

I. Introduction

Suspicious of media bias have been around since the beginning of American presidential campaigns when George Washington “railed against the anti-Federalist newspapers of the 1790’s” and John Adams, because he was so angered by the press, “persuaded Congress to enact a Sedition Act to prohibit the publication of false and malicious statements” (Perloff 1998: 311). Because media bias has been ingrained in American society since its inception, it is neither a new nor unstudied phenomenon. Due to the significant influence the media often has over opinions of the American people, numerous scholars have added to the large body of work surrounding not only media bias in general, but the special significance it has during elections. With advances in technology, news can now be spread faster than ever before, especially because of the powerful influence of the Internet and the 24-hour television news cycle. Recent research on the impact of media bias during the 2008 election has concluded that the United States is neither as post-racist nor post-sexist as some might think (Friedman 2009).

This study therefore aims to add to the body of research regarding gender bias in the media by conducting a content analysis of four national newspapers in regard to their coverage of Hillary Clinton compared to Barack Obama during the primary season of the 2008 election. The purpose of this study is to determine whether gender bias occurred within national newspapers during the 2008 primary and if so, if that bias occurred throughout the campaign or in reaction to specific events.

This is an important question for both political science and gender studies because if trends of gender bias are discovered within a variety of national newspapers, it proves that nearly 100 years after the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment, women still are not treated as equals to men within the United States. While it is unlikely that bias will ever be completely eradicated,

many may be surprised to learn that gender bias still exists at such extreme levels in the United States that it permeates national newspapers. Without realizing that such bias still exists, America will be unable to take the necessary steps forward to ensure that one day, a woman not only can run for president of the United States, but also be given a fair chance at winning based on her qualifications. Because the media play such a crucial role in the everyday lives of Americans and in their opinions of political candidates, women will be unable to obtain the office of the presidency until the media eliminates their inherent gender bias.

II. Literature Review

General Studies of Media Bias Against Women

In *The Political Consequences of Being a Woman* (1996), Kim Fridkin Kahn examines the impact of sex role stereotyping on the electability of women candidates, and as a central factor in the conduct and consequences of female candidate's campaigns. Through a multi-tiered data-based study of races for governor and senator, Kahn seeks to identify the impact of stereotypes in U.S. Senate elections where women's perceived weaknesses are highlighted. Kahn examines the style and substance of candidate's advertisements, and compares the candidates' political advertisements with news coverage of those campaigns (1996: 16). She ultimately finds that gender differences in news coverage influence people's interpretation of electoral candidates and she discusses how the pervasiveness of stereotypes affects the quality of political representation in the United States (Kahn 1996). It is the news media, ultimately, that perpetuates these gender stereotypes. Overall, she finds the press appears to be more responsive to the campaign messages of male candidates by echoing their campaign messages, while largely distorting the messages sent by female candidates (1996: 132). Ultimately Kahn finds that gender differences in news coverage can influence the electability of women running for political

office and regardless of what that office is, the media differentiates between men and women candidates, and consistently do a better job representing the campaign messages of the male candidates (1996: 133-4). Kahn goes on to give campaign advice for women candidates that includes being mindful of gender stereotypes within the press. Kahn urges female candidates to emphasize their policy concerns more frequently in their campaign appeals to try and receive the same amount of press coverage of their issues as a similar male candidate (1996: 135).

In *Women for President* (2008), Erika Falk builds on the work done by Kahn by creating a study that systematically assesses the extent to which women have fared in print media coverage during their campaigns for the presidency. The study includes eight female presidential campaigns over a 132-year-period, starting with Victoria Woodhull's run in 1872 and ending with Carol Mosley Braun's in 2004. Falk compares the print media coverage of these eight women with a comparable male candidate. She does this by collecting *New York Times* articles from the first day of the first month that the first candidates entered the race in each year studied to the day the last candidate withdrew or the election was held, whichever came first. She also searched the largest circulating newspaper in the home state of each candidate, from the first day of the first month when each candidate entered the race until the election or the date the candidate exited the race. Falk collected, read, and analyzed more than 1,240 articles that mentioned the candidates. In her research, she also evaluates how much progress women have made over the time period covered. Falk concludes that even after 130 years of women seeking the presidency, as compared to men, they are covered less by reporters, considered less viable candidates, presented as more likely to represent special interests, and as being better suited for the vice presidency. What she found most surprising in her study was that "such a disparity was

present when the woman was the front-runner, and that such a pattern, which had been manifest in press coverage since 1884, still held in 2007” (Falk 2008: 1).

Dianne Bystrom and other researchers also set out to create a study to uncover gender bias in the media. They use a data set consisting of over 1,300 political spots made by candidates, 48 candidate’s websites, and 1,800 newspaper articles of political candidates in presidential and mixed-gender gubernatorial and senatorial campaigns to conclude that in the 2000 and 2002 elections, newspaper coverage in mixed-gender races was not only more impartial than in previous campaigns, but it was also more evenly balanced, so voters “had quantifiably more, as well as more favorable, information about female candidates (2004: 185). The authors also note, however, the presence of troubling stereotypes within the noted newspaper coverage by stating, “the media’s penchant to stereotype women with regard to mentioning their sex and marital status more often than they do for men” continues to be a troubling characteristic of the national media (Bystrom et al. 2004: 185). Also, by “focusing on the appearance of women political candidates, the media treat them less seriously than men candidates and distract attention from their issue positions” (Bystrom et al. 2004: 185). Reiterating the advice of Kahn, Bystrom urges female candidates to highlight their policy initiatives more often than their male opponents to try and receive similar amounts of media attention.

Other scholars look to answer similar questions related to gender bias such as, why are there so few women in elected political positions? One study took a group of 3,8000 “eligible candidate” men and women questionnaire responses to find that in the United States, even the most highly successful and professionally qualified females are much less likely than men to have any ambition to seek political office (Lawless & Fox 2005). The authors of the study

attribute that lack of ambition among females to “deeply embedded patterns of traditional gender socialization” (Lawless & Fox 2005: 149) in American society that are perpetually conveyed to the American public through the media. Another academic finds that the sexist coverage of women running for high office does not necessarily make it less likely that a female candidate will win, but that the real problem is that such press coverage may make women less likely to run (Falk 2008). In recognition of what scholars have found to be true of gender bias within media, Hillary Clinton adopted a feminine style as a communicator and a crafted a message that was affirming (never defensive), tough (yet not hypermasculine), and caring (to exhibit feminine attributes), as part of an effort to frame her identity as a to counter gender bias and sexism (Borrelli 2011).

Print (Daily)

In 1991, Daniel Wood conducted a study to analyze representation of political women in major American newspapers. The study found that more than 85 percent of front-page stories and 70 percent of local front-pages stories were devoted to men. Among the observations made by the study included find that the vast majority of stories were about men, their jobs, their weaponry, and their opinions. Stories about female soldiers were rare and when they did appear, they were more centered on the women's parental status. Quotes from female soldiers were seldom included and photos of females were most frequently of women at home showing concern for or grieving over loved ones who were involved in the war (Wood 1991).

Four years later, Kim Fridkin Kahn (1994) developed a method to test gender bias within state newspapers that covered 47 statewide political campaigns between 1982 and 1988. Kahn argues that voters see the political landscape largely through the eyes of the news media and therefore in races for statewide office, where direct contact with the politician running is rare,

citizens receive most of their news about campaigns from a state newspaper. Her content analysis of newspaper coverage for the 47 statewide political campaigns revealed that the press does differentiate between the coverage of male and females candidates in their campaign coverage. Overall, Kahn concluded:

In senatorial races, women receive less campaign coverage than their male counterparts and the coverage they receive is more negative-emphasizing their unlikely chances of victory. In both senatorial and gubernatorial races, women receive consistently less issue attention than their male counterparts. Furthermore, the news media seem more responsive to the messages sent by male candidates (1994: 154).

Kahn found that the newspapers' content more closely resembled the agenda issued by the male candidates in their televised political advertisements (Kahn 1994).

A different study was performed a few years later that compared newspaper coverage of male and female athletes during the 1996 Summer Olympic Games (Kinnick 1998). The study examined the profiles of athletes in five leading U.S. newspapers for incidence of gender bias in both reporting and photography. The analysis found evidence of gender bias in a number of criteria examined, including the language and descriptive tone used in the articles referring to female athletes. However, the study found no evidence of gender bias in terms of quantitative representation of female athletes, or in the placement and prominence of stories (1996).

Print (Weekly)

Raluca Moldovan used a case study approach to examine the media's bias against Hillary Clinton by examining two weekly magazines, *Time* and *Newsweek*, from January 2007 until June 2008 (2009). Raluca finds, by means of positive vs. negative coverage analysis, that the media bias was more clearly evident to the detriment of Hillary Clinton, which may have ultimately influenced the fact that she lost the Democratic nomination for president (2009).

Television

Focusing on the televised side of media, scholars have concluded that the most egregious statements about Clinton and Palin were made by broadcasters and not by leading political reporters or analysts for print media, ultimately citing cable television as the chief offender during the primary season (Farmer 2009). Other research has found that television networks went so far as to choose anchors of both genders and multiple ethnicities during the election coverage to reflect the diverse candidate pool and offset claims of bias (Wenger and MacManus 2009).

The media bias against Hillary Clinton became so apparent during the 2008 primary season that the governor of Pennsylvania, Ed Rendell, spoke out about it in the days before the primary in his state by saying, “The US media have abandoned all pretense at neutrality in the Democratic presidential contest and are heavily biased towards Barack Obama and against Hillary Clinton” (Luce 2008). Often, especially on cable television, the enthusiasm for the Obama campaign was palpable and the dislike for Hillary Clinton obvious (Rivers 2008). This bias was often heavily gender based. As one scholar notes:

When a woman of Hillary Clinton’s character, experience, and intelligence is deemed unfit for the White House because of perceptions the voting public will be turned off by the prospect of watching a woman age before their eyes, it sends a message to the world that feminism is still several battles from winning the gender equality war (Posetti 2008).

Posetti continues her analysis by stating, “the media’s commentary on Hilary’s pantsuits, a discourse which has distracted from coverage of her politics and intellectual gravitas, has proved, even women politicians who wear pants can’t escape gender bias in the media” (Posetti 2008).

Such focus on Clinton’s appearance came to a climax during the 2007 “cleavage controversy” (Appendix 1). A *Washington Post* headline printed on July 20, 2007 read, “Hillary

Clinton's Tentative Dip into New Neckline Territory." The article and the ensuing press from multiple outlets revolved around an outfit Clinton wore on the Senate floor as she gave a speech regarding the burdensome cost of higher education. The *Washington Post* article's opening line read, "There was cleavage on display Wednesday afternoon on C-SPAN2. It belonged to Sen. Hillary Clinton" (Givhan 2007). The article, located in the paper's Style section, discussed Clinton's sense of fashion and how she usually keeps herself covered as much as possible. Givhan's article became a key piece of news on MSNBC with 23 minutes and 42 seconds being devoted to Clinton's cleavage from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. on July 30, 2007 (Media Matters for America 2007).

Internet

During the 2008 election, 74% of Internet users went online to obtain news and information about the 2008 campaign, which represents 55% of the entire adult population and marks the first time that more than half of the voting-age population used the Internet to connect to the political process during an election cycle (Smith 2009). With this increased user base also came an increase in Internet presence, both by the media and by the campaigns themselves. One study of gender bias within the Internet news examined the use of gendered descriptive language, metaphors, status, and power designations as well as personal detail in the Internet news stories (Burke & Mazzearella 2008). The researchers assessed 168 lead stories that appeared on CNN.com, FoxNews.com, and NYT.com. Their findings reveal that the Internet news stories "rely on gendered language and both male metaphors and analogies (Burke & Mazzearella 2008: 397). Furthermore, the articles are more likely to include personal information about female candidates while simultaneously omitting information regarding a female candidate's status and power.

Using rhetorical analysis, drawing from gendered mediation and frame theory, one academic created a study to identify gender bias within online political blogs during the 2008 election (Gardner 2010). The scholar's use of rhetorical analysis provides "a method to examine the way bloggers attempt to persuade the audience by looking at various components of the text" (Gardner 2010: 28). The author continues her explanation by stating, "Because audience members, once they have commented on a blog post, become rhetors themselves, this analysis can, and should be, extended to examine audience members' rhetorical strategies as well" (Gardner 2010: 28). Gardner also uses gender mediation theory in her study, defined as "the way in which politics is reported is significantly determined by a male-oriented agenda that privileges the practice of politics as an essentially male pursuit" (Sreberny & Ross 1996: 93). According to such theory, "female politicians are regarded as novelties whose behavior is subject to more evaluation and interpretation because it opposes traditional feminine stereotypes" (Gardner 2010: 29). Gardner therefore examines elements within blogs that have been shown to support gendered mediation, such as when journalists use language differently depending on the sex of the candidate. The results of Gardner's study reveal that gendered mediation was common on blog posts and that mediation was often followed by a gendered discourse that was much more blatant in content among those commenting on the blog's content (Gardner 2010).

Both authors of these two Internet studies agree that the gender bias present on the Internet can have both lasting and significant effects on the goal of gender equality within the United States, with Burke and Mazzerlla providing evidence that major Internet news outlets place more emphasis on male candidates and their agendas than female candidates thereby reinforcing the notion that the male standard is the norm in American society with females presented as outside that norm (2008). Gardner concludes that gendered mediation on the

Internet could have an impact on individual and social constructs of female candidates, perhaps even influencing the outcome of elections (2010).

Cartoons

Within print media, political cartoons have also played a role in influencing the opinions of American voters and highlighting aspects of individual campaigns that a news article might not explicitly say. This function of political cartoons dates far back in American history, becoming popularized by cartoonist Thomas Nast during the 1800s. His relentless depiction of the Tammany crowd, the corrupt New York City political organization headed by Boss Tweed, is credited with helping to topple the organization with Tweed ultimately going to prison for his crimes (Carpenter 1999). Nast was also particularly vicious to Victoria Woodhull, who was a well-known advocate of “Free Love” and women’s rights. In 1872, she became the first woman to be nominated for president. In the cartoon shown below, Nast “depicts Woodhull as Satan incarnate for her advocacy of Free Love—i.e., the rejection of marriage as an oppressive institution and the embrace of sexual freedom” (Kennedy 2010). The cartoon conveys Nast’s view that people should travel the hardest path of matrimony rather than follow in Woodhull’s footsteps.



Fig. 1: Thomas Nast (Harper’s Weekly: Originally Published February 17, 1872)

Nast's work is also significant in that it conveys the reality that political cartoons can have a lasting impression on their audience. His depiction of elephants representing the Republican Party and donkeys representing the Democratic Party are symbols still used to this day ("The Donkey and the Elephant" 2004).

The 2008 election cycle was no exception to the scrutiny of political cartoons, with artists frequently highlighting the issues of gender and race in their cartoons (McDonald 2010; Conners 2010). One study of 57 political cartoonists during the primary season found that while Clinton was featured in more political cartoons than was Obama, the cartoons of Obama often featured the issue of race in a favorable way, while cartoons of Clinton often focused on gender-related themes of her emotions and appearance in a negative way (Conners 2010). Cartoons of Clinton also often relayed the image of Clinton as a determined but trailing candidate (Conners 2010).

Another study of political cartoons used content analysis to examine cartoons that featured Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton, and/or John McCain during the 2008 primary season and found that cartoons featuring Obama were most likely to be favorable compared to the other candidates while cartoons featuring Clinton were the most likely to be unfavorable (Zurbriggen & Sherman 2010). Clinton was also often presented as ugly and small in size compared to Obama and shown as perpetrating violence more often than the male candidates. Overall, the research shows "that racist and especially sexist themes continue to appear in editorial cartoons (Zurbriggen & Sherman 2010: 245) and both the subtle and not subtle forms of sexism present in these cartoons "likely reflect continued discomfort with the level of power and achievement, both actual and symbolic, that are represented by Clinton's candidacy. (Zurbriggen & Sherman 2010: 241).

One such cartoon (Figure 2) depicts a crying Hillary Clinton in a room with male dictators from around the world, conveying the idea that she would be unable to handle dealing

with such figures as President of the United States. The male dictators are all shown making gender-based comments about Clinton, with one saying, “Awww...She’s sensitive – I had no idea” and another saying, “You’re the one who mentioned the pantsuit.” The cartoon also features Bill Clinton stating, “This is when PMS goes nuclear.” The overall cartoon conveys nothing but negative gender stereotypes toward Hillary Clinton. This cartoon reinforces the idea that a female should not try to enter the male dominated world of politics and would probably make readers question whether or not a female really could handle the “bad guys” of the world. The basis of such a question resides solely in Clinton’s gender. It is also significant to note that this cartoon was drawn by a major cartoonist at the *New York Times*, and was therefore widely seen upon its publication.



1/10

Fig. 2: Pat Oliphant (New York Times: Originally Published January 11, 2008)

Framing

Each of these studies of bias in the media ultimately relate to the theory of framing. Framing theory points to the significance of structural sources of influence on news, including organizational routines, editorial processes, media ownership, and journalistic values. These frames are patterns of interpretation that determine what is fact and therefore subject to debate, as opposed to what is beyond question and can therefore be safely ignored (Reese, Gandy & Grant 2001). When a journalist chooses to frame a female political candidate in a negative light solely because of her gender, that outlook on that candidate is spread to the thousands of people that read that journalist's work, thereby perpetuating negative gender stereotypes in America.

This gender bias in the media arose heavily during the 2008 election, primarily because of the dominant female candidates that emerged, Hillary Clinton during the Democratic primary and Sarah Palin as the Republican vice-presidential nominee. Robert Entman works to explain how the framing of certain stories by the media ultimately impacts a voter's decision by creating a case study of Sarah Palin's media coverage during the 2008 election cycle (2010). Entman illustrates how slanted framing changes over time in reaction to real world developments, cultural norms, and journalistic decisions, but how it ultimately had a negative impact on Palin's ability to be on the winning ticket in the 2008 election (2010). The concept of media framing is therefore a crucial component to politics as a whole, for what the public knows about politics is often largely determined by the news frames that results from lenses – reports' ways of seeing the world (Jamieson and Waldman 2002). Some scholars argue that it is because of these news frames that the media sometimes bypass crucial facts and allow news that is presented to the general public to be manipulated (Jamieson and Waldman 2002).

African American Man v. White Woman

During and in the wake of the 2008 election, questions of media bias arose mainly because of the diversity of the frontrunner candidates: a Caucasian male, an African American male, and a Caucasian woman. During both the 2008 Democratic primary and the general election, scholars found that while an African American did ultimately win the election, race still played a role in both the decision of some voters on Election Day and also in bias of the media (Payne 2010, Morrisison 2008). Other scholars have noted how race is still a factor in U.S. elections, even though when asked directly, most voters would respond that race was not a factor in their decision. However, once the responders to such a question were at the polls, race would, in fact, become a factor in their decision of who to vote for (Deggans 2008). This phenomenon has been dubbed the “Bradley Effect” after Tom Bradley, an African American who ran for governor of California in 1982. Polls showed Bradley to be significantly ahead in the race, but he ultimately lost the election. Similar voting behavior was noted in the 1989 race for Governor of Virginia. Between the two candidates, Douglas Wilder, an African American, and Marshall Coleman, a Caucasian, Wilder ultimately won the election, but by less than half a percentage point, when pre-election poll numbers showed that on average Wilder had a nine percent lead. Academics began to theorize that voters may have responded to polls differently than they actually voted with regard to the politician in question being African American (Cost 2008).

Other academics, however, have instead questioned whether race actually was still a factor in the minds of voters during the 2008 election (Brune 2008), with one author claiming that it is time to retire the “Bradley Effect,” meaning that the current society has moved past the issue of race and it would no longer influence voters (Parker 2008). Additional articles have

centered on specific instances of race related comments or undertones in the media (Fitzgerald and Worden 2008; MacIntyre 2008).

III. Hypothesis

These studies and others focus on the overall effect of gender bias in the media, but do little to establish that gender bias in the media ultimately played a key factor in the outcome of a specific election, such as Hillary Clinton's loss of the Democratic nomination for president. Some scholars have, however, concluded that if the 2008 election has taught America anything, it is that any campaign or election that fails to account for the sexist terrain candidates must navigate, falls short of fully assessing gender roles in American politics and women's place in society (Lawless 2009), while other scholars believe that when party and incumbency are controlled for, candidate sex alone is found to have little or no effect on election outcomes (Darcy & Schramm 1977).

The factor many of these studies have ignored is the extent to which gender bias actually occurred in the national media during a specific period of time. While articles focusing on gender bias in the 2008 election that use specific examples of biased instances (Falk 2008(a); Farmer 2009; McDonald 2010; Nacos 2008) do add to the body of research on the topic, they lack a structured research component to present reliable evidence to prove gender bias in the media over the time period of the campaign. This study therefore hypothesizes that:

1. Newspapers will give more coverage to Barack Obama than Hillary Clinton.
2. Newspaper articles will be written more often by male authors than female authors.
3. Newspapers will quote more from male sources than female sources.
4. Newspaper articles will refer to more personal details about Hillary Clinton than Barack Obama.

5. Negative press within newspapers toward Hillary Clinton will be about personal characteristics, while negative press towards Barack Obama will be about his qualifications to become President.

6. The overall tone of newspaper articles will favor Barack Obama while acting as a detriment to Hillary Clinton.

IV. Methodology Explained

This study focuses on five specific events that took place over the course of the 2008 primary season and analyzes how they were covered by four major newspapers in regard to the coverage of Hillary Clinton versus Barack Obama. Newspapers were chosen as the source of this study because of the body of research that positively links reading a national newspaper to voting (deVreese et al. 2006; Gerber et al. 2009; Peer et al. 2003). A 2010 Pew Research study also concluded that readers of printed national newspapers were decidedly upscale, college graduates, resided in households earning \$75,000 or more, and were Internet users (18). These characteristics are also positively correlated with the percentage of the population that votes (U.S. Census Bureau 2011).

The four newspapers chosen for this study are: (1) *The Washington Post*; (2) *The New York Times*; (3) *USA Today*; and (4) *The Minneapolis Star Tribune*. These specific newspapers were chosen because they are all within the top twenty largest circulating newspapers in the country, with *USA Today* ranking second with a daily circulation of 1,829,099, *The New York Times* ranking third with a daily circulation of 916,911, *The Washington Post* ranking sixth with a daily circulation of 550,821, and the *Minneapolis Star Tribune* ranking seventeenth with a daily circulation of 296,605 (Audit Bureau of Circulation 2011). The first three newspapers were chosen specifically because of their wide circulation, while the *Minneapolis Star Tribune*

was chosen to gather the perspective of “Middle America.” These newspapers were also chosen because of their extensive coverage of American politics, while the *Wall Street Journal*, American’s largest circulating newspaper, was not chosen because of their lack of political coverage. The large circulating Chicago newspapers were not examined because of their ties to Barack Obama and could therefore, if used, have affected the results of the study.

The events chosen to be examined over the course of the primary are: (1) each candidate’s formal announcement to run for President of the United States; (2) the first filing deadline of campaign contributions; (3) the candidate’s first appearance on *Meet the Press*; (4) the first caucus; and (5) the first Democratic debate in which Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama were the only participants.

By choosing five specific events, this study seeks to uncover whether gender bias existed within newspapers while the newspapers were reporting on a key event during the campaign. Other studies (Burke & Mazzarella 2008; Bystrom et al. 2004; Gardner 2010; Kahn 1994; Lawless & Fox 2005) have sought to prove gender bias within the media over a chosen period of time, not because the chosen dates “correspond with any particular event, incident, or time span, but rather because they provide us with a snapshot of typical day-to-day news coverage” (Burke & Mazzarella 2008: 404). This study, however, aims to investigate more issue based newspaper articles, because if gender bias is present within newspapers as they are reporting on an event, those reading the article may tend to take what they read as more credible than statements made within a personal article about the candidates.

For each of the events, a one-week period of articles (two weeks for the announcement of their presidential bids and the first filing deadline) were identified. The dates of newspaper articles included for examination were:

1. Formal Announcement of Presidential Campaigns
 - a. Hillary Clinton: January 21, 2007 – February 2, 2007
 - b. Barack Obama: February 11, 2007 – February 24, 2007
2. First Filing of Campaign Contributions
 - a. March 31, 2007 – April 17, 2007
3. First Appearance on *Meet the Press*
 - a. Hillary Clinton: September 23, 2007 – September 29, 2007
 - b. Barack Obama: November 11, 2007 – November 17, 2007
4. First Caucus (Iowa)
 - a. January 3, 2008 – January 9, 2008
5. First Debate with only Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama
 - a. January 30, 2008 – February 5, 2008

Every article during any of the above mentioned time periods that mentioned either Hillary Clinton or Barack Obama within the four newspapers were identified. While not every article pertained directly to the event they were categorized under, the articles were still included because they were written within a short period of time from one of the major events of the campaign and were therefore considered still relevant to the overall news about the specific candidate.

Variables

Each of the newspaper articles collected were coded according to the following criteria: (1) length of article; (2) gender of author; (3) issue based or personal based article; (4) mention of candidate appearance; (5) mention of personal detail about candidate; (6) whether any negative press about the candidate was based on personal details or their qualifications; (7)

whether sources within the articles were male or female; (8) and how many positive versus negative words each article contained regarding the candidates.

Operationally, these variables were defined as follows:

1. *Length of Article*: The number of words within each article was noted.
2. *Gender of Author*: The gender of each author was noted. If two males wrote an article, the author was simply noted as male and likewise, if an article was written by two females the article was noted as being written by a female. If, however, a male and a female wrote the article, it was noted as such. Contributing authors were not noted.
3. *Issue Based or Personal Based*: If the article was predominantly based on the event in question or any aspect of the campaign, even if it mentioned personal details, the article was categorized as issue based. If the article was predominantly based upon personal characteristics or personal details about the candidate, then it was categorized as personal based.
4. *Mention of Candidate Appearance*: If an article mentioned any detail of a candidate's outward appearance, such as their clothing or hair, then the article was noted as containing a mention of appearance. Number of mentions within an article were not noted. Race and gender were also not noted under this category.
5. *Mention of Personal Detail*: Any mention of a personal detail about the candidates not related to their qualifications to become President was noted. These personal details included, but were not limited to, mentions of a candidate's race or gender, age, their families, or personality traits.

6. *Substance of Negative Press (Personal or Qualified)*: If an article contained negative information about a candidate, the basis of that negative press was coded as being either: (1) about a personality or a personal traitor, (2) about the candidate's qualifications. An example of personal negative press is, "lingering concerns about whether the nation is ready to elect an African American president" (Bacon 2008), while qualified negative press would be, "his background, including a father from Kenya and a mother from Kansas, has elevated his appeal, but it does little to answer questions about whether he has the experience to serve in the White House" (Healy & Zeleny 2007).
7. *Gender of Sources*: The gender of each source within an article was noted. How many times the source was quoted, however, was not noted.
8. *Positive versus Negative Words*: Any word or phrase found within the newspaper articles that contained either a positive or negative connotation was noted. The words or phrases were only noted when they referred directly to one of the candidates and when they were used not within a quotation, therefore representing the tone the author of the article himself was conveying. Examples of negative words and phrases included but were not limited to: accuse, rival, defend, ice-cold demeanor, coerce, and brass-knuckle demeanor. Examples of positive words and phrases included but were not limited to: inspiring, hard-working, energetic, star power, and experience.

Once the articles were coded, they were separated into one of three categories: articles about Hillary Clinton, articles about Barack Obama, or articles about both candidates. Editorials were not used within this study, except for the last time period examined – the first debate with

only Clinton and Obama. Editorials were not used throughout this study, because of the same rationale used for not including language within quotes as possible words to be coded. Both editorials and quotes express the opinions and views of a specific person and it is often clear to readers that this is the case. This study, however, seeks to uncover gender bias within the newspaper institution itself and therefore only coded language that was presented to readers as fact. After the first debate with Clinton and Obama, however, a large number of editorials were found and were included in the study because of the fact that while the newspapers themselves did not write the articles, they acted as gatekeepers of which articles would be included for publication. The overwhelming number of editorials that favored Obama was noted as significant enough to include all editorials about the candidates published during the one week period examined.

V. Results

In total, 116 articles were coded with 30 articles featuring Hillary Clinton, 34 articles featuring Barack Obama, and 52 articles featuring both candidates. Overall, this study consistently found that gender bias was present in the four newspapers examined. The results are presented below.

To test hypothesis one, newspapers will give more space to Barack Obama than Hillary Clinton, the number of words in each article was noted. Only the articles about either candidate individually were used, (n=30) for Clinton and (n=34) for Obama. Ultimately, newspapers gave more coverage to Obama with 33,300 words. Clinton received 27,031. Of the combined total, Obama therefore received 55.2% of the coverage while Clinton received 44.8% (Table 1). Hypothesis one was therefore confirmed. Each newspaper, except for *USA Today*, gave more coverage to Obama than Clinton, with *The New York Times* writing roughly 3,500 more words

about Obama than Clinton. Also significant was an examination of the large quantity of newspaper articles that mentioned both candidates. In these articles, Obama was mentioned first 31 times (60.8%) while Clinton was mentioned first only 20 times (39.2%). While not a direct confirmation of hypothesis one, this additional information helps to show that Obama not only received more coverage during the primary than Clinton, but also that the type of coverage he received was more significant.

[Table 1 About Here]

To test hypothesis two, newspaper articles are more often written by male authors than female authors, the sex of each author was noted. If there were two authors, one being male and one being female, it was coded as such. If, however, the article had two authors, both male or both female, it was only noted that the author was male or female. This study found that 75 authors were male (63.0%) and 44 were female (36.9%), as noted in Table 2. These results, broken down by both newspaper and which candidate the article was about, are noted in Table 3.

[Tables 2 and 3 About Here]

To test hypothesis three, newspapers quote more from male sources than female sources, each quoted source was counted and their gender noted. The number of times a source was quoted was not factored. Out of 324 sources used, 247 were male (76.2%) and 77 (23.8%) were female. These findings are found in Table 4. For articles written about Clinton (n=30), 59 sources (70.2%) were male and 25 (29.8%) were female. For articles written about Obama, (n=34), 73 sources (76.0%) were male and 23 (24.0%) were female. These findings show that

male sources were consistently used more frequently than female sources and therefore hypothesis three is confirmed.

[Table 4 About Here]

To test hypothesis four, newspaper articles will refer to more personal details about Hillary Clinton than Barack Obama, each article examined was coded for whether the article was issue or personal based, whether there was an inclusion of the appearance of the candidate, and whether there was an inclusion of personal details of the candidate. Of the articles written about Clinton (n=30), 20 (66.7%) were issue based, while 10 (33.3%) were personal based. For the articles written about Obama (n=34), 29 (82.9%) were issue based, while only 5 (14.7%) were personal based (Table 5). This large discrepancy in the *type* of coverage the candidates received illustrates a key bias in the media by presenting Obama as a more serious candidate by associating him more often with hard issues.

[Table 5 About Here]

To measure inclusion of personal details and mention of appearance, all articles (n=116) were coded for such inclusions. Included in the calculations are mentions of appearance and inclusion of personal details for candidates for whom the article is not specifically about. For example, while no article written about Clinton had either a mention of Obama's appearance or a personal detail about him, in an article about Obama there was a personal detail about Clinton that was included in the calculations. Multiple mentions or details were not factored into calculations. Overall, this study found that out of 116 articles, 4 included a mention of Clinton's appearance (3.5%), 6 articles included a mention of Obama's appearance (5.2%), 26 articles

included a personal detail relating to Clinton (22.4%), and 23 articles included a personal detail about Obama (19.8%) (Table 6). While calculating the number of times a mention of appearance is used in the 116 articles shows that Obama received two more mentions than Clinton does not support hypothesis four, the numbers are so small that they may easily be an artifact of the small sample size. The same applies to the inclusion of personal details. While Clinton did receive three more inclusions of personal details, the percentages are quite similar.

The most telling statistic in determining whether hypothesis four is true is in the calculation of the type of articles written about the candidates. The study was conducted in a way to obtain mostly issue-based articles due to the fact that the periods covered were surrounded by a major event during the 2008 primary. Therefore, these articles were not covering a “typical news day” in the way other research has been conducted (Burke & Mazzearella 2008). The fact that articles about Obama were nearly 20% more likely than articles about Clinton to focus on a hard issue clearly portrayed Obama as a more serious candidate. Therefore, even though specific instances of personal press were not statistically significant, the overall trend of Obama receiving more mentions in issued-based articles than Clinton did, confirms hypothesis four; newspaper articles will refer to more personal details about Hillary Clinton than Barack Obama.

[Table 6 About Here]

To test hypothesis five, negative press within newspapers toward Hillary Clinton will be about personal characteristics, while negative press toward Barack Obama will be about his qualifications to become president, each article was coded to identify instances of negative press and to then categorize that negative press as either about a personal characteristic or trait or about

the candidate's qualifications to become president. Out of the 116 articles examined, 21 contained an instance of negative personal press about Clinton (18.1%) and 5 contained an instance of negative press regarding her qualifications to seek the office of the presidency (4.3%). For Obama, 9 articles contained an instance of personal negative press (7.8%) and 7 articles contained negative press regarding his qualifications to become president (6.0%) (Table 7).

While the statistics do confirm hypothesis five, the percentages, especially regarding negative press about qualifications, are not as high as expected. When comparing the political experience of Clinton to Obama, Clinton definitively had more experience in the world of politics, while Obama was a relative newcomer at the national level. Yet, during the time period of this study, Obama received negative press about his qualifications to become president only two more times than Clinton did, a surprisingly low number. In regards to negative personal press, hypothesis five was more strongly confirmed by Clinton being more than ten times more likely than Obama to receive such negative press.

[Table 7 About Here]

To test hypothesis six, the overall tone of newspaper articles will favor Barack Obama while acting as a detriment to Hillary Clinton, positive and negative language within each article was coded. In total, 120 positive words or phrases were found with Clinton receiving 49 instances of such positive language (40.8%) and Obama receiving 71 positive mentions (59.2%). Of the 116 negative words or phrases that were found, 89 (76.7%) were aimed at Clinton, while 27 (23.3%) were aimed at Obama (Table 8). It is significant to note that it is not just one candidate that received the majority of both positive and negative language. In that case, the

statistics would have shown that the particular candidate evoked strong reactions from the media. Instead, the statistics show that Obama received the most positive press (59.2%) and Clinton received the most negative press (76.7%). These statistics confirm hypothesis six that newspapers were more likely to print articles favorable to Obama and negative toward Clinton.

[Table 8 About Here]

VI. Discussion of Results

These findings paint an overall picture of gender bias within national newspapers. The findings also show such bias was present not only in the coverage of Hillary Clinton's campaign, but within the journalistic institution itself as well. By having such a significant portion of newspaper writers be male and by quoting from an overwhelmingly male portion of experts, the newspaper industry intrinsically continues to portray the ideal of male superiority. This ultimately permeates into the type of coverage a female politician, such as Hillary Clinton, receives and therefore puts her at a disadvantage during a campaign period when she is running against a male. The findings of this study show that Hillary Clinton was in fact at a disadvantage during her run for the presidency because of consistent gender bias both within in the newspaper industry itself and in the coverage she received.

The findings of this study uphold previous research that found evidence of "the male-centered frame that continues to prevail in the news industry" (Parameswarn 2007: 61) and the "journalistic practice in which more emphasis is placed on the male sphere of influence than the female sphere" (Burke & Mazzarella 2008: 409-10). By consistently giving more coverage to Obama during the course of the campaign, even when Clinton was considered the "frontrunner," Obama was given an advantage in the election simply by receiving more press coverage. By

receiving roughly 10% more coverage, American voters were exposed to more press about Obama than Clinton. By receiving less coverage, Clinton's electability was directly affected in the same way that Kim Fridkin Kahn found in her 1996 study that gender differences in news coverage can negatively impact the electability of women running for political office. The findings of this study also support Raluca Moldovan's findings that gender bias within print media was clearly a detriment to Clinton's viability as a candidate in the 2008 primary (2009).

Based on previous studies documenting journalists' reliance on male sources (Armstrong 2006; Freedman & Fico 2005; Ross 2007), it was expected that the sources quoted within the articles examined would be predominately male. This study confirms that hypothesis. Out of the total number of sources quoted, 324, an overwhelming majority of them were male, 76.2%. While it was expected that there would be underrepresentation of female sources and therefore of female's voice within the press, it was not expected that the discrepancy would be so large as to have females be barely more than 20% of the total number of sources used.

While the percentage of sources was overwhelmingly male, the percentage of male writers was closer to the expected value. While still overwhelmingly male, 63% of the authors, one newspaper did have a higher frequency of female writers than male writers, *USA Today*. *USA Today* was an outlier, with 21 articles being written by females (84%) and 4 being written by males (16%). These findings show that at least one newspaper is moving toward a more level playing field for women, even arguably portraying gender bias toward men because of the significantly large frequency of female writers compared to men. However, by including the *USA Today* statistics that skew the results heavily toward female authors, it makes the overall results become even more significant. Without the inclusion of the *USA Today* authors, the results change dramatically with the total number of authors becoming 94, with only 23 females

and 71 males. The percentages then change to 24.5% female authors and 75.5% male authors for the other three newspapers examined, *The New York Times*, *Washington Post*, and *Minneapolis Times Tribune*. Such figures represent similar gender bias to that of the source calculations.

The largest discrepancy between the genders of authors occurred with articles written specifically about Obama. Out of a total of 36 authors, only 9 (25%) were female, while 27 (75%) were male. Authors for articles specifically about Clinton had slightly more proportional percentages with 37.9% of female authors and 62.1% of male authors. These statistics reinforce the idea of a male dominated frame, not only with a greater number of male writers in general, but also because of the consistency to have men write the articles about the male candidate, Obama, more often than female writers.

Of all the variables tested, one of the most telling results was the type of coverage each candidate received, with Clinton's coverage being 66.7% issue-based and Obama's coverage being 82.9% issue-based. This finding directly supports previous research by Kim Fridkin Kahn (1994) who found that women receive consistently less issue attention than their male counterparts. In Kahn's further research (1996) she also finds that gender differences in news coverage influence people's interpretation of electoral candidates. These two findings by Kahn work together to continue to paint a picture of the relationship between the media and female political candidates. Clinton was at a disadvantage in her campaign due to the fact that she received less issue-based coverage because the voting public was presented with two Democratic primary candidates; Obama, who was often (82.9%) written about in the context of serious issues affecting the country and rarely (14.7%) written about in the context of a personal issue, and Clinton, who received just over half of her overall coverage (66.7%) on hard-issues.

USA Today had some of the most personally based descriptions of Clinton, such as

“One is a former first lady with a name known globally and a Secret Service entourage that goes back two decades. The other is a political phenomenon who until four years ago was an obscure state legislator” (Kiely & Moore 2008). By describing the candidates this way, Clinton is depicted entirely in the context of her husband while Obama is depicted as a rising star in the political world. Another description by *USA Today* stated, “Obama’s success was impressive partly because of the contrast between him and Clinton: a black freshman senator from Illinois with a background as a community organizer and state legislator vs. a former first lady and second-term New York senator married to a charismatic former president” (Lawrence 2007). Again, Obama’s description is based completely on his own achievements while two out of three descriptive phrases of Clinton are about her husband.

The results of testing mentions of appearance and inclusion of personal details were not as telling as was expected, with similar percentages being reached for both candidates. While Diane Bystrom concluded in 2004 that the media continues to stereotype women with regard to mentioning their sex and marital status more often than they do for men, this study’s findings did not add support to that conclusion because mention of marital status was not a variable the articles were coded for. Including such a variable in this particular case would not have been objective, because of the fact that Clinton’s husband is a former president, while Obama’s wife, while well accomplished, is not as nationally known. Therefore, mentions of marital status or mentions of the candidate’s spouse were not included in this study.

Another conclusion made by Bystrom, that by focusing on the appearance of women political candidates, the media treat them less seriously than male candidates, distracting attention from female candidate’s issue positions, was not directly supported by this study due to a low finding of mentions of Clinton’s appearance. However, it is to be reminded that this study

only examined articles following five specific events during the primary. If the study was expanded to include a longer time period, the results may change.

Instances of gendered details, however, were not hard to find. One example from the *New York Times* states, “Campaigns have different ways of dealing with the press, and for the Democrats, the contrast could not be starker heading into Tuesday. Mrs. Clinton often engages in chats with reporters on her campaign plane. On Wednesday, the campaign even served peach cobbler to reporters to flying to her events in Georgia; Mrs. Clinton held the pan while staff members scooped it” (Kantor 2008). The inclusion of Clinton holding a pan of peach cobbler has no bearing on the article other than to reinforce gender stereotypes. Another *New York Times* article states, “While her advisors have said that Mrs. Clinton would never cry on command to win sympathy from voters, they also believe that these moments are effective, and that she needs to start showing “more heart than head” at large rallies” (Healy 2008). It is highly unlikely that such a comment would appear in regard to Obama.

While Obama did actually have more mentions of appearance than Clinton, the comments about Clinton were often to a more sexist degree, such as *USA Today*’s comment, “Their race is close: Each has two major-state victories apiece, while Clinton also won “beauty contests” in Michigan and Florida that awarded no delegates” (Jackson 2008). Such a comment has no purpose other than to perpetuate gender stereotypes. This finding helps to support Kim Fridkin Kahn’s (1996) conclusion that it is the news media, ultimately, that perpetuates gender stereotypes in America.

To test hypothesis six, the overall tone of newspaper articles will favor Barack Obama while acting as a detriment to Hillary Clinton, a subjective method was used. The hypothesis was tested by recording instances of positive or negative words and phrases. Because, however,

there was no definitive system as to what was considered a positive or negative phrase, these results are the least definitive. However, they are still notable due to the large discrepancy in frequencies. If the numbers were within ten percentage points, the statistics may not be conclusive, but due to the fact that the numbers are largely skewed in certain ways, even accounting for possible errors, the overall results would most likely be the same. The most significant finding in language came from a total number of 116 negative words and phrases, 76.7% were directed at Clinton while only 23.3% were directed at Obama.

One such article featuring many negative phrases about Clinton appeared in a *Washington Post* article about her **win** in the New Hampshire Primary. The article opened with, “It was to have been Hillary Rodham Clinton’s political funeral Tuesday night, and her podium stood three feet high in the middle of the room, draped in black cloth like a catafalque.” The remainder of the article included phrases such as, “the unexpected victor” and “stunned aides” (Milbank 2008), reinforcing Erika Falk’s (2008) conclusion that the media portrays females as less viable candidates by conveying the unlikelihood of their success.

Similarly, Obama was the recipient of the majority (59.2%) of the positive words and phrases. A January 8th *Washington Post* article commented on this positivism by stating, “Barack Obama, now the media’s odds-on favorite to win the White House, is drawing effusive praise from the chattering classes” and “The media overall are being swept up by a wave of Obamamania, in which normally hard-bitten journalists watch the orator in action and come away dazzled by his gifts” (Kurtz 2008). *USA Today* added to this positive theme by stating, “Obama, meanwhile, conveyed the confidence of a front-runner campaigning above the fray” (Page & Lawrence 2008).

Another telling factor, though not coded for, was the headlines of articles during the first filing deadline. A *Washington Post* headline read, “Obama’s Campaign Takes in \$25 Million; He Nearly Matches Clinton, With Twice as Many Donors,” a *New York Times* headline stated, “Obama Shows His Strength in a Fund-Raising Feat on Par With Clinton,” and two *USA Today* headlines read, “’08 race smashes money records; Obama’s \$25M close to Clinton” and “Clinton trails Obama in first-quarter collections; FEC reports show Romney has most in bank on GOP side.” What is striking about these headlines is that they all refer to Obama’s apparent triumph in fundraising, while Clinton in fact had raised more funds. A *USA Today* headline even used different figures to compare which candidate had raised more for a specific part of the campaign, to say that Obama had raised *more* than Clinton.

VII. Conclusion

While the findings of this study provide evidence of gender bias within the media, the study itself is not without its shortcomings. While a seemingly large sample of articles were chosen to be examined, 43.9% of the total number of words coded were in articles that fell in the “both” category, that is, articles that were about both Clinton and Obama. Because of this, there was a significantly smaller sample of articles about either candidate specifically and therefore not as many articles to code for whether the article was personal or issue-based. Also, there was a surprisingly low amount of instances of mentions of personal appearance and inclusion of personal details. To overcome both of these issues, it would be beneficial to see the results of this study by using a larger sample size, perhaps using fifteen or twenty events over the course of the primary.

In addition to increasing the size of the study, the other most significant change to the methodology would be standardizing the positive and negative words and phrases. It was

sometimes difficult to determine is a phrase should be quantified as negative personal press or as a negative phrase. It was most often decided based on the context of the phrase and the exact wording used. Standardizing what words would be considered positive or negative, however, would eliminate this uncertainty while coding the articles and would ultimately lead to more verifiable results.

In subsequent research, it would also be interesting to include quotations as language that could be coded. This study did not include the language within quotations, because it was reasoned that the this language was the opinion of the person being quoted and not the newspaper itself and would therefore not be fair to count any gender bias within these quotations as reflecting bias by the actual author of the article. The writer would be reporting something that had been said and as long as the writer himself did not make a gender based comment, it was reasoned that the inclusion of a gender-biased quote should not count against the newspaper. This method worked well in its approach, but it would be interesting to compare this study's findings to the same study's finding including quotations as language able to be coded. While it would not be the author specifically making the gender-biased statement, it is their decision to include the comment, acting as a gatekeeper, and it could therefore provide added insight to gender bias within newspapers.

Overall, however, this study joins a growing body of research that provides evidence of the journalistic practice of gendering news, with women being disadvantaged by such gendered coverage. The findings of this study show how Hillary Clinton was consistently fighting a losing battle with mainstream print media. The negatively shown towards her, even after she won the New Hampshire primary and raised more money than Obama for the first filing deadline, is a telling sign of how the media ultimately played a role in Clinton's loss of the Democratic

presidential nomination. Due to the high finding of personal-based coverage for Clinton compared to Obama, this finding supports previous research that concludes such a finding “has dramatic implications for the electoral process because without critical issue-based coverage, the public has no basis for determining whether female candidates are qualified for office” (Burke & Mazarella 2008: 399).

The strength of this study lies in its design. By choosing articles that coincided with specific events throughout the primary, the articles were in theory supposed to be heavily about that specific issue, as many of them were. By finding that even during these significant events of the primary, many articles about Clinton were personal-based shows an even greater instance of gender bias. Because of the timing of the articles examined, the fact that gender bias was still discovered presents a worrisome conclusion that even when the national newspapers are presenting apparently issue-based news, it is still often gender-biased which can lead readers to take such biased statements as fact. Until the national media, most specifically national circulating newspapers, eliminate their inherent gender bias, both structurally with the genders of their authors and sources and within the language of the articles themselves, females will continue to be unable to break through the glass ceiling of running a successful presidential campaign.

Works Cited

- Armstrong, C. L. "Story Genre Influences Whether Women are Sources." *Newspaper Research Journal*. 2006. 27(3): 66-81.
- Audit Bureau of Circulation. 30 September 2011. <<http://abcas3.accessabc.com/ecirc/newstitlesearchus.asp>>.
- Bacon, Perry. "Obama Tries to Prove Electability to Black in S.C.; Senator Battling Clinton for Support From Demographic That Backed Her Husband." *The Washington Post*. 9 January 2008.
- Borrelli, MaryAnne. "Review of Nichola D. Gutgold 'Almost Madam President: Why Hillary Clinton "Won" in 2008'" *Politics &* (2011). *Gender*, 7, pp 128-131. doi:10.1017/S174 3923X10000656
- Brune, T. "Experts debate whether race a factor in Obama polls?" *Newsday*. 25 October 2008. <<http://www.newsday.com/news/experts-debate-whether-race-a-factor-in-obama-polls-1.885819>>.
- Burke, Cindy. Mazzarella, Sharon. "A Slightly New Shade of Lipstick": Gendered Mediation in Internet News Stories." *Women's Studies in Communication* 31.3 (2008): 397-401.
- Bystrom, Dianne G., Mary Christine Banwart, Lynda Lee Kaid, and Terra A. Robertson. *VideoStyle, WebStyle, NewsStyle: Gender and Candidate Communication*. New York: Routledge. 2004.
- Carpentar, Brown H. "Nast's Cartoons Make a Mark" *Virginian - Pilot* 25. Apr. 1999, ProQuest. Web. 20 Nov. 2011.
- Cost, Jay. "Testing the Bradley Effect." *National Review* 20 Oct. 2008: 24+. *Military & Government Collection*. Web. 14 Nov. 2011.
- Darcy, R., and Sarah Slavin Schramm. "When Women Run Against Men." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 41.1 (1977): 1-12. *Communication & Mass Media Complete*. Web. 13 Nov. 2011.
- Deggans, E. "Race isn't the obvious issue you may think." *St. Petersburg Times*. 19 October 2008. LexisNexis database.
- deVreese, Claes, and Hajo Boomgaarden. "News, Political Knowledge and Participation: The Differential Effects of News Media Exposure on Political Knowledge and Participation." *Acta Politica* 41.4 (2006): 317-41. *Sociological Abstracts*. Web. 13 Nov. 2011.
- Entman, Robert. "Media framing biases and political power: Explaining slant in news of Campaign 2008." *Journalism* [1464-8849] yr:2010 vol:11 iss:4 pg:389 -408.

- Falk, Erika (a). "Cutting women out: The media bias against female candidates." *In These Times*. 25 February 2008. <http://www.inthesetimes.com/article/3539/cutting_women_out/>.
- Falk, Erika (b). *Women for President: Media Bias in Eight Campaigns*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008.
- Farmer, Ann. "The Political Pillorying of Pantsuits: The Media's Gender Bias in the 2008 Presidential Campaign." *Perspectives* Winter 2009 [1062-1083] yr:2009 vol:17 iss:3 pg:4. <http://www.americanbar.org/publications/perspectives_magazine_home/perspectives_magazine_index/women_perspectives_enews_winter09_enews_winter09_mediabias.html>.
- Fitzgerald, T., & Worden, A. "Rendell defends race quote: He said some White voters were not ready to support a Black presidential candidate. Reaction has been mixed." *The Philadelphia Inquirer*. 14 February 2008. LexisNexis database.
- Freedman, E. & F. Fico. "Male and Female Sources in Newspaper Coverage of Male and Female Candidates in Open Races for Governor in 2002." *Mass Communication & Society*. 2005. 8(3): 257-272.
- Friedman, Max Paul. "Simulacrobama: The Mediated Election of 2008." *Journal of American studies* 43.2 (2009): 341,341-356. *International Bibliography of the Social Sciences (IBSS)*. Web. 18 Oct. 2011.
- Gardner, Lori. "Gender Bias as Evidenced on Political Blogs in the 2008 Presidential Election." University of Arkansas at Little Rock, 2010. United States -- Arkansas: *ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT)*. Web. 18 Nov. 2011.
- Gerber, Alan, Dean Karlan, and Daniel Bergan. "Does the Media Matter? A Field Experiment Measuring the Effect of Newspapers on Voting Behavior and Political Opinions." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 1.2 (2009): 35-52. *EconLit*. Web. 13 Nov. 2011.
- Givhan, Robin. "Hillary Clinton's Tentative Dip Into New Neckline Territory." *Washington Post*. 20 July 2007.
- Healy, Patrick. "For Clinton the Speaker, the Smaller the Better." *The New York Times*. 5 February 2008.
- Healy, Patrick & Jeff Zeleny. "Clinton Enters '08 Field, Fueling Race for Money." *The New York Times*. 12 January 2007.
- Jackson, David. "Clinton, Obama Stress Differences from Bush; Democrats Agree on Need for New Path in L.A. Debate." *USA Today*. 1 February 2009.

- Jamieson, Kathleen Hall & Paul Waldman. *The Press Effect: Politicians, Journalists, and Stories That Shape the Political World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Kahn, Kim Fridkin. "Does Being Male Help? An Investigation Of The Effects Of Candidate Gender And Campaign Coverage." *Journal Of Politics* 54.2 (1992): 497. *Business Source Premier*. Web. 11 Nov. 2011.
- Kahn, Kim Fridkin. "The Distorted Mirror: Press Coverage of Women Candidates for Statewide Office." *The Journal of Politics*. Vol. 56, No. 1 (Feb., 1994), pp. 154-173.
- Kahn, Kim Fridkin. *The Political Consequences of Being a Woman*. Columbia University Press: New York. 1996.
- Kantor, Jodi. "The Final two in a Multifront Battle." *The New York Times*. 31 January 2008.
- Kennedy, Robert. "Get Thee Behind Me, (Mrs.) Satan." *The American View*. 2010. <<http://archive.theamericanview.com/index.php?id=302>>.
- Kiely, Kathy & Martha Moore. "Contrasting Styles Serve Top Dems; Clinton Works on Warmth; Obama on Winning Aura." *USA Today*. 5 February 2008.
- Kinnick, Katherine N. "Gender bias in newspaper profiles of 1996 Olympic athletes: A content analysis of five major dailies. " *Women's Studies in Communication* 21.2 (1998): 212-237. Women's Interest Module, ProQuest. Web. 19 Nov. 2011.
- Kurtz, Howard. "Even Conservative Media Chorus Sings Obama's Praises." *The Washington Post*. 8 January 2008.
- Lawless Jennifer L. and Richard L. Fox. *It Takes a Candidate: Why Women Don't Run for Office*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Lawless, Jennifer. "Sexism and Gender Bias in Election 2008: A More Complex Path for Women in Politics." *Politics and gender* 5.1 (2009): 70,70-80. *International Bibliography of the Social Sciences (IBSS)*. Web. 18 Oct. 2011.
- Lawrence, Jill. "Fundraising Shows Dem Race Shaping up as 'Battle of Titans'; Clinton Campaign Congratulates Obama on Success." *USA Today*. 5 April 2007.
- Luce, Edward. "Media accused of bias against Clinton." *Financial Times*. 14 April 2008: *ProQuest Central*; *ProQuest Social Science Journals*. Web. 1 Dec. 2011.
- MacIntyre, B. "The white lie that keeps Obama awake at night." *The Times*. 16 October 2008, p. 25.
- Milbank, Dana. "She Lives." *The Washington Post*. 9 January 2008.

- Moldovan, Raluca. "A Tale of Two Clintons: Media Bias in the Coverage of Hillary Clinton's 2008 Presidential Campaign." *Studia Universitatis Babes-Bolyai.Studia Europaea* 54.2 (2009): 41,41-59. *ProQuest*. Web. 18 Oct. 2011.
- Morrison, P. "The 'Bradley effect' in 2008." *Los Angeles Times*. 2 October 2008. LexisNexis database.
- "MSNBC cleaves to Clinton neckline coverage controversy." *Media Matters for American*. 31 July 2007. < <http://mediamatters.org/research/200708010003>>.
- Nacos, Brigitte. "Clinton's Cleavage." *Media Report to Women*. Winter 2008. 36:1. Proquest.
- Page, Susan & Jill Lawrence. "Amid Calls for Change, the Tension is Building; challenges ahead Could Thin Field." *USA Today*. 7 January 2008.
- Parameswaran, R. "Military Metaphors, Masculine Modes, and Critical Commentary." *Journal of Communication Inquiry*. 42 (1): 22-38.
- Parker, D. "Time to retire 'Bradley effect'" [Editorial]. *The Boston Globe*. 13 August 2008. LexisNexis database.
- Payne. "The Bradley effect: mediated reality of race and politics in the 2008 U.S. presidential election." *American Behavioral Scientist* [0002-7642] yr: 2010 vol:54 iss:4 pg:417-435.
- Peer, Limor, Edward C. Malthouse, and Bobby J. Calder. "Estimating the Effect of News Media Consumption on Political Participation." Paper presented at the 2003 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia, PA, Aug. 27-31 2003.
- Perloff, R. M. *Political Communication: Politics, Press, and Public in America*. Hillsdale, NJ : Lawrence Erlbaum. 1998.
- Pew Internet & American Life Project. "Understanding the Participatory News Consumer: How Internet and Cell Phone Users Have Turned News into a Social Experience." 2010. Web.
- Posetti, Julie. "Clinton's Age." *Media Report to Women*. Winter 2008. 36:1. 20 September 2011. <<http://www.j-scribe.com/2007/12/turning-blind-eye-to-gender-bias.html>>
- Reese, S., Gandy, O. H., Jr., & Grant, A. E. (Eds.) "Framing public life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world." Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. 2001.
- Rivers, Caryl. "Clinton the Candidate." *Media Report to Women*. Winter 2008. 36:1. 20 September 2011. <<http://www.womensenews.org/article.cfm/dyn/aid/3484>>
- Ross, K. "The Journalist, the Housewife, the Citizen and the Press: Women and Men as Sources in Local News Narratives." 2007. *Journalism*. 8(4): 449-473.

- Smith, Aaron. "The Internet's Role in Campaign 2008." *Pew Internet & American Life Project*. 15 April 2009. <<http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1192/internet-politics-campaign-2008>>.
- Sreberny-Mohammadi, Annabelle. Ross, Karen "Women MPs and Media: Representing the body politic." *Parliamentary Affairs*. (1996): 103-15.
- "The Donkey and the Elephant" *The Washington Post*. 2 Nov. 2004. ProQuest Newsstand, Web. 20 Nov. 2011.
- U.S. Census Bureau. "Voting and Registration." October 2011. <<http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/socdemo/voting/publications/p20/2010/tables.html>>.
- Wenger, Debora Halpern, and Susan A. MacManus. "WATCHING HISTORY: TV COVERAGE OF THE 2008 CAMPAIGN." *Journalism Studies* 10.3 (2009): 427-435. *Communication & Mass Media Complete*. EBSCO. Web. 18 Oct. 2011.
- Wood, Daniel B. "Study Finds Gender Bias in Newspaper Stories. " *The Christian Science Monitor*. 11 April 1991. ProQuest. Web. 18 Nov. 2011.
- Zurbriggen, E. L. and Sherman, A. M.. "Race and Gender in the 2008 U.S. Presidential Election: A Content Analysis of Editorial Cartoons." *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*. 2010. 10: 223-24.

Appendix 1



<<http://www.breitbart.tv/2007/07/page/11/>>.

Table 1: Number of Words Given to each Candidate

	<u>Hillary Clinton</u>	<u>Barack Obama</u>	<u>Both</u>
<i>Washington Post</i>	13,672	15,977	12,433
<i>The New York Times</i>	9,003	12,520	13,787
<i>USA Today</i>	3,515	2,267	13,417
<i>Minneapolis Star Tribune</i>	841	2,536	7,606
Total:	27,031 (44.80%)	33,300 (55.20%)	47,243

Table 2: Gender of Author

	<u>Number of Articles</u>	<u>Percentage of Total</u>
<i>Female</i>	44	36.94%
<i>Male</i>	75	63.03%
n=119		

Table 3: Gender of Author by Newspaper

	<u>Female (C)</u>	<u>Male (C)</u>	<u>Female (O)</u>	<u>Male (O)</u>	<u>Female (B)</u>	<u>Male (B)</u>
<i>Washington Post</i>	6	9	4	15	6	10
<i>The New York Times</i>	1	8	2	9	3	8
<i>USA Today</i>	4	0	3	1	14	3
<i>Minneapolis Star Tribune</i>	0	1	0	2	1	9
Total:	11	18	9	27	24	30

n=119

*Where (C) denotes articles written about Hillary Clinton, (O) denoted articles written about Barack Obama, and (B) denotes articles written about both candidates.

Table 4: Gender of Sources Quoted

	<u>Number of Sources</u>	<u>Percentage of Total</u>
<i>Female</i>	77	23.77%
<i>Male</i>	247	76.23%

n=324

Table 5: Issue Versus Personal Based Articles

	<u>Hillary Clinton</u>		<u>Barack Obama</u>		<u>Both</u>
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency
<i>Issue</i>	20	66.67%	29	82.86%	48
<i>Personal</i>	10	33.33%	5	14.71%	3

Clinton: n=30; Obama: n=34

Table 6: Mention of Appearance and Personal Details

	<u>Hillary Clinton</u>		<u>Barack Obama</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
<i>Mention of Appearance</i>	4	3.45%	6	5.17%
<i>Inclusion of Personal Details</i>	26	22.41%	23	19.83%

n=116

Table 7: Type of Negative Press

	<u>Hillary Clinton</u>		<u>Barack Obama</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
<i>Personal</i>	21	18.10%	9	7.76%
<i>Qualification</i>	5	4.31%	7	6.03%

n=116

Table 8: Positive Versus Negative Language

	<u>Hillary Clinton</u>		<u>Barack Obama</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
<i>Positive</i>	49	40.83%	71	59.20%
<i>Negative</i>	89	76.72%	27	23.28%

Positive: n=120; Negative: n=116
