from featuring negative attack appeals about a woman in his ads; here, it might be interesting to consider how race may have acted as an intervening variable.

H3 and H4: It's All About Style

The third and fourth hypotheses concern gender differences in appeal strategies. I hypothesized that Senator Clinton would employ a greater number of

feminine strategies than Senator Obama and that Senator Clinton would be more likely to employ a strategy characteristic of a challenger.

In regards to dominant appeal type, both candidates employed logical appeals most frequently in their ads. After logical appeals they made most frequent use of emotional appeals, then appeals to source credibility, and lastly fear appeals. Both candidates made almost equal use of fear appeals. Of note is that Senator Clinton did utilize emotional appeals (37.1%) slightly more often than Senator Obama (31.73%). This was perhaps a consequence of an effort to balance appropriate displays of both "masculine" and "feminine" behavior. However, it is important to note that the difference in use of emotional appears is not very large and that both candidates overwhelmingly utilized logical appeals.

As regards specific strategic appeals, both candidates made frequent use of "feminine" strategies. Overall, Senator Clinton did feature a greater proportion of the "feminine" strategies "addressing viewers as peers" (10.48% vs. 5.76%), "inviting participation and action (20.95% vs. 13.46%), "identifying with the experiences of others" (20.95% vs. 3.85%), and "making gender an issue" (2.85% vs. 0%) in comparison with Senator Obama. Thus, these findings provide limited support for H3 that Senator Clinton employed a greater number of "feminine" strategies. However, it is important to note that Senator Obama also utilized the "feminine" strategy of "inviting participation and action" quite frequently. Furthermore, despite the fact that both candidates overwhelmingly employed the "feminine" strategy of "personal tone," Senator Obama utilized it more often (91.34% vs. 78.095%).

Hence, while the results of this study maintain that female candidates may be more likely to use "feminine" strategies, it is interesting to consider whether party acts as an additional mediator towards "feminine" vs. "masculine" strategies as both candidates made frequent use of "feminine strategies." Furthermore, as the scope of this study was restricted to an analysis of gender dynamics, it was not possible to examine the impact of race on "videostyle." However, it is important to consider the possibility that the interaction of race and gender provided more flexibility for Senator Obama in use of "feminine" strategies. This would be an interesting topic for future research.

On the topic of "masculine" strategies, both candidates made similar use of "masculine" strategies "use of statistics" and "use of expert authorities." While Senator Clinton was more likely to employ "use of statistics (Clinton: 15.24% vs. Obama: 10.57%), Senator Obama was more likely to employ "use of expert authorities" (Obama: 29.81% vs. Clinton: 20%). Thus, it is clear that both candidates also utilized a mixture of "masculine" appeals alongside their "feminine" appeals.

As regards strategies characteristic of challenger and incumbent appeals, the candidates made use of components of both. Consistent with gender-related trends, Senator Clinton made more frequent use of the challenger strategy of "attacking opponent's record" confirming part one of H4 (Bystrom: 2004). However, Senator Obama more frequently utilized the challenger strategies of "calling for change" (Obama: 53.85% vs. Clinton: 16.19%) and "optimism for the future" (Obama: 72.12% vs. Clinton: 63.81%). Of particular note is Senator Obama's significantly greater usage of the "calling for change" strategy, which became a trademark of his

campaign. Hence, while Senator Clinton did utilize the challenger strategy of "attacking the opponent's record" and "optimism for the future," Senator Obama utilized challenger strategies more frequently overall.

In regards to incumbent appeals, Senator Clinton utilized the strategy "emphasizing own accomplishments" more frequently than Senator Obama (63.81% vs. 55.76%), contradicting gender-based trends in the literature and negating the second part of H4. Both candidates made almost equal use of the incumbent appeal "using endorsements." These data indicate that Senator Clinton employed a greater number of incumbent appeals overall. These trends may be indicative of Senator Clinton's greater political experience; it seems reasonable that Senator Clinton would have chosen to emphasize her experience and her accomplishments when her leading competitor, Senator Obama, suffered a disadvantage on this topic due to his limited experience in Washington. Furthermore, these findings suggest that traditional association of incumbent appeals with "masculine" behavior and challenger appeals with "feminine" behavior may merely be a byproduct of challenger status.

In sum, what is notable is that both candidates chose to use a mixture of both "masculine/feminine" and "challenger/incumbent" appeals but that Senator Clinton was slightly more likely to employ "feminine" appeals and "incumbent"—typically characterized as "masculine"—appeals than Senator Obama.

H5, H6, H7: Getting To The Issue Of It

The fifth and sixth hypotheses concern the issue emphasis in the candidates' videostyles. I hypothesized that both Senator Clinton and Senator Obama would employ issue appeals more frequently than image appeals but that Senator Clinton

would place a greater emphasis on both image appeals and "feminine" issues than Senator Obama. The data largely confirms my initial two hypotheses, H5 and H6. Both candidates frequently chose to utilize issue appeals over image appeals (confirming H5). However, Senator Clinton chose to employ issue appeals more frequently than Senator Obama (Clinton: 76.19%, Obama: 67.31%); this confirms H6. Furthermore, this finding is consistent with the literature, and suggests that female candidates at the Presidential level, like those who run for lower levels of office, may try to counter gender stereotypes regarding leadership capabilities by overemphasizing issue competency.

The dominant style of issue appeals used in each candidate's ads reveals some interesting findings as well. Senator Clinton's appeals most commonly featured reference to a vague policy preference (60.95%), followed by reference to a general issue concern (57.2%), and lastly specific policy proposals (28.57%). In contrast, Senator Obama's appeals most frequently consisted of reference to a general issue concern (67.31%), followed by reference to a vague policy preference (56.73%), and then specific policy proposals (12.5%). These numbers reveal that Senator Clinton was significantly more likely to feature more specific policy proposals in her ads in comparison with Senator Obama. This trend may be indicative of a gender strategy to illustrate issue competency in order to overcome conventional gendered assumptions.

In regards to issue foci, Senator Clinton discussed the economy (57.4%), health care (38.1), energy dependence (28.57), and foreign policy (20%) most frequently. Senator Obama, on the other hand, highlighted issues such as dissatisfaction with government (30.76%), health care (30.76), the economy

(27.88%), education (23.08%), and bipartisanship/unity in government (23.08%) most frequently. Of note is the fact that both the economy and health care consisted of the top issues for the two candidates. Perhaps, this is indicative of partisan proclivities towards certain policy issues. Furthermore, of interest, is the fact that *both* Senator Clinton and Senator Obama attributed almost equal airtime to health care—a conventionally "feminine" issue.

However, the data does appear to indicate that Senator Obama attributed greater attention to "feminine" issues overall. For instance, Senator Obama discussed the "feminine" issue of education more frequently than Senator Clinton (23.08% vs. 10.48%). While Senator Clinton did pay additional attention to "women's issues"—such as the concerns of single mothers and daycare services—these issues were mentioned in passing a meager 1.9% of the time. Moreover, while the dominant focus of Senator Obama's top three ads was "feminine," featuring issues of health care and education, the dominant focus of Senator Clinton's top three issue ads, consisting of economy, health care, and foreign oil/energy dependence, was slightly more "masculine."[2] Thus, while both candidates featured a similar amount of appeals to "feminine" issues, Senator Obama was more likely to make these "feminine" issues the focus of his campaign. This finding negates H7, which expected that Senator Clinton would place greater emphasis on "feminine" issues, and contradicts gendered assumptions regarding gendered dynamics of policy/issue orientation.

---

[2] In my analysis, I chose to subdivide the environment into two categories: 1) environmental issues related to domestic environmental concerns (which I coded for as "feminine"), 2) foreign oil/energy dependence (which I coded for as "masculine" because it is relevant to international security issues traditionally characterized as "masculine).

Furthermore, although the data indicates that *both* candidates utilized a mixture of "masculine" issues quite frequently in their ads, it also suggests that Senator Clinton chose to focus on "masculine" issues with greater frequency. For instance, both candidates emphasized the "masculine issue" of foreign policy with similar frequency. However, while Senator Obama emphasized traditionally "masculine" issues such as taxes more frequently than Senator Clinton (19.23% vs. 9.52%), Senator Clinton emphasized issue concerns such as the economy (57.4% vs. 27.88%) and energy dependence/foreign oil (28.57% vs. 11.54%), with much greater frequency than Senator Obama. Furthermore, Senator Clinton top three issue ads had a more "masculine" focus. Thus, while it is evident that both candidates made use of appeals to "masculine" issues, it appears that Senator Clinton may have placed a slightly greater emphasis on "masculine" issues. This strategic choice is indicative of a gender "tactic" resonant with "equality" feminism.

Also of interest, as regards Senator Obama's policy concerns was his unconventional focus on issues such as dissatisfaction with government (30.76%), bipartisanship/unity (23.08%), anti-lobbyist/corporate interests (23.08%), and ethics reform (14.42%). These trends in issue focus likely strategically positioned him as an outsider to conventionally corrupt Washington politics, successfully turning his inexperience into an advantage while simultaneously strengthening his slogan for change. While not relevant to gender-based distinctions or our analysis of gender strategy, this trend in Senator Obama's ads is notable because it likely provided him an undeniable edge and provides insight into the development of the Democratic Primary race.

In sum, while the data does confirm some conventional gender assumptions within the literature—namely, that Senator Obama emphasized taxes (a "male" issue) more frequently than Senator Clinton—overall, the results do not confirm gender expectations regarding policy orientation. Rather, the data reveals that both candidates illustrated great issue concern for "feminine issues" and that Senator Clinton may have placed slightly more emphasis on certain conventionally "masculine" issues. Furthermore, it is apparent that they both addressed a healthy mixture of "masculine" and feminine" issues. This suggests that traditional gender-related trends found within the literature in regards to image foci may be better explained by partisan affiliation than gender dynamics.

H8, H9: How Do You Like My Look?: Traits and Image Emphasis

Hypotheses 8 and 9 concern the substance and style of image emphasis in the candidate's paid media. Based on trends within the literature, I assumed Senator Clinton would emphasize "masculine" character traits of toughness and strength more frequently than Senator Obama and that Senator Obama would emphasize the "feminine" traits of sensitivity and understanding alongside the "masculine" trait of experience. The data largely confirms H8: while Senator Clinton chose to emphasize the characteristic of toughness/strength 20.95% of the time, Senator Obama only emphasized this characteristic a meager 1.923% of the time. This is consistent with the literature on gender strategies, indicating that Senator Clinton was likely concerned with surmounting gender stereotypes regarding her perceived capabilities as commander-in-chief.

In contrast, the data largely negates H9. While Senator Obama chose to emphasize the character trait of sensitivity/understanding 15.24%, Senator Clinton emphasized this characteristic 28.57% of the time. Furthermore, Senator Clinton emphasized the "masculine" trait of experience significantly more often than Senator Obama (17.14% vs. .95%). This suggests that common associations of experience with "masculinity" may merely be a product of female candidates traditional status as outsiders to politics due to the gendered history of the political arena.

Interestingly, however, Senator Obama did discuss his past performance in politics more frequently than Senator Clinton (26.92% vs. 15.23%). This trait, like emphasis on experience, is typical of an incumbent appeal. Perhaps, this trend was part of a general strategy to confront accusations of inexperience and emphasize his capacity to impart change; in other words, by emphasizing his performance/success during his brief time in politics, he may have been trying to indicate that, despite his limited time in politics, the time he had spent was marked with success and accomplishments, suggesting that he had the ability to really change Washington and get things done. The emphasis of this trait, alongside his other top traits, honesty/integrity (31.73%), sensitivity/understanding (15.38%), inspiring (12.5%), and aggressiveness/fighter (11.54%), complement one another in depicting him as a successful agent of change. Whether or not this finding is relevant to broader gender-related trends is uncertain.

In terms of general trait emphasis, Senator Clinton's top character traits of relevance were as follows: leadership (29.52%), sensitivity/understanding (28.57%), aggressiveness/fighter (24.76%), warmth/compassion (21.9%), toughness/strength

(20.95%), honesty/integrity (19.05%), and then experience in politics (17.14%). The use of sensitivity/understanding and leadership as her top two image traits seems to bespeak of an effort to balance "femininity" and "masculinity" by merging sensitivity/understanding, often associated with women, with the ability to be an effective leader. This likely fit into a larger strategy to cast her as an effective leader capable of bringing change. However, it is easy to see how her implicit calls for change alongside her emphasis of the need for new leadership may have gotten lost alongside Senator Obama's explicit references to change.

Circling back to the relevance of these traits in regards to gender strategy it is evident that both of the candidates chose to emphasize "masculine" and "feminine" traits simultaneously. While the findings indicate that Senator Clinton emphasized "masculine" traits of leadership, fighter, and toughness/strength more frequently than Senator Obama, they also indicate that she emphasized feminine traits of sensitivity and warmth/compassion more frequently than he did. In contrast, Senator Obama emphasized "masculine" traits of past performance/success in politics and feminine" traits of "honesty/integrity more frequently than Senator Clinton. Furthermore, both candidates chose to emphasize "competency/intelligence" at similar rates. In sum, although Senator Clinton placed slightly more emphasis on "masculine" traits than Senator Obama, both candidates used a mixture of "masculine and "feminine" traits most frequently. Thus, in contrast to assertions that Senator Clinton haphazardly shifted emphasis from "masculine" to "feminine" appeals, the data indicates that, at least in regards to character traits, Senator Clinton consistently chose to emphasize *both* "masculine" and "feminine" traits.

H10 – 11: Gendered Roles: Family and Children

Hypotheses 10 and 11 concern the frequency with which the candidates featured their families and/or children that were not their own in the ads. I had suggested that Senator Clinton would be less likely to feature ads with her family than Senator Obama and that Senator Clinton would be more likely to feature ads with children that were not her own.

The data confirms both of these hypotheses. Senator Obama featured images of his family in 20.19% of his ads, while Senator Clinton featured images of her family in only 5.71% of her ads—a large discrepancy. When this data is broken down, it reveals that Senator Obama featured his spouse in 4.81% of his ads, his children in 4.81% of his ads, his mother in 15.38% of his ads, his father in 9.62% of his ads, and himself as a child in 14.42% of his ads. In contrast, Senator Clinton featured her spouse in 0 ads, her daughter in 2.86% of her ads, her mother in 4.76% of her ads, her father in 1.9% of her ads, her grandfather in .95% of her ads, and herself as a child in 1.9% of her ads. In all the categories surveyed, Senator Obama featured his family more frequently in his advertisements. Therefore, the data validates H10. In regards to H11, the data reveals that Senator Clinton featured children that were not her own in 54.29% of her ads while Senator Obama included children that were not his own in 22.12% of his ads. Thus, the data affirms H11 as well; Senator Clinton chose to feature children that were not her own at significantly higher rates than Senator Obama.

These findings suggest that Senator Clinton may have felt particularly constrained in the context of discussion of traditional and accepted feminine roles in society. Her reluctance to feature family members in advertisements, in comparison with Senator Obama, indicates that she likely recognized the "double binds" under which she was placed and may have been wary of gendered criticism related to fulfillment of traditional gender roles. Furthermore, the complete absence of her spouse, former President Bill Clinton, from her advertisements is indicative of the unique gender binds under which she was placed as a former First Lady and the efforts she made to legitimize her candidacy independent from him. Unfortunately, these binds disadvantage female candidates because voters tend to feel more favorably towards female candidates when they are featured within the "content domains of family" images (Hitchon and Chang 1995: 430). Hence, perhaps Senator Clinton's decision to feature children that were not her own at a high frequency than Senator Obama, a trend consistent with the literature, was part of an overall strategy to overcome these double binds and appease gender stereotypes.

In contrast, Senator Obama's frequent use of family and children in his ads suggests that he did not feel the same constraints that Senator Clinton confronted. He frequently featured his family in his ads. Furthermore, his choice to feature children that were not his own at lower rates may be indicative of a "masculine" gender strategy which recognizes that male candidates are often rated more favorably when viewed within the context of campaign activities (Hitchon and Chang 1995: 430).

Thus, analysis of both Senator Clinton and Senator Obama's strategic placement of family and children in their ads suggests that they were both

manipulating gender dynamics in different ways that would be most beneficial to their individual candidacies.

H12 – 14: Nonverbal Communication: Smiles and Eye Contact

Hypotheses 12 -14 concern the facial expressions and nonverbal interactions of the candidates with their audience. I hypothesized that Senator Clinton would speak and smile more frequently in her ads while both Senators Clinton and Obama would employ similar rates of eye contact. The data negates H12 and 14 while it confirms H13.

In contradiction with H12, the data illustrates that Senator Obama chose to speak in his ads more frequently than Senator Clinton (Obama: 47.11% vs. Clinton: 28.57%) while Senator Clinton utilized an announcer as the solitary speaker more frequently (Clinton: 41.43% vs. Obama: 28.84%). While both candidates made use of mixed techniques—employing both announcer and speaker, placing the disclaimer at the start of the ad, and/or utilizing multiple speakers—with similar frequency, Senator Obama chose to speak directly to the audience more frequently. Whether this finding is indicative of a specific gender strategy or larger gender-related trends at the Presidential level is uncertain and additional research should be conducted to consider whether race might have acted as an intervening variable in this case. Interestingly though, according to Kaid and Johnston's measure of Presidential Videostyle, victorious presidential contenders tended to speak more often in their campaign spots (2001:181). Thus, perhaps Senator Obama was able to better appeal to voters through his use of this technique.

Affirming H13, the data indicates that Senator Clinton chose to smile in her ads 83% of the time while Senator Obama only smiled in his ads 37.5% of the time. In contrast, Obama wore an attentive/serious expression in 98.08% of his ads while Senator Clinton wore an attentive/serious expression in only 72.381% of her ads.

As regards H14, Senator Clinton was slightly more likely to employ direct eye contact than Senator Obama. Both candidates overwhelmingly chose not to use eye contact. However, whereas Senator Obama opted not to use eye contact 73.08% of the time Senator Clinton chose not to do so only 61.9% of the time. Senator Clinton made direct eye contact "always" 8.57% of the time, "almost always" 5.71% of the time, "sometimes" 12.28% of the time, and "almost never" 11.43% of the time. In contrast, Senator Obama made direct eye contact "always" 8.65% of the time, "almost always" 6.73% of the time, "sometimes" 4.81% of the time, and almost never 6.73% of the time. Thus, while Senator Clinton and Senator Obama both chose to make direct eye contact "always" and "almost always" at similar rates, the data does suggest that Senator Clinton made more frequent use of eye contact "sometimes" and "almost never." As the categories that reveal significant differences were those that featured less eye contact, this finding does not indicate a huge discrepancy. However, it does suggest that Senator Clinton utilized direct eye contact slightly more often than Senator Obama.

The fact that Senator Clinton chose to use direct eye contact and to smile more frequently suggests that she may have been trying to make a more personal connection with voters. It is also possible that by smiling frequently she was trying to soften her image in order to balance accepted characteristics of "masculine" and

"feminine" behavior. Alongside this trend, the use of direct eye contact may have been used as a tool to illustrate her commitment and legitimacy to the voters. These findings are consistent with the literature and may be indicative of socialized patterns of behavior of males and females in society.

H15-17: Who, Where, and Wardrobe?: Setting, Demographics, Dress

The remaining hypotheses concern the dress of the candidates, the setting of the ads, and the major demographic groups featured in the ads. I suggested that Senator Clinton would be slightly more likely to dress in formal attire than Senator Obama but that there would be no significant differences in either the settings or the demographic groups included in each candidate's campaign spots.

Regarding H15, the data provides limited support for my assumption. Senator Clinton was slightly more likely to dress in formal attire than Senator Obama; while none of Senator Clinton's ads featured her in casual dress, 5.76% of Senator Obama's ads depicted him in more casual attire. While this finding does provide limited support for the assertion that female candidates may feel more constrained by gender and therefore less likely to wear casual dress, the difference noted in this case is not very significant and should be considered with prudence. Overall, it is important to recognize that both candidates overwhelmingly chose to wear formal attire. In addition, Kaid and Johnston suggest that "presidential style" is usually characterized by formal dress (2001: 179). Thus, formal dress appears to be a dominant characteristic not only of female candidate's spots, but also of Presidential candidates more generally (Kaid and Johnston 2001: 179).

In regards to H16 and 17, the data largely affirms my assumptions. Both Senator Clinton and Senator Obama chose to use a combination of inside/outside settings in the majority of their ads (Clinton: 52.38% vs. Obama: 59.62%), followed by exclusive use of an inside setting (Clinton: 45.71% vs. Obama: 36.53%), and then outside setting (Clinton: 1.9% vs. Obama: 3.84%). Moreover, both candidates featured similar percentages of white men (Clinton: 87.62% vs. Obama: 90.38%), white women (Clinton: 90.48% vs. Obama: 88.46%), and ethnic/racial minorities (Clinton: 60% vs. Obama: 68.26%).

Of slight note, however, is the fact that Senator Clinton featured slightly more white women and that Senator Obama featured slightly more ethnic/racial minorities. Furthermore, although not explicitly coded for, during the coding process, I frequently observed a larger proportion of women featured in Senator Clinton's individual ads and a larger proportion of ethnic/racial minorities featured in Senator Obama's individual ads. Whether this was a consequence of the images drawn from campaigns and rallies—and the characteristics of the voters that attended those events—or an explicit choice made by the candidates to appeal to specific demographic groups is interesting to consider and might be an interesting topic for future researchers to explore.

Discussion and Concluding Remarks

The analysis of campaign spots aired during the Democratic Presidential Primary revealed many similarities between Senator Obama and Senator Clinton's videostyles. Nevertheless, some notable differences were uncovered that are both

consistent and inconsistent with broader gender-related trends within the literature. These insights into gender strategy provide a unique look not only into the candidate's chosen gender strategy, but also into the candidate's overarching campaign strategies.

Overall, the data reveals a consistent mixture of "feminine" and "masculine" appeals in both candidates' campaign spots. As regards issue concern, strategic appeals, and image emphasis, both candidates employed a medley of "feminine" and "masculine" appeals. While Senator Clinton utilized feminine appeals/speech strategies slightly more often than Senator Obama, Senator Obama employed a slightly more "feminine" issue focus. In regards to image focus, Senator Clinton consistently employed conventionally "masculine" and "feminine" traits at greater frequency that Senator Obama. Senator Obama, in contrast, made use of a lot of unconventional issues and image traits that consistently cast him as an outsider to Washington politics—indicative of his larger campaign strategy. Nevertheless, aside from minor differences in dominant focus of their campaign spots, the data indicates that both candidates made frequent reference to a variety of "masculine" and "feminine" appeals.

Specifically, in regards to Senator Clinton, it is clear that she did not present a strategy that was wholly resonant with either "equality" or "difference" feminism. Rather, she consistently mediated between tactics of both. Thus, it does not appear that Senator Clinton chose to emphasize an explicit gender strategy at the expense of another or that she haphazardly shifted emphasis from one to another; rather, the data

reveals that she consistently made use of a mixture of "masculine" and "feminine" appeals through her campaign.

Furthermore, in regards to nonverbal techniques, it is evident that both candidates manipulated gender in ways that may have been most beneficial to them. This is evident in regards to trends in placement of family and children in the advertisements as well as in trends related to use of particular facial expressions and direct eye contact. Senator Clinton was less likely to include her family in her ads and more likely to include children that were not her own. In addition, Senator Clinton used direct eye contact and smiled more frequently than Senator Obama. The findings concerning these trends were largely consistent with the literature and are suggestive of broader gender-related trends. While these strategies are undoubtedly indicative of specific gender strategies, it is important to consider how socialized patterns of behavior in relation to smiling and use of direct eye contact may affect male and female candidates "videostyle."

The one area in which both Senator Clinton and Senator Obama's campaign strategy overtly tended to contradict gendered assumptions within the literature was in relation to use of incumbent and challenger appeals. The literature posits that female candidates are more likely to use challenger appeals in their ads (Bystrom 2005). However, this trend seems less attributable to gender and more relevant to the challenger status of incoming female candidates who have been historically excluded from the political arena. In this case, Senator Clinton had greater experience than her competitor; thus, it is reasonable to expect that she would have employed a more

incumbent strategy. Similarly, it is understandable why Senator Obama's campaign would have exhibited characteristics more common of a challenger strategy.

Also of slight note is the fact that Senator Obama's campaign strategy did conflict with some of the literature's gendered assumptions. In particular, although Senator Obama chose to emphasize both "masculine" and "feminine" traits and issues, the dominant focus of his appeals tended to be more "feminine" than is common for male candidates within the literature. I recognize these trends throughout my study and have consistently suggested that race may have acted as an intervening variable in this case. Whether this finding is indicative of narrowing differences in different gender strategies of male and female candidates, at least at the Presidential level, is uncertain; it would be interesting to re-run an analysis of gendered strategies within this race, with an additional measure of Senator John Edwards's videostyle in order to assess the impact of race on videostyle and to ascertain a clearer picture of gendered dynamics within this election. Nevertheless, this study still provides useful insight into the broader campaign dynamics underlying the Democratic Presidential Primary race as well as the gendered dynamics within the Clinton campaign. With these results in mind, I now turn to the secondary purpose of this study: to assess the prevalence of media bias in coverage of the Clinton campaign.

V. Correspondence between Paid and Free Media: Biased or Not?

"'The image of charismatic leadership at the top has been and continues to be a man," said Ruth Mandel, director of the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University. "Barack Obama's appeal and charisma is uniquely his own, but it also fits with an age-old history of men who electrify followers. . . . We don't have an image, we don't have a historical memory of a woman who has achieved that feat.'...That may not be coming anytime soon. Gender isn't the most restricting force in American life. It remains a force to be reckoned with" (Marcus 2008).

In modern campaigns, paid (purchased political advertisements) and free (independent news) media play an important complementary role in delivering candidate's messages, issue orientations, and character presentations to the public. The quantity, quality—substance—and tone of news media affects the ways in which the voters receive and interpret candidate's messages presented via paid media. Campaign messages "will be most coherent if those messages are…echoed by the press…[When] the agendas of the candidate and the news media do not correspond, the impact of the candidate's message" may be diminished (Kahn 1993: 483). In the following section, I utilize the data ascertained from examination of Senator Obama and Senator Clinton's political advertisements in order to draw a comparison between the candidates' personal campaign and gender presentation, and free media's independent coverage of similar topics. If free media appears to have unfaithfully conveyed the messages of one candidate over the other, then bias will be further evident. Furthermore, in regards to gender presentation, if the media's discussion of gender largely deviates from Senator Clinton's personal gender presentation in comparison with Senator Obama, than a gender bias will be further difficult to refute. However, if the media's focus on certain policy issues, personal matters, character traits, and names/titles of the candidates correspond with the candidate's personal

focus on those topics in paid media, it can be reasonably argued that a certain degree of gender bias surfaced as a consequence of flawed gender campaign strategy.

Before embarking on this discussion, it is important to note that the indicators of bias, which this section seeks to assess, are largely "traditional" indicators of media bias—notably discrepancies in quantity and quality of coverage (Miller, Peake, and Boulton 2010). However, one of the most important findings regarding media bias in the 2008 Presidential Primary recognize evidence of a significant "tonal bias" which is more difficult to account for in this study (Lawrence 2010, Murray 2010, Miller, Peake, and Boulton 2010). Although I will attempt to address all the findings of the studies pertaining to media bias, tonal bias—in terms of pure negativity of coverage—and bias in the form of negative horse-race coverage cannot be directly confirmed or denied as a product of faulty gender or campaign strategy in paid media; paid media is meant to be positive when produced by the candidate in question and obviously does not focus on the horse-race. Nevertheless, I intend to discuss the implications of tonal bias, in the four subsections of my discussion (naming, issues, character traits, and personal matters), in contrast with the candidate's message presentations to the best of my ability. It might be interesting to consider how the negative attacks by opposing candidates in paid media might have affected free media's negative coverage of the candidates in question. Unfortunately, as not all the candidates from the Primary election were surveyed, this task is beyond the scope of this study. I recommend future research into this topic. With these limitations in mind, I now turn towards the focus of my study: analysis of trends in free media's

coverage of naming, issue coverage, character traits, and personal matters vs. paid media's candidate presentation of those same topics.

Naming/Titles

The use of titles and trends in naming female candidates is a frequent topic of interest in discussion of gendered media bias. Historically, presidential female candidates have been recipients of a notable gender bias in regards to naming (Falk 2008). In a comparison of the campaigns of presidential candidates Margaret Chase Smith in 1964, Shirley Chisholm in 1972, Patricia Schroeder in 1987, and Moseley Braun in 2004, with their male competitors, Falk finds that for three out of the four female candidates free media was less likely to use the relevant "honorary titles"—Senator/Congresswoman—than for their male competitors (62). Furthermore, the female candidates were more likely to be referred to as "Mrs." or "Ms.," making direct reference to their marital status, while a survey of eight former presidential female candidates revealed that women were also more likely to be referenced by their first name than their male opponents were (Falk 2008: 62-63).

In the context of the 2008 Democratic Primary, scholars observed similar trends regarding Senator Clinton. In a study of television and cable networks news coverage from November 1, 2007 – May 30, 2008, Uscinski and Goren discovered that Senator Clinton was 6% more likely than Senator Obama to be referenced by her first name only, and 14% less likely than Senator Obama to be referenced by her last name only (2010). In Lawrence's analysis of newspapers and televised evening news programs dating from mid-October 2007 through mid-June 2008, the data revealed

that Senator Clinton was slightly more likely than Senator Obama to be referenced by her "surname preceded by Senator" and significantly more likely to be mentioned by "first name only" (2010: 165). The data revealing that Senator Clinton was referenced by her honorary title more frequently is interesting. Perhaps, it was a product of her more frequent emphasis on her accomplishments and experience or a consequence of the notable name recognition she had garnered over the years as Senator and First Lady. Possibly, it could illustrate that some reporters were more cognizant of her gender and were concerned with referencing her in an appropriate manner. Nevertheless, the differences found between reference of Senator Clinton and Senator Obama's honorary titles were not statistically significant in both studies. On the other hand, more frequent reference to Senator Clinton by first name, in contrast to more frequent reference of her competitors by last name was found to be statistically significant in multiple studies (Murray 2010, Lawrence 2010, Uscinski and Goren 2010). This would seem to suggest a gender bias in free media.

However, contrasting these trends in free media with the candidate's personal emphasis in paid media encourages one to assess those findings with a grain of salt. Whereas Senator Obama was referenced by only his full name and his last name in his political advertisements, Senator Clinton was frequently mentioned by not only her full and last name, but also her first name. While none of Senator Obama's ads mentioned him by first name, 20.95% of Senator Clinton's political advertisements referenced her by first name only—a notable difference. Senator Clinton's position as former President Bill Clinton's wife likely placed her in a difficult position. During his time in office, she had been viewed as a largely polarizing figure. Thus, the use of

her first name, “Hillary” was likely employed as a tool to distinguish herself from her husband and simultaneously make her appear more “likeable.” Nevertheless, while the personal binds imposed on her by her past are relevant in understanding the constraints that she faced, this does not diminish the fact that her use of “Hillary” in her paid media likely contributed/encouraged free media’s use of that title. In this case, it seems very feasible that the naming biases Senator Clinton experienced were partly a product of a mismanaged gender/campaign strategy. Thus, naming cannot be referenced as a reliable indicator of gender bias in this case.

Issues

Scholarly literature regarding media bias directed at female candidates suggests that female candidates are likely to be attributed less issue attention than male candidates due to lower journalistic perceptions of the female candidate’s viability (Kahn 1994: 166). In addition, the literature posits that female candidates will be more likely to receive coverage with regard to “female issues”—typically identified as more domestic concerns such as health care, education, etc; if this is the case, female candidates are at a significant disadvantage due to general prioritization of “male issues”—foreign policy, economics, etc.—within the executive arena (Kahn 1994).

Diverging from conventional trends related to quantity of issue coverage for female candidates, most of the studies conducted on the 2008 election indicate that Senator Clinton received almost equal or slightly elevated amounts of issue coverage in comparison to her competitors. Lawrence’s analysis of national newspapers and

network television indicates that a slightly greater number of issue paragraphs were devoted to Senator Clinton in comparison with Senator Obama (2010: 183). The percentage of issue stories appearing alongside Senator Clinton in the headlines was slightly less but remarkably similar in number to those associated with Senator Obama (Lawrence 2010). Miller's analysis of major newspapers in every state alongside two national papers reveal similar trends with Senator Clinton receiving a slightly greater percentage of issue-based news than her competitor Senator Obama (Miller, Peake, and Boulton 2010: 179). The only major deviation from these trends is apparent in a study conducted of local newspapers in Iowa and New Hampshire which recorded Senator Clinton receiving issue-based coverage in only 8% of stories while Senator Obama received issue-based coverage in 24% of studies. It may be that local-based news affiliations are more likely to report on the basis of gender biases; further research should be conducted to explore the validity of this assumption. In sum, however, it appears that, at least on a national scale, Senator Clinton was receiving largely equal or more issue attention than Senator Obama.

Comparison of these trends with those found in the candidates' paid media suggests that in this instance, national news networks and national publications may have been faithfully mirroring the differences in Senator Clinton and Senator Obama's emphasis in their political advertisements. Both candidates Senator Clinton and Senator Obama were overwhelming more likely to emphasize issues rather than images as the dominant focus of their ads. However, whereas Senator Clinton emphasized issues 76.19%, Senator Obama emphasized them only 67.13%, culminating in a net difference of 9.13%. Furthermore, Senator Clinton was

significantly more likely to suggest specific policy proposals in her ads than Senator Obama. While causality is difficult to determine directly, in this instance it seems probable that Senator Clinton's overwhelming focus on issues may have contributed to a corresponding, although slight, elevated issue focus on her in the news media. In contrast, if future studies of local news reporting display a similar trend to those found in local newspapers in Iowa and New Hampshire, then this is undeniable evidence of a gender bias in local news that cannot be attributed to mismanaged campaign strategy regarding this topic.

The other aspect of issue coverage of concern for this study regards the issue foci of free media and paid media. The top two issues discussed in free media coverage of the Democratic Primary consisted of Iraq and health care (Miller, Peake, and Boulton 2010: 179). Interestingly, these were the two topics upon which Senator Clinton had a more mixed record; her efforts at health care reform during the (Bill) Clinton administration had not succeeded and she had voted to go to war in Iraq, which was widely viewed negatively by the public. 5.7%—a rate significantly higher than her opponents—of news stories discussing these issues made reference to a "job-related failure," meaning that 5.7% of Senator Clinton's major issue coverage made reference to her failed policy attempts (Miller, Peake, and Boulton 2010: 179). According to the Project for Excellence in Journalism (PEJ), 9.9% of the 9.9% of stories discussing foreign policy in relation to Senator Clinton discussed the Iraq War, while the 8.3% of foreign policy-related stories discussing Senator Obama focused on a larger variety of issues. This focus on what the media "characterized as her biggest

failures" gave a decidedly negative slant to her coverage, suggesting bias (Miller, Peake, and Boulton 2010: 180).

Looking towards the content of issue appeals, in the candidates' paid media, it appears that both Senator Obama and Senator Clinton were highly focused on health care and the economy in their campaign spots. Senator Clinton's ads focused on the economy most frequently (57.4%), followed by health care (28.57%), while Senator Obama's ads concentrated on health care and "dissatisfaction with government" most often (30.76% each), followed by the economy (27.88%). Reviewing this data, it is difficult to say that the focus on health care was solely a product of a news media bias. Health care was clearly a dominant focus of the candidate's campaign spots; thus, it is reasonable to infer that free media would have chosen to discuss this issue with frequency, meaning that this trend would not be a reliable indicator of bias.

In regards to Iraq, while Senator Clinton made reference to general foreign policy issues 20% of the time in paid media, she made direct reference to this issue only 3.81% of the time. In contrast, while Senator Obama made reference to foreign policy issues a similar 20.19%, he directed attention towards Iraq in 8.65% of his ads. Thus, free media's coverage of Iraq in relation to Senator Clinton is clearly inconsistent with her and Senator Obama's emphasis on this issue in their ads. This trend clearly disadvantaged Clinton and would seem indicative of bias. Female candidates are often considered less competent on "masculine" issues such as foreign policy (Kahn 1994). Thus, the media's overwhelming focus on Clinton's one-time foreign policy error—her vote to authorize the war on Iraq—appears consistent with claims of gender bias. However, it is important to note that the Iraq war's general

unpopularity with the public situated it as an unavoidable topic of discussion for the 2008 elections. Nevertheless, correlation of Iraq with Senator Clinton, in comparison to Senator Obama, at the expense of other foreign policy issues may be suggestive of a slight gender bias regarding the relationship between female candidates and perceptions of competency concerning "masculine issues."

Personality/Character Traits

With the turn in modern journalism towards "soft" news, political candidates are increasingly portrayed via "character frames" that seek to create an overarching campaign narrative about a candidate (Lawrence 2010, Miller 2010). These narratives become embedded in evaluations of political candidates for the relevant offices they seek, positioning certain character traits as prerequisites to presidential character. In turn, this trend towards personalization of presidential candidates heightens perceptions of perceived candidate flaws and virtues, which can ultimately sway voter's decisions at the ballot box.

This trend is particularly unsetting for female candidates, since historical legacies of masculine dominance in the executive preferences images and characteristics of male candidates; "male" characteristics are traditionally associated with prerequisites of effective leadership—competency, experience, strength, etc. (Huddy and Terkildsen 1993). As a consequence, female candidates must struggle to overcome association with "feminine" traits that make them appear unfit for office and instead exhibit appropriate displays of masculine behavior. Free media can perpetuate these gender stereotypes by focusing disproportionately on the

personalities of female candidates or associating female candidates with disproportionately negative characteristics that suggest that they are ill prepared for office.

During the 2008 Democratic Presidential Primaries, Senator Clinton, as in other categories, observed minor, if any, discrepancies in total *amount* of coverage on her character. Unlike previous female contenders, Senator Clinton, on average, received similar amounts of character-based coverage in the content of newspaper articles as her major competitor, Senator Obama (Lawrence 2010: 183, Miller, Peake and Boulton 2010: 181). According to a study of headlines of major national newspapers and evening news programs, Senator Clinton appeared in slightly less character-based stories (Lawrence 2010: 183). However, a study of major state publications alongside national newspapers, Clinton was featured in character-based headlines more frequently than Senator Obama at a statistically significant rate (Miller, Peake, Boulton 2010). This might suggest what was perceived earlier in regards to issue coverage of Senator Clinton—namely that local news outlets are more likely to reflect a notable gender bias in reference to quantity of coverage.

In paid media, Senator Clinton featured significantly less image-focused campaign spots than Senator Obama. Thus, any overt focus by free media on character-based stories would suggest inconsistent transmission of candidate messages and additional bias against Senator Clinton. While it appears that some bias may have been evident in local news coverage of Senator Clinton, on the whole, amount of coverage appears to have been primarily equitable with little evidence of discernible bias.

However, in reference to quality of candidate-based news coverage, a notable bias was observed in coverage of Senator Clinton's character traits. Senator Clinton received criticism or negative coverage regarding her personal traits significantly more often than Senator Obama (Lawrence 2010, Miller, Peake, and Boulton 2010). In the content of news articles, Clinton received a balance of negative and positive character-based coverage at a net difference of +.08, while Senator Obama received a balance a +6, providing him with significantly more positive coverage (Miller, Peake and Boulton 2010: 180). Furthermore, in headline references, Obama received a net difference of +14.3 while Senator Clinton received a net difference of -.04, an even more notable difference. As regards evaluation of traits, Senator Clinton was consistently rated more negatively on "character-related" traits while Senator Obama was consistently rated more negatively on "job-related" traits. This is interesting in considering that in their paid media, Senator Clinton was significantly more likely to emphasize her experience and qualifications than Senator Obama. Perhaps this positive focus on the "job-related" as opposed to "character-related" traits is somewhat reflective of the emphases of their campaigns.

The negative and positive character traits frequently associated with Senator Clinton are listed as follows. In an analysis of *The New York Times* and *USA Today*, Clinton was significantly more likely to be associated with "masculine" traits—tough, powerful independent, uncompromising, authoritative, secretive, cold, methodical, and steely (Murray 2010). In Milton's analysis of major state publications and national newspapers, Senator Clinton was most frequently associated with the negative characteristics of "secretive/lying/deceptive" (18%),

"negative/cold/calculating/unlikable" (14.2%), "polarizing/divisive/partisan" (11.7%), and "Washington insider/status quo" (10.4%) (Miller, Peake, and Boulton 2010). In contrast, the positive characteristics most frequently associated with her were "experienced/qualified/competent" (24.2%), "strong/tough/leader" (12.8%), and "prepared/ready/tested" (8.8%) (Miller, Peake, and Boulton 2010). Interestingly, the character traits she was most frequently associated with, both negatively and positively, were more "masculine" oriented.

In contrast, the negative and positive character traits associated with Senator Obama were more "feminine" oriented (Murray 2010, Milton, Peake and Boulton 2010). In analysis of *The New York Times and USA Today*, he was never characterized as tough or aggressive (Murray 2010). Furthermore, the top positive traits associated with him were "change agent/outsider" (18%), "inspirational/hopeful" (13.4%), "good speaker/charismatic," and "uniter/bipartisan" (8.6%) (Miller, Peake, and Boulton 2010). In comparison, the top negative traits associated with Senator Obama were "inexperienced/unqualified" (31.6%), "all talk/short on details" (11.3%), and "lying/deceptive/dishonest" (6.4%) (Miller, Peake and Boulton 2010).

In comparison with the character traits emphasized in Senator Clinton and Senator Obama's paid media, free media's emphasis on positive character traits seems to interestingly mirror those character traits with the greatest differentials in emphasis between the two candidates. While it is true that Senator Clinton emphasized leadership most frequently in her ads (29.52%)—likely accounting to a certain extent for free media's focus on her competency and leadership—her

emphasis on toughness/strength (20.95%) and experience (17.14%) was preceded by emphasis on warmth/compassion (21.9%) and sensitivity/understanding (28.57%)—traditional female characteristics. However, Senator Obama also frequently made reference to these similar female characteristics (warmth: 10.58%, sensitivity/understanding 15.38%) and they ranked within his top five character traits emphasized. In contrast, he almost never emphasized experience (.96%) or toughness/strength (1.923%). Similarly, Senator Obama's emphases on candidate traits such as "inspiring" (12.5%), hopeful (4.81%), and bipartisanship (which I coded for as an issue and which Senator Obama emphasized 23.08% of the time), which were never mentioned by Senator Clinton, are those that he was rated most positively for.

In a media world increasingly oriented towards "game framing"—focus on who is winning and who is losing—and character scripts, it is reasonable to assume that free media would have exploited any notable difference between the candidates. Part of the reason why the primary battle was so closely contested was due to the fact that the two major candidates—Senator Obama and Senator Clinton—were actually very similar in terms of policy orientation; hence, any noted differences in the candidates' message presentations would have been fair game. Thus, Senator Clinton became hyper-"masculinized" while Senator Obama, in some ways, became hyper-"femininized." This may have worked to his benefit in the unique political environment of 2008, increasingly oriented towards change in the wake of the Bush Presidency. Furthermore, it seems feasible that allegations of overt and mismanaged gender strategy may have emerged from this media trend. Many political elites and

scholars criticized Senator Clinton for attempting to depict herself as hyper-"masculine" and then suddenly switching course to a hyper-"feminized" persona in the aftermath of the New Hampshire primary—where she reportedly "teared" up (Lawrence 2010, Traister 2010). Hence, it seems that perceptions of explicit gender strategy in this sense may have been more a product of free media's candidate narratives and depictions of Senator Clinton rather than a valid reflection of her personal strategy, which consistently featured emphasis on both "masculine" and "feminine" appeals.

Thus, it appears that neither candidate received a faithful transmission of the candidate traits that they chose to emphasize. Both were saddled with those positive traits, highlighted in their campaigns, which illustrated the greatest differences in their candidacies. Furthermore, once candidate narratives had been established, the converse of the positive traits for one candidate became the equivalent of the negative traits for the other. Hence, while Senator Obama was likeable, hopeful, inspiring, and oriented towards compromise, Senator Clinton was cold, unfeeling, unyielding, and the representative of the status quo (Milton, Peake and Boulton 2010). Similarly, while Senator Clinton was experienced, authoritative, and strong, Senator Obama was weak and inexperienced. While both candidates were recipients of modern journalistic trends oriented towards construction of "meta-narratives," it is evident that the negative focus on Senator Clinton's character, in contrast to the negative focus on Senator Obama's qualifications, may have disproportionately disadvantaged Senator Clinton as a consequence of the growing personalization of presidential candidates. Furthermore, her candidate narrative portrayed a specific gender narrative

that may have implicated that she was unstable or unfit for office. Thus, as regards the question of media bias, it is clear that any bias regarding character traits was less a product of the candidate's personal strategy and more a product of journalistic trends in free media. In other words, faulty gender strategy cannot be argued to have promoted the bias in this area of media coverage. If anything, comparison of trends in free media and paid media reveal an even more discernable media bias.

Husbands and Children: The Frightening Case of the Ambitious Woman

Gender framing can serve as another prominent lens via which to disadvantage female candidates. Although this framing can manifest itself in a multitude of ways, in my analysis I examine its application in discussion of Senator Clinton and Senator Obama in depiction of traditional gender roles. For female candidates, gender framing can be particularly harmful as it can draw undue attention to the candidate's gender and her traditional outsider status within the political arena, causing the candidate to appear unsuited for office.

During the 2008 Democratic Presidential Primary, Senator Clinton was consistently discussed more frequently than Senator Obama in relation to her spouse and her children. In Lawrence's study of major national news publications and national network television, it was revealed that former President Bill Clinton was referenced in 30 percent of the stories surveyed, while only 4% mentioned Michelle Obama (2010: 165); Senator Clinton's daughter, Chelsea Clinton, was mentioned 4.6% of the time while Senator Obama's daughters were only discussed 2.5% of the time. Similarly, in Miller's study of major state news publications and national news

providers, Senator Clinton's marital status was mentioned 24.9% of the time while Senator Obama's marital status was mentioned only 4.2% of the time. Furthermore, Senator Clinton's gender was mentioned explicitly 13.4% of the time while Senator Obama's gender was discussed only 1.5% of the time (Miller, Peake and Boulton 2010: 178). Senator Clinton's marital status and gender were most frequently referenced in conversations about her "electability," suggesting that these discussions of gender were considered especially relevant to evaluation of whether or not she would be an effective President (Miller, Peake, and Boulton 2010: 178). Also of interest, though not the focus of this study, is the fact that Senator Obama's race was mentioned significantly more frequently than Senator Clinton's, 15.3% of the time, also often in reference to his "electability" (Miller, Peake, and Boulton 2010: 179).

In comparison with dominant trends in paid media, free media's exaggerated focus on Senator Clinton's personal life—in terms of familial roles—and gender provide further evidence of media bias. In Senator Clinton's political advertisements she consistently featured different family members at lower rates than did Senator Obama. While Senator Obama featured his spouse and children each in 4.81% of his advertisements, Senator Clinton never featured her husband and featured her daughter in only 2.86% of her advertisements. Furthermore, including depiction of other extended family members such as mother, grandfather, father, and the candidate him/herself as a child, Senator Obama featured family-oriented images in 20.19% of his ads while Senator Clinton did so in only 5.71% of her ads. Thus, it is clear that Senator Clinton emphasized her family less frequently than did Senator Obama, indicating that free media's elevated discussion of Senator Clinton's familial status is

illustrative of an inconsistent transmission of campaign messages and greater evidence of media bias.

Regarding Senator Clinton's personal discussion of gender, I coded that Senator Clinton made indirect reference to "gender as an issue" 2.85% whereas Senator Obama never made explicit reference to "gender as an issue." However, this percentage is insignificant and clearly not an adequate reflection of the 13% difference in discussion of Senator Clinton's gender in free media (Miller, Peake, and Boulton 2010). Furthermore, Senator Clinton's less frequent depiction of family in her ads appears to be indicative of a less overt reference to gender in regards to fulfillment of traditional gender roles. In contrast, Senator Obama's more frequent inclusion of family in his ads would have been more suggestive of gender. Thus, free media's more consistent mention of gender in relation to Senator Clinton is evidence of a clear gender bias; the fact that these references were made in relation to Senator Clinton's qualifications for office further illustrates this point (Miller, Peake, and Boulton 2010). Similarly, though not the focus of this study, I felt compelled to note that more frequent reference by free media to Senator Obama's race in comparison to the focus in his paid media, in which I observed explicit reference to race in only .96% of the ads surveyed, is likely indicative of a racial bias; further research should be conducted to determine the full scope of such bias.

Hence, it is evident that gendered bias in the form of disproportionate focus on Senator Clinton's familial/marital status and gender was clearly a product of gendered bias within the media. It seems likely that suggestions of mismanaged gender strategy were more a product of free media's one-sided focus on Senator Clinton's gender in

contrast to her opponents. Thus, accusations of faulty gender strategy regarding this area of media bias do not provide evidence of less notable gender bias within the media. On the contrary, this inconsistency in transmission of the candidate's messages provides greater support for claims of gendered media bias.

Caveat Regarding Tonal Bias and Horse-Race Coverage

As a brief side note, I provide a summary of other indicators of media bias that were discovered in analyses of gendered media bias in the 2008 Presidential Primaries: overall tonal bias and disproportionate allocation of gendered horse-race coverage; I was unable to address these indicators fully in my analysis due to the nature of my research—namely, the fact that my analysis of political ads centered on discussion of candidate presentation and gender strategy which are largely positive and do not feature discussion of the horserace. Nevertheless, evidence of these trends is suggestive of significant gender bias and should, therefore, be briefly discussed.

In analyses of free media coverage of Senator Clinton's campaign, it became evident that Senator Clinton was the recipient of media bias via more frequent negative discussion of her candidacy and greater allocations of negative horse-race coverage than her opponents. In analysis of national newspaper publications and televised network television, it was discovered that Senator Clinton received at least one negative mention in news stories 23.1% of the time while Senator Obama received negative mention only 15.8% of the time (Lawrence 2010: 161). While .38 paragraphs per story aired negative comments about Senator Clinton, only .24 aired negative comments about Senator Obama (Lawrence 2010: 161). Furthermore, while

the focus of free media's news coverage was overwhelmingly subject to "game-framing" or horse-race coverage—less than 1% of the total paragraphs surveyed in the sample mentioned the candidates in relation to substantive issue concerns, with horse-race coverage encompassing 89.4% of Senator Clinton's coverage and 88.9% of Senator Obama's coverage—Senator Clinton was subject to increasing amounts of negative horse-race coverage in which she was depicted as "the loser" (Lawrence 2010: 182-184). Moreover, Senator Clinton was criticized for campaign strategies and or/tactics at a rate statistically greater than Senator Obama (Lawrence 2010: 184). For female candidates, negative horse-race coverage can be particularly damaging because it lowers perceptions of candidate viability within a gendered context where the candidate is already disadvantaged and perceived to be less fit for office. Thus, in addition to the indicators addressed in my study, it is evident that media bias also exhibited itself in these ways throughout the campaign further disadvantaging Senator Clinton.

Summary and Concluding Remarks

In conclusion, final analysis of free media trends in comparison with paid media trends reveals that the trends indicative of media bias, on the whole, cannot be argued to have been a product of mismanaged gender or campaign strategy. While there were instances in which free media faithfully transmitted the campaign messages of both Senator Obama and Senator Clinton, there were also notable instances of discrepancy—particularly in regards to coverage of candidate traits and personal matters, alongside slight indications of additional bias in regards to issue

foci of free media coverage. Culmination of these analyses revealed not only that free media's delivery of campaign messages had been inconsistent, further highlighting biased media trends, but also illustrated that perceptions of mismanaged gender strategy were largely consequent of journalistic media trends.

It is important to note one area in which the validity of accusations of faulty gender strategy may have some weight—in regards to trends in naming and use of titles. Scholars of media bias illustrated that Senator Clinton had been a frequent recipient of less formal reference via use of her first name, "Hillary" (Uscinski and Goren 2010, Lawrence 2010). However, analyses of Senator Clinton's campaign strategy in paid media reveals significant and consistent use of her first name in reference to her candidacy in comparison to Senator Obama. In this instance, campaign strategy may have contributed to a gender bias in reference to her title.

However, the other areas of my analysis—concerning character traits, personal concerns, and issue foci—invalidate accusations of faulty gender strategy, strengthening the validity of claims regarding the predominance of gendered media bias in coverage of Senator Clinton's Presidential campaign. These findings, concomitant with other trends regarding media bias which could not be assessed in this study—overall tonal bias and negative horse-race coverage—provide confirmatory evidence of gendered media bias in coverage of Senator Clinton during the 2008 Presidential Primaries.

VI. Conclusion

This study sought to analyze and assess the validity of assertions regarding the prevalence of gendered media bias during the 2008 Democratic Presidential Primaries. In order to do this, I conducted a content analysis of advertisements released by the two major competitors, Senator Obama and Senator Clinton, during the Democratic Presidential Primary. These advertisements were made available through the Wisconsin Advertising Project, which provided a reliable source of all advertisements aired in the nation's top 75 media markets. The advertisements were coded based upon categories and techniques derived from Bystrom and Kaid's analyses of videostyle; the relevant coding sheet is attached at the end of the document.

Upon culmination of a comprehensive assessment of gender and campaign strategy inherent in the candidate's political advertisements, the study then turned to an analysis of trends in free media for comparison purposes. Trends in free media coverage were ascertained from examination of various content analyses of different media outlets. The transmission of campaign messages and candidate presentation in paid and free media was then assessed in order to determine whether or not it could be maintained that mismanaged gender strategy was a cause of gender bias in free media coverage.

It is important to note that this study was subject to certain limitations. Namely, this analysis was restricted to study of a single race set in unique historical circumstances. Furthermore, the race under examination consisted of a Presidential Primary rather than a general election campaign. In addition, Senator Clinton's main

opponent, Senator Obama, was an African-American male. This study consistently recognizes the possibility that race may have acted as an intervening variable during assessment of his gender strategy and I recommend that an additional content analysis be conducted in the future with the inclusion of Senator John Edwards in order to better account for the interaction of race and gender during this race. However, that task was beyond the scope of this study. Moreover, as the main focus of this study was on media bias in presentation of Senator Clinton's campaign message and presentation, I do not feel that race presented a major obstacle to assessment of Senator Clinton's specific gender strategy.

With reference to the findings of this study, the data reveals incredible insight into the dynamics of the race and effectively confronts the validity of accusations that Senator Clinton's gender strategy was the cause of gendered media bias. Firstly, in contradiction with the suggestions made by scholars and media elites that the Clinton campaign adopted an inconsistent and faulty gender strategy, the evidence reveals that Senator Clinton actually adopted a gender strategy that consistently made both "masculine" and "feminine" appeals. In this instance, it seems more likely that free media coverage and focus on Senator Clinton's gender was the actual force driving perceptions of an explicit and inconsistent gender strategy. Moreover, in regards to assertions that Senator Clinton's gender strategy contributed to gendered coverage of her campaign, this claim holds true only as concerns trends in naming and use of titles. In contrast, trends in image focus, coverage of character traits, and coverage of personal and traditional gendered roles, there appears to be a consistent discrepancy in transmission of Senator Clinton's personal candidate presentation and free media

coverage of her candidacy. Rather than invalidating claims of media bias, these findings provide additional support of media bias and further suggest that perceptions of faulty gender strategy may have been a product of media bias. In this sense, it appears that a gendered media bias may have been even more prominent than originally thought.

VII. Data Summary

TABLE 1	Hillary Clinton	Barack Obama
Dominant Title/Name Used in Ad	1) Hillary Clinton = 100% 2) Hillary = 20.95% 3) Hillary Rodham Clinton = 1.904% 4) Mrs. Clinton = 1.904% 5) Clinton = 1.904%	a. Barack Obama = 100% b. Barack: 0 c. Obama = 13.46%
Type of Ad	1) Candidate-positive focused = 87.61% 2) Opponent-negative focused: 0 3) Comparative/cannot determine = 12.38%	1) Candidate-positive focused = 93.27%% 2) Opponent-negative focused = .96% 3) Comparative/cannot determine = 6.73% 4) Total neg = 7.69%
Purpose of Attack, if Attack is made	1) Attack on personal characteristics of opponent – personal character: 7.692% 2) Attack on issue stands/consistency of opponent – issue stands : 46.153% 3) Attack on opponent's group affiliations of associations – group affiliation = 15.38% 4) Attack on opponent's background/qualifications = 0 5) Attack on opponent's performance in past offices/positions – past performance = 38.46%	1) Attack on personal characteristics of opponent – personal character = 50% 2) Attack on issue stands/consistency of opponent – issue stands = 75% 3) Attack on opponent's group affiliations of associations – group affiliation = 0 4) Attack on opponent's background/qualifications = 0 5) Attack on opponent's performance in past offices/positions – past performance = 0
Type of Negative Attack	1) Direct attack against another politician/candidate = 76.92% 2) A partisan attack = 7.69% 3) More general, indirect attack against government and other parties = 15.38% 4) Indirect/implicit attack without	1) Direct attack against another politician/candidate= 87.5% 2) A partisan attack 3) More general, indirect attack against government and other parties 4) Indirect/implicit attack without

	specific mention of the object of the attack = 0	specific mention of the object of the attack = 12.5%
Dominant Strategy of Attack	1. Humor/ridicule 2. Negative association = 100% 3. Name-calling (using negative labels) 4. Guilt by association	1. Humor/ridicule 2. Negative association = 100% 3. Name-calling (using negative labels) = 62.5% 4. Guilt by association
Type of Appeals	1. Logical appeals (use of evidence in favor of some position to either support the candidate or attack opponent) = 93.33% 2. Emotional appeals (designed to invoke particular feelings or emotions in viewers, such as happiness, anger, etc.) = 37.15% 3. Source credibility (appealing to qualifications or attack qualifications of opponent) = 12.38% 4. Fear appeals = 2.857%	1. Logical appeals (use of evidence in favor of some position to either support the candidate or attack opponent) = 96.15% 2. Emotional appeals (designed to invoke particular feelings or emotions in viewers, such as happiness, anger, etc.) = 31.73% 3. Source credibility (appealing to qualifications or attack qualifications of opponent) = 1.92% 4. Fear appeals = 2.88%
Strategic Appeals:	1. Use of statistics = 15.24% 2. Calling for Change = 16.19% 3. Optimism for the Future = 63.81% 4. Emphasizing Own accomplishments = 63.81% 5. Attack Opponent's record = 12.381% 6. Make Gender an Issue = 2.85% 7. Using endorsements = 18.095% 8. Personal tone = 78.095% 9. Addressing viewers as peers = 10.48% 10. Identifying with the experiences of others = 20.95% 11. Inviting participation and action = 20.95% 12. Traditional values/yearn for the past = 1.9% 13. Use of expert authorities = 20% 14. Calling for Leadership = 1.9%	1. Use of statistics = 10.57% 2. Calling for Change = 53.85% 3. Optimism for the Future = 72.12% 4. Emphasizing Own accomplishments = 55.76 % 5. Attack Opponent's record = 3.84% 6. Make Gender an Issue = 0 7. Using endorsements = 19.23% 8. Personal tone = 91.34% 9. Addressing viewers as peers = 5.76% 10. Identifying with the experiences of others = 3.85% 11. Inviting participation and action = 13.46% 12. Traditional values/yearn for the past 13. Use of expert authorities = 29.81% 14. Calling for Leadership = 0
Issues	1. Economy in general = 57.4%	1. Economy in general = 27.88% 2. Education/schools = 23.08%%

	2. Education/schools = 10.476% 3. Environment 4. Environment solely = .95% 5. Energy/oil in/dependence = 28.57% 6. Dissatisfaction with Government = 4.76% 7. Health Care = 38.1% 8. Crime/prisons = .95% 9. Senior Citizens Issues = 7/105 = 6.67% 10. Welfare = 0 11. Foreign Policy = 20% 1. Iraq = 3.81% 12. Immigration = 0 13. Women's Issues =1.9% (mention of daycare) 14. Taxes = 9.52% 15. Bipartisanship = 0 16. Voting: = 8.57% 17. Middle class = 11.43% 18. Children's rights/families = 6.67% 19. Katrina = .95%	3. Environment 1. Environment = .96% 2. Energy = 11.54% 4. Dissatisfaction with Government = 30.76% 5. Health Care = 30.76% 6. Crime/prisons = 0 7. Senior Citizens Issues = 6.73% 8. Welfare = 0 9. Foreign Policy = 20.19% 3. Iraq = 8.65% 10. Immigration = .96% 11. Women's Issues = 0 12. Taxes = 19.23% 13. Bipartisanship/Unity = 23.08% 14. Other: _____ 4. Anti-lobbyist/corporate interests = 23.08% 5. Middle Class = 5.77% 6. Ethics Reform = 14.42% 7. Voting = .96%
Emphasis of Ad/Appeal:	1. Issues = 76.19% 2. Image = 19.05% 3. Mixed Appeal = 4.7%	1. Issues = 67.31% 2. Image = 26.92% 3. Mixed Appeal = 5.76%
Content of appeal of the ad:	1. Emphasis on partisanship of candidate = .95% 2. Issue-related appeal: candidate's issue concern = 57.62% 3. Issue-related appeal: vague policy preference = 60.95% 4. Issue-related appeal: specific policy proposals = 28.57% 5. Personal characteristics of candidate = 36.19% 6. Linking of candidate w/ certain demographic groups = 4.76%	1. Emphasis on partisanship of candidate = 0 2. Issue-related appeal: candidate's issue concern = 67.31% 3. Issue-related appeal: vague policy preference = 56.73% 4. Issue-related appeal: specific policy proposals = 12.5% 5. Personal characteristics of candidate = 51.92% 6. Linking of candidate w/ certain demographic groups 67.31%
Character Traits Emphasized:	1. Honesty/integrity =19.047% 2. Toughness/strength = 20.95% 3. Warmth/compassion = 21.9% 4. Leadership = 29.52% 5. Competency/Intelligence=	1. Honesty/integrity = 31.73% 2. Toughness/strength = 1.923% 3. Warmth/compassion = 10.58% 4. Leadership = 9.62% 5. Competency/Intelligence =

	13.33% 6. Past Performance/Success in Politics = 15.23% 7. Experience in politics = 17.14% 8. Aggressiveness/Fighter = 24.76% 9. Action oriented = 64.76% 10. Qualifications = 10.48% 11. Sensitivity/Understanding = 28.57% 12. Other_____ i. determined =.95% ii. ready = 1.904% iii. likeable = .95% iv. courage = .95% v. solidarity = .95%	11.53% 6. Past Performance/Success in Politics = 26.92% 7. Experience in politics = .96% 8. Aggressiveness/Fighter = 11.54 % 9. Action oriented = 41.35% 10. Qualifications = 0 11. Sensitivity/Understanding = 15.38% 12. Other_____ 1. Inspiring = 12.5% 2. Hopeful/hope = 4.81% 3. Courage = 1.923% 4. Judgement = .96% 5. Independence = .96% 6. Character/good temperament = 1.923% 7. Depth/broadness = .96% 8. Vision = .96%
Demographic Groups Pictured:	1. Men = 87.62% 2. Women = 90.48% 3. Children (not candidate's) = 54.29% 4. Ethnic/racial minorities = 60%	1. Men = 90.38% 2. Women = 88.46% 3. Children (not candidate's) = 22.12% 4. Ethnic/racial minorities = 68.26% 5. Other 1. Elderly = 2.88% 2. Students = .96% 3. Obama as child = 3.85%
Family of Candidate:	1. Husband = 0 2. Children = 2.86% 3. Other family member____ 8. Mother = 4.76% 9. Father = 1.904% 10. Grandfather = .95% 11. Hillary as child = 1.904%	1. Husband = 4.81% 2. Children = 4.81% 3. Other family member____ 1. Mother = 15.38% 2. Father = 9.62% 3. Obama as child = 14.42%
Candidate the Speaker:	1. Yes = 30/105 = 28.57% 2. No = 54/105 = 41.43% 3. Mixed Techniques (including candidate intoning in announcer predominant ad, putting disclaimer at front to give appearance of candidate speaking, having announcer speak in between candidate-	1. Yes = 47.11% 2. No = 28.84% 3. Mixed Appeals = 24.04%

	dominant spoken ad) = 20/105=19.1% 4. No speaker = 1 = .95%	
Facial Expression:	1. Smiling = 83% (in some ads not a dominant smile but many of the ads were dominated by smiling content) 2. Attentive/Serious = 72.381%	1. Smiling = 37.5% 2. Attentive/Serious = 98.08%
Direct Eye Contact:	1. Always = 8.57% 2. Almost always = 5.71% 3. Sometimes = 12.38% 4. Almost never = 11.43% 5. Never = 61.9%	1. Always = 8.65% 2. Almost always = 6.73% 3. Sometimes = 4.81% 4. Almost never = 6.73% 5. Never = 73.08%
Dominant Dress:	1. Formal = 100% 2. Casual = 0 3. Varied = 0	1. Formal = 94.23% 2. Casual = 0 3. Varied = 5.76%
Setting of the Ad:	1. No Setting 2. Inside Setting = 48/105 = 45.71% 3. Outside Setting = 2/105 = 1.9% 4. Combination/Other = 55/105 = 52.38%	1. No Setting 2. Inside Setting = 36.53% 3. Outside Setting = 3.84% 4. Combination/Other = 59.62%
American Values Emphasized:	1. Value of the individual = 10.48% 2. Achievement Success = 28.57% 3. Change/Progress = 48.57% 4. Ethical Equality = 5.71% 5. Equality of Opportunity = 9.52% 6. Effort and Optimism = 82.86% 7. Efficiency/Pragmatism = 20.95% 8. Sociality = 13.33% 9. Material Comfort = 4.76% 10. Humor = 0 11. Generosity/Considerations = 76.19% 12. Patriotism = 21.9 %	1. Value of the individual = 0 2. Achievement Success = 9.62% 3. Change/Progress = 85.58% 4. Ethical Equality = 0 5. Equality of Opportunity = 13.46% 6. Effort and Optimism = 90.38% 7. Efficiency/Pragmatism = 25.96% 8. Rejection of Authority = 27.88% 9. Science 10. Sociality = 11.54% 11. Material Comfort = 0 12. Humor = 0 13. Generosity/Considerations = 21.15% 14. Patriotism = 36.54% 15. Morality/Ethics = 17.31

VIII. Appendix: Videostyle Coding Scheme

These questions were drawn from the "videostyle" codesheets and analyses in Kaid and Johnston's *Videostyle in Presidential Campaigns* and Bystrom's *Gender and Candidate Communication*.

Code O if not present

2. Candidate name:
3. Verbal Content
    a. Type of Ad: is the ad candidate or opponent focused? (Negative or positive?)
        5) Candidate-positive focused
        6) Opponent-negative focused
        7) Comparative/cannot determine
    b. If a negative attack is made, what is the PURPOSE of the attack?
        6) (Code 1 if present)
        7) Attack on personal characteristics of opponent – personal character
        8) Attack on issue stands/consistency of opponent – issue stands
        9) Attack on opponent's group affiliations of associations – group affiliation
        10) Attack on opponent's background/qualifications
        11) Attack on opponent's performance in past offices/positions – past performance
    c. If negative attack is made, is it
        5) Direct attack against another politician/candidate
        6) A partisan attack (I don't anticipate a great number of partisan attacks since the subject of the study is the 2008 Democratic Presidential Primary; however, evidence of partisan attacks might be indicative of a strategy geared more towards the general election)
        7) More general, indirect attack against government and other parties
        8) Indirect/implicit attack without specific mention of the object of the attack
        0) No attack is made in ad (0)
    d. Dominant Strategy of the Attack
        1. Humor/ridicule
        2. Negative association
        3. Name-calling (using negative labels)
        4. Guilt by association
    e. Dominant Content: Type of appeals:
        1. Logical appeals (use of evidence in favor of some position to either support the candidate or attack opponent)
        2. Emotional appeals (designed to invoke particular feelings or emotions in viewers, such as happiness, anger, etc.)
        3. Source credibility (appealing to qualifications or attack qualifications of opponent)

    4. Fear appeals

f. Strategic Strategies:
    1. Use of statistics
    2. Calling for Change
    3. Optimism for the Future
    4. Emphasizing Own accomplishments
    5. Attack Opponent's record
    6. Make Gender an Issue
    7. Using endorsements
    8. Personal tone
    9. Addressing viewers as peers
    10. Identifying with the experiences of others
    11. Inviting participation and action
    12. Traditional values/yearn for the past
    13. Use of expert authorities
    14. Calling for Leadership

g. Issues discussed:
    1. Economy in general
    2. Education/schools
    3. Environment
    4. Dissatisfaction with Government
    5. Health Care
    6. Crime/prisons
    7. Senior Citizens Issues
    8. Welfare
    9. Foreign Policy
    10. Immigration
    11. Women's Issues
    12. Taxes
    13. Bipartisanship/Unity
    14. Other: _____

h. Emphasis of Ad/Appeal:
    1. Issues
    2. Image

i. Content of appeal of the ad:
    1. Emphasis on partisanship of candidate
    2. Issue-related appeal: candidate's issue concern
    3. Issue-related appeal: vague policy preference
    4. Issue-related appeal: specific policy proposals
    5. Personal characteristics of candidate
    6. Linking of candidate w/ certain demographic groups

j. Is a candidate or party slogan used in the ad?
    1. Yes
        1. If yes, what is it?
    2. No (Code o for No)

k. Character Traits Emphasized

1. Honesty/integrity
2. Toughness/strength
3. Warmth/compassion
4. Leadership
5. Competency/Intelligence
6. Past Performance/Success in Politics
7. Experience in politics
8. Aggressiveness/Fighter
9. Action oriented
10. Qualifications
11. Sensitivity/Understanding
12. Other_____

l. Reference to Traditional Gender Roles
    1. Wife
    2. Mother
    3. Husband
    4. Father
    5. Other

4. Nonverbal Content
    a. Who is Pictured?
        1. No One
        2. Candidate Only
        3. Opponent
        4. Candidate and opponent
        5. Candidate and others
        6. People other than candidate
    b. Demographics Groups Pictured
        1. Men
        2. Women
        3. Children (not candidate's)
        4. Ethnic/racial minorities
    c. Family of candidate (Code 0 if not pictured)
        1. Husband
        2. Children
        3. Other family member____
        4. Combination
    d. Is the Candidate the Speaker
        1. Yes
        2. No
    e. Facial Expression
        1. Smiling
        2. Attentive/Serious
    f. Direct Eye Contact
        1. Always
        2. Almost always
        3. Sometimes

        4. Almost never
        5. Never
    g. Dominant Dress
        1. Formal
        2. Casual
        3. Varied
    h. Setting of the Ad
        1. No Setting
        2. Inside Setting
        3. Outside Setting
        4. Combination/Other
5. Both Verbal and Non-Verbal
    a. American values emphasized:
        1. Value of the individual
        2. Achievement Success
        3. Change/Progress
        4. Ethical Equality
        5. Equality of Opportunity
        6. Effort and Optimism
        7. Efficiency/Pragmatism
        8. Rejection of Authority
        9. Science
        10. Sociality
        11. Material Comfort
        12. Humor
        13. Generosity/Considerations
        14. Patriotism

IX. Bibliography

1. Ansolabehere, Stephen, Shanto Iyengar, Adam Simon, and Nicolas Valentino. "Does Attack Advertising Demobilize the Electorate?" *American Political Science Review* 88.4 (1994): 829-38.
2. Atkeson, Lonna Rae. "Not All Cues Are Created Equal: The Conditional Impact of Female Candidates on Political Engagement." *The Journal of Politics* 65.04 (2003): 1040-061. Print.
3. Aubin, Jessica, Michelle Haak, and Andrew Mangini. "Media Coverage of Women Candidates." *The First Woman President*. Ed. Joseph P. Caruso. New York: Nova Science, 2007. 113-217.
4. Baumgartner, Jody and Jonathan S. Morris. 2006. "The Daily Show Effect: Candidate Evaluations, Efficacy, and American Youth." *American Politics Research* 34(3): 341-367.
5. Beckwith, Karen and Kimberly Cowell-Meyers. 2007. "Sheer Numbers: Critical Representation Thresholds and Women's Political Representation." *Perspectives on Politics* 5(3): 555-67.
6. Bystrom, Dianne G. *Gender and Candidate Communication: VideoStyle, WebStyle, NewsStyle*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
7. Carroll, Susan, and Richard Fox. Gender and Elections: Shaping the Future of American Politics. NY: Cambridge University Press, 2006. pg. 23
8. Carroll, Susan J. 2009. "Reflections on Gender and Hillary Clinton's Presidential Campaign: The Good, the Bad, and the Misgynic," *Politics and Gender*, Vol. 5, Issue 1, pp. 1-20.
9. Carroll, Susan J., and Richard Logan. Fox. *Gender and Elections: Shaping the Future of American Politics*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2010. Print.
10. Dahlerup, Drude. "The Story of the Theory of Critical Mass." *Politics & Gender* 2.4 (2006): 511-22.
11. Dolan, K. "Do Women Candidates Play to Gender Stereotypes? Do Men Candidates Play to Women? Candidate Sex and Issues Priorities on Campaign Websites." *Political Research Quarterly* 58, no. 1 (2005): 31-44.
12. Falk, Erika. *Women for President: Media Bias in Eight Campaigns*. Urbana: University of Illinois, 2008.
13. Faucheux, Ronald. "Why Clinton Lost." *Campaigning for President 2008: Strategy and Tactics, New Voices and New Techniques*. By Dennis W. Johnson. New York: Routledge, 2009. 44-59.
14. Goldstein & Freedman. 2002. "Campaign Advertising and Voter Turnout: New Evidence for a Stimulation Effect." *Journal of Politics*.
15. Goren, Lily J., and Joseph E. Uscinski. "What's in a Name? Coverage of Senator Hillary Clinton during the 2008 Democratic Primary." *Political Research Quarterly* (2010): 1-13. Print.
16. Heldman, Caroline, Susan Carroll, and Stephanie Olson. "'She Brought Only a Skirt': Print Media Coverage of Elizabeth Dole's Bid for the Republican Presidential Nomination." *Political Communication* 22.3 (2005): 315-35.

17. Hitchon, J. C., and C. Chang. "Effects of Gender Schematic Processing on the Reception of Political Commercials for Men and Women Candidates." *Communication Research* 22.4 (1995): 430-58. Print.
18. Huddy, L., and N. Terkildsen. "The Consequences of Gender Stereotypes for Women Candidates at Different Levels and Types of Office." *Political Research Quarterly* 46, no. 3 (1993): 503-25.
19. Hunt, Albert R. "Clinton's Loss Not Driven by Sexism: Albert R. Hunt (Correct) - Bloomberg." *Bloomberg - Business & Financial News, Breaking News Headlines*. 9 June 2008. Web. 20 Mar. 2011. <http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=newsarchive&sid=aYr7Evv6n3Rw>.
20. Htun, Mala. 2004. "Is Gender Like Ethnicity? The Political Representation of Identity Groups." *Perspectives on Politics* 2(3): 439-58.
21. Iyengar, Shanto, Nicolas A. Valentino, Stephen Ansolabehere, and Adam F. Simon. "Running as a Woman: Gender Stereotyping in Political Campaigns." *Women, Media, and Politics*. By Pippa Norris. New York: Oxford UP, 1997. 77-98.
22. Jalalzai, Farida. "Women Candidates and the Media: 1992-2000 Elections." *Politics and Policy* 34, no. 3 (2006): 606-33.
23. Jalalzai, Farida. "Women Rule: Shattering the Executive Glass Ceiling." *Politics and Gender* 4, no. 2 (2008): 205-32.
24. Jamieson, Kathleen Hall. *Beyond the Double Bind: Women and Leadership*. New York: Oxford UP, 1995.
25. Jones, Erik, and Salvatore Vassallo. *The 2008 U.S. Presidential Elections: a Story in Four Acts*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
26. Kahn, Kim Fridkin. "Gender Differences in Campaign Messages: The Political Advertisements of Men and Women Candidates for U. S. Senate." *Political Research Quarterly* 46.3 (1993): 481-502. Print.
27. Kahn, Kim, and Ann Gordon. "How Women Campaign for the U.S. Senate: Substance and Strategy." *Women, Media, and Politics*. By Pippa Norris. New York: Oxford UP, 1997. 59-76.
28. Kahn, K. F. "The Distorted Mirror - Press Coverage of Women Candidates for Statewide Office." *Journal of Politics* 56, no. 1 (1994): 154-73.
29. Kaid, Lynda Lee., and Anne Johnston. *Videostyle in Presidential Campaigns: Style and Content of Televised Political Advertising*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2001.
30. Kantor, Jodi. "Gender Lives On as Clinton's Bid Wanes." *NY Times*. NY Times, 19 May 2008. Web. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/05/19/us/politics/19women.html>.
31. Lawless, Jennifer L. "Women, War, and Winning Elections: Gender Stereotyping in the Post-September 11th Era." *Political Research Quarterly* 57.3 (2004): 479-90. Print.
32. Lawless, Jennifer L. 2009. "Sexism and Gender Bias in Election 2008: A More Complex Path for Women in Politics," *Politics and Gender*, Vol. 5, Issue 1, pp. 70-80.

33. Lawrence, Regina Lawrence and Melody Rose. 2009. *Hillary Clinton's Race for the White House: Gender Politics & the Media on the Campaign Trail*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
34. Mansbridge, Jane. "Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent "Yes"" *The Journal of Politics* 61.3 (1999): 628-57. Print.
35. Marcus, Ruth. "The Force of Gender." *The Washington Post*. The Washington Post, 5 Mar. 2008. Web. <washingtonpost.com>.
36. Miller, Melissa K., Jeffrey S. Peake, and Brittany A. Boulton. "Testing the Saturday Night Live Hypothesis: Fairness and Bias in Newspaper Coverage of Hillary Clinton's Presidential Campaign." *Politics & Gender* 6 (2010): 169-98.
37. Murray, Rainbow. *Cracking the Highest Glass Ceiling: a Global Comparison of Women's Campaigns for Executive Office*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2010.
38. Nagourney, Adam, and Jeff Zeleny. "Clinton to End Bid and Endorse Obama." *NY Times*. 05 June 2008. Web. 24 Jan. 2011. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/05/us/politics/04cnd-campaign.html>.
39. Nelson, Michael. *The Elections of 2008*. Washington, D.C.: CQ, 2010.
40. Paxton, Pamela and Sheri Kunovich. 2004. "Women's Political Representation: The Importance of Ideology." *Social Forces* 82(1): 87-114.
41. *THE INVISIBLE PRIMARY: INVISIBLE NO LONGER: A First Look at Coverage of the 2008 Presidential Campaign | Project for Excellence in Journalism (PEJ). Project for Excellence in Journalism (PEJ) | Understanding News in the Information Age*. Web. 16 Mar. 2011. <http://www.journalism.org/node/8187>.
42. Sapiro, Virginia, Katherine Walsh, Patricia Strach, and Valerie Hennings. "Gender, Context, and Television Advertising: A Comprehensive Analysis of 2000 and 2002 House Races." *Political Research Quarterly* 20.10 (2009): 1-13.
43. Seelye, Katharine Q. "About $2.6 Billion Spent on Political Ads in 2008 - NYTimes.com." *Politics and Government - 2012 Presidential Watch - The Caucus Blog - NYTimes.com*. 2 Dec. 2008. Web. 09 Jan. 2011. <http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/12/02/about-26-billion-spent-on-political-ads-in-2008/>.
44. Semetko, Holli A., and Boomgaarden, Hajo G., "Reporting Germany's 2005 Bundestag Election Campaign: Was Gender an Issue?" *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics* 12.4 (2007): 154-71.
45. Whitaker, Lois Duke., ed. *Women in Politics: Outsiders or Insiders? : a Collection of Readings*. Upper Saddle River (N.J.): Pearson Prentice Hall, 2006.