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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The election of women to political office is a relatively new phenomenon in the United States, and few studies have examined the subject compared to other areas of emphasis within political communication. One explanation for this paucity of research is that the public had only elected a handful of women to office until the late 1970s. By 1979, voters elected one woman to the U.S. Senate and sixteen to the U.S. House of Representatives. Also at this time, women were mayors in 735 cities, and 770 women served as state legislators. Subsequent to the 1980 election, 16,136 women won elective offices in the United States (Wadsworth 77-78). Women advanced even further in the 1990 elections as eighty-five females ran for statewide office, and forty-seven were elected. According to the Women's Political Caucus, "Women will continue to run in greater numbers, for higher offices, and more women running means more women winning" (Trent 22). The 1994 election results saw more women win office, as forty-nine women won seats in the House, and eight won seats in the Senate ("Minorities" 10).

Women in the political realm encounter difficulties unique to their sex. Because the number of women in political offices likely will continue its growth in
the future, these difficulties merit further scholarly examination. The problems faced by women politicians are, to some extent, a result of societal differences in perception of women and men. As a result of the pervasiveness of the media in society, the media constructions of candidates, in many cases, become the public perception of candidates. Several explanations exist for the prevalent influence of the media. First, candidates grant the media influence based on their dependency on the media to impart the campaign message. Furthermore, the media outlets (television, newspapers, magazines, radio, etc.) construct stories about candidates that may or may not be congruous with the candidates' desired messages to hear. Third, recognizing the media's ability to construct narratives, candidates often construct their narratives emphasizing the items they believe the media desires. Finally, knowledge of how the media constructs male and female narratives will assist both male and female candidates in the future.

A study of the media's narrative constructions of both female and male candidates would provide insight for future politicians as they shape and plan their approaches to managing their campaigns and establishing narratives that will support their platforms and appeal to voters. Acknowledging possible differences in the media-constructed narratives, female and male candidates alike will have the capability to acknowledge specific components of their narratives that have proven successful while reducing emphasis from those narrative characteristics that are not as effective. Furthermore, as the media
realizes its influence in the construction of political campaign narratives, perhaps its awareness will result in the move towards more balanced coverage of both male and female candidates. As society receives a different view of candidates via the media, societal perceptions of men and women in politics will change. As a result, voters would be less likely to elect candidates based on the media's stereotypical factors related to the differences in media constructions of candidates. Recognizing that candidates make an overt effort to stereotype themselves based on factors such as party affiliation, supporters, sound bites, stump speeches, etc., the candidates are creating their own identities. As media awareness to gender stereotypes is acknowledged, the barriers to women seeking political office will succumb to the capable candidate. Perhaps an emergence of women into politics will transcend all areas in which women are traditionally underrepresented.

Statement of the Purpose

In order to understand the issue encompassing the differences in the media constructions of male and female narratives within political campaigns, the problem area must be conceptualized. Before the research questions can be posed, several terms need to be defined. First, this research uses "narrative" as a genre through which a thematic analysis of the candidates will occur. For the purposes of this study, narrative will be defined as: "An account in prose of an actual or fictional event or a sequence of such events" (Holman 319). The
study of the distinction between the media constructions of male and female narratives in campaigns will seek the answer to four consequential research questions. The first inquiry addresses the following question: Does the media devote more coverage to male or female candidates? Next, does the media endorse male or female candidates more often? Third, are men and women depicted in different settings? And if different sexes are portrayed in different settings, are women portrayed in more traditionally-held feminine roles while men are portrayed in more traditionally-held masculine roles? Finally, are the attitudes expressed by the media more favorable to male and female candidates when they are perceived as adopting traditional sex-typed roles?

Using Fiske's concept of hyperreality, this study seeks to test the hypothesis that the media constructs male and female campaign narratives differently. According to Fiske, a media event is an indication that in a postmodern world we can no longer rely on a stable relationship or clear distinction between a "real" event and its mediated representation. Consequently, we can no longer work with the idea that the "real" is more important, significant, or even "true" than the representation. A media event, then, is not a mere representation of what happened, but it has its own reality. . . . (Fiske 2)

Fiske conceptualizes hyperreality as the implosion of the concepts of reality and representation into a single concept (2). Recognizing that all candidates for
political office engage, to some extent, in the telling of personal narratives, and understanding that media events construct metanarratives resulting in a hyperreality, an investigation into the construction of their stories by the media may bring greater insight into the American political process. Thus, an understanding of the differences between the media-constructed narratives of male and female candidates in campaigns can be vitally important to winning a political race.

Significance of the Study

As the American media acknowledges its bias concerning women and builds a more level campaigning arena for female candidates, the public perception of women politicians may change. As women increasingly are seen as viable candidates by the public, more women may feel empowered to seek political office. If women are to win elections, they must understand the function of hyperreality created by the media within the implementation of their campaign tactics. By revealing unconscious media bias related to female candidates, the media can take a more objective approach to their news reports. As a result of a more unbiased view of the capabilities of female candidates, women in all fields would be viewed more favorably in time. Furthermore, until the media begins to depict women and men equally, this study could assist women running against male incumbents as well as female incumbents with male opponents to understand how the media constructs a hyperreality that voters view as reality.
Not only will candidates seeking office benefit from this study of campaign narratives, but American society as a whole will also profit as voters elect more women representatives into the Senate and House. As the number of women holding political offices continues its rate of growth, the public's perception of women will continue to evolve. Perhaps many of the current gender stereotypes which allocate women to the private realm and men to the public sphere will eventually dwindle. Once the barriers no longer exist, society will more readily accept women into the world of politics, and the types of narratives told by both women and men will begin to bear some resemblance.

This study will benefit rhetorical theory by deepening the understanding of rhetorical phenomena. In regard to the media construction of a hyperreality, more research questions may be raised.

Scope of the Study

Because a study of the contrasting narratives of male and female candidates is rather broad, the topic must be limited. The first research restriction deals with those political candidates who will be the focus of investigation. The campaign races between a male and female candidate from the 1994 election will be the sole focus for this research endeavor. Only the races involving candidates seeking U.S. senate or congressional offices will be studied. Local, other state legislators, and appointed officials will not be included in this analysis since they often generate less newspaper coverage. As
a result, it is difficult to obtain a consistent reporting of the media constructions of candidate narratives.

Furthermore, primary elections within parties will not be addressed. In order to narrow the study, candidates from the South will be studied for this research endeavor; however, no distinctions will be made between other regions of the country. The study will be limited further by selecting for analysis the three races with the most media coverage.

Review of Literature

The media construction of narratives is a relatively new area since the increase in the media's influence has broadened its influence with the growing technologies available. The differences in the media constructions of male and female candidates is also a recent addition since women as political candidates in the United States have developed only in the past thirty years as a significant research area since more women than ever before were elected during this period. In order to study the media constructions of the narratives of male and female candidates in congressional campaigns during the 1994 election, a basic understanding must be established, through a review of literature, in order to acknowledge the status quo in the political realm. The criteria for determining the inclusion of studies were based on the appropriate representative benchmark studies primarily from the 1970s to the 1990s. After reviewing the
literature of campaign advertisement narratives, characteristics of female candidates as well as gender language differences will be assessed.

Campaign Advertisement Narratives

In order to review the literature in the area of campaign advertisement narratives, several areas must be analyzed. Candidate qualities, of both males and females, will first be assessed. Next, candidate references to demographic groups will occur. Following a discussion of the typical narrative settings, the issue of campaign financing will be determined. Among those qualities which voters value in candidates are: leadership, honesty, concern, responsiveness, strength, determination, perseverance, vigor, and purpose (Joslyn 94; Benze 283). Women are often seen as deficient in toughness and competence (Benze 283; Wadsworth 79); as a result, female candidates stress compassion and warmth twice as often as men (Benze 283). When women attempt to show aggression and toughness, voter expectations are often violated (Wadsworth 79). Male candidates, however, stress toughness three times more than female candidates (Benze 283; Trent 22). As women advanced into politics in the 1990s, Kern and Edley determined in their study of the 30-second advertisement format that women can succeed in politics showing strength and toughness without compromising femininity (Kern 92; Wadsworth 91). The public/private paradigm forces women to communicate both masculine and feminine qualities and policy issues. While the 30-second format does not allow women or men to
fully construct campaign narratives, women are at a bigger disadvantage since they must include masculine and feminine qualities (Kern 93).

Group-related information has been identified in campaign strategies of both male and female candidates. Demographic groups such as workers, farmers, the elderly, and the young are most commonly recognized (Joslyn 94). Congressional candidates refer to groups one-third of the time (Benze 283).

Kaid, et al., studied the settings candidates used for their narratives in order to identify with groups. Female candidates were rated higher by voters in hard hat, grocery store, and man-on-the-street settings, while male candidates outperformed women in an educational setting (Kaid 44-8). Up-from-the-bootstraps and traditional family settings are effective for men (Kern 84). Family settings fared poorer than career settings for female candidates (Wadsworth 87). While these studies provide insight into the campaign narratives of both female and male candidates, no studies have specifically analyzed the differences in the narratives that candidates tell about themselves.

In any study of candidates, researchers must be familiar with the campaigns that the candidates design for themselves since these are often the basis from which the media constructs the narratives of each candidate.

Female Candidates

With the onset of the women's movement, researchers began studying female political candidates. When discussing female candidates, one must
Understand two key issues: prejudicial concerns and the aggressive, masculine nature of politics.

While some scholars believe that women are stereotypically banished from the "man's activity" of politics (Hedlund 515), other researchers acknowledge stereotypes against women in politics but deny that these stereotypes prevent voters from electing women into office (Burrell, “The Political Opportunity of Women Candidates for the U.S. House of Representatives in 1984” 66; Ekstrand 78-82; Hedlund 519-20). One of the reasons more women have not been elected into nontraditional political roles is that women, more than men, run in elections with little hope of winning (Burrell, “The Political Opportunity of Women Candidates for the U.S. House of Representatives in 1984” 66; Ambrosius 40; Gertzog 457). Even though more women are running for office, similar numbers are elected. The current political structure makes it difficult for women to win. Many of these election campaigns are hopeless because women are more likely to challenge incumbents (Burrell, “The Political Opportunity of Women Candidates for the U.S. House of Representatives in 1984” 66; Carroll 1242; Ambrosius 29; Gertzog 458).

Due to the aggressive and dominant nature of politics, some persons believe that women do not belong; however, research results indicate that women politicians have ambition levels equal to men (Carroll 1242; Constantini 225). Perhaps women are often even more ambitious since women candidates work more diligently than men to collect campaign funds. Furthermore, women
frequently collect more for primary campaigns than men (Ingalls 87-8).


Since women have become political contenders within the past thirty years, a review of literature based on the unique characteristics of female candidates is important to develop an understanding of the unique problems women face in elections.

Gender Language Differences

Language differences between men and women have been studied extensively for decades. For the purpose of this paper, however, only the more recent studies are pertinent. After reviewing some of the identifiable language differences and myths, the literature of the major studies in the twentieth century will be assessed.

According to Mulac and Lundell's study of language differences between males and females, the aesthetic quality is significantly higher for women, while male speakers were generally rated higher on dynamism ("Differences in Perceptions Created by Syntactic-Semantic Productions of Male and Female Speakers" 117). When labeling self communication strengths, men credit themselves with preciseness while women report a more animated style (Montgomery 131). Staley added impression leaving, open, and attentive to

Early in the twentieth century, Jespersen (1922) believed that women’s language is deficient in comparison to men’s in its limited vocabulary, inventive phrases, exaggeration, and fragmented sentences (Jespersen 245-50). As the women’s movement emerged, a new deficient language position, suggested by Lakoff (1975), implied that cultural biases refuse women the capability of complete expression (7). Spender criticized Lakoff’s assumptions that women should be evaluated against the male norm (8). The code-switching position on language suggests that women adjust language style to fit a situation (Johnson 136); however, Johnson identifies problems in code-switching since it stereotypes based on sex roles (138). While many studies depict stereotyping as problematic for women speakers, Zahn believes that stereotypes in rating speakers has diminished due to awareness (71).

Because it is likely that language differences lead to the differences in the ways the media constructs the narratives of male and female candidates, it is vital to be familiar with studies in the language differences among genders.
Methodology

In studying narrative constructions of male and female candidates by the media, the first decision regarded selecting the election year from which the races would be gathered. Because the narrative constructions continually evolved with the progression of the political season, studying the most recent election was vital to the study. Since the 1996 election was in progress at the onset of this study, gathering a complete set of data would not have been possible. Therefore, the 1994 election was selected as the most recent completed election for which to analyze the media-constructed narratives of men and women.

Next, the time period of the study had to be selected. The November election provided a logical cessation for the span of the study; however, the time of origination for the study had to be decided. Because the primaries involved communication within the individual political parties, additional factors beyond the parameters of this study would have arisen. The study began upon completion of the last primary election. Thus, a four-month window was assessed beginning in July and culminating on November 7, 1994, one day prior to the election.

The next decision was to limit the study to the South. For the sake of this study, the South was defined as the eleven states of the original Confederacy which includes Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. While regional
communication and reporting differences may not be as significant as in other periods of history due to factors such as technological advancement and the transient nature of modern society, regional characteristics are still likely to impact the media constructions of campaign narratives. In order to concentrate specifically on the differences between the narrative constructions of male and female campaigns by the media to avoid discussions of regional variations, this study focused on the South. Although any other region of the country could have been selected, size limitations of this study necessitated an arbitrary region selection.

In order to select the election races, a comprehensive list of election results was obtained. Only the two main parties in the United States were analyzed since they received the majority of the votes in most cases and because other parties did not receive comparable media attention by which to analyze their media constructions. All races in which two men or two women competed against one another were eliminated since only races between a male and a female were the focus of this study. Fifteen races in the South involved a male versus a female candidate, each with either Republican or Democratic party affiliations. Five states, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee, did not have any congressional races between a male and a female candidate. All of the 1994 congressional races involving a male versus a female candidate are presented in Table 1. The original intent of the study was to select the three races with the most media coverage. However, for reasons to
be discussed in the following paragraph, only two of the fifteen races were studied. These races include: (1.) Leslie Byrne versus Thomas M. Davis, III (District 11, Virginia), and (2.) Karen L. Thurman versus “Big Daddy” Don Garlits (District 5, Florida).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Female Candidate</th>
<th>Male Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Blanche Lambert</td>
<td>Warren Dupwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berta L. Seitz</td>
<td>Tim Hutchinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Carole Griffin</td>
<td>Pete Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrine Brown</td>
<td>Marc Little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karen L. Thurman</td>
<td>“Big Daddy” Don Garlits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sue Munsey</td>
<td>Dave Weldon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beverly “Bev” Kennedy</td>
<td>Peter Deutsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Cynthia A. McKinney</td>
<td>Woodrow Lovett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Eva Clayton</td>
<td>Ted Tyler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sue Myrick</td>
<td>Rory Blake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maggie Palmer Lauterer</td>
<td>Charles H. Taylor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
South Carolina | none | none
Tennessee | none | none
Texas | Donna Peterson | Charles Wilson
 | Sheila Jackson-Lee | Jerry Burley
Virginia | Mary Sinclair | Herbert H. Bateman
 | Leslie Byrne | Thomas M. Davis, III


The next decision involved the medium through which the media-constructed narratives of these four candidates would be studied. After discussing the topic of study with the head librarian of the government documents department of the University of North Texas Willis Library, it was determined that newspapers would be the most accessible media to analyze. Video would be difficult to obtain, especially for some of the more obscure candidates; however, all of the candidates would be the topic of articles in the newspapers of their regions during the campaigning season. The newspaper articles used for this study were obtained from a Nexis search within the confines of the four month period prior to the election (July 1 through November 7). A significant number of articles were identified in the Nexis search for only two of the fifteen races (Byrne versus Davis and Thurman versus Garlits). The remaining thirteen races did not generate adequate coverage (fewer than four
articles) to contribute to this study. For this reason, only four candidates were analyzed instead of the intended six. All articles were assessed for the four candidates in the two races with the most newspaper coverage. Press releases by a candidate's staff and transcripts of speeches were not studied. Press releases and transcripts are mediated constructions that are narratives constructed by the candidate, or his/her staff, rather than by the newspaper reporter. However, all other articles mentioning a candidate were assessed since the coverage contributed to the hyperreality constructed by the media.

The newspaper articles were subjected to a content analysis to answer the research questions. In order to determine whether more media coverage is devoted to male or female candidates, the word count of each article was determined first. If both candidates were the subject of an article, only those references to each candidate were used in the measurement of media coverage; and, if a candidate was mentioned in the context of an article which was primarily about another subject, only the reference(s) to the candidate contributed to the assessment of whether male or female candidates receive more media coverage during campaigns. When a candidate referenced his/her opponent, the candidate who was speaking received credit for the words since his/her voice was acknowledged by the journalists. After the word counts were determined, the following question was posed: Do male or female candidates receive more headline coverage?
The second research question was answered by noting the candidate endorsements by each newspaper. If a particular newspaper did not endorse either candidate, that was noted as well. Then, all of the endorsements for male candidates were added and compared to the total number of endorsements for female candidates.

As the newspaper articles were examined, the settings in which the media portrayed candidates were noted in the format of a table. Then, a judgment was made, based on past studies that have identified masculine and feminine settings for candidates, as to whether the setting was traditionally masculine or feminine. If the setting was neither masculine or feminine, it was coded as a "gender neutral" setting. After each setting was labeled, totals were derived for the number of female candidates, and then for the number of male candidates, pictured in masculine, feminine, and neutral settings. Then, the results for the female and male candidates were compared.

Finally, the reporter's attitude toward each candidate mentioned in his/her article was described, and the conclusions about the attitude were entered into a table. When a reporter's attitude could not be identified, an entry of "unidentifiable" was noted. After an evaluation of each reporter's attitude, a judgment was formed of whether or not the reporter's attitude corresponded to his/her perception of each candidate's adoption of traditional sex roles. This perception was based on each reporter's depiction of candidates in specific
settings. Then, the sex of each reporter was compared to his/her attitude about the candidate(s).

Conclusion

This chapter has proposed a foundation for the study of mediated candidate narratives through statement of the purpose, significance, scope, review of pertinent literature, and methodology. The next chapter will provide a deep background into the history of the media, the manner in which the media constructs a hyperreality, and the history of the media in politics including the disparate depiction of male and female political candidates. Chapter three will analyze the newspaper articles for the six candidates selected. The final chapter will summarize the findings of the content analysis, present conclusions of the analysis, answer the questions posed, and submit recommendations for future research in the area of the differences in the media constructions of male and female campaign narratives.
CHAPTER II

HISTORY OF THE MEDIA AND POLITICS IN
CONSTRUCTING HYPERREALITY

Introduction

Having introduced the topic and defined the research questions, an historical perspective of the media can be examined in more depth. This chronicle of the media will establish a necessary foundation for the content analysis in the subsequent chapter. This historical viewpoint will begin with a brief history of the media that will primarily focus on the newspaper industry since newspapers are the focus of this study. Next, the media's role in constructing hyperreality will be discussed. Finally, the media's role in the political process will conclude this chapter.

History of the Media

Before an historical perspective of the media can be discussed, a definition of the media must be established. In order to begin, the purpose of the media will be assessed. The media generates information for circulation to audiences, including a wide range of forms, which is constantly changing due to technological advances such as audio and visual recordings, books, radio,
television, magazines, newspapers, films, theater productions, and computer communications (Anderson 51). In addition, media relies upon mass communication to transmit its messages to the public. "Mass communication is the industrialized production, reproduction, and multiple distribution of messages through technological devices" (Turow 10).

In order to begin assessing the history of the media, the early forms of the media must be studied. One of the first forms of mass media was the newspaper. Historically, newspapers have served a twofold purpose: information purveyor for merchants and a means for political protesters to dissent. As a result of the potential power of political unrest that newspaper had on society, the newspaper developed slowly in English and British colonial America. William Caxton established the first press in England in 1476; however, almost two hundred years passed before a newspaper was printed regularly within English borders. One reason England did not establish a permanent newspaper was because it was not a mercantile power (Turow 53-4). Another reason was the "British Crown's fear of dissent and desire to fully control all printing" (54). In 1509, King Henry VIII censored books and developed a licensing system which only allowed those with written permission from the Crown to operate a printing press. His successor, Queen Mary Tudor, instituted the Stationers Company, who were the elite printers who served as the printing police. The Stationers Company regulated what material was printed and who printed it. As England began to develop as one of the great trading
nations, more communication became necessary in order to inform the merchant class about work conditions outside of England. At this time, governance changed from the Protestant Tudors to the Catholic Stuarts. As a result of political and religious arguments, the empire deteriorated (54).

With the deterioration of the monarchy, British aristocracy began to question the extent to which the press should be allowed to publicly reflect disputes. . . . The idea that truth would always win out in a printed debate became the rallying cry behind those in England and America who wanted press freedoms. Among the British, it contributed directly to the establishment of the first English Bill of Rights in the 1680s, which endorsed free expression for members of Parliament. in the American colonies, it lay behind the glorification of a press system that was not only free from government control but was also free to attack the government. (Turow 54-5)

Freedom of the press occurred slowly throughout the eighteenth century even in the United States. Newspapers like the Boston Newsletter continued to include the phrase, "by authority of the Crown," even after it was no longer required due to political and social pressures (55). Nonetheless, a few printers were bold enough to defy the status quo, and their deviance led to eventual changes in the system.
One of the renegades was James Franklin, a printer and publisher of the New England Courant. In the 1720s, Franklin, Benjamin Franklin's brother, printed articles criticizing Cotton and Increase Mather’s guidance during an outbreak of smallpox in Boston. Even though Franklin was jailed and then banished from the city, he managed to print a poignant defense of his behavior. Another ally of press freedoms, Andrew Hamilton, convinced a jury that his client, Peter Zenger, a newspaper reporter who was charged with seditious libel in 1735, was not guilty. The rationale for Zenger’s innocence was that he was exposing the truth which is a noble task (Turow 55). The actions of Franklin and Hamilton, and other crusaders like them, eventually led to the press freedoms that American citizens enjoy today.

During this time period, newspapers were considered equivalent to an individual voice, and the support of freedom of the press was perceived as a logical extension of the overall protection of free speech. As long as most newspaper owners possessed only one paper and the costs of joining the industry were relatively inexpensive, this view of newspapers as individual voices is feasible. However, technological advances in newspaper production throughout the century increased costs which limited admission to major newspaper markets and drove smaller papers out of business. In the meantime, the larger papers with the most resources expanded their productions.

By the beginning of this century the age of chain ownership and the press barons had arrived, prompting liberal democratic
commentators to acknowledge a growing contradiction between the idealized role of the press as a key resource for citizenship and its economic base in private ownership. (Murdock 91)

As a result of the changes in ownership, newspapers can no longer be compared with the individual voice.

As new media forms become popular, the newspaper faces obstacles brought about by competition. The new electronic media has forced the newspaper industry to reevaluate its production. Major city newspapers are witnessing a drop among younger sections of the population in reading newspapers. As a result, new newspaper formats and delivery methods have been discussed and tried in order to appeal to the television generation (Turow 2). With the emergence of information through the internet, newspapers will continue to face unique challenges as they compete with the computer age.

Television was the first electronic media form to pose a serious threat to the newspaper industry. In the 1950s, the introduction of the television into most American homes changed the form of news to which most individuals turned. Television replaced newspaper as the number one news source. As a result, television provided a new means by which candidates could disseminate their persuasive messages. Even though television reaches a larger audience, newspapers may offer more coverage than television (Just 89-90). Newspapers vary from television reporting in providing significantly less space to stories discussing the campaign trail than to reports initiated by journalists, especially
news analysis. This is another instance of a separation of media labor. One reason for this division is that newspapers cannot provide immediate attention to breaking stories, so they use their detachment from the occurrence to stress interpretation instead of description. As a result, voters receive varied resources through television and newspapers. While television offers an immediate view of the electoral process as it develops, newspapers impart additional dissection and interpretation of the incidents (99).

The Media's Role in Constructing Hyperreality

Now that a brief history of the media has been provided, the narrative form by which the media conveys the world's happenings can be explored. The media communicates its information in narrative form. These narratives recreate an individual's

moment by moment experience into events, punctuated by the

concepts of motive, intent, purpose, and cause; goals, outcomes, consequences, and rewards; attitudes, values, morals, and judgments; agents and receivers; perpetrators and victims—in short, all of the notions that create events and connect them over time. (Anderson 100)

According to Anderson, the story is of greater significance than its mediated structure (101). However, this author believes that the mediated form of the story is what becomes the actualized narrative for many individuals. As a result,
the media's version becomes the public's truth. The media's audience is not aware of the original happenings, or the primary story, so it relies upon the media's version as the absolute truth in its own existence. According to Hartley,

The social function of journalism has at this general structural level nothing to do with the reality or truth of pre-discursive events in themselves, but with the diegetic world imagined inside reporting; a world verified by constant and militant reference to the real, to be sure, but one in which the real is secondary to the vision, for it is the visualization of order/disorder that is authenticated by reference to actuality, not vice versa. Journalism, in short, makes sense by inventing the real in the image of vision. . . . This characterization of journalism as a social discourse of disciplinary vision leads to the parallel but contrary observation that truth, as that which exists in fact, has already been toppled from its pedestal; journalism seeks verification in that which can be seen, but it needs to be understood that what is being verified in such moves is not the truth of factual existence but the plausibility of the discursive vision. . . . The "reality," whether it be a person, an event (behavior) or a document, does not mean what is says, at least for the viewer of news. It means: You can see with your own eyes that I symbolize reality, because seeing is believing; but what the viewer actually sees is the journalist and his or her account,
anchored to reality by visual evidence, which however is not
evidence for viewers to read directly (iconically), but to use as
verisimilitude (the simulation of truth). (141-42)

Much like the United States’ monetary system, the media pervade
American society. While it is possible for an individual to survive without the
media and the monetary system, it would take enormous effort since it is not
natural within modern society. It would be a remarkable occurrence for someone
in the contemporary United States to deliberately evade contact with television,
radio, and/or newspapers, just as it would be for that same individual to refuse to
use cash, checks, or credit cards (Anderson 133-4). “The point is not that we
have to participate in the media. The point is that it is expected that we will have
participated in the media. The media are there for us as a currency of social
exchange” (134). Because each individual has no other choice but to participate
in the messages of the media, all of its forms have a pervasive influence on the
entire population. Therefore, the media’s power must be assessed in order to
determine if its effects are merely innocent reports of the truth or harmful
manipulations of the truth with the capability of influencing all areas of human
existence. Most likely, the effects of media lie on a continuum somewhere in
between these two extremes.

One theory of the media is that it sets the agenda for discussion in
societies. The media configures the overwhelming current of information by
practicing professional news values in order to determine what stories will be
relayed to the public. As a result, the media serves as the agenda-setting agent since newspapers, television, and news magazines direct public attention on a few topics and exclude others (McCombs 281-82). The agenda-setting effect is dependent upon how reporters and editors opt to structure issues. In 1977, Shaw and McCombs discovered distinctive agenda-setting effects in regard to crime. In instances when crime was framed as a social dilemma, effects were stronger than when the news reports were portrayed as conventional crime stories. In regard to politics, Williams, Shapiro, and Cutbirth (1983) revealed greater agenda-setting effects when issues were presented as elements of an electoral campaign rather than without this critical structure (McCombs 289).

In the context of media, journalists play a powerful role in the constructions of narratives. According to Ericson, et al.,

In effect, journalists join with other agents of control as a kind of “deviance-defining élite,” using the news media to provide an ongoing articulation of the proper bounds to behavior in all organized spheres of life. Moreover, journalists do not merely reflect others’ efforts to designate deviance and effect control, but are actively involved themselves as social-control agents. . . . In sum, journalists are central agents in the reproduction of order. (Hartley 141)
History of Media in Politics

Now that a foundation has been established for the history of the media, the intersection of the media and politics can be explored. Since a general outlook has been determined of the mediated constructions of hyperreality, a more specific analysis of the media's impact in the political world can be assessed. Candidates realize that they are unable to completely direct media coverage of campaigns; however, campaign managers make every effort to form a favorable impression of the candidate so as to guarantee that the image is expressed in a consistent manner throughout the campaign. If a candidate is portrayed favorably, the candidate's consistency is emphasized by media coverage (Jamieson 229).

According to King and Schudson, Reagan was labeled the Great Communicator in the media as a result of his ability to communicate with the media. Contrary to popular belief, Reagan did not exemplify special communication skills in his addresses to the American people. While the media concluded that Reagan was an exceptional public communicator, no indication exists that the public echoed the media's conclusions in the first two years of his presidency, the time frame in which the media formulated its conclusions. On the contrary,

Reagan's honeymoon in the polls was less intense than with previous presidents; his rating on personal likeability was high but no higher than for previous presidents; and the percentage of
people disapproving his policies (rather than having no opinion) was much higher than for his predecessors. (King 148-49)

If it had not been for the media's framing of the President, Reagan might not have received recognition as one of the greatest public communicators in political history.

News reports, as in the instance of Reagan mentioned, activate the creation of political presentations. As a result, the reporters and editors involved have a motive to contour the political spectacle in a way that will magnetize audiences and to advocate desired interpretations through content and form. News accounts concoct "pseudoevents," which are "hyperreal" events which initiate specific beliefs. "A closely related tactic is the depiction of events to evoke assumptions about the past, the future, and agents who bring about good or evil outcomes" (Edelman 90). These staged events can often facilitate the election of candidates who were not likely to win without the cooperative framing by the media (Jamieson 233).

For example, Robert Graham, elected governor of Florida in 1978, was just an unknown state legislator three years prior. Even his media consultant, Bob Squier, said that Graham had only three percent name recognition and zero percent of the vote in a small opinion poll. By working beside and for his constituents as a police officer, a worker in a steel mill, a teacher in an inner-city school, etc., he was able to overcome his obscurity and win the governorship (Jamieson 234). As in the instance of Graham's campaign, media events are
often planned by campaign managers or consultants for the media, television
and newspaper reporters, in order to provide a positive picture that will stay in
the minds of the viewers and/or readers (Hiebert 193).

While political candidates have minimal control in framing their
campaigns in a favorable manner so the media will report them, the candidates
do not have complete control. The media judge the materials that merit reporting
(Edelman 91).

There is, in short, a stylized view of what constitutes news: a view
that insures the dissemination of many items that have little
bearing on future developments or on the quality of life and that
preclude dissemination of other stories that have a vital bearing on
both. (91)

As individuals watch political occurrences on the news, they are experiencing
language about those events instead of the actual episodes. As a result, the
political language becomes the political reality for these viewers of news
programming (104).

As they report political campaigns, the media tend to view and portray
political campaigns as competitions which are often reported in battle or athletic
metaphors. If the campaign process is depicted as a contest, it has opposing
sides, regulations, and a goal. Sports metaphors allow reporters to relate
graphically the
stages of the process (early primaries are the first innings or the first quarter), the intensity of the struggle (two outs in the ninth with the runner at bat, third down in the last quarter), the stakes (the Superbowl Tuesday, the World Series), and the outcome (touchdown, home run). (Jamieson 241)

Individuals running for political office must surpass the newsworthiness test and the idiosyncrasies of the reporters and editors who control the media if they are to receive media attention (Hiebert 193).

Other scholars have studied media effects on politics. Because the Lazarsfeld (1944) study, the first important study in voting, did not find that the media persuasively affected voters, subsequent researchers did not regard the news media as a significant research field (Just 89). Even in 1976, Hofstetter’s study reported comparable coverage across the networks and recognized diminutive proof of “political bias;” however, he did detect “structural bias” in the amount of coverage of the events and the horse race rather than the issues involved. Patterson’s study of the 1976 campaign suggested that the public’s acceptance level of the media coverage is advanced by the congruity of the coverage by varied news outlets (Just 91). A few years later in 1983, Jamieson’s study reported a shift in the influence of the media on voters. According to Jamieson, voters claim that their voting decisions are affected by the news media (newspapers, television, radio, etc.) more than by their perceptions from commercials which are initiated by the candidates (237).
Regardless of the reasons for the shift from the 1940s to the present time in the effects of the media on voters, additional studies are necessary in order to determine the media’s role in constructing the narratives of political candidates.

The study by Just et al., of the media coverage in the 1992 Presidential campaign deals with four areas of analysis: access, quality, candidate advertisement, and news consensus. The study evaluates the media by analyzing network news, local news, and local newspapers in Los Angeles, Boston, Winston-Salem, and Moorhead (89). The pattern of coverage of the candidates is comparable on network and local news as well as in newspapers since each of these types of media put emphasis, from highest to lowest, on: (1.) personal characteristics of the candidates, (2.) odds for election, (3.) stance on issues, and (4.) campaign details such as finance and staffing (101). The incumbent receives a majority of the media attention and is generally depicted as distinguished and reputable (101).

While proof exists that the media constructs the stories of politicians, does the media have a history of depicting women politicians different from men politicians? Women politicians and advocates of political women often detect a prejudice in the positioning of articles regarding women elected officials. They contend that one of the means by which the media regards women less earnestly than it regards men is by strategically positioning articles about female politicians in the Style or women’s section of newspapers instead of relegating them to the front section, with the articles about male politicians, where they
belong. By placing articles about women politicians in these sections, the media sends the message that the accounts of women in Congress are not newsworthy, and the allocation of stories to the style section may institute the ideology that women's legislative conduct is not as significant as their clothing they wear or vegetables they feed their families (Carroll 136-7).

A notable proportion of articles—14 percent of all articles on women in Congress (N=291) and 10 percent of those articles with significant content on women in Congress (N=201)—were published in the style sections of major newspapers. Nevertheless, the majority of the stories—54 percent of all articles and 60 percent of those with significant content on women in Congress—made their way into the front or national news section, suggesting that women in Congress more often than not are being taken seriously as national news and policy makers. (Carroll 137)

Twenty-five percent of the articles published in the Washington Post, a major newspaper in the United States, that had substantial coverage of women in Congress were placed in the style section. This statistic is greater than double the average for all major newspapers (137).

Another persistent complaint expressed by female politicians is that the media concentrates its attention on the unfavorable. In other words, the media emphasizes problems that female politicians encounter rather than their successes. One of the most recognized instances of sexism was a remark made
by Representative Henry Hyde on his 1993 appearance of the television program, *Firing Line*, in which he commented that "there are some who say there are so many women now on the floor of Congress, it looks like a mall" (Carroll 138). Episodes such as this about condescending language from male associates and examples of women representatives being confused for staffers are frequent. An exemplary story, with the concept of juggling the duties of family and career, was a long article that appeared on the front page of the *New York Times* with the following headline: "Even Women at Top Still Have Floors to Do" (*New York Times*, 31 May 1993). Constituents also learned other interesting facts about women in Congress through reading this article. For example, Senator Dianne Feinstein picks up her husband's bath towels that he declines to hang up, and Congresswoman Lucille Roybal-Allard enjoys collecting recipes (138-9).

In their study, Kahn and Goldberg examined gender differences in U.S. Senate campaign coverage. They acknowledge the common justifications for a lack of women in politics (women seldom pursue political careers, women have insufficient political resources, women enter races in which they could not possibly win, and voters stereotype women based on their sex), and they added another explanation: the media can influence the information that voters learn about candidates and guide the criteria used to assess the candidates (181). If the media depends upon certain generalizations when reporting on men and women candidates, and if this dependency results in distinctions in their
reporting of the candidates, then media accounts of these candidates can result in significant effects for voter information and candidate choice. As a result of reporting men and women candidates differently, the media may obstruct a woman's contingency of success within the political realm. In order to study the differences in coverage, Kahn and Goldberg analyzed the quantity and substance of coverage in a content analysis of newspaper coverage of twenty-six U.S. Senate races in 1984 and 1986 (181). Reporters and editors have a newsworthiness standard that they must meet in order to publish a story. Women running for the U.S. Senate often meet this criteria since few women run in these races. Other distinctions in coverage may surface if the reporters' and editors' sex stereotypes interfere with coverage. As a result, both quantity and quality of coverage may be impacted (184).

In their assessment of quantity of coverage, Kahn and Goldberg discovered that the media devoted more coverage to races between male candidates than to races which included women. A total of 38.4 paragraphs per day were dedicated to races involving only men, and 29.6 paragraphs were written about races that contained female candidates. As a result of the disparate coverage of men and women candidates, the media makes it more difficult for voters to obtain information about female candidates (185-86).

In their evaluation of the substance of coverage, Kahn and Goldberg detected that horserace coverage is more extensive for women seeking office in the Senate. Of all the articles written about male candidates, 21% analyze the
horserace, and 27% of the articles written about female candidates analyze the horserace.

Because the emphasis on the horserace aspects of campaigns is consistently greater for female Senate candidates, voters who are exposed to this information may become more concerned with the viability of female candidates. This could lead to more negative evaluations of female candidates if the horserace information about female candidates is negative. (188)

The media depicts female candidates with more negative viability than male candidates. While the male candidates are portrayed as competitive (3.1), the female candidates are seen as less competitive (2.5). Even female incumbents are perceived more negatively than male candidates. In spite of the evidence presented in the first chapter which indicates that women are not inferior fund raisers, the media focuses on a lack of campaign resources more often for female candidates (10% of the articles) than for male candidates (5% of the articles) (189-90).

The media covers issues more often for men (more than 3.5 paragraphs each day) than for women (less than 3.0 paragraphs per day) (Kahn 191). “Male” issues (foreign policy, defense, economics, and agriculture), those in which men are thought to be more competent, are covered more often than “female” issues (minority rights, environment, abortion, school prayer, drugs, and discussions of social programs), those in which women are thought to be more
competent. Determining, however, if different topics in the media mirror dissimilar emphases by candidates or dissimilar news choice decision by those who edit and report the news is a difficult task. Data suggest that women in the media are more likely to report on the campaigns involving women candidates. More significantly, women report on campaigns involving both men and women candidates, but men report on these races only 30% of the time. In addition, women reporters are more prone to communicate “female” issues more often than men reporters in their coverage of mixed-gender races (35% v. 28%). Furthermore, this disparity in emphasis of issues is most noticeable in the coverage of women candidates. When reporting on female candidates, women reporters dedicate 42% of their issue coverage to “female” issues, and men reporters only devote 19% of their time to “female” issues (192-93).

The substance of trait coverage was different for male and female candidates.

“Male” traits are those traits that are consistently associated with men (e.g., independent, objective, competitive, strong leader, insensitive, aggressive, unemotional, ambitious, and tough) while “female” traits are linked with women (e.g., dependent, noncompetitive, passive, gentle, emotional, weak leader, and compassionate). (Kahn 194-5)

The media discusses “male” traits more often when covering political campaigns; however, when “female” traits were covered, they were used more often to
describe female candidates than male candidates. When the media's trait
coverage of male and female candidates is dissimilar, the public is likely to
accept the different assessments of the candidates (195).

The inadequate portrayal of female politicians, which includes gender
stereotypes, may indicate symbolically the status of American women and their
absence of power. In other words, it indicates the "symbolic annihilation" of
women (Tuchman 533). Since women politicians are portrayed as less important
than men politicians by the media, this message of inequality infiltrates into all
areas of society. As a result, women continue to struggle for equal coverage
and attention.

Other scholars have explored the differences in the reporting styles of
men and women reporters who cover politics. According to Kay Mills, as more
women have pursued the media as their profession, female reporters have
assisted in catapulting women politicians into the forefront. Furthermore, women
reporters have had an influence in molding politics, and as a result, the
environment in which women choose to pursue political careers (137).

Of articles with a significant focus on women in Congress (N=201),
46 percent were written by women and 33 percent were written by
men. Perhaps women more often volunteer to write these stories
or perhaps they are more frequently assigned to them because of
their gender. (137)
Male reporters who author articles concerning women in Congress are more likely to have their articles printed on the front pages.

Of the articles on women in Congress written by men, 61 percent were published in the front or news section of the paper; of the articles on women in Congress written by women, only 47 percent were published in the front section of the paper. In contrast, 20 percent of women journalists' stories ended up on the style page compared with only 8 percent of the stories by male journalists.

(138)

Conclusion

Through studying the history of the media, its role in constructing hyperreality, and the media's impact on politics, the research clearly suggests that the disparate coverage of male and female political candidates is detrimental, not only to women politicians, but to all women. Through construction of narratives, the media concocts hyperreality which individuals believe to be truth. Most individuals do not think to question the amount of candidate coverage or the placement of stories within the newspaper. Rather, they accept what they read and form their own perceptions about candidates based on the media constructions. The next chapter will analyze the media constructions of the narratives of four political candidates (two men and two women).
Chapter two provided a detailed summation of the history of the media in politics. Chapter three will present the data relevant to assessing whether or not the media constructs the narratives of male and female political candidates differently. A total of thirty-three newspaper articles were used for this study. Twenty-three of the articles discussed the Byrne versus Davis race, and the remaining ten articles covered the Thurman versus Garlits race. The results of the content analysis of newspaper articles in the two Congressional races with the most coverage in the South between a male and female opponent (Byrne versus Davis and Thurman versus Garlits) will provide answers for the four research questions posed in the first chapter. At the outset, a synopsis of each of the races will be provided, including biographical information about each of the candidates and their campaigning platforms, in order to establish a background for the data.

Synopsis of the Races and Candidate Information

Information about each of the candidates will provide a frame of reference for the data to be presented in this chapter. Biographical information was
readily available for Thurman and Davis since they have maintained their seats in Congress over the past several years. Even though Garrits has not held an elected office, information was obtainable about his life due to his celebrity status. As a matter of fact, all three of these candidates had web sites. However, information about Byrne was more difficult to uncover. For this reason, all of the candidate biographies were limited to approximately the same number of lines in order to give equal coverage to each of the candidates in this study. It is also important to note that at the outset of this chapter, the intent was to provide each of the candidate's campaign platforms. Because their platforms were not published in any government document or newspaper, the platforms presented here were pieced together based from the information from the newspaper articles and other sources studied. Due to the premise of this study which believes that the media constructs the narratives of political candidates, one should note that the platforms are also constructions. One should also notice that equal platform coverage was not given to the four candidates; however, the inequality is a direct reflection of the media's unequal coverage of the candidates' beliefs.

Byrne versus Davis (District 11, Virginia)

Leslie Byrne (Democrat) was born October 27, 1946, in Salt Lake City, Utah, and attended the University of Utah; however, she did not earn a degree. Byrne worked as a human resources consultant, and she and her husband have made a home for their two children in Annandale. She served in the Virginia
House from 1986 to 1992, when her victory over Henry N. Butler made her the first woman elected to the U.S. Congress from Virginia. In the 1992 congressional race, Byrne emphasized her experience as a state delegate and her accomplishments as a consultant to flourishing small businesses. While in the Virginia House, Byrne served on the Finance Committee and focused on transportation problems on behalf of her district ("Leslie L. Byrne, D-Va. (11)"

During the campaign period, Byrne opposed the Contract with America because it would cut federal pensions, benefits to veterans, and health coverage for government employees (Lipton, "GOP's Davis Bolstered by Party's Momentum" B5). On the issue of crime, she backed extended prison sentences for violent criminals. In addition, she advocated a waiting period on buying handguns as well as a prohibition on all semiautomatic assault weapons. Furthermore, Byrne was an advocate of broad health-care reform and a childhood immunization bill (Lipton, "Burnishing the Byrne Image" V3). The final issue which Byrne favored, as mentioned by the newspaper media, was that of abortion rights (Lipton, "11th Congressional District" V7).

Tom Davis (Republican) was born on January 5, 1949, in Minot, North Dakota, and graduated with honors from Amherst College with a political science degree. He received his degree in law from the University of Virginia. His military experience included: service as an officer in the U.S. Army, the Virginia National Guard, and the U.S. Army Reserve. Davis was the Vice President and
When Davis was elected as the Chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, he moved to the position of Corporate Counsel of PRC, Inc. During his term in office as Chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Fairfax County was acknowledged as the best financially managed county in the nation ("Congressman Tom Davis"). Even though Davis was not the incumbent candidate in the 1994 congressional race, his past experiences in politics brought him similar name recognition and results as his incumbent opponent.

While Byrne opposed the Contract with America, Davis signed the contract because it supported new tax breaks, a balanced budget amendment, and additional defense spending (Lipton, "GOP's Davis Bolstered by Party's Momentum" B5). However, Davis objected to welfare benefits to unwed, minor mothers and additional benefits to welfare mothers who had more children. Davis desired to fortify parents' rights in the education of their children, and he supported stronger child pornography laws. In addition, Davis backed a tax credit for married couples with children (Lipton, "At VMI, Oliver North is the Overwhelming Choice" V3). While he did not believe companies should be obliged to furnish insurance to their employees, Davis advocated limited health-care revision (Lipton, "Byrne, Davis Debate Taxes, Business at Fairfax Luncheon" C4). Unlike many Republicans, Davis supported abortion rights; however, he supported a mandatory parental notification law for minors seeking to have an abortion. Furthermore, he objected to using federal funds for
abortions. On the issue of gun-control, Davis supported a ban on assault weapons (Lipton, "Byrne and Davis Wrangle Over His Spot on Spectrum" B3).

Thurman versus Garlits (District 5, Florida)

Karen L. Thurman (Democrat) was born in Rapid City, South Dakota, on January 12, 1951, and began her professional career as a middle school math teacher in the mid-1970s in Dunnellon, Florida. Thurman’s political career began at the prompting of her students as she was elected and served on the Dunnellon City Council until 1981. In 1982, Thurman was elected to the Florida Senate where she served for a decade until she was elected to her first term in Congress in 1992. While in the Florida Senate, Thurman sponsored approximately sixty bills annually, and eighty-five percent of these bills passed. Thurman also gained a reputation for her expert knowledge about numerous issues including: agriculture, consumer protection, education, crime, and veterans and seniors issues. Furthermore, she chaired the following committees: the Senate Agriculture Committee, the Committee on Professional Regulation, and the Senate Subcommittee on Congressional Reapportionment. (The Almanac of American Politics 1996; "Congresswoman Karen L. Thurman (D)).

In regard to the issue of crime, Thurman opposed Clinton’s crime bill due to the prohibition on assault weapons (Booth A1); however, she supported legislation that would fund measures to protect women and victims of crime. Thurman was an advocate of changes in the distribution of Medicaid, and in the
area of healthcare, she supported "universal coverage, pharmaceutical assistance and long-term care." Thurman advocated abortion rights and supported efforts to protect admittance to abortion clinics; however, she did not support government funding to indigent women seeking abortions (Ross, "It's a Very Odd Race" 1B).

The biography of “Big Daddy” Don Garlits (Republican) reads quite differently from that of Karen Thurman, an experienced politician. Garlits, age sixty-three, already had a reputation across the country, outside of the political arena, as an “eight-time National Hot Rod Association Top Fuel drag racing champion.” His only educational degree is from Hillsborough High School in 1950. Self-employed, Garlits operates automotive businesses in the drag racing circle. Originally a Democrat, Garlits changed parties to run in his first political race as the Republican candidate based on his concerns about taxes and the economy (Connolly). At sixty-two years of age, Garlits campaigned for his first public office in an effort to commence a career in politics (“In Case You Missed It”).

Consistent with his shift to the Republican party, Garlits signed the Contract with America and supported its provisions (Fallstrom A1). Garlits’ tough stance on crime included some of the following suggestions: “more medieval-style prisons,” expedient executions, jails for violent criminals modeled after the Mexican jail, and “public paddling of juveniles in town squares as a partial remedy for truancy and other misdemeanors” (Booth A1).
health-care, Garlits denied the existence of a crisis and did not believe in overregulation. Garlits backed "sending all illegal immigrants back to their countries of origin and sending other refugees to Ellis Island to await placement in Montana pending job openings" (A1). Garlits' other beliefs included his outspoken idea that homosexuality is an "abomination," that African-Americans are more violent than Caucasians, and that the "ACLU is a traitorous organization" (A1). Garlits objected to abortion in most cases (Ross, "It's a Very Odd Race" 1B). In regard to the environment, Garlits rejected the notion that the planet is not in a dangerous situation (Fallstrom A1).

Media Coverage of Male and Female Candidates

In order to answer the first research question, which deals with the issue as to whether more media coverage is devoted to male or female candidates, two areas were analyzed: (1.) the word count within the articles, and (2.) the headline coverage of the candidates. As the researcher read each of the articles, the portions of the articles were coded as referencing either the male or female candidate. Those sections which discussed both candidates or which compared the candidates were coded as mentioning both candidates. Quotations in which one candidate referred to his/her opponent were credited to the speaker of the quotation since the journalist opted to use that candidate's voice. (A key to the newspaper code numbers is located in Table 2.)
Table 2

Newspaper Code Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code #</th>
<th>Full Bibliographic Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
A7  Lipton, Eric, and Donald P. Baker. "At VMI, Oliver North is the

A8  Woellert, Lorraine. "'Sour Grapes' Serano." The Washington Times

A9  Lipton, Eric, and Marylou Tousignant. "Burnishing the Byrne Image."
    1997.

A10 Lipton, Eric. "Dix Declines to Run for Chairman; Republican
    Supervisor Endorses McConnell." The Washington Post 29


A12 Lipton, Eric. "Byrne, Davis Debate Taxes, Business at Fairfax
    Nexis. 31 July 1997.

A13 Lipton, Eric. "Signs of the Political Times; Byrne, Davis Campaigns


In the Byrne versus Davis race, a total of 9,940 words were devoted to the race in the twenty-three newspaper articles. Byrne was referenced in 2,960 words, Davis in 5,299 words, and both candidates in 1,681 words. Therefore, of the total newspaper coverage of the race during the campaign period, Byrne, the female candidate, received 29.78% of the coverage while her male opponent,
Davis, received almost twice as much coverage at 53.31%. The remaining 16.91% of the coverage discussed both candidates. As the word counts were analyzed more closely for each article, it was determined that eight of the twenty-three articles did not devote any word coverage to Byrne while only two of the twenty-three articles did not devote any word coverage to Davis. Furthermore, fourteen of the twenty-three articles devoted more word coverage to the male candidate while only seven of the articles allocated more word coverage to the female candidate. (The word count for both Byrne and Davis in each individual article is presented in Table 3.)

Table 3
Words Dedicated to Candidates During the 1994 Congressional Campaign:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sex of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Reporter(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Florida race between Thurman and Garlits, a total of 7,050 words discussed the campaigns. 1,635 words were devoted to Thurman, the female candidate, while 4,790 words discussed Garlits, the male candidate. The remaining 625 words mentioned both Thurman and Garlits. Similar to the Byrne
and Davis race, the majority of the words were devoted to the male candidate; however, the percentages between the male and female candidate indicated an even wider gap in coverage in the Thurman versus Garlits race. The newspapers only wrote 23.19% of the total words about Thurman; whereas 67.94% was recorded about Garlits. As the results for each of the ten individual articles were viewed more closely, the discovery was made that while three of the ten articles in this race did not devote any word coverage to the female candidate, all of the articles devoted word coverage to the male candidate. Furthermore, every article during this campaign period allocated more word coverage to Garlits than to Thurman. (The word count for both Thurman and Garlits in each individual article is presented in Table 4.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper Code</th>
<th>Female Candidate</th>
<th>Male Candidate</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sex of Reporter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1432</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In evaluating the headline coverage, twelve of the twenty-three articles covering the Byrne versus Davis race referenced neither candidate in the headline, and one of the articles did not have a headline. In the remaining articles, two devoted headline coverage to only Davis, the male candidate, while only one article devoted headline coverage to Byrne, the female candidate. The remaining seven articles referenced both the male and the female candidate in the headlines. Two of these seven headlines listed Davis first, and the remaining five listed Byrne first.

While the headline coverage in the Byrne versus Davis race did not indicate a significant difference in the media coverage of the male and female candidates, the Thurman versus Garlits race indicated a definite difference in media coverage through the use of headlines. Six of the ten headlines referenced the male candidate; however, none of the headlines devoted any coverage to the female candidate. The remaining four articles failed to reference either candidate in the headlines. (The results of the headline
coverage are in Table 5 (Byrne versus Davis) and Table 6 (Thurman versus Garlits).)

Table 5

Headlines Dedicated to Candidates During the 1994 Congressional Campaign:

  Byrne versus Davis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper Code</th>
<th>Headline Reference(s) to Candidate</th>
<th>Sex of Reporter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>male, female</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>male, female</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>no headline recorded</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>male, female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>female, male</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>female, male</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>male, male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A16 neither  male
A17 female, male  male, male
A18 male  male
A19 neither  male
A20 neither  male, male
A21 female, male  male
A22 neither  male
A23 female, male  male

Table 6

Headlines Dedicated to Candidates During the 1994 Congressional Campaign:

Thurman versus Garlits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper Code</th>
<th>Headline Reference(s) to Candidate</th>
<th>Sex of Reporter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the word counts allocated to the male and female candidates in these two races, the mediadevotes more newspaper space to the male candidates. The headline coverage, however, was not as conclusive. Even though the male candidate received significantly more headline coverage in the Thurman versus Garlits race, the Byrne versus Davis race resulted in more equal headline coverage.

Newspaper Endorsements of Male and Female Candidates

The second research question asked the following question: Do male or female candidates receive more newspaper endorsements? To the surprise of this author, only one of the articles, out of the thirty-three articles in both the Byrne versus Davis race and the Thurman versus Garlits race mentioned candidate endorsements. While other articles implied certain candidate loyalties, they did not officially endorse one candidate over the other. The November 6, 1994 Metro Edition of The Tampa Tribune, which was published two days prior to the election, printed the only article that did discuss candidate endorsements, and it discussed several endorsements that various newspapers had given in the Thurman versus Garlits race. According to staff writer Dean Solov,
Most of the endorsements in the race for U.S. House District 5 in Tuesday's general election have gone to incumbent Karen Thurman, though a few West Central Florida newspapers urged voters to give Republican challenger “Big Daddy” Don Garlits a shot. (Solov)

According to Solov, the following newspapers endorsed Thurman: \textit{The Tampa Tribune, The St. Petersburg Times, The Citrus County Chronicle, The Gainesville Sun, and The Daily Commercial of Leesburg}. Reasons for endorsing the incumbent female candidate included her past accomplishments, none of which were listed, and her experience in office. However, the primary reasons for Thurman's endorsements by these papers referenced Garlits' ineptness for the high political office.

\textit{The St. Petersburg Times} said Garlits “seems to think his success on the track translates into qualification for Congress. While the ability to get out of town fast can benefit a public official, that's about all Garlits would bring to the job.” (Solov “More Papers Flag Don Garlits Down”)

While five newspapers endorsed Thurman, \textit{Hernando Today} and \textit{The Ocala Star-Banner} were the only two papers to support Garlits. These newspapers reference Thurman's past support of tax increases and her seeming willingness to support programs when no money is budgeted for them. Interestingly, Solov did not cite any of Garlits' capabilities when referencing
these two articles. Rather, the reporter elected to only mention the shortcomings Thurman's critics found in her and the reasons Thurman was not the candidate of their choice (“More Papers Flag Don Garlits Down”).

Settings in Which Male and Female Candidates are Portrayed

The third research question asked: Are male and female candidates portrayed in different settings? In the campaign races involving Byrne and Davis and Thurman and Garlits, the reporters depicted the candidates in a variety of settings. Once the settings were identified for each candidate, a determination was made as to whether the setting was traditionally masculine or feminine. Throughout history, society has allocated men and women to different roles. Men and women then fulfill these roles in appropriate settings. For example, women have traditionally cared for children; therefore, settings such as homes and schools have been marked as feminine. At times, the settings were difficult to judge since no past studies referenced them as traditionally masculine or feminine. In these cases, this author based the setting judgments on traditionally masculine and feminine characteristics. Some might argue that, since the candidate decides upon the settings in which he/she will appear, that the media does not shape the issue. However, the media does decide the settings on which to report and overlook. Because of their selective power, the media chooses the settings about which the newspaper audience reads. For this reason, analysis of differences in setting coverage is important to the study.
of the differences in the way the media shapes the narratives of male and female political candidates. (The candidate settings and judgments are listed in Tables 7 (Byrne versus Davis) and 8 (Thurman versus Garlits).)

Table 7
Candidate Settings During the 1994 Congressional Campaign: Byrne versus Davis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper Code</th>
<th>Female Candidate Setting</th>
<th>Male Candidate Setting</th>
<th>Female Candidate Judgment</th>
<th>Male Candidate Judgment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>•Falls Church campaign stop</td>
<td>•neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>•Fairfax County GOP pep rally</td>
<td>•neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>•Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce luncheon</td>
<td>•masculine •Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce luncheon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16</td>
<td>•Debate at elementary school •Arab American Institute forum @ Raddison •Greater Merrifield Business Association luncheon @ Marriott •Fairfax County Chamber of</td>
<td>•feminine •Debate at elementary school •Arab American Institute forum @ Raddison •Greater Merrifield Business Association luncheon @ Marriott •Fairfax County Chamber of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commerce luncheon @ Sheraton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commerce luncheon @ Sheraton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A18</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>•his office for afternoon conference •Little League baseball tournament •neutral •masculine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A20</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Candidate Settings During the 1994 Congressional Campaign: Thurman versus Garlits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female Candidate Setting</th>
<th>Male Candidate Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>televised debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Inverness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the race between Byrne and Davis, Byrne was depicted in four different settings which included: (1.) a Chamber of Commerce luncheon (cited in two articles), (2.) an elementary school, (3.) an Arab American Institute forum, and (4.) a business association luncheon. The Chamber of Commerce luncheon and the business association luncheon were both classified as masculine settings since the business environment is primarily operated by men. Even though women have made significant advances in the business sector, a majority of business dealings are still handled by male executives (Sharpe, "Women Make Strides, But Men Stay Firmly in Top Company Jobs" A1, A10; Sharpe, "Family Friendly Firms Don't Always Promote Females" B1). The Arab American Institute forum was also classified as a masculine setting since sex roles are carefully defined in the Arab culture in which women are socialized to take the submissive role in their culture. The elementary school was categorized as a feminine setting since women are traditionally the nurturing candidates who concern themselves with issues related to education. Overall, the media depicted Byrne in four masculine settings and one feminine setting.
Davis was depicted in twice as many settings as his female opponent. The following four settings were classified as gender neutral: (1.) a campaign stop, (2.) a political rally, (3.) a GOP pep rally, and (4.) his office. Each of the four masculine settings (the Chamber of Commerce luncheon (cited twice), the Arab American Institute forum, and the business association luncheon) and the one feminine setting (the elementary school) in which the media depicted Byrne were also used in the references to Davis. Furthermore, one additional masculine setting was used for Davis: a Little League baseball tournament. This baseball tournament was categorized as masculine since athletics, in this case baseball, is primarily a masculine arena. Overall, four gender neutral settings, five masculine settings, and one feminine setting depicted Davis.

Just as the male candidate was portrayed in more settings than the female candidate in the Byrne versus Davis race, Garlits was depicted in more settings than his female opponent. Thurman was only described in two settings within the ten newspaper articles studied. One of these was a televised debate, which was categorized as gender neutral since it is neither a traditionally masculine nor feminine setting. The other, classified as a feminine setting, described Thurman in her congressional office. The reason this setting was classified as feminine was because the reporter characterized Thurman, in the first sentence of the article, as offering her guests punch and cookies. In the Byrne versus Davis congressional race, when Davis was depicted in his office,
the reporter did not feel the need to mention the refreshments that were served as if it was a women's club afternoon tea and fashion show.

Garlits, on the other hand, was portrayed in five settings. The one setting in which both candidates were described, the televised debate, was neutral. Two additional settings also were categorized as gender neutral: (1.) a CNN profile and (2.) a profile on Pat Robertson's CNN. The remaining two settings for Garlits, however, were masculine settings. They include: (1.) a drag racing convention and (2.) the Don Garlits Museum of Drag Racing. Not only are these settings specific to Garlits, but the athletic nature of each contributed to the masculine judgment.

Overall, Davis and Garlits were depicted in a combined total of fifteen settings, and Byrne and Thurman were characterized in a combined total of seven settings. Seven gender neutral settings portrayed the male candidates in this study while the female candidates were only portrayed in one gender neutral setting. The male candidates also were pictured in seven masculine settings, but the female candidates were seen in only four masculine settings. Feminine settings were rare. The male candidates were depicted in only one feminine setting, and the female candidates were characterized in only two feminine settings.
The Media's Attitude Toward Male and Female Candidates

The final research question dealt with whether the media's attitude is different toward male and female candidates. In order to determine if the media constructs the narratives of female and male candidates differently in the congressional races involving Byrne and Davis and Thurman and Garlits, the words used to describe the four candidates were identified in each of the newspaper articles. Then, these descriptive words were categorized in one of four ways: (1.) words used by the journalist, (2.) words used in a quotation by another individual, excluding either candidate or the journalist, (3.) words used by a candidate, in a quotation, to describe his/her opponent, and (4.) words used by a candidate, in a quotation, to describe him/herself. After each of the words or phrases was identified and categorized, a determination was made as to whether the words were masculine traits, feminine traits, or gender neutral traits. The masculine, feminine, and gender neutral traits were determined based on the sixty characteristics in Bem's sex role inventory and the male and female traits defined by Kahn. According to Kahn, male traits include: independent, objective, competitive, strong leader, insensitive, aggressive, unemotional, ambitious, and tough. Female traits include: dependent, noncompetitive, passive, gentle, emotional, weak leader, and compassionate (Kahn 194-95; Bem). (The categorization of the descriptive words for each of the four candidates are recorded in Tables 9, 10, 11 and 12. The traits identified by Bem as masculine, feminine, and neutral are listed in Table 13.)
Table 9

Descriptive Words Used in Articles of Female Candidate: Byrne versus Davis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Words used by journalist to describe a candidate</th>
<th>Words used by others to describe a candidate</th>
<th>Words used by Code journalist to describe candidate</th>
<th>Words used by Code journalist to describe candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>• confrontational (M)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(M)(^a) -(^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• fighter (M) +(^c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>• Rep. (N)(^d)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• first-term incumbent (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>• Rep. (N)</td>
<td>• vulnerable (F)(^e)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Democrat (N)</td>
<td>(F)(^e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Democrat (N)</td>
<td>• incumbent (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• member of Clinton's party (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rep. (N)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
<td>Democrat (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>Rep. (N)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Democratic Rep. (N)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>Democratic Rep. (N)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incumbent (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>Rep. (N)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>Rep. (N)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>Democratic Rep. (N)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trademark wit (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hard-nosed, aggressive approach (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>abrasive (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>arm-twisting (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>• Rep. (N) none none none none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• (D-Va) (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Davis' opponent (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• outmaneuvered (N) -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• first-term representative (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| A14 | • Democratic none none none none |
|     | • Rep. (N) |

| A15 | • Rep. (N) none • acerbic, • not a go-
|     | • (D-Va) (N) hardball style along-to-get-
|     | • aggressive (M) + of politics (M) along kind of
|     | • confrontational - a gal (M) +
|     | • 47-year-old (N)
|     | • skillful strategist
|     | and legislator (M)
|     | +
|     | • mean-spirited
showoff (N) -
• loose cannon (N) -
• hard-charging,
sometimes sneaky
politician (M) -
• tough image (M) +
• politically
aggressive woman
(M) +
A16 • Democratic Rep. none none none
(N)
A17 • Rep. (N) • Liberal (N) • Clinton none
• (D) (N) Democrat (N)
A18 • Rep. (N) none none none
• (D-Va.) (N)
A19 • Democratic none none none
incumbent (N)
A20 • first-term none none none
Democratic Rep.
(N)
A21 • Rep. (N) none none none
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rep. (N)</th>
<th>none</th>
<th>none</th>
<th>none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D-Va.)</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23</td>
<td>first-term</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48 (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>savvy,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spark-plug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>style (N) +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aggressive tactics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(M) +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(N) =</th>
<th>38 (N) =</th>
<th>3 (N) =</th>
<th>1 (N) =</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(M) =</td>
<td>14 (M) =</td>
<td>0 (M) =</td>
<td>1 (M) =</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(F) =</td>
<td>0 (F) =</td>
<td>1 (F) =</td>
<td>0 (F) =</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>factual =</td>
<td>35 factual =</td>
<td>3 factual =</td>
<td>1 factual =</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ =</td>
<td>9 + =</td>
<td>0 + =</td>
<td>0 + =</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- =</td>
<td>8 - =</td>
<td>1 - =</td>
<td>1 - =</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (M) = masculine

* (F) = feminine
Table 10

Descriptive Words Used in Articles of Male Candidate: Byrne versus Davis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Words used by journalist to describe a candidate to his/her opponent</th>
<th>Words used by others to describe a candidate to his/her opponent</th>
<th>Quote C: describe him/herself</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>• ambitious chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors (M) +</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• consensus-builder (N) +</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• cipher (N) -</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>• Republican (N)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• chairman of the Fairfax County Board of</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>none none none none none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>• Republican (N) • moderate (N) • Republican Party shill (N) - • enthusiasm (N) + none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>• Republican (N) none • chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors (N) none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>none none none none none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>• Republican (N) none none none none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Fairfax County board Chairman (N)
  • chummy (N) +
  • Republican challenger (M)
  • chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors (N)
A8
  • Republican opponent (M)
  • Fairfax County Board Chairman (N)
A9
  • County Board Chairman (N)
  • R (N)
A10
  • GOP nominee • damn liar (N) - none (N)
A11
  • Fairfax County none none none none
A12
Board Chairman  
(N)  
• smiling (N) +  
• passionless (N) -  
• unfocused (N) -  
A13  
• Fairfax County Board of 
Supervisors Chairman (N)  
• GOP candidate (N)  
• threat to Byrne (M) +  
A14  
• independent-minded (M) +  
• anti-crime (N)  
• anti-deficit (M)  
• family man (M) +  
• fierce Virginia independence (M) +  
• independence (M) +
Supervisors (N)
- his own man (M)
  +
- county chairman
  (N)

Fairfax County Board of Supervisors Chairman (N)
- challenger (M)
- 44 (N)
- moderate Republican (N)
- married (N)
- three children (N)
- consensus-seeking style (N)
  +
- thin skinned (F)
- petulant (N)

Republican none none none none
opponent (M)

A17
• Fairfax County none none none
Board Chairman
(N)

A18
• Fairfax’s top none none none
elected official
(N)
• county’s most
visible advocate
to land a Major
League Baseball
team (M)
• conciliator (F) +
• passionless
leader (N) -
• 45-year-old (N)
• baseball fan (M)

A19
• Fairfax County none none none
Board Chairman
(N)

A20
• Republican none none none
challenger (M)

A21
- Fairfax County board chairman (N)
- right-wing zealot (N)
- moderate Republican (N)

A22
- none

A23
- Fairfax County Board Chairman (N)
- R (N)
- Fairfax County board chairman (N)
- 45 (N)
- moderate Republican (N)
- effectiveness to that of a palm
tree (N) -

• search for

compromise (N)

+

• weak leader (F) -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(N) =</th>
<th>(M) =</th>
<th>(F) =</th>
<th>factual =</th>
<th>+ =</th>
<th>- =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 factual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 factual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Descriptive Words Used in Articles of Female Candidate: Thurman versus Garlits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Quote A: Words used by Words others used to describe candidate</th>
<th>Quote B: Words used by a candidate to describe a candidate</th>
<th>Quote C: Words used by an opponent to describe him/herself</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>• freshman Rep (N) none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• (D) (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 43 (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• conservative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• democrat (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• conservative (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>• freshman U.S. Rep. (N) none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• D-Dunnellon (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 43-year-old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>former</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>schoolteacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and state senator
(N)
• incumbent (N)
• Clinton puppet
(F) -
B3  
• first-term  none  none  none  none
Democratic
incumbent (N)

B4  
• Democratic  none  none  none  none
incumbent (N)

B5  
• first-term  none  none  none  none
Democratic U.S.
Rep. (N)

B6  
• first-term  none  none  none  none
Democrat from
Dunnellon (N)

B7  
• U.S. Rep. (N)  none  none  none
• skilled politician
(M) +
• 43-year-old
Democrat (N)
• conservative Democrat (N)
• a freshman (N)
• vulnerable (F) -

B8
• incumbent none none none
Democrat (N)

B9
• incumbent (N) savvy, none none
• Democrat from hardworking
  Dunnellon (N) servant (F) +
• model of fiscal Democrat
  responsibility (M) made in the
  + mold of Bill
• leadership (M) +
  Clinton (N) -
  • hard worker
  (N) +

B10
• incumbent U.S. the none
  Rep. (N) president's
• 43 (N) lapdog (F) -
• married (N)
• two children (N)
Table 12

Descriptive Words Used in Articles of Male Candidate: Thurman versus Garlits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Words used by journalist to describe a candidate</th>
<th>Words used by others to describe candidate</th>
<th>Words used by a candidate to describe opponent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>• undisputed lifetime champion (M) +</td>
<td>• strongest determination (M) +</td>
<td>• not mainstream professional politician (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• nitromethane-sucking, drag-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quote B:

Quote A:

Quote C:
racing god (M) +
• flamboyant, anti-tax and hang-em-high conservative
• unvarnished folk hero (M) +
• 62 (N)
• bigoted big mouth (N) -
• straight-talking anecdote to Washington
doublespeak (N) +
• Mr. Safety (N) +
• bespectacled racer (N) -
• bigot (N) -
• popular appeal (N) +

• cross between David Koresh and David Duke (N) -
• the man (M) +
• not full of bull (N) +
• straight and true (N) +

• Mr. Safety (N) +
• bespectacled racer (N) -
• bigot (N) -
• popular appeal (N) +
B2
• simple, plain-spoken, common
• straight shooter (N) +
• sense approach down-to-earth, honest (N) +
• Republican (N) (N) +
• throwback to the darkest days of the 1950s (N) -
• isn’t a racist (N) +

B3
• 62 (N) none none none
• drag racing legend (M) +
• racetrack legend (M) +

B4
• 62 (N) none none none
• drag racing legend (M) +

B5
• 62 (N) none none none

B6
none • conservative (N) none none
B7 • enthusiasm (N) + none none none
• 62 (N)
• Republican (N)
• sports legend (M) +
• racist, anti-
  female, ultra-
  conservative nut (M) -
B8 • Republican (N) none none none
• drag racing legend (M) +
B9 • Republican challenger (M) • crank (N) - none none
• freewheeling, mentally (M) -
  politically incorrect rhetoric (N) -
• more of a novelty than an attractive alternative (N) -
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>retired drag</th>
<th>racing king (M) +</th>
<th>sincere (N) +</th>
<th>great role model (N) +</th>
<th>more fiscally responsible (M) +</th>
<th>celebrity and none</th>
<th>none</th>
<th>none</th>
<th>none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unfettered, tell-it-like-you-see-it speaking style (N) +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>colorful blip (N) +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>outsider (N) -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62 (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>married (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>two children (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(N) = 29</td>
<td>(N) = 7</td>
<td>(N) = 0</td>
<td>(N) = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M) =</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F) =</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factual =</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>factual =</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>factual =</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ =</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+ =</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+ =</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- =</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>- =</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>- =</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13

Bem's Sex Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male Characteristics</th>
<th>Female Characteristics</th>
<th>Neutral Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>self-reliant</td>
<td>yielding</td>
<td>helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defends own beliefs</td>
<td>cheerful</td>
<td>moody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independent</td>
<td>shy</td>
<td>conscientious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>athletic</td>
<td>affectionate</td>
<td>theatrical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assertive</td>
<td>flatterable</td>
<td>happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has strong personality</td>
<td>loyal</td>
<td>unpredictable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forceful</td>
<td>feminine</td>
<td>reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analytical</td>
<td>sympathetic</td>
<td>jealous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has leadership ability</td>
<td>sensitive to needs of others</td>
<td>truthful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willing to take risks</td>
<td>understanding</td>
<td>secretive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makes decisions easily</td>
<td>compassionate</td>
<td>sincere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
self-sufficient  eager to soothe hurt  conceited
feels

dominant  soft-spoken  likable
masculine  warm  solemn
willing to take a stand  tender  friendly
aggressive  gullible  inefficient
acts as a leader  childlike  adaptable
individualistic  does not use harsh  unsystematic
language
competitive  loves children  tactful
ambitious  gentle  conventional


The first category, which described the words used by a journalist to describe a candidate, contained the majority of descriptive words or phrases totaling 186. Category two, which encompassed words used by another, in a quotation, to describe a candidate, contained twenty-two words or phrases. The third category, words used by a candidate, in a quotation, to describe his/her opponent, contained only seven words or phrases, and the final category, words used by a candidate, in a quotation, to describe him/herself was even smaller with only four words or phrases. When the words of a candidate or another
individual were paraphrased, they were recorded as words used by the reporter, in the first category, since the journalist elected to use those specific descriptive words to identify the candidates. At the same time, however, it is also true that the reporter selected certain quotes, either written or spoken, by others to use in his/her article about the candidates. With the reporter's motive in mind in his/her word usage, this author believed it necessary to distinguish between the voices of the descriptive words used within the articles for several reasons. First, words spoken by one candidate about another candidate are likely to be negative. Second, words spoken by a candidate about him/herself are likely to be affirming.

Considering the disparity between the total number of words dedicated to male and female candidates yielded from the word count, it is not surprising that the articles also contained more descriptive words and phrases for male candidates than for the female candidates. A total of fifty-nine words and phrases were dedicated to Byrne while seventy-three words and phrases described her male opponent, Davis. Thirty-three words and phrases were used to describe Thurman while her male opponent, Garlits, was described in fifty-four words.

A large portion of the gender neutral words and phrases describe the political affiliations of the candidates and titles the candidates have held. For example, Davis is often referred to by his title as the chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, and the media often refers to Thurman as a
freshman U.S. Representative. All of the candidates are labeled often as either a Republican or Democrat. Besides the gender neutral words and phrases that indicate a candidate's title or party affiliation, other gender neutral words and phrases reference factual items such as his/her marital status, age, or parental status. The remaining words and phrases reflect opinions concerning the candidate's character or style of governance, and they were catalogued into one of four categories.

The first category included words used by journalists, not in quotation marks, to describe the candidates, and this was undoubtedly the largest category since the other three categories only contained words used in quotation marks. The media used sixty-four words and phrases to describe Davis. Of these words and phrases, 76.6% were neutral, 18.8% were masculine, and 4.7% were feminine. The masculine words and phrases used to describe Davis include: “ambitious,” “challenger,” “opponent,” “threat to Byrne,” “independent-minded,” “anti-deficit,” “his own man,” “advocate to land a major league baseball team,” and “baseball fan” (some of which were used more than once throughout the articles). The feminine words and phrases used in the reporter’s description of Davis include: “thin skinned,” “conciliator,” and “weak leader.”

A total of fifty-two words and phrases were used to describe Byrne, the female candidate. 73.1% were neutral, 26.9% were masculine, and 0% were feminine. The masculine words and phrases describing Byrne contained in the articles are as follows: “confrontational,” “fighter,” “hard-nosed, aggressive
approach;" "abrasive;" "arm-twisting;" "opponent;" "skillful strategist and legislator;" "hard-charging;" "sometimes sneaky politician;" and "tough image" (some of which were repeated throughout the articles). In these articles, the media did not elect to describe Byrne by using feminine traits.

In the articles about Thurman’s opponent, Garlits, forty-one words and phrases were used to describe him. Gender neutral words and phrases comprised 70.7%, masculine words and phrases comprised 29.3%, and the feminine comprised 0% of the words and phrases reporters used to describe him. The masculine words and phrases include: "undisputed lifetime champion;" "nitromethane-sucking, drag racing god;" "unvarnished folk hero;" "drag racing legend;" "racetrack legend;" "sports legend;" "racist, anti-female racing king;" and "more fiscally responsible." The reporters did not use feminine words and phrases to describe Garlits.

In category one, the media used a total of twenty-nine words and phrases to describe Thurman. Of these, 82.8% were gender neutral, 10.3% were masculine, and 6.9% were feminine. The masculine words and phrases include: "skilled politician," "model of fiscal responsibility," and "leadership." The feminine are as follows: "Clinton puppet" and "vulnerable."

The second category included all of the words in quotation marks within the articles that others, not including one of the candidates or the reporter, used to describe a candidate. In the newspaper articles, only four words and phrases were used to describe Davis in a quotation by an individual other than the
reporter or one of the candidates. Two of the four were gender neutral, one was feminine, and one was masculine. The masculine phrase used was: "fierce Virginia independence." The feminine phrase was: "backbone of boiled spaghetti." In the articles, four words and phrases were also used to describe Byrne. Three were gender neutral, one was feminine, and none were masculine. The feminine word used was: "vulnerable." Eleven words and phrases were used to describe Garlits. Seven were gender neutral, four were masculine, and no feminine words and phrases were used in the quotes. The masculine words and phrases about Garlits include: "strong man;" "strongest determination;" "the man;" and "daredevil mentality." Only three words and phrases were used to describe Garlits' female opponent, Thurman. Two were neutral, one was feminine, and none of them were masculine. The feminine phrase was: "savvy, hardworking servant."

In the third category, the words, in quotation marks, used by a candidate to describe his/her opponent are listed. Four words and phrases, as spoken by Byrne, were used to describe Davis. Three of these were neutral and one was masculine. The masculine phrase was: "independent voice." Only two phrases, as spoken by Davis, described Byrne in this category; one was neutral and one was masculine. The masculine phrase was: "acerbic, hardball style of politics." No words were used to describe Garlits in this category, and only one phrase, as spoken by Garlits, described Thurman. This descriptive phrase, which is feminine, was: "the president's lapdog."
The final categorization of words and phrases included those in quotation marks spoken by a candidate in order to describe him/herself. Only one article quoted Davis describing himself, and this one word, of a masculine nature, was: “independence.” Similarly, only one phrase described Byrne, and it, also masculine, was: “not a go-along-to-get-along kind of a gal.” Two phrases, both gender neutral, described Garlits. The journalists did not use any words and phrases in which Thurman described herself.

In order to further determine the media’s attitude towards male and female congressional candidates, each of the descriptive words and phrases in each of the four categories already discussed was identified as either fact-oriented or opinion-oriented. The factual included such items as marital status, job or position titles, party affiliations, etc. Then, the opinion-oriented words and phrases were classified as either favorable or unfavorable in order to determine whether reporters were more apt to speak of male or female candidates more favorably.

The first category discussed the words used by a journalist to describe the candidate. Of the sixty-four words and phrases about Davis, the majority, 65.6%, were factual. For Davis, the favorable opinions, 18.8%, and unfavorable, 15.6%, were relatively close in number. Favorable opinions included such descriptions as: “enthusiasm,” “independent-minded,” and “chummy.” The unfavorable opinions included such terms as: “cipher,” “unfocused,” and “effectiveness to that of a palm tree.” The fifty-two words and phrases about
Byrne yielded similar results to her opponent. While 67.3% were factual, 17.3% were favorable and 15.4% were unfavorable. Reporters referred favorably to Byrne in words and phrases like: “fighter;” “skillful strategist and legislator;” and “savvy, sparkplug style.” Unfavorable references by reporters include: “arm-twisting,” “mean-spirited showoff,” and “outmaneuvered.” However, the results in the Thurman versus Garlits race were quite dissimilar. Out of the forty-one words and phrases describing Garlits, only 29.3% were factual. The largest percentage, 48.8% were favorable, and 22% were unfavorable. Examples of favorable comments about Garlits by reporters include references to his status as a sports legend and other words and phrases like: “straight-talking anecdote to Washington doublespeak” and “sincere.” Journalists elected to reference Garlits unfavorably with words and phrases such as: “racist, anti-female, ultraconservative nut;” “outsider;” and “throwback to the darkest days of the 1950s.” The newspaper reporters discussed factual aspects the majority of the time, 82.8%, in the twenty-nine words and phrases about Thurman. Favorable opinions represent 10.3% of the words and phrases, and the unfavorable account for 6.9%. Examples of favorable opinions include: “skilled politician,” “leadership,” and “model of fiscal responsibility.” Unfavorable references include: “vulnerable” and “Clinton puppet.”

The second category included words in questions that others used to describe a candidate (not the reporter or either of the candidates). Out of the four words and phrases in this category that describe Davis, one was factual,
one was a favorable opinion ("fierce Virginia independence"), and two were unfavorable ("damn liar" and "backbone of boiled spaghetti"). Of those words and phrases describing Byrne, three were factual, none were favorable, and one was unfavorable ("vulnerable"). In regard to Garlits, out of the eleven words and phrases, only one was factual while seven were favorable (examples include: "strongest determination," "straight shooter," and "the man") and three were unfavorable ("cross between David Koresh and David Duke," "crank," and "daredevil mentality"). No factual words and phrases were used to describe Thurman in this category, but two favorable opinions ("savvy, hardworking servant" and "hard worker") and one unfavorable opinion ("Democrat made in the mold of Bill Clinton") were offered.

Category three describes the words used by a candidate in quotation marks to describe his/her opponent. In those words and phrases that Byrne used to describe Davis, none were factual, one was a favorable opinion ("independent voice"), and three were unfavorable opinions ("not a fresh-face Republican clone," "tremendous amount of baggage," and "shilly-shally waffling"). In those phrases in which Davis described Byrne, one was factual and one was unfavorable ("acerbic, hardball style of politics"); however, none were favorable. The reporters did not use any quotations in which Thurman described Garlits, and only one phrase, which was unfavorable ("the president's lapdog"), was used to describe Thurman.
The final category lists the words and phrases used by a candidate in quotations to describe him/herself. The reporters only used one word in which Davis described himself, and that word was favorable ("independence"). Similarly, the one phrase in which Byrne described herself was favorable ("not a go-along-to-get-along kind of a gal"). The two phrases in which Garlits described himself were difficult to categorize as favorable or unfavorable opinions because depending upon a person's perspective, they could be placed in either category. However, because Garlits used these words to describe himself and because many individuals in the district perceived these as desirable qualities, both phrases were labeled as favorable opinions ("not mainstream" and "no professional politician"). The articles did not reference any words in which Thurman described herself.

The attitude of the media was not only measured by the descriptive words and phrases the reporters used to reference the candidates, but also by the direct comparisons the reporters made between the candidates. Once the comparisons were identified in each of the articles, they were grouped according to similar categories such as campaign finances, issues, candidate attributes, etc. Next, a determination was made for each of the individual comparisons as to whether the male candidate was superior, the female candidate was superior, or the candidates were depicted as having an equal status. (The comparisons between candidates are recorded in Tables 14 (Byrne versus Davis) and 15 (Thurman versus Garlits).)
Table 14
Comparisons Made Between Candidates by the Media: Byrne versus Davis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code #</th>
<th>Comparisons Made</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Superior Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>• Davis continues to bring in more money than Byrne</td>
<td>campaign</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For both candidates, about half of the money raised in the first half of October came from PACs</td>
<td>finances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>• Davis has raised more money than Byrne</td>
<td>campaign</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Davis' campaign polls show him pulling into the lead, But Byrne's polls indicate a statistical dead heat</td>
<td>finances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Political analysts believe it is Davis' race to lose and Byrne is vulnerable to Davis who will probably drown Byrne</td>
<td>horserace</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Davis' poll shows that he has 46% support while Byrne has 33%; Byrne's</td>
<td>horserace</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
poll shows her trailing Davis by 4 points

• Both candidates have emphasized similar priorities, but some believe that voters will be more willing to listen to Davis

• Byrne has not expressed as much optimism as Davis

• Davis is as vulnerable to the anti-incumbent fervor as Byrne is

• Davis has raised $928,503 compared with $770,028 for Byrne

• Davis has raised about $65,500 more than Byrne during the last three months

• From July 1 to Sept. 30, Byrne raised $311,970, and Davis collected $377,457

• Since the beginning of the campaign, Davis has raised $928,503, while Byrne has collected $770,028

• As of Sept. 30, Davis had $157,846 in cash on hand, and Byrne had $244,491

• About 80% of Davis' money is from
individuals rather than PACs; 55% of Byrne's money is from individuals.

- Davis and Byrne each tried to cast themselves as the better friend to Northern Virginia's business community.

- Both candidates are taking campaign signs seriously.

- Byrne's campaign plans to put up about 7,500 signs before the Election Day, and Davis said he expects to have more than 10,000 signs.

- Both campaigns consider a sign on a front lawn more valuable than one on a public right of way.
Davis had raised $550,000 as of the latest filing date in July, about $115,000 more than Byrne.

Both candidates expect to raise more than $1 million before the election.

No one expects that either candidate will collect anywhere near their $1 million targets from 11th District residents.

As of the end of June, Davis had collected $550,000 and Byrne, $430,961.

Davis has raised more money than Byrne, but Byrne has more money in the bank.

Both hope to raise more than $1 million before election day.
A22 • Davis raised slightly more than Byrne • campaign • male finances

A23 • Davis and Byrne have outlined many of • issues • neutral the same priorities, but there are differences in their approaches • Davis thinks about only 15% of the • issues • neutral health care system needs fixing, and Byrne supports broader health-care reform • The differences between their • candidate • neutral leadership styles has been a focus of the campaigns

Table 15
Comparisons Made Between Candidates by the Media: Thurman versus Garlits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code #</th>
<th>Comparisons Made</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Garlits slightly trailing Thurman</td>
<td>horserace</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Thurman has raised $387,000 and still has $221,000 in the bank, while Garlits has raised $173,000 and spent all but</td>
<td>campaign</td>
<td>female finances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
$62,000 as of Sept. 30

B3  none
B4  none
B5  none
B6  • differences in contributions and spending: between April 1 and June 30, Garlits raised $92,151 and spent $22,677 while Thurman raised $73,546 in this time period for a total of $110,298

B7  • backgrounds: Thurman worked her way from the drab Dunnellon City Council, through the Florida Senate and up to the U.S. House of Representatives; Garlits is a sports legend who won 115 national racing events, holds several speed records, and is curator of the Marion
County drag racing museum

- Federal Taxes: Thurman voted in Congress for a tax increase; Garlits loathes tax increases

- Social Security: Thurman says there is no secret plan to cut it; Garlits would leave it alone

- Contract with America: Thurman says it is bogus economics; Garlits signed it

- Gas Tax: Thurman says it costs people $25 more per year; Garlits says it costs people $500 more per year

- Health Care: Thurman supported Clinton's health care plan; Garlits supports smaller-scale changes

- Immigration: Thurman's term in Congress resulted in federal reimbursement to Florida for money spent incarcerating illegal aliens, she worked to deport illegal aliens who commit federal felonies, and she worked
to increase border patrols; Garlits would deport illegal immigrants in prisons and he would halt all legal immigration until a better policy is developed

- Crime: Thurman supported the legislative bills that provide additional funding, she sought to better protect women and crime victims, and she voted against the crime bill because she disliked the gun-control measures; Garlits believes prisoners should be worked hard and all comforts should be taken from them and he would have voted against the crime bill

- Abortion: Thurman supports abortion rights; Garlits opposes them

- Water: Thurman seeks water reuse conservation projects; Garlits supports desalination and water reclamation

- Both candidates are willing to discuss specifics on issues but rarely get to in
the limited time they have at political gatherings.

- Thurman poll shows her with a solid lead, but Garlits thinks he is ahead.

| B8 | none | none | none |
| B9 | none | none | none |
| B10 | Both have focused on issues and ideas in this hard-fought campaign |
| | Thurman has worked on the key issues facing the nation; Garlits is an outsider |
| | Deficit Reduction Bill: Thurman voted for this bill as a great step; Garlits disagreed with the bill |
| | Health Care: Thurman supports the Clinton plan; Garlits says it needs a fine-tuning not an overhaul |

In the Byrne versus Davis race, the comparisons were grouped into one of the following five categories: campaign finances, the horserace, candidate attributes, campaign signs, and issues. The reporters made a total of twenty-nine comparisons in the newspaper articles. Sixteen of these were about campaign finances, and in these, Davis, the male candidate, was given the
superior position in ten of the comparisons, and Byrne, the female candidate, was only superior in one comparison. Byrne and Davis were granted equal status in the remaining five comparisons. In the horserace category, four comparisons were made. Davis was depicted as superior in two of them, and the remaining two put them in an even standing. Four comparisons were also drawn in the candidate attributes category. One offered superior status to Davis, and the remaining three placed them on equal ground. In the category of campaign signs, Davis was given superiority in one comparison while the remaining two gave equal standing to Byrne and Davis. The final category, that of issues, only contained two comparisons, and each of these offered equal status to the male and female candidate.

A total of twenty comparisons were drawn in the Thurman versus Garlits race, and the following four categories were determined: the horserace, campaign finances, background, and issues. Two comparisons were made about the horserace, and one of these gave Thurman, the female candidate, superiority while the other regarded them as even. In the category of campaign finances, Garlits was superior in one comparison, but Thurman was superior in the remaining two. Only one comparison was made about the candidates' backgrounds, and it offered equal status. The category of issues encompassed the majority of comparisons between Thurman and Garlits. Of the fourteen issue comparisons, one placed Thurman in a superior position to Garlits, and the remaining thirteen regarded them as even.
This chapter provided a close analysis of the thirty-three newspaper articles pertaining to the Byrne versus Davis and Thurman versus Garlits races by identifying information that will assist in developing conclusions about the four research questions posed in the first chapter. After the number of words allocated to each candidate were determined, the newspaper endorsements were identified. Next, the depictions of the candidates in various settings were identified. Finally, the attitude of the media towards male and female candidates was explored by recognizing descriptive words and comparisons that were made between opposing candidates. The final chapter will draw conclusions from the data presented in Chapter Three and offer suggestions for future researchers interested in studying the differences in the way the media constructs the narratives of political candidates.
CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND CONCLUSIONS

The previous chapter analyzed the newspaper articles about the four congressional candidates for media coverage, newspaper endorsements, setting usage, and the media's attitude toward each of the candidates. This chapter will begin with a summary of the findings, for each of the research questions, based on the analysis in the previous chapter. Next, conclusions of this analysis of media constructed narratives will be presented. Third, workable solutions will be proposed, and finally, recommendations for future research will be offered.

Summary of Findings

Media Coverage of Male and Female Candidates

After analyzing the data concerning the media coverage of male and female candidates, several findings were discovered. First, the media wrote a significantly greater number of words about male candidates than about female candidates. Furthermore, the media failed to acknowledge the female candidates in significantly more instances than they failed to recognize the male candidates. Finally, more newspapers devoted a greater amount of coverage to
the male candidates than the papers that allocated more coverage to the female candidates.

Analysis of the headline coverage is not as conclusive as the analysis of word coverage. Even though the Thurman versus Garlits articles depicted headline favoritism toward the male candidate, since none of the headlines mentioned Thurman, the Byrne versus Davis race demonstrated more equal coverage. Perhaps the media even reflected slight favoritism in headline coverage towards the female candidate since five of the seven headlines mentioning both Byrne and Davis listed Byrne first.

Newspaper Endorsements of Male and Female Candidates

Since only one newspaper discussed candidate endorsements, this research question did not yield conclusive results. In the one article that did discuss candidate endorsements, Thurman received five endorsements, and Garlits received only two.

Settings in Which Male and Female Candidates are Portrayed

Analysis of the data pertaining to the third research question, which dealt with the settings in which reporters portrayed male and female candidates, exhibited several findings. First, the female candidates were not depicted in as many settings as their male opponents. These results coincide directly with the fact that male candidates receive more word coverage than female candidates. Another result of the data analysis uncovered that feminine settings are rare in
political campaigns. Out of the twenty-two settings, only three were classified as feminine.

The Media's Attitude Toward Male and Female Candidates

Just as the media used more word coverage for the male candidates, the reporters also used more descriptive words and phrases to describe the male candidates than the female candidates. Reporters did not use many feminine words and phrases to describe any of the political candidates (whether male or female). The majority of the words and phrases used to describe the candidates were gender neutral; however, a significant portion (between ten and thirty percent for each candidate in the first category) of the words and phrases were masculine. Therefore, just as masculine settings are preferred to feminine settings, masculine words and phrases are used to describe candidates more frequently than feminine traits.

The second category, words used in quotes by someone other than the reporter or one of the candidates, also used a majority of the gender neutral words and phrases to describe both male and female candidates. However, little or no distinction was made in the reporter's selection of masculine or feminine descriptive words in quotes.

The words in quotation marks used by a candidate to describe his/her opponent were relatively even in terms of the percentage of neutral, masculine, and feminine descriptive words and phrases that were used.
Another interesting finding revealed that none of the media’s selected quotes that the candidates used to describe themselves used feminine words or phrases. Rather, all of these self-descriptive terms were either masculine or neutral.

Now that a summary of masculine, feminine, and gender neutral comparisons of the words used to describe the male and female candidates has been completed, the findings of the opinion-based descriptive words can be summarized. In the first category, words and phrases used by the reporter, the majority of the words and phrases used to describe the candidates were factual, with the exception of Garlits. Surprisingly, the favorable and unfavorable opinions were relatively close in number for three of the four candidates. Again, Garlits was the exception. The favorable and unfavorable opinions about Garlits were each significantly greater in number than for the other candidates since the factual statements were significantly lower than for the other candidates. However, a significant difference also exists in the favorable and unfavorable descriptions of Garlits. While both the favorable and unfavorable opinions are much greater in number than for the other three candidates, more than twice as many favorable descriptions defined Garlits than the unfavorable references.

The remaining three categories did not produce many recognizable similar patterns among candidates for favorable and unfavorable descriptions. The quotes, spoken by individuals other than the reporter or one of the candidates, selected by the reporters were relatively close in number with one
exception. Again, Garlits is the exception with more than three times more favorable descriptive words and phrases than any of the other candidates. No identifiable patterns were determined in the third category which encompassed the words used by a candidate in quotation marks to describe his/her opponent. The final category, words used by a candidate in quotation marks to describe him/herself also contained few descriptive elements; however, all of the descriptive terms were classified as favorable opinions. Of course this finding is not surprising since it would be difficult for a reporter to find negative quotes by a candidate describing him/herself.

In the arena of the comparisons that journalists made between candidates in order to determine the media’s attitude, the results for the two races were dissimilar. In the Byrne versus Davis race, the male candidate was given superior status in fourteen comparisons while his female opponent was only awarded superior status in one comparison. The comparison that was made most frequently, campaign finances, provided the widest gap. The Thurman versus Garlits race, however, continues to display inconsistent results. While a majority of the comparisons were candidate neutral, Thurman was superior in a total of four while Garlits was only superior in one. Campaign finances were not discussed as frequently in this race as in the Byrne versus Davis race.
Conclusions of the Study

Media Coverage of Male and Female Candidates

One of the surprising factors in each of these races was that each of the female candidates was the incumbent, and traditionally, the incumbent receives more media attention. In the Byrne versus Davis race, even Byrne suggested that Davis was much like an incumbent due to his role as the chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors. However, the fact still remains that Byrne was the incumbent and Davis was her challenger. Overall, as indicated by word coverage, the media did not choose to discuss her prior record in the office for which she was running as much as they chose to discuss her challenger's prior record in a lesser office. Theoretically, Byrne's prior record as a U.S. congresswoman should have been a newsworthy topic upon which journalists could have reported. As this sampling of newspaper articles has indicated, however, her prior history in this political office for which she sought reelection was not a priority. Perhaps if the reporters had focused on her past record, she would have been a more visible candidate to the voters in her district. Whether or not reporters consciously decided not to provide Byrne with equal or comparable coverage to her male opponent, the effects were the same for her fate in this election.

Some might argue that the novelty of the race between Thurman and Garlits was the cause of the disparate coverage of these two candidates; however, the fact still remains that the media elected to devote more coverage to
the male candidate even though Thurman had previously held the office for
which they were competing. Garlits contained many of the qualities of
newsworthiness. He was a colorful character with an interesting and exciting
past which enabled reporters to use entertaining political metaphors.
Furthermore, his bizarre ideologies and solutions to societal dilemmas spawned
discussion. Garlits is similar to an automobile accident on the highway at which
those who pass by slow down to observe the spectacle. While voters may not
agree with Garlits that illegal immigrants should be held at Ellis Island and then
transported to Montana as jobs become available, most people can not help
listening to his rationale.

Perhaps the media’s slight favoritism in headline coverage towards Byrne,
the female candidate, is a reflection of Byrne’s status as the incumbent
candidate. But why did the headlines in the Thurman versus Garlits campaign
not reflect Thurman’s incumbency? As stated previously, this author believes
that the novelty of Garlits’ campaign directed attention away from Thurman and
to her drag-racing legend opponent. Because of Garlits’ popularity and unusual
political ideologies, headline coverage was diverted from Thurman and given to
the candidate that would draw in the largest audience. As a result, an economic
factor, the candidate with the most newspaper selling ability, overrode equality in
headline coverage.
Newspaper Endorsements of Male and Female Candidates

Originally, this author believed that male candidates would receive a greater percentage of the endorsements; however, this hypothesis did not prove true in this one article. Perhaps Thurman received more endorsements because of Garlits' right-wing rhetoric.

Settings in Which Male and Female Candidates are Portrayed

In regard to the discrepancy in settings, it is not likely that Byrne and Thurman made significantly fewer public appearances than Davis and Garlits; however, by reporting fewer female candidate settings, the media leads the audience to believe that the female candidates are not as active in the campaigning process.

One might presume that female candidates would be depicted in a greater percentage of feminine settings; however, this did not prove true in this study. Of course this does not mean that the female, and for that matter male, candidates did not speak at more feminine settings like women's groups, teas, or hospitals during their campaigns. Rather, the results possibly could signify that the media failed to report these events. Instead, the media elected to depict all candidates in masculine and gender neutral settings a majority of the time. Another explanation might be that the journalists omitted setting because reporting it might be viewed as "masculine" or "feminine" by readers; however,
this author does not believe that the media consciously determines whether or not to report an event based upon a masculine or feminine setting.

An alternative explanation as to why feminine settings are used seldomly is that they do not coincide with the political image which has functioned traditionally in the masculine realm. It is this masculine political world which the media has played an integral role in creating as media forms have developed throughout history. As a result of the expectations for appropriate backdrops for political candidates, candidates may adhere to those norms out of a fear that being depicted in too many feminine settings would be harmful to their political image and thus decrease chances for election.

Finally, this author expected the settings in which candidates were depicted to be more developed with more detail and description; however, this expectation was not met. On the contrary, the settings were vaguely mentioned in most of the articles with little or no details. For example, Lipton reported that Byrne and Davis both spoke at a Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce luncheon ("Byrne, Davis Debate Taxes, Business at Fairfax Luncheon"). No details about the luncheon were described; as a result of the few details, the reader of the article is left with the responsibility of creating his/her own image of the candidate in that setting. Television footage of the event would provide many more details through visual images of the setting; however, newspaper leaves more interpretation to the reporter and the reader. If the newspaper reporter elects to offer more details than just a listing of the place, then he/she
manipulates the reader’s image of the event even more. For example, as Ross described Thurman in her Inverness congressional office, he manipulated the reader’s image of her in the setting by including the image of her serving refreshments to her guests (“It’s a Very Odd Race”). In this instance, Ross manipulated a normally gender neutral setting into a feminine setting with just a few choice descriptive words. However, most of the articles lacked descriptions and merely provided an announcement of the event.

The Media’s Attitude Toward Male and Female Candidates

The finding that masculine descriptions are used to describe candidates more often than feminine ones reinforces the notion that politics is a masculine arena which the media reinforces through failing to cover feminine traits. Furthermore, the fact that the media uses many more masculine words and phrases than feminine to describe the candidates causes the masculine traits to be valued more than feminine traits in the political realm. As a result, female and male candidates must strive to only demonstrate masculine traits in order to survive in this political arena. One only needs to look at Kahn or Bem's categorizations of masculine and feminine traits to realize that many of the masculine traits (for example: independent, competitive, aggressive, ambitious, etc.) could be labeled easily as political assets while feminine characteristics (for example: dependent, passive, emotional, weak leader, etc.) could be detrimental traits for a political candidate. As a result, feminine traits are devalued, and female and male candidates who likely possess some of the
feminine characteristics may feel compelled to suppress them in favor of the more acceptable political masculine traits.

As stated previously, the words and phrases used by a candidate to describe his/her opponent was relatively proportional in the use of neutral, masculine, and feminine descriptions that were used. This finding was surprising since this author believes that a candidate could degrade his/her opponents political aptness by describing him/her with a few choice feminine words or phrases. However, the only feminine description was used by Garlits in reference to his female opponent, and one must not neglect the fact that Garlits' quote was selected by the journalist.

Perhaps the candidates avoid using feminine traits to describe themselves due to the negative political implications associated with feminine characteristics once those feminine traits are reported by the media. As discussed previously, candidates acknowledge the masculine environment of politics.

Even though Garlits was described by many more favorable opinions than the other candidates, many of Garlits' favorable references, however, cited his status as a drag racing champion. Thus, the high number of favorable opinions is a product of his novelty rather than his ability to serve in Congress.

Conclusions about factual, favorable, and unfavorable opinions were difficult to determine; however, close analysis suggests that reporters do not select as many quotes spoken by one of the candidates (either about him/herself
or about his/her opponent) as quotes from a third party. Perhaps this is because the reporter prefers to use third party quotes which offer an opinion that is not as biased as quotes spoken by one of the involved candidates. Furthermore, using more third party quotes leads the readers of the articles to believe that the reporter is not focusing on his/her own political agenda since no identifiable pattern was identified in quotes by third parties. Even if the reporter's narrative in the rest of the article contains biases toward one candidate over the other, the reporter can claim no biases exist as a result of the third party quotes which more comparably represent both candidates.

While the original intent of this study was not to compare the favorable and unfavorable opinions with the masculine and feminine descriptive words and phrases, several patterns were noticed. Since relatively few masculine or feminine traits in the articles were referenced in the last three categories, no differentiation will be made between any of the categories; rather, the comparison between the masculine and feminine and favorable and unfavorable will be made for all of the descriptions as the four categories are combined. For every candidate, the descriptive opinions were placed in one of the following four combinations: (1.) favorable masculine, (2.) unfavorable masculine, (3.) favorable feminine, or (4.) unfavorable feminine. In the favorable masculine classification, the following number of descriptive words and phrases were used for each of the candidates: Byrne, 7; Davis, 8; Thurman, 3; and Garlits, 13. The unfavorable masculine traits include: Byrne, 6; Davis, 0; Thurman, 0; and
Garlits, 2. The characteristics that were categorized as favorable feminine were: Byrne, 0; Davis, 1; Thurman, 1; and Garlits, 0. The final category, unfavorable feminine, include: Byrne, 1; Davis, 3; Thurman, 3; and Garlits, 0. Based on these results of the gendered traits cross-referenced with the opinion-based traits, this author determined that masculine traits are more likely to be favorable and feminine traits are more likely to be unfavorable. This supports the notion asserted previously that the political arena has a masculine nature. Journalists likely do not purposely use negative feminine traits more than the positive feminine trait qualities. Rather, feminine traits, in general, are not valued as much as the masculine traits by society. Many of the traits that society deems undesirable are feminine by nature, and reporters seldom used the feminine traits that are considered positive. While some of the characteristics that Bem defines as feminine could be construed as favorable traits in certain environments, they are often seen as liabilities in political circles. For example, one would desire his/her doctor (whether male or female) to have feminine traits such as compassion, tenderness, eagerness to soothe hurt feelings, and sympathy. After all, these qualities make good bed-side manner. However, few political candidates (whether male or female) would strive to be described in these terms.

Perhaps the reporters elected to compare Byrne and Davis with comparisons in which the male candidate was superior. These results are consistent with previous findings about the Byrne versus Davis race which
include more word coverage, more setting descriptions, and more descriptive words and phrases for the male candidate.

Perhaps campaign finances were not discussed as often in the Thurman versus Garlits race because Thurman raised more finances than her male opponent. If Garlits had won the financial race, maybe more comparisons in this area would have been made by the reporters in this race. Also, maybe so many of the comparisons were neutral because it was difficult to find areas in which Garlits was superior to Thurman. Instead of focusing on areas in which Thurman was superior to Garlits, like campaign finances, reporters elected to provide equal status through equal coverage to the candidates in areas like campaign issues.

Additional Conclusions

Through analysis of media coverage, setting depictions, and the media's attitude about male and female candidates, several broad conclusions were determined. First, due to these differences in coverage, it is obvious that the newspaper media constructs a hyperreality for its readers. Because the audience of these newspapers can not possibly attend every political event or appearance by the candidates in a race, many rely heavily upon the newspaper to provide a comprehensive review of the important occurrences, and most readers expect an unbiased report from the papers so they can make their own determinations about the campaigning candidates. While many of these journalists most likely did not predetermine to offer more coverage, more setting
depictions, and more descriptive words and phrases to the male candidates than to the female candidates, the media does so unconsciously. As the media reports less information about the female candidates and more about the male candidates, an alternative reality is created in the minds of the readers. When more data is read about one candidate, that candidate becomes more familiar to the reader. Of course it is impossible to know for sure if the female candidates actually did appear in fewer settings and if they solicited fewer descriptive words and phrases about them; however, the true concern is with the hyperreality created by the newspaper media that becomes the reality for its readers.

Furthermore, feminine qualities are not sought or admired by the newspaper media in male and female candidates. As stated previously, when feminine qualities are used rarely, and when they are used, they are most often unfavorable qualities, the media is creating or reinforcing the hyperreality that feminine characteristics are not worthy. This undervaluing of feminine qualities does not only harm the political world, but it infects all other areas of existence. Through the narratives that the media creates, unconscious messages are sent to individuals about those characteristics that are desirable and undesirable.

Finally, few female reporters covered these two campaign races. While this researcher hypothesized that female reporters were more likely to present female candidates favorably, this was not discovered. Rather, the conclusion was made that men are more likely to report elections. This supports the assertion that politics is a masculine arena into which few women dare to enter.
Proposal for Workable Solutions

Because of the media's power to construct the narratives of all political candidates, the media must become cognizant of the affects it has on the audience. Since society views the media as a main source of information, the media has a responsibility to its audience to devote comparable coverage to all candidates, regardless of gender.

The candidates, however, also have the responsibility to monitor their coverage by the media. If coverage is not on an equal level and the candidate believes it could harm his/her chances of being elected, he/she might create a media event to attract additional media attention. Female and male candidates alike should stress their own politically acceptable character traits and avoid emphasizing those which may result in damaging coverage. In order to attract more media attention, women, who were not found to have been depicted in as many settings, might appear in unique settings which would draw in reporters. Feminine settings should probably be avoided by the candidates since this study found that newspapers rarely covered political events at feminine settings.

While every candidate may not have a colorful background and ideology like Garlits, every candidate could promote media coverage by devising a campaign strategy that would lend itself to metaphorical language by the media.

Finally, the media's audience must also become aware of discrepant coverage. As voters read their local newspaper, watch a television report, or
listen to a newscast on the radio, they must demand comparable coverage so they can learn more about their voting choices. In addition, voters must recognize the media as a constructor of their reality and not as reality itself.

Recommendations for Future Research

The media constructions of the narratives of male and female political candidates is a research area in need of additional study. An analysis of word coverage and headline coverage should be conducted with a larger candidate base. In addition, more focus should be placed on any differences between male and female journalists. Perhaps in a broader campaign study or in a different region, more women reporters would cover elections. More study should also be devoted to the differences in the media attention to novel candidates like Garlits. Furthermore, studies about masculine and feminine characteristics should be analyzed for possible biases toward feminine qualities. Another promising area of research might seek to answer the following question: To what extent is the media selective of the settings on which they report? Furthermore, how can the media achieve objectivity? In the areas of discrepant coverage, would similar results be found against male opponents of different race, or are these results unique to the male and female opposition? To what extent are the findings a result of party affiliations rather than sex? Finally, are these results unique to the South, or does the media also formulate the narratives of male and female candidates differently in other regions?
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