University of Pennsylvania
ScholarlyCommons

CUREJ - College Undergraduate Research Electronic Journal

College of Arts and Sciences

4-30-2009

Gender and the Presidential "Horserace": An Examination of Candidate Self-Presentation in the 2008 Democratic Primaries

Abigail M. Coyle
University of Pennsylvania, coyleam@sas.upenn.edu

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. http://repository.upenn.edu/curej/95
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Gender and the Presidential "Horserace": An Examination of Candidate Self-Presentation in the 2008 Democratic Primaries

Keywords
Gender and politics, presidential politics, 2008 election, Social Sciences, Political Science, Richard Johnston, Johnston, Richard

This article is available at ScholarlyCommons: http://repository.upenn.edu/curej/95

Gender and the Presidential "Horserace":

An Examination of Candidate Self-Presentation in the 2008 Democratic Primaries

Abigail Coyle

Thesis in Political Science

Spring 2009

Advisor: Dr. Richard Johnston

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction……3

a. A Historic First, or a Familiar Story?.....3

b. Research Design and Hypothesis…….5

c. Limitations……...7

d. Why do Presentations of Gender Matter?.....8

e. Organization of the Thesis……...9

II. A Woman President?……...10

a. The Roots of Women's Absence in American Politics……10

b. Gender Roles and Persisting Stereotypes……..12

c. The Oval Office as a Male Domain…….....17

III. Women Candidates and Their Campaigns……20

a. A Perverted Filter: Women Candidates and the Media……20

b. In Their Voices: Gender and Political Communication Strategies……23

c. From First Lady to First Among Men: The Gendered Context of Clinton's Candidacy...28

IV. Empirical Analysis……...34

a. Method……...34

b. Discussion of Results……37

V. Conclusions……...52

VI. Further Studies……56

VII. Appendix...……..60

a. List of Advertisements Analyzed……...60

b. Codesheet……...65

c. Tables……71

d. Sample Coded Advertisement……80

VIII. Bibliography……...81

INTRODUCTION

A Historic First, or a Familiar Story?

On January 20, 2007, Hillary Clinton formally announced her candidacy in the 2008 presidential contest, with hopes of becoming the forty-fourth President of the United States. She thus launched what signified a historic race, as she established herself as the first viable female front-runner for a major American political party's presidential nomination. In announcing her intention to run, Clinton insisted that she was "not just starting a campaign" but was "beginning a conversation" with America. The conversation she proposed targeted such critical issues as bringing the "right end" to the war in Iraq, moving toward energy independence and affordable health care, and combating the federal deficit. However, over the seventeen months of her official campaign and in the aftermath of her June 7, 2008 withdrawal, it was often suggested that much of this "conversation" with America was not conducted on Clinton's own terms, particularly due to potential bias she encountered among the press and public as the lone female candidate. In an interview with *The Washington Post* in May 2008, Clinton commented on what she saw as "incredible vitriol…engendered by comments and reactions of people who are nothing but misogynists." Yet, perhaps more noteworthy was her observation that such gender bias was generally regarded as unremarkable, as she lamented that "so much of what ha[d] occurred" had been "very sexist" but was "just shrugged off." Indeed, her deepest frustration seemed to lie in the very pervasiveness of doubts surrounding her gender, for she insisted that, according to "every poll" she'd seen, "more people would be reluctant to vote for a woman than to vote for an African-American" as president.

Such allegations of sex discrimination against a female candidate point to a broader social and cultural framework that continues to deem women less fit for political leadership. Traditional gender roles have contributed to the underrepresentation of women as candidates, and those who do run for office confront enduring stereotypes as well as a political system structured to sustain male dominance. The historic nature of Senator Clinton's campaign and the prominence of her political family may have drawn attention to the challenges faced by female politicians, but constraints particular to women candidates

have long been a reality of American campaigns. Consequently, despite Clinton's deflated remarks, indications of sexism likely did not come as a surprise to a woman so well-versed in national politics. The fact that gender stereotypes persisted even for an established leader like Clinton may mark the extent to which such expectations are something all candidates must consider in designing the public image they put forth. Contemporary campaigns rely extensively on polling to put out tightly targeted messages, leaving little to chance, so their communications are carefully devised to portray traits and discuss issues in a way that voters and the media will favorably receive. In the process, as Kahn (1996) has found, all candidates seek to identify "common views about the typical capabilities and liabilities of male and female candidates" in crafting a campaign message they hope will be effective (10).

Taking the demands of a gendered society as a given, it is worth investigating how candidates present themselves to a press corps and public whose judgment they expect. Gender biases and stereotypes may be unavoidable, but the conscious decisions candidates make about their communications can prove instrumental in reinforcing or dispelling stereotypes in the minds of voters. In particular, it is through political advertisements, an unmediated form of communication shaped by these strategic choices, that politicians can define their candidacies in their own words. For this reason, I have chosen to assess candidate self-presentation in the 2008 Democratic primaries through an examination of televised advertisements, a central medium of communication in contemporary politics. I conceptualize gender as a continuum and acknowledge that considerations of masculinity and femininity are of concern not only for women but also for men, particularly in races in which at least one candidate is female. I plan to use this case to address the general issue of how male and female presidential candidates in a mixed-gender presidential race, faced with an identical context, portray elements of masculinity or femininity in the campaign communications over which they retain the most control. Broadly, I ask, in what ways did the Democratic candidates employ communication strategies and emphasize issues and attributes identified as "masculine" or "feminine," as determined by cultural expectations as well as theories of gender and political communication?

Research Design and Hypothesis

In particular, I plan to analyze the masculinity/femininity of Hillary Clinton's, Barack Obama's, and John Edwards' advertising strategies as conveyed through their televised campaigns during the 2008 primary contest. Drawing from the Stanford Political Communication Lab's online Presidential Primary Ad Archive, I will run a content analysis using a coding scheme modeled after previous literature that has categorized gender-specific attributes and issue areas as well as identified the communication styles and production techniques common to candidates of each gender. Specifically, I will operationalize femininity and masculinity based on variables classified in Dianne G. Bystrom's 1995 doctoral dissertation and in her work with colleagues on *Gender and Candidate Communication: VideoStyle, WebStyle, NewsStyle* (2004), as this research has recorded the different televised communications strategies employed by male and female candidates in mixed-gender senatorial races, proposing these styles for further investigation. While I initially planned to focus only on Clinton and Obama as the leading Democratic candidates, the inclusion of an additional male candidate will help me control for the variable of race and may support stronger gender-based conclusions. In addition to documenting each candidate's overall self-presentation, I will look for any interesting relationships and will chart empirical trends over the course of the primary season.

On one hand, the content of these campaign advertisements may reveal the common influence of a context that was the same for all three Democratic candidates. Favoring a presentation of masculinity was the focus on national security in a post-September 11th, wartime environment, which may have reinforced expectations of "strong" and masculine presidential leadership to require a portrayal of toughness and decisiveness on the part of all the presidential contenders. This would be unsurprising in light of suggestions that the "male" traits of competence and leadership are among the most valued across the overwhelming majority of political campaigns (Huddy and Terkildsen, 1993a). Alternatively, however, the Democratic electoral climate in 2008 was ripe for change, and both anti-Bush and anti-war sentiment may have invited more of a "feminine" style as a departure from George W. Bush's assertions

of masculinity and an alternative to his administration's partisan, uncompromising approach. Such findings would be also consistent with research positing male candidates' espousal of "feminine" characteristics in recent mixed-gender races at other levels. Furthermore, this tendency toward femininity may have been accentuated within the more liberal domain of the Democratic primaries as well as encouraged by the forum of televised communication, a medium which invites "feminine" intimacy, narration, and self-disclosure (Jamieson, 1995).

Other electoral demands, however, may have manifested themselves differently as a function of each candidate's gender. Kahn (1996) has concluded that women make campaign choices that will "respond to voters' doubts" and "eradicate stereotypes" as much as possible (131), and thus Clinton may have felt particularly compelled to highlight her toughness as a way of countering her potential disadvantage on a principal presidential attribute deemed "masculine." On the other hand, she may have been inclined to accentuate her perceived advantage on "feminine" qualities and issues, particularly as this approach could help her court a key base of women voters. Similarly, the strategies of the male candidates may point to an effort to match the characteristics stereotypically ascribed to their female competitor, especially because she was long regarded as the front-runner. Yet, they too may have chosen to emphasize their "masculine" executive credentials in order to underscore traits and issue areas on which a female competitor may have faced an inherent disadvantage.

As a result of these competing influences and the fact that all advertisements in the study were produced by Democrats, I expect to find an overall convergence on the issues and traits portrayed, with a roughly equal balance of masculinity/femininity and differences attributable more to the electoral context or candidates' backgrounds than to candidate gender specifically. However, I suspect that the drive to appear qualified and "presidential" prompted Clinton to emphasize her strength/toughness more than Obama or Edwards and that she balanced this with "feminine" communications strategies, thereby acknowledging the framework of traditional gender stereotypes that demand a woman convey a certain warmth and nurturance.

Limitations

I recognize that significant conclusions or generalizations may not be possible given my highly contextual analysis of one race within a particular election year. However, I find this case interesting for its lack of historical precedent and feel that my research addresses a gap in the existing literature on women in presidential politics, which is significantly limited by the dearth of viable female candidates for the American presidency. Much of the relevant literature is theoretical, raising questions about what factors may bar women from executive leadership and outlining potential ways they may overcome these obstacles. The value of such theoretical constructs, however, is undermined by the highly variable nature of electoral environments; campaign strategies, and even the salience of gender expectations, are powerfully shaped by the issues and demands of the specific context in which candidates present themselves (Dolan, 2004).

Some empirical research on gender and politics has offered more concrete conclusions; namely, hypothetical scenarios have successfully transcended context to isolate and analyze the variable of gender, while survey data and case studies have helped identify real dilemmas as well as the ways women have managed them. Yet, I have chosen to focus on the presidency in particular, and the cases in which women have been viable presidential candidates are too few in number, spanning too large a time interval, for a comparison that could lead to meaningful conclusions. And while empirical studies of congressional and gubernatorial races have provided insight into gendered communication strategies generally, it is not obvious that their conclusions necessarily apply in the same way to presidential contests. The continual frustration of women candidates' attempts to wage competitive campaigns for the presidency seems to indicate that presidential races may entail constraints or hurdles distinct from those women face in both executive races at the state level and national legislative races, a potential divergence that I believe justifies my singular case study approach.

Moreover, an additional limitation of my study is its narrow focus on Democrats alone. Because more than two-thirds of women candidates run as Democrats, current understandings of the role of sex

and gender in elections are restricted to a particular ideological framework, and an analysis of Republican candidates may point to different strategies (Dolan, 2008). It would be interesting to look at the role of gender in a Republican primary or a general election, especially given that Republicans may benefit from a presumed strength on "masculine" issues such as defense but may be deemed less competent than Democrats in areas of "feminine" compassion issues. However, because there was no female Republican presidential candidate in 2008 and partisan disposition would add another variable confounding that of gender, I have chosen to focus on a particular primary race consisting of candidates appealing to the same base of voters. In addition, since the Democratic candidates in the presidential primary ultimately hoped to continue as competitive contestants in the general election, I posit that they tried to craft messages they believed could transcend the traditional Democratic base and appeal to independents and Republicans.

Why Do Presentations of Gender Matter?

Despite its limitations, I feel that my research will contribute to broader understandings of the role of gender in contemporary presidential politics. In addition to studying trends in women's political participation, it is important to understand the precise challenges or advantages that female candidates encounter when they decide to run, with a focus on how these may be different from those that confront their male opponents or their female counterparts in other mixed-gender races. As Kathleen Dolan (2008) has proposed, "sex and gender considerations are not the same in every campaign" and thus "we should ask whether they matter more or less in cultivating public images for candidates at different levels (local, state, national) or different offices (executive, legislative, judicial)" (118). Some challenges particular to women politicians relate to variables other than gender, such as an emphasis on experience that disadvantages populations historically excluded from leadership; still, these factors are compounded by gender-specific expectations that affect women candidates in meaningful ways. Accordingly, identifying the representation of gender in candidates' strategies may highlight particular constraints that female presidential candidates face and point to ways politicians manage gendered expectations in the communications they control.

Differences between Clinton's communication strategy and the strategies of her male opponents may not even begin to explain how voters perceived her or why she failed to win the nomination, as there were many other variables at play in the candidates' profiles and the electoral context. However, specific divergences may signal the candidates' anticipation of or response to distinct gender stereotypes, providing a context for future studies of public opinion and related media coverage. As a result, my analysis of candidate self-presentation could help future researchers distinguish the influence of gender on candidate-controlled communications from its role in others' framing of candidates, also contributing to studies of the interaction between the two. If my results corroborate the trend of increasingly "feminine" self-presentation among male candidates, such findings could indicate potential openings for feminine aspirants to the presidency, much like those that may have facilitated women's success in other races.

Organization of the Thesis

In the first section of this paper, I will lay out a review of literature that traces women's political underrepresentation to the gendering of political institutions and the evolution of distinct male and female sex roles, each of which has dictated gender-specific categories of appropriate traits and behaviors. I will then outline theories on how these role assignments have translated into enduring stereotypes with real political consequences and, based on evidence from political races at other levels, will posit ways that gender expectations may affect female candidates for the presidency. The second section of my paper will assess how women candidates have dealt with these constraints. I will first address the implications of biased press coverage of female candidates, conceding an important obstacle to their campaigns but arguing that the influence of press treatment does not render candidate self-presentation irrelevant. Accordingly, I will then examine the strategic options available to women candidates and will summarize research that has identified characteristics distinguishing women's self-presentation in recent ad campaigns. This will provide a theoretical backdrop for the final portion of this section, which will outline the particular context of Clinton's 2008 candidacy by probing the influence of gender in perceptions of her as a First Lady and then as a female politician. Finally, the third section of my paper

will present the findings of my content analysis of Democratic advertisements in 2008, which I will use to draw conclusions and submit questions for further studies on this and future mixed-gender presidential campaigns.

A WOMAN PRESIDENT?

The Roots of Women's Absence in American Politics

The underrepresentation of women in positions of political power continues to be a significant source of concern in American politics as well as an impediment to the realization of a truly democratic polity. In 2009, while women make up as much as 50.8% of the total population and participate in politics at least as often as men, they hold only 16.8% of seats in the United States Congress and comprise a mere 24.2% of state legislators. Only thirty-eight women to date have ever served in the U.S. Senate, almost half of whom were appointed or took power as a result of a special election. Moreover, an examination of those occupying executive positions reveals even greater disparity, as women governors lead just eight of the fifty states, and only twenty-nine women have ever been elected to this highest state office (*Women in Elective Office 2009*). Although women's increasing presence in politics and historically male professions such as finance, medicine, and law provides reason for optimism, scholars point to the persistence of a "glass ceiling" barring women from positions of full executive authority in both the professional and political realms.

Nowhere is the absence of women more glaring than in the institution of the American presidency. Notably, while women have attained the highest position of leadership in nations as diverse as Turkey, Germany, Pakistan, Argentina, and Sri Lanka, the nation that calls itself the "most advanced democracy in the world" has yet to elect a female president. In fact, no major United States political party has ever even nominated a woman as its presidential candidate. Since Victoria Woodhull became the first woman to run in 1872, when she gained a spot on the ticket of the Equal Rights Party, only about fifteen women have obtained the nomination of their party, though close to one hundred have sought the nod unsuccessfully (including about fifty who sought nomination from either the Democratic or

Republican party) (Falk, 2008, 4-5). Given this stark state of affairs, I seek to extend to presidential leadership a question that researchers have long explored with regard to women in political life; as Virginia Sapiro wondered in 1982, why, "given the lack of legal or obvious structural barriers to the recruitment of female elites, are women still so underrepresented among political officials?" (61).

In proposing a response, some theorists have pointed to the evolution of a gendered political structure that has worked to women's disadvantage. Georgia Duerst-Lahti and Rita Mae Kelly (1995) broadly define gender to include a "set of practices and norms for interpersonal behavior, roles for individuals to perform, ways of being, ways of knowing, standpoints and worldviews" (6). They identify an underlying problem in the conception of sex as a dichotomous variable, arguing that the notion of a gender continuum offers a more accurate framework to understand both ways of "conducting politics" and "the people who do politics" (16). However, they also note that, at present, traits and behaviors are too inextricably fused with gender stereotypes to be considered neutral; accordingly, even if men and women perform the exact same acts, their behaviors are assigned different meanings in light of the fact that all social acts are interpreted through a "gender lens" (33). Narrowing their analysis of gender to its influence on politics, Duerst-Lahti and Kelly ascribe the concept of "gender power" to the way masculine assumptions have shaped norms in social relations and political interactions; specifically, they contend that because men have always been in positions of public authority in most institutions, they have been able to structure these institutions and the overall political culture in ways that perpetuate their dominance over women (20).

Complementing this assessment of gender in the political system are studies tracing the distinct sex roles that developed out of the historical separation between the private female and public male spheres, each of which specified expectations for appropriate traits and behaviors. In this view, while the emphasis on labor and military participation for men promoted assertiveness and "deliberation" on their part, nineteenth-century conceptions of domesticity called for women to be caring and nurturing (Kann, 1999). In the same way that men's public actions were seen to be governed by their minds, ideas about

"raging female hormones" suggested that women fell under the command of their bodies and emotions (Jamieson, 1995, 53). Furthermore, this dichotomous understanding was reinforced in the law, as men's and women's rights were often "structured on their [presumed] sex differences" (Duerst-Lahti and Kelly, 1995, 52). In a particularly candid iteration of this perspective, the 1863 Supreme Court explained in *Bradwell v. Illinois* that the "natural and proper timidity and delicacy which belongs to the female sex evidently unfit it for many of the occupations of civil life" and stressed that the "paramount destiny and mission of woman are to fulfill the noble and benign offices of wife and mother" (qtd. in Duerst-Lahti and Kelly, 1995, 53-54). As dichotomy increasingly gave way to hierarchy, masculine dominance in the public realm was depicted as a logical product of biology and nature rather than a consequence of deliberate discrimination.

Gender Roles and Persisting Stereotypes

It was in large part these deeply engrained social roles and power relationships that led scholar Wendy Brown (1988) to remark that, "[m]ore than any other kind of human activity, *politics* has historically borne an explicitly masculine identity" (4). This dynamic has not been significantly modified by recent commitments to equal opportunity, as blatant prejudices deeming women unfit for office have been supplanted by a more subtle sexism that assigns certain beliefs and traits to female candidates that are not ascribed to males (Fox and Oxley, 2003). Gender theorists and researchers have identified the wide power of "sex stereotypes," which denote a "structured set of beliefs about the personal attributes of men and women" that stipulate distinct gender-based personality traits, characteristics, beliefs, and expected behaviors (Ashmore et al., qtd. in Bystrom, 2004, 16). Psychological theories propose that it is cognitively taxing to consider others individually, and thus people resort to generalizations and employ stereotypes; classifying someone as a member of a group can offer insight into the characteristics of the individual, and people rely on these preconceptions, however simplified, when processing new information (Kahn, 1996). The political consequences of such a tendency are not hard to imagine, as voters often possess limited information and may be unlikely to mobilize the resources or effort to

research candidates individually. In some ways, the application of gender stereotypes specifically may be tied to the rarity of women in politics, as the American Psychological Association has stated that "[s]ingular or rare individuals…are more likely to be perceived as enacting stereotyped roles" (qtd. in Jamieson, 1995, 141). Underrepresented in politics, women are more likely to be viewed as "an instance or exemplar of 'women,'" invoking all the cues that such a group identification provides, whereas men are more often assessed individually (Jamieson, 1995, 127). As a consequence, even as gender roles become more flexible, socialization and the tendency toward cognitive simplification still lead people to compartmentalize women politicians' strengths into private, "compassionate" areas such as education, health care, and helping the poor, while they conclude that men are better poised to deal with issues relating to the military, the economy, and law and order (Fox and Oxley, 2003).

Interestingly, many of the issues delegated to women are also issues associated with Democrats, and the fact that more women identify with this party makes it difficult to isolate gender-specific assumptions from those related to partisan differences. In some cases, as Dolan (2004) has asserted, partisan cues may overwhelm all others, including gender and other personal characteristics. Nonetheless, researchers have found that when lacking specific information about a given candidate's political beliefs, gender is often the primary cue that experiment participants use to infer the candidate's political outlook (Huddy and Terkildsen, 1993a, 132). Such generalizations also extend to personal attributes, as what Fox and Oxley (2003) have termed "trait stereotypes" characterize women as more compassionate, willing to compromise, and oriented toward people, whereas men are seen as more assertive, active, and self-confident (835). Across many studies, women are overwhelmingly identified with traits of "warmth and expressiveness," or beliefs that they are more gentle, passive, and emotional, just as men are deemed stronger in the "instrumental" realms of toughness, aggression, and rationality (Huddy and Terkildsen, 1993a). As Kathleen Hall Jamieson (1995) has pointed out, these associations gain particular significance from their origins in traditional gender roles; those traits termed "instrumental" are tied to the public sphere, the brain, and production, areas in which males have enjoyed

a presumed superiority, while "expressive" female attributes are linked to the private domain, mothering, and reproduction (124). These historically based constructs, it seems, have translated into deeply embedded cultural assumptions and preferences; correspondingly, psychology researcher Sandra Bem (1987) has found that attributes such as "compassionate," "yielding," "soft-spoken," and "understanding" were rated by both sexes as significantly more desirable for women, much as those like "aggressive," "acts like a leader," "analytical," and "independent" were regarded as more desirable for a man (210-211).

In the context of political campaigns, sex stereotypes may influence vote choices or result in self-fulfilling prophecies, as candidates may change their behavior to conform to expectations (Dolan, 2004). Even so, it is worth noting that sexism and stereotyping are not on their own responsible for women's underrepresentation. To begin with, the candidate-centered, winner-take-all, single-member district structure of the political system contributes to women's difficulties entering political races in the first place (Fox and Lawless, 2005). In the case of the presidency, the attitudes of party leaders, as well as the procedures guiding nomination, can similarly thwart the candidacies of "outsiders" like women. Additionally, other characteristics of the political structure contribute to the re-election of 95% of congressional incumbents who seek it, and this low turnover rate disadvantages not only women but many minority groups that have historically been barred from equal political power. Indeed, all presidents have been Caucasian males, and since the election of Eisenhower all who ascended to the presidency have previously served either as vice-president, governor, or a representative in *both* houses of Congress, or they have been distinguished as a five-star general. Thus, the mere thirty-eight women in history who have met this informal set of presidential prerequisites have produced a comparatively small pool of potential winning candidates (Falk, 2008, 5). Even as women do make gains in representation, they continue to be less likely than men to present themselves as candidates; whether because of societal norms, professional patterns, or other reasons, they constitute only 8% of these candidates and a much lower proportion of those for the presidency (Fox and Lawless, 2005; Falk, 2008). In light of these

factors, stereotyping seems to be only one impediment among many, and women's underrepresentation emerges as a single manifestation of the incremental nature of change in the American political system.

In addition, some have pointed out that gender stereotypes do not necessarily work to the detriment of women who seek positions of leadership; in effect, stereotypes can work both ways. Studies such as Sapiro's (1982) and Huddy and Terkildsen's (1993) have found women to be judged as more compassionate, honest, and competent in certain issue areas. Issues deemed "feminine" in fact represent crucial components of American politics and society, meaning that candidates' expertise in these domains can help establish their broader credibility as future leaders. As a result, a perceived advantage on these issues, even if stereotypically attributed, may actually help women candidates. The assumption of women's dominance in "feminine" areas may especially advantage female candidates in certain political environments, as Kahn (1996) has concluded that "[w]omen's changing fortunes in electoral politics are driven by the correspondence between people's stereotypical images of women candidates and the salient issues of the day" (1). Women candidates may benefit when electoral circumstances complement their presumed strengths, as was the case in 1992; in that year, the prominence of domestic issues, the preference for "outsider" candidates, and the attention accorded feminist causes all positioned women to successfully appeal to voters on a wide scale (Duerst-Lahti and Verstegen, 1995, 223-224). Consequently, women enjoyed a historic increase in representation in the House and Senate, culminating in what became known as the "Year of the Woman." In terms of gender and politics, the implications of such gains did not go unnoticed; as Senator Barbara Boxer commented, "Being a woman running for public office in '92 was a distinct advantage" (qtd. in Fox and Lawless, 2005, 22).

However, even such instances do little to refute the centrality of stereotyping and have thus far been exceptions to the political rule of privileged masculinity. Huddy and Terkildsen (1993b) have proposed that voters' "preference for candidates with masculine characteristics is probably more stable and enduring, transcending the specifics of any given election" (521), and most women vying for office are still challenged to prove themselves on masculine terms. Features of the political system unrelated to

sexism and gender stereotyping may help contextualize and elucidate the holistic picture of women's power deficit, but these factors must be understood as tangential to the more pervasive cultural expectations and historical biases that women candidates confront. Women continue to be significantly less likely to view themselves as qualified to run or to receive encouragement to run, and the specter of imbalanced domestic responsibilities continues to limit the number of women who present themselves for political office (Carroll and Fox, 2006). At the same time, the efforts of those who do run are burdened by findings that suggest voters consistently associate masculine qualities with leadership, deeming these more important than feminine traits at all levels of politics (Rosenwasser and Dean, 1989; Lawless, 2004). Despite progress, opinion polls such as the General Social Survey (GSS) continue to reveal considerable public agreement with statements like "men are better suited emotionally for politics than are most women" and "women should take care of running their homes and leave running the country up to men"; as Kathleen Dolan (2004) has concluded, such responses mean that "anywhere from one-fifth to one-quarter of the public willingly express[es] concern about the abilities of women in the political arena" (61). These unsettling results have drawn attention to the serious consequences of gender expectations and have challenged optimistic assessments of women's prospects for political equality. Regrettably, highlighting "deeply embedded patterns of traditional gender socialization," Jennifer Lawless and Richard Fox (2005) have explained that "barring radical structural change in the institutions of politics and the family, achieving gender parity in United States government is not on the horizon" (152).

Notably, gender stereotypes may be even more damaging to women in executive races. Researchers have suggested that women may be especially unlikely to present themselves as candidates for "masculine" executive positions in the first place, and studies have uncovered a particular preference for "male" characteristics in races for higher level office (Fox and Oxley, 2003). As former Congressional Representative Elizabeth Holtzman articulated, "[p]eople are willing to see women in legislative positions because that's talking, and women can do that. But running the show? They worry about that" (qtd. in Clift and Brazaitis, 2000, 119). Some researchers have proposed that in national

races, a lack of intimate contact with or concrete information about candidates may make voters more inclined to employ stereotypes and classify female candidates as "typical" women (Huddy and Terkildsen, 1993a). This may be less of an issue in presidential contests, with the media spotlight on candidates' profiles, but the personality focus in modern presidential campaigns may still serve to activate voters' stereotypical gender schema, and the blurring of distinctions in issue positions can prompt "default processing" (Chang and Hitchon, 2004). In fact, the prospect of stereotype activation may hold particularly serious implications for women in the case of the presidency, as they are challenged to present their credentials in a way that effectively undercuts voters' almost invariably "masculine" images of this executive office.

The Oval Office as a Male Domain

The institution of the presidency, with its symbolic emphasis on the president as a pillar of national strength, stands out for its conspicuous evocation of traditional masculinity. Georgia Duerst-Lahti (2006) has defined the office as "gendered to the masculine," as notions of what is "presidential" have been shaped by a masculinity construct that is often both explicit and implicit (15). She finds especially insidious the masculine assumptions underlying presidential elections, as sports and war metaphors dominate discourse that evaluates the candidates based on tests of executive toughness. Even in races between males, this masculine ideal may distinctly color candidates' self-presentation; Duerst-Lahti claims that in 2004, Kerry "donned ever more manly costumes" and staged "manly" campaign events in order to counter Republicans' charges that he was insufficiently masculine, as they implied with the "flip-flopper" image that "cast him as like a stereotypical woman who keeps changing her mind" (33-34). Insofar as they correspond to traditional images of the institution, such "masculinist" standards may be equally applied to women presidential candidates, demanding similar empty visual and verbal displays on their part as they attempt to demonstrate the requisite masculinity (Heldman, 2007, 23).

In one noteworthy, if short-lived, female presidential campaign, Patricia Schroeder discovered the way femininity and "presidential" could be deemed incompatible. Presenting herself as a potential

candidate in the 1988 race, Schroeder attempted to throw the test of masculinity back at the public, as she faithfully declared, "I think America is man enough to back a woman." Yet, as she repeatedly faced questions about whether she was running "as a woman" and endured criticism for not looking "like a President," it became clear that her gender was essential to perceptions of her candidacy. Significantly, when she was eventually forced to withdraw due to insufficient financial backing, Schroeder's expression of emotion elicited vocal disapproval, as some chastised her for confirming stereotypes about women's inadequate presidential "toughness." Although seventeen seconds of weeping may have been unremarkable for – or even beneficial to – a male politician, observers like *Washington Post* columnist Judy Mann used the episode to inquire, "Does the world need a weepy woman next to the red telephone?" (qtd. in Gutgold, 2006, 91).

In addition, this preference for masculinity in the presidency has consistently been manifested in studies of public opinion. When Rosenwasser and Dean (1989) asked college students to describe a good president, 61% of the traits they indicated were "masculine" in nature, and voters have rated "masculine" duties concerning the military and defense as more important for a president than those dealing with feminine issues requiring compassion (Huddy and Terkildsen, 1993b). Indicating the persistence of such views, a poll released in 2000 reported that one-third of the American population still agreed that "there are general characteristics about women that make them less qualified to serve as president." Of this sample, fifty-one percent also affirmed the idea that a man could do a better job than a woman leading the nation during a crisis and in making difficult decisions, the top two qualities deemed "very important" in presidential candidates (Bystrom et al., 2004, 3). Correspondingly, a February 2001 press release by the White House Project, a nonpartisan organization dedicated to the goal of electing a woman president by 2008, showed that as many as 15% of respondents would not be willing to vote for a woman president (Kennedy, 2003, 133). A CBS/*NY Times* poll in January 2006 reported this willingness at 92%, but only 50% of those surveyed believed that others would support a female candidate. While many factors may have contributed to this finding, Hanson and Otero (2006) have interpreted the discrepancy to reveal

voters' projection of their own doubts onto others, possibly signifying their reluctance to admit to "sexist" stereotyping (37).

Furthermore, there is also evidence suggesting that a transformed electoral environment following the events of September 11th, with its hyper-masculine discourse of aggression and war, may have posed unique challenges for women presidential candidates. As Coe and colleagues (2007) point out, Americans in the immediate post-9/11 climate most often saw men in roles as decision-makers and saw women positioned as victims, while politicians used gender-coded discourse to emasculate the enemy. At the same time, given widespread evidence of men's perceived strength in national security and on traits like toughness and decisiveness, the emphasis on these areas may have set up an uneven playing field for candidates whose gender failed to stir such associations. The election year 2002 marked the first since 1994 that women did not increase their presence in Congress, and Jennifer Lawless (2004) has found that the War on Terror was accompanied by an exaggerated preference for "masculine" leadership among the public. Specifically, from a sample of people among whom she found gender stereotyping to be "quite apparent," Lawless reported that more than 40% believed men were better able to protect the country from future attacks, and 30% believed that men were more capable of bringing about peace in the Middle East (482). In some respects, in the aftermath of crisis it seemed more evident that those who were "associated with constructs of femininity – or even simply non-hegemonic conceptions of masculinity" could be "suggested to be unfit for public office" (Coe et al., 2007, 49).

Though these results may have been isolated to a distressful period of national shock, the broader post-9/11 security mindset in recent years may have interacted with symbolic notions of presidential strength to deter female aspirants to the presidency. In 2002, only 65% of respondents surveyed were sure they would be willing to vote for a woman for president if she were qualified and nominated by their party, marking a sharp decrease from the result of 92% in 1999; 28%, in contrast, indicated they were not sure they would be ready to do so (Hanson and Otero, 2006; Lawless, 2004). The national climate was very different by 2008, and Democratic disillusionment with the conduct of the War on Terror may have

realigned views of presidential leadership. Nonetheless, the variation in perceptions of women candidates in these anxious, wartime years provides compelling evidence that women are disadvantaged when "men's issues" dominate the agenda, which may be taken as proof that sex continues to matter in a real way (Lawless, 2004, 479).

In essence, the amplification of masculinity in presidential contests and in public images of the presidency may deepen the rigidity of gender stereotypes to impede the candidacies of women. Thus, although the prospects of future female presidential candidates remain uncertain, these theories may help clarify why the conclusion that "when women run, women win" has yet to prove true at the presidential level (Seltzer et al., 1997).

WOMEN CANDIDATES AND THEIR CAMPAIGNS

A Perverted Filter: Women Candidates and the Media

Another commonly cited systemic barrier to women's political success is biased press treatment, which may bestow women less coverage or portray their candidacies as less serious. Given the potentially significant role of media coverage as a filter for candidates' communication as well as the press's capacity to set the frame for campaign events more generally, purported differences in the treatment of male and female candidates are certainly not to be taken lightly. Especially disconcerting is Kahn's (1996) conclusion that "[t]he news media appear to echo the campaign messages of men candidates, while they largely distort the messages sent by women candidates" (132); such an imbalance could have the serious consequence of reinforcing men's messages and undermining those put forth by women. Studies consistently suggest that stories about women candidates focus less on issues and, instead, more often highlight their gender, appearance, emotions, and traditional roles as mothers and wives. One study, entitled "The Lipstick Watch," revealed that 30% of the coverage of vice-presidential candidate Geraldine Ferraro in 1984 and 40% of the coverage of Elizabeth Dole's presidential bid in 2000 contained references to clothing, makeup, hair, and other "feminine" concerns that did not apply to their opponents (Heith, 2003, 126). Such emphases may single women out and contradict messages

communicated by the candidates themselves. For example, Kahn (1996) found that when the media reported on men, they covered stereotypically masculine traits 72% of the time, even though these men only mentioned such traits 67% of the time; in contrast, masculine traits were only discussed 41% of the time for women candidates, despite their frequent mention of these traits at a rate of 91% (41).

In a culture that deems most valuable leadership traits "masculine" in nature, such depictions may make women appear less equipped for political office, trivializing their candidacies and further jeopardizing their chances for success. In effect, subtly biased coverage can insidiously reinforce the traditional gender roles that were more explicitly laid out in past times. Descriptions that imply "woman doing male job" and headlines announcing "women candidates" may heighten public awareness of their gender as a novelty and further underscore masculinity as the political norm (Falk, 2008, 94). Such attention to gender may be particularly consequential in light of research that has suggested voters respond most positively to candidates who, "regardless of their gender, receive the type of coverage generally accorded male incumbents" (Hitchon, Chang, and Harris, 1997, 49). And as Jamieson asserts, the press's stereotyped and imbalanced treatment of women may have significance for gender dynamics beyond electoral outcomes; as she attests, "to the extent that language shapes as it reinforces, widespread journalistic practices can accelerate or retard forces at work elsewhere in society" (1995, 166).

Such bias may be magnified by the scope and import of coverage in the case of presidential campaigns, and masculine presidential stereotypes may prove especially resilient. As one researcher has suggested, "unlike state, local, and even congressional positions, the presidency remains defined by the press in masculine terms" (Heith, 2003, 130). One study showed that as a candidate in 2000, Elizabeth Dole received less serious and less overall coverage than both George W. Bush and John McCain, even when she was leading McCain in the polls (Heldman, 2007). In 2008, Clinton herself complained of the media establishment's apparent indifference to sexist comments, and preliminary reports have suggested that press coverage of Clinton may indeed have differed from that of her male opponents. In one study, Erika Falk (2008) indicates that in the month following Clinton's and Obama's announcements of their

candidacies, the top six nationally circulated newspapers ran fifty-nine stories mentioning Obama in the headline and only thirty-six that mentioned Clinton. As Falk notes, such evidence was surprising not for its suggestion of press bias against a female candidate but for the fact that such imbalance persisted even when that woman was widely seen as the front-runner; a Gallup poll from December 2006, the preceding month, had showed that most respondents (33%) preferred Clinton over Obama (20%) for the Democratic nomination (1).

However, in 2008, media bias was not a new phenomenon. In fact, it has been extensively publicized as a consistent factor affecting political campaigns, and candidates are often very much aware of the expectations the media brings to assessments of their communications and campaign events. This consciousness of biased press coverage may influence the messages they put forth, but it does not negate the element of choice involved in candidates' decisions about how, in light of varying constraints, they ought to portray their candidacies. Candidates have the power to at least indirectly influence the media's portrayal, and the rise in news coverage of political advertisements since 1988 has enhanced the potential of political campaigns to "shape the visual and verbal language of news," thereby guiding the coverage their candidate receives (Jamieson, 1992, 124). Furthermore, in cases where sexism is alleged, the causal direction of discrimination is not always clear; because stereotypes can prompt self-fulfilling prophecies, what is deemed prejudicial campaign coverage may at times reflect manifestations of stereotypes within the candidate self-presentations being covered. Even more blatant sexism may echo a cultural ambivalence about gender roles and should be examined in relation to its broader context. The interaction between the press and public opinion has often been described as "circular," as widespread cultural stereotypes may shape reporters' judgments, and reporters in turn reiterate these stereotypes in the information they present (Bystrom et al., 2004, 5). Consequently, while it may be unwise or unethical for journalists to circulate slanted, discriminatory coverage, they may in some cases be unintentionally articulating a stereotypical framework they share as members of society.

Additionally, press coverage is only one aspect of communications in an election. Even when media gender bias has been revealed across many congressional and gubernatorial campaigns, women have had greater success in these than in presidential races. Admittedly, in the case of presidential campaigns, the national scale and the focus on candidate personality may exacerbate the media's influence. Yet, the ability of many women candidates to overcome biased press coverage provides further reason to investigate the ways women address potential challenges in the areas over which they retain control. Neither investigations of journalists' assessments, nor analyses relating press coverage to the success rates of women's campaigns, take into account *how* women attempt to defeat their male counterparts in a political environment infused with stereotypes and bias.

In Their Voices: Gender and Political Communication Strategies

Indeed, as Kahn (1993) insists, "Candidates often have a choice: they may adopt strategies that exploit voters' stereotypes about male and female candidates, or they may try to dispel stereotypes by acting in ways inconsistent with their traditional strengths" (483). Even if public and media expectations provide a backdrop for these choices, they leave room for the discretion of politicians, and each woman must determine how to represent herself and persuasively convey her credentials. Research on political advertising has provided grounds for analyzing such decisions of self-presentation, for the substance of campaign advertisements is controlled entirely by a candidate and his or her staff. As Ted Brader (2006) has noted, candidates rely on "ad campaigns to control the amount and content of the information conveyed to the public" (19), and recent evidence has revealed political advertisements' real potential to impact vote choices. Specifically, researchers have pointed out that in addition to their general capacity to "enlighten" voters on candidates' positions and leadership qualities, the accessibility and brevity of campaign ads have enhanced their influence on a population of voters with limited resources to process complex political messages (Ansolabehere and Iyengar, 1995, 59).

At the same time, communications research has acknowledged that political advertising, rather than simply "something that candidates *do* to voters," necessarily considers the predispositions and

preferences of its audience (Kaid and Johnston, 2001, 25). As a result, the interactive nature of such communication as both a product of candidate decision and a reflection of voter preferences provides an interesting opportunity to study the relationship between the two. Goffman's (1973) theory of the "presentation of self" has provided a basis for studies of communication strategies, asserting that "when an individual appears in the presence of others, there will usually be some reason for him to mobilize his activity so that it will convey an impression to others which it is in his interests to convey" (4). Kaid and Davidson (1986) have extended this theory of interpersonal communication to examine political advertising. As they reasoned, political communication involves a similar type of exchange between candidates and voters, and candidates have an incentive to put forth images and messages that will be judged favorably by the receiving audience. In their study of Senate races in 1982, the "first attempt to describe systematically the style of political commercials" (186), and again in Kaid and Johnston's (2001) analysis of televised presidential races, these researchers have documented political advertisements' patterns of verbal, nonverbal, and production techniques to collectively define the "VideoStyle" of each sponsoring candidate. Recognizing that political advertisements are "constructed using fears, myths, concerns, and narratives that exist in culture and in voters" (Kaid and Johnston, 2001, 25), they have thus provided a useful method of assessing political candidates' self-presentation within their electoral and cultural contexts.

Many studying political communication as it relates to gender have sought to uncover the choices women candidates make in light of the unique constraints they face; in particular, it has been proposed that "[a]ll too often there is a contradiction between the attributes voters expect in a candidate and what they want in a woman" (Cantor and Bernay, 1992, 85-86). As such, conflicting expectations pose a challenge to female candidates and may force them to choose between two suboptimal strategies, both of which could ultimately serve to reinforce masculinity as the norm. Namely, they can choose to adopt traditionally "feminine styles," affirming that gender differentiation exists, or they can "do masculine leadership," thereby confirming its dominance (Duerst-Lahti and Kelly, 1995, 31). Grounding the

concept of women's constrained communications in a detailed history of gender roles, Kathleen Hall Jamieson (1995) understands this conflict as a "double bind," or a "rhetorical construct that posits two and only two alternatives, one or both penalizing the person being offered them" (14). As she explains, women in politics are scrutinized under a different lens than their male counterparts, and they often confront "no-win situations" that set them up to fail. In one especially prescient dilemma, the choice to take on typically "masculine" leadership attributes as women may invite criticism, but the alternative decision to accentuate femininity can imply they are "soft" and incompetent (7). Jamieson notes that women's obligation to balance femininity and competence in their public personas is complicated by society's definition of "femininity in a way that excludes competence," a paradox which may yield "unrealizable expectations" (18). Thus, many women are frustrated in their efforts to prove themselves on others' terms, faced with unclear boundaries between the requisite "like male" and the inappropriate "too male" (Witt et al., 1994). When they do succeed in breaking free from these binds, Jamieson recounts, women are all too commonly judged as exceptional cases, often praised on the curious terms of having proved themselves "more manly than men" (128).

Given these circumstances, researchers have examined the important choices women make about their self-presentation as they vie for "masculine" positions of leadership. Some of this work has been descriptive in nature, as Kahn's (1993) study suggested that male and female political candidates commonly emphasize issues which correspond to their stereotypical strengths, whereas Huddy and Terkildsen's (1993b) pointed to a possible sex role reversal in terms of traits; from their analysis of mixed-gender races, they concluded that women were more likely to wage "masculine" campaigns stressing their toughness and aggressiveness, while male candidates endeavored to appear sympathetic, kind and accessible. Other work has gone further to posit successful approaches for female candidates. Some have recommended that women candidates should primarily demonstrate their competence on "male" issues so as to combat stereotypes and sideline media discussions of their "feminine" roles (Kahn, 1996; Falk, 2008), and related research has advised women's adoption of a masculine style of

communication, with Hitchon, Chang, and Harris (1997) concluding that "women can benefit by adopting a rational, unemotional approach in mass media messages" (64). Furthermore, in broader consideration of the intersection between gender-based and context-driven electoral constraints, researchers such as Iyengar and colleagues (1997) have recommended that women candidates must consider stereotypes but should ultimately "pick the characteristics which will resonate best with voters based on the issue environment during that particular campaign season" (98).

Yet, even if women candidates properly craft their appeals around contextual demands, experimental research has indicated that cues provided by their gender may still govern the way audiences perceive their messages. In one study of televised advertising in a gubernatorial campaign, Ansolabehere and Iyengar (1991) found the effectiveness of appeals to be correlated with the sponsoring candidate's gender, evidence that has been corroborated by findings from other races. For example, comparing responses to commercials from mixed-gender Senate and gubernatorial campaigns, Banwart and Carlin (2001) concluded that female candidates received more hypothetical election "votes" only when they were evaluated higher on *both* stereotypical "masculine" and "feminine" characteristics, whereas male candidates seemed to enjoy more flexibility; unlike their female opponents, they earned more "votes" when balancing gendered attributes but also continued to win races in which they principally emphasized stereotypical "masculine" traits (Bystrom et al., 2004).

Accordingly, another strand of research, and the one that provides the basis for my study of 2008, has systematically compared the televised advertisements of male and female candidates to gain insight into themes and trends in the choices they make. This work, driven primarily by Dianne Bystrom and her colleagues, has drawn from Kaid and Davidson's methodology to note several distinctive features that consistently mark females' and males' respective VideoStyles. Specifically, they have synthesized the concept of VideoStyle with a gender construct originally outlined by Campbell (1989), who argued that the historical definition of rhetorical action as a masculine domain required women speakers to feminize their role and that women's relegation to the private sphere led them to develop a distinct rhetorical style.

Campbell presented this feminine style of speech, crafted around the goal of empowerment, as distinguished by a more personal tone, a reliance on personal experiences and anecdotes, an inductive structure, and a cooperative invitation to audience participation, in addition to addressing the audience as peers and identifying with their experiences (1989, 13). In contrast, according to this classification, masculine speech strategies are characterized by deductive logic and reasoning, affirmation of one's own expertise, use of expert or statistical authority, and use of impersonal examples (Bystrom et al., 2004). Campbell herself proposed feminine style as neither the only strategy employed by women nor a tendency unknown among men, and Jamieson (1995) has identified the potential for candidates to capitalize on both styles' advantages, in a fashion she described as "[s]peaking softly while carrying a big statistic" (197). In this way, Campbell's rhetorical construct has provided researchers with a tool to distinguish male and female candidates' respective ad strategies as well as the way they may relate in mixed-gender races.

Most usefully, Bystrom and her colleagues have expanded Campbell's definition of rhetorical style to identify ways women candidates may downplay or acknowledge their femininity through various verbal and nonverbal aspects of their ads, such as the selection of their image and dress, the presentation of their spouses and children, their style of speaking, or the issues and traits they highlight. While maintaining that advertising strategies may be shaped at least as much by electoral context as by candidate gender, they have identified reliable markers of each sex's VideoStyle and have considered key interactions between the two. In their analysis of mixed-gender Senate and gubernatorial races from 1990-2002, Bystrom et al. (2004) have found women to be significantly more likely to emphasize their strength/toughness, potentially as a way to compensate for a perceived disadvantage on this "masculine" characteristic. Notably, they have also found male candidates to be just as likely as females to discuss feminine traits like honesty, integrity, cooperation, and trustworthiness, and even more likely to portray their sensitivity, as competition with women may prompt men to reveal this feminine side. Overall, these researchers have determined that candidates of both sexes are motivated to balance "masculine" and

"feminine" qualities in their self-presentations; as they explain, "both men and women seem to be presenting themselves as tough but caring – at least when running against each other" (15).

Contradicting previous recommendations that women candidates should appear as masculine as possible, Bystrom et al. have concluded that the VideoStyles of winning female candidates feature balanced discussions of masculine and feminine issues and are marked by an identifiably feminine style of communication. They concur with previous studies' findings that women candidates are more likely to use negative advertisements, as their perceived compassion may give women wider latitude to go on the attack, as well as that women candidates show a greater tendency to smile, a distinction that may signify their implicit recognition of normative "feminine" roles demanding softness and warmth. In addition, they also single out women's tendency to dress more formally, perhaps with the goal of communicating their seriousness as candidates, and they observe that women are more likely to speak for themselves in their ads. Male VideoStyle, they contend, more commonly employs a testimonial or endorsement format, with men more willing to dress casually, show images of their families, and cite statistical evidence. More broadly, they posit a recent trend in male candidates' increasing use of feminine communication styles, which they understand as a potential indication of feminine appeal strategies' suitability for televised communications.

As Bystrom and her colleagues' research has indicated, stereotypes and expectations pertaining uniquely to women as public figures may continue to distinguish their advertising choices from those of their male opponents. At the same time, the particular demands of mixed-gender races may complicate the relationship between gendered communications strategies and candidate gender, blurring aspects of the male/female divide as both seek to put forth the appeal best suited to the expectations of their context.

From First Lady to First Among Men: The Gendered Context of Clinton's Candidacy

Although these studies have illustrated much about the political appeals women and men make to voters, their methods of analysis have yet to be systematically applied to presidential campaigns. The assessment of self-presentation may hold particular relevance for women and the presidency, as one

author has suggested that in order to "achieve 'Madam President,' a candidate must either redefine leadership, redefine herself, or be helped by circumstances that trump current biases" (Heith, 2003, 130). In view of these alternatives, the 2008 election provides a unique opportunity to examine the ways a female candidate, as the leading Democratic contender, defined her candidacy and depicted her understanding of presidential leadership. Moreover, given the significant influence of electoral circumstance on the role played by gender, the climate in 2008 presents an interesting backdrop of gendered expectations and motivations underlying the candidates' messages (Dolan, 2004).

In discussions surrounding the election, it was widely recognized that many voters, and especially Democrats, were eager for a departure from the Bush administration's aggressive rhetoric and ultra-masculine assertions of unilateralist, "cowboy" diplomacy. This context may therefore have been conducive to a more "feminine" style of leadership and to less staunchly masculine claims to authority. As one author conjectured, Clinton may have benefited from "the ideal position" as a result of her gender and political background; while her femaleness was an "obvious symbol of her femininity…her position on the Senate Armed Services Committee and experience with foreign dignitaries" could serve as "examples of her more masculine expertise" (Conroy, 2007, 144).

Even with persisting masculine presidential standards, Clinton in some respects may have entered the 2008 race having already proven her sufficiently "masculine" leadership credentials. According to an August 2005 CNN/*USA Today* poll, 68% of respondents believed the label "strong and decisive leader" applied to Clinton, marking a level of agreement higher than that for past Democratic candidates Al Gore and John Kerry (Hanson and Otero, 2006, 38). In addition, a Gallup report on January 31, just after Clinton announced her candidacy, declared "Clinton Eclipses Obama and Edwards on Leadership," affirming that a sample of Democrats polled endorsed her as "the strongest leader" by a margin of 59% to Obama's 22% and Edwards' 15% and predicted she "would be the best in a crisis" by a margin of 54% to 20% for each male candidate (Saad, 2007, 2). At the same time, such positive assessments do not render irrelevant the particular constraints Clinton may have faced as the lone female candidate in a race for a

traditionally masculine office. In spite of her impressive background, many critics wondered whether a Democratic woman associated with feminine causes like child care and education would ultimately be seen as too far removed from conventional images of what was "presidential." Reportedly, even former president Clinton privately expressed doubts many may have shared about his wife when he remarked that "the country may be ready for a woman President" but "the first one to make it is more likely to be a Republican in the Margaret Thatcher mold" (Tumulty, 3).

Given this paper's narrow focus on a specific campaign in which a vast array of national issues and candidate variables were at play, it is important to note that Hillary Clinton did not simply come before voters as an unknown, like the hypothetical female candidates of experimental situations; in fact, she stepped into the race as a political figure whose gendered characteristics had long been a subject of public debate. In her first position of service at the national level, Clinton defied traditional notions about the role of a First Lady when she emerged as a visible leader rather than a behind-the-scenes spectator of her husband's presidency. She became the most traveled First Lady in history, often embarking on trips alone, and she served as the chair of the White House Task Force on National Health Care Reform. Previous First Ladies had also assumed active roles during their husbands' tenure, but Clinton took "that power out of the closet," even proposing to establish an office in "the West Wing of the White House, traditionally a male domain" (Clift and Brazaitis, 2000, 47). Such a bold assumption of leadership incited criticism of a "co-presidency," and controversy was further provoked by several comments Clinton made in public, which critics interpreted as signs of her disdain for traditional gender roles. While some Americans praised her as a "trailblazer," others viewed her as a "dangerous nonconformist" First Lady who was contemptuous of stay-at-home motherhood and, as "neither the emotional core of her family nor the subordinate of her husband," was even "potentially threatening to the social imaginary family and the gender inequality upon which it rests" (Gardetto, 1997, 236).

Consistent with notions of gender as a "double bind," moments in which Clinton put forth an alternative, "softer" image were often judged as phony, "as if a woman could not be tough and soft, or

tough in some environments, soft in others" (Jamieson, 1995, 39). The prospect of her complexity frustrated some in the press, who tried to decide whether she was a "cold, mouthy…career-crazed…feminist who commandeers microphones" and a "power-starved liability" or a "warm, down-to-earth mother" (Mary Voboril, qtd. in Jamieson, 1995, 39). At the same time, Clinton engendered mixed reactions among a larger public that appeared ambivalent about changing gender roles. On one hand, critics like Paul Gigot of the *Wall Street Journal* complained that "anyone who criticizes Hillary is accused of wanting to enslave women in the kitchen," but a 1993 poll suggested that only 61% of the public believed her to be a "good role model for mothers," with 46% finding her "too pushy" and 41% saying she was "too strong a feminist" (Jamieson, 1995, 47).

Clinton faced similar charges in 2000, when she sought political authority in her own right by running for an open Senate seat in the state of New York. During that campaign, Clinton and her staff seemed to recognize gender as an important factor in the way others assessed her candidacy. Her pollster, Mark Penn, concluded from the results of a January 2000 poll that Clinton's sex posed "an electoral hurdle to overcome," for "[a]cross the board, including women, the public [was] more likely to vote for a male candidate." In response, one account found that Clinton strategically mixed masculine and feminine styles in this first national race; for example, Clinton's announcement speech featured many of the characteristics of Campbell's feminine rhetorical style, but she also made the decision not to have her husband speak and to position him by her side, in keeping with the model of a male politician accompanied by the "requisite supportive spouse" (Anderson, 2002, 114). However she managed them, Clinton displayed an awareness of gender expectations as a potential limitation, as she noted, "[t]he stylistic range seems to be more limited as to what is or is not appropriate for a woman to do, or say, or appear" (qtd. in Clift and Brazaitis, 2000, 20).

In her presidential campaign in 2008, an election year touted as a landmark in terms of both gender and race, Clinton likely retained this consciousness of gender-related constraints before the public eye. By this point, she had established herself through her Senate career and, having shattered

fundraising records with $26 million raised in the first three months of her campaign, she was widely seen as the front-runner for the nomination. Nonetheless, Clinton's gender quickly emerged as a subject of interest, particularly as the idea of whether she was running "as a woman" came under much scrutiny. As one journalist reported, some observers detected a shift during Clinton's campaign and claimed that she increasingly portrayed herself "more as motherly and traditional than as trailblazing and feminist," possibly as a way of courting some of the older, married women with whom she was less popular. Likewise, individual Clinton advisors indicated that she had "demonstrated her strength and credibility on the issues" and thus could "afford to let her feminine side show" (Bombardieri, 2007, 1). Comments Clinton made along the campaign trail further provided grounds for such allegations, as she told voters "I'm your girl" and trivialized her opponents' attacks as "attention from all these men." Often welcomed by large numbers of female supporters, Clinton publicly made issue of topics like motherhood and pregnancy in the workplace, and she alluded to traditional gender roles when she told a crowd at the Iowa State Fairgrounds that having a woman in charge could work in the country's favor, as "we're going to have a lot of cleaning up to do." Additionally, Clinton made headlines when she choked up before a group of women in New Hampshire, answering a voter's question about how she got "out the door every day." Yet, as at prior moments in Clinton's political life and career, observers debated the authenticity of such gender-laden references and displays of emotion, wondering whether they marked a contrived political strategy or constituted real evidence of Clinton's "softer" side.

In addition to coming up in discussions of her own self-presentation, Clinton's gender often took center stage as a potential factor guiding her opponents' strategies and voters' eventual choices. Specifically, allegations of sexism were raised in relation not only to press coverage but also to the treatment of gender by Clinton's male opponents, as some questioned the motivation behind debate references such as Obama's comment that she was "likeable enough" and Edwards' mention of her bright-colored jacket. Moreover, a student attending a November 2007 debate prompted such discussion when she asked Clinton whether she preferred diamonds or pearls – a question unlikely to be posed to her

opponents or to any male presidential candidate. And as press accounts circulated stories of notable incidents along the campaign trail, they raised serious debates about whether voters, and which ones, might vote for or against her because she was a woman. At one end of the spectrum were suggestions of overt sexism, such as a story about a group of male voters in New Hampshire who reportedly yelled at Clinton to iron their shirts. At the other, however, were reflections evoking her campaign's larger significance for gender parity; one journalist, for example, inferred that Clinton's electoral loss in Iowa had aroused female sympathy, predicting that she "may have succeeded in getting more women to see her as she presents herself: not a dominant figure of power, but a woman trying to break what she has called 'the highest and hardest glass ceiling' in America" (Kantor, 2008, 1). As such, deliberations about the importance of Clinton's gender did not go unnoticed by the campaigns of her opponents, who speculated about her advantage among women and seemed eager to affirm their own credibility with this population; as Elizabeth Edwards remarked in July 2007, "[Clinton's] just not as vocal a women's advocate as I want to see. John is" (Bombardieri, 2007, 1).

To be certain, many issues not specifically related to Clinton's gender stand out as critical to the way voters and the press responded to her campaign in 2008. For example, her candidacy was difficult to separate from her husband's legacy, and a June 2006 Gallup poll found that 30% of Americans felt that preventing Bill from becoming "first husband" was in itself a reason to vote against Hillary for president (Han & Heldman, 2007, 190). Yet, gender was widely recognized as a significant campaign issue, and additional factors remain distinct from efforts to probe the gendered aspects of the candidates' campaigns. It is important to assess Clinton's self-presentation and that of her opponents in their own right, even if the precise motivations for their choices or voters' reactions require further exploration. Ultimately, in their quests for the presidency, all of the Democratic candidates encountered the same context, though perhaps not the same obstacles, as they crafted appeals they believed would be most compelling.

EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

Method

My study attempted to extend the VideoStyle methodology put forth by Kaid and Davidson (1986) and modified by Bystrom et al. (2004) through a content analysis of the 2008 Democratic presidential primary campaign. All Clinton, Obama, and Edwards advertisements posted on the Presidential Primary Ad Archive that were recorded in the English language and aired on the television (radio and internet ads were excluded for consistency) were analyzed based on a codesheet with 25 categories of verbal and nonverbal content. The ads coded amounted to a total of 212: 89 for Senator Obama, 87 for Senator Clinton, and 36 for Senator Edwards; one Clinton ad, titled "Only One," was not included due to technical difficulties with the website. Each advertisement that was listed on the archive under a unique name or date was coded as an individual unit. Therefore, two advertisements that may have been otherwise identical but which were assigned different dates were recorded separately. Often these duplicate ads included state-specific references, in which case they were assigned names in the format of "Title (State)" so as to identify each as its own entity. If no particular state or set of states was explicitly specified, the designation "v. 2" was given to the advertisement whose listed air date occurred later in the campaign. There was only one such repetition in Edwards' ad set and 4 in Clinton's, while Obama included 14; thus, the number of duplicates was small relative to the sample size, and some of these did differ in content, if only subtly. Nonetheless, a candidate's choice to imitate or repeat an advertisement shown earlier in the campaign was seen to mark an emphasis on that advertisement's content; in light of this and my study's reliance on overall percentages/frequencies for the purposes of content analysis, it was important to properly document duplicates in order to answer my research questions and thoroughly record each candidate's self-presentation [See Appendix A].

The advertisements were analyzed for such elements as the length and tone of the ad; the ad's dominant format and focus; the strategies of any attack; the issues and traits mentioned; the appeal type, structure, and content; the sex and status of any speakers; the dress, facial expression, and eye contact of

the candidate; the nature and subjects of any candidate interactions; and whether the candidate featured his/her family. The date of the first airing, as indicated by the electronic ad archive, was noted, as was any specific state or primary date referenced in print or audio within the ad [See Table 1.1]; this data contextualized the content of individual ads and provided an opportunity to track and compare changes over the course of the primary season. The category of "fear appeal" was originally included in the codesheet, but it was later removed because such tactics were absent in this generally positive set of primary ads. Otherwise, wherever a code's meaning required elaboration, detailed clarification was provided in the coding instructions [See Appendix B]. Codesheet questions asking for the "dominant" format left this judgment to the coder, with the exception of the categories of dominant expression and dress, which were determined by a more precise count of the number of times the candidate was shown smiling vs. serious and dressed formally vs. casually; an ad in which the candidate was featured with a smiling expression in three images and a serious expression in four, for example, would be coded as "smiling" for dominant format.

- ***Gendered Categories***

The codesheet was used to examine each ad for those elements of verbal and nonverbal content that previous political communications literature has deemed "masculine" or "feminine," based on Campbell's construct of rhetorical style and empirical research on the strategies predominantly adopted by male and female political figures. In particular, the markers of a "feminine" VideoStyle included: discussion of "female" issues (education, health care, senior citizens' issues, welfare reform, women's issues, government ethics, environment, veterans' issues, and poverty); reference to "feminine" traits (sensitivity/compassion, cooperation, honesty, and trustworthiness); emotional and inductively-structured appeals; certain appeal strategies associated with Campbell's feminine rhetorical style (mention of biographical experiences or anecdotes, addressing viewers as peers – i.e., "we" or "let's," use of a personal "I" tone, identification with others' experiences); candidate speaking for him/herself; more attacks, particularly character-based attacks; more formal attire; eye contact; and smiling expression.

Alternatively, the elements of a stereotypically "masculine" strategy and male VideoStyle that were recorded included: discussion of "male" issues (economy, taxes, defense/war, energy, and foreign policy); reference to "masculine" qualities typically valued politically (toughness/strength, experience, leadership/taking the initiative, competence); logical and deductively-structured appeals; certain appeal strategies (use of statistics, emphasis on accomplishments, citation of non-political/expert endorsements); a testimonial or endorsement format, with the candidate less often speaking for him/herself; attacks in the form of "guilt-by-association" or "group affiliation" charges; casual attire; and representation of his/her own family.

Additionally, certain characteristics associated with candidates' status as a "challenger" or "incumbent," as defined by Kaid and Davidson (1986), were included, as these provided a contextual consideration beyond candidate gender. Many strategies that have been linked to challengers overlap with those characteristic of a feminine VideoStyle, while incumbent strategies have been associated with the male politicians who have typically been the incumbents in American politics. However, the case of the 2008 Democratic primaries afforded an interesting opportunity to analyze the interaction between gender and status, for it was the female candidate who was most like an "incumbent" in terms of her political experience and "insider" status.

- ***Coder Reliability***

A test of coder reliability was performed on the data set, first to revise and clarify the codesheet and then to confirm that the coding results were in fact replicable. A second coder was given six Obama ads and six Clinton ads; all were selected using a random number generator except for one, which was randomly selected from a subset of "contrast" ads, as several items in the codesheet applied only to ads in which an attack was featured. Using Holsti's formula (1969), intercoder reliability was calculated for each of the 25 categories of variables, and this produced coefficients ranging from the outlying low values of 0.67, 0.75, and 0.83 for appeal structure, content, and type, to 1.0 (length, tone, dominant attack strategy, opponent visual, dominant focus, status and sex of advocates, eye contact, facial expression, and

family representation). The only other variable whose coefficient fell below 0.90 was that of traits (0.85), and the overall coder reliability was 0.93.

Discussion of Results

Once the coding data was collected and assembled, cross-tabulations were run to compare differences across the three sponsors on the 169 variables within the 25 categories, and a chi-square test was performed to test each notable difference for statistical significance. In several cases, differences between only Clinton and Obama were also tested for significance, as they were in the race longer and the strategies of these leading candidates more closely resembled each other than they did those of Edwards, whose advertising campaign was characterized by a more distinctive style.

- ***Ad Length and Tone:***

The overwhelming ad length of choice was the 30-second spot, which made up 84.9% of the three Democrats' ads. The length of Clinton ads was the most consistent, as over 92% of hers were 30 seconds, compared to 82% of Obama's and 75% of Edwards', and this conformed to Bystrom's (1995) conclusion that men candidates are more likely to feature a variety of spot lengths. Yet, as many of Obama's longer ads featured a documentary format, included biographical references, and were aired before the Iowa caucuses, Obama's greater variation in spot length may have primarily reflected a strategy designed to address his preliminary status as a lesser-known candidate.

Overall, most of the 212 ads were positive in tone, with 87.3% of them advocating for a particular candidate or issue position. Interestingly, Clinton was the most positive, at 89.7% versus Obama's 88.8% and Edwards' 77.8%, but she also went directly on the attack more, at a rate of 5.7% (compared to 2.2% for Obama and 0% for Edwards). Previous researchers have found that women in mixed-gender political campaigns are often more negative in their advertisements, but Bystrom et al. (2004) concluded from their study of seven election cycles that this difference was not significant over time, and an examination of Clinton's and Obama's collective contrast and attack ads shows that Obama included some form of attack at a similar rate (at 11.2%, versus 10.3% of Clinton's). Consequently, the differences in tone

between the two candidates' sets of ads were not statistically significant, although Edwards was significantly more negative, consistent with his status as a "challenger." As all of his attack/contrast ads were aired within the two weeks before his January 30 withdrawal, this shift to a more critical tone may be interpreted as part of a last-ditch effort to make the case for his "underdog" candidacy.

- ***Ad Format and Focus:***

By a large margin, the most common ad format focused on issues, at 43.9% of overall ads in the Democratic sample, and all three candidates used the issue format most often (41.4% of Clinton's, 43.8% of Obama's, and 50% of Edwards'). Edwards selected opposition-focused ads the most frequently, again demonstrating the greater negativity that was evident in the tone of his ads. For her part, Clinton stood out in her use of testimonial ads, which comprised 25.3% of her set, in contrast to only 19.1% of Obama's and 5.6% of Edwards', and this difference was statistically significant. Given that this format has been associated with male VideoStyle and incumbent strategy, Clinton's selection may signify an effort to capitalize on her "incumbent" advantage as the most experienced candidate. Nonetheless, as a female striving for the presidency, she may also have featured others testifying on her behalf as a way to confer credibility on her candidacy and to assuage potential doubts about a woman candidate's viability. Additionally, in these testimonial ads as well as others in which an advocate spoke on her behalf, Clinton featured male supporters (18.4%) more often than females (14.6%). Both she and Obama presented more interactions with male leaders than with female leaders, an imbalance likely resulting from women's underrepresentation in the political system, but the proportion of Clinton ads with male leaders was still more than double that of such Obama ads. Because she was already largely perceived as the more "experienced" of the two, the divergence may be associated with her unique position as a female candidate; namely, Clinton may have tried to communicate her fitness for the role of the presidency by calling attention to her relationships with and respect among male figures of authority.

At the same time, Clinton emphasized introspection more in her ads, a format that Johnston and White's 1994 study of female Senate candidates identified as a preferred strategy among women.

Although Bystrom (1995) found that both men and women politicians commonly use this intimate, "feminine" format, it is worth noting that the female candidate in this presidential primary was the only of the three to opt for "introspection," and that she did so in 5 (6.9%) of her ads. Moreover, a larger proportion of her ads (5.7%) were candidate-centered than were Obama's (3.4%), and none of Edwards' ads used this format. This is more difficult to relate to previous literature, as this format was added to categories from other studies, but its predominantly personal nature seems coherent with characteristics denoting a feminine rhetorical strategy.

[Table 2.1 about here]

Clinton's ads were also slightly more image-focused, with a total of 37.9%, compared to Obama's 28.1% (and Edwards' 30.6%). However, more than 60% of each candidate's ads dealt mainly with campaign issues, marking a propensity that has frequently been observed in both male and female VideoStyles. Bystrom et al.'s 2004 study, for example, found that 62% of women candidates' ads and 64% of men candidates' ads accentuated issues rather than images. Consequently, these fairly uniform results across a range of electoral contexts may be seen as an indication that candidates – regardless of sex – have largely understood their personal characteristics to be tangential to or secondary to their positions on the pressing national issues that meaningfully affect voters' lives.

- ***Appeal Content, Type, and Structure:***

Clinton's advertisements were the most personal in their appeal content, as 42.5% of her ads included this type of appeal, compared to only 32.6% of Obama's and 16.7% of Edwards', a difference that was statistically significant. In contrast, Obama was slightly more likely to outline his ideas on policy matters, whether in the form of vague preferences (found in 41.6% of his ads, compared to 33.3% of Clinton's and 30.6% of Edwards') or more specific policy proposals (at 10.1%, versus 5.7% of Clinton's and 5.6% of Edwards'). This divergence could be related to Obama's lack of experience relative to Clinton, as he may have sought to counter his status as an "unknown" by explicitly outlining his issue stances, but Clinton's more personal appeal content also supports the theory associating

feminine rhetorical style with audience engagement. Furthermore, this pattern extended to the variable of appeal type, which was more often emotional in Clinton's case (29.9% to 16.9%) and logical in Obama's (57.3% to 41.4%). Interestingly, Edwards used emotional ads at the greatest rate (36.1%). While the sample size of his ads was much smaller and their format distinctive, this difference may be explained by the observed connection between feminine VideoStyle and a "challenger" strategy.

The variable of appeal structure may be less easily analyzed, for many (59%) of the ads vaguely combined images and verbal appeals in a way that was difficult to identify as inductive or deductive. Nonetheless, of the ads for which appeal structure could be categorized, only 10 (4.7% overall) of these were defined as deductive, and all the candidates were much more likely to structure their appeals inductively. This finding corroborates a trend in both male and female candidates' use of inductive appeals and may represent one way that feminine rhetorical style is encouraged by the intimate medium of televised communications.

- ***Appeal Strategies:***

Again supporting the widespread adoption of feminine style, all three candidates used a personal tone in roughly equal proportion, featuring this appeal strategy in about one-third of their ads. Otherwise, Obama appears to have used "masculine" appeal strategies more often than Clinton (and Edwards): his ads were significantly more likely to cite statistics, to use expert/non-political endorsements, and to mention his accomplishments. However, he also employed the "feminine" strategy of addressing the audience as peers significantly more, phrasing appeals in terms of "we" and "let's" in a manner redolent of feminine speech as rhetoric meant to empower (Campbell, 1989). Additionally, Obama was more likely to identify with the audience's experiences, and the two male candidates used the feminine rhetorical technique of inviting audience participation slightly more than Clinton, though these differences were not statistically significant.

Thus, an analysis of appeal strategies alone points to Obama's adoption of both masculine and feminine strategies at a greater frequency than Clinton. The only feminine appeal strategy that the female

candidate used in greater proportion than her male opponents was that of biographical or anecdotal references, as Clinton featured such a reference in 34.5% of her ads, which was more than Obama (25.8%) but not much different than Edwards (30.6%). Together with the fact that Clinton was significantly less likely to apply the masculine appeal strategies that Obama employed in many of his ads, these results suggest that her appeals were more "gender-neutral," while he balanced equally prominent masculine and feminine techniques.

[Tables 3.1, 3.2 about here]

In addition to the finding that the candidates blended masculine and feminine appeals, several of the differences in their appeal strategies can be related to their particular electoral positions rather than their gender. For example, Clinton's and Obama's ads more often included political endorsements (12.6% and 11.2%, respectively), whereas Edwards did not feature any in his 36 ads; this relationship was not significant, but the difference likely reflects Edwards' position as a "Washington outsider." Edwards used attacks and cited traditional values, additional "challenger" strategies, slightly more often than Obama and Clinton, though this difference similarly was not significant. Moreover, Obama's ads also reveal certain characteristics of a challenger strategy, in keeping with his appeal as a youthful outsider promising to bring about change in Washington. Namely, he employed the challenger-associated strategies of directly appealing for change and emphasizing optimism/hope for the future significantly more than his opponents.

[Table 3.3 about here]

- ***Identity and Sex of Dominant Speaker:***

Consistent with Edwards' distinction as a type of "challenger," he was the most likely to employ the technique of speaking for himself, for he was the dominant speaker in 69.4% of his ads. This difference was statistically significant, and it is worth noting that Clinton was the least likely to adopt this strategy of feminine VideoStyle. In fact, at 34.5% of her ads, Clinton featured herself as the dominant

speaker significantly less than Obama as well (50.6%); instead, she more often used the incumbent technique of an anonymous speaker to carry her ads' messages.

On the measure of the dominant speaker's sex, Clinton's ads were significantly more likely to use a female voice, but this apparent difference can be explained by the fact that Clinton herself was the dominant speaker in 30 of her 32 ads that predominantly featured a female. In fact, Obama's 7 female dominant speakers put his total above the 2 in which she included another woman's voice, even if female speakers constituted a lower percentage of his total ads (7.9% of Obama ads used a female voice, compared to 36.8% of Clinton's); conceivably, Obama may have had an incentive to feature a female voice in light of Clinton's purported advantage with women voters. Perhaps even more noteworthy was all three candidates' reliance on male speakers, found in 92.1% of Obama's ads, 88.9% of Edwards', and, when excluding from Clinton's total the ads that featured her as the "female speaker," 91.2% of Clinton's. Such high percentages provided one of the strongest results across all the variables recorded, manifesting the extent to which masculine representatives are the norm in campaign advertisements at the presidential level, if not across the board in American politics.

[Tables 4.1, 4.2 about here]

Furthermore, a cross-tabulation of ad tone and speaker sex reveals that none of the attack or contrast ads, whether produced by a male or female candidate, featured a female dominant speaker. This finding is surprising against the consistent finding in political communications literature that suggests women candidates may have greater freedom to go on the attack because of their perceived compassion and "softness." As a result, this finding may imply that this "advantage" in attacking stems from factors not readily inferred from the sound of a female voice; it may be that this voice must be associated with an identifiable female figure, and thus stereotypical "feminine" traits like compassion or passivity, in order to effectively soften an attack. Based on the choices observed in their advertisements, none of the three candidates seemed to feel that attacks would be more acceptable if articulated by an anonymous or third-

party female voice, and in fact they may have believed that an attack could be perceived as stronger when communicated by a male voice.

- ***Issues:***

In total, 83.5% of ads across the sponsoring candidates made some reference to at least one specific campaign issue, and those most discussed were health care (36.8%), government ethics (29.7%), jobs (26.9%), defense/war (20.3%), taxes (19.3%), energy (18.4%), the economy (16.0%), and education (14.6%). Appearing in less than 10% of the overall ads were the issues of Washington reform (9.9%), foreign policy (9.0%), housing (7.5%), veterans' issues (6.6%), senior citizens' issues (5.7%), and the environment (2.4%). Finally, less than 1% of the ads made reference to the less central election topics of women's issues, welfare reform, and poverty (0.9%, or 2 ads, each). Evidently, the "feminine" issue of health care and "masculine" concerns about the economy were both especially prominent among Democratic concerns in this primary season; 43.7% of Clinton's and 37.1% of Obama's ads mentioned health coverage, while 63.2% of Clinton's and 61.8% of Obama's ads noted the general state of the economy or concerns about jobs and taxes in some way.

[Table 5.1 about here]

Examining the issues as "gendered" reveals that all three candidates highlighted both "masculine" and "feminine" topics in their ad campaigns. Clinton was significantly more likely to discuss the feminine issues of health care and education, was the only candidate to directly refer to women's issues, and mentioned veteran's issues more often than her opponents, though this was not a significant difference; as such, Clinton's issue emphasis seems to support theories associating women candidates with "feminine" issues. Yet, it is clear that Clinton, like her male opponents, balanced stereotypically feminine and masculine issues in her ads. In addition to her more frequent discussion of certain "feminine" topics, she more often referenced the stereotypically masculine issue of the economy, featured the topics of jobs and energy in slightly greater proportion than the male candidates did, and mentioned taxes about as often as Obama. In fact, the only "masculine" categories for which Clinton's mentions

were fewer than her opponents' were foreign policy and defense/war, and the difference on the latter variable was not statistically significant. Furthermore, the male candidates were significantly more likely than Clinton to mention the "feminine" issue of government ethics, and Obama was the only candidate to discuss the "feminine" issue of the environment.

[Table 5.2 about here]

As Clinton's balanced discussion demonstrates, the candidates' issue selection seems to conform to recent research indicating that both masculine and feminine issues are important in political campaigns and that individual issue choices are often driven predominantly by the electoral context, rather than by gender-based differences. Many of the differences that did appear can upon closer examination be explained by contextual factors such as the candidates' positions in the race or their particular political backgrounds, which are especially relevant considering the case study basis of this data. For example, Clinton's past activism on health care reform may have at least partly motivated her focus on this issue, and many of her ads cited her record of fighting for health coverage as an important illustration of past leadership, just as many of Obama's mentions of government ethics referred to his record in this area. Similarly, Clinton may have downplayed war and defense issues to divert attention from the pro-Iraq War vote on her record, which was seen as a liability by many Democratic voters in 2008. Otherwise, the broad convergence on issue agenda was especially predictable in this case, as all the Democratic primary candidates were courting the same base of voters.

- ***Traits:***

For the three Democratic candidates collectively, 93.9% of ads included some reference to candidate traits, which were featured in over 97% of each of Clinton's and Obama's ads, but in only 75% of Edwards'. Consistent with my expectations based on the existing literature, the candidates' selection of traits revealed a gendered balance, as the "masculine" characteristics of leadership and toughness/strength were the first and third most commonly cited, respectively, while three of the top five most mentioned traits (compassion, honesty, and cooperation) were stereotypically "feminine" in nature.

Both Clinton and Obama emphasized their leadership and compassion, but Clinton stressed her toughness/strength in lieu of Obama's accentuation of honesty. The similar importance Edwards placed on toughness, which was his third most frequently cited trait after compassion and honesty, may indicate a common overlap between the strategy of challengers and that of female candidates, both of whom may seek to more explicitly communicate that they are sufficiently "tough" for the job.

[Table 6.1 about here]

Furthermore, the personal qualities the candidates emphasized often defied gender stereotypes. Indeed, the only traits for which there were statistically significant differences in candidate mentions were the "masculine" quality of experience, which appeared most often in Clinton's ads, and the "feminine" traits of cooperation and honesty, which Obama stressed more than the other candidates. Interestingly, two of Obama's and two of Edwards' top three mentioned traits were "feminine," compared to only one of Clinton's. As previously noted, the female candidate also spoke of her "toughness" or "strength" at the highest frequency (33.3% of her ads); on the other "masculine" measures of leadership and competence, which may be in large part identified as such based on the traditional definition of politics as a "male" domain, Obama cited each in the greatest proportion, though neither of these differences was statistically significant. Of the "feminine" trait categories, moreover, none received the greatest emphasis in the ads of the female candidate. Although Clinton discussed compassion more often than Obama, Edwards presented this quality in the largest percentage of ads. Additionally, Obama was the most likely to stress the "feminine" quality of cooperation, and the difference between only Obama and Clinton on this variable was also statistically significant. Obama and Edwards stood out for their mentions of "feminine" honesty, which was included in only 5.7% of Clinton's ads but in 38.2% and 30.6% of their ad sets, respectively.

[Table 6.2 about here]

Obama's and Edwards' presentations of characteristics associated with femininity can be seen to indicate, as other studies have found, that men seeking votes in mixed-gender races have an incentive to

underline traits commonly attributed to their female opponents. Furthermore, the greater importance Clinton placed on her "masculine" toughness and experience is consistent with literature suggesting that, even if all candidates in a mixed-gender race present a balance of stereotypically gendered traits, women candidates may attempt to put more emphasis on those areas for which their sex could confer a perceived disadvantage. Whereas Edwards' presentation of toughness seemed to tie into his broader argument that "the Democratic Party needs to show a little backbone," Clinton's appeared more personal. Several of her ads featured text explicitly proclaiming that she would be "strong for us," and her "Kitchen" ad defined the presidency as the "toughest job in the world," citing Truman's comment, "If you can't stand the HEAT, get out of the kitchen" as it asked "Who do you think has what it takes?" Additionally, Obama often used endorsements that depicted him as inspirational, while Clinton's again spoke to her toughness; ads like "Fighter" and "Steel" featured male governors and senators who characterized Clinton as a "fighter" with a "spine of steel" who was "ready to be Commander-in-Chief from day one." Her advertisements even seemed to depict experience as a corollary to toughness, as an ad featuring a "3 a.m. phone call" evoked the need for presidential strength in a time of crisis and used this to argue that the person to answer should be someone who is "tested."

However, Clinton's "strength" presentation notwithstanding, it appears that the candidates' overall campaign messages may have influenced their trait emphases at least as much as any conscious effort to refute or confirm gender stereotypes. Clinton's political background constituted an important part of her profile as a candidate, and discussions of her experience were integral to the arguments she made for her nomination over Obama's. Correspondingly, many of Obama's ads, and much of his campaign, presented him as an "outsider" candidate able to overcome partisan polarization in Washington and to speak directly to the American people; thus, his decision to highlight the qualities of cooperation and honesty can be seen as coherent with his overall communication strategy. Still, the ability of all three candidates to "co-opt" traits of the other gender, as well as their choice to blend masculinity and

femininity in their self-presentations, demonstrates the extent to which both types of qualities are deemed valuable to political leadership – even at the presidential level.

- ***Representations of Family:***

On first glance, differences in the candidates' representations of family in this study seem to support previous research pointing to more of a family emphasis in male VideoStyle, which men may use to show their compassion, whereas women may avoid such reminders of their traditional roles as mothers and wives, images seen as incompatible with their political persona. Correspondingly, 11.2% of Obama's and 25% of Edwards' ads showed their wives, children, siblings, parents, and/or grandparents visually, compared to 5.7% of Clinton's, a difference that was statistically significant, and Clinton was also less likely to show herself interacting with family members. However, closer scrutiny of the ads' family representations suggests that Clinton did not avoid these images, as she produced ads that presented her at home with her mother, discussing the experience of raising her daughter, and out on the campaign trail with both of them. In one particularly telling ad, "Proud," a series of images featured the three generations of female Clintons; with text announcing, "Hillary's mom lives with her," Clinton described the values her mother taught her, adding, "what I'm most proud of is knowing who I've passed them on to." In this way, she seemed to relate her experience as a daughter and mother to that of a typical American woman, mentioning that she often met "families who share the same values I was brought up with."

Some of the difference observed, therefore, may stem from the fact that both Obama and Edwards featured their spouses, whereas Clinton did not; excluding spousal representations from the analysis would drop their proportion of ads with family to 7.9% and 11.1%, respectively. In Clinton's case, her husband's political background provided an additional factor complicating the decision of whether to represent him. Yet, the former president's exclusion also underscores the extent to which all three candidates primarily represented female family members. Indeed, all of the family members who spoke on any candidate's behalf were female; Obama's ads featured testimonials by his sister and wife,

Edwards' by his wife, and "Hillary's Mom" presented Clinton's qualifications as understood by her mother.

Nonetheless, Clinton was significantly more likely than either male candidate to feature other people's children in her ads, as she did so in 50.6% compared to 16.9% of Obama's and 8.3% of Edwards'. As in other mixed-gender races, the strength of this contrast may be interpreted to denote a deliberate strategy on the part of the Clinton campaign to accentuate the compassionate, nurturing side that is more expected of women. Clinton may have used images evoking her experiences with childhood and motherhood to consciously stress a "softer" side that could complement her "toughness" in presidential politics, thereby assuring voters that she was in touch with this socially prescribed "feminine" role. Interestingly, Clinton's version of the infamous "3 a.m. phone call" ad, called "Ringing" in Obama's case, was titled "Children" and featured images of children asleep in their beds before showing the candidate poised at her desk, as if to present a maternal variation on the president as the nation's protector. At the same time, both Obama and Clinton featured the nurturing interaction of touching or being touched by others in around two-thirds of their total ads (67.4% for Obama and 65.5% for Clinton), a feminine strategy and a characteristic of female VideoStyle. As this portrayal of intimacy and the representations of family illustrate, all the candidates in this mixed-gender race seem to have tried to communicate their versatility and to connect with a base of women voters; this common effort may have simply manifested itself differently, with the depiction of Clinton's mother and daughter and interactions with children in her ads and the appearance of the men's wives and children in theirs.

- ***Nonverbal Components:***

Perhaps the most unambiguous difference between the set of Clinton's ads and those of her male opponents was in their non-verbal or physical self-presentation, both in terms of their dress and their facial expressions, which has been a consistent finding in past research on male and female VideoStyles. It has been posited that women candidates and politicians generally have far less flexibility in terms of their dress, as formal attire has traditionally been a way they have emphasized their seriousness in the

"male" domain of politics. In this study, 72.2% of the three Democrats' ads featured the candidates primarily wearing formal attire, but a clear difference emerged between Clinton's dress and the attire of her male opponents. While Obama and Edwards donned rolled-up sleeves or a shirt without a tie, casual dress often used as a way to appeal to working-class voters, Clinton only wore formal suits in her ads. In fact, only one image of Clinton, which recurred in multiple ads, could be defined as "casual," as it showed her in a trendier, less business-like attire of an open jacket with a wide-buckle belt at her waist. Even with this image, she featured predominantly formal dress in 100% of her ads, compared to 49.4% of Obama's and 61.1% of Edwards'. Obama presented the two styles in similar proportion, with 49.4% formal, 43.8% casual, and 6.7% in which both were shown equally. And even though Edwards was more formal than Obama, perhaps as a result of his underdog status and his potential image as a less viable candidate, he still featured mostly casual dress in 33.3% and presented the two equally in 2.8% of his ads.

On the additional nonverbal element of facial expression, the data again confirmed prior findings on female VideoStyle. Whereas formal dress has been associated with political seriousness, smiling has been identified as a way for women candidates to acknowledge societal expectations that they be friendly and warm. Clinton was significantly more likely than either of the male candidates to smile, as she presented smiling and serious expressions in almost equal proportion, at 42.5% to 43.7%, respectively. In contrast, only 7.9% of Obama's ads and 19.4% of Edwards' ads presented each of them smiling more often than they were serious, and 86.5% of Obama's and 77.8% of Edwards' featured mostly serious expressions.

Conversely, Clinton was significantly less likely to use the "feminine" strategy of establishing eye contact with the audience. 85.1% of her ads "almost never" presented live shots of her looking at the camera, versus 76.4% of Obama's and 58.3% of Edwards'. Unlike other recent studies purporting that men and women candidates exhibit about the same amount of eye contact, Clinton established eye contact in 13.8% of her ads, far less often than the 23.6% of Obama ads and 36.1% of Edwards' (for whom all fell into the category of "almost always"). More generally, the low overall use of eye contact

"sometimes" or "almost always" in only 21.7% of the three Democrats' total ads may seem to contradict research suggesting that the intimate medium of television encourages this visual intimacy. However, this discrepancy may be explained by the emphasis in many of the ads on either still images or a *cinéma verité* format in which the candidate spoke to others rather than to the camera.

[Table 7.1 about here]

- ***Attacks:***

In ads that featured attacks, the candidates overwhelmingly focused on criticizing their opponents' campaign tactics, which was the case in 76.2% of the overall ads in which attacks were made. This differed from previous research such as Bystrom et al.'s (2004) finding that both male and female candidates most often attack opponents' issue positions, but this departure is likely explained by the broad issue agreement among the Democratic primary candidates. Clinton more often opted for personal attacks than Obama did (by a difference of 33.3% to 20%), a tactic associated with female candidates, and she used three times as many record-focused attacks (33.3% versus 10%), which was an interesting finding given Obama's shorter time in office and her campaign's effort to spotlight his inexperience. The male candidates were more likely than Clinton to represent their opponents visually (in Obama's case, only Clinton was shown, while Edwards depicted both opponents). All of Edwards' ads with attacks showed his opponents, as did 90% of Obama's but only 60% of Clinton's.

However, more interesting were the expressions depicted in these opponent visuals, especially as they related to the facial expressions the candidate presented in images of themselves. In particular, while Clinton was overwhelmingly more likely to air ads in which she was predominantly smiling, none of the visuals she included of Obama depicted him with a smile, and none of his shots of her mirrored the smiling expression that her ads often conveyed. Notably, in both Clinton's "Deserves" and "Debate" ads, she directly juxtaposed photographs of her own smiling face with serious shots of Obama. Thus, these intersecting choices may suggest that depicting Clinton as smiling was in fact seen to be advantageous to her candidacy, as she emphasized a smiling expression in her advocacy ads and still chose to present

herself this way in the visuals of her contrast ads, rather than matching serious shots of Obama with similar photos of herself. Presumably, this may further support theories identifying smiling as a nonverbal signal that acknowledges expectations of feminine warmth. The Obama campaign's choice not to depict Clinton smiling may be explained by his efforts to present her as an unlikable proponent of "negative politics," but it is nonetheless telling that he did not seem to view images of her smiling as a "feminine" weakness or as a point of comparison that would work in his favor.

CONCLUSIONS

Analysis of the three Democrats' self-presentation confirms the first part of my hypothesis, which predicted a broad issue convergence and a common blend of stereotypically masculine and feminine issues and traits on the part of all the candidates [See Tables 5.1 and 6.1]. In this race, partisanship provided a point of commonality, and the inclusion of stereotypically feminine issues was unsurprising in light of the traditional association of Democrats with "feminine" causes like health care and education. These were also highly relevant national issues in 2008, as were more "masculine" concerns relating to the economy and energy independence. As has been found in political races at other levels, the candidates' issue agendas overlapped significantly and seem to have been guided more by their electoral context than by any gender-specific strategy, although their personal backgrounds and positions in the race likely contributed to individual differences.

Similarly, each candidate appears to have merged and balanced "masculine" and "feminine" personal characteristics in his/her self-presentation; evidently, the candidates sought to convey that they were equipped for compassionate and cooperative leadership while also demonstrating the competence and strength associated with other equally essential presidential responsibilities. It can be assumed that no candidate, male or female, considered it advantageous to come across as wholly "masculine" or "feminine" in the traits he/she portrayed. In spite of masculine presidential standards and election discourse, citizens in a democratic society expect their president to understand their needs – or, at the very least, "care" – and "feminine" traits like compassion and sensitivity are critical to a candidate's fitness for the office. Furthermore, in 2008, demonstrating honesty and a willingness to cooperate may have been especially central to the Democrats' appeal for change; with many voters criticizing the Bush administration for manipulating facts and refusing to work across party lines, disaffection with the ultra-masculine approach of the Bush administration likely encouraged the candidates to underline these "feminine" traits.

The second aspect of my hypothesis, which conjectured that Clinton as a female candidate may have acknowledged a greater incentive to prove her "masculine" strength, was supported by the finding that she was the most likely to reference the characteristics of toughness/strength and experience in her ads. Although the value she placed on experience was also key to her broader campaign message, it is noteworthy that Clinton did not feature any "feminine" characteristic more often than her male opponents. In a related way, Clinton was significantly more likely to use the masculine or incumbent testimonial ad format, and she featured more male advocates and interactions with male leaders, thereby appearing to in part communicate her "presidential timber" by a function of her credibility with masculine authorities and supporters (Duerst-Lahti, 2006). Like both Edwards and Obama, Clinton did balance this masculine portrayal with more feminine elements. Nonetheless, it seems that her campaign was more careful to explicitly point out her stereotypically "masculine" qualifications. The greater accentuation of strength in Clinton's ads is especially telling in view of the considerable advantage she seemed to enjoy over Obama and Edwards on most markers of presidential leadership going into the primary season, as indicated by multiple polls. In the midst of a "horserace" for an office never held by a woman, Clinton may have anticipated that her gender would serve as a cue distinct from her other personal characteristics.

Whether or not Clinton complemented these "masculine" personal traits with a feminine style of appeal, as I expected, is at first glance less clear. Certain differences between Clinton's ads and those of her opponents suggest that her strategy was actually less characteristically "feminine," as she was less likely to use most of the feminine appeal strategies, to feature herself as the dominant speaker, and to make extensive eye contact with the audience. Additionally, whereas Obama employed many of the appeal strategies classified as "feminine," as well as all that were deemed "masculine," more often than she did, Clinton's verbal strategy appeared more gender-neutral; she often employed feminine tactics such as using a personal tone and masculine tactics such as mentioning her accomplishments, but she stood out from her opponents only on a single appeal strategy (that of biographical/anecdotal references).

Yet, at the same time, several nonverbal components of Clinton's ads collectively reflected a markedly feminine style. Her smiling expression and formal dress, for example, exemplified a strategy many female candidates use to convey at once an appropriately feminine congeniality and a seriousness essential to their political viability. Clinton also appeared to accentuate her femininity through her interactions with children and her relationships with her mother and daughter. One ad, titled "Presents," even seemed to conjure up images of female domesticity, as Clinton was shown surrounded by holiday gifts cutting wrapping paper and adding tags; each gift's tag was labeled with a distinct aspect of her issue agenda, and in the ad's audio, Clinton wittily remarked, "Where did I put Universal Pre-K?" before smiling, "Ah! There it is" and securing the gift tag. Furthermore, several elements of her ads together conveyed "femininity" in the sense that they established a personal, emotional connection: in particular, Clinton's ads were slightly more image-focused, more personal in appeal content and attack strategy, more often used a candidate-centered or introspective format, and employed more emotional appeals than Obama's.

The fact that she did not appear to avoid representations of family members, as women in other races often have, could signify that female candidates at the presidential level may find they have verified their qualities of "masculine" leadership sufficiently to balance them with their private, feminine family roles. However, it is perhaps more likely that this flexibility was unique to Clinton, an established political figure whose family life had already been very public during her time as First Lady. With no young children and little doubt that she could put her obligations as wife and mother second to public office, Clinton may have had more freedom to portray the compassionate, nurturing roles that male candidates' representations of family often seek to evoke. If any generalization is to be drawn from her emphasis on family, it may be that the intense national media spotlight on candidate personality in presidential races demands more overt demonstrations of women's warmth and likability. These were attributes less readily ascribed to Clinton, and perceptions that she was a cold, tough "feminist" may have

therefore motivated her to highlight her traditional roles a caring mother and daughter, images that could make her more relatable to women and more acceptable among men.

Finally, consistent with literature pointing to the widespread adoption of feminine communications strategies in political advertising, all three candidates often employed Campbell's "feminine" strategies of a personal tone, an inductive appeal strategy, and references to personal biography/anecdotes, each of which was present in over 30% of the overall ads. Similarly, they conspicuously emphasized endorsements and testimonials by female family members who could speak to their personal qualities, and the two leading candidates commonly showed intimate interactions in which they touched others. Signifying the male adoption of these feminine strategies, only one indicator of Campbell's feminine rhetorical style was employed in the greatest proportion by the female candidate. Edwards was the most likely of all to use a personal tone and to invite audience participation, while Obama was more likely than either of the other candidates to structure his appeals inductively, identify with others' experiences, and address the audience as peers; featured in 56.2% of Obama's ads, this cooperative and empowering feminine tactic of referring to the audience in terms of "we" was the most widely used appeal strategy of any in an individual candidate's ad set. It may be that, as Jamieson (1995) has maintained, the medium of television particularly invites these intimate means of engaging with the audience. Additionally, Democrats generally have been associated with feminine attributes, and it may also be possible that Clinton's front-runner candidacy promoted the male candidates' illustrations of femininity, especially in light of frequent speculations about the "gender factor" in this mixed-gender race. Yet, a more holistic consideration of the candidates' ads indicates that rather than simply signs of gender-consciousness, "feminine" characteristics were critical to the communication of their messages and, as such, constituted essential components of their self-presentation.

These trends, both the increasing tendency to blend masculinity and femininity and the growing prominence of "feminine" styles of appeal, may hold important implications for political communications strategies and for the legitimation of women politicians. The emphasis on traits associated with women

and on techniques exemplifying feminine rhetoric may serve to valorize femininity and confer advantages on the public roles of women, who are perceived as more naturally exhibiting these qualities. The widespread adoption of "feminine" attributes and manners of communication, moreover, could blur distinctions between the two sexes and prompt reassessment of the one-sided masculine discourse that surrounds political campaigns and elections, thereby advancing a more equal playing field. The mixing of gendered characteristics may also promote a redefinition of gender itself; in place of traditional understandings of a dichotomy pre-determined by nature, gender may be instead considered in terms of malleable behaviors and attributes to be blended and harmonized, in conjunction with Georgia Duerst-Lahti's and Rita Mae Kelly's conception of "transgendered" traits and styles and of gender as something that one can "do" or "perform." (1995). Such fluid gender role understandings could help release candidates of both sexes from the constraints of strict gender expectations, empowering them to pursue the strategy best suited to their particular personal qualities and electoral context.

FURTHER STUDIES

While this study of self-presentation focused on political advertising as the most candidate-controlled form of communication, it could also provide a context for further studies of public opinion and media coverage during the Democratic primaries. Examining voters' reactions to and the media's portrayal of the candidates could demonstrate the ways their judgments intersected with the campaigns' strategies and, in light of the contemporary reliance on polling, could elucidate potential motivations behind the candidates' strategic choices. One type of analysis might compare the most frequent trait and issue references in candidates' ads with the corresponding emphasis on these elements in press treatment or public opinion polls; for the purposes of understanding the challenges of women's candidacies, it would be especially useful to focus on Clinton in relation to the other leading candidates. For example, one question worth exploring would be whether she continued to be judged "tougher" than her male opponents throughout the campaign. Conceivably, her opponents may have held an inherent advantage on certain "masculine" attributes and issue areas as a result of gender stereotypes, and her explicit

emphasis of this trait implies her anticipation of this potential hurdle. Yet, pre-election polls pointed to broad perceptions of Clinton's strength and leadership qualities, and it may be more interesting to examine public and media discussions to uncover whether "masculine" personal traits ascribed to Clinton were seen favorably, as indications she was "presidential," or negatively, as improper deviations from stereotypical femininity. It is likely that Clinton's masculinity, even if necessary to her presidential prospects, may have elicited criticism that she was "too manly," for gender stereotypes continue to stipulate a more limited range of behavior for women than for men.

Furthermore, it would be interesting to look at whether Clinton's "feminine" techniques of smiling and interacting with children in her ads persuasively communicated her friendliness and warmth; otherwise, were voters and journalists prone to dismiss Clinton's demonstrations of "feminine" traits as artificial or contrived, as initial reports seemed to suggest? Additionally, it is possible that her presentations of femininity, even if expected of her as a female candidate, may have further reminded voters of her "womanness," activating gender stereotypes that deem women less suited for presidential leadership. This may have been true even though the male Democratic candidates similarly employed many elements of feminine style in their communications. Unfortunately, it may be the case that a man can take on feminine traits deemed attractive without compromising his masculinity while a female candidate balancing the two elicits criticism on both measures, redolent of Jamieson's double binds. In this case, Clinton may have been denounced on the grounds of being a "cold, mouthy…feminist" departing from traditional femininity *and* on the basis of being a "warm, down-to-earth mother" incompatible with notions of presidential masculinity (Jamieson, 1995, 39).

In addition, other analyses of the 2008 election could investigate the evolution of Obama's advertising techniques, looking at the extent to which his gendered self-presentation remained consistent or changed as he moved into the general election campaign against a male, Republican opponent. Further comparisons between the campaigns of the Democrats in the presidential primary and those competing in Senate races in 2008 could relate presidential and legislative strategies in a similar electoral context,

identifying points of commonality as well as ways that expectations of the two offices may differ. In future presidential elections, the simultaneous occurrence of mixed-gender Democratic and Republican primaries could provide an opportunity to isolate the influence of gender on self-presentation from that of partisanship, allowing for an examination of the extent to which female presidential candidates of different parties resemble or differ from each other and their male counterparts. This bipartisan research would also allow for broader conclusions about the adoption of feminine communications strategies among both sexes, probing whether this trend is common to politicians of both parties. Similarly, comparative analyses of multiple mixed-gender presidential races could compensate for several of this study's limitations, many of which stem from its restricted application to a single case and electoral context; documenting the choices of other women candidates for the presidency would particularly help distinguish the gender-specific motivations behind Clinton's tactics from her unique characteristics and background. Moreover, for this race and others, as candidate websites become increasingly central forums for self-presentation, additional analyses could investigate the way male and female presidential candidates may similarly or differently adapt their strategies of appeal to this relatively new medium of political communication.

Ultimately, the election of a woman president could change the terms of the debate about women's fitness for the Oval Office, and her tenure could help transform expectations of the presidency itself. In 2008, by successfully positioning a female candidate as the Democratic front-runner, even Clinton's fruitless campaign may have contributed to progress on this front; in effect, Clinton may have challenged many Americans' notions of what is "presidential," and other women may now be more likely to see the presidency as within their reach. Yet, in the introduction to *Anticipating Madam President*, Robert Watson remarks, "Sadly, the existence of Madam President will be less an end than simply a means to an end to a long history of disenfranchisement and inequality experienced by women" (2003, 1). Accordingly, he understands the true marker of equality as a time of gender neutrality, when "an individual's sex is unimportant as a factor in the voting booth or a story by the media or is no longer a

reason to treat one poorly or indifferently" (2). Nonetheless, in the interim, while sex blindness remains a distant ideal, identifying gendered discourse and expectations in political campaigns may constitute a crucial step in the march toward gender parity. Indeed, many scholars of gender and politics have proposed that it is the very invisibility of masculine assumptions in American politics that has proved most insidious, enduring even as women have made significant gains in terms of electoral success and political representation. Thus, studies examining gendered components of candidate strategies, their relationship to press judgments, and the corresponding responses of voters can be influential in uncovering societal and institutional gender expectations so as to subject them to critical scrutiny and pave the way for eventual reform.

APPENDIX

Appendix A **- List of Ads Analyzed**

Title	Date	Brief Description of Ad's Message
CLINTON		
Invisibles	13-Aug-07	Life of standing up for people; next pres. won't treat you as invisible
Ready for Change	5-Sep-07	Can change this country; if we have will, she has strength, experience
Health Care Plan	17-Sep-07	Changed our lives when she introduced univ. health care; has a plan
Stand By Us	4-Oct-07	Hillary stood up for univ. HC when others wouldn't; won't back down
Stand By Us (SC)	27-Dec-07	South Carolina version
Trapdoor	19-Oct-07	Bush economy is like a trap door; must change course, on Iraq and HC
There for You	29-Oct-07	She has pushed and fought for seniors, been there for you all along
Energy Future	11-Nov-07	Energy plan: fund investments by taking tax subsidies from oil co's
Energy Independence	11-Nov-07	Same as above but different setting, shot of crowd
Serious	22-Jan-08	Same as "Energy Independence"
Joe Ward	20-Nov-07	Bone marrow transplant anecdote: I trusted her to save my son's life
Machine	20-Nov-07	Republican attacks are back b/c they know there's one candidate who…
Strong	28-Nov-07	Issues- there's a lot of talk but pres. has to be ready to solve on day one
Wes Clark	5-Dec-07	Clark: known Hillary for 24 yrs, she has what it takes; the right choice
New Beginning	9-Dec-07	Need a new beginning; Clinton strength, experience, proven record
Hillary's Mom	13-Dec-07	Hillary helps people; I'd endorse her even if she wasn't my daughter
Proud	14-Dec-07	Mother taught values, and I'm most proud of who I'm passing them to
Great Things	17-Dec-07	Des Moines Register endorsing Clinton
Guard	17-Dec-07	HC fight bipartisan effort; must stand ground but find common ground
Tested	18-Dec-07	Des Moines Register second endorsement
Presents	19-Dec-07	Putting tags on holiday gifts with parts of her agenda listed as gifts
Make it Happen	21-Dec-07	Need change, as well as strength and experience to make it happen
Stakes	26-Dec-07	Silent film dramatizing the stakes of the election
President	28-Dec-07	What if we had a different president this year? - She's ready to lead
Crossroads	2-Jan-08	Starting a new year, America at a crossroads; opp. for new beginning
Best Choice	3-Jan-08	NH newspapers noting Clinton's credentials
Listen	11-Jan-08	In the past week I've listened to you; need pres. to stand for your future
Voices	17-Jan-08	I'll bring more than experience to the White House; I'll bring your voice
Falling Through	22-Jan-08	Bush econ. trapdoor, for oil co's; I'll be a pres. who stands up for you
Falling Through (PA)	7-Apr-08	Same but "strong for us" text at end replaces "it's about people"
Warned	22-Jan-08	Hillary warned Bush; we need more than talk, we need solutions
Lifetime	29-Jan-08	Try to help someone every day; spent whole life standing up for people
Lifetime (v. 2)	12-Feb-08	March 4th version
Can Do	30-Jan-08	Americans have a "can do" spirit; stakes too high, future too important
Freefall	30-Jan-08	In freefall; she's a person you can depend on to fix our economy, future
Times	30-Jan-08	Times endorsing Clinton: she's more qualified
Hartford Courant	31-Jan-08	Hartford Courant endorsement
Dignity	1-Feb-08	RFK Jr. comparing her to RFK; champion of most alienated in society
Bobby	1-Feb-08	Same as above but slightly different images

Arkansas	1-Feb-08	I use lessons learned in AK each day; will bring your voice to WH
Happen	7-Feb-08	Fought for univ. HC before popular; one with a plan; moral obligation
Kerrey	7-Feb-08	Bob Kerrey supporting Clinton to be CIC, fix economy and schools
Soldiers	13-Feb-08	Won HC for Nat'l Guard; fights for those who fight for us, their voice
Debate	13-Feb-08	Obama won't debate; he gives speeches but won't answer on HC, econ.
Deserves	15-Feb-08	Obama's hiding behind false attack ads; he's weaker on the issues
Rebuild	15-Feb-08	She's fighting for middle class, will be president who stands up for you
Voice	19-Feb-08	In struggling economy, I hear you; will bring experience, your voice
Night Shift	19-Feb-08	You've worked hard; she'll help, b/c she's worked the night shift too
Level (multiple)	22-Feb-08	Fight for mid. class, level playing field: purpose of life and presidency
Level (PA)	25-Mar-08	Pennsylvania version
Level (TX)	26-Feb-08	Slightly modified version: some different text; audio identical
Level (RI)	28-Feb-08	Slightly modified again: diff. voice and audio, adds social security
Proud	22-Feb-08	John Glenn: we're both from mid. America, working families; NAFTA
Deliver	22-Feb-08	In Texas, have to roll up sleeves and deliver - Hillary has done that
Resolved	23-Feb-08	Debate: blessed, resolved to fight for others – that's what motivates me
Fighter	28-Feb-08	Gov. of Ohio speaking to Hillary's credentials as a fighter, "for us"
Children	29-Feb-08	3 a.m. phone call; your vote decides who answers; need someone tested
Partner	2-Mar-08	Ohio-specific ad: will fight for working class
Partner	2-May-08	Indiana version
"True"	3-Mar-08	Obama too busy for Afghanistan; she will end war, pursue Al Qaeda
Ringing	2-Apr-08	3 a.m. econ. crisis, McCain won't intervene; need president that's ready
Ask Me	3-Apr-08	Invites NC to ask questions on web; this election's about you
Get it Done	7-Apr-08	Mayor Nutter of Phil. explaining how Hillary will get the job done
Scranton	7-Apr-08	"This is me in Scranton," bio ad; "A pres. who will be strong for us"
Spectacular	7-Apr-08	Gov. Rendell (Pennsylvania) endorsement
Steel	7-Apr-08	Sen. Evan Bayh (IN) endorsement; "strong, seasoned," ready to be CIC
Pennsylvania	14-Apr-08	Obama bitter comment; Hillary's been fighting for people like us
Pocket	15-Apr-08	Obama has energy ad, but Hillary voted against Bush oil co. bill
Closed	16-Apr-08	Factory in IN closed, jobs sent to China; support American workers
Answer	20-Apr-08	Questions about Obama; instead of attacking, he should answer
For People	20-Apr-08	Citizens: Hillary can turn this econ., country around; she's for people
Spoke Out	20-Apr-08	Spoke out vs. Bush econ plan from the start; pres. who knows how
Talk	20-Apr-08	Obama has ties to special interests, and he's attacking Hillary?
Kitchen	21-Apr-08	Toughest job; "if you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen"
Jobs	22-Apr-08	Election about "jobs, jobs, jobs"; next pres. will put your needs first
David	22-Apr-08	Q&A ad about veterans; we owe everything to those who served us
Cost	22-Apr-08	With gas this expensive, talk is cheap; it's time for leadership
Dreams	28-Apr-08	Park Ridge, IL, bio; hard work, promise of America- intend to keep it
Maya	29-Apr-08	Maya Angelou endorsement
Trouble	29-Apr-08	Obama said no to gas tax; Clinton has plan; people hurting, time to act
Determined	30-Apr-08	Gov. Easley (North Carolina) endorsement
Turn	2-May-08	A fighter; if you give me the chance, we'll turn our country around
Strongest Plan	8-May-08	Ambassador Joe and Valerie Plame Wilson; Hillary will end this war
Right Track	16-May-08	Will get special interests, cut mid. class taxes; America back on track

What's Right	16-May-08	She's the one…; right when it matters, will be there when it counts
Responsibility	23-May-08	Will stop spending money we don't have; fiscal responsibility
17 million	1-Jun-08	Tuesday, up to you; 17 mill. votes, 17 mill. reasons should be nominee
OBAMA		
Choices (IA)	26-Jun-07	"I am my brother's keeper"; Obama's bio, devotion to community
Choices (NH)	23-Oct-07	New Hampshire version
Carry (IA)	27-Jun-07	Bipartisan appeal, he sees both sides; carried legislation he believed in
Carry (PA)	21-Mar-08	Pennsylvania version
Join Us	22-Jul-07	Can end this war, save the planet - can change the world; join us
Join (MN)	3-Feb-08	Minnesota version; “caucus for change”
Join (NC)	14-Apr-08	North Carolina version; “change begins with you”
Join (IN)	29-Apr-08	Indiana version; “change begins with you”
Take it Back	1-Aug-07	In Wash. long enough to know it must change; here to take it back
Change	6-Sep-07	Legislative record; all b/c he believes gov't should work for people
Mother	21-Sep-07	Mother's struggles to afford HC; to fix HC, have to fix Washington
Mother	18-Jan-08	Missouri version
Believe	24-Sep-07	Asking you to believe in my ability to change Wash., and in yours
Gulf	5-Oct-07	Endorsement by military official; need judgment from CIC
Safe	29-Feb-08	Same as "Gulf"
Quiet (NH)	10-Oct-07	Energy dependence, security; must tell people what they need to hear
Quiet (VT)	27-Feb-08	Current energy policy bad for FP and environ.; lays out "Obama plan"
Conventional	22-Oct-07	Can be a beacon of light; I want to tell the world, "America's back"
What If?	26-Oct-07	What if we had a leader who believed in unity, hope, one nation?
Wind	29-Oct-07	Social Security; will bring people together to solve a problem
High and Dry	8-Nov-07	Man’s pension cut by CEOs; “Barack Obama's gonna look out for me”
Chances I Had	15-Nov-07	Bio: not much but had a great education; all should have same chance
Need (IA)	17-Nov-07	Middle class treading water or worse; give tax breaks to those in need
Need (ND)	14-Feb-08	North Dakota version
Need (NC)	14-Apr-08	North Carolina version
Hope	20-Nov-07	Change and hope not just campaign slogans but how he's lived his life
Our Moment Is Now (IA)	8-Dec-07	Same old Washington politics won’t do; moment is now to change
Our Moment Is Now(TX)	15-Feb-08	Texas version
Candor	18-Dec-07	Got tough on CEOs; not politics as usual but change we can believe in
Friendship	21-Dec-07	Obama family holiday wishes; we all have a stake in each other
Interest	28-Dec-07	Same old Washington politics won't fix health care; but we can
Listening (IA)	28-Dec-07	Stop talking, start doing something about problems; the moment is now
Listening (SC)	14-Feb-08	South Carolina version
Listening (SD)	26-May-08	South Dakota version
Unify	28-Dec-07	Will bring the country together; a nation healed, a world repaired
One Voice (IA)	31-Dec-07	Power of one voice: "let's go change the world"
One Voice (IN)	16-Apr-08	Same as Iowa version but with text listing concrete issues
Leader (IA)	3-Jan-08	Final, head-on appeal to voters before Iowa caucus
Leader (TX)	29-Feb-08	Texas version
President (NV)	18-Jan-08	"I’ll be a president who…"
President (LA)	14-Feb-08	Louisiana version

Would	18-Jan-08	What he's done, what he will do
Inspiring	21-Jan-08	Obama bio, record; professor and senators speaking on his behalf
Caroline	29-Jan-08	Caroline Ken.: JFK a president who inspired, Obama can lift the nation
Dakota	29-Jan-08	Sen. Kent Conrad (ND) speaking to Obama's ability to lift the nation
First	30-Jan-08	Sen. Janet Napolitano (AZ) discussing Obama's credentials
Lift	30-Jan-08	Sen. Claire McCaskill (MO) endorsement
Year	31-Jan-08	Sen. Kathleen Sebelius (KS) endorsement
Stock	31-Jan-08	Obama has a plan to jumpstart the economy
Debate	14-Feb-08	Question of Clinton's same old politics, or change we can believe in
Desperate	15-Feb-08	Ducking debates intro;"same old politics"; contrast of their plans
Future	7-Feb-08	Election about the past vs. the future; can't afford another 4 years
Plan	27-Feb-08	Economic plan, for workers
Voices	27-Feb-08	Ethics background, ad specific to Texas
Challenged	28-Feb-08	Ethics background, ad specific to Ohio
Direction	28-Feb-08	Need a new direction; specific issues listed
Major	28-Feb-08	All major state newspapers have endorsed him; Obama is that change
Return	28-Feb-08	Accomplishments on Veterans Affairs Comm.; honor those who served
Steve	28-Feb-08	Man who lost job to NAFTA; Obama opposed, will bring change
Moving	29-Feb-08	Steve's story but with contrast to Hillary's position (pro-NAFTA)
Ringing	29-Feb-08	Phone ringing in WH; want judgment like Obama showed on Iraq
Toughest	21-Mar-08	Obama's ethics record
Opportunity (PA)	21-Mar-08	Bio, record of working for change; there's no problem we cannot solve
Opportunity (IN)	29-Apr-08	Indiana version
Nothing's Changed (PA)	28-Mar-08	Since gas lines in '70s, nothing's changed; time Wash. worked for you
Nothing's Changed (WV)	25-Apr-08	West Virginia version
For Decades	3-Apr-08	He has helped workers, will end tax breaks that ship jobs overseas
Maya	8-Apr-08	Sister: Obama listens, wants future for others like for his daughters
Billy	9-Apr-08	Story of Rx. drug companies and "game-playing"; Obama will end
It Won't	14-Apr-08	Sen. Casey (PA): Obama's ability to unite and bring real change
Represent	15-Apr-08	Rejecting Hillary's tactics; if we stop same old politics, can do anything
Enough (NC)	15-Apr-08	Stop tax breaks to co's that ship jobs overseas; "enough is enough"
Enough (IN)	29-Apr-08	Indiana version
Dime	16-Apr-08	Hillary same old politics; Obama not a dime from PACs/spec. interests
Afford	18-Apr-08	What's Hillary not telling you about her health care plan?
Reason	18-Apr-08	There's a reason all the major newspapers have endorsed him
Exactly	20-Apr-08	Hillary 11th hour smears; she's connected to PACs more than any other
He Has What it Takes	21-Apr-08	Who has what it takes to really bring about change?
Fat Cat	21-Apr-08	No special interests; will be answerable to you, not "fat cat donors"
Next Door	29-Apr-08	What needs to be done; you can change Washington on Tuesday
Truth	30-Apr-08	Gas tax gimmick; need someone who tells you truth, gives solutions
Pennies	1-May-08	Hillary's gas tax proposal useless; Obama plan for real change
Minute	2-May-08	Long history of public service; commitment to "North Carolina values"
Boost	5-May-08	Clinton gimmicks, big oil vs. real energy plan for middle class
Hometown	5-May-08	Clinton taking the low road, her hometown papers agree; need honesty
Straight	26-May-08	Sen. Daschle (SD): Obama rooted in our values, will talk to us straight

Achieve	27-May-08	It's about helping you achieve the American dream; change the world
He Understands Us	29-May-08	Obama born on an island, understands worries; his plan best for PR
Message to PR	29-May-08	Understands hardships of island, wants to help change
EDWARDS		
Courage	2-May-07	Youth figures: ask Congress to push president to end war; need courage
Iowans	8-May-07	Same as above but specific to Iowa, older people speaking
Strength of America	26-Jun-07	Strength of America here; time to ask for patriotism outside of war
30 Years	17-Jul-07	Wife Elizabeth: Edwards optimistic, tough; can stare worst in the face
Hair	23-Jul-07	"Hair" music and pictures vs. images of suffering - what really matters?
Response to Bush	13-Sep-07	Iraq address: time to end the war
Heroes (v. 1)	6-Nov-07	We decided in hospital room to fight for heroes; party needs backbone
Heroes (v. 2)	10-Dec-07	Same as above but different images
Health Care	12-Nov-07	Will take HC from Wash if not univ.; no excuse if you don't have it
Amer. Jobs & Workers	13-Nov-07	Father and I worked at this mill, closed now; time to work for jobs
Thanksgiving	19-Nov-07	Thanksgiving message: thankful for parents, marriage, kids, and you
Born	25-Nov-07	Home state; will never stop fighting, never forget where I came from
Mess	25-Nov-07	Take on corrupt system; fixing the mess as moral test of generation
Together	2-Dec-07	Universal health care: nothing we can't do if we do it together
20 Generations	3-Dec-07	20 generations worked to give the next better life; will fight, moral test
Rigged	5-Dec-07	System rigged; replacing corp. Repubs w/ corp. Dems won't change it
Voice	13-Dec-07	Man with no voice, no HC; finally got voice, time for you to get yours
Fight	17-Dec-07	Not a dime from lobbyists; saving middle class is fight I was born for
Season	17-Dec-07	Christmas: we speak for you, promise the chance to build better life
Power	24-Dec-07	Will use power of presidency wisely, know the power comes from you
Choice	26-Dec-07	Can pretend system works or tell the truth; for better life, start in Iowa
Time	26-Dec-07	Jan. 3, rising begins here in Iowa; wave of change that can't be stopped
Born For	27-Dec-07	Corp. greed destroying all; saving middle class is fight I was born for
Native Son	27-Dec-07	SC images; fight I was born for, will never forget where came from
Bishop	1-Jan-08	Iowa man who lost job; need pres. who fights for jobs: Edwards
Wave of Change	2-Jan-08	Corp. greed infiltrated democracy; you will rise, create wave of change
Your Time is Now	3-Jan-08	Epic fight for future of country; time to speak up, do what's right
Underdog	6-Jan-08	I may be underdog, others rich, but real underdogs are middle class
Mill	10-Jan-08	54 yrs believing workers in father's mill were worth as much as owner
Ban	14-Jan-08	Who's the only Dem who would ban lobbyists from White House staff?
Beats	14-Jan-08	Who's the only Dem who beats all Republicans in a recent CNN poll?
Deal	14-Jan-08	Which Dem opposed NAFTA, deals that send American jobs away?
Dime	14-Jan-08	Which Dem has never taken a dime from Washington lobbyists?
One Winner	15-Jan-08	WH staff, CNN poll clips; will be our president, winner every time
What Happened?	22-Jan-08	One opp. funded by drug co's, other by lobbyists -party of the people?
Grown Up	25-Jan-08	Debate: squabbling won't get us anywhere, not about us personally

Appendix B **- Codesheet**

What is the title of the ad?

State Code:

- **(0)** **National/no reference to state** (in audio or print)
- **(1)** **Iowa/January 3**
- **(2)** **New Hampshire/January 8**
- **(3)** **Nevada/January 19**
- **(4)** **South Carolina/January 26**
- **(5)** **Multiple – February 5**
- **(6)** **Arkansas**
- **(7)** **Connecticut**
- **(8)** **North Dakota**
- **(9)** **Nebraska**
- **(10)** **Washington**
- **(11)** **Maryland**
- **(12)** **Wisconsin**
- **(13)** **Multiple – March 4**
- **(14)** **Ohio**
- **(15)** **Rhode Island**
- **(16)** **Texas**
- **(17)** **Vermont**
- **(18)** **Pennsylvania/April 22**
- **(19)** **Indiana**
- **(20)** **North Carolina**
- **(21)** **West Virginia/May 13**
- **(22)** **Kentucky**
- **(23)** **Oregon**
- **(24)** **Puerto Rico**
- **(25)** **Multiple – June 3 (Montana, South Dakota)**
- **(26)** **Montana**
- **(27)** **South Dakota**
- **(28)** **Missouri**
- **(29)** **Arizona**
- **(30)** **Kansas**
- **(31)** **Louisiana**
- **(32)** **Minnesota**

NOTE*: unless overall/dominant noted specifically in question, code all that apply*

1. **Length of Ad:**
   - **(1) 30 seconds**
   - **(2) 1 minute**
   - **(3) 2 minutes**
   - **(4) Less than 30 seconds**
2. **What is the overall tone of the ad?**
   - **(1) Positive/advocacy**
     (emphasizes good qualities or performance of candidate; presents candidate's view/position on an issue)
   - **(2) Negative/attack**
     (primarily derides or criticizes bad qualities, tactics, or performance of opponent)
   - **(3) Contrast**
     (contrasts bad qualities/stands/tactics of opponent with those of the candidate; offers candidate as alternative to opponent's weakness or faults)

3. **If an attack is made, who makes the attack?**
   - **(1) Candidate criticizes/attacks opponent**
   - **(2) Known surrogate attacks opponent**
     (someone other than candidate – could be spouse, politician, constituent, etc.)
   - **(3) Anonymous announcer attacks opponent**
     (voice of announcer unknown, not actually pictured in the ad)
   - **(4) Not applicable** (no attack)
4. **If an attack is made, what is/are the purpose(s) of attack?**
   - **(1) Personal characteristics of opponent**
     (e.g. questioning the honesty, compassion, or competence of opponent)
   - **(2) Campaign choices of opponent**
     (attacks opponent's ads, remarks, debate performance – i.e., "same old politics," "false charges")
   - **(3) Issue stands of opponent**
     (attacks opponent's positions/proposals on specific issues)
   - **(4) Group affiliation of opponent**
     (attacks opponent's ties to individuals/groups with negative qualities – e.g. lobbyists, oil companies)
   - **(5) Opponent's background/qualifications**
     (attacks opponent's background, experience, and/or qualifications for office)
   - **(6) Opponent's past performance**
     (attacks opponent's political record – e.g. votes, things he/she has done in past)
   - **(7) Not applicable**
5. **If an attack is made, what is the *dominant* strategy employed?**
   - **(1) Humor/ridicule**
   - **(2) Negative association**
     (linking opponent with undesirable *issues and/or images*; includes references to campaign tactics, issue stands; code this if an attack is made and no other strategies apply)
   - **(3) Name-calling**
     (negative *labels* attached to opponent)
   - **(4) Guilt by association**
     (showing or stating opponent's interaction with undesirable groups/individuals, implying he/she associates with undesirable people)
   - **(5) Not applicable** (no attack)
6. **If the ad includes an attack on opponent, is the opponent shown visually?**
   - **(0) No**
   - **(1) Yes**
   - **(2) Not applicable** (no attack)
7. **Of the following issues, which are *explicitly* discussed in the ad?**
   - **(1) Economy** (general/budget/deficit)
   - **(2) Taxes** (do not include gas tax – this is energy policy)
   - **(3) Education/schools/children** (include student loans, college affordability, policies such as No Child Left Behind, etc.)
   - **(4) Defense/war** (includes Iraq)
   - **(5) Health care**
   - **(6) Energy policy** (include price of gas, oil, alternative energy; gas tax)
   - **(7) Senior citizens' issues** (e.g. Social Security, retirement, care for elderly, pensions)
   - **(8) Welfare reform**
   - **(9) Women's issues** (include abortion rights, day care, etc.)
   - **(10) Government ethics** (include lobbyists, special interests, corporate influence)
   - **(11) Environment**
   - **(12) Jobs/unemployment/wages** (include free trade policies, NAFTA, jobs going overseas; not just mentions of workers but specifically related to employment, like increasing/keeping jobs here)
   - **(13) Reform Washington** (e.g. "change the way things are done in Washington" and other references; not just general change, must specifically reference Washington, government, way things done)
   - **(14) Foreign Policy** (include general references or specific mentions other than Iraq/war)
   - **(15) Housing** (include references to foreclosures)

(16) **Veterans' issues/benefits**
(17) **Poverty/homelessness/hunger**
(18) **No issues – personal/vague**

8. **What is the *dominant* focus of the ad?**
   (1) **Campaign Issues** (focus on issues of concern to state/country/campaign)
   (2) **Candidate Images** (focus on attributes or qualifications of candidate/opponent)
9. **Which of the following appeal strategies are employed?**
   (1) **Use of statistics in support of issue positions or candidacy**
   (2) **Mention of personal biographical experiences or anecdotes** (candidate or surrogate; note: this is personal, does not include mentions of what candidate has done politically – that is coded under #6)
   (3) **Attack on opponent's record/plan/tactics** (or contrast with)
   (4) **Citation of endorsements by political/party leaders**
   (5) **Citation of non-political endorsements or experts** (includes experts cited in attack/contrast – includes newspapers, scholars, etc.; not family members)
   Note: this does not include factual references – if a newspaper is cited, only code as #5 if it is endorsement or opinion-based, not factual confirmation (i.e., not "she passed X law," but "she is the most experienced candidate"; also code as #5 if member of Republican party endorsing/speaking on candidate's behalf)
   (6) **Emphasis on accomplishments/record**
   (7) **Use of personal tone ("I")** (by candidate only – issues/positions/beliefs presented as personal views – "I believe in…" – views not just factual but presented as personal conclusions)
   (8) **Addressing *viewers* as peers ("We," "let's" "one of us")** (by candidate only; this does not apply if "we" seems to be in reference to Washington/political leaders – i.e., "we need to pass new laws"; the "we" should be candidate + audience – i.e., "we can do this together," "we can change Washington")
   (9) **Identification with others' experiences**
   (***Note***: explicit reference – i.e., "I know what it's like" or "candidate X understands what you're going through/wants you to have the chance he/she had"; not just general references to sensitivity or cooperation with others)
   (10) **Use of language intensifiers**
   Removed from coding
   (11) **Call for change** (if made explicit – not just campaign slogan or end to specific problem but "we need change," "it's our time for change," etc.)
   (12) **Inviting viewer participation/action** (by candidate only – i.e., asking for people's votes, "tomorrow, let's change Washington," etc.)
   (13) **Emphasis on optimism/hope for future**
   (14) **Yearning for past/traditional values** (reinforcing American dream, traditions, the past – e.g. "bring America back")
   (15) **Other – specify**
10. **What type of appeal would you identify in the ad?** (code for dominant format)
   (1) **Logical argument**
   (use of evidence – facts presented to support positions/argument, or claims follow logical line of reasoning; code this if any evidence is given in support of arguments)
   (2) **Emotional**
   (designed to evoke feelings primarily – e.g. happiness/sympathy/fear, etc.)
   (3) **Credibility claim**
   (emphasis on candidate's qualifications or attack on qualifications of opponent; credibility/trust)
11. **What is the structure of the appeal? (**made by candidate or announcer only – do not code if others are only to speak on candidate's behalf; code for dominant format)
   (1) **Inductive** (examples, then conclusion)
   (2) **Deductive** (conclusion/generalization, followed by examples)
   (3) **Cannot determine/combination/candidate does not speak**
12. **What is the content of the appeal?** (code for dominant format)
   (1) **Issue-related appeal - candidate's concern**
   (nothing said about how candidate would address/solve problem – just that he/she is concerned, or opponent is not)

(2) **Issue-related appeal – vague policy preference**
(i.e., "I favor universal health care"; "I will get the troops out of Iraq"; "I will make us less dependent on foreign oil" – some vague/general reference to what he/she will do)

(3) **Issue-related appeal – specific policy proposals**
(i.e., "I will cut costs by x%"; laying out specific program, steps to remedy problem, often involves numerical figures)

(4) **Personal characteristics of candidate**
(good traits/qualities – or negative for opponent)

(5) **Linking of candidate with demographic group(s)**
(emphasis on sympathy for particular demographic group in U.S.– e.g. senior citizens, women, ethnic minorities)

(6) **Not applicable**

13. **Which of the following character traits are specifically referenced or implied**? (in reference to candidate and/or opponent; in all of these cases, must be explicitly stated or suggested)

(1) **Toughness/strength**
(courage/"fighter" included; "got tough on…"; "reined in"; "pushed"; "stand up" – note: do not include "fight for you" or "takes stands for middle class," as these may speak primarily to compassion or leadership)

(2) **Experience in politics**
(not just discussions of what candidate has done in office but explicit references to "candidate has the experience we need" or "candidate has been on the job for many years")

(3) **Sensitivity/understanding/compassion**
(i.e., candidate shares our values, cares, wants to make sure our voice is heard, "wants to help you," – not just references to policies that suggest compassion, like helping middle class, but *specific* suggestion that candidate cares about others, understands)

(4) **Cooperation with others**
(include *bipartisan efforts* as well as working with constituents/listening to voters; references like "will bring people together" or "unite")

(5) **Leadership**
(taking the initiative, action-oriented; i.e., "ready to take action" or "will do X, Y, Z to solve this problem")

(6) **Honesty, integrity**
(include references to campaign donations, such as "doesn't take money from lobbyists"; otherwise, only include specific references to speaking/acting honestly, i.e.,"will tell people what they need to hear," "speaks the truth")

(7) **Trustworthy**
(i.e., "you can count on him/her" or "trust him/her to follow through – not just references to candidate's commitment/belief, etc.)

(8) **Competency/intelligence**
("knows how to get job done/deliver"; "has the knowledge required";"judgment" – not just general capability for office or leadership)

(9) **Not applicable**

14. **Who is the *dominant* speaker in the ad?**

(1) **Candidate**
(2) **Anonymous announcer**
(3) **Spouse or family member**
(4) **Prominent official/celebrity**
(5) **Citizen(s)/constituent(s)**
(6) **Not applicable/no audio**

15. **What is the sex of the dominant speaker?**

(1) **Male**
(2) **Female**
(3) **Not applicable**

16. **If others speak on the candidate's behalf, what is their sex?**

(1) **Male**

(2) **Female**
(3) **Not applicable**

17. **What is their status in the community?**
    (1) **Experts/leaders** (not average citizens or family – e.g., military figures, senators, etc.)
    (2) **Constituents**
    (3) **Family of candidate**
    (4) **Not applicable**
18. **What is the dominant dress of the candidate?**
    (1) **Formal** (full suit or full suit without jacket)
    (2) **Casual** (for men, defined as not wearing tie and/or sleeves rolled up – i.e., if candidate wearing shirt and tie but sleeves are rolled up, or if no tie, or if both)
    (3) **Both shown equally**
    (4) **Not applicable/candidate not present**
19. **How often does the candidate make eye contact?** (defined as looking directly at camera in live shot – not still photo)
    (1) **Almost never**
    (2) **Sometimes**
    (3) **Almost always**
    (4) **Not applicable/candidate not shown live in ad**
20. **What is the candidate's dominant facial expression?** (shown live or in still photo)
    (1) **Smiling**
    (2) **Attentive/serious**
    (3) **Both shown equally** (count of shots smiling exactly the same number as count of serious shots)
    (4) **Not applicable/candidate not present**
21. **Who is the candidate shown interacting with in the ad?** (can be direct interaction – i.e., candidate addressing/touching, or more indirect, like being pictured nodding/agreeing with/reacting to candidate)
    (1) **Male constituents**
    (2) **Female constituents**
    (3) **Children/infants** (not candidate's)
    (4) **Male leaders** (include if shown on stage/sitting next to other politicians)
    (5) **Female leaders**
    (6) **Soldiers/veterans**
    (7) **Large crowds** (not a small gathering or room with 20-30 people but real crowd, as in speaking venue – i.e., where candidate could not realistically speak individually to members of audience)
    (8) **His/her family** (not still photo, family portrait, etc. – live interaction/shot)
    (9) **No interactions are shown**
22. **If the candidate interacts with others, what is the nature of the interaction?**
    (1) **Speaking with microphone**
    (candidate does not have to be heard speaking – just if pictured with microphone)
    (2) **Speaking to crowd with no microphone**
    (3) **Speaking to individual(s)**
    (actually shown speaking, not just standing with someone or listening – i.e., hand gestures indicate candidate is explaining something)
    (4) **Hugging/touching**
    (candidate touching someone or someone is touching candidate)
    (5) **Walking next to or listening to others**
    (walking next to someone or shown actively listening while other speaks – i.e., nodding, look of concern)
    (6) **Not applicable**
23. **What is the format of the ad?** (code for dominant format)
    (1) **Documentary**
    (describes or documents some event in life or career of candidate; offering background info – often use of photos/story)
    (2) **Issue statement/dramatization**

(pertains primarily to campaign issues – can be statement of candidate's proposals or stands, attack on or contrast with those of opponent, or dramatization/explanation of issue at hand; may be vague)

(3) Opposition-focused/contrasting
(negative attack on or contrast with opponent's record/campaign/stands; even if ad pertains to specific issue, use this code if it is primarily contrasting candidates' positions on that issue)

(4) Endorsement/testimonial
(primarily features another individual – this may be to endorse the candidate, speak to candidate's credentials, or relate relationship/past interactions with him/her)

(5) Bandwagon/excitement/inspirational appeal
(emphasis is on supporters or what the candidate offers – this is a vague appeal that does not primarily reference campaign issues but speaks to the excitement behind this candidate or makes emotional appeal to audience)

(6) Introspection
(features candidate reflecting on his/her campaign, mission, or beliefs – may be head-on discussion with camera or could be directed at an audience)

(7) Confrontation
(presents climate of confrontation in which candidate is being challenged or is challenging others)

(8) Question-and-answer
(citizen/constituent/group is shown presenting candidate with question, to which he/she responds)

(9) Candidate-centered
(clear focus on candidate qualities or accomplishments with no real discussion of issues or biographical background – otherwise, would code as issue statement/documentary)

(10) Other – specify

24. Is candidate's family pictured? (in still photo or live)

(0) No
(1) Yes

25. Does the ad feature a fear appeal? (message/visuals designed to provoke fear)*

(0) No
(1) Yes

Removed from coding

Source: Modeled after codesheet in Dianne G. Bystrom's "Candidate Gender and the Presentation of Self: The VideoStyles of Men and Women in U.S. Senate Campaigns." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1995.

Appendix C **– Tables**

Table 1.1: States with Greatest Number of State-Specific Ads, By Candidate

Clinton	Obama
1. February 5 States* (8) **Pennsylvania** (8) 2. **Iowa** (5) **New Hampshire** (5) 3. March 4 States** (4) **Indiana** (4) **North Carolina** (4) 4. Ohio (3)	1. **Iowa** (15) 2. **Pennsylvania** (12) 3. **Indiana** (8) 4. Texas (7) 5. **New Hampshire** (6) **North Carolina** (6)
*22 states voted on February 5 (Super Tuesday) **March 4 states included OH, RI, TX, VT (These ads included references only to election date)	

Note: 36.8% of Clinton ads and 9.0% of Obama ads included no discernible reference to a specific state or election date

Table 2.1: Ad Format

		Sponsor			
		Clinton	**Obama**	**Edwards**	**Total**
Format	**Documentary**	3.4%	5.6%	11.1%	5.7%
	Issue Statement	41.4	43.8	50.0	43.9
	Opposition-Focused	9.2	10.1	19.4	11.3
	Testimonial	25.3*	19.1	5.6	19.3
	Bandwagon/Inspirational	4.6	14.6	11.1	9.9
	Introspection	6.9	0.0	0.0	2.8
	Q&A	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.5
	Candidate-Centered	5.7	3.4	0.0	3.8
	Other Format	2.3	3.4	2.8	2.8
	Total Ad Count	87	89	36	212

* Indicates statistically significant difference; χ^2 (2, n=212)=6.36, p=0.04

Table 3.1: Most Common Appeal Strategies, By Candidate
(Those Featured in at least 10% of Candidate's Ads)

Clinton	Obama	Edwards
1. Bio/Anecdote (34.5%)	1. Addressing as Peers ("We") (57.3%)	1. Personal Tone (36.1%)
2. Personal Tone (33.3%)	2. Mention of Own Accomplishments (40.4%)	2. Bio/Anecdote (30.6%)
3. Mention of Own Accomplishments (26.4%)	3. Personal Tone (34.8%) Appeal for Change (34.8%)	3. Addressing as Peers ("We") (27.8%)
4. Addressing as Peers ("We") (13.8%)	4. Expert/Non-Pol. Endorsement (33.7%)	4. Attack (19.4%) Invitation to Participate (19.4%)
5. Political Endorsement (12.6%)	5. Bio/Anecdote (25.8%)	5. Mention of Own Accomplishments (13.9%) Appeal for Change (13.9%)
6. Invitation to Participate (11.5%)	6. Use of Statistics (20.2%)	
7. Attack (10.3%)	7. Hope Emphasis (16.9%)	
	8. Invitation to Participate (12.4%)	
	9. Political Endorsement (11.2%) Attack (11.2%)	

Note: The "appeal strategies" category allowed for multiple responses

Table 3.2: Candidate Differences on "Gendered" Appeal Strategies

"Masculine" Strategies			
Statistics	***Obama***: 20.2%[1]*	Clinton: 6.9%	Edwards: 5.6%
Expert/Non-Pol. Endors.	***Obama***: 33.7%[2]*	Clinton: 9.2%	Edwards: 5.6%
Accomplishments	***Obama***: 40.4%[3]*	Clinton: 26.4%	Edwards: 13.9%
"Feminine" Strategies			
Addressing as Peers	***Obama***: 57.3%[4]*	Edwards: 27.8%	Clinton: 13.8%
ID with Audience	***Obama***: 11.2%	Clinton: 5.7%	Edwards: 2.8%
Bio/Anecdote	***Clinton***: 34.5%	Edwards: 30.6%	Obama: 25.8%
Personal Tone	Edwards: 36.1%	Obama: 34.8%	Clinton: 33.3%
Invitation to Participate	Edwards: 19.4%	Obama: 12.4%	Clinton: 11.5%

*Indicates statistically significant difference
[1] χ^2 (2, n= 212)=9.08, p=0.01
[2] χ^2 (2, n=212)=22.29, p=0.00
[3] χ^2 (2, n= 212)=9.57, p=0.01
[4] χ^2 (2, n=212)=37.74, p=0.00

Note: The "appeal strategies" category allowed for multiple responses

Table 3.3: Edwards and Obama as "Challengers"

"Challenger" Strategies			
Attack	***Edwards***: 19.4%	Obama: 11.2%	Clinton: 10.3%
Traditional Values	***Edwards***: 5.6%	Obama: 4.5%	Clinton: 3.4%
Appeal for Change	***Obama***: 34.8%[1]*	Edwards: 13.9%	Clinton: 6.9%
Hope/Optimism	***Obama***: 16.9%[2]*	Edwards: 5.6%	Clinton: 4.6%
"Incumbent" Strategy			
Political Endorsements	Clinton: 12.6%	Obama: 11.2%	***Edwards***: 0%

*Indicates statistically significant difference
[1] χ^2 (2, n= 212)= 22.57, p=0.00
[2] χ^2 (2, n=212)= 8.33, p=0.02

Table 4.1: Status of Dominant Speaker

		Sponsor		
		Clinton	**Obama**	**Edwards**
Dominant Speaker	**Candidate**	34.5%	50.6%[2*]	69.4%[1]*
	Anonymous	47.1	32.6	16.7
	Spouse/family	1.1	1.1	2.8
	Official/celeb	13.8	12.4	0.0
	Citizen	2.3	3.4	8.3
	Speaker N/A	1.1	0.0	2.8
	Total Ad Count	87	89	36

*Indicates statistically significant difference
[1] χ^2 (2, n=212)=13.2, p=0.001
[2] Statistically significant difference between Clinton and Obama; χ^2 (1, n=176)=4.65, p=0.03

Table 4.2: Sex of Dominant Speaker

		Sponsor		
		Clinton	**Obama**	**Edwards**
Speaker Sex	**Male**	59.8%	92.1%	88.9%
	Female	36.8*	7.9	2.8
	N/A	3.4	0.0	8.3
	Total Ad Count	87	89	36

*Of these, 93.75% featured Clinton herself

Table 5.1: Issues Most Frequently Discussed, By Candidate

Clinton	Obama	Edwards
1. Health Care (43.7%)	1. Ethics Reform (39.3%)	1. Ethics Reform (44.4%)
2. Jobs (31.0%)	2. Health Care (37.1%)	2. Health Care (19.4%)
3. Economy (29.9%)	3. Jobs (28.1%)	3. Jobs (13.9%)
4. Education (25.3%)	4. Taxes (24.7%) Defense/War (24.7%)	4. Defense/War (11.1%) Wash. Reform (11.1%)
5. Taxes (21.8%) Energy (21.8%)	5. Energy (19.1%)	5. Energy (8.3%)
6. Defense/War (19.5%)		

Table 5.2: Candidate Differences on "Gendered" Issues

"Feminine" Issues			
Health Care	***Clinton***: 43.7%[1]*	Obama: 37.1%	Edwards: 19.4%
Education	***Clinton***: 25.3%[2]*	Obama: 9.0%	Edwards: 2.8%
Veterans' Issues	***Clinton***: 10.3%	Edwards: 5.6%	Obama: 3.4%
Government Ethics	***Edwards***: 44.4%[3]*	***Obama***: 37.1%[3]*	Clinton: 13.8%
Environment	***Obama***: 5.6%	Clinton: 0%	Edwards: 0%
"Masculine" Issues			
Economy	***Clinton***: 29.9%[4]*	Obama: 9.0%	Edwards: 0%
Jobs	***Clinton:*** 31.0%	Obama: 28.1%	Edwards: 13.9%
Energy	***Clinton:*** 21.8%	Obama: 19.1%	Edwards: 8.3%
Foreign Policy	***Obama:*** 15.7%[5]*	Clinton: 4.6%	Edwards: 2.8%

* Indicates statistically significant difference

[1] χ^2 (2, n= 212)=6.44, p=0.04

[2] χ^2 (2, n=212)=14.23, p=0.001

[3] χ^2 (2, n= 212)=18.24, p=0.00

[4] χ^2 (2, n= 212)=22.55, p=0.00

[5] χ^2 (2, n= 212)=8.72, p=0.01

Note: The "issues" category allowed for multiple responses

Table 6.1: Traits Most Frequently Referenced, By Candidate

Clinton	Obama	Edwards
1. Leadership (58.6%)	1. Leadership (74.2%)	1. Compassion (47.2%)
2. Compassion (42.5%)	2. Honesty (38.2%)	2. Honesty (30.6%)
3. Toughness (33.3%)	3. Compassion (36.0%)	3. Toughness (27.8%)
4. Experience (20.7%)	4. Toughness (30.3%)	4. Leadership (13.9%)

Table 6.2: Candidate Differences on "Gendered" Traits

"Masculine" Traits			
Experience	***Clinton***: 20.7%[1]*	Obama: 10.1%	Edwards: 0%
Toughness	***Clinton***: 33.3%	Obama: 30.3%	Edwards: 27.8%
Leadership	***Obama***: 74.2%	Clinton: 58.6%	Edwards: 13.9%
Competence	***Obama***: 12.4%	Clinton: 9.2%	Edwards: 5.6%
"Feminine" Traits			
Cooperation	***Obama***: 28.1%[2]*	Clinton: 12.6%	Edwards: 5.6%
Honesty	***Obama***: 38.2%[3]*	***Edwards***: 30.6%[3]*	Clinton: 5.7%
Compassion	***Edwards***: 47.2%	Clinton: 42.5%	Obama: 36.0%
Trustworthiness	***Edwards***: 8.3%	Clinton: 6.9%	Obama: 3.4%

* Indicates statistically significant difference
[1] χ^2 (2, n= 212)= 10.76, p=0.005; also significant b/w Clinton and Obama only: χ^2 (1, n=176)=3.79, p=0.05
[2] χ^2 (2, n= 212)= 11.64, p=0.003; also significant b/w Clinton and Obama only: χ^2 (1, n=176)=6.45, p=0.01
[3] χ^2 (2, n=212)=26.88, p=0.00

Note: The "traits" category allowed for multiple responses

Table 7.1: Nonverbal Strategy, By Candidate

		Sponsor		
		Clinton	**Obama**	**Edwards**
Dress	**Formal**	100.0%[1]*	49.4%	61.1%
	Casual	0.0	43.8	33.3
	Both Equal	0.0	6.7	2.8
Facial Expression	**Smiling**	42.5[2]*	7.9	19.4
	Serious	43.7	86.5	77.8
	Both Equal	13.8	5.6	0.0
Eye Contact	**Almost Never**	85.1[3]*	76.4	58.3
	Sometimes	9.2	12.4	0.0
	Almost Always	4.6	11.2	36.1
	Total Ad Count	87	89	36

*Indicates statistically significant difference
[1] χ^2 (6, n= 212)=63.96, p=0.00; Phi value 0.549, Cramer's V value 0.388
[2] χ^2 (6, n= 212)=47.05, p=0.00
[3] χ^2 (6, n=212)=32.54, p=0.00

Note: N/A values excluded from table

Appendix D

Sample Coded Ad

Barack Obama – "Our Moment is Now"

Ad Transcript (Audio):

Obama: I'm Barack Obama and I approve this message.

We are in a defining moment in our history. Our nation is at war. The planet is in peril. The dream that so many generations fought for feels as if it's slowly slipping away. And that is why the same old Washington textbook campaigns just won't do. That's why telling the American people what we think they want to hear, instead of telling the American people what they need to hear, just won't do.

America, our moment is now.

I don't want to spend the next year or the next four years refighting the same fights that we had in the 1990s. I don't want to pit red America against blue America - I want to be the President of the United States of America.

Images:

Still shot of Obama during disclaimer statement. Clips alternating between Obama speaking with microphone and shots of crowd, faces of women in audience listening.

Text:

"For Obama, it's not politics as usual." – *Cedar Rapids Gazette*, 10/27/07

"Scrupulous honesty." – *Time Magazine*, Joe Klein 11/12/07

"Vision" to lead the nation. – *Concord Monitor*, 10/11/07

"Across the Divide." – *Newsweek*, 7/16/07

Barack Obama for President. Caucus January 3rd. Iowa.BarackObama.com

Coding:

Date: 8-Dec-07
State Code: 1

1. 2
2. 1
3. 4
4. 7
5. 5
6. 2
7. 18
8. 1
9. 5, 7, 8, 11, 14
10. 1
11. 1
12. 2
13. 4, 5, 6
14. 1
15. 1 (self)
16. 3
17. 4
18. 1
19. 2
20. 2
21. 2, 7
22. 1
23. 5
24. 0

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Karrin Vasby. "From Spouses to Candidates: Hillary Rodham Clinton, Elizabeth Dole, and the Gendered Office of U.S. President." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (2002): 105-132.

Ansolabehere, Stephen and Shanto Iyengar. *Going Negative: How Attack Ads Shrink and Polarize the Electorate.* New York: The Free Press, 1995.

Bem, Sandra Lipsitz. "Probing the Promise of Androgyny." *Psychology of Women*. Ed. Mary Roth Walsh. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987, pp. 206-225.

Bem, Sandra Lipsitz. *The Lenses of Gender: Transforming the Debate on Sexual Inequality*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

Bombardieri, Marcella. "Clinton shows femininity to court key constituency." *The Boston Globe.* 18 Oct. 2007: 1-2.

Bosman, Julie and Katharine Q. Seelye. "Media Charged with Sexism in Clinton Coverage." *The New York Times Online*. 13 June 2008. <http://nytimes.com>

Brader, Ted. *Campaigning for Hearts and Minds: How Emotional Appeals in Political Ads Work*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Brown, Wendy. *Manhood and Politics: a feminist reading in political theory.* Totowa, N.J.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1988.

Bystrom, Dianne G. "Candidate Gender and the Presentation of Self: The VideoStyles of Men and Women in U.S. Senate Campaigns." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1995.

Bystrom, Dianne G. "Women as Political Communication Sources and Audiences." *Handbook of Political Communication Research*. Ed. Lynda Lee Kaid. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2004, pp. 435-459.

Bystrom, Dianne G. et al. *Gender and Candidate Communication: VideoStyle, WebStyle, NewsStyle*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. *Man Cannot Speak for Her: A Critical Study of Early Feminist Rhetoric*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1989.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs and E. Claire Jerry. "Woman and Speaker: A Conflict in Roles." *Seeing Female: Social Roles and Personal Lives.* Ed. Sharon S. Brehm. New York: Greenwood Press, 1988.

Cantor, Dorothy W. and Toni Bernay, with Jean Stoess. *Women in Power: The Secrets of Leadership*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1992.

Chang, Chingching and Jacqueline C. Bush Hitchon. "When Does Gender Count? Further Insights Into Gender Schematic Processing of Female Candidates' Political Advertisements." *Sex Roles*, Vol. 51, No. 3 (Aug. 2004): 197-208.

"CIA - The World Factbook: United States." *CIA World Factbook*. 4 Dec. 2008 [last update]. <https://www. cia.gov/library/ publications/the-world-factbook/geos/us.html>

Clift, Eleanor and Tom Brazaitis. *Madam President: Shattering the Last Glass Ceiling*. New York: Scribner, 2000.

Clinton, Hillary Rodham. "Sen. Clinton Discusses 'Sexist' Treatment." Interview with Lois Romano, *The Washington Post Online*. 20 May 2008. <www.washingtonpost.com>

Coe, Kevin et al. "Masculinity as Political Strategy: George W. Bush, the 'War on Terrorism,' and an Echoing Press." *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy*, Vol. 29(1) (2007): 31-50.

Conroy, Meredith. "Political Parties: Advancing a Masculine Ideal." *Rethinking Madam President: Are We Ready for a Woman in the White House?* Ed. Lori Cox Han & Caroline Heldman. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2007, pp. 133-144.

Dolan, Kathleen. "Do Women Candidates Play to Gender Stereotypes? Do Men Candidates Play to Women? Candidate Sex and Issues Priorities on Campaign Websites." *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 58, No. 1 (Mar. 2005): 33-44.

Dolan, Kathleen. "Electoral Context, Issues, and Voting for Women in the 1990s." *Women & Politics*, Vol. 23, No. 1 (2001): 21-36.

Dolan, Kathleen. *Voting for Women: How the Public Evaluates Women Candidates*. Boulder: Westview Press, 2004.

Dolan, Kathleen. "Women as Candidates in American Politics: The Continuing Impact of Sex and Gender." *Political Women and American Democracy*. Ed. Christina Wolbrecht et al. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008, pp. 110-127.

Duerst-Lahti, Georgia. "Presidential Elections: Gendered Space and the Case of 2004." *Gender and Elections: Shaping the Future of American Politics*. Ed. Susan J. Carroll and Richard L. Fox. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006, pp. 12-42.

Duerst-Lahti, Georgia and Dayna Verstegen. "Making Something of Absence: The 'Year of the Woman' and Women's Political Representation." *Gender Power, Leadership, and Governance*. Ed. Georgia Duerst-Lahti and Rita Mae Kelly. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995, pp. 213-238.

Duerst-Lahti, Georgia and Rita Mae Kelly. *Gender Power, Leadership, and Governance*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995.

Falk, Erika. *Women for President: Media Bias in Eight Campaigns*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2008.

Fox, Richard L. "Congressional Elections: Where are we on the Road to Gender Parity?" *Gender and Elections: Shaping the Future of American Politics*. Ed. Susan J. Carroll and Richard L. Fox. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006, pp. 97-116.

Fox, Richard L. and Jennifer L. Lawless. *It Takes a Candidate: Why Women Don't Run for Office*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Fox, Richard L. and Zoe M. Oxley. "Gender Stereotyping in State Executive Elections: Candidate Selection and Success." *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 65 No. 3 (August 2003): 833-850.

Gardetto, Darlaine C. "Hillary Rodham Clinton, Symbolic Gender Politics, and the *New York Times*: January-November 1992." *Political Communication*, 14 (1997): 225-240.

Geer, John G. *In Defense of Negativity: Attack Ads in Presidential Campaigns*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Gender and Elections: Shaping the Future of American Politics. Ed. Susan J. Carroll and Richard L. Fox. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Gigot, Paul. "It's Time We Knew More about Hillary's 'Meaning.'"*The Wall Street Journal*. 28 May 1993: A10.

Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Woodstock, NY: The Overlook Press, 1973.

Gutgold, Nichola D. *Paving the Way for Madam President*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2006.

Han, Lori Cox and Caroline Heldman, eds. *Rethinking Madam President: Are We Ready for a Woman in the White House?* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2007.

Hansen, Susan B. and Laura Wills Otero. "A Woman for U.S. President? Gender and Leadership Traits Before and After 9/11." *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy*, Vol. 28(1) (2006): 35-57.

Heith, Diane J. "The Lipstick Watch: Media Coverage, Gender, and Presidential Campaigns." *Anticipating Madam President*. Ed. Robert P. Watson and Ann Gordon. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2003, pp. 123-130.

Heldman, Caroline. "Cultural Barriers to a Female President in the United States." *Rethinking Madam President: Are We Ready for a Woman in the White House?* Ed. Lori Cox Han & Caroline Heldman. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2007, pp. 17-42.

Hitchon, Chang, and Harris. "Should Women Emote? Perceptual Bias and Opinion Change in Response to Political Ads for Candidates of Different Genders." *Political Communication*, 14 (1997): 49-69.

Huddy, Leonie and Nayda Terkildsen. "Gender Stereotypes and the Perception of Male and Female Candidates." *American Journal of Political Science,* Vol. 37, No. 1 (Feb. 1993): 119-147.

Huddy, Leonie and Nayda Terkildsen. "The Consequences of Gender Stereotypes for Women Candidates at Different Levels and Types of Office." *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 46, No. 3 (Sep. 1993): 503-525.

Iyengar, S., Valentino, N.A., Ansolabehere, S., & Simon, A.F. "Running as a Woman: Gender Stereotyping in Political Campaigns." *Women, Media, and Politics*. Ed. P. Norris. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 77-98.

Jamieson, Kathleen Hall. *Beyond the Double Bind: Women and Leadership*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Jamieson, Kathleen Hall. *Dirty Politics: Deception, Distraction, and Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Kahn, Kim Fridkin. "Gender Differences in Campaign Messages: The Political Advertisements of Men and Women Candidates for U.S. Senate." *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 46, No. 3 (Sep., 1993): 481-502.

Kahn, Kim Fridkin. *The Political Consequences of Being a Woman: How Stereotypes influence the Conduct and Consequences of Political Campaigns*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.

Kaid, Lynda Lee, ed. *Handbook of Political Communication Research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2004.

Kaid, Lynda Lee and Anne Johnston. *Videostyle in Presidential Campaigns: Style and Content of Televised Political Advertising.* Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, Inc., 2001.

Kaid, Lynda Lee and Dorothy K. Davidson. "Elements of Videostyle: Candidate Presentation Through Television Advertising." *New Perspectives on Political Advertising*. Ed. Lynda Lee Kaid, Dan Nimmo, and Keith R. Sanders. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986, pp. 184-209.

Kann, Mark E. *The Gendering of American Politics: Founding Mothers, Founding Fathers, and Political Patriarchy*. Westport: Praeger Publishers, Inc., 1999.

Kantor, Jodi. "Gender takes center stage in Democratic primaries." *International Herald Tribune*. 10 Jan. 2008: 1-3.

Kennedy, Carole. "Is the United States Ready for a Woman President? Is the Pope Protestant?" *Anticipating Madam President*. Ed. Robert P. Watson and Ann Gordon. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2003, pp. 131-144.

Kornblut, Anne E. "Clinton Shatters Record for Fundraising." *The Washington Post*. 2 Apr. 2007: A01.

Lawless, Jennifer. "Women, War and Winning Elections: Gender Stereotyping in the Post-September 11th Era." *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 57, No. 3 (Sep. 2004): 479-490.

Marshall, Brenda Devore and Molly A. Mayhead. *Women's Political Discourse: A 21st-Century Perspective*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2005.

Rossenwasser, Shirley Miller and Norma G. Dean. "Gender Role and Political Office." *Psychology of Women Quarterly,* Vol. 13 (1989): 77-85.

Saad, Lydia. "Clinton Eclipses Obama and Edwards on Leadership." Gallup News Service. 31 Jan. 2007. <http://www.gallup.com>

Sapiro, Virginia. "If U.S. Senator Baker Were a Woman: An Experimental Study of Candidate Images." *Political Psychology* (1982): 61-83.

Seltzer, Richard A., et al. *Sex as a Political Variable: Women as Candidates and Voters in U.S. Elections*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1997.

Tumulty, Karen. "Hillary: Love Her, Hate Her." *Time Magazine*. 20 Aug. 2006: 1-9.

Watson, Robert P. and Ann Gordon, eds. *Anticipating Madam President*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2003.

Witt, Linda et al. *Running as a Woman: Gender and Power in American Politics*. New York: The Free Press, 1994.

Wolbrecht, Christina, et al., ed. *Political Women and American Democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Women in Elective Office 2009. Center for American Women and Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics. Aug. 2008. <http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu>