The Dissertation Committee for Ingrid Bachmann Cáceres certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Toward a Theory on Gender and Emotional Management in Electoral Politics: A Comparative Study of Media Discourses in Chile and the United States

Committee:

Dustin Harp, Supervisor

Renita Coleman

Sharon Jarvis

Paula M. Poindexter

Natalie J. Stroud

Toward a Theory on Gender and Emotional Management in Electoral Politics: A Comparative Study of Media Discourses in Chile and the United States

by

Ingrid Bachmann Cáceres, B.A.; M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2011

Dedication

For my parents, to whom everything I do is nothing short of finding the cure for cancer

and securing world peace.

Acknowledgements

This dissertation has been a labor of love several years in the making. Such an undertaking, however, would have been excruciating without the support, guidance and encouragement of many people over the years.

First of all, I would like to thank my family for all their support. They took in stride my decision to move 7,000 kilometers away for an undetermined period of time to pursue my dreams. They avoided asking me how long it would take to finish the dissertation, and told me to keep working as much as I needed. I am especially grateful to my parents, for they taught me to reach for my goals with passion and instilled in me both the love of learning and the importance of hard work. This dissertation is as much theirs as it is mine.

I am indebted to José Antonio Soto and his assistant, Macarena Baeza, for their help with the news clips from Chilean networks. Many thanks go to Ana Triviños, for being the kindest of friends and a source of constant support, encouraging emails and selfless and efficient help in desperate times and tiring data collection in Chile. She really meant it when she said, "If you need anything, just let me know."

I also thank Rosental Alves and the Knight Center for Journalism in the Americas for the space to work, hang out with friends and students, and ramble on about my dissertation. More importantly, my Knight Center friends —Amy, Dean, Eva, Ian, Jennifer, Joe, Paul, Rachel, Summer, and Vanessa— heard my reflections on

emotions, gender and politics with no complaint, and let me bounce ideas off them when I wasn't sure where I was going or what I was doing.

Acknowledgment also goes to my fellow graduate students in the School of Journalism, my classmates and the members of the CJCR group lead by Homero Gil de Zúñiga, for their camaraderie has made my graduate experience one to cherish. Monica Chadha, Summer Harlow, Jaime Loke and Tania Cantrell Rosas-Moreno, in particular, have accompanied me in this journey and made this adventure called the doctoral program a worthwhile experience beyond the classroom and campus. They introduced me to bubble teas, dragged me to the gym, and drove me around Austin. They also joined me for karaoke sessions, happy hours, and great conversations on research, current affairs and life. My five years in Austin would have been quite different without them and I am grateful for having their collaboration and friendship enlivening my academic path. A special thanks goes to Summer, who kindly offered to proofread and revise this manuscript, and helped with the accuracy of several translations. Her thorough corrections have greatly improved the clarity of these pages, and any remaining error in this copy is mine alone. In addition, I had the good fortune of knowing Teresa Correa and Sebastián Valenzuela from my college years as an journalism major in Chile, having them as guides of my move to Austin and then sharing my UT experience with them; now that we all are moving back to Santiago, I am looking forward to our next endeavors.

I also would like to give my heartfelt gratitude to my dissertation committee members, for their dedication and mentoring have helped me and inspired me greatly. I

have been told that this could be the very first committee in the Journalism program at the University of Texas at Austin where all the members are women. My choice of chair and committee members was not based on these professors' gender, but on their academic qualities, their stellar example as researchers, and the insight they could offer in guiding my work. To those who asked me along the way things like, "Don't you need a man on that committee?" I can honestly reply that these five professors, who happen to be female, were exactly the people I needed, not only to make this dissertation possible, but to make the best of such an undertaking.

The idea for this dissertation started with a discussion in Dr. Sharon Jarvis' Politics and Media class, and thanks to her wonderful advice it became much more than that. I always joke that the way the media portray men and women candidates' emotionality became an obsession, but in all seriousness it was Dr. Jarvis's encouragement to dwell upon what puzzled me about certain media messages that spurred this project and its comparative approach. Further, she was the one who suggested the term "emotional management" used in this dissertation.

Dr. Talia Stroud asked me the big questions that ended up defining exactly what about emotion, gender and politics I wanted to examine. In doing so, she helped me enrich my ideas and find this research path that I am so passionate about. She offered a wealth of knowledge, guidance and enthusiasm. This dissertation was an enjoyable project that came alive in great part because of her great support and insightful feedback regarding my ideas and musings, even those that I couldn't articulate clearly or in a straightforward fashion.

My first study addressing media coverage of female politicians—a paper on the first months in office of the first female Chilean President, Michelle Bachelet—was in Dr. Paula Poindexter's class almost five years ago. Little did I know that it would become a common thread in my scholarship, but I do know that that the rigor and thoroughness I have embraced in doing research were strengthened in Dr. Poindexter's class. The multiple conversations on the topic with her ever since have also reinforced my confidence in my own research.

Since my very first semester in the doctoral program, Dr. Renita Coleman offered me prompt and great advice, thoughtful commentaries and constructive criticism to my work. She always was willing to review a manuscript and encourage me to submit my papers —or keep trying after a rejection. Her pep talks boosted my confidence and her reflections on academic research and journalism paved the way to my own approach to academia. She has taught me greatly and I was fortunate to have her as a professor.

Above all, I would like to thank my chair and mentor, Dr. Dustin Harp. Her support and guidance have been remarkable and this 270-page long dissertation is a testament to that. Dr. Harp has been both encouraging and challenging, always with my best interests at heart. She has a sharp intelligence without a hint of arrogance and a easygoing attitude that made me immediately at ease in her presence. More importantly, over the years, Dr. Harp has helped me navigate the waters of the "F word" of academia—feminism and feminist scholarship. She stirred an intellectual fire in me and for that I will always be in debt to her. I still remember having too little confidence to

write a paper with a feminist theoretical framework for her class during my first year in the doctoral program. Less than ten months later we had co-authored a manuscript based on feminist theories and since then we have continued collaborating on multiple projects. She always has had her door open for me, and offered me great words of advice and encouragement, to the extent that she has been my sounding board, de facto therapist, co-author, mentor and adviser. Her passion and dedication are contagious and she has made sure that I excelled on my own. She is a great model to follow and I hope I can make her proud.

Toward a Theory of Gender and Emotional Management in
Electoral Politics: A Comparative Study of Media Messages in
Chile and the United States

Publication No._____

Ingrid Bachmann Cáceres, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2011

Supervisor: Dustin Harp

The role of a political leader often is associated with the emotional attributes of a man, and there is empirical evidence that media coverage reinforces culture-specific emotion display rules for politicians. Feminist communication scholarship also has shown the gendered assumptions manifest in mediated discourses. This dissertation explores the relationship between gender, culture and candidates' emotionality by examining and comparing news media coverage of the emotional management of Chile's Michelle Bachelet and the United States' Hillary Clinton, two female candidates with a viable bid for the presidency in their respective countries.

Using a discourse analysis of 1,676 items from national newspapers, news magazines and television newscasts, this study found that cultural differences influence

the discursive constructions of these women candidates' emotionality. In the case of Bachelet, she was deemed as a soft, empathic and ultimately "feminine" candidate who needed to toughen up to convey authority and convince voters that she had the skills, in addition to the charm, to lead a country. In the case of Clinton, she was described mainly as a cold and unsympathetic contender, an unwomanly woman with too much ambition to be likable, and who was portrayed either as fake or frail when being more emotionally open.

These mediated discourses suggest the media favored determined understandings for a woman's place and role, reinforcing socially-shared and culturally-bound meanings about gendered identities. Informed by a feminist theoretical framework, the discussion addresses how these mediated discourses on Bachelet and Clinton illustrate the power of culturally-sanctioned sexism in Chile and the United States to make of gender a restrictive force that keeps women out of the realms of politics and policy.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1. Introduction

When Geraldine Ferraro died on March 26, 2011, news media extolled her trailblazing career and credited her for paving the way for female politicians in the United States. In 1984, Ferraro became the first female on the ticket of a major party for national office, which prompted *The Washington Post* to write the editorial cited above lambasting the notion that women's gender informed their fitness for office. Yet, 24 years later, when Hillary Clinton unsuccessfully bid for the Democratic presidential nomination, issues of gender and suitability were far from being outmoded, as *The Washington Post* had suggested in 1984. For example, in what *The New York Times* labeled as "a nakedly emotional plea for her candidacy" (Kantor, 2008), Clinton choked back tears in a New Hampshire diner while admitting that coping with the campaign's demands was a constant challenge. According to media reports, the incident helped propel her to a come-from-behind victory against all pollsters' predictions. However, Clinton's "stunning"—and "feminine"—display of emotion also was criticized, for it did not make her appear "very presidential" and suggested that she would not respond well to the pressures linked to being the head of the national government. One voter was cited saying, "If she is breaking down now, before winning her party's nomination, then how would she act under pressure as president?" (Kantor, 2008).

1

The more things change, it would seem, the more they stay the same. Despite the important inroads made by women in the public sphere worldwide, scholarship suggests that the role of a political leader—at least in Western societies—still is often associated with the stereotypical attributes of males, including their emotional traits. Research also shows that media coverage reinforces culture-specific emotion display rules and stereotypes of the behavior deemed appropriate for politicians. Indeed, emotion-related incidents in the political arena have the potential to be highly influential. Emotions are constructed and understood in response to social situations, and while politics is about social evaluation, research often has overlooked this perspective (Troyer & Robinson, 2003).

Exploration of these phenomena promises to enrich our understanding of politics and media effects and representations. It has been argued that there is an emotional deficit in political communication in general (Kinder, 1994; Richards, 2004), and to date, research has tended to ignore candidates' emotionality. Several studies suggest that consideration of a candidates' character has a significant impact on voters' preferences, and that media messages reinforce culturally-based normative rules about people's roles (see, for instance, Tomkins, 1991).

Grounded in a feminist theoretical framework, this dissertation explores the relationship between media messages, gender, emotions and politics. It aims to examine and compare news media discourses from Chile and the United States about female candidates running for the highest office and their emotional behavior and management. Using a discourse analysis of national newspapers, news magazines and television

2

newscasts from each country, this comparative study focuses on the possible cultural differences that might influence how the media frame and interpret women candidates' shows of emotions in the context of an electoral race. The attention is on the representations that news media circulate about politicians in culturally and developmentally different countries. Specifically, the research addresses what the media make of political leaders' displays of emotion; whether the emotional management of women and men stir a particular (and different) reaction in the media; what circumstances define these media representations; and what kind of socially constructed concepts are circulated by the media about women and men in politics, their appropriate gender roles, their social identity, and their acceptable behaviors.

In doing so, this project advances the idea that candidates' emotionality has political implications, and argues for an analysis of news media's role in promoting "appropriate"—and stereotypical—gendered identities and emotional roles. Further, this study suggests that feminist and political communication research would benefit from examining politicians' affective behavior, making a case for the elaboration of a theory of gender and affective behavior in electoral politics.

FEMALE LEADERSHIP IN POLITICS TODAY

Scholars have documented the rise of more egalitarian attitudes toward the roles of women and men, including in terms of political leadership (see Inglehart & Norris, 2003). However, women's marginalization in the public sphere is still very real. Today, only one in five parliamentarians worldwide is a female, as well as one in ten cabinet

ministers and one in twenty heads of state or government. Indeed, in modern history, women rarely have headed up a government and since 1960, when Sirimavo Bandaranaike of then Ceylon (now Sri Lanka) became the first elected female prime minister in the world, only 64 women have ever served as an elected president or prime minister.

Research from the last two decades also shows that when women go beyond the usual boundaries of their roles in politics, they may meet with some resistance from the media and the public (Devere & Davies, 2006; Devitt, 2002; Robertson & Anderson, 2001; Scharrer, 2002). For example, political women receive less coverage than men (Heldman et al., 2005; Kahn, 1994; Niven & Zilbe, 2001; Norris, 1997) and when they do receive attention, the focus is on "women's issues" such as abortion and family leave (Huddy & Terkildsen 1993a; 1993b; Robertson & Anderson, 2001; Ross, 2002; 2004). Media coverage also is more likely to suggest that men are qualified and knowledgeable (Devitt, 2002; Kahn, 1994a; Robertson & Anderson, 2001). Even without these perceived differences gender would have an effect on people's impressions on a female politician. For instance, both allies and adversaries can perceive it as salient, and as a result change their own behavior toward that woman (Genovese & Thompson, 1993).

Because they still are relative novelties in the political arena, female politicians have to endure media focus on their personal traits rather than their handling of political matters (Devitt, 2002; Kahn, 1994a; Robertson & Anderson, 2001), and there is empirical evidence suggesting women need to convince voters that their gender is not at odds with being competent (Ross, 2002; 2004; Thomas, 1997).

4

When it comes to government heads, there has not been much opportunity for analyses, but arguably the mere fact of a "Madam President" can generate high expectations about this woman's performance, imposing even more attention on her (Clift & Brazaitis, 2000), particularly when considering how masculinized the presidential office is (Heldman et al.; 2005).

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

Feminist communication scholarship's focus on, and challenging of, gender relations offers a valuable insight into the intersection of media, women and politics. Considering that mass media are central sites in which gender negotiations take place (Van Zoonen, 1994), feminist media analyses favor a rich understanding and critique of women's marginalized status and women's treatment by and in the media (Kitch, 1997; Harding, 1987; Steiner, 2008). Indeed, decades of feminist communication research have shown evidence of the gendered assumptions manifest in mediated discourses (Byerly & Ross, 2006). Mass media messages and representations promote determined ideals of femininity, with mediated discourses telling women what to do and how to act, often times with a limited repertoire that undermines women's real-life circumstances and options (Kitch, 1997; Van Zoonen, 1994). Along these lines, feminist scholars have criticized stereotypical media portrayals of females in the public sphere that posit that women do not belong in politics (see, for example, Byerly & Ross, 2006; Derman & Ross, 2003Gallagher, 2001; Ross, 2004, 2002; Sreberny-Mohammadi & Ross, 1996; Vavrus, 2002).

The media are powerful agents of socialization and their representations play an important role in people's understandings. Moreover, the gendered lens pervading news content shapes not only the public comprehension of gender (Vavrus, 2002), but also excludes women from important debates in the public arena (Byerly & Ross, 2004; Norris, 1997). Thus, the news media reinforce gender stereotypes working to women's disadvantage. Among these stereotypes are the appropriate emotional attributes for a female, traditionally regarded as the emoter, in contrast to the rational male (Burrow, 2005; Mendus, 2000; Porter, 2006;Winsky-Mattei, 1998).

According to Inglehart and Norris (2003, see especially chapter 8), when it comes to gender equality in politics, culture matters, and a lot. Arguably, news frames reflect broader social norms and provide information about the social world (Byerly & Ross, 2006). The political rhetoric in mainstream news texts contributes to the promotion of these particular social identities, and news coverage is a key element when it comes to defining the personality and identities of individuals in the public sphere (Falk, 2008; Vavrus, 2002). Similarly, studies from different fields agree that norms and beliefs about the appropriateness of displaying emotion in social settings vary from one culture to another. Thus, examination of the interplay of gender, emotion and politics through a comparative study presents an avenue of research that can reach conclusions that go beyond one system while avoiding the overgeneralizations of single-case studies (see Blumler, McLeod & Rosengren, 1992; Esser & Pfetsch, 2004b). Accordingly, this dissertation opts for a comparative design to explore mediated discourses on candidates' emotionality.

6

This dissertation is not just a description of media messages regarding female politicians or their emotional management. Rather, it tries to explain the arguments used in mediated discourse interconnecting emotion, gender and politics. Given the influence of culture in the definition of gender roles and social identities, and in an effort to get a more nuanced assessment of the situation than what a single case study would offer, this study compares media discourses of two countries.

Arguably, there is a certain appropriate demeanor linked to the role of the presidential office, which includes the appropriate emotions a leader can show in certain contexts. Considering the gendered readings of emotion and reason, such interplay may be shaping the perception of women running for the highest office. How this relationship is described, contextualized and supported not only informs people's knowing, but also what is deemed as truth.

Thus, the purpose of this dissertation is three-fold:

1.	to explore the discursive constructions in media from Chile and the United States in discussing the interaction between gender, emotions and politics.

2.	to understand how meanings regarding candidates' emotional management are presented and negotiated in two culturally different countries;

3.	to discuss the implications of such constructions and meanings in light of feminist and political communication research.

Chapter 2. Feminist Communication Theory

> The choice to conduct feminist research is often met with resistance at a number of levels. . . and the very term "feminist" has negative social implications.
> (Spitzack & Carter, 1989, p. 1)

Feminist theories offer a comprehensive framework to address and understand the nature of women's definition in society and the way in which women are represented in the public sphere, the arena for the formation and enactment of social identities. Stemming from social movements that originally challenged the status quo of women—in particular, notions that women naturally lacked rationality and could not be considered full citizens (Donovan, 1992)—feminist scholarship encompasses multiple practices that theorize about the status of women and the nature of gender. Such scholarship analyzes the structures that define women's experiences and circumstances and pays attention to issues of power, culture, social relations and subordination (Cirksena & Cuklanz, 1992; Donovan, 1992; Van Zoonen, 1994). In that sense, feminist theories offer tools for understanding and critiquing the differences used to dominate and devalue women (Harp, 2008; Rakow & Wackwitz, 2004), and for advocating for changes that go much further and deeper than just the concession of certain rights to women (Donovan, 1992).

Regarding the mass media, this line of critique tends to focus on representations of women that lead to reinforcement of social definitions, ideologies and stereotypes of women and other marginalized groups. In the twenty-first century, women still face many problems of marginality and misrepresentation in news and other fact-based

8

media (Byerly & Ross, 2006), and feminist communication scholarship can contribute to our understating of these issues by analyzing the emergence of particular news discourses about women, and their implications for both males and females in society.

This chapter addresses these issues and provides an overview of the tenets of feminist theoretical perspectives. In doing so, it sets the theoretical framework for the present study.

FEMINISM AND THEORY

At its core, feminist theory tries to explain the cultural and political status of women and often times does so by exposing and challenging sexism. While feminism was born as a social movement that promotes women's equal rights, feminist theories offer a far broader vision than the advocacy of respect for women and their roles in society (Norris, 1997). Feminist theory is an intellectual project that challenges conventions about women's (subordinate) status, and as such, it is an interpretation of the condition of being a woman—a condition that is the basis for a woman's identity (Butler, 1999; Donovan, 1992). Its attempt to understand the category of women (Butler, 1999) combines "theorizing, research and activism" (M. Gallagher, 2003, p. 34) at the same time as a theoretical critique of the conventions and arrangements that circumscribe women's place and status. Accordingly, it allows for an understanding of the inequalities and oppression women experience (Harp, 2008).

Feminist theory argues that the dynamics and structures of patriarchy—the male-dominated society—set up the male as the positive, or the norm, in society, and

9

thus legitimize sexism (Donovan, 1992). As the root of women's oppression and subordination, patriarchal relations operate at the level of ideologies, or values, beliefs and ideas that are used to make sense of the world, and that serve to legitimize social and political behaviors (Freeden, 2003; Gramsci, 1971; Johnston & Swanson, 2006). By means of ideologies, ruling classes reproduce the social relations of their supremacy while making them appear natural (Makus, 1990; Van Zoonen, 1994) and in the case of women—historically kept out of positions of power—patriarchal discourse promotes notions that take for granted gender roles and women's subordination. Feminist theory acknowledges women's historical experiences and the problems generated by the power inequalities that diminish women's agency.[1]

Women, however, are not a unified or homogeneous constituency. Their experiences are diverse, and the understanding and analysis of such circumstances and identities are equally diverse and multifaceted (Ganguly, 1992; Steiner, 2008; Van Zoonen, 1994). As such, feminist theories—plural—are heterogeneous, complex, and transdisciplinary. Feminists disagree about the best approach to theorizing and challenging differences used to subordinate females (Rakow & Wackwitz, 2004), and each approach emphasizes different aspects of the nature of gender and women's identity (Cirksena & Cuklanz, 1992). Feminism itself has been influenced by the varied philosophical and cultural approaches that compose the intellectual heritage of

---

[1] Power is commonly equated with domination and control over people or things (hooks, 1994). Accordingly, power inequalities translate into women being controlled by others –usually men—who tell females what to do and how to act.

humankind, including the Enlightenment, Liberalism, Marxism, Positivism, Culturalism and Existentialism (for a summary, see Butler, 1999; and Donovan, 1992).[2] What constitutes—or should constitute—the category of women is as variable as the signifier "women" itself; after all, there is no common identity for all the females in the world, and feminist perspectives are positioned within this diverse landscape (Cirksena & Cuklanz, 1992; Harp, 2008; Van Zoonen, 1994). In the words of MacKinnon (1982), "feminists do not argue that it means the same to women to be on the bottom in a feudal regime, a capitalist regime, and a socialist regime; the commonality argued is that, despite real changes, bottom is bottom" (p. 523).

While feminist theories are not easily delineated as a whole, all of them pay attention to power and women's subordination, and have an explicitly political dimension—rather that just identify problems, feminist approaches are committed to solving them by transformative action (Steiner, 2009). Thus, despite the fragmentations, feminist theories can be distinguished from other perspectives in that they theorize about gender as a mechanism that structures the world (Carter & Spitzack, 1989; M. Gallagher, 2003; Rakow, 1986; Rakow & Wackwitz, 2004; Van Zoonen, 1994; Donovan). This is, feminist theory goes beyond the differences between women and men—real or otherwise—and offers insights into the structures and concepts that define what is fundamentally female (Cirksena & Cuklanz, 1992; Houston, 1992).

---

[2] Despite this acknowledgement of diversity, feminist scholarship as a collective has been criticized for being an endeavor about Western women, in particular white females (hooks, 1994; Rakow 1992). Since the 1980s, feminist theories have paid more attention to the differences among women themselves (Donovan, 1992) as well as the relationship between women's subordination and other types of oppression, such as race, ethnicity, class and sexual orientation (Steiner, 2008).

THEORIZING GENDER

For decades feminist scholars have tried to understand what being a woman entails and why females are relegated to "peripheral, secondary, or inferior status" (Cirksena & Cuklanz, 1992, p. 20). In doing so, they have theorized *gender* as a complex and culturally constructed system of differentiation (Ardizzone, 1998; Butler, 1999; Rakow & Wackwitz, 2004, Wackwitz & Rakow, 2007) that organizes "biology and social life into particular ways of doing, thinking, and experiencing the world" (Rakow, 1986, p. 22). Gender is the cultural means by which sexual difference becomes the base for defining men and women's identities, roles and experiences, pairing down the biological terms of "female" and "male" to the cultural constructions of "feminine" and "masculine" respectively—in other words, transforming biological sexes into discrete and hierarchized genders (Butler, 1999). Gender is "never simply an individual's attribute" (Wackwitz & Rakow, 2007, p. 263), but rather dictates behaviors and qualities that make women and men very different from one another (Buzzanel, Sterk & Turner, 2004; Perry, Turner & Sterk, 1992). As a classification system, gender organizes the world and takes place as interaction and social practice (Rakow, 1986), originating from those with the authority to make it so (Rakow & Wackwitz, 2004). Historically, these have been men, and thus in patriarchal cultures the male/masculine is set up as the norm, whereas the female/feminine is defined in negative terms as "the other" (Donovan, 1992).

As Bem (1981; 1983; 1993) argued, these cultural definitions of maleness and femaleness are embedded in discourse and social practices. Gender is the product of

social interaction and power relations (Van Zoonen, 1994) and is linked to constructions of racial, ethnic, class, sexual and even geographical identities (Buttler, 1999). Because of that, feminist scholars posit that it is impossible to separate "gender" from the political and cultural intersections that both produce it and maintain it (Butler, 1999). Moreover, gender is neither biological nor natural, but what Butler calls *performative*, "manufactured through a sustained set of acts" (Butler, 1999, p. xv) and thus has "no ontological status apart from the various acts which constitute its reality" (p. 173). In Butler's view, gender attributes are not expressive but a performance by which these attributes effectively constitute gender configuration—such as masculinist domination and compulsory heterosexuality (Buttler, 1999). As such, gender articulates presumptions about the limits and propriety of what counts as masculinity and femininity, as well as the ways in which various traits are assigned to different sexes (Dow & Condit, 2005), thus informing whole ways of life (Van Zoonen, 1994) and ultimately leading to sexism (hooks, 1994).[3]

Gender is a crucial component of culture, a term encompassing the shared meanings used in processes of symbolization and representation of reality (Wackwitz & Rakow, 2004; Van Zoonen. 1994). Accordingly, feminist theories produce a cultural critique[4] of these meanings and contested categories (Rakow & Wackwitz, 2004). Gender identities are not fixed and thus can be re-interpreted, negotiated and shifted

---

[3] Gender alone, however, "does not determine either a superordinate or subordinate position" (Hurtado, 1989, p. 833).

[4] Not surprisingly, feminist scholars have an affinity with the cultural/critical studies approach (see, for instance, Ganguly, 1992; and Van Zoonen, 1994).

over time (Rakow, 1986; Rakow & Wackwitz, 2004). While dominant meaning systems about gender vary within and across cultures, over time and from place to place (Perry, Turner & Sterk, 1992; Rakow 1986), feminist scholars argue that they all have to do with configurations of power and economic inequities (Van Zoonen, 1994). In other words, gender and the cultural values inform assumptions about hierarchical relationships and naturalize social inequities (Cirksena & Cuklanz, 1992; Houston, 1992), which make the concept of power a key element in feminist theory's insights into the nature of patriarchy and women's oppression (Donovan, 1992; Dow & Condit, 2005).

For instance, feminist scholars historically have been concerned with the public-private division that assigns women to the domestic sphere (Donovan, 1992). The functional roles circumscribed to the house—motherhood, emotionality, body—have cemented an ideology of gender division that stresses women's inferiority to men both in physical and intellectual terms. This has led not only to women's oppression, but also to women's insights being ridiculed and denied. Likewise, the politics of domination relies on language to subordinate and exclude women, and thus language can be seen as a form of power that prescribes how an issue should be understood (Butler, 1999; Donovan, 1992; hooks, 1994; Rakow & Wackwitz, 2004; Van Zoonen, 1994).

Because of power inequalities, often times women have had little say or control of the realities that shape their lives, and thus feminist theories question the power relations and structures that secure men's dominance in society (Byerly & Ross, 2004). This power is not necessarily secured by coercion or violence—although it can adopt

14

such strategies—but by the politics of hegemony and consensus (Gitlin, 1980; Gramsci, 1971a, 1971b; Vavrus, 2002), which promotes an ideological space that appears permanent, natural and commonsensical, even if it is continually contested (Hebdige, 1979). Accordingly, the cultural meanings associated with gender have resulted in power differentials that are justified by arguments about biology and gender-appropriate behavior (Vavrus, 2002). Feminist theorists have adapted Gramsci's notion of hegemony to further explain how both men and women participate in a social system that is inherently unequal and undemocratic (Byerly & Ross, 2004). Further, power differences embedded in the construction of gender mean that women constitute an oppressed class. Feminist theory sheds light on sexism as an ideology of domination that permeates culture on various levels, and that can be related to other types of dominance, such as racism and classism (hooks, 1994; Houston, 1992). These hegemonic ideologies are so ingrained and interconnected in the social system (Ardizzone, 1998) that important structural changes are necessary to end sexist oppression. Actions such as enforcing equal rights, granting legal protection or opening doors so women can be relevant actors in public spaces, as important as they might be, are not enough. For instance, eighty years after the Nineteenth Amendment in the United States—which granted women the right to vote—females have yet to achieve equal rights or have their secondary status in politics eliminated. As such, feminist theory advocates for a transformative and interventionist approach to improve women's status, as the dominant patriarchal structure is too powerful and long-standing to change overnight, or even over the course of several years.

While feminist research deliberately theorizes about gender and women's experiences, but many studies on women and gender issues are, however, largely untheorized approaches (Rakow & Wackwitz, 2004).[5] Simply adding women or gender considerations to any study without a theoretical linkage or clear rationale does not serve any purpose and assumes that gender is theoretically unproblematic (Wackwitz & Rakow, 2007). Treating gender as a simple or sole variable ignores the complex structures and power relations that influence women's status (Ardizzone, 1998; Rakow, 1986) and disregards that gender is produced by social and discursive practices (Van Zoonen, 1994).

While there is no distinctive feminist method of research—feminist scholars gather evidence as any other social scientist (Harding, 1987; Van Zoonen, 1994)—those analyses labeled as feminist have distinctive characteristics and particularities that can be thought of as epistemological (Harding, 1987). Using a critical lens, feminist research systematically adds to the understanding of women's status and sexist oppression (Spitzack & Carter, 1989; Harding, 1987) by looking at the way people experience, define, organize and appropriate reality. It theorizes gender by acknowledging and analyzing the structural inequalities involved in and coming out of the process of making meaning (Van Zoonen. 1994). This undertaking focuses on an interpretative strategy of power—"the power to define situations and identities, to frame

---

[5] Similarly, not all studies on gender issues are feminist interpretations.

issues and problems, to legitimize interpretations and experiences"—that is unequally distributed (Van Zoonen, 1994, p. 134). Accordingly, feminist interpretations of gender acknowledge its relation to issues of culture and power, and try to be explanatory—e.g., make connections between concepts—while being political and transformative (Rakow & Wackwitz, 2004) in an effort to fully comprehend women's status (Ardizzone, 1998).

Such a framework pays attention to differences; to voices and representations of both men and women and how label such dichotomous categories (re)produce their identities and status, a task that is not particularly easy and has been met with resistance (M. Gallagher, 2003). In fact, the term "feminist" itself is ill-regarded (Spitzack & Carter, 1989), and feminist scholars argue that they still need to "convince others of the worthiness of [their] causes" (Rakow, 1989, p. 213). Further, such an endeavor is not a sex-specific enterprise (Hardin, 1987; hooks, 1994), just as the willingness to contribute to feminist understanding is not circumscribed solely to females. In other words, it is not only about women, for women or by women.

FEMINIST COMMUNICATION SCHOLARSHIP: WOMEN AND/IN MASS MEDIA

The media always have been at the core of feminist critique and research, given that media content (re)produces and promotes particular constructs of femininity: Gendered assumptions underpin media narratives and permeate public discourse (Carter & Steiner, 2004; M. Gallagher, 2001; Van Zoonen, 1994). Feminist communication scholarship has stressed that media outlets send important messages to the public about women's place and women's lives (Ross 2002). Such research offers evidence that the

17

constructed mediation of women portrays them not only as "different from" but "less than" men (Dezman & Ross, 2003, p. 2). Feminist communication theory has paid particular attention to matters of representations, stereotypes, alternative images, semiotics, distortion, and pornography, all of which are related to the socialization of norms and values in the public discourse regarding women's expected behaviors, roles and status in society (Carter, Branston & Allan, 1998; Dow & Condit, 2005; Kitch, 1997; Rakow, 1986; Rakow & Watzwick, 2004; Van Zoonen, 1994).

In addition, the focus on communication in feminist scholarship has to do with both gender and communication being social and discursive phenomena (Van Zoonen, 1994) that have the media as one of their main sites of interaction and processing (Rakow, 1986), including those regarding gendered assumptions (Byerly & Ross, 2006). Media accounts play a key role in the discursive construction of what should be accepted as reality by creating, supporting, or refuting different cultural beliefs and practices (Carter & Steiner, 2004; Vavrus, 2002), and thus mediated representations and messages in the public discourse affect cultural practices (Vavrus, 2002). Along those lines, media producers and consumers alike construct meanings that dictate what it means to be female (Van Zoonen, 1994), thus defining what gender entails. In other words, the relationship between gender and communication is primarily a cultural one, as media depictions are part of the culture as reality (Rakow & Wackwitz, 2004) by playing out in human communication (Dow & Condit, 2005; Vavrus, 2002). While feminist theory has focused on a wide range of discursive spaces and representations of women, its insights into the field of communication are among its richest contribution to

the reality of gender, as media texts—either factual or fictional—(re)articulate the rules to which individuals are supposed to subscribe, and disseminate these rules in the public arena (Byerly & Ross, 2004; 2006; Wackwitz & Rakow, 2007).

As such, feminist communication theory can be distinguished from other theoretical frameworks by virtue of three criteria: It theorizes gender, it theorizes communication, and it theorizes social change (Rakow & Wackwitz, 2004, pp. 5-6). At its best, feminist communication theory addresses "*how* gender operates, *why* a particular gender system is in place, *where* meanings come from, and *what* those meanings are" (Wackwitz & Rakow, 2007, p. 263, emphasis in the original). Its epistemological commitments to women's experiences and the gender configurations are tied to a better understanding of relations of power and exclusion, which in turn may help to undermine them (Van Zoonen, 1994).

The emergence of feminist communication scholarship and the visibility of feminist endeavors in culture at large have followed similar trajectories (Dow & Condit, 2005), both of them being mainstreamed with increasing acceptance of feminist ideas and theories in academia and society in general. For example, early on the analysis of mediated discourse on and about women focused mostly on the portrayal of a woman's status and circumstances in fictional content, particularly literature, film, and art (Kitch, 1997). For instance, feminist scholars have criticized the glorification of male power over women in pornography and its effects on violence against women (Rakow & Wackwitz, 2004; Van Zoonen, 1994). In art, females seem to lack agency, as their fate is to be looked at, while the act of looking is reserved to men (Mulvey, 1975). Similarly,

many authors have pointed to the harmful effects on ordinary women of this to-be-looked-at-ness (Donovan, 1992, p. 87).

By the early 1970s, academic research started to address matters of stereotypes verbal and visual imagery of women in mass media (Kitch, 1997). In this line of inquiry, the focus was on messages that reproduce and further cement gender and patriarchal relations that tell what women do and how they act, often times with a limited repertoire that undermines women's real-life circumstances and options (Kitch, 1997; Van Zoonen, 1994). Despite some improvements in terms of gender equalities in society at large, research has shown that in the last forty years little has changed on mediated discourse, as mainstream media continue to marginalize, commodify and sexualize women (Byerly & Ross, 2004). Living in a mediated world, these messages, even those from fiction, are powerful enough to define individuals' understanding of reality and what counts as common sense (Byerly & Ross, 2004; Buzzanel et al. 2004; Vavrus, 2002).

In news media and journalism, the story is not much different—women are not treated equally in or by the industry (Harp, 2008). Issues of ownership and management, employment, news sources, narrative forms and news audiences, to name a few, reflect the gendered structure of the industry and the pervasiveness of gender ideologies and representations (Carter, Branston & Allan, 1998; Carter & Steiner, 2004; Van Zoonen, 1994). Admittedly, the representation of women in the news media is complex and presents a mixed picture of women as subjects and actors in society (Byerly & Ross, 2006), but feminist scholars stress that mainstream news media are

strongly linked to the political and economic interests of men (Rakow & Kranich, 1991). While sexism is not merely a matter of media messages or news texts—the inclusion of so-called "more realistic" portrayals of women alone will not eliminate it— these representations indeed set the established boundaries of what "real" women are or do (Carter & Steiner, 2004; Harp, 2008; Sreberny & Van Zoonen, 2000).

The inequities of power and privilege based on gender are deeply ingrained in the social system and are reflected in the news media. Accordingly, women and women's issues also are marginalized as legitimate topics of news media interest, in what Tuchman (1978) labeled "symbolic annihilation." By erasing women from the news as either sources or newsmakers, or presenting them as minorities, the news media tell society that females are not important and exclude them from debates in the public arena (Byerly and Ross, 2004; Steiner, 2008). When they do appear in the news, it is in stereotypical roles such as victims, mothers and wives, incompetent or inferior to men, functioning as signs rather than speaking subjects (Rakow & Kranich, 1991; Van Zoonen, 1994; Vavrus, 2002). Thus,

> As "signs of the times," women are used [mostly as private individuals and] to illustrate the private consequences of public events and actions. Women as sources in the capacity of institutionally unaffiliated individuals located in the private sphere serve to illustrate the consequences, emotions, or behaviors that underlie a story. *These women are not sources of information, as sources generally function, but specimens.* (Rakow & Kranich, 1991, p. 16, emphasis added)

Such sexism is more than a matter of media representations, as any improvement in the treatment of women requires changes more fundamental than just

21

including more women in the news (Carter & Steiner, 2004; Rakow & Kranich, 1991). That said, women's news and problems are not considered newsworthy (Steiner, 2008) and as a whole, these constructions make real specific ways of understanding and thinking about gender (Cirksena & Cuklanz, 1992), cement feminine ideals against which women are judged (Falk, 2008), and restrict females' participation in the political arena. News coverage of women reflects the media's investment in particular constructions of femininity and feminism (Vavrus, 2002). Research shows that the masculine narrative of news informs a rather monolithic discourse on women's concerns (e.g., home, family, domestic violence, and sexual relations) as the realm of the private world, while the proper masculine interests "are left to constitute the real *substance* of public sphere discourse" (Ross, 2002, p. 11).

While representations of gender are dynamic and subject to revision, news media are part of the ideological apparatuses that hold together the dominant social order (Gramsci, 1971), and thus research addressing news media messages on females, such as this dissertation, is important to understand public meanings of women's role and women's place. As the contemporary mediators of hegemony in the public sphere, the news media reinforce the hegemonic mode of domination (Fraser, 1993; Van Zoonen, 1994). In that context, feminist theorists argue that the news is one of the main sites for gender struggles: the discursive framing of females' roles and circumstances in the news ends up reinforcing the dominant and hegemonic meaning of gender (hooks, 1994; Vavrus, 2002). Despite its importance, relatively little research has been done in the area of feminist analysis of news and a "feminist perspective of the crucially

22

important genres of news, current affairs and other factual media content is . . . long overdue" (M. Gallagher, 2002, p.14, cited by Vavrus, 2002).

THEORIZING MEDIA REPRESENTATIONS OF POLITICAL WOMEN

According to Margaret Gallagher's (2003) analysis, feminist theorization and research on gender representation in the news and other forms of journalism has grown during the last two decades. However, until recently little attention was paid to the interrelationships between gender, politics and communication, or the gendered underpinnings of political institutions. Further, even less research takes a comparative politics approach (Chappel, 2006; Tripp, 2006; Weldon, 2006).

Among the main tenets of such interrelation is the public-private divide. While the distinction between the two spheres is rather artificial, it nevertheless is a framework through which gender differences are understood, negotiated, analyzed and interpreted. After all, the principles that govern the public arena are neither separate nor independent from the relationships in the private domain (Paterman, 1989).[6] That said, women around the world have historically been left out of the public sphere and have had less power to speak and be heard in the political arena (see Fraser, 1993). Women's confinement to domestic worlds has resulted in females being perceived as not having what it takes to participate in the political-public realm. Pervasive categorizations in public discourses promote and reinforce the association that men are natural and women

---

[6] The conceptual dichotomy is not as clear-cut as suggested by the term "public-private divide." Critics such as Paterman (1989, chapter 6 in particular) and Chinkin (1999), have called for a more nuanced interpretation of the boundaries of either space, given that they overlap and adjust under different circumstances, and are more interrelated than what a dichotomous categorization suggests.

unnatural in the political sphere (Falk 2008), and often time political leadership is defined with a double standard for men and women (Marotta, 2005). These distinctions between the public and the private spheres heavily influence the definitions of gendered identities. The media's reliance on such a boundary when presenting stories consistent with the dominant, gendered understandings (Howard & Prividera, 2004) further promotes the expected behavior for women (Vavrus, 2002), including their political roles. In doing so, the media keep women out of the centers of authority and decision-making.

Gendered institutional practices may differentially constrain the opportunities for leadership by women and men, to the point of undermining women's effectiveness once they have access to power (Winsky-Mattei, 1998; see also Delli Carpini & Keeter, 2000). There also is growing evidence that women in leadership and management positions receive unfair evaluations as the gendering of leadership roles operates to the disadvantage of both women and men (Eagly, Karau & Makhijani, 1995; Eagly, Makhijani & Klonsky, 1992; Eagly & Johnson, 1990). The gendered logic of the media influences how the news is gathered and reported, giving way to sexism and stereotypes (Falk, 2008) that carry over into the political realm. Labeled as the "gendered mediation of politics," the "way in which politics is reported . . . privileges the practice of politics as an essentially male pursuit" (Sreberny-Mohammadi & Ross, 1996, p. 112). Not surprisingly, then, females have a hard time breaking into politics and political leadership.

The political rhetoric in mainstream news texts contributes to the promotion and definition of particular social identities (Falk, 2008; Vavrus, 2002). The mass mediation of the public sphere gives the media great power to structure public life and imbue it with meaning to understand politics, public affairs and campaigning (McLaughlin, 1995, cited by Vavrus, 2002). However, when the media consistently treat women in politics qualitatively and quantitatively different than men (Gidengil & Everitt, 2003a; 2003b; 2000; Ross & Sreberny, 2000; Sreberny-Mohammadi & Ross, 1996), they are reasserting the notion of women's unsuitability for public office. Further, empirical evidence from the United States shows that "the press has not changed how it covers women candidates" (Falk 2008, p. 14) despite the great changes in the last decades in women's social and political rights.

The image and language of mediated politics supports the masculine norm, and thus women in politics struggle to be regarded as legitimate actors and contenders in the eyes of the media (Winsky-Mattei, 1998; Ross, 2002; 2004), especially when forging new political ground (Braden, 1996; Witt, Paget & Matthews, 1994). Women politicians are subject to a mostly critical and gendered-specific analysis (Norris, 1997; Ross, 2002; Sreberny-Mohammadi & Ross, 1996), are persistently trivialized and sexualized in the media (Braden, 1996; Byerly & Ross, 2006; M. Gallagher, 2001; Vavrus, 2002), and are more likely than men to be the subject of negative gender distinctions.[7] News accounts constantly dismiss the notion that women can be

---

[7] For example, see the critical portrayal of counter-stereotypical Hillary Clinton (Scharrer, 2002; Edwards & Chen 2000), the Rottweiler epithet to refer to New Zealand's Helen Clark (Devere & Davies,

successful with both their public and private sphere responsibilities (Jamieson, 1995), and female running for office are described as less knowledgeable than men, with skills limited to domestic areas of expertise and "women's issues" (see, for instance, Gidengil & Everit, 2003; Norris, 1997; Ross, 2002; 2004). Ultimately, the media shortchange women politicians (Byerly & Ross, 2006; Falk, 2008; Khan, 1991, 1992, 1994a, 1994b; Kahn and Goldberg, 1991; Sreberny & Ross, 2000) and regard them as not tough enough and just "too nice to get involved in the dirty business of big boys' politics" (Ross, 2002, p. 40). Just running for office, then, contravenes expectations about the appropriate place of a woman (Ross, 2002).

The role of a political leader, as promoted by media discourses, is linked to stereotypical male attributes and qualities, such as assertiveness, ambition, and strength, which are viewed as inappropriate for a woman and counter-stereotypical (Devere & Davies, 2006; Hoogensen & Solheim, 2006). Women running for office or trying to engage in the public world of policy and authority are thus faced with a dilemma: to succeed in politics, they must show masculine traits, but when they do they are portrayed as breaking the mold, violating the deeply held notions of appropriate and acceptable female behavior.

The image and language of mediated politics supports the notion of males as norm, and media portrayals of female politicians tend to marginalize their political work by sake of gender-based assumptions (Ross, 2004). Emphases on sartorial styles,

2006), the "Blair's babes" label used in the U.K. (Ross, 2005), and the reportedly tough-talking and aggressive female party leaders Kim Campbell, Audrey McLaughlin, and Alexa McDonough in Canada (Gidengil & Everit, 2003).

personality, physicality and domestic lives—including family issues—not only mark women politicians as different (Ross, 2002; Vavrus, 2002), but make their sex and gender the dominant aspect of their political selves (Ross, 2002). More importantly, as Karen Ross argued, "framing serious women politicians in this way might be seen as merely irreverent or even playful, but it signals a dangerous tendency to denigrate and neutralize the potency of women to be actors and leaders on the political stage" (2004, p. 64).

This media coverage restrains how men and women translate their personal traits into political action (McGerr, 1990), and feminist scholars argue that the gendered mediation in politics reinforces the public's sexist attitudes, yielding gendered-specific responses from voters (Ross, 2004, 2002; Sreberny & Ross, 2000; see also Norris, 1997). Accordingly, women politicians' gender is used as a reasonable way to draw inferences about their fitness for office (Hoogensen & Solheim, 2006; Thomas, 1997) and given that female politicians and officials are scarce—with the exception of the Scandinavian countries—they are perceived as representatives of the larger female population (Rakow & Kranich, 1991). For example, Falk's (2008) analysis of coverage on female presidential candidates in the U.S. found that the news consistently argue that emotionality would render women incompetent at leadership, and beliefs about men's emotional suitability for politics act as a predictor of voter stereotypes about the ability of politicians to handle issues (Sanbonmatsu, 2003). As a consequence, the female-feminine association implies a biological determinism the media rely on to explain differences between men and women in politics (see, for example, Ross, 2002; Sreberny

& Van Zoonen, 2000). Femininity is not a valued trait by voters (Wandsworth et al., 1987) and this forces women to convince the polity that they are competent *despite* their gender, which is perceived and described by the media as a hindrance rather than an asset or a neutral trait (Ross, 2002; 2004; Thomas, 1997).

In other words, women in politics are seen and treated differently, by the public and the media. Thus, particularly in Western societies, political leadership is often understood within a male profile (Hoogensen & Solheim, 2006; see also Genovese, 1993). It is not simply that voters do not believe women can be competent politicians, or that the media conspire to exclude women, but rather political women's "adjudged viability is much more context-specific and complicated" (Ross, 2002, p. 128). The "depressing stability in the articulation of women's politics" in the media (M. Gallagher, 2001, p. 81) reveals that the underlying frame of reference for female politicians is their gender: women belong to the family and domestic life and femininity is about care, nurture and compassion (Sreberny & Van Zoonen, 2000). These traditional gender interpretations function as a ready-made framework for the news, one that ultimately serves to slant media coverage and promote sexism as natural and common sense.

Chapter 3. Literature Review

> Human emotion plays a fundamental role in
> sustaining the indelible communal and public character
> of our everyday being-with-other.
> (Smith & Hyde, 1991, p. 460)

> "The candidate that gets too emotional at the
> wrong times or for no apparent reason loses points. If
> you get emotional for the right reason, meaning you are
> responding very fervently to an attack or you feel very
> deeply, you get points."
> (Sam Donaldson, October 11, 1984, as cited by
> Shields & MacDowell, 1987, p. 78)

Emotional phenomena are important to human experience and have both personal and social impact. While the definition of "emotion" differs widely among scholars and fields, some commonalities do exist, including the social dynamics that serve to evaluate and make sense of emotions. In that sense, culture and socialization are pivotal in our understanding of emotions and how they come to be manifest in different ways. Governed by social expectations, the subject and object of emotional behavior matters, as culturally specific ways define the right approach to show emotion (Citrin, Roberts & Frederickson, 2004; Ekman & Scherer, 1984; Kirouac & Hess, 1999; Shields, 2002; Thoits, 2004). This includes gender stereotypes, as long-standing and traditional dichotomous constructions associate men with reason and women with emotion (Porter, 2005; Fodor, 2002).

The interrelationship between these gendered assumptions and culture-specific ways of understanding emotional behavior are shaped by social interactions. They also have important consequences in the public arena. The rhetoric of control (see Rosaldo,

1977; Lutz, 1990) that surrounds emotions implies that emotional expressiveness carries great influence when individuals interact with other people, which coupled with the gendered cast of emotion translates into differential evaluations for women and men in the public sphere (Brescoll & Ulhman, 2008; Brody, 2000; Citrin et al., 2004; Shields, 2000; 2002; Zammuner, 2000). The concept of emotional management (i.e., the control of emotional responses that are openly displayed and recognized; see Glaser & Salovey, 1998) itself suggests that emotions can and are supposed to be managed.

Research suggests that such naturalized assumptions work to the disadvantage of women running for public office, especially considering that the role of a political leader "is more often than not associated with the stereotypical physical, mental, and *emotional* attributes of a man" (Hoogensen & Solheim, 2006, p. 12, emphasis added)—all of these hegemonic assumptions are further naturalized by the media. As electoral politics is rife with emotion and emotion-producing situations (R. Collins, 1984; Glaser & Salovey, 1998; Neuman, Marcus, Crigler & MacKuen, 2007), such emotional stimuli may generate political responses and inform citizens' impressions and appraisals about candidates. Furthermore, the media help in transmitting and naturalizing the social norms that enact social identities, such as the rules for displaying emotions and the appropriate behavior for males and females. Considering how public opinion is largely mediated by the news media's presentation of political information, what the press says about females and their emotional management is relevant and consequential.

This chapter outlines the scholarly research on emotions, culture, gender and politics and informs the rationale and foundation of this dissertation.

EMOTIONS AS PART OF HUMAN BEHAVIOR AND EXPERIENCE

People's capacity to experience emotions—to feel, express, control, conceal and simulate emotional responses and reactions—has been deemed as a "fundamental human quality" (Shields, 2002, p. 3), one that is "necessarily about people's experience of the world" (Leach & Tiedens, 2004, p. 1) and "central to human behavior" (Mastead, Fridja & Fischer, 2004). Affective and emotional phenomena are part of everyday experience (Scherer, 2005b) and convey important information, even involuntarily, and thus constitute communicative signals (Ekman, 1997). Research shows that people rely on the emotional expressions they perceive to draw conclusions about others (Falk, 2009; Leach & Tiedens, 2004; Planalp, 1999; Shields & MacDowell, 1987), and empirical evidence suggests that individuals accurately distinguish other people's emotions (Sullivan & Masters, 1988).

As such, emotions are studied from a variety of disciplinary perspectives and theoretical approaches (for overviews, see Ekman & Scherer, 1984, Tiedens & Leach, 2004; Wirth & Schramm, 2005) and authors like Plato, Hobbes, Descartes and Hume, among many others, have argued that an analysis of emotions may inform our understanding of human nature (G.E. Marcus, 2000; se also Neblo, 2007). However—or perhaps because of all of the above—there is no consensus on what exactly emotions are (Le Doux, 1995; Wirth & Schramm, 2005). The answer strongly depends on the theoretical approach. Some researchers use the terms *emotion* and *affect* interchangeably, while others attempt to make distinctions among them as well as the concepts of *mood*, *feeling*, *evaluation* (i.e., summary judgment, or "gut reaction"),

nonverbal reaction (linked to facial displays and gestures), *emotional state*, and *emotionality* (Abelson, Kinder, Peters & Fiske, 1982; Bucy, 2000; Bucy & Grabe, 2008; Burgoon & Hale, 1988; Ekman, 1982; Glaser & Salovey, 1998; G. E. Marcus, 2000; Philippot, Feldman & Coats, 1999; Plutchick, 1984; Scherer, 2005b; White, 1999).[8] That said, the scientific conceptualizations of emotions coincide in ascribing affective, cognitive, conative and physiological components to these complex and high-powered phenomena (Wirth & Schramm, 2005, see also Kleinginna & Kleinginna, 1981; Planalp, 1999, introduction; Scherer, 2005b). Thus, emotion is "a short-term adaptive response which, because it is not the result of deliberation and reflection, may not have the most advantageous long-term consequences" (Shields, 2002, p. 5). More importantly, emotions are dynamic phenomena, and emotional states are composed by many elements, including physiological changes, attitudes toward oneself, and impulses to action. Rather than simply static actions or bodily expressions, emotional experiences operate as tactical responses to immediate situations (Mesquita & Markus, 2004; Shields, 2002; Tomkins, 1982; 1984).

Emotions are also both personal and social. As responses, they are linked to specific individuals, who express them and deal with them on a regular basis, but they do not occur in a vacuum; instead, they function and become relevant in relationship to others—"constituted and afforded by the particular sociocultural contexts in which they occur" (Mesquita & Markus, 2004, p. 342). They are essential to social relations (Abu-

---

[8] As a concept, emotion is also culture-bound (Wierzbicka, 1999). This idea is expanded later in this chapter.

Lughod & Lutz, 1990), and serve as both indications of what people are feeling and cues to others about individuals' actions (Saarni & Weber, 1999). In that sense, they function within—and are key to—social interactions (Campos & Barrett, 1984), which makes emotional-expressive behavior inseparable from social context (Saarni & Weber, 1999). Emotions are socially shared and their expression, perceived authenticity, and legitimacy play a key role in defining people's public character and personality (Smith & Hyde, 1991; Shields, 2002; see also Plutchick, 1984), to the extent that people make social inferences based on particular emotions in social settings, helping people infuse the world with meaning (Leach & Tiedens, 2004). As Planalp (1999) explains, just the fact that humans communicate emotions suggests their double functionality as both personal experience and characteristic of human social behavior. As such, their evaluation is determined by the social setting in which they occur, and their particular environmental determinants or eliciting events (Shweder, 2004) and thus "brought under strict social control" (Tomkins, 1984, p. 187).

Defined by specific contexts in social settings, human emotions have social meaning and, for instance, Randall Collins (1984) considers them as fundamental in society, "a form of social energy." This makes emotion mechanisms constructed and understood in response to social situations: they have a social value (Shields, 2002; Wentworth & Ryan, 1992), are contextually anchored in social meaning (Saarni, 1998; 1999), socially significant (Wentworth & Ryan, 1992), and evaluated within social

contexts, reinforced in processes of socialization[9] (Shields, 2002). Accordingly, people acquire the knowledge and abilities deemed appropriate to the emotional behavior of a person based on characteristics such as age, gender, race/ethnicity and class (Thoits, 2004), which serves to (re)enact the social structure (Planalp, 1999). These skills and knowledge are regarded as "emotional intelligence" or "competence" (Frida, Manstead & Fisher, 2004; Planalp, 1999).

In this view, social interactions depend on how individuals understand normative content that determines and predicts their affects and behaviors (Thoits, 2004). Cultural messages on emotions disseminate these transactions and definitions (Saarni, 1999) and comment on practices essential to social relations (Abu-Lughod & Lutz, 1990). Not surprisingly, social life requires people to be emotionally competent (Planalp, 1999)—that is, to be able to manage one's emotions—as being emotional locates the person in the world of social interaction with others (Denzin, 1990). As Planalp explains,

> Meaning is not created by people living on their own private planets; it is created by people who talk with one another, live in groups, and experience a social world in part inherited from their forebears. *We live in societies that offer us ways of interpreting life.* (Planalp, 1999, p. 23, emphasis added)

Because emotions are social, their expression also provides social meaning. Being socially shared, and regulated by social pre- or proscriptions (Leach & Tiedens,

---

[9] In this view, socialization is a "lifelong process of learning to be a member" of one's group (Shields, 2002, p. 92).

2004), the social meaning of emotion is about telling people apart, including their gendered identities (e.g., boys from girls; Shields, 2002). Thus, while there are several social circumstances for different ways in which people understand, explain and monitor their (and others') emotional displays (Shields, 2002), society as a whole selects and defines the emotions deemed appropriate to specific situations, and exercises control over emotional experiences. Societies do not allow the free expression of any emotion at any time, and thus people are not encouraged to be emotional whenever and wherever they wish (Tomkins, 1982; 1984). Accordingly, "male," "female," "mourner," "teacher," "physician," each have an interactionally appropriate emotional character woven into that identity (Wentworth & Ryan, 1992; see also Heise, 1989; Shields & Koster, 1989). Beliefs about certain emotions being correct, socially appropriate, and healthy sustain the boundaries of each emotional character (Shields, 2002), and thus a sense of appropriateness serves as standards against which people compare given interactions (Burgoon & Hale, 1988; Bucy & Newhagen, 1999; Clayman, 1995; Smith & Hyde, 1991). Further, some authors suggest that emotions are capable of supporting different ways to organize communities, such as the relations between the sexes or the hierarchy of groups in a given society (R. Collins, 1984; Kemper, 1984; Kirouac & Hess, 1999). In doing so, emotions determine social patterns for actors, situations, and organizations (Wentworth & Ryan, 1992) and equip people with scripts to perform identity-appropriate tasks within society (Alexander & Wood, 2000) as they manage their emotions in order to perform in social context.

Taking all of this into consideration, this dissertation uses the word "emotion" as a comprehensive term that includes all kinds of affective phenomena and their expression as both personal and social phenomena. The focus on this dissertation is on matters of emotional management by female politicians, and uses the terms emotion, affect and emotionality interchangeably. This approach is useful, as viewing emotions as socially-dictated constructs suggests that they are judged, appraised and evaluated in terms of situational contexts, social relationships, and cultural conventions (Philippot, Feldman & Coats, 1999). Emotional behavior, then, needs to comply with prescriptions that define the extended interactional scenarios surrounding an emotion (Fivush & Buckner, 2000). This includes the discourse and language about emotion, as they inform within broad limits the expectations and even meaningful division of emotional experience (Fivush & Buckner, 2000; Stearns, 1992; Shields, 2002). Thus, emotional displays are the bearers of information about someone (Manstead, Fischer & Jakobs, 1999), and empirical evidence shows that individuals strive to manage their emotional behavior for the sake of presenting themselves in a particular light (Ekman & Scherer, 1984; Planalp, 1999).

This means that the discourse about emotions has an impact on people's everyday lives. Emotions have been ignored or denigrated in much of the Western philosophical tradition (Solomon, 1993). Beyond socialization and emotional competence, individuals are seen as needing to adapt their behaviors to conventions that present emotion as irrational and in need of control (Planalp, 1999). For instance, English expressions like "being emotional," "loosing control," "feeling upset," or

"emotional outburst" convey a negative evaluation and present emotion as something dangerous, irrational and physical (Lutz, 1990; Wierzbicka, 1999), in line with the rhetoric of control of emotions (cf. Rosaldo, 1977; see also Lutz, 1990). Past research has explored how people may manage their emotional displays (Ekman & Scherer, 1984), and there is evidence that individuals constantly try to control what others will observe about their own behavior and emotional experience (Saarni & Weber, 1999). According to Shields (2002), rather than emotions in general being inevitably devalued, "inappropriate" emotions are discouraged and denigrated. Emotion discourse, then, leads not necessarily to regulation of all emotion, but to management that can be perceived and communicated in "just the right way" (Shields, 2002, p.1).

DOING EMOTION THE "RIGHT WAY"

Emotional displays are governed by social expectations, as societies determine which emotions are appropriate for their members to display (Bucy, 2003; Wentworth & Ryan, 1992). These societal assessments inform the expectations concerning when, where and how emotions should happen, and what they mean (Shields, 2002). Given that emotions connect the self with its external relationships (Levy, 1984), societal considerations about legitimate emotional behavior serve to lessen the risk of maladaptive behavior (Saarni & Weber, 1999). Arguably, these expectations and norms are broad, and thus people vary in their interpretation of what emotion means and how it is supposed to be done the "right way." Most of the time, the concern is not about the authenticity of emotional experience, but that the expression be appropriate to the

occasion (Planalp, 1999). Considering that "everyday life is not lived at the extremes" of emotional behavior but "somewhere in the indeterminate middle" (Shields, 2002, p. 179-180), the norms policing emotional displays also influence the attribution of emotions (Kirouac & Hess, 1999). As a consequence, emotions help produce social order and social change (Stearns, 1992; Thoits. 2004).[10]

Empirical evidence further supports the notion that emotional experiences are controlled by social principles. Thoits (2004) listed several features of the attitudes and standards held toward emotion: as social constructs, these norms reflect social structures and thus vary over time, cultures and contexts; they are learned by the members of the social group, who have to conform to them; and individuals try to manage the emotions that could violate these emotional expectations, which in turn have social consequences. Moreover, those who refuse or fail to conform—"emotional deviants"—are stigmatized and subject to social control,[11] although occasionally they may become agents of social change. In addition, social group membership influences not only the display of emotions but also their decoding, and further informs expectation and group membership (Kirouac & Hess, 1999). Organized as a network of beliefs about behavior, these societal principles about emotional demeanor and appropriateness embody the dominant ideology about emotion in any given culture (Shields, 2002).

---

[10] Along these lines, Stearns (1992) attributes to Victorian emotional segregations a key role in alterations in gender roles during the transition to the twentieth century.

[11] For example, people tend to associate odd emotional behaviors with mental illness, and indeed violations to emotion norms are part of the criteria for almost a third of the disorders listed in current edition of the American Psychiatric Association's manual of mental disorders, published in 1994 (Thoits, 2004).

In this context, *who* expresses *what* emotion is important. Emotional demeanor can convey moral regards or deference for others, especially facial expressions (Sherman, 2004; see also Goffman, 1967), and there is evidence that people of different status levels experience and display different emotions (Citrin et al., 2004). Emotional expressions, alone or coupled with other organizing categories like power and status, act as potent identifiers (Shields, 2002), and given that in any communication setting people hold expectations about the behaviors of others, individuals' emotional demeanor reflects and encourages specific attitudes in human conduct (Bucy & Newhagen, 1999a; Franks & Gecas, 1992). Thus, emotional expression creates an image of the self and conveys one's adherence to emotional and gendered norms (Citrin et al., 2004). These efforts at emotional conformity help to sustain the social order and maintain hierarchy in social groups (Thoits, 2004).

The standards of how people should feel and act, however, are not universal. Cross-cultural research has shown that emotions are subject to several degrees of variation across cultures (Rodriguez-Mosquera, Fischer & Manstead, 2004), and thus the "right" way to feel and express emotion is linked to normative and habitual social behaviors specific to a particular culture (Mesquita & Markus, 2004). What is right, or natural, to emote depends on social constructions, and what may seem completely certain from within a culture can be seen as absolutely wrong from the outside, despite commonalities across societies (Planalp, 1999). They make sense to the members of the group, but their content is learned and shared, not fixed or innate.

Culturally defined norms have been labeled *display rules* (Ekman & Friesen, 1969; Ekman, 1984). As tacit social standards, these rules direct what emotions can be displayed, when, how and by whom, and act as consensually agreed-upon standards for emotional expression in social circumstances (Ekman & Scherer, 1984; Kuppersbush et al., 1999; Saarni & Weber; 1999). Display rules act as templates that every society provides to its members (Kuppersbush et al., 1999; Lazarus, 1984; 2001), and inform appraisals of the significance of specific emotions displayed in all kinds of social interactions (Lazarus, 1984; 1991; 2001; Tiedens & Leach, 2004).[12] Ekman suggested that display rules vary by social class and ethnic background, both within and across national cultures (Ekman, 1984), and can also act at very local, relationship-specific settings (Tiedens & Leach, 2004). Empirical evidence also reveals the influence of culture-specific display rules in biased decoding of certain emotions in certain cultures (Kirouac & Hess, 1999). Thus, the appropriate causes, expressions and consequences of emotional experience—including whether to express at all—are in part controlled by cultural standards that rely on stories, scripts, and sanctions governing how to manage our emotions (Fivush & Buckner, 2000; Schweder, 2004). In other words, while emotions can be very personal, they also are subject to collective definition about the proper way to express emotion.

---

[12] In contrast, Hochschild (1979) provided the notion of "feeling rules" to refer to culturally-defined conventions for assessing the fit between felt emotion and the situation. Feeling rules dictate how people actually feel, not how these emotions are presented (Lazarus, 1984; Shields, 2002).

Thus, while human emotional endowment is universal, it is people's culture what shapes their emotional lives to a great extent (Wierzbicka, 1999). Emotionality is a relational phenomenon (Denzin, 1990) and thus, like other dimensions of human conduct, emotions (and their appropriate expressions) are regulated not only by social standards, but also cultural attitudes undergirding the conceptualization of emotions (Franks & Gecas, 1992; Wierzbicka, 1999). These standards and attitudes suggest people how to emote, what to think about emotions—others' and their own—and how to express them. They are dictated by actors, situations and organizations with the power to control and coordinate emotions (Wentworth & Ryan, 1992; Wierzbicka, 1999), and enacted through language, discourse, media, education and other cultural agents. The influence of culture on display rules and emotional appraisal is such that dispositional emotionality of members of diverse cultural groups is evaluated differently (Kirouac & Hess, 1999).

This means that the cultural influences on emotions go beyond expression and perception, and understanding them requires tapping into the social meanings of emotions for particular cultures (Kuppersbush et al., 1999). Emotion serves different functions across and within societies, and more importantly, the differences are neither distinct nor fixed. There is room for individual variation, as all members of a culture are not equally guided by cultural norms (Planalp, 1999), and while culture plays a fundamental role organizing emotional behavior (Lutz, 1980; Levy, 1984; Wierzbicka, 1999), it is with varying degrees of strength (Fischer & Manstead, 2000, see also Deaux, 2000).

41

Cultural meanings, while common resources for people to employ, are dynamic and subject to change, and in that sense, cultural ideologies about emotion are similarly heterogeneous and variable. Cultural variance has been used to explain differences in emotional experiences and indeed research has found that emotions are conceptualized in various ways across and within cultures and societies (see, for instance, Fischer & Manstead, 2000; Kirouac & Hess, 1999; Kuppersbush et al., 1999; Philippot et al., 1999; Rodriguez-Mosquera et al., 2004).[13] However, there is also evidence of commonalities, and intergroup/intercultural interactions and socialization help spreading shared meanings, more so with increasing globalization.

CULTURE AT THE HEART OF EMOTION

Cultures are not separate or clearly defined entities, but rather heterogeneous and changeable. More specifically, culture is a complex system of meaning comprised by shared beliefs, values, norms and expectations (Mesquita & Markus, 2004; Rodriguez-Mosquera et al., 2004; Wierzbicka, 1999). As a multidimensional construct, culture shapes the social environment by influencing structures, traditions, and practices—informal and traditional—which also influence behavior and thus individuals act and conduct themselves on the basis on those shared meanings (Deaux, 2000;

---

[13] Scholars like Ekman have posited the existence of six basic emotions (namely happiness, sadness, anger, fear, disgust, and surprise) recognized in all cultures. However, even these are expressed, lexicalized and appraised in different ways (Wierzbicka, 1999; see also Manstead, Fischer & Jakobs, 1999). As an example, Wierzbicka (1999) explains that the English word "emotional" has negative overtones, but languages like German, Italian or Russian do not have an analogous word in their lexicon. Similarly, the fact that speakers sometimes borrow terms from other languages to convey certain emotions (e.g, "schadenfreude") further supports this approach.

Kuppersbush et al., 1999; Rodriguez-Mosquera et al., 2004; Thoits, 2004). Due to individuals' participation in cultural practices, culture is constitutive of both emotional processes and the social context of emotion (Denzin, 1990; Rodriguez-Mosquera et al., 2004). In this line, emotions are constituted by cultural realities—including, but not reduced to culture-specific display rules—and acquire significance and meaning as relational processes taking place in social life (Mesquita & Markus, 2004; Rodriguez-Mosquera et al., 2004). Because of this, "culture lies at the heart of emotion" (Rodriguez-Mosquera et al., 2004, p. 187).

Most of the time, cross-cultural studies operationalize culture as countries or as race/ethnicity, but as an encompassing term packaging values, beliefs, norms and practices, cultural variation can also be found within a country and across national boundaries (Kirouac & Hess, 1999; Kuppersbush et al., 1999; Rodriguez-Mosquera et al., 2004; Matsumoto, 2006). In any case, cultural practices constitute "a large body of folk knowledge, passed down from one generation to the next" (Thoits, 2004, p. 362). Thus, emotional culture informs human behavior in social life through socialization.

The reality of emotions is social and cultural but also political, as the real forces underlying emotional expectations are power and status, two central dimensions characterizing social relationships (Kemper, 1984; Planalp, 1999, see also Deaux, 2000). Power involves the capacity to carry one's own will and direct others despite resistance (Weber, 1972; Foucault, 1983), while status has to do with the compliance that people accord one another, a differential social value without coercion, intimidation or threat (Kemper, 1984; La France & Hecht, 1999). Thus, the attitudes and standards

43

maintained toward emotion and their appropriate expression—that is, the right way to do emotion—are embedded in dominant ideals in such a way that they seem natural and common-sensical (Shields, 2002). Likewise, these same representations establish and reinforce power and status differences, as not everybody is entitled to the same emotions (Lutz, 1990; Saarni & Weber, 1999).[14] Further, as Kemper explained, to a great extent emotions are consequences of outcomes of power and status relations, be these "real, anticipated, recollected or imagined" (Kemper, 1984; p. 371).

Power and status are interconnected and both can be conveyed by markers such as those enacted by social roles. Thus, certain roles carry more power and/or higher status than others, which translates in general into more emotional freedom (Citrin et al., 2004; Planalp, 1999). Conversely, less power and lower status means more restraints, so authority and property routines can be upheld (R. Collins, 1984; Wentworth & Ryan, 1992). In that sense, emotions are powerful signals of dominance, subordination, or bonding, further regulating status and power relationships (Masters & Sullivan, 1993; Bucy, 2000; Bucy & Grabe, 2008). Given that meaning is collectively created, the social world includes the scripts to vindicate hierarchical relationships (Lutz, 1990; Planalp, 1999). Some of these scripts have to do with markers such as class, racial ethnicity, age, occupation and gender (Shields, 2002; Planalp. 1999). As such, (naturalized) emotional-expressive behavior factors into these societal boundaries by setting patterned demeanors (Saarni & Weber, 1999).

---

[14] Lutz (1990) refers to studies on colonial violence to exemplify how discourses on fear were key elements in practices of dominant groups.

As previously stated in chapter 2, gender itself is a cultural construction and the interrelationship between emotion, gender and culture is mutually constitutive. Gender, like emotion, is manifested and shaped in the public realm of social interactions within a cultural context that gives meaning to it (Leach & Tiedens, 2004; Shields, 2002). Likewise, representations of both gender and emotions channel cultural assumptions with their manifestation in social interactions (Leach & Tiedens, 2004), and the gendered cast ascribed to emotions further cements cultural assumptions about sex-defined roles and individuals' identification as either male or female (Shields, 2002). In addition, in patriarchal cultures, where men have more power than women, the discourse surrounding emotion enacts gender boundaries and reinforces the seemingly naturalness of women's subordination (Citrin et al., 2004; Lutz, 1990), and display rules maintain culturally-sanctioned imbalances of power and status between the sexes (Brody, 1999; 2000). Thus, the cultural construction connecting women and emotion vindicates gender distinction and hierarchy (Lutz, 1990).

GENDER AND EMOTION

While both men and women can experience emotions, in most societies emotions have a gendered motif. Indeed, women's emotionality, as opposed to men's rationality, is a widespread traditional belief at the core of gendered stereotyping (Brody, 1999; Kelly & Hutson-Comeaux, 1999; 2000; Perry, Turner & Sterk & 1992; Shields & MacDowell, 1987). Such a link between emotion and gender is rooted in centuries-old assumptions about (seemingly natural) sexual differences, with the female

emoter/rational male pair present in texts by Aristotle and Plato (Falk, 2009; Shields, 2002; Sokolon, 2006; Solomon, 1993, see also Mendus, 2000, and Porter, 2005). The distinction also has to do with different social roles for men and women (Citrin et al., 2004), as gender role profiles imply different ways of dealing with the world, with the dichotomy of emotion-reason at its core (Zammuner, 2000). Gender beliefs are consensually shared, communicated and acted upon (Deaux, 2000), and gender norms about emotions limit people's options to express themselves (Citrin et al., 2004). Thus, emotion beliefs define cultural representations of masculinity and femininity, which makes emotions powerful tools informing people's notion of gender and influencing how individuals perceive others as gendered subjects (Citrin et al., 2004; Deaux, 2000; Shields, 2002). As a consequence, emotional practices are gender-specific, shaped by the same ideological structures of domination and gender stratification that relegate women to an inferior status in relation to their male counterparts (Denzin, 1990; Dezman & Ross, 2003).

Even when males can and do experience emotion, the cultural constructions linking emotion and women serve to define and maintain gender limits, as if emotional behavior were a means to differentiate men from women. Lutz (1990) argued that rather than enact the suppression of emotion in men, the cultural assumption of women's emotionality in itself creates emotion in women. Grounded in shared social norms about gender-appropriate emotional behaviors, gender-coded emotional behavior delineates gender boundaries to the extent of shaping shape emotional experience, expression and

understanding for both sexes (Shields, 2002; Thoits, 2004). For instance, men are said to *act* emotional whereas women *are* emotional (Shields, 2002; see also Shields, 2000).

Gender performance embodies these notions about emotion and further supports society's gender hierarchy. The social construction and maintenance of gender-as-difference translates into seemingly natural sex differences in social behavior (Alexander & Wood, 2000; Shields, 2002), and socialization further equips men and women to perform sex-appropriate tasks within society (Alexander & Wood, 2000). In other words, the relationship is reciprocal and self-perpetuating: gender molds emotional experience, and male-female emotional differences support and replicate gendered ways (Citrin et al., 2004). Considering that the emotion-reason dichotomy corresponds to other oppositional pairs such as private-public, body-mind, and subjective-objective, and nurture-violence (Cirksena & Cuklanz, 1992; Frank & Gecas, 1992), the assumption of women's emotionality ends up constraining females to the circle of the private, intimate and emotional relations, which reduces the female domain to the matters of family and home (Lutz, 1990). Conversely, the male domain is equated to the public, political realm.

Emotions, then, are key in the definition of gender boundaries. As Shields (2002) argued, the main function of gendered emotion to "tell the boys from the girls," and emotional practice further normalizes cultural representations of masculinity and femininity as well as gender-coded emotionality (i.e., behavior or experiences that are seen and expected to be more typical, natural, or appropriate for one sex rather than the other; see Shields, 2002, p. 40-41). These gendered standards are socialized and thus

people strive to experience and express emotion in conformity with these assumptions—so they do "gender-correct" emotion (Planalp, 1999; Shields, 2002). Consequently, the interconnection of emotion and gender acts as a framework for acquisition and maintenance of gendered identities and underscores how gender operates and is negotiated in social interactions (Shields, 2000; 2002). Just like gender, emotion becomes an organizing category by its association to women and a keystone of the profiles of masculinity and femininity (Lutz, 1990; Shields, 2002). Thus, the language of emotions, the social conventions regarding emotions and any discourse on emotionality also comprise a discourse on gender and gender boundaries (Lutz, 1990; Shields, 2002). Arguably, the discourse that portrays emotion as imperfection or loss of control also casts women in a negative fashion—unstable and temperamental.

In other words, gender-coded behavior ensures that women and men conform to gender roles, thus maintaining a status quo of power and status differences among the sexes. These gendered ways of being and behaving are embodied in displays rules and notions of appropriate behavior for male and female (Brody, 2000; Citrin et al., 2004). Indeed, cross-cultural research shows the prevalence of gender-specific display rules (Fischer & Manstead, 2000; LaFrance & Hecht, 1999), which ensure the maintenance of cultural values concerning gender roles, and reflect and support status differences (Brody, 2000: Citrin et al., 2004; Fischer & Manstead, 2000). Accumulated empirical evidence also indicates gendered emotional differences are socialized in conformity with cultural stereotypes about emotional behavior and expression (Alexander & Wood, 2000; Brody, 2000). The socialization process is complex but across and within culture

48

manages to vindicate the distinction between men and women (Brody, 2000; Lutz, 1990). In Citrin and colleagues' words,

> Stating that emotions are gendered is more than a simple reference to differences in the ways men and women experience or express emotions; it is also a reference to the underlying set of social rules—both implicit and explicit—that govern the way emotion is "performed" by men and women. Being an anatomical male or female does not likely cause one to emote or not emote, or to express or not express particular emotions. Rather, it is gender—the set of social expectations that are affiliated with being male or female—that leads one to emote in particular ways. (Citrin et. al, 2004, p. 205)

This is not to negate that there are sex differences in emotion. However, research has found that the differences are not as ubiquitous as the cultural assumptions and discourses suggest, and they are considerably more context-dependent than presumed (Shields, 2002). For instance, conversational analyses show no difference in the frequency that men and women use emotional words in conversation or the intensity of frequency reported in emotion diaries (Pennebaker & Roberts, 1992; Lutz, 1990), and yet females assert to being more emotional and expressing more extreme emotions relative to men (Alexander & Wood, 2000; Frank & Gecas, 1992; Hall et al., 2004). There is also evidence that while adult women are more prone to cry than men, these differences are not present at birth (Vingerhoets & Scheirs, 2000), and in any case women place sadness in a more interpersonal context than do men (Fivush & Buckner, 2000). Similarly, a man's anger is described as a response to objective, external circumstances, but a woman's anger as catalogued as a product of her personality (Brescoll & Ulhman, 2008), and non-smiling females report feeling significantly less

comfortable and less appropriate than non-smiling males (LaFrance & Hecht, 1999).[15]

Yet despite this scientific evidence, the pervasive gendered cast on emotions remains,

constantly socialized via education, parenting, media, popular culture and likewise

social apparatuses and institutionally sanctioned instances.

These cultural beliefs about gender-appropriate emotional experience translate

into socially constructed concepts of acceptable displays and releases of emotions

(Burrow, 2005). Women are expected to be more emotional, while men are taught and

socialized early on that they are supposed to be tough (e.g., "boys don't cry," but they

are entitled to express anger; Oransky & Marecek, 2009; Kring, 2000). Media texts rely

on these stereotypes that ascribe emotions as more typical or appropriate for females

(Rodgers, Kenix & Thorson, 2007; Shields, 2002). Individuals conform to these norms

because they are socialized to be emotionally competent, and thus seek social approval

and avoid the sanctions that come to violations (Thoits, 2004; Zammuner, 2000).[16]

Indeed, emotional gender transgressions (e.g., a woman expressing rage or a man crying

in public) usually result in a social penalty (Citrin et al., 2004).

Accordingly, much of these notions about females and males' emotionality have

to do with individuals' capacity of *managing* their emotions embedded in the rhetoric of

control mentioned earlier. Given that emotions are constructed as dangerous, irrational

and chaotic, it makes sense that the content of display rules vouches for a need for

---

[15] For an updated overview of sex differences in emotional expression, see the volume edited by Fisher (2000).

[16] In the words, of Zammuner (2000), "we are motivated to become emotionally competent, because, as most of us discover quite early in life, emotional incompetence is likely to result in social rejection, loneliness, or greater stress" (p. 48).

control (Lutz, 1990), and gender conceptions shaped by emotion culture—including the proper emotional attributes for a female—put women at disadvantage in social relations. As the emotional ones, they come up short in terms of power relations and sociability, especially in what Randall Collins (1984) labeled "emotion-producing situations," such as conflict, war and politics.

EMOTION IN POLITICS

The interconnections of emotion, culture and gender are important aspects of social relations, and therefore also play a role in the very public and very social sphere that is the political domain.

Traditionally, emotions rarely have been seen as central to political sense-making and citizenship. Authors have argued that politics is about power, security, and order (Porter, 2006) and emotions have no room in the rational contest that supposedly dominates the discussion of public affairs and democracy (Bohman, 1996; Richards, 2004). Several political theories have addressed the dangers of mutual contamination by realms of, on the one hand, family, domestic life, and intimacy—the private sphere—and, on the other, the world of politics/policy, rationality and authority—the public sphere (Gal, 2002). James Madison, for instance, placed great emphasis on the need to control the inherent "passions" of the citizenry in the political arena (Redlawsk, 2003), and from the perspective of some religions, emotions are part of the "fallen" nature of human beings and require suppression (Sokolon, 2006). Further, several philosophical

approaches have argued that emotions ought to be suppressed or controlled in the pursuit of human knowledge and political stability (Bohman, 1996; Sokolon, 2006).

In this context, emotional behavior is perceived as a loss of control and an inappropriate response that cannot provide rational ground for actions (Burrow, 2005; see also Bohman, 1996; Koziak, 1999). This explains why emotions are seen as playing a distorting role in the political arena (Pantti & Van Zoonen, 2006) and why they should be dismissed or controlled in politics (Brader, 2005; Sokolon 2006), as well as released in private (Campbell, 1994; Porter, 2006). Some scholars have even questioned whether there is a legitimate place for emotion in the public sphere (e.g., Pantti & Van Zoonen, 2006).

However, in later decades there have been calls to revise the classical and ideal dichotomy between emotion and reason (Kuklinski et al. 1991; Heins, 2007), part of a spreading trend of reappraisal of emotions in politics.[17] Research has shown that the political brain is "an emotional brain . . . not a dispassionate calculating machine" (Westen, 2008, p. xv) and scholars have argued that there is indeed an "affect effect," at least regarding the way emotion interacts with political thinking and behavior (Neuman, Marcus, Crigler & MacKuen, 2007).[18]

---

[17] Change came, in part, with advances in cognitive sciences, which show the importance of emotions in information processing and cognition in general (Lau & Sears, 1986; Redlawsk, 2003; Redlawsk & Lau 2003).

[18] Some approaches to the link between emotion and politics stem from philosophy, social and cognitive psychology, political sciences, and the so-called "neuropolitics" or "biopolitics" tradition (Bucy & Graber, 2008; Marcus, Neuman & MacKuen 2000; Neuman, Marcus, Crigler & MacKuen, 2007; Spezie & Adolphs, 2007; Somit, & Peterson, 1998), as well as feminist theory (Burrow, 2005; Campbell, 1994).

Albeit some scholars see emotions as scarce in the political arena (see Pantti &
Wieten, 2005), or regarded for the most part as anomalous, at least in the United States
(Manstead 1991; Masters & Sullivan, 1993), emotion-related incidents do occur in
politics. Even if emotional displays are indeed scarce—an arguable statement—they
have the potential to be highly influential. Emotions are, after all, constructed and
understood in response to social situations: they have a social value and impact
(Shields, 2002; Wentworth & Ryan, 1992) and are evaluated within social contexts.
Considering the relevance of social evaluation in politics, "it is surprising that this
sociological perspective [has been] often overlooked" in research (Troyer & Robinson,
2003, p. 7), and indeed, several political communication scholars have complained
about the emotional deficit in political communication research (Kinder, 1994;
Richards, 2004).

In part due to different approaches and emphases, as well as measurement
challenges, there is not a singular theory of the role of emotions in politics and the
public sphere connecting notions of thinking, feeling, and acting (Neuman, Marcus,
Crigler & MacKuen, 2007), and even the definition of "emotion" differs among
scholars examining this venue of inquiry. Beyond definitions, however, the current
study focuses on nonverbal behavior[19] and emphasizes the role of emotional
management based on cultural-critical and sociological perspectives.

---

[19] It should be noted, however, that not all nonverbal behavior is necessarily a sign of emotion (Hall et
al., 2000).

There are several social circumstances for different ways in which people understand, explain and monitor their (and others') emotional displays (Shields, 2002). As explained earlier, each society selects and defines the emotions believed appropriate to specific situations, and different social roles and identities are attached to an interactionally appropriate emotional character. This sense of appropriateness reinforces behaviors that adhere to display rules that work as a rubric to evaluate and appraise people's behavior, including political leaders and candidates (Burgoon & Hale, 1988; Bucy & Newhagen, 1999; Clayman, 1995; Smith & Hyde, 1991). Such appropriateness also can be seen as a communicative trait manifested, among others, in the communication of political leaders (Bucy, 2000). The argument is that there are dominant ideologies of what it means to be a "good (or the right) politician" (Benson & Saguy, 2005), culturally resonant notions that include politicians' abilities to express and manage their emotions (Clayman, 1995; Richards, 2004), penetrating many processes of leadership and decision-making (Fineman, 2004).

These expectations can in turn be consequential in an election setting. For example, research suggests that a candidate's violations of emotion-related stereotypes can lead to a decrease in their appeal and subsequent diminished voter preference (Manstead, 1991; Masters & Sullivan, 1993; Sullivan & Masters, 1988). Experiments have shown that in political settings, people prefer men who, counter-stereotypically, had cried and women who had not (e.g., Labott et al., 1991; Simon, 1994) and surveys suggest that in the United States, liberals are perceived as being more emotional than conservatives (Stroud et al., 2006; see also Albritton, Oswald, & Anderson, 2008). Past

studies also argue that consideration of the personal qualities of candidates plays a central role in candidate perception—consideration that has a significant impact on voter's preferences (Masters & Sullivan, 1993; Rosenberg, Bohan, McCafferty & Harris, 1986). Thus, personality traits are seen as stable over time, and by ascribing traits to their political leaders, individuals have some basis for gauging the reaction of their political leadership to future demands of their office (Kinder, 1986; see also Sheafer, 2007).

Conflict and emotion are common in electoral politics and the emotional expressions by politicians and political leaders contain important social information that can be efficiently processed by citizens (Bucy, 2000; Bucy & Newhagen, 1999; Bucy & Grabe, 2006). Emotional displays also can be controversial and thus the subject of much media attention. Emotional behavior, then, may generate political responses and inform citizens' impressions regarding the candidates' suitability to hold public office, given that several studies suggest that consideration of the candidates' character has a significant impact on voter's preferences, and that the media contributes to stereotypical definitions of how a political leader is supposed to behave (Tomkins, 1991).

Arguably, there is a particular appropriate demeanor linked to the role of the presidential office. This demeanor includes the "appropriate" reactions the president can express in certain contexts, acting as nonverbal cues that convey important information about that person (Bucy, 2000; 2003; Bucy & Grabe, 2008), and thus informing citizens' evaluations. For instance, within the U.S. culture in particular, politicians strive for an image of competence and rationality that is at odds with extreme emotional

55

behavior (Glaser & Salovey, 1998), explaining why some displays of emotion can draw large media coverage (Glaser & Salovey, 1998; Stroud et al., 2006), as shown in cases like Edmund Muskie's apparent crying in response to a couple of nasty newspaper articles, Michael Dukakis' cold response when asked about the hypothetical rape of his wife, Howard Dean's screams after the Iowa caucus, or more recently, Brazilian president Lula da Silva's tears while speaking about his administration's social accomplishments.

Research conducted on this area has focused considerably more on people's emotional responses to political stimuli than on political responses to emotional stimuli. In the words of Glaser and Salovey, the focus is "on the emotions of voters with regards to candidates, largely to the exclusion of studies of the impact of candidates' emotionality" (1998, p. 156).[20] More recent efforts into what has been called "candidates' political emotional intelligence" and "political appropriateness" have started to expand on the idea that citizens may draw conclusions about the emotionality of politicians based on certain standards or expectations regarding their (proper) behavior (for an overview, see Bucy, 2007).

Indeed, research on citizens' expectations about normative political behavior shows that politicians' emotional displays—mostly nonverbal behavior—carry great influence on evaluative appraisals including, potentially, voting decisions (see, for

---

[20] For example, studies in this venue have addressed and explored individuals' affective judgments (e.g., Marcus & McKuen, 1993), emotional appeals in campaign ads (e.g., Huddy & Gunnthorsdottir, 2000), and the role emotions play in the perception of candidates (e.g., Sullivan & Masters, 1988), voting decisions (e.g., Seligman, 1990), information-seeking (e.g., Valentino et al., 2004), and deliberation (e.g., Kuklinski et al., 1991).

instance, Bucy, 2004; Bucy & Grabe, 2006; Stroud et al., 2006). The magnitude of the violation determines how significant it is, with greater deviations from expectations having greater impact (Burgoon & Hale, 1988). Studies of the nonverbal behavior of political leaders also support the idea that emotional expression is a socially important stimulus and is instrumental in conveying and regulating status and power relationships (Bucy, 2003; 2004; Bucy & Grabe, 2008; Bucy & Newhagen, 1999a; Masters, Sullivan, Lanzetta, McHugo & Basil, 1986; McHugo, Lanzetta, Sullivan, Masters & Basil, 1985; Stroud et al., 2006). There also is evidence of differential effects on public opinion of the affective framing used by the media to report on candidates' nonverbal communication (Coleman & Banning, 2006). However, these studies mostly have ignored the role of the media in promoting the social rules directing the standards for emotional management, or how, from a critical perspective, the media exercise at least some control over people's evaluations by underscoring behavior that fails to meet said standards.

Further, displays of emotion by politicians and political leaders are by definition, visibly identifiable and even quantifiable (Stroud et al., 2006). In this scenario, several schemas play a role, such as those connected to gender and party identification, prominent characteristics and important cues about any given candidate (e.g., Rapoport, Metcalf & Hartman, 1989; Tomkins, 1991). These impressions might add to the display rules and expectations regarding politicians' emotional management, which in turn could translate to the appraisal of candidates. For that reason, a candidate's party identification or gender may factor into the impact that their shows of

emotions can have on people's evaluations and favorability toward the candidate. For example, in the United States, Democrats are expected to be more emotional (Hayes, 1995; see too Albritton et al., 2008) and therefore it is possible that highly emotional Democratic candidates are evaluated in less harsh terms than highly emotional Republican candidates.

Thus, politicians' emotional behavior shapes their political images and becomes an important attribute—or at least a cue—for traits deemed important in a political leader, such as leadership skills, intelligence, and competence (Albritton et al., 2008; Balmas & Sheafer, 2010; Hayes, 2005; Rosenberg et al., 1986). That is, emotions convey a distinct image of a candidate's character, an image or demeanor that projects some general quality of fitness for office that informs people's opinions about a candidate's ability to get the job done properly (e.g., Bucy & Grabe, 2008; Rosenberg et al., 1986).

The studies conducted along these lines, however, have failed for the most part to address the role of gender stereotypes when exploring emotional appropriateness in politics. Presidential election settings have also been ignored, which is especially relevant for the present study. Female politicians' gender still is an issue, regardless of party, background, expertise or ideology (Thomas, 1997), at least in local and state elections. Likewise, there is not much knowledge regarding those women running for the highest office, even when it seems that there is no political position where gender stereotypes work more to women's disadvantage than the highly masculinized office of the presidency (Heldman et al., 2005). As such, the stereotypes and cultural

expectations regarding gender and a woman's place seem to be especially pervasive, undermining female politicians' chances.

EMOTIONAL WOMEN AND POLITICS

Throughout history, women have been in a marginalized position when in comes to public affairs and politics (Fraser, 1993). Confinement of women into domestic worlds—home and family—resulted in females being perceived as not having what it takes to participate in the public sphere. Women got the right to vote a little more than a hundred years ago—for the first time in New Zealand in 1893; in the United States, in 1920 (Clift & Brazaitis, 2000)—and even then it was with limitations to get elected themselves (Donovan, 1992). Studies show that in most countries, the (mostly male-run) media were against suffragist movements, just like they opposed the women's movement in the 1960s (Byerly & Ross, 2006; Ryan, 1992).

Not surprisingly, then, it has been rare for women to head up a national government: in the modern era, only about 65 women around the world have held the highest position of national governments.[21] Those women who have made it to the top came from varied political systems, followed different paths to power, and enjoyed long and short tenures (Clift & Brazaitis, 2000; Genovese, 1993). Many of them rose to power not on their own terms, but because of family ties (e.g., widow or daughter of a murdered leader, making them the heiresses to their kin's political legacy). But

---

[21] To put the number in perspective, there are 191 sovereign members states in the United Nations (a number that excludes Taiwan and the Holy See).

whatever conditions these few national female leaders experienced, one thing seems constant—they had to endure significant gender biases (Norris, 1997).

While women have had a hard time breaking into politics, inroads have been made and during the last decade females have managed to break the last glass ceiling in countries like Germany, Liberia, Chile, Argentina, Costa Rica and Australia; and Brazil's Dilma Rousseff was sworn in January 2011. Further, world statistics also show that female participation in all levels of government is increasing, albeit slowly (United Nations, 2010).[22] However, studies also show that female politicians' gender is perceived and described by the media as a hindrance rather than as an asset or a neutral trait (Ross, 2002; 2004; Thomas, 1997). In other words, women in politics are seen and treated differently, by the public and the media, and especially in Western societies, where political offices at all levels have a masculine cast, imposing great obstacle to females trying to gain leadership positions (Genovese, 1993; Hoogensen & Solheim, 2006; Hitchon, Chang & Harris, 1997). There also is evidence suggesting that being a man is considered a necessary trait to be a successful presidential candidate (Smith, Paul & Paul, 2007).

Both political and feminist communication scholarship offer evidence that media portray female politicians and leaders as out of (their proper) place in the arena of politics and policy-making (see, for example, Byerly & Ross, 2006; Falk, 2009; Huddy & Terkildsen 1993a, 1993b; Niven & Zilbe, 2001, Norris, 1997; Robertson &

---

[22] On a less positive note, the 2009 midterm election in the United States marked the first time in 30 years where the number of women in Congress decreased (Parker, 2010).

Anderson, 2001; Ross, 2004, 2002; Sreberny-Mohammadi & Ross, 1996; Vavrus, 2002). Thus, while arguably gender role stereotypes have diminished over the past several decades, women politicians still are viewed differently than their male counterparts. For example, voters believe that male candidates are stronger leaders (Kahn, 1994b), and Matland (1994) found that a candidate's gender affects the perceptions of a candidate's abilities even in a country like Norway, where women participate extensively at all levels of electoral representation. Further, people associate stereotyped masculine traits as more important in politics than the feminine traits, particularly as the elected office level rises from the local to the national level (Dolan, 2004), but aggressive and assertive female candidates appear unfeminine—and therefore unacceptable—while "feminine" women are deemed ineffective (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009; Devere & Davies, 2006; Falk, 2008; Jamieson, 2005).

One commonality in these perceptions is the assumption that women are emotional, which often times is linked to a supposed incapacity for logic and reason. Their allegedly biological (i.e., natural) compulsion toward nurturing and child-raising constrains them to the domestic world, and unfit for leading and legislating (Falk, 2008). Thus females, for centuries marginalized from public affairs and regarded with skepticism and contempt as political actors (Witt, Paget & Matthews, 1994, see also Ross, 2002; 2004), also have to deal with gender stereotypes that regard them as emoters, in contrast to the rational males. If one is to be a political leader, one should act rational, deliberate, and market-driven, not irrational and uncontrollable as the gendered reading of the woman/emoter pairing suggests (Winsky-Mattei, 1998). As a

result, women are perceived as unnatural in politics, incompetent as leaders, and naturally lacking the attributes necessary to come to power.

Even when there have been important changes in women's rights and political participation over the last century, the private/public dichotomy still heavily influences the definitions of gendered identities. Because of the cultural dichotomy that equates showing emotion in politics to a liability or character failure, the expectations and assumptions about women's emotionality make it even harder for females looking to break and move up in politics (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009; Winsky-Mattei, 1998).

Indeed, survey data shows that as of 2007, while almost 90% of Americans said they would be willing to vote for a woman for president "*if she were qualified for the job,*" almost 25% of respondents also agreed that "most men are better suited emotionally for politics than are most women" (Lawless & Redford, 2009, p. 26, emphasis added).[23] Empirical data also suggests that evaluations of politicians' emotions favor women who adopt "a rational, unemotional approach" (Hitchon, Chang & Harris, 1997, p. 64) and that people rely on their beliefs about men and women's emotionality to evaluate how well candidates can handle public affairs and issues (Sanbonmatsu, 2003). Likewise, neutral appeals—rather than emotional—seem to work best for women candidates in terms of audience recall, especially for issue instances (Hitchon & Chang, 1995).

---

[23] Recent survey data also showed that women are more likely than men to doubt that they have the skills and traits necessary for electoral politics (Fox & Lawless, 2011).

Finally, the argument that women are too emotional and unable to handle crises—and thus, not viable as candidates—was a recurring theme used by the U.S. press in its coverage of the eight women who have run for president since 1880 (Falk, 2008). In her study, Falk concluded the media focus on women's emotional expressions underscores cultural assumptions about women's unsuitability for public office. Falk also suggested that female candidates needed to avoid being described as emotional and "focus on rationality" (Falk, 2008, p. 160). The mere fact that the media tend to stress female candidates' gender—a detail that sheds little light on the candidate's character or stance on issues—further marks these politicians as different, and by implication, unfit for office.

Such gendered logic in public opinion and news accounts has important consequences for social understandings of gender, as well as its relationship to institutional power, race, and socioeconomic class (Vavrus, 2002). Studies have shown that media coverage excludes women from serious debates in the public sphere (Byerly & Ross, 2004; Norris, 1997), and news frames not only reinforce gender stereotypes (Norris, 1997; Ross, 2002), but inform citizens' impressions of candidates, as they rely on the mediated images and stories to form their assessments (Bucy & Grabe, 2006; Clayman, 1995; Ross, 2002, 2004; Falk, 2009). More so, as agents of socialization, the media play a key role in shaping the content of public expectations of a politician's job, the appropriate demeanor of a public official, and the markers that define social categories as gender, race, class, work, family, policy and other cultural ideas (Denzin, 1990; Philippot et al., 1999). However, little is known about the content of these media-

fed expectations (Mayer, 2001), despite the fact that they provide cues about a candidate's electoral suitability (Bucy & Grabe, 2006). More importantly, considering that electoral politics is highly mediated—the press supplies the information that nourishes citizenship (Grabe, 2004)—the news texts about female candidates and their emotionality can be both culturally and politically consequential.

MEDIA SOCIALIZATION AND MEDIATED POLITICS

In the interrelationship between gender, emotion, culture and politics, the mass media are significant social forces. Gitlin (1980) stressed three decades ago the power of the media in forming and delimiting of public assumptions, attitudes, and modes. In doing so, they usually promote the status quo and construct the consent that defines the hegemonic mode of domination (Fraser, 1993). While the media could facilitate discourse and debate within the public sphere, most of the time they end up constructing and limiting public discourse to those themes and terms validated and approved by those in power (Kellner, 2000). As a result, ideological definitions—such as gender standards and hierarchy, display rules, or expectations about presidential demeanor— seem natural and enduring despite ongoing challenges (Hebdige, 1979; Kellner, 2000).[24]

These definitions, then, are socialized, and the media are among the factors ensuring the transmission of such social norms. In other words, the media teach and

---

[24] Such consent is not only promoted by the media, but given the media's scope and reach in the public arena, they are amongst the most important institutional sites for hegemony, or what Althusser (1971) labeled "ideological state apparatuses."

inform about norms and values regarding expected behaviors, roles and status in society (Van Zoonen, 1994). Media content equips individuals to perform tasks in the public social world according to culturally-defined norms, which makes understanding normative content important—it helps predict individuals' affects and behaviors (Shields, 2002; Thoits, 2004).

As such, what the media do with women and vice versa becomes relevant, as research consistently shows that people learn and adapt their self-presentation and behavior according to societal rules and meanings created, negotiated, performed and shaped through social interaction (see, for instance, Carter, Branston & Allan, 1998; Deaux, 2000; Fiske, 1996; Harp, 2007; Mulvey, 1979; Saarni & Weber, 1999; Shields, 2002). Things are not different with the sets of rules for displaying and dissembling emotion, notions of femininity and masculinity, and appropriate places and roles for individuals—they are learned over the course of socialization (Brody, 1999; Brody, 2000; Lutz & Abu-Lughod, 1990; Lutz, 1990; Saarni, 1998; Saarni & Weber, 1999; Thoits, 2004). Therefore, media exerts power and can make very real differences in people's lives, as press discourses shape ways of knowing and what might count as truth. (Novinger & Compton-Lilly, 2005).

Such influence of the media is particularly relevant in politics, as public opinion is largely mediated by the news media's presentation of political information. News reporting affects how people interpret and construct social meaning (e.g., Carragee & Roefs, 2004; Entman 1993; Gamson, 1989; Scheufele, 2000). There also is evidence of the influence of the mass media on public images of political candidates (e.g., Iyengar

& Kinder, 1987; Iyengar & Reeves, 1997; Scheufele, 2000; Sheafer, 2007), and agenda-setting research has shown that news media shape how voters view and evaluate issues and candidates (McCombs & Shaw, 1972; McCombs, López-Escobar & Llamas, 2000; McCombs, 2004). Additionally, voting behavior research suggests that voter perceptions of the qualities of the candidates can influence perceived candidate suitability (e.g., Prysby, 2008).

Another source of influence on public opinion is the biases within the news media (e.g, Bennet, 1988, 1993; D'Alessio & Allen, 2000) and there is evidence that commentators' evaluations of candidates' emotionality are largely a function of their own partisanship (Shields & MacDowell, 1987). From a critical approach, journalistic discourses have the power to manufacture and distribute beliefs and ideals that are used to construct meaning (Freeden, 2003; Prividera & Howard, 2006), and, in more generic terms, research shows that audiences react and respond accordingly to media coverage. Thus, the media tell people what to think (McCombs, López-Escobar & Llamas, 2000) and think about (e.g., McCombs & Shaw, 1972), prime evaluations (Gidengil & Everitt, 2000; Valentino, 1999), and promote traditional images and stereotypes of women's political roles (Devere & Davies, 2006; Devitt, 2002; Scharrer, 2002). Framing research has shown that people use the media as sources of cues to understand and interpret the world (Entman, 1993; Scheufele, 2002). In other words, news reporting affects how people construct social meaning.

As a result, how the media describe electoral politics, including accounts regarding candidates' displays of emotion, is likely to have political consequences. For

instance, scholars argue that the underrepresentation of women in politics is in large part due to gender biases in media coverage that undermine their chances to run a successful, or at least a viable, campaign (Shepard, 2009). Following this argument, if media discourse insists on minimizing and dismissing females' political agency and their bids into the political arena, framing women as emotional and not fit for office, the public will likely perceive them like that. There also is evidence that due to the gendered mediation in politics people's attitudes and responses are gendered-specific as well (Ross, 2004, 2002; Sreberny & Ross, 2000; see also Norris, 1997). People recall and favor male candidates much more than female candidates even when exposed to similar print and television news coverage (Knopf & Boiney, 2001). Given that female politicians are scarce, they are perceived as representatives of the larger female population (Rakow & Kranich, 1991). The public may also find in media coverage reinforcement and support for their own biases and stereotypes regarding women in general, and female politicians in particular (Bystrom, 2004).

Modern politics is not only mediated, but increasingly personalized (Bennet, 1998; 2000; Caprara & Zimbardo, 2004; Lawrence & Bennet, 2000), and the perceived qualities of candidates, male and female, help predict voter preferences, in detriment of party identification and platforms (see for instance, Caprara & Zimbardo, 2004; Hayes, 2005; Prysby, 2008; Sheafer, 2007). Arguably, politicians strive to convey an image that matches the desires and expectations of the policy, and how the media portray the candidates and their personalities receives attention for the possible and actual effects these messages have (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Fraley & Vecchioni, 2007; Coleman &

Banning, 2006). Research also suggests that perception of the personalities of political figures undergoes a simplification effect. In general people do not think of politicians in complex ways and indeed most citizens operate "as cognitive misers in focusing on the characteristics that they believe are most important in politics and what they expect from a politician" (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Fraley & Vecchioni, 2007, p, 404). Consistency while portraying particular people and situations favors specific interpretations (e.g., Candidate X is cold) and undermines other perspectives (Clayman, 1995).

In that context, an analysis of media discourse about politicians' emotional management becomes relevant. Past literature supports the idea that what the media have to say about politicians and their emotional behavior is important: these portrayals may inform citizens' assessments about a person's fitness to hold public office. The research that has tapped into these ideas, however, has failed to consider gender stereotypes in politics or has focused on lower levels of elected political office. Considering the pervasiveness of the dichotomies linking women, emotions and the private sphere, what the media reports about the demeanor of female candidates may reveal a lot about culturally sanctioned ideals of how women and government heads are supposed to behave.

In that line, media formats and contents also play an important role in telling audiences how to *read* politics and candidates. Growing empirical evidence shows that nonverbal emotional displays of leaders can serve as a potent vehicle for expression and sway support (Bucy, 2003; Bucy & Newhagen, 1999; Masters & Sullivan, 1993;

Sullivan & Masters, 1988; Coleman & Banning, 2006), as displays are read as accurate indications of a candidate's electoral suitability (Bucy & Grabe, 2006; 2008). Furthermore, there is evidence that the more televisual the political process has become, the more people *read* politicians through their gestures and their faces (Richards, 2004; Elias & Dunning, 1986; Bucy & Grabe, 2008), to the extent that the affective framing of candidates influences the public's perception (Coleman & Banning, 2006). Similarly, visual images are important for observer evaluations, and in the case of political candidates, can actually shape how potential voters view that candidate (Barret & Barrington, 2005; Coleman & Banning, 2006; Grabe & Bucy, 2009).

While the present study does not examine the effects of such news coverage, it builds on this empirical evidence to argue that an analysis of media messages is important because they can be politically consequential. To paraphrase Bucy and Grabe (2006), candidates' portrayals in the media act like images of clear weather patterns or incoming storms. Political conventional wisdom says that a candidate's emotions can make or break a public image, but emotional displays and its appropriateness are evaluated within social context, which in turn are culturally defined. As previously stated, culture plays a role in emotions' gendered character (Perry, Turner & Sterk & 1992), and their understanding, definition and categorization differ in specific ways in different societies (Shields, 2002). Journalistic framing also is contingent upon features of a country's culture and history (Esser & D'Angelo, 2006; Hanitzsch, 2008a; 2008b), and it must be stressed that the political communication culture of each country shapes political rhetoric and ways of presenting and interpreting politics in the news (Blumler

& Gurevitch, 1995; Hallin & Mancini, 1994)—including news media representations of female politicians. In other words, a comparative framework can provide information on similarities and differences that explain the impact of such cultural notions and shared meanings in shaping the media politics environment.

70

Chapter 4. Comparative Communication Research

> Thinking without comparisons is unthinkable.
> (Swanson, 1971, p. 145)

Research recognizing the ways in which journalists and mass media discursively frame identities is important, especially considering the role the media play in socializing cultural norms and beliefs regarding gender and emotional management. In this context, comparative analyses are particularly useful to delineate differences in news content (in this dissertation, about female leadership) in countries that are culturally and developmentally different, but with several similarities that lend themselves for meaningful comparisons. People's expectations and beliefs about emotions may also be conditioned by social settings and political scenarios, and cultural resonances can thus contribute to an explanation of what journalists and editors say about politicians in different countries, as well as why the media circulate certain representations that are considered familiar or even commonsensical for those citizens (Van Gorp, 2007; see also Benson & Saguy, 2005; Burgoon, 1992).

Comparative research is a discipline of communication studies in its own right, albeit heavily skewed toward Western democracies (Esser & Pfetsch, 2004a; Gurevitch & Blumler, 2004). Comparison is the basis of all science and thus cross-cultural examination of news coverage, values, and journalistic practices in searching for commonalities and differences can extend our knowledge of communication (Edelstein, 1983). Consideration of media coverage in different countries is important, yet this type of research is for the most part rare (e.g., Gurevitch & Blumler, 2004; Hanitzsch,

2008b), in part because theoretically and methodologically sound comparative research is difficult and taxing (Chang et al., 2001).

What follows is description of the core principles of comparative communication research and an overview of the kind of systematic cross-national research that informs the present study.

COMPARATIVE APPROACHES: REASONS AND ADVANTAGES

Comparative inquiry—especially regarding description and classification—has long served the sciences, although it was only after the Second World War that distinctively comparative research became common in the social sciences and humanities (Hanitzsch, 2008a; 2008b).[25] Despite pitfalls and challenges, a comparative approach can be useful for communication research (Ptetsch & Esser, 2004a). For instance, Graber (1993) argued that political communication needs comparative research, as it varies between cultures and societies.

Defined as "comparisons between a minimum of two media systems or cultures (or their sub-elements) with respect to at least one object of investigation relevant to communication research" (Esser & Pfetsch, 2004b, p. 385), comparative communication research has an international nature, and aims to reach conclusions that go beyond one system or culture while explaining differences and similarities between objects of analysis within contextual conditions (Esser & Pfetsch, 2004b). In this sense,

---

[25] However, Swanson (1992) argued that the terms "comparative" and "comparative analysis" were redundant in the social sciences.

it deals with complex factors shaping mass communication processes that range from the very macro to the very micro (Chang et al., 2001). For instance, national media systems are not empty containers; the news is shaped by multiple structures and journalists are not impervious to outside stimuli (Hanitzch, 2008a; Ptetsch & Esser, 2008). Thus, comparative analyses allow researchers to tease out cross-cultural equivalences (or differences) regardless of other divergences (or similarities) various societies may have (Edelstein, 1983). More importantly, comparative research helps scholars to overcome limitations of the generalizability of theories derived from single-nation studies, as they have to develop explanations that can apply across systems and test their interpretations against cross-cultural inconsistencies (Blumler, McLeod & Rosengren, 1992; Hanitzsch, 2008b).

Scholars posit four purposes for these comparisons: 1) contextual description of cases/countries; 2) classification and generation of typologies by grouping cases into distinct categories with identifiable and shared characteristics; 3) explanation of the cross-cultural variation, and 4) causal predictions about outcomes in other countries based on generalizations (Esser & Pfetsch, 2008b; Blumler & Gurevitch, 1995; Landman, 2008; Lim, 2006; Wirth & Kolb, 2004). These reasons also explain the benefit and challenges of comparative research, including the expansion of the existing database of research, the provision of antidotes to universalism and ethnocentrism, and awareness of other systems, cultures, and patterns of thinking and acting (Blumler & Gurevitch, 1995; Esser & Ptetsch, 2004b; Gurevitch & Blumler, 2004; Hanitzsch, 2008a), as long as the comparisons are conceptually and theoretically sound (Pfetsch &

Esser, 2004a; Hanitzsch, 2008a). Chang and colleagues found that much of international communication scholarship lacked a theoretical framework, suffered from incomparability of units of analysis, and failed to effectively address structural factors that could affect the interpretation of the results (Chang et al. 2001, see also Hanitzsch, 2008b). Yet, when conducted properly, cross-national studies are important tools of theory-building by contextualizing and generalizing theories, verifying the validity of concepts, and identifying differences and similarities (Esser & Ptetsch, 2004b). Thus, comparative research requires an articulation of theory, method and evidence in order to stand (Landman, 2008; Lim, 2006).

THE PROBLEM OF COMPARABILITY

Distinctively comparative research comes with several methodological challenges, especially regarding units and contexts of analysis.

At the core of the comparisons of this type of research is the notion that the objects being compared are indeed comparable (Blumler et al., 1992, p. 13). Scholars have stressed that beyond the names of the units of comparison or the use of identical measures, the key in this comparability is on establishing functional equivalence, where the concepts, constructs and items are *qualitatively* identical across all countries in the study (Blumler & Gurevitch, 1995; Chang. et al. 2001; Hanitzsch, 2008a, 2008b). Further, often times atheoretical comparative studies can only account for what cross-national differences or similarities take place, but not why they occur. While descriptions are valid scientific evidence, they cannot capture variation across countries

in a meaningful way. As Chang and colleagues (2001) argued, "To say that apples and oranges do not look alike or taste differently is to state the obvious" (p. 423). In that sense, sound comparative research can shed light on both the particular phenomena under study *and* the different systems examined (Pfetsch & Esser, 2004a), and the comparison are not only between units, but also within them (Chang et al. 2001).

Other methodological issues have to do with the power of such comparisons. While cross-cultural studies can foster the formulation and refinement of theories, researchers should ponder whether such an enterprise would extend the scope of the interpretations in a sufficient way (Hanitzsch, 2008b). That is, the comparison should be justified, as including more cultures does not guarantee more learning (Hanitzsch, 2008b). Moreover, this kind of research is prone to what has been labeled "safari research," where investigators' focus on differences may lead them to underplay commonalities across or within cultural and national boundaries (Hanitzsch, 2008a). Further, such comparisons have the risk of relying on normative standards and expectations (e.g., one model is deemed better than the other), and indeed early comparative research has been called ethnocentric for having a Western bias (Esser & Pfetsch, 2004a; Merrill, 2004; Nerone, 2002). Much of these studies portrayed societies in the Third World as needing to "catch up" with the norms and systems in the developed world (Hanitzsch, 2008a), without consideration to regional realities.

Most comparative communication studies involved two or three cultures, although there are a few studies with an extensive scope of countries (see, for instance, Inglehart & Norris, 2003; Norris, 2000; 2004). Comparing just a few countries may not

allow for the strong inferences of large-sample studies, but it does avoid the conceptual stretching of single-case studies. Comparing a few countries also allows for thick description and area studies, although the inferences are less secure and the risk of selection bias (e.g., the choice of countries) has to be considered (Landman, 2008; Lim, 2006). Indeed, comparative research must endure the rather small number of cases available for comparative purposes and, for instance, forgo relying on statistical analyses that would be more appropriate for other cases (Blumler & Gurevitch, 1995).

In this context, studies can choose one of two approaches. Studies based on a "most similar systems design" attempt to identify key divergences among cases that for the most part share a range of similarities. In other words, such research seeks a differentiating feature that could account for the specific outcome under study. Conversely, a "most different systems design" looks for similarities among widely different cases and thus allows researchers to tease out the common elements from such diverse set of cases (Lim, 2006; Ptetsch & Esser, 2004a; Wirth & Kolb, 2004). The latter has greater explanatory power, but is more rare in communication research (Hanitzsch, 2008a, 2008b; Pfetsch & Esser 2004a).

COMPARING COUNTRIES

Historically, comparative research has compared countries, although terminology and rationale of these comparisons have been ambiguous.[26] For those study

---

[26] Some of the labels used to refer to comparative research include "cross-country," "cross-national," "cross-societal," "cross-cultural," "cross-systemic" (e.g., media systems in different countries), "cross-

designs that deliberately employ a comparative approach, "countries" serves as a label for a set of different systemic constraints and particularities (Mayerhoffer, Maurer & Pfetsch, 2008), including the discretionary power of the media (Semetko, Blumler, Gurevitch & Weaver, 1991), their media and political systems (Pfetsch & Esser 2004a; Esser & Pfetsch, 2004b), political culture and notions of citizenship (Gurevitch & Blumler, 2004), as well as economic and financial variables, and cultural differences (Blumler & Gurevitch, 1995).

While comparativists have developed strong sensitivity for the shortcomings of "country" as a meaningful scientific unit, and despite growing transnational convergence, multivariate data analyses show evidence of the enduring importance that national parameters continue to exert (Esser, 2008). Studies show, for instance, that globalization does not put an end to comparative research and that media and political systems still can be compared along the lines of national boundaries (Ptetsch & Esser, 2008). In other words, global processes and increasing integration may blur borders, but research shows that national contexts still matter the most (Esser, 2008). In the end, national actors are the key institutions that eventually translate international trends into policies, and these policies vary among nations (Ptetsch & Esser, 2008).

However, some problems may arise for lack of understanding of variation within the units under study. After all, neither nations nor cultures are typically homogeneous (Blumler et al., 1992). Comparative analyses should be system-sensitive, and attempt to

institutional," "trans-national," "trans-societal," "trans-cultural," and "inter-national" (Hanitzch, 2008a; see also Chang et al. 2001).

understand how the systemic context may shape different phenomena (Blumler et al., 1992; Gurevitch & Blumler, 2004).

According to Kohn (1989), nation-states may serve several roles in comparative research:

- *Nation as context*, where national boundaries are treated as different contexts in which the phenomenon under study is exposed to various stimuli, like when scholars test the generality of their findings about the operation of different media systems.

- *Nation as unit of analysis*, where the goal is to understand variations in national characteristics and, according to Esser and Pfetsch (2004) the results are often some kind of typology that convert the country names into variables (e.g., information-rich and information-poor countries).

- *Nation as object*, where countries are treated as homogeneous and independent objects of study. The comparison aims to enhance understanding of nations by analyzing the whole context.

- *Transnational research*, where nations are operationalized as elements of a larger international system and the study focuses on the influence of specific transnational and supranational phenomena, treaties and organizations, such as the European Union or globalization (Kohn, 1989; see also Blumler et al., 1992, pp. 10-12; Esser & Pfetsch, 2004b, pp. 394-395).

Most cross-national studies explicitly or implicitly overlap culture and nation but these two parameters are not necessarily congruent (Ptetsch & Esser, 2004a). That said, while convenient, nation-states are not the default or the only reference point in comparative analyses, and researchers rely on theory to choose the relevant units and concepts to compare, not on convenience or access (Esser & Pfetsch, 2004b; Esser, 2008).

POLITICAL AND MEDIA SYSTEMS IN COMPARATIVE RESEARCH

Because comparative communication studies look for similarities and differences that hold regardless of the contextual influences, this scholarship has paid great attention to the articulating relationships between media and political institutions and systems that shape media messages and mediated politics. This includes structural and cultural components (Blumler & Gurevitch, 1995).

In this context, notions such as political culture—"values, norms, beliefs, sentiments and understandings of how power and authority operate within a particular political system" (Amin, 2002, p. 127-128; see also Gurevitch & Blumler, 2004)—and journalism culture—the "particular set of ideas and practices by which journalists, consciously and unconsciously, legitimate their role in society and render their work meaningful for themselves and others" (Mayerhoffer, Maurer & Pfetsch, 2008)—become important, potentially influencing the position of politics in society, newspeople's orientation toward politics, and variation of media competition (Semetko et al., 1991).

Further, research shows that political culture is key to understanding the construction and encoding of political messages, including symbols commonly invoked and ways of framing political issues and controversies in the news (Gurevitch & Blumler, 2004). Despite journalistic variations, the cultural production of the media operates and is bounded by cultural parameters and constraints imposed by the political structure (Ostini & Fung, 2002). Likewise, journalism culture ends up influencing the political communication system of a country (Mayerhoffer, Maurer & Pfetsch, 2008). On their own and with their shared interactions, media and politics also have a role in the process of socialization and give shape to the culturally imbued idea of citizenship (Esser & Ptetsch, 2004b; Gurevitch & Blumler, 2004). Thus,

> [Citizenship] is also essentially relational, prescribing how the members of a society should regard and participate in their political institutions. It is a rich notion as well, incorporating, among others, attitudes to political authority (e.g., deferential or skeptical); entitlements to participate, be heard, have one's claims satisfied; all degrees of partisanship or its opposite; sentiments of duty and efficacy; *even attitudes toward the rightful place of reason and emotion in politics.* (Gurevitch & Blumler, 2004, p. 337, emphasis added)

Indeed, the literature gives examples of interesting insights drawn from work comparing all kinds of political- and media-related explanatory variables for understanding political communication issues (for an overview, see Blumler & Gurevitch, 1995, pp. 82-85; Esser & Ptetsch, 2004b, pp. 397-402).

As such, a comparative framework can provide information on how culture influences perceptions about women's roles and their communication within different countries, and empirical evidence further supports the existence of variability within the

broad category of competitive democratic politics (Esser, 2008). A comparative analysis like the one proposed in this study attempts to reveal culturally defined meanings related to assessment of the right emotional response in social life for both women and men. Given that women still have a very hard time breaking into politics—let alone moving up the political ladder—the chances to explore their media portrayals in specific countries have also been limited so far. The present study aims to build on current research on female politicians using the recent presidential races in Chile and the United States, two countries where for the fist time a woman ran a campaign with a strong prospect to succeed.

Chapter 5. Country Profiles and Research Context

This dissertation compares news media discourse about female and male candidates running for the highest political office, and their emotional management in two culturally and developmentally different countries that, however, have several similarities that favor meaningful comparisons. The following is a brief description of Chile and the United States, the two countries under study, and the research context that, coupled with theoretical conceptualizations, explain the selection of these two nations.

CHILE

Regarded as one of the most stable countries in Latin America, Chile, a democracy with a market-oriented economy, has a population of about 16 million. With a Spanish heritage, almost 95% of its population is either white or mestizo (i.e., mixed race), 96.5% is literate, and 70% is Catholic. The country is among the leaders in Latin American nations in terms of human development, life expectancy, public education, protection of civil liberties, competitiveness, quality of life, political stability, globalization, economic freedom, press freedom, and transparency (United Nations, 2010). Chile also increasingly has assumed regional and international leadership roles, especially after the mostly peaceful end in 1990 to the military dictatorship led by Augusto Pinochet. This 16-year-long regime was the most recent gap in the country's commitment to democratic and representative government.

Still, deep inequalities—including gender divides in the social, political, and economic realms—tarnish a record of an otherwise prosperous and developed country. While in the last three decades the country has reduced poverty rates by more than half, it has one of the highest income inequality scores (according to the Gini index) on the continent, and gender empowerment indices lag behind in comparison to other countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OCDE), which has Chile as its only South American member. Likewise, women make up only a third of the workforce, despite being half of the population; occupy 22 of 158 parliamentary seats, and are twice as likely to live in poverty as men.

Press and speech freedom are protected by the Constitution and the media industry is mostly private, but there is a state-run newspaper[27] as well as public television network, TVN, which follows a commercial model and has financial autonomy. Until 2010, the Catholic University owned one of the largest television networks,[28] and several higher education institutions hold radio licenses. Cable had a late and slow penetration in the country, and in early 2011 the sole major cable company in the nation reached almost 40% of households. A third of women and half of men in Chile declare to have access to the Internet, although there has been a moderate increase in recent years.

According to survey data, 43% of the population regularly read a newspaper—national, regional or local—and 73% watch television news everyday. Of those with

---

[27] *La Nación*, the state-own newspaper, became a digital-only operation in November 2010.

[28] In August 2010, the university sold 67% of its 51-year-old network, Canal 13, to a private corporation.

cable, less than 5% reported following cable news regularly, a number that has to do with the limited offer: until 2009, BBC Mundo (the Spanish service of the British corporation) and the Atlanta-based CNN en Español were the only cable news networks available. At the end of that year, CNN Chile and 24 Horas (a cable news service from the national public network) were launched to moderate success. Radio historically has been the most trusted, plural and diverse source for information. Radio also played a crucial role during Pinochet's military regime, and while it has lost some prominence, it remains popular: 71% of the population said they listen to radio news daily.

It is within these political, social, and economic contexts—mostly shaped in the last 30 years—that Chilean society frames gender ideologies and gendered expectations along the lines of a highly patriarchal country characterized by a machista culture of male dominance (Nierman et al. 2007). Pinochet's regime portrayed both Marxism and feminism as foreign influences that undermined the Fatherland (Franceschet, 2005; see also Huneeus, 2003; Larraín, 2005). The regime also promoted an image of females in general—and mothers in particular—as the moral reserve of the country, whose "adherence to traditional values—domesticity, motherhood, and sexual propriety—embodied the recovery of a lost order" (Mora, 2006). This, in turn, helps explain the prevalence of traditional and conservative ideals among Chileans (Larraín, 2005; see also Nierman et al. 2007). For instance, the military regime's population plan restricted access to contraceptives. More so, abortion remains illegal and the ability to divorce—as well as issues involving spousal support or child custody—was enacted only in 2003. Religious influences further promote pronatalist ideals that stress the importance of

motherhood, child-rearing and nurturing for women (Huneeus, 2003). These notions also restrict women to gender-specific roles, including housewife, nurse, or elementary school teacher (Franceschet, 2005). Women are thus for the most part marginalized from positions of power (Larraín, 2005), and research suggests that at the democratic transition, females retreated to civil society (Franceschet, 2005).

Empirical evidence shows that womanhood and motherhood tend to be equated in Chile (Mora, 2006), and that the label of "mother" is among the most valued social identities and roles in the country (Larraín, 2005). The pervasive representations of femininity as demanding self-sacrifice and a duty toward children and husband, however, does not preclude women from engaging in paid work out of the home; indeed, for many "good mothering means providing for ones' children emotionally *and* economically" (Mora, 2006, p. 52, emphasis added).

THE UNITED STATES

One of the largest countries—by land area and population—in the world, the United States is also one of the richest and most powerful nations. A multi-cultural and ethnically diverse federal republic with a strong democratic tradition and a capitalist market economy, the country enjoys a dominant position in the international system.

The United States also is among the most developed countries in the world, with top-20 positions in indices on transparency, press freedom, quality of life, human development, and economic freedom, albeit less stellar income equality scores (on the Gini index) in comparison to other European nations and Canada (United Nations,

85

2010). The country scores high in the United Nations' gender empowerment measure and females comprise almost 47% of the labor force. However, 90 years after the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment which gave women the right to vote, women hold just a sixth of the seats in Congress; only 29 women have ever served as the governor of a state, and only three women have ever been appointed to the Supreme Court. Females still make less money than their male counterparts—regardless of the field—and despite women making up the majority of journalism graduates since 1977, currently only one in seven news articles is written by a female (Bennet & Ellison, 2010).

The U.S. Bill of Rights guarantees both freedom of speech and freedom of the press. Private interests (and in some cases transnational corporations) dominate the media landscape, which also includes two non-profit and national public media organizations—PBS and NPR. Cable reaches nearly 60% of U.S. households, and three-fourths of the population has access to the Internet.

The most recent survey from the Pew Research Center (2010) indicated that 26% of the population regularly read a print copy of a newspaper, a telling number about the decline of newspaper readership in the United States. This decline is slightly offset by online consumption: 34% of respondents said they get their news online, with 58% of Americans getting their news from television, which remains the most popular medium. Unlike in Chile, U.S. cable news plays an important role in people's news habits, and 39% of respondents said they regularly get news from a cable channel.

Almost a third (34%) follow the news on the radio, and 36% said they get news from both digital and traditional sources.

The United States is a less patriarchal country with relatively more egalitarian ideals than Chile (Nierman et al, 2007). However, whereas structural and historical conditions lend themselves to greater gender equality, normalized gender roles keep prescribing "acceptable" masculine and feminine forms of behavior (Chappel, 2006). These ideals involve issues like the primacy of the breadwinner role, the belief in gendered separate spheres, the linkage of motherhood and the feminine self, and the acceptance of male privilege (Davis & Greenstein, 2009). Such notions impact workplace and educational outcomes, like labor force participation, occupational choice, educational expectations, and educational attainment (Davis & Greenstein, 2009; see also Baber & Tucker, 2006; and Barnett, 2004).

Despite changes in American life in recent decades that have transformed women's roles in the private and public spheres, to a great extent mothering is still seen as a woman's primary identity (Harp & Bachmann, 2007). Thus, while women's participation in the public arena has increased, mothering became more intensive, time-consuming and emotionally absorbing (Garey, 1999; Hays, 1996), which ends up perpetuating traditional gender roles (Johnston & Swanson, 2006; see also Loke, Harp & Bachmann, 2011). Research offers little support for the idea that career-oriented women are against motherhood, or, conversely, that motherhood-oriented women are "anti-work" (e.g., Mcquillan et al. 2008), yet the media insists on pitting women against each other by perpetuating this conflict (Harp & Bachmann, 2007).

Chile and the United States are different countries, but have similar media and political systems. Both countries are established presidential democracies with similar levels of women's political representation (see Table 1 below).

Table 1:   Cross-National Comparisons*

	Chile	**United States**
Political regime	Electoral democracy	Electoral democracy
Government system	Presidential republic	Federal presidential republic
Population	16 million	300 million
Women in national parliaments - Lower House - Upper House	17% 13%	16% 16%
Gross Domestic Product per capita	US$14,560	US$46,901
Transparency International's low corruption perception ranking	25	19
Freedom House' Press Freedom Index	30	18
Gini Inequality Index	.520	.480
U.N. Human Development Index	0.783	0.902
U.N. Gender Empowerment Measure ranking	75	18

* Data from the United Nations Database (data.un.org), the Inter-Parliamentary Union, (www.ipu.org), Transparency International (www.transparency.org/) and Freedom House (www.freedomhouse.org).

While still behind the United States, Chile ranks highly in international comparisons—especially within the Latin American context—and more importantly, in both countries female candidates with very different party affiliations, background and expertise (see Table 2 below) were able to run viable campaigns—a first for a woman.

Table 2:   Cross-Biographical Comparisons

Country	Candidate	Party	Political expertise	Background
Chile	Michelle Bachelet	Socialist Party	• Secretary of Health (2000-2002) • Secretary of Defense (2002-2004)	• Lived in exile during military dictatorship • Grass-root experience, never ran for any other office • Pediatrician • Divorced, 51 at the time of the election
United States	Hillary Clinton	Democratic Party	• First Lady (1993-2001) • Senator for New York (2001-2008)	• Active in politics since youth • Political career linked to husband's • Lawyer • Married, 61 at the time of the election

Michelle Bachelet, who became Chile's 34th president and the first female to hold this position in the country's history, was sworn in March 11, 2006, after running as the nominee of "Concertación," the ruling coalition. A moderate socialist, she campaigned on a platform of continuing Chile's free market policies, while increasing social benefits to help reduce the country's gap between rich and poor. She faced three

other candidates: Tomas Hirsch, of the Partido Humanista, who had the support of an alliance of the political left without parliamentary representation; and two candidates from the right wing opposition, Joaquín Lavín of the Unión Demócrata Independiente, and Sebastián Piñera for Renovación Nacional. Almost an unknown in politics before 2000, Bachelet became popular while serving as Health Minister and Defense Minister under President Lagos (2000-2006). Unlike her predecessors, Bachelet did not have a visible political career before the 1973 military coup, nor was she a main protagonist in the journey that led to a return to democracy. She won the 2005-2006 election in a runoff against Piñera with 53.5% of the vote.

Hillary Clinton was a senator from New York when she made official her presidential aspirations on January 20, 2007. While early on she appeared as the most likely winner, the Democratic Party primaries of 2008 turned out to be a close race, one that also included Barack Obama, John Edwards and early on, another five contenders. Hardly a newcomer to politics, her campaign stressed her experience and preparedness for the post. The contest remained competitive for longer than expected, and despite getting almost 18 million votes in the primaries, Clinton was not able to overcome Obama's lead in pledge delegates and ended her campaign on June 7, 2008. Despite loosing the nomination, Clinton remained quite popular among Democrat ranks, as a Gallup poll (2008) reported that by the time of the Democratic convention in August 2008, she still enjoyed 80% approval ratings among Democrats.

Admittedly, a presidential campaign and a primary race for a party nomination may not be identical electoral settings, but these cases have several similarities that

make them comparable. Both races are candidate elections (as opposed to party elections common in Parliamentary regimes), and both were the subject of much media attention from beginning to end. Bachelet and Clinton both had to campaign for several months in their bids to become the head of the government in each country. Both candidates participated in debates with their male competitors and had constraints when it came to political advertising. More so, generalized dissatisfaction with the George W. Bush administration made the Democratic race a virtual national election, as the nominee would be the likely winner in November 2008, and the primary democratic voting—with proportional allocation of delegates—resembles the Chilean popular vote for presidential elections.[29]

Distinctively comparative research is meant to be system-sensitive and theoretical in its perspective (Esser & Pfetsch, 2004; Esser, 2008). A comparative analysis like the one proposed in this study attempts to reveal culturally defined meanings related to assessment of the right emotional response in social life for both women and men. Thus, while both women have to meet and deal with expectations from citizens and the media about their demeanor, they had to do so in countries with diverse cultural heritage. Recent empirical evidence shows that there are significant cultural differences between both countries when it comes to gender role beliefs—with Chileans as a group holding more traditional ideals (Nierman et al. 2007). Such gender

---

[29] Admittedly, superdelegates could override the primary voters and caucus-goers, and indeed became particularly prominent in the 2008 Democratic campaign due to the tight race.

norms determine "acceptable" masculine and feminine forms of behavior, rules, and values for men and women (Chappell, 2006).

In this sense, an analysis of media coverage of female politicians in different countries is important. Given women's obstacles to enter and succeed in politics worldwide the chances to explore their media portrayals in specific countries also have been limited thus far. Further, the focus of comparative politics gender research remains "too focused on Europe and North America, and therefore by definition incomplete" (Tripp, 2006, p. 251). The present study aims to build on that while contributing to a more nuanced understanding of the gender-politics conjunction.

Chapter 6. Research Questions

Theory and past research support the notion that people may draw conclusions about the emotional traits of politicians based on certain standards or expectations regarding the attributes of someone running for public office. These expectations can be particularly prominent regarding the interconnection of emotion and gender. This dissertation emphasizes the role of emotions in electoral politics, including candidates' abilities to express and manage their emotions. In doing so, it aims to provide a framework for examining and understanding the interplay of gender, media and candidates' displays of emotions within electoral settings.

The fact that there is no benchmark study of this type of coverage calls for a cautious approach for this dissertation, which aims to both contribute to this type of analysis, as well as advance the political communication knowledge of these two specific countries. While a strictly descriptive approach is valuable, this study goes beyond mere descriptions and examines underlying meanings and categories in the media content. Further, the comparative approach allows for generation of typologies and explanations for cross-cultural variations. Therefore, the concern is in the representations that news media circulate about both male and female candidates in the recent elections in Chile and the United States.[30] This study focuses on the interplay of

---

[30] As Weldon (2006) stressed, gender research is not just about studying women and the feminine. "It is also about, for example, understanding how ideas about masculinity shape male behavior, about how gender norms construct relations between and within the sexes, and how our institutions and social practices privilege or value forms of behavior associated with privileged groups of men" (p. 236-237).

the repertoire of emotions ascribed to both male and female candidates and the media's interpretation about their emotional management.

Specifically, the analysis aims to answer the following research questions:

- **RQ1** What are the similarities and differences in the emotions ascribed to Michelle Bachelet and her main male competition as articulated in the Chilean media discourse?

- **RQ2** What are the similarities and differences in the emotions ascribed to Hillary Clinton and her main male competition as articulated in the US media discourse?

- **RQ3** What similarities and differences exist in how Michelle Bachelet and Hillary Clinton manage their emotion as articulated in the media discourse?

- **RQ4** How does the media discourse in each country describe and explain the way Michelle Bachelet and Hillary Clinton managed their emotions (e.g., was there some general quality of fitness for public office projected by these emotions)?

- **RQ5**. Is there an appropriate presidential demeanor conveyed by these media discourses? If so, what attributes encompass this demeanor?

While the goal is to examine if and how these women's gender influences the coverage they receive when running for the highest office in comparison to their male counterparts, ultimately the analysis is about the characteristics and quality of public discourse.

Chapter 7. Methods

As communication and gender are both discursive and social phenomena at the same time, the study of gender, culture and media is interdisciplinary. An interpretative research strategy that employs qualitative methods seems the best for analyzing the social construction of gender in cultural and media practices, and the meanings and interpretations circulated in the news regarding candidates' emotional management.

Discursive practice has to do with "socially constructed domains of significations" (Connel & Miles, 1985), like the meanings produced and structured in the news reflecting and reinforcing social relations. Indeed, discourse is "the means by which meaning is socially constructed" (Fiske 1996, p. 5). The notion of mediated discourse focuses on this process in the context of media and their communicational forms and meanings, such as news texts. This approach allows for a deeper understanding and interpretation of rich phenomena (see, for instance, Lindlof & Taylor, 2002)

This chapter outlines the rationale and foundation for the methodological approach used in this dissertation and describes the media chosen for the study, the sample used in the analysis, and the steps taken in processing the data.

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

This study comprises a discourse analysis, a qualitative method that allows for a focus on the construction of meaning within the news employing cross-disciplinary principles. In contrast to what is called critical discourse analysis (CDA)—which

greatly reckons on structural and linguistic approaches to the analysis of texts—a rhetorical approach to discourse analysis like the one employed in this dissertation concentrates on the identification of the processes and strategies relevant to particular messages. Such an approach intends to understand and interpret relevant or significant communicational forms, meanings, and patterns in a particular situation, focusing on social messages and representations.

Discourse analysis focuses on higher-level structures and the power of language that sees meanings as the product of specific and socially determined practices (see, for example, Connel & Miles, 1985; Fiske, 1996; van Dijk, 1985; 1988; 1993). It is a macro-analysis that entails multiple readings and notations. The focus is on themes and patterns of what is being said (messages), who voices these messages (speakers), and in what environment (context). This way, the researcher looks for commonalities in the messages, the topics and meanings raised in them, and their articulation.

The choice of a discourse analysis allows for an understanding the relationship between gender, culture, and emotions in media messages in a holistic way (see Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Rather than describing news texts from different outlets, the goal was to look at the meanings embedded, and hinted at, within the mediated discourse. Following Hall's example (1985), the focus was on the articulation of these meanings and social beliefs with underlying assumptions, attitudes and conventions about women and politics. In other words, instead of documenting just what the news texts said, the analysis focused on "the communicational processes and strategies relevant to particular engagements, [and] the understanding and interpretation of what the relevant or

96

significant communicational forms, meanings, and patterns are in a particular situation" (Jones & Collins, 2006, p. 42).

Admittedly, a quantitative content analysis would allow for a characterization of manifest content and satisfy a legitimate need for testable relations and measurements regarding news media's portrayals of female politicians in different countries. However, as van Dijk (1985) argued, cultural processes may not be fully addressed by meticulous micro-analysis of a particular problem. In addition, mere occurrences cannot convey the whole extent issues of human experience and power, with social meanings and processes that can make real differences in people's lives. More so, given that the emphasis of this dissertation was on the quality of public mediated discourse regarding female politicians, a qualitative approach addressing social messages and representations was more fitting. This is, gender ideologies are part of a broad discourse and the focus here is how gender impacts news coverage and news commentary. This also has been the approach of several recent studies regarding media discourses on women, such as Falk's (2008) analysis of media coverage of eight female presidential candidates in the United States, Vavrus' (2002) study on media representations of feminism and elections in the 1990s, and Loke and colleagues' (2011) examination of news media's discursive framing of governors who had given birth while in office.

Further, the interpretative research strategy used by discourse analysis allows for rich details and interpretations of discourse—that is, the relationship between language and social institutions (cf. Potter, 1996). As a rather wide concept dealing with social interactions and language use, this method is not exempt from pitfalls and caveats,

including the need for an appropriate theoretical framework and the researcher's training in both precision and sensitivity.

In any case, discourse analysis is particularly useful when analyzing news media accounts. The press has an important role in shaping public opinion and promoting and reinforcing specific social meanings. The news media not only report the news, but make the news meaningful (Hall, 1975) and if one wants to understand social meanings and representations, news media are an important site to do just that.

The present study entails an analysis of news media discourses during the campaigning periods of Chile's President Michelle Bachelet and United States Senator and presidential hopeful Hillary Clinton. As explained earlier, both of them were the first females with a viable candidacy to the highest office in their countries; in the case of Chile, also a successful bid for the presidency. By employing a discourse analysis, the focus is on the construction of meaning in the news, and more specifically, the definition of the Bachelet and Clinton personae within the public sphere. Therefore, a close reading and analysis of news media texts aimed to identify the most prominent themes and ideas used by news media professionals to define and interpret their actions and performances as candidates during their campaigns.

SAMPLE AND MEDIA

Given the comparative approach defined in chapter 5, the analysis included news media discourses from Chile and the United States, treating these countries as different contexts that encase issues of emotional management, gender and politics. The

study focused on examining and interpreting gender ideologies that dictate gendered expectations and gender roles, as well as their socialization via media representations.

In order to capture the diversity of mediated discourse, the analysis included messages from newspapers, news magazines and network television newscasts in both countries. Going beyond words and headlines, the examination of media texts included a general analysis of the images accompanying articles and television segments.[31] Due to the low penetration of cable television in Chile, this format was excluded from the analysis.

Accordingly, the study included stories published by the two most prominent newspapers in each country: *El Mercurio* and *La Tercera* in Chile, and *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* in the United States. All of them are national newspapers of record, and have systematically shown a leading role in setting the agenda for other news media (see, for instance, Sparrow, 1999; Ramírez, 1995).

Chile's *Qué Pasa* and the United States' *Time* and magazines also were included. Unlike dailies, these weekly news magazines have the advantage of a longer news cycle that lends itself to more reflection and interpretation, rather than focusing on deadline and breaking news reporting. In this sense, these media may offer different and richer meanings about candidates' emotional management, and thus their texts were relevant for the current study.

---

[31] An in-depth analysis of the images in the media coverage escapes the scope of the present dissertation. Future research, however, would benefit from examining such type of content and consider for example semiotic and visual framing analyses.

Finally, in consideration of the prominence of television in political communication, the present study also included clips from the most popular newscasts in each country: Megavisión and Canal 13, in the case of Chile; and ABC and NBC, in the case of the United States.

The focus was on media messages that somehow mentioned the politicians running for higher office and their emotional management, attributes or displays during the campaigns. Although officially the campaigns may be rather brief in both countries, the main candidates running in each country had been in the media's eye long before their names were secured in a ballot. Further, past research shows that females breaking into politics are subject to intense media scrutiny. Given that this study's goal was to examine the meanings circulated by the media regarding females' emotional management, purposive sampling was more appropriate to understand these messages. While lacking the representativeness of random samples, purposive sampling lets researchers include what they deem appropriate to include in the sample while providing a robust snapshot of the object of study (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002; Neuendorf, 2002).

Informed by post-electoral analyses in Chile and the United States (see, for instance, Huneeus & López, 2006; Pew Research Center, 2008), as well as data from Google Trends and the Project for Excellence in Journalism's News Coverage Index, key moments in each presidential race were chosen for the analysis. These moments marked instances of extensive media coverage and public attention, and arguably allowed for mediated discourses particularly rich in descriptions and portrayals of the

candidates. Thus, the data includes newspaper stories and newscast clips from those milestone days, as well as the following days of coverage, in an effort to follow the evolution of the topic. For the newsmagazine articles, the edition selected is that published right after the key moment.

In the case of the Democratic race in the United States, the key moments were the following:

- January 20, 2007: Hillary Clinton announced her candidacy.

- October 30, 2007: Philadelphia debate and first major campaign setback for Clinton.

- January 3/January 8, 2008: Iowa caucus and New Hampshire primary (while technically two separate moments in the campaign, the closeness of the two events allowed for one combined narrative in the press).

- February 5, 2008: Super Tuesday.

- March 18, 2008: Obama addressed the Jeremiah Wright controversy.

- March 27, 2008: Democrat leaders and media personalities called for Clinton to withdraw.

- June 3, 2008: Last primaries; Obama became the presumptive presidential nominee.

In the case of Chile's 2005 presidential race, the milestones were as follows:

- April 27, 2005: The Concertación (government) coalition held its first debate.

- May 24, 2005: Sebastián Piñera entered the race and Bachelet became the presumptive presidential nominee for the government coalition after the withdrawal of her only competitor.

- August 3, 2005: Historian Alfredo Jocelyn-Holt accused Bachelet of being a media product and questions her leadership skills.

- October 19, 2005: First presidential debate.

- November 16, 2005: Second presidential debate.

- December 6, 2005: A bus transporting Bachelet's supporters to a final campaign rally had an accident, bringing Bachelet's campaigning to a halt.

With these dates in consideration, a database search led to an initial identification and collection of all the stories in the different print media that mentioned any of the main two competitors in the races in both countries, including op-ed pieces and letters to the editor.[32] Next, a search of microfilm copies of the newspapers and the magazines allowed for a compilation of all the pictures and graphics portraying the candidates under study, as well as a verification that all the relevant text materials had been gathered during the database search.

The collection of the newscasts segments was different in each country. For the U.S. sample, a search in the Vanderbilt Television News Archive provided a list of pieces relevant for the analysis. A copy of each of these segments was then requested.

---

[32] While news and opinion are different types of content, they are part mediated discourse and thus the meanings and ideologies in them are similarly circulated by the media. Furthermore, there is evidence that audiences do not necessarily make a distinction between news and opinion (see, for instance, Pew Research Center, 2010).

Given that the researcher is not a native English speaker, the transcript from each newscast was pulled from Lexis Nexis as a means to guarantee having an accurate record of what was said. The Chilean clips, in contrast, were obtained directly from the networks, which were asked for all the segments regarding politics or the 2005 election broadcasted in specific dates. A few of the segments were deemed irrelevant and discarded from the analysis. In this case, the scripts were transcribed by the author herself.

This approach yielded 1,676 pieces for the analysis: 312 from *El Mercurio*; 197 from *La Tercera*; 53 from *Qué Pasa*; 60 from Canal 13's Teletrece; 39 from Megavisión's Meganoticias; 502 from *The New York Times*; 458 from *The Washington Post*; 55 from *Time*; 48 from ABC's World News; and 45 from NBC's Nightly News.

DATA PROCESSING

Employing cross-disciplinary principles of discourse analysis, this research was "conducted through the critical concepts of ideology, power, and conflict interacting with social formations" (Makus, 1990, p. 503). The news media messages were examined to identify themes through multiple readings. The findings then were analyzed in line with the patterns that emerged during the readings. Therefore, the analysis went further than just a topical assessment. Rather than considering only what themes rose from the stories, the goal was to make connections to larger ideas to give voice to some frames embedded or alluded to by the news stories, informed by feminist

theory and critical analysis. While there is an opportunity for multiple interpretations, these readings were contextually bound (Janesick, 1994; 2000).

In order to answer the research questions, the analysis entailed multiple readings focused on gender stereotypes regarding the emotional management of the candidates in each race. The emphasis in these readings was on the construction of gender dichotomies and boundaries in the discourse, as informed by the literature on gender roles, masculinity and femininity. Without being extensive, some of these dichotomies are the following:

Table 3:   Dichotomies of Gender

Masculinity	Femininity
Public/Politic	Private/Domestic
Reason	Emotion
Mind/Brain	Body/Physical
Strength	Weakness
Active	Passive
Violence/Aggression	Nurture/Docility
Assertiveness	Shyness
Objective	Subjective

Specifically, the analysis was conducted in several steps, with exhaustive note taking through the entire process. A first reading of all materials informed an early analysis of the arguments used news stories, op-ed pieces and letters to the editor. Successive readings aimed at coding and categorizing the data into distinguished patterns and themes, and identifying the links and contexts of the meanings found in the mediated discourse. These readings were organized in different ways to ensure a thorough interpretation of the articulation of the messages. For example, one reading

included all the stories from a specific medium; another comprised all the stories from a specific day in all outlets; and another one focused on the images used in the newscasts.

Next, the patterns and themes identified were related to each of the research questions posited in chapter 6 as a way of interpreting the findings. Such classification then led to a preliminary narrative answering the research questions and the selection of discourse examples to illustrate the articulation of meanings. In the case of the Chilean sample, these examples were eventually translated into English and thus may not completely reflect the original message.

This iterative analysis also considered the circumstances directing when, how much and which emotions—according to the journalists and editors—political leaders running for higher office should express. This included the beliefs about the social meaning of emotions and the news context defining them, while relating meanings to broader and wider social constructs. Because of that, the findings may go beyond gender dichotomies, especially in regard to implications for how people understand the role of emotions in normative terms.

Chapter 8. Analysis

The media discourses analyzed account for a complex relationship between emotional management, gender and culture in electoral contexts. The conventions, arguments and arrangements embedded in these discourses—mixed and sometimes contradictory—inform how two female politicians with viable campaigns were positioned, defined and represented in the public sphere. Paired with expectations and assumptions about leadership and political roles, the media discourse emphasized the varied expectations regarding females' competence for higher office and the impact of their emotional management in their suitability to run the whole country. They also position women as essentially different—nicer, more empathic, colder or just tougher than their male competitors—and thus reinforce women's marginalization in public life, even when not all the coverage is negative. Indeed, even flattering coverage cements expectations and culturally defined meanings of the appropriate emotional response or attitude in a given situation, be it a political rally, a presidential debate, or a news conference.

This chapter addresses these topics and answers the research questions. In doing so, it presents evidence from the media coverage on Bachelet and Clinton to exemplify the common threads and arguments found in the discourse.

SAMPLE OVERVIEW

In general, the U.S. media was considerably more analytical and interpretative than their Chilean counterparts, where the media texts were mostly straightforward

reports of the events of the day or the week. Unlike the U.S. print media, in Chile, op-ed pieces and contributions regarding the emotional management of the candidates were few and far in between, and editorials seldom talked about the candidates' personalities. In-depth pieces in *Qué Pasa* and Sunday edition features sections aside, analysis and interpretation of the candidates' behavior was reduced mostly to occasional quotes from pundits and political strategists in the news stories. The tone of the coverage, however, was rather similar for news and opinion pieces. Further, while the columnists offered different points of view circulated in the media discourses, the gendered arguments used in their writings were across the board, regardless of the authors' gender or ideological background.

While in Chile newspapers do not endorse candidates, *El Mercurio* clearly favored Sebastián Piñera, who was often cast in a positive light. *La Tercera* and *Qué Pasa* were more neutral in their coverage. The focus on Bachelet's feminine attributes and soft demeanor was across the board in all media, as well as the cautionary message that in her case, charm seemed to trump skills. Political coverage in the Chilean newscasts focused on specific campaign events (e.g., rallies, debates, speeches) rather than the candidates' platform or the issues. Megavisión was the medium with the least amount of stories dealing with Bachelet or the other contenders in the presidential race.

In the case of the U.S. media, *The New York Times* was the outlet with the most critical accounts regarding Clinton, which is surprising given the Gray Lady endorsed Clinton and not Obama for the New York State primaries. However, and just like a letter writer complained to the *Times*, it was not "just the amount or the placement of

pictures" of the candidates what bothered people, but "the content, especially from some of your most respected opinion writers" (Shire, 2008). That said, the media discourse in U.S. outlets in general was more varied. There was space for alternative interpretations for the events related to the Democratic race, as well as acknowledgments of biases, "Hillary-hate" and Obamania, including in *The New York Times*. *The Washington Post* was the medium with the fairest accounts of Clinton and the dilemma she had when trying to show her softer side without dismissing her masculine traits.

The newspaper photos and television images focused mostly on portraying the candidates on the campaign trail. The vast majority of the images showed Bachelet smiling, whereas Piñera was portrayed with a broader repertoire of reactions—from frowning deep in thought to looking smug after coming up with a witty reply to another candidate. In the United States, the images tended to cast the candidates in a more positive light than the overall texts, although occasionally they would contrast an uptight and grim-looking Clinton with a loosened-up and composed Obama.

MALE-FEMALE COMPARISON IN CHILE

If there was one dominant word to define Bachelet in the Chilean media it was "congenial," followed by "empathic." The media discourse constantly reminded that this female candidate seemed to have a special emotional bond with voters, but the rather flattering portrayal of her emotional attributes also opened the door to questions about the importance of wearing one's heart on the sleeve when running for the highest

office. The argument was that Bachelet may empathize with people easily, but running the country is not the same thing as getting voters' approval, a construction that ultimately neutralized the agency of this female candidate in the political arena. In contrast, her main male competitor, Sebastián Piñera, a successful businessman, conveyed a sense of authority and while he may have been strident and brazen, he also was portrayed as astute, courageous and judicious.

Table 4:   The Emotional Management of Michelle Bachelet and Sebastián Piñera

Michelle Bachelet	Sebastián Piñera
Congenial, warm	Somewhat abrasive, energetic
Serene, but no (presidential) gravitas	Conveys certain authority
Weak, may be manipulated by others	Sly, astute, cunning, even calculating
Soft, mellow; not aggressive	Can be brazen; gutsy, but not aggressive
Wears her heart on her sleeve, empathic	Serious, managerial
Sensitive; to the extent of being a bleeding heart	Egotistical, ambitious, comes off as arrogant
Content, always smiling	Smug, always smiling
Charismatic, charming	Amiable, optimistic
Spontaneous, authentic	Wily, somewhat staged
Levelheaded	Strident
May lack courage	Courageous, somewhat of an opportunist

In line with more traditional understandings of femininity, Bachelet was portrayed as soft, warm, friendly and serene. She was not particularly prone to emotional reactions or outbursts, albeit she did talk about how she felt and reacted to certain circumstances. Her soft demeanor and congeniality made her both non-aggressive and non-threatening. For example,

109

Those who know her describe her as happy. She can sing and dance well, which she has done since a child . . . Warm and welcoming, she's the despair of her advisors when she stays too long after the campaign event, talking with people about everyday topics, which messes things up and delays her schedule." ("Bachelet, la abanderada atípica de la coalición," 2005)

Bachelet's demeanor was labeled as quiet, soft-spoken, calm and lacking any stridency (e.g., C. Salinas, 2005a). However, the media reports stressed that she needed to show to critics that the so-called "Bachelet phenomenon"—the popularity among voters—"[was] much more than her congeniality" (Canal 13, 2005g), as if congeniality were not important to become the leader of a whole country. The assumption was that while she was calm and amiable, she did not exhibit signs of a presidential gravitas, at least in comparison to other candidates (e.g., Edwards, 2005), and that for someone who could become the next president, that was a significant shortcoming. She appeared fragile, and indeed, "[leaving] aside the war to become Miss or Mister Congeniality . . . Bachelet is the weakest rival" (Barros, 2005a) which could have lead many voters to opt for Piñera (e.g., "¿Con quiénes compite Lavín?" 2005). After all, Bachelet may have "the charisma, [but] Piñera has the guts to run for office" (Tironi, 2005a).

In contrast to Bachelet's soft demeanor, Piñera was cast as a hyperactive, enthusiastic person, who joked around and was comfortable in his own skin. Quite a character, *El Mercurio* described him in the following terms:

He's a workaholic, obsessive, a perfectionist, sometimes even cantankerous, a fountain of energy, and because so many things are going through his head at the same time, his words often trip on each other, and his words come tumbling out.

110

He's also a multi-millionaire, and always manages to get what he wants. He reduces everything to three adjectives, he bites his nails—and his fingers—he's nervous, and always going, so he sleeps less than he should. ("El empresario que logró el sueño de ser candidato," 2005)

The confident and self-assured Piñera claimed he had been preparing for this campaign his whole life (e.g., Canal 13, 2005d), but, unlike Bachelet, had problems connecting with people. He was somewhat charming and easy-going, but did not have warmth and charisma, especially in comparison to Bachelet, and was seen as sly, cunning and even calculating. For instance, where a *Qué Pasa* cover story on Bachelet had her sitting on a bench in a waiting room smiling to the camera, another cover story in the same magazine a few weeks later showed Piñera in a close-up frame playing chess and pondering his next move. Furthermore, the businessman, said *El Mercurio*, was "too clever to give up. He [was] too sure of himself to be able to convince others that he needs them," (Peña, 2005d) and "he puts his own interests above [those of the country and party]" (Becker, 2005). As such, Sebastián Piñera was the epitome of the "chico listo:"[33]

[Somebody who] doesn't get tangled up in arguments, doesn't get complicated by the meanderings of his own intelligence, and above all he's never associated with his emotions. He has a cold intellect, he's calculating, exceptionally objective. He sees things as they are and not as he wants them to be. That's why he can come to conclusions more quickly and accurately. (Villegas, 2005)

---

[33] For lack of a better translation, "wise guy," but without negative connotations.

Whereas Piñera was deemed cunning, Bachelet was considered by her critics as manipulable. Her soft and empathic demeanor gave fodder to those arguing that women need to rely on others to make a decision. Portrayed as weak, she could be manipulated by others, as her mellow attitude suggested that she could not stand for herself. Thus, an editorial stressed that "the omnipresence of [then president Ricardo] Lagos and his cabinet in Bachelet's campaign could reinforce one of the main doubts that people have about her: her leadership abilities to run the country" ("Encuestas: percepciones y tendencias," 2005). Similarly, Piñera argued that "it seems [Bachelet's advisors] want to change her personality and character in 24 hours" (Canal 13, 2005e), although this comment earned him criticism as being condescending.

Bachelet's soft demeanor lacked aggressiveness, which could play to her advantage, according to politicians: "Michelle is very lovable, she is not affected, she's so friendly, so not quarrelsome, that it's hard not to make friends with her fast," said a close collaborator (Arthur, 2005b). Indeed, the reports stressed that she avoided attacking or being aggressive, to the extent that she chose to "treat [her contenders] well during the campaign" ("Sebastián Piñera y RN 'con los brazos abiertos,'" 2005).

By August 2005, four months before the elections, polls showed that Piñera was not considered "close to people, credible or trustworthy" ("Piñera activa estrategia para arrebatar voto popular a Lavín," 2005), and thus he decided to adjust his campaign strategy to get a "more audacious profile" (Campusano, 2005c). His goal was to undermine Bachelet's popularity by questioning her skills and forcing her move "from a discourse of emotions to one of content" (Campusano, 2005c). While Piñera may have

112

questioned Bachelet's credentials, he was hardly aggressive or confrontational, and thus, "despite being antagonistic toward the [ruling coalition Concertación] government, he [didn't] resort to mud slinging" (Fernández, 2005). The idea was that in general terms, he could keep his cool and even take the higher road, as when he "recognizes and applauds the progress and achievements of the government, with high-mindedness and arguments" (Fernández, 2005). He projected an image of somebody who was "moderate, not confrontational" as the country "[didn't] need a boxer, but a president" ("Lavín apunta a Lagos," 2005). He even criticized fellow candidate Joaquín Lavín for his aggressive tone during a presidential debate, arguing that "Chile has had enough mud slinging, aggressiveness, hatred, which isn't conducive for anything" ("Piñera potencia perfil de candidato ponderado," 2005).

The media discourse overwhelmingly emphasized Bachelet's empathy and how she successfully used that emotional attribute to her advantage. Indeed, her rivals needed to take her out of "the field of pure emotion, which is where she plays best" ("Una inyección de ánimo que llegó a tiempo," 2005). Even the other contender for the Concertación ticket, former Minister of Foreign Affairs Soledad Alvear, "saw her [own] attributes fade when up against the likeable personality of [Bachelet]" ("Una candidatura que nació fuerte, pero no logró tomar vuelo," 2005), prompting Alvear's bowing out of the race months before the Concertación primaries.

If Bachelet was the emotional and emphatic candidate, Piñera was the "serious, smart and managerial" one (D. Gallagher, 2005b). He was described as someone "prudent and judicious, even too cerebral, when analyzing his options" (Canal 13,

2005c). Yet, even when he portrayed himself as thoughtful, like arguing that his decisions come after "dialoguing and talking" to other people (Peña, 2005d) or saying that Alvear's bowing out was "not the moment to make political calculations" ("Sebastián Piñera y RN 'con los brazos abiertos,'" 2005), he appeared to several analysts and reporters as sneaky, and ultimately sly and guileful, as it was "his well-oiled political machine" that made Alvear leave the race for the Concertación nomination (Bascuñán, 2005).

Further, the "chico listo," someone "so totally controlled by his brain" and "inhumanly efficient and ruthless," did not stir passion:

> It's difficult for people like Piñera to start religions or movements, or even points of view. His fertile mind is about practical ideas . . . Simply put, Piñera and other wise guys don't have the required dose of emotion or a priori faith for anything else. (Villegas, 2005)

More so, even in debates and public appearances, Piñera may have been "cautious and controlled . . . [in order] to project conviction and serenity in his responses" (Navia, 2005a), but his statements lacked heartfelt sentiment. Indeed, after the first presidential debate in October 2005, he was questioned for "the lack of emotionality" ("El momento más complejo, según los comandos," 2005) in his performance.

Piñera being a successful businessman—indeed, one of the richest men in Chile—served to ascribe ambition and self-interest as his main emotional attributes. According to columnist Carlos Peña, Piñera "is not accustomed to holding back or self

restraint . . . and as shown by his political performance, he's far from being the proverbial Florentine who said it was better to love one's country than one's self" (Peña, 2005d). A similar argument was used in an op-ed piece that warned that "in a struggle between the interests of the country and Sebastián, and he is the one making the decision, we know how it will end" (Pérez de Arce, 2005).

A letter to the editor argued that "It's true that's it's not a sin to have ambition, and it's necessary for anyone who wants to be president, but unlimited ambition at any price is a different matter" (Becker, 2005). Piñera's supporters, however, dismissed this and argued that punishing anybody for being successful was ridiculous. Another letter writer argued, "What's wrong with presidential ambitions? It would be strange not to have them, if you have the ability, the means, and the ideas to be president" (Krajljevic, 2005). His supporters claimed that he may have came from an affluent family, but companies and his doctoral degree from Harvard were the result of his talent and intelligence, while his critics accused him of being "too ambitious and thinking that everything can be fixed with money" (Barros, 2005b). Piñera himself was unapologetic about his own fortune and, when questioned about whether being a wealthy businessman was at odds with running for president, he said, "I don't feel in the least repentant or ashamed for having woken up early every day of my life and worked hard" (Rubio, 2005). Further, a *Qué Pasa* story posited that Piñera "exudes success and optimism" unlike other politicians who were "more sensitive" to life's miseries (Tironi, 2005b). Considering Bachelet ran on a platform that stressed the need to reduce the

country's income gap, the portrayal favored her as somebody more responsive to people's needs.

Not only was Bachelet described and shown as constantly content and smiling—for example, the vast majority of pictures and television images portrayed her in this fashion—but the media discourses also stressed extensively how she was neither bitter nor resentful, despite having personally endured some of the horrors of Pinochet's dictatorship. Before going into exile in the 1970s, her father was tortured and died after suffering a cardiac arrest in prison, and Bachelet herself was arrested, interrogated and tortured, and yet, she did not hold any grudges about the past. The argument in the press was that she may have had reasons to hate, but she did not, and more importantly, did not live in the past like many politicians still did. (The fact that Piñera, the candidate from a right-wing party, had openly opposed Pinochet in the late 1980s was presented as another sign that the country was finally moving forward and letting go of the hatred and violence of the past). As *El Mercurio* posited,

> The life of Dr. Michelle Bachelet Jeria gets mixed up with the most turbulent period of recent Chilean history. Many say she embodies the passion and pain that has characterized the political evolution of our country over the last 40 years.
>
> But such facts did not leave marks of resentment or bitterness on [this] leftist militant who embodies a new political style with which the government is betting on to renew itself. ("Bachelet, la abanderada atípica de la coalición," 2005)

Similarly, Piñera was a man who kept his cool and could "maintain an implacable smile" at all times (Campusano, 2005b), while he also was portrayed as

somewhat of an opportunist promoting "hatred and resentment to achieve his own personal goals" (Yáñez & Álvarez, 2005). Furthermore, his rather abrasive attitude had a negative impact on his "connection with the crowd" and the politician reportedly attempted to change this in the second presidential debate, by "appealing to humor" ("Piñera se plantea como unica alternativa de la alianza," 2005). Piñera "concerned himself with showing emotion and getting closer to the public by using various analogies easily understood by anyone who listened" ("Propuestas parecidas y mensajes cruzados," 2005). He was "especially forthcoming (more than technical) and showed the strengths he's known for: informed, fast*" (Méndez, 2005). This helped him to project—at least in front of the cameras—"the confidence that he is the real contender to Bachelet" (Cavallo, 2005b).

Despite his efforts, Piñera could not equal Bachelet's charisma and emotional rapport with citizens, labeled as one of a kind, to the extent that a prominent politician extolled, "I've spent many years in politics and never have I seen an identification with someone as strong as what I saw today with Michelle" (Guerra, 2005). According to the media, this identification came from her genuine, humble demeanor, as she did not rely on any façade (see, for instance, Donoso, 2005c) nor did she gloat, even when polls showed her as the most likely winner. Indeed, one widely reported post-Concertación debate poll revealed that 77% of viewers thought that Bachelet was "the closest to people*" (Canal 13, 2005b; also C. Salinas, 2005b), but instead of bragging about it or celebrating her success, she demurely said she was "very thankful and happy with the poll results" (Megavisión, 2005b).

117

The campaign took a toll on the candidates. By the end of the race, and in particular during the presidential debates, the always-smiling candidate seemed to be more serious and, in the words of the media, she "did not exhibit her [trademark] empathy" ("Lavín apunta a Lagos," 2005). This issue is addressed in an interview a few days later after the first presidential debate, where the reporter asked Bachelet why in formal situations she looked serious, almost uncomfortable, all the while polls suggested that her greatest asset was the empathy she stirred among voters. Bachelet replied, "even if I'm a happy person, I always tackle issues with seriousness. Sometimes I tend to get more stiff [in those situations]" (Álamo, 2005). That is, she did not try to portray a character and opted to be more natural, at the expense of seeming tense.

The idea that Bachelet was natural and the more-authentic candidate was in stark contrast to Piñera. The media reports asserted that Piñera staged and ambushed ("in a deliberate move to get attention") a party meeting to be greeted by cheers urging him to run for the presidency (Campusano & Camhi, 2005), and when asked "if he was willing to give his all as a candidate, he replied emotionally, 'Yes, I am.'" (Molina, 2005). Despite the seemingly heartfelt sentiment, he came off in the media discourse as arrogant, feeling entitled to upstage a party meeting, and unnaturally ambitious, to the extent that media discourse repeatedly suggested that "his presidential ambitions [had] a lot to do with a whim" (Cordero, 2005).

The notion of naturalness and authenticity also pervaded the media discourse, in particular during one of the most dramatic moments of the campaign. On the eve of Bachelet's final rally in the capital city concluding her campaign, a bus transporting

118

several of her supporters was hit by a truck and ended up going off of a bridge over a river. The accident left five people dead—among them the driver of the bus, who was not affiliated with the campaign—and two dozen people wounded, including one of Bachelet's cousins. The accident put a halt to all of her campaign activities, as the candidate visited the wounded in the hospital and then went to the accident site. Her reaction was praised as natural and lacking any political. One story mentioned that Bachelet's own camp thought that the incident "strengthened the emotional rapport of [Bachelet] with voters," all the while they insisted, "they wouldn't do anything that could suggest they were taking political advantage of the tragedy" ("Comandos analizan efecto en la agenda política a pocos días de la elección," 2005). Indeed, one letter to the editor highlighted that Bachelet represented "the ideal of an unmasked woman who can put aside her political status when the situation demands so" (Ahumada, 2005). Thus, "the strength and humanity Bachelet showed makes clear that she is the most prepared to direct the fate of our country during the coming years" (Ahumada, 2005).

This discourse also portrayed Bachelet as a levelheaded individual who could be empathic and sensitive to situations, but had the strength to carry on. She may have been soft, her supporters argued, but she did not lack a backbone. Bachelet herself stressed, "What does character mean? It means that where there are difficulties, instead of fainting, we continue on. What does character mean? That when everyone is pressuring you, you don't back down. There are other people who in their political history can't say the same" (Canal 13, 2005f). The comment was a not-so-subtle jab at

119

Piñera, who had announced his intentions to run for president twice in previous years only to withdraw before formally making a bid for the presidency.

Yet it was the same discourse that argued that Piñera decided to run for the presidency because he saw he had good chances in light of the Concertación hopefuls' "political weakness and leadership shortcomings . . . especially Bachelet" ("¿Con quiénes compite Lavín?," 2005). Piñera himself insisted that he had the audacity and courage to become the next president, as he did not play it safe. For instance, during the first presidential debate, Piñera went on to say that at the end of the day that "leadership consists of making decisions, and this requires capability, courage" ("Planteamientos de los candidatos," 2005). His own leadership style was cast as different—not necessarily better—as he is an "audacious, intelligent man" (R. Correa, 2005c) and very confident about his presidential bid, as well as utterly comfortable in his skin.

The fact that Bachelet cancelled her last campaign rally and did not go ahead with it as planned was questioned by one letter writer who claimed that this decision—not her reaction to the accident—was evidence of lack of the necessary gravitas of a president: "To be a great leader, one must have a solid foundation. I think that Dr. Bachelet, again, has shown who she is and not who she would be if she were President of the Republic" (Blanco, 2005). A couple of politicians from her own party argued that she missed the opportunity to "give a sign of courage" by canceling her closing campaign act ("Comando oficialista organiza sobrio acto de cierre de campaña," 2005). In any case, Piñera's camp acknowledged "that any criticism [regarding Bachelet's reactions] would be punished" by the citizenry ("Comandos analizan efecto en la

agenda política a pocos días de la elección," 2005) and Piñera avoided using the tragedy to attack Bachelet.

Throughout the race, she may have taken a few blows, but the discourse suggested she never seemed to lose confidence. While by the end of the race "she [was] not seen as spontaneous as usual, she still [was] pretty sure she [would] be the next president of Chile" (R. Correa, 2005a). While this confidence never appear to falter, she did not appear cocky either. It was a sharp contrast to Piñera, the billionaire businessman and ambitious politician labeled as smart and capable, but above all "egotistical" (Pérez de Arce, 2005), "wily" (Canal 13, 2005c) and "calculating" (Giner & Bezanilla, 2005)—which explained his success as a businessman. Yet, as one columnist argued, "as he is satisfied with himself, [Piñera] forgets details and ideas. He's talented . . . but he loves himself too much, and it was obvious" (Peña, 2005e). In this case, Piñera's traditionally masculine traits ended up giving Bachelet the advantage, as she was portrayed as selfless instead of self-centered, like Piñera.

Thus, the Chilean discourses relied on traditional gender roles to portray the main two presidential candidates. Bachelet's soft and "feminine" style seemed to appeal to voters, as she was deemed compassionate, warm and empathic. Bachelet embodied a gentler approach to politics, in line with traditional notions of femininity. The frequent calls to rely more on a platform than personality suggest that the social identities reinforced by media favored the notion of politicians engaged in the sphere of ideas rather than emotional appeals. However, for all the discussion about Bachelet being a woman or having feminine attributes, there was little emphasis on matters of sexism or

gender discrimination. The case of the U.S. media discourse, however, was a different story.

MALE-FEMALE COMPARISON IN THE UNITED STATES

The media discourse on Hillary Clinton's emotional management told the story of an overall discomfort with the former New York Senator. While smart and competent, she was labeled as extremely tough and emotionally deprived to the extent that she was inhuman. She was portrayed as too cold, and Clinton's masculine traits and emasculating attitude were presented as highly disruptive. Subject to much media attention, her steely demeanor was cast as off-putting and as a source of uneasiness, a sharp contrast to Barack Obama, a charismatic newcomer running on a platform of hope and change. The media discourse mostly posited that Clinton contradicted basic expectations regarding a female politician in the United States, while at the same time insisting that sexism was not behind the mostly critical portrayal of the candidate. The blame was on herself and her polarizing and not likable persona.

Table 5:   The Emotional Repertoire of Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama

Hillary Clinton	Barack Obama
Tough, ruthless and unsympathetic	Gentle, kind, and sympathetic
Ambitious, heartless	Cerebral and passionate
Secretive, utterly cold, emotionless	Cool, collected, emotionally accessible
Stiff, phony, not authentic	Natural, candid, loosen-up
Strong, distant, lacking warmth	Charismatic, rousing, sunny
Arrogant and overconfident	Comfortable in his own skin, occasionally cocky
Fierce, aggressive, harried	Measured, stays above the fray
Frail	Subdued, contained

122

Unapologetic, harpy	Graceful, levelheaded
Bitter, resentful, sore loser	Magnanimous, does not brag
Getting desperate	Hopeful

From the moment she announced she was in the race, the majority of the media discourse stressed how tough Clinton was. Indeed, she was called "absolutely ruthless" (Kurtz, 2007), known for her "upright bearing and her bare knuckles" (Kurtz, 2007, citing the *Chicago Tribune*). While a dozen voters were quoted saying they preferred Clinton for "her forcefulness" (Slevin & Lydersen, 2008)—one of the few instances where her strength was not labeled as plain aggression—Barack Obama, "with a gentler style and approach" (Churchill, 2008), was quite a contrast. He mixed "a cool and somewhat princely demeanor with warm smiles and touches" (Stanley, 2008a) and "[kept] his cool whether he [was] loosing or winning" (Barron, 2008), although he was occasionally reminded that he was not perfect and needed "to convince those who doubt him" (Newton-Small, 2008).

The differences were not lost to the media scrutiny. From the Iowa Caucus onward, the discourse portraying the candidates followed a parallel/contrast logic that constantly opposed the two candidates—usually with Clinton taking a blow with the comparison. Thus, while Clinton "focused on seriousness and strength . . . [Obama] fired up a crowd" (ABC, 2008c), and the Democratic primaries were "a battle between passion and the machine; between Hillary Clinton's establishment support and the superior enthusiasm of Obama's supporters" (Milbank, 2008c). Further, when acting

123

"cautious, guarded and strenuously on message," Obama was described as being "Clinton-like" (Leibovich, 2008a).

Clinton's image of an unsentimental and unsympathetic person went in hand with the notion that she thought only with her head. Ambitious and calculating, she was described as heartless and unapologetically political. Thus, she was "cold-eyed about wanting power and raising money and turning everything about her life into a commodity" (Dowd, 2007). While *Time* contributor Patricia Marx argued that "Obama's style is too cerebral" (Klein, 2007a), it was Clinton who was described as "flagrantly political" (Klein, 2007b), "perpetually calculating, triangulating and cold, without core convictions" (Klein, 2007b). For example, Obama's speech on race and religion after highly critical statements made by his former pastor Jeremiah Wright[34] had Clinton "using the inflammatory comments of Obama's minister . . . to make the argument to party insiders . . . that Obama [had] too much baggage to win in November" (ABC, 2008i). An ensuing comment from a college professor about how "absolutely nothing [is] fair about politics" further reinforced that Clinton engaged in dirty politics and did not play fair. Such portrayal of Clinton as a calculating person further cemented the caricature of this 21st century "Lady Macbeth" (see Applebaum, 2007). It is not surprising, then, that people saw her as "too political, too calculating, too trying to have it all ways" (ABC, 2007c).

---

[34] Footage of sermons by Rev. Wright showed him characterizing the United States as fundamentally racist and the government as corrupt and murderous. Obama's Philadelphia speech on race become the "Obama moment" of the campaign.

Further, fellow Democratic presidential hopeful Joe Biden's wife said that Biden "would never be a politician like Hillary Clinton," as he "thinks with his head and his heart" (Copeland, 2008b). The argument was that Clinton only used her head and more so, Obama's "inspirational message" (Balz, Kornblut & Murray, 2008) was all about the heart. Surprisingly, this kind of discourse happened even amidst the New Hampshire primary coverage—when Clinton had what was deemed as an emotional breakdown and showed her heart**.**

By Super Tuesday, and as the race dragged on, this head-vs.-heart frame became more prominent, with parallels insisting that Clinton's campaign was based on "carefully thought-out solutions to the central public problems" whereas Obama's platform was one that created "a feeling of liberation, the core of the emotion behind [his] appeal" (Dionne, 2008c). In any case, her own advisers thought she needed "to start showing 'more heart than head' at large rallies" (Healy, 2008b) if she wanted to have any real option of securing the nomination. Likewise, her campaign had no "passion" (unlike Obama's), only the "organization and discipline" (Dionne, 2007).

She was tough, and Obama should take care, because "she doesn't play nice" (Robinson, 2007). This also cemented the idea that in the race she was utterly aggressive. Most of the media discourse also stressed that while Clinton showed "resolve in the face of the [latest campaign] developments" (Nagourney, 2008c), her decision to stay in the Democratic race was dragging on the nomination, and consequently the "battle [got] bloodier" (Kristof, 2008b). Further, there were pundits who posited that Clinton's "real strategy [was] to destroy Mr. Obama's chances of

winning the general election so that she [could] compete in 2012" (Kristof, 2008b). In other words, if she could not be the winner, nobody would, and indeed she was blamed for "the increasing battle for the Democratic presidential nomination" (Seelye & Powell, 2008)—although *Time* also reported that as the race went on, Obama "stepped up [the] personal attacks on Hillary Clinton, escalating the conflict" (Carney, 2008). Yet, even when he was aggressive, Obama was described as cool, collected and tempered, and thus Obama "took his shots, judiciously, even comfortably so" (Klein, 2007a).

Clinton's reserved persona was presented as one of her greatest shortcomings, as she was not personable—at least not in front of crowds. She admitted that "she did not like talking about herself" (Healy & Zeleny, 2008)—that is, she was a private person— but the media stressed that she "rarely engaged an audience in an emotional way" while Obama, on the other hand, was "very open" (Baker & Kornblut, 2008). She could not neutralize that weakness, perhaps because the way she was portrayed, as "kind of distant, not very warm" (Achenbach, 2008a), "often cast as a stick figure" (Dionne, 2008a), fed a dominant portrayal of Clinton as not simply stoic, but plainly cold, tough and, ultimately, emotionless. Indeed, the image of a "cold and calculated politician [was] difficult to overcome" (Balz, 2007a), and in order to appeal to voters she needed to be "personalized" (Balz, 2007a), "softened" (Romano, 2008), and "humanized" (Dowd, 2008b; Greene, 2008; Kornblut, 2007a). Humanizing her was, furthermore, an "effort" (Kornblut, 2007a), with her staff "pressed to find ways to do so" (Baker & Kornblut, 2008).

Yet for all of Clinton's tough and fierce demeanor, and criticism for only thinking with her head, there was an undercurrent in the media discourse that commonly warned about her frailty and mental stability with a gendered assumption that women are vulnerable and cannot endure much. "There is a need to show her as solid . . . and the sort of person who won't go crazy on us" (Klein, 2007b), as she would go psycho or loose control of her mental health.

Such an argument was further solidified with the occurrence of the most talked-about moments of the campaign, in the wake of the Iowa caucus—and the so-called "Hillary Clinton moment" (ABC, 2008e). During a Q&A session with prospective voters at a diner in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, Clinton briefly choked up while admitting that coping with the campaign's demands was a constant challenge. Labeled as "emotional" across the board (e.g., ABC, 2008e; Balz, 2008d; NBC, 2008c), during the incident Clinton "never actually let a tear escape from her eye and roll down her face," but one "could tell that she was clearly fighting back tears" (ABC, 2008e). ABC indeed used the whole moment, a 45-second soundbite with the whole reaction—and no commentary. In line with the rhetoric of control, the media stressed that "Clinton let slip a glimpse of uncontrolled emotion [and] had a jarring moment of vulnerability" (Givhan, 2008). As *Time* put it, "the Ice Queen melted" (Gibbs & von Drehle, 2008), and a *Washington Post* account mentioned that "Clinton's voiced cracked as she conceded that the nonstop campaigning—and all it entails—is not easy" (Givhan, 2008). Further, the moment was also labeled as a "meltdown" (Broder, 2008b), "breakdown" (Grossman, 2008), "outburst" (Kantor, 2008a), a "crying game" (Carey,

2008) where "Mrs. Clinton appeared momentarily *overtaken* by emotion" (Nagourney, 2008d, emphasis added). Her showing "deep emotion" was a sign of Clinton "loosening her control over her psyche" (Kunin, 2008), and if the moment was seen as "too authentically vulnerable and tender" by voters she ran "the risk of being called a wuss" *(*Givhan, 2008).

In this context, the discourse regarding Clinton's moment in New Hampshire put forward the idea that all the debate about her seemingly heartfelt reaction had to do with how rare it was seeing her expressing anything other than ambition. The moment, thus, was unexpected and out of character, as "Clinton has constructed a public face that is controlled and largely inscrutable" and this "spontaneity and emotional frankness are not character traits one associates with her" (Givhan, 2008). She had never come across as hurt before, "angry maybe; defiant perhaps," but not wounded (Givhan, 2008). This time in New Hampshire, however, she "let her emotions show" (Kornblut & Shear, 2008a), "reveal[ing] a side of her rarely seen before, a more vulnerable Clinton" (Balz, 2008d), which could explain why the incident was labeled as "dignified, yet human" (as if they could be opposites and as if Clinton being human was actually up for question.) As a matter of fact, a "single checked tear . . . finally revealed she wasn't an android" (Lithwick, 2008), and "having been told so many times to reveal a little more of her personal side, she let down her guard on election eve . . . choking up with emotion as she talked about how important the election is to the country" (Baker & Kornblut, 2008).

Only a few accounts framed the moment as a sign of the expected fatigue the candidates have to endure while on the campaign trail instead of just Clinton's weakness (or ultimately fake, sympathy-bait display). Within this frame, *The New York Times* brought to mind an unflattering image of Clinton that ran in several media outlets, as if this candidate were not allowed to get tired and weary (Leibovich, 2008c). *The New York Times* went on to discuss how other candidates, unlike Clinton, "have been emotionally accessible," and dubbed the incident as a moment in which she was "making a nakedly emotional plea for her candidacy" (Kantor, 2008a). A similar frame is used in another *New York Times* story that says that at a Portsmouth diner, "she bared her feelings" (Healy & Cooper, 2008). Further, in the NBC account of the incident, "Clinton was right on the edge [and] clearly show[ed] the strain" that day (NBC, 2008c). Further, "the tough cookie crumbled" (Dowd, 2008f), and Clinton revealed "a chink in [her] steely façade" (Givhan, 2008), and thus the candidate who had "presented a consistent face of steely determination and invincibility, had a jarring moment of vulnerability" (Givhan, 2008).

Not surprisingly, then, some critics used the opportunity to spin this a sign of frailty rather than as having a heart. Presidential hopeful John Edwards, for instance, was quoted on camera saying that "a commander-in-chief needs to have strength and resolve," implying that Clinton did not (ABC, 2008f). More interestingly, he also said that "presidential campaigns are tough business, but being president of the United States is also a very tough business" (ABC, 2008f), suggesting that Clinton was not tough enough—the very same Clinton labeled throughout the race as hard, aggressive and in

need of being softened. As NBC reporter Andrea Mitchell put it, this "woman known for her steely resolve . . . quickly recovered" from her emotional moment (NBC, 2008c). The *Washington Post* went on to say that "as displays of emotion go, this one was tasteful and reserved—and ever so brief" (Givhan, 2008). However brief, it gave way to much discussion about the how authentic it was and how fit for somebody bidding for the presidency. For example, a *New York Times* reader wondered, "If she is breaking down now . . . then how would she act under pressure as president?" (Kantor, 2008a).

Conversely, when Obama acknowledged "the toll that the campaign was taking" (Cardwell, 2008), this was not seen as a sign of vulnerability or weakness. Indeed, "despite the disappointment of New Hampshire, the Obama phenomenon continued" (ABC, 2008g), even though "his performances" could get "static, nourishing but unexciting" (Klein, 2007a).

The New Hampshire incident and her own revised approach to campaigning thereafter also opened the door to an acknowledgement that a more empathic Clinton did exist. Thus, "in intimate settings . . . Clinton comes across far more personably, listening and empathizing and on occasion showing her emotional side" (Healy, 2008b)—an argument not seen before that point in the coverage.

On the other hand, throughout the campaign, Obama was portrayed as the open candidate, the one that did have a heart. Both tempered and passionate, he did not lose control of his own emotions. He was enthusiastic and the epitome of coolness, a depiction constantly highlighted in the media discourse and reinforced in television

images, with Obama appearing relaxed, unbuttoned and composed. Furthermore, instead of getting angry at Clinton and the way she had conducted her campaign during the primary season, he thought it was "depressing" more than anything else (ABC, 2008d). Obama was so cool that his anger only came off in writing as when he "issued a statement expressing outrage" over people snooping into his personal passport file (NBC, 2008f).

The discourse over Obama's speech addressing the Jeremiah Wright controversy also illustrated how personable and emotionally accessible he was deemed by the media. The levelheaded candidate gave the "most intensely personal speech on race he's ever given" (NBC, 2008e), a "profile in courage" with a "frank talk about race" ("Mr. Obama's profile in courage," 2008). He spoke "with an honesty seldom heard in public life" ("Mr. Obama's profile in courage," 2008) and in doing so chose "reconciliation over rancor" (Scott, 2008), addressing a complex situation "with dignity and grace" (Nagourney, 2008b). This cool and collected candidate set a "personal example" and was "courageous and path breaking" in his approach (Nagourney, 2008b)—no wonder the was the vision of hope.

Unlike Clinton's overanalyzed and overblown "emotional moment" in New Hampshire, Obama's speech was quickly put on the back burner by the media. For all the reported hype before the speech, once delivered, the topic was wrapped up and the press moved on to other topics, such as the chances of the DNC calling for a revote for the Michigan and Florida primaries, the release of Clinton's records from her days as

131

First Lady, how long the primaries could actually last, and, in the case of *The New York Times*, the scandal that lead to Governor Eliot Spitzer's resignation.

Occasionally the discursive constructions of the candidates would allow for alternative articulation. In *The New York Times,* for instance, Obama was admonished that "for all his soaring, rousing oratory, he [remained] emotionally buttoned-up" ("Obama carefully shifts focus," 2008). Others argued that Obama was "no emotional bleeding heart;" rather, he was "an intensely serious guy whose identity and behavior and tone is pretty rigid" (Powell, 2008c). At 46, though, this seriousness lent gravitas, which explained his careful manner (Powell, 2008c) and "Ivy-cool mien" (Klein, 2008a). The contrast was explained in terms of a public/private divide:

> Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton of New York tends to excel in this province of the private. He does not . . .
>
> "He is a public speaker; Hillary is a private speaker," said Mr. Sheinkopf. "Do not expect great moments of emotional connection; expect great moments of emotional direction." (Powell, 2008c)

Given that Clinton was deemed emotionless, it is not surprising in all the media outlets that commentators and reporters appeared to question her authenticity. The argument articulating these messages was that she was too cold to be genuine, so *anything* coming from her was actually staged, faked or scripted, and as op-ed columnist David Brooks joked, Clinton was somebody who "placed [her] authentic self in a cryogenic vault in the National Archives" (Brooks, 2007). Indeed, her opponents "challenged her candor," questioning whether she had any ("Clinton in hot seat at

debate," 2007; and Nagourney & Bumiller, 2007). This interpretation seemed to go hand in hand with the notion that she was not honest, which by default made her untrustworthy. Such an argument was not constrained solely to her emotional behavior, but was applied to her complete persona. She was labeled as dishonest about her presidential intentions—her eyes were on the prize, not on the voter she vowed to help—and her choked-up reaction in New Hampshire produced crocodile tears as part of a strategy to win some sympathies. She was, above all, *performing* a role so she could achieve her goal of becoming the next president. For instance,

> Her primary campaign has been marked by her careful avoidance of any positions that would swing her too far left for the general election. Conservatives fasten on her caution and stiff demeanor as proof positive of her fakery and insincere maneuvering. Prior to her widely panned performance in Philadelphia, she met practically every verbal challenge at debates with a studied laugh, which might have softened her image but galled conservatives more than anything she could ever say. (Lowry, 2007)

Any similar attention to Obama's body language was presented in a positive light. Thus, he had "an incandescent smile, but it's not frozen in place," and when he laughed, "you have the feeling it [was] because something [was] funny" (Herbert, 2008b). Obama and his words, even on the stump, were deemed as authentic, not scripted, and, more commonly, natural, which favored an image of somebody not only refreshingly true to himself, but one with no façade and nothing to hide. Thus, the "scrupulous honesty of his answers was striking," but also "unsolicited, and far more presidential than the dodging and fudging" of most candidates (Klein, 2007a). More so, he was "candid [about his presidential ambitions]" (ABC, 2007c), as well as "not

canned . . . [and] grounded and authentic" (Weisman, 2008b). The fact that he showed genuine strain (Cardwell, 2008), and apologized when his voice got raspy (Balz, 2008b) as a result of the intense campaigning further reinforced this aura of authenticity, as those were signs that he was human instead of scripted, unlike his competitor, who was accused of "being too dishonest and untrustworthy to win the White House" (Weisman, 2008c). Yet, at least a few writers did acknowledge that this was a political setting, and Obama's "groundbreakingly cool campaign [was] just as stage-managed as hers" (Klein, 2007b).

In addition, Michael Kinsley also stressed in *Time* magazine something that was mostly ignored in other news outlets: all of the candidates were "running because they are ambitious, and that doesn't make them bad people. It makes them people," period (Kinsley, 2008). Further, Kinsley highlighted that in "[U.S.] culture, an ambitious politician can neutralize almost any human weakness or hunger and even turn it into a plus, as part of his or her life story." Alas, Clinton was the one enduring the epithets of being a political, overambitious, power-hungry shrew. The fact that Clinton seemed distant and not close to people reinforced this image. Her character shortcomings—she rubbed "people the wrong way and she [didn't] have charisma" (Powell, 2008b)—were used to explain her lesser standing in comparison to the "Obama effect". Being an "ice princess, lacking in humanity" (Rubin, 2008) accounted for a "personality deficit" (Healy & Broder, 2008) that forced her to show that she could "be inspiring, not just safe" ("The political road ahead," 2008), in contrast to Obama, her "sunny, charismatic opponent" (Healy & Broder, 2008). Indeed, Obama offered "inspirational leadership"

134

("The political road ahead," 2008) and "showed . . . a capacity to make people feel good about their country again" (Herbert, 2008b). Even young students were "absolutely gaga over him [and] absolutely enthralled" (Merida, 2008). However, evidencing the gendered readings of emotional attributes, Obama was described as needing to "get tough [and] look like a leader" (NBC, 2007c).

In any case, media discourse continually emphasized how charming and rousing Obama was, a man that could get "unprecedented crowds" in what used to be intimate gatherings (i.e., campaign events; ABC, 2008c); who "fired up the crowds [so much] that authorities [fire marshals] had to step in" (ABC, 2008c). His rallies had "the feel of a rock concert" (NBC, 2008a), with "large and energized" crowds (NBC, 2008c), and as he himself said, he and his supporters were "happy warriors" (ABC, 2008e). His campaign events were "ecstatic experiences that create a patriotic lump in every throat in the room" (G. Collins, 2008c). This energy was so contagious that *New York Times* op-ed writer David Brooks noted that "you'd have to have a heart of stone not to feel moved by" his Iowa win (Brooks, 2008b). Obama "drew standing ovations in crowded gymnasiums" (Zeleny & Healy, 2008), while Clinton's appearances were "by comparison, funereal" (Achenbach, 2008b).

Notions of hope and optimism related to Obama's bid started to surface in the media discourse during the coverage of the Iowa caucus. Up to that point, the main focus was on how enthusiastic and inspiring Obama was—to a great extent, because of his minority and underdog condition—but the Iowa caucus coverage brought up the first outspoken words of Obama's "message of hope and his idea of hope" in regular citizens

quoted in the media (ABC, 2008b). This turned out to be a problem for Clinton and as an ABC anchor posited, "how do you run against hope?" (ABC, 2008b). It was in Iowa, too, that Clinton was presented as going aggressively against Obama. This was deemed as a sign of desperation (NBC, 2008c)—those who are losing get too defensive—or at least "looking like it" (ABC, 2008b). She had grit (McKenzie, 2008) and went increasingly aggressive, so if by a Friday she was relying on a "slightly shaper language," by Saturday "she began to toughen that message . . . by Sunday she was making even stronger arguments [and] by Monday morning she was in all-out contrast mode" (Balz, 2008a). This was also explained as a character failure, as she seemed to "run against hope with fear" (ABC, 2008b), "sharpening her attacks" (ABC, 2008d), while other reporters said that "getting tough may be the only way to stop Obama's momentum" (ABC, 2008d). Furthermore, while Obama's message was uplifting and energizing, Clinton, "with her wonkish, pragmatic approach to politics seemed uninspired" (Brooks, 2008b). No wonder then, her "personal appeal emerged as a problem" and "people found her remote" (Healy & Zeleny, 2008).

In addition to cold and insincere, Clinton's demeanor also was interpreted as a sign of arrogance. Thus, Clinton's "buttoned-up demeanor" suggested quite an arrogant streak, "a tone of moral superiority" (Lowry, 2007). Her "manufactured laugh" (Klein, 2007b), among other things, may be an effort to soften her image, but she was "relentless" (Dowd, 2008c), with "an inability to admit fault or lousy judgment" (Richard Cohen, 2008b), such as her vote on Iraq. While she had worked on her image, it would seem she could not leave behind her arrogant streak, a mix of "self-indulgence

136

and self-absorption" (Ignatius, 2008). For example, her winning in Massachusetts—despite John Kerry and Edward Kennedy endorsing her competitor—"meant significant bragging rights" (Kornblut & Layton, 2008), all the while through the race she had had to pay the "price of overconfidence" (Ponnuru, 2008).

Even if she occasionally could emote—at least in the seemingly feminine, loss-of-control sense of the word—like in New Hampshire, and even if these displays were authentic, these were not cast in a positive light. Maureen Dowd, op-ed columnist for *The New York Times,* argued that Clinton's "emotional moment" in Portsmouth was not out of passion, but anger and entitlement:

> What was moving her so deeply was her recognition that the country was failing to grasp how much it needs her. In a weirdly narcissistic way, she was crying for us. But it was grimly typical of her that what finally made her break down was the prospect of losing. (Dowd, 2008b)

Confident but not arrogant, Obama was someone "comfortable with himself" and did not "get too hot" (Herbert, 2008b). In the words of *New York Times* columnist Frank Richer, Obama "radiated the kind of wit and joy . . . that can come only with self-confidence and a comfort in [his] own skin" (Rich, 2008d), something that Clinton, with her stiff demeanor and distant attitude, clearly was not.

Make no mistake. Obama was not perfect. While charming, he could not stay that way all the time and eventually tiredness crept in—although his spirits remained high. His big blunder, however, did not receive as much attention as the "Hillary moment." During a debate in New Hampshire, local reporter and co-moderator Scott Spradling asked Clinton about the polls showing she was not as well liked as Obama.

137

"Well, that hurts my feelings," she responded, to laughter in the audience (Kornblut & Balz, 2008b). She admitted that Obama was very likable and added, "I don't think I'm that bad" (Krauthammer, 2008a). Then Obama deadpanned, "You're likable enough" (Healy & Zeleny, 2008; see also NBC, 2008d). He may have been trying to go for "graciousness" (Dionne, 2008a), but he actually came across as snarky (Dionne, 2008a), condescending (Rich, 2008a), and contemptuous (as *The Washington Post* reported, his comment was not with a smile, but with a smirk and while looking down; Krauthammer, 2008a). People "really hated [his] graceless barb" (Gibbs & von Drehle, 2008). As op-ed writer Bob Herbert remarked in *The New York Times*, "There's a fine line between brash and cocky. You can't embark on a quest as audacious as Mr. Obama's without a certain brashness. But cocky turns people off. And the senator seemed at times to stray across that line" (Herbert, 2008a).

Also creeping into the discourse were a few voices pondering how long it took Obama to condemn the words of Rev. Wright and whether this was evidence of bad judgment on his behalf. Admittedly, he "faced up to his dubious behavior towards his explosive friends" but was "finally confronted by a problem that neither his charm nor his grandiosity would solve" (Dowd, 2008a). Obama "should have moved aggressively to distance from Wright months ago" ("Moment of truth," 2008) but he tried "to remain loyal to his pastor" (Saslow, 2008) and "was unequivocal in his refusal to disown Wright" (Klein, 2008c).

Obama's character flaw in this case, was an understandable sense of loyalty to a man he embraced as a "wayward member of the family" (Gerson, 2008). In any case,

there was an undercurrent that stressed that a presidential candidate should know better and distance himself from bad company. Thus,

> A presidential candidate is not a mere church member, and he operates in a different context. We examine everything about him for the slightest clue about character. On Wright, Obama has shown a worrisome tic. He has done so also with his relationship with Tony Rezko, the shadowy Chicago political figure . . . . But that hardly changes the fact that Obama should never have done business with Rezko in the first place. He concedes that now, but it was still a failure of judgment. (Richard Cohen, 2008c)

For a "refreshingly cerebral" (Will, 2008b) and an "exceptionally charismatic, bright guy" (NBC, 2007c), Obama was not free of error and critique. However, the bulk of the criticism focused on Clinton. Her seemingly unrestrained arrogance was paired in the media discourse with a constant defiance and anger at the candidate who threatened her once taken-for-granted nomination. Not only did she let this impair her judgment—she refused to admit having made mistakes—but she was described as downright shrill and enraged at the possibility of not being named on the Democrat ticket. Thus, she was just plain "fierce and [with a] *limitless* desire" to attack the Bush administration and her competitors (Klein, 2007a; emphasis added), going "harshly negative" (Kornblut & Murray, 2008), and presenting a "newly aggressive posture" (Zeleny & Healy, 2008), trying "repeatedly to knock Sen. Barack Obama off his footing" (Kornblut & Balz, 2008b), "confronting Barack Obama more directly" as well as "going on the offensive [and] continuing her attacks on [his] message" (NBC, 2008b). By the time Clinton finally conceded her defeat and endorsed Obama, the media discourse unanimously argued that one of her greatest mistakes was following the recommendation of one

139

adviser of "taking a hard line [and] attack[ing] Obama." This "far more aggressive strategy—or 'brute force'" (Kaiser, 2008) was described as unnecessary and unjustified—even though Clinton was not the only candidate attacking contenders in the race.

Indeed, when Obama was doing the attacks, he was described as doing so with a "calm, measured, let's-all-work-together presence" (G. Collins, 2007), "keeping his cool demeanor." Always levelheaded, he described "Clinton's tendency toward secrecy as simply 'a problem'" (Kornblut & Balz, 2007b). Conversely, Obama was advised in the media to go more "macho" (Klein, 2007a) and "forcefully against her" (Hauser, 2007), as he needed to show "more strength" (NBC, 2007c). That said, *Time*'s political columnist Joe Klein stressed that "eviscerat[ing] your opponents is not as presidential as the ability of defend yourself" (Klein, 2007a), which Obama did quite well. In any case, even though he vowed to be "tougher against Senator Clinton" (NBC, 2007c), this was not understood as force, but as him "challenging her assertively enough" (Hauser, 2007).

Even when he could attack his competitor and "push for an aggressive message," he did not rely on "harsh rhetorical attacks" (Kane & Weisman, 2008). He had "a calm confidence" whereas she was the one who "lost her cool" (Achenbach, 2008a). More so, despite the prospect of a long Democratic race, Obama "stayed above the fray." One of Obama's political advisers reinforced that portrayal describing "Obama's mood as euphoric but realistic: 'He never gets too high, and he never gets too low. When we have things to celebrate, he's happy but he understands there are

challenges ahead'" (Murray, 2008). Even when advised by his wife "to forswear the cerebral and embrace the visceral," he, however, insisted on "calm [and] rarely display[ed] public agitation," although condescension could creep in sometimes in his manner (Powell, 2008a). He was not flawless and indeed "a large trap for [him was] his cockiness" (Rich, 2008c).

In an interesting contrast, the majority of the media discourse presented the "Obama moment" of the campaign—his speech in Philadelphia on race—as inspiring and candid but also very personal and emotional for the candidate himself. However, unlike Clinton's "teary moment," this one was subdued and controlled. For instance, *Time* reported, "After he delivered his speech, Obama found his wife Michelle backstage. She was weeping. He shared a quiet, emotional moment with her. Then Obama was all business again. 'What's next?' he asked" (Carney & Sullivan, 2008). Likewise, Obama delivered his 37-minute speech "with his wife, Michelle, looking on solemnly but with deep emotion" (ABC, 2008h), while Obama spoke "in what seems like deliberately flat and unemotional tones" (Balz, 2008c). This may have been personal, but he certainly did not lose control as Clinton was described as doing at the diner in New Hampshire.

As the race dragged on for months longer than usual, Clinton's refusal to quit the race was used to portray her as a harpy and a sore loser who would do whatever it takes to get things the way she wanted them. The media reports stressed the increasing tensions among DNC ranks. In the words of ABC anchor Charles Gibson, "I don't think I've seen that level . . . of bitterness, of vitriol between the campaigns in a while. This

seems like it's getting to be pretty nasty" (ABC, 2008j). As if all the negativities were coming only from the Clinton campaign, she was called on "to show leadership and sensitivity" (Healy, 2008a). Indeed, while endorsing Obama, then-New Mexico Governor Bill Richardson explained, "I believe the campaign has gotten too negative," adding that is "what's been very good about Senator Obama's campaign—it's a positive campaign about hope and opportunity" (Nagourney & Zeleny, 2008), further cementing the notion that the negativity and aggression came from Clinton and Clinton only. The "Obama bashing" by Clinton, as an Obama supported was quoted calling it (Stewart, 2008) was just more evidence of how aggressive and desperate she was. Indeed, Clinton was described as "adopting an increasingly indignant tone" (Kornblut & Balz, 2008a) while challenging Obama.

Once the nomination was almost secured by Barack Obama, Clinton's refusal to put an end to her presidential bid was presented as a sign of how stubborn, defiant and ultimately stuck on her sense of entitlement she could be. Her remarks during those days included "a strong pushback at anyone who says she can't win" (NBC, 2008g) and she stayed "more determined than ever to remain in the contest" (Kornblut & Bacon, 2008a). Her professed "confidence and determination to fight on for in the presidential race" (Halperin, 2008a) was presented as evidence that she "placed her own interests above those of her party and her country" (Kolb, 2008). Obama, however, was not the one calling her to drop out. Instead, in what was presented as graciousness and equanimity,

> [Obama] welcomed Clinton to continue campaigning. "My attitude is that
> Senator Clinton can run as long as she wants," he said. "She is a fierce and
> formidable opponent, and she obviously believes she would make the best
> nominee and the best president." (Bacon & Kornblut, 2008)

At the very end of the Democratic race, Clinton was cast overwhelmingly as a sore loser who just could not admit defeat or gracefully back up Obama, the presumptive nominee. The media discourse occasionally showed how she seemed to not even reflect and ponder on what she was doing, and was unapologetic about it. For instance, when "asked about what mistakes she has made in of the campaign and what lessons she has learned, Clinton demurred, saying 'Oh, I have not had time to think about that'" (Kornblut, 2008c). While a minority of texts praised Clinton's "determination and tenacity" "Exit, sort of, Sen. Clinton," 2008), the consensus was that her arrogance and sense of entitlement defined her bid for her party nomination. For instance,

> You have to admire Hillary Clinton for her ability to reshape reality to her
> preferred outcome. She seems to assume that if she says something loudly
> enough, and repeats it often enough, it will become true. Her victory speech in
> Puerto Rico was a minor masterpiece in carefully parsed self-delusion.
> Unfortunately for her, it takes more than conviction to win the Democratic
> nominating contest. ("Clinton's count doesn't add up," 2008)

Unlike the sore loser, Obama's "ability to fight through one of the most bruising nomination battles . . . proved the candidate's mettle" (Saslow & Mummolo, 2008). Conversely, a minority of the media texts stressed that Obama's "extraordinary journey [had been] magnified, not diminished, by the gritty, resilient performance of his main rival" (Broder, 2008a) and Obama himself stated that he was "a better candidate

because [he] ran against her" (NBC, 2008i). Further, Obama "heaped praise on Clinton in the last weeks [of the race], speaking glowingly about her at virtually every public event" (Kornblut & Bacon, 2008b). She did not have the same gracefulness. Indeed, she finally ended the primary season without saying she was ending her campaign. "Characteristically measured and noticeably upbeat," Clinton addressed her supporters and praised Barack Obama—but "she did not endorse him" (Kornblut, 2008a). That speech, however, "rang even more true in the absence of a campaign ahead" and thus more authentic once her eyes were not on the prize (Kornblut, 2008a). Likewise, in South Dakota—where the last primary was held—she and her family "took the stage smiling, clapping, and bopping to the beat," while saying nothing about losing the nomination. Thus, while in defeat, the Senator from New York "graciously pretend[ed] to win" (Milbank, 2008b) and "act[ed] like a gracious loser" ("Inside the times," 2008). That is, this was a performance, not a genuine gesture from Clinton.

The end of the race also further cemented the serene image of Obama. Once he secured the nomination he thanked supporters without gloating. On the contrary, "the victor was plenty coy" (Copeland, 2008a) and "looked a little stunned himself" (Murray, 2008), all the while "the emotion of the moment showed on his face" (Balz & Kornblut, 2008).

Thus, Hillary Clinton started the race as the likely Democratic nominee and the candidate with the confidence and the political machine to get the nomination, but it was Barack Obama who got the nomination and won the November 2008 election. At several times throughout the race, Clinton's gender became a more prominent aspect

than her actual candidacy, and her masculine traits and emasculating attitude were presented as highly disruptive. While the discourse occasionally addressed some accusations of sexism, these were usually dismissed with arguments that the problem was not Clinton's gender, but Clinton herself. Clinton's failure to fit traditional gender roles seems to have undermined her presidential bid, as despite her experience she was deemed as showing too much ambition—she was too inhuman and uninspiring to become the next American president.

CHILE-UNITED STATES COMPARISON

Both females bidding for a presidential ticket, Michelle Bachelet and Hillary Clinton did not receive completely distinct coverage, although they are described for the most part in opposing terms. Two frames pervade the coverage of their emotional management, and both have to do with them being women. First, Bachelet's "feminine" approach to politics and campaigning were deemed as one of her defining characteristics, a label that helped explain her popularity among voters even if the press did not seem convinced that she was the best candidate. In contrast, Clinton's *lack* of decidedly feminine attributes and rather emasculating attitude were deemed as threatening and disruptive, something that fostered a sense of uneasiness among voters and the media alike.

Tied to this is the notion of both candidates tapping into their emotionality to appeal to voters. Bachelet was the one who—quite effectively—used her emotional repertoire to empathize with voters, regardless of her qualifications for the presidential

office. Clinton, on the other hand, was described as trying to play both the emotional and the gender card—trying to win sympathies by tearing up and making accusations that she was being mistreated because she was a woman—although with uneven results. Her so-called character gap did not make her appealing to voters, despite her scripted efforts to be more personable and close to people, and despite her claims of speaking from the heart.

Table 6:   The Emotional Management of Michelle Bachelet and Hillary Clinton

Michelle Bachelet	Hillary Clinton
Feminine	Not feminine, emasculating
Sympathetic, understanding	Ruthless, unsympathetic
Wears her heart on her sleeve	Emotionless
Authentic, natural	Phony, flagrantly political
Charming	Distant
Levelheaded, not aggressive	Aggressive, angry
Soft, demure	Strident
Plays the emotional card effectively	Tries to play the emotional card

The Chilean media discourse constantly stressed the traditionally feminine attributes of Michelle Bachelet, whose soft and demure demeanor was equated to that of a tender mother ("Elecciones en juego," 2005) and "homemaker" ("Candidata oficialista define impuestos y se acerca a Lagos," 2005). With "so much femininity" (D. Gallagher, 2005a), it is not surprising that her campaign platform stressed social issues and "a new way to treat citizens" ("Bachelet lanza su programa de gobierno," 2005). Further, she was described as being "just as demanding as understanding," as well as "fun and happy"—which in the words of an economist interviewed by *Qué Pasa*, made her the best vacation companion ("Elecciones en juego," 2005). She embraced that

gendered image of homemaker and mother, ending her campaign with the following statement: "Because I'm a mother and a doctor, I know how [countries] are built: like a home, with love and patience and also with imagination" (Donoso, 2005a).

These were not words used to describe Clinton, who was presented as emasculating and not feminine. Stiff and scripted, her above-the-fray posture led to discussions on how a woman should be more sensitive, to the point she even became a caricature (e.g., "Mrs. Clinton, we're assured by sources right and left, tortures puppies and eats babies;" Krugman, 2008). Further, she "rose politically in her husband's orbit" (Murray & Harris, 2008), all the while complaining of sexism in the wake of her failed presidential bid and abusing her feminist supporters. Thus,

> For months, Hillary has been trying to emasculate Obama with the sort of words and themes she has chosen, stirring up feminist anger by promoting the idea that the men were unfairly taking it away from the women, and covering up her own campaign mistakes with cries of sexism. Even his ability to finally clinch the historic nomination did not stop her in that pursuit. She did not bat her eyelashes at him and proclaim him Rhett Butler instead of Ashley Wilkes. (Dowd, 2008d)

In addition, Bachelet was always serene, even when she appeared "without her traditional smile" ("Sebastián Piñera y RN 'con los brazos abiertos,'" 2005). This served to offer a little bit of a widespread warning in the media discourse, as she appeared "warm and light," while it was the other candidates who acted studious in their campaigning (Arthur, 2005b), to the extent that her critics continually said that "Michelle Bachelet's popularity is based on how congenial she is, and not on her ideas" (Campusano, 2005d). Sympathetic and understanding, Bachelet was praised for being

147

"more sensitive to the multiple dimensions of inequality [in the country]" (Peña, 2005a), as well as promoting a less aggressive approach to politics.

In the wake of the accident that marred her campaign, she received condolences and sympathetic calls from supporters and adversaries, including fellow presidential contenders. These gestures were publicly valued by Bachelet, who went on to say that "this is how we should behave as human beings ("Presidenciables solidarizan con candidata," 2005). The argument was that Bachelet can move beyond the political dimension of governance, and just be a decent human (female) being.

In the U.S. discourse, though, Clinton was constantly portrayed as flagrantly political, to the extent of being calculating and conniving. Not only was she ambitious, she was "ruthlessly" so (Healy, 2007c), and thus there was "no doubt that she'll do whatever it takes to win the presidency" (Cheney, 2007). Overall, she ran "with a sense of entitlement and hubris" (Wilder, 2008). However, while most of the media discourse focused on an unsentimental and ruthless depiction of Clinton, there was certain acknowledgment that the media-fed portrayal was not exactly accurate, as she was far from being uninspiring or completely unsympathetic. Indeed, her supporters "filled gymnasium after gymnasium on her two-day trip through Indiana [and] the mood of the rallies and town meetings was far from the grim picture portrayed in the endless whirl of political chatter on cable television" (Zeleny, 2008).

As someone who seemed to wear her heart on her sleeve, it is not surprising that widely reported polls stated that Bachelet was the most likely candidate to be described as both respected by most Chileans and as an affectionate person (e.g, "Atributos:

candidatos mantienen sus ventajas comparativas," 2005). Indeed, her rivals should have taken her out of the zone of mere emotions (e.g., "Una inyección de ánimo que llegó a tiempo," 2005) if they wanted to be serious candidates. Her warm and emphatic demeanor seemed to give her a magic halo that kept voters emotionally attached to her, even when her platform and ideas did not make her the strongest candidate. A few critics went even further and said that in her performance in the first presidential debate she exploited this very same trait: "There was some imperfection, certain reluctance accentuated by her white suite and auburn hair, a withdrawn smile, firm on one or two basic ideas. Nothing more. Just enough—barely—to not break the spell" (Peña, 2005e).

Clinton seemed to get this kind of connection only in situations like the New Hampshire moment, instances that "showed voters a more human side of Clinton." Indeed, in Portsmouth "Hillary offered a glimpse of who she really is, hearing her blasted for being manipulative when she finally lowered her cast-iron shield might have cut too close to the bone." (Lithwick, 2008). These moments were rare, however, and the media discourse predominantly articulated her rather reserved attitude, such as the fact she said "nothing about why she was in [the race] beyond her own ambition" (Baker & Kornblut, 2008). Further, the release by the National Archives of Clinton's documents as First Lady helped the media highlight, once again, the idea that she was ultimately heartless. The documents were "the briefest outline of a life, all mechanics and no feeling" (Copeland, 2008c), and everything she did then and when running was described as "so cushioned, so controlled" (Copeland, 2008c). This portrayal served to

149

reinforce that notion that her secretiveness was a sign of less-than-transparent intentions:

> There's a difference between being transparent and being scrutinized. Clinton is one of the most studied figures in public life, but she's also one of the most opaque . . . . We know what she did on any particular day—we might even know where she stood—but not what she felt. Not what she said to her husband, the president. Not what she thought about it all. (Copeland, 2008c)

This perceived phoniness (e.g., Lowry, 2007) of Clinton arguably caused distrust, as her life did not come across as authentic, as the Obamas' did (see Williams, 2008). She was labeled as "opportunistic" (Williams, 2008), lacking conviction or real concern for others. The media discourse was imbued with the idea that she was only performing a character that could please voters, but that all her crafted, scripted, choreographed, sheer production, brilliant staging, studied spontaneity, and pre-tested words may not work. After all, "Americans know Hillary Rodham Clinton" (NBC, 2007b) and "Hillary hatred has been a fixture of [U.S.] politics" due to a great extent to her "hiding her true plans behind dastardly artifice" (Lowry, 2007).

Quite the opposite, Bachelet was deemed as acting "natural" (e.g, Donoso, 2005c), someone who did not rely on a façade. Even her blunders—at one debate she completely lost her train of thought while admitting to having forgotten a name—showed how unscripted she was, which "increase[d] her empathy with people" ("La primera muestra de vulnerabilidad," 2005). In the words of one pundit quoted by *La Tercera*, "Bachelet is noted for her communication skills and affability. She even

remained natural when she answered some questions incorrectly" ("Las claves del primer debate Alvear-Bachelet," 2005).

Bachelet's charisma was not bulletproof and seemed to be at odds with a more presidential gravitas. For instance, the general consensus after the first of two presidential debates on Oct. 19, 2005, was that Bachelet performed well, but because she was serious and for the most part tried to convey readiness, her usual charisma and empathy suffered. The argument went, she could either look competent or engage voters, but could not do both. Not surprisingly, then, polls showed "a progressive deterioration in what are considered to be Bachelet's strong points: empathy, warmth, accessibility, spontaneity" (Cavallo, 2005a), which helped critics to stress that Bachelet could win hearts, but come Election Day, voters would choose a stronger and more prepared candidate. Along those lines, Bachelet also denied that her appeal was limited to her being nice or that she could smile her way to the presidential seat:

> "When I speak seriously, I speak seriously," she explained. And she denies trying to appear more serious, so she's not seen as "Miss Congeniality." "Before I was criticized because I smiled too much, and now because I don't smile," she said, laughing. "I'm not an actress or a marketing product. Of course I'm told to smile more . . . But if I'm talking about inequality, how am I supposed to smile?" she said, showing her perfect teeth (R. Correa, 2005a)

While some analysts argued that Bachelet's appeal to voters was strictly affective, her supporters said that what actually got to voters was her "peaceful message, solid, with thoughtful approaches" (Peña, 2005e). In any case, while her soft demeanor was attractive—"she's warm, never tense" (Arthur, 2005b)—she denied that

151

she was popular among voters just because of her personality or a media-darling status. In her words,

> "To identify my high citizen support because I'm likeable is not disrespectful toward me, but toward the people. Because there are a lot of likeable people, and a lot of circus clowns, and none of them are candidates for President of the Republic," she said before pausing to drink a glass of water and continue with her response. (Trujillo, 2005)

If Bachelet had the charisma of empathy, Clinton had the "charisma of competence" (R. Marcus, 2008a), which is not that charismatic after all. Described as "an ultra-capable technocrat" (R. Marcus, 2008a), Clinton's weakness was precisely that, being an "ice princess" (Rubin, 2008), uninspiring and uninspired. For example, while campaigning in Iowa she was "true to her methodical form . . . even though she sometimes sounds a little bored delivering it" (Healy, 2008e). In any case, she was also accused of building a campaign "suffused in overconfidence, driven by acrimony and weighted by the emotional baggage of a marriage between former and would-be presidents" (Baker & Rutenberg, 2008).

Further, Clinton was deemed as off-putting and the opposite of calm. When she fought back against repeated attacks during a debate, she did so "with defiance and flashes of anger, pursuing her lips, stiffening her back and staring intently at her rivals" (Healy & Zeleny, 2008). *The Washington Post* admitted that "her laughter has been analyzed and judged inappropriate, insincere and annoying" (Givhan, 2008). Her campaign strategy also drew "some pretty nasty deadlines," explained NBC, like a reference to "her *angry* claim that she's an agent of change" (NBC, 2008b). Further

152

feeding that image was the reference to her having "been angered by recent calls for her to quit" (Murray & Kornblut, 2008) and how "she wouldn't allow herself to be rushed into anything" (Weisman & Balz, 2008). Although by the end of the campaign, anger had given way to resignation (Baker & Rutenberg, 2008), before that point the pressures had "only hardened her resolve" (Kornblut & Bacon, 2008a), to the extent that she seemed blasé about how long the race could go on. In doing so, she defied those who warned about the possible consequences of prolonged and divisive content among the Democratic Party ranks. Even at the end, she "conced[ed] little" and her "largely self-focused non-concession speech" (Dionne, 2008b) further served as an argument against Clinton, as it revealed her character. Clinton "displayed no grace or dignity" and should have "drop[ped] [her] ego and with open heart embrace[d] [her] opponent," as there was "much more at stake than Ms. Clinton's bruised ego" (Burger, 2008).

As such—and in stark contrast to Bachelet's demure and soft demeanor—Clinton was presented as utterly strident, to the extent that political reporter Joel Achenbach argued in *The Washington Post* that Clinton "needs a radio-controlled shock collar so that aides can zap her when she starts to get screechy" (Achenbach, 2008a). Admittedly, as one strategist said, as a woman she "had a harder time going negative" and would "look 'shrill or bitchy'" (Baker & Kornblut, 2008)—and that was exactly what happened. Admittedly, her stump speech aspired "to grace notes . . . but often she raises her voice to a shout that can sound grating" (Healy, 2008b), and her challenge was "to connect with and inspire large audiences more than she did" (Healy, 2008b). Further, while the final days of her campaign were difficult and "not without a measure

153

of defiant pride, satisfaction and gratitude" (Leibovich, 2008b), *The Washington Post* reminded that even among Democratic ranks Clinton was compared "to a crazed Glenn Close in Fatal Attraction" (Akers & Kane, 2008a).

On the other had, even when "visibly upset, indignant [and] baffled" with some lines of inquiry (Trujillo, 2005), Bachelet managed to keep her cool. For instance, she replied in a civil and firm manner to a scholar who asked whether she was a media product for the masses—albeit she "had to make more than one pause before continuing speaking while remaining calm" (Trujillo, 2005).

In any case, she was most effective when she was dealing with personal matters. For example, during one presidential debate, and the journalists posited personal questions,

> Bachelet spoke from her heart, and it was obvious. What's more, she was able to convert her weak answers from the first part [of the debate] into evidence of her main strength. Her "I will not let [the public] down" was the most credible statement of the debate. ("Apuntes del foro en TV," 2005)

The emotional card might have worked for Clinton as well, as her "emotional moment" in New Hampshire was widely attributed as the main reason why she won that primary—even if there was little evidence offered to support that assessment. The newly human Hillary Clinton ("Op-Extra: Selections from Opinion Online," 2008) "descended from the Olympian heights of carefully guarded front-runnerhood to expose herself more" as "the glimpse of vulnerable Hillary was her affecting, and effective, moment of the campaign and a factor in her unexpected victory Tuesday" (R. Marcus,

154

2008b). Reporters and commentators repeatedly argued that her "style of campaigning . . . shifted dramatically" the morning she "bared her thoughts about the race's impact on her personally . . . in perhaps [her] most public display of emotion" in the campaign trail, even though she was "trying to steel herself against pessimism [about the future of her bid]" (Healy, 2008d). It was after losing in Iowa that Clinton tried "to break through the invisible wall that sometimes seems to separate this private woman from her supporters. She began giving voters long hugs—startling some—and discussing carefully her feelings" (Powell, 2008d).

Furthermore, Clinton was presented as embracing this "new side" as her new campaign strategy, reinforcing the calculating and insincere portrayal of the candidate. Her victory speech, "I come here tonight with a very, very full heart" (e.g., "In their own words," 2008; Milbank, 2008d), was widely cited as an example of a "new emotional Clinton," one that was "newly capable of showing emotion" (Milbank, 2008d), but the media discourse also stressed frequently that she "would not be comfortable emoting on cue on the campaign trail" (Healy, 2008c)—as if that were even possible. The approach of this "all-new, listening and accessible" Senator Clinton, however, "was about as spontaneous as a 500-guest wedding" (Steinheuser, 2008). She may have tried to play the emotional card, but given Clinton's "character gap" and engagement "in political calculation to mislead voters" (ABC, 2008j), this might not have been successful after all.

These portrayals did not occur in a vacuum. They were part of a mediated conversation the public made sense of by tapping into hegemonic understandings and

155

conventions of appropriate gender roles. As such, the media discourse relied on several

strategies and arguments to define, explain and interpret Bachelet's and Clinton's

behavior in the context of electoral politics, and in doing so, suggested how fit for office

these two women might have been.

MEDIA DISCOURSES ON EMOTIONAL MANAGEMENT AND APPROPRIATENESS

In both countries, Michelle Bachelet and Hillary Clinton became the first female

with a viable bid for the presidency and in both cases their gender seemed to act as a

constant reminder of how different they were from their male counterparts. The

distinction seems to favor Bachelet, whose "feminine" and "soft" approach to politics

was used to explain her high popularity among voters, even though her charm did not

project a sense of authority. With Clinton, the discourse reflected the uneasiness the

politician stirred among people, as she was breaking every female mold for in her

overambitious attempt to get to the White House. "Polarizing" and "too political," she

was accused of playing the gender card in order to get the nomination, and messages

stressing how not even other women liked her further cemented the idea that she did not

fit the conventions of "feminine" behavior.

The media discourses on these two candidates were imbued with notions of

leadership, authority, and gendered behavior. In the Chilean media, the discourse was

articulated in such a way that the notions of charm and skills were deemed opposites;

whereas in the United States, the media messages contrasted head and heart and

dismissed the possibility that sexism had anything to do with how Clinton was portrayed.

Table 7:   Arguments in the Media Discourse on Michelle Bachelet and Hillary Clinton

Michelle Bachelet	Hillary Clinton
"Female/feminine" leadership	Not feminine
Charms trumps skills	Head trumps heart
Soft, may need to toughen up	A woman should be more sensitive
The (survivor) woman	The "Hillary" factor
No qualifiers	Qualifiers
Not a traditional politician	Too political
Media product	Under everybody's microscope
When emotional/upset, contained	When emotional, either fake or frail
Charming, not leader/authority	Competent, not leader
Determined	So ambitious it impairs her judgment
At the end she lost part of her appeal	Only at the end she relaxed
She plays the emotional card quite well	Tried to played the gender card
Not Lagos	Not Bill; not Obama

Being Bachelet, the presumptive next president, a woman, the Chilean media discourse focused extensively on what women bring to the political arena and how female leadership was different from what Chile had been used to see. For instance, according to campaign strategists, women "arrive to politics with a very refreshing view, a non-traditional approximation to politics" (Valdés & Mujica, 2005). This kind of discourse stressed that women and men running for office are indeed different, and that by being in the public arena, women highlight their already-existing personality traits that make them look weak in the eyes of the citizenry. For instance, while "women exhibit high sympathy in the polls," they have to endure the doubt "that's

157

always present in the electorate as to whether they would be able to manage a crisis and lead during hard times" (Valdés & Mujica, 2005). The conundrum was even labeled "the woman's syndrome": "If she shows a strong personality, she's hysterical; if she doesn't confront problems, she's weak" (Valdés & Mujica, 2005). While labeled as a notion from the "unconscious, macho collective" (Valdés & Mujica, 2005), little was done to debunk such ideas, further promoting the notion that any woman is always "manipulated by someone, dominated by someone, influenced by someone" (Valdés & Mujica, 2005).

By the time Piñera jumped into the race, the argument that women are essentially different than men in politics had become one of the most common themes in the discourse about the presidential candidates. Women's difference, however, was not necessarily seen as a liability. The notion was that female politicians bring a different approach, flavor, and decision-making process to the public arena, which could be seen as an asset. In other words, the dominant idea was that women's leadership is qualitatively different, but not necessarily worse or lesser than male leadership. This feminine leadership—or at least Bachelet's—is "light" ("Sebastián Piñera y RN 'con los brazos abiertos,'" 2005), "low profile" (T. Correa, 2005), and "non-confrontational" (C. Salinas, 2005c).

One site to test this rather meek approach, the media said, was the first debate scheduled by the Concertación coalition in advance of the primaries (eventually, Bachelet's only competitor for the coalition nomination bowed out months before any vote was cast). Bachelet and her rival—another woman, former minister of Foreign

158

Affairs Soledad Alvear—had a hard time "hiding their nervousness" (Canal 13, 2005a); that day also "hesitation was abundant" (Canal 13, 2005a). Critics insisted that the broadcast "made clear the candidates' weaknesses" and how neither Bachelet nor Alvear had "the capabilities to govern Chile" (Canal 13, 2005b; also Campusano, 2005a), while Bachelet's supporters insisted this was "a capable, consistent woman" (Megavisión, 2005a), as if being a woman inherently entailed lesser capabilities to be president.

The media reports emphasized how Bachelet avoided attacking her competitor, and thus a "non-confrontational ambient" prevailed (C. Salinas, 2005c), in line with stereotypes that define women as not aggressive. One newspaper not only stressed repeatedly that the debate was defined by "low confrontation" ("Las claves del primer debate Alvear-Bachelet," 2005) and that "neither [candidate] attacked the other" ("Candidatas evitan confrontarse y enfatizan historias personales," 2005), but that emotionality and personal stories played an important role in the event. Thus, the candidates "used an emotional discourse" (Díaz, Saldivia, Sallaberry, & Canales, 2005) and "talked emotionally about their families" ("Candidatas evitan confrontarse y enfatizan historias personales," 2005). In particular, Bachelet "remembered—choking up—that [that day] was the birthday of her father, the late general Alberto Bachelet" ("Candidatas evitan confrontarse y enfatizan historias personales," 2005). While the candidate did not cry, this clearly emotional moment was just briefly mentioned in the news copy and for the most part ignored in the discussion and analysis of the debate.

159

More so, Eugenio Tironi, a well-know campaign strategist in Chile, said that the way Alvear and Bachelet resolved their differences—with one bowing out two months before the scheduled Concertación primaries, showed that "when women assume leadership they have different ways than men of making decisions" ("'En Bachelet hay mucha huella de Alvear,'" 2005). The way that Alvear and Bachelet sorted out their presidential bids "is proof that something has started to change [in politics] as a result of female leadership" (Tironi, 2005b). Alvear and Bachelet themselves stressed over and over again how their approach was a new way of doing politics. Likewise, Bachelet explained that such was "the hallmark of women politicians: a fair competition, friendly, and civil" (Megavisión, 2005c). She went on to acknowledge Alvear's credentials, and invite Alvear to join her campaign in whatever capacity. The gesture was labeled as gracious and generous, rather than calculating, in all media (e.g., Tironi, 2005b).

Months later, after the second presidential debate, Bachelet would still be mainly described as the more meek candidate. As one Concertación politician said, Bachelet "came across naturally, she was more herself" ("Piñera se plantea como unica alternativa de la alianza," 2005) and others expressed that "the real Michelle came out, more laid back, warmer, more approachable" (Arthur, 2005a). Being the (natural) emoter, she appeared as the most sincere presidential hopeful. More so, she demonstrated poise and confidence to govern the country, although there was a constant reminder that some people thought that while she "showed warmth and empathy, she lacked the leadership and initiative to direct Chile" (Méndez, 2005). In any case, her

performance was well evaluated by politicians from different parties, as "she seemed more secure than in other debates," as well as "convincing" (Méndez, 2005). At least among her supporters, the argument was that that female leadership, as Bachelet embodied it, entailed a "non-traditional perspective in politics*"* ("Piñera se plantea cómo unica alternativa de la alianza," 2005).

In the case of Hillary Clinton, it was her counter-stereotypical attributes that gave fodder to much discussion and the argument that she did not look presidential. Her "hardness and lack of warmth" hindered her likeability, although she was considered "capable and smart" even by those who disliked her (Healy, 2007c). Deemed too fake and too calculating, Clinton needed to "persuade people [her stance] was authentic" (Healy, 2007c). In her case, having presidential ambition meant having her eye on the prize only, and thus her attempts to convey "both her policy smarts and her warmer maternal side" (Healy, 2007b) were just a strategy on her path to the White House. Indeed, she went to the extent of suggesting "various personas she wants to convey to voters" (Healy, 2007d), with "the affected demeanor of a kaffe-klatching neighbor while speaking" (Hornaday, 2007).

By Super Tuesday, a sense that Clinton was just spoiling the race dominated the media discourse. The media did not see her winning the nomination and criticized her for continuing campaigning on mostly a whim—the capricious idea that this was her right and her time. Not surprisingly, then, around this time Clinton had to make a million-dollar loan to her own campaign, suggesting that financial problems could determine how much longer she could stay in the race.

161

Specifically, Clinton was seen as not feminine enough, emasculating, and undermining traditional gender roles, which could explain the constant criticism that had reporters, columnists and letter writers trying to take her down a peg or two. That said, the quandary of her gender factoring into the discussion was occasionally acknowledged, to the extent that one article stressed that "genuine independence isn't a quality that Americans . . . actually admire in first ladies"—be them former, current or prospective ones (Applebaum, 2007). More interestingly, there were constant reminders that Clinton was a feminist, emasculating, and not a typical female (e.g., she "has to work overtime to prove herself non-threatening," Howley, 2008), yet she was ascribed female shortcomings, such as the frailty associated with women (e.g., she has to show she "won't go crazy on us;" Klein, 2007b), and she was described with gender-based themes (e.g., "loosening her control over her psyche;" Kunin, 2008). She was set up to fail regardless of what she did.

Early on in the Chilean race, while polls give a wide advantage to Bachelet over her main competitor for the Concertación coalition nomination, most of the media discourse stressed that Bachelet relied heavily on the empathy and the rapport she had with citizens, even though her platform, credentials and overall substance were light or thin. She was considered personable and sociable, but lacking gravitas. The fact that a woman was in all likelihood the next president of Chile was portrayed as something new and novel (e.g., Valdés & Lob, 2005), albeit "finally the people are going to decide who is the person who best can solve their problems, and this doesn't depend on whether [the candidate] is a man or a woman, but rather their qualities" (Valdés & Lob,

2005). Such "huge lack of substance" (Ibáñez, 2005) could have been detrimental, and unless she "can combine her natural approachability with more articulated and coherent positions—avoiding showing her disgust with journalists when they touch on uncomfortable topics—her popularity inevitably will begin to fade" (Navia, 2005b).

In any case, her campaign staff hoped that Bachelet's "personal charm and charisma continue 'shielding' her candidacy" (C. Salinas, 2005b), as if her personality can deflect any criticism she may have gotten. Indeed, just tapping into "her natural niceness and spontaneity" could do the trick for her (Arthur, 2005b) and get her the presidency. For instance, while "analysts believe Alvear won the debate . . . the public thought differently" (Aravena, 2005), in a pervasive argument that regardless of how bad she did her job [campaigning], her charm still won the public. Further, Piñera's irruption into the presidential the race were credited with shaking up the race and forcing Bachelet to prove that she was more than charm: "From now on Sebastián will force the three candidates to set aside the fight to be Mr. or Miss Congeniality and to get back to fighting over ideas, where Bachelet is the weakest rival" (Barros, 2005a).

The fact that Bachelet's strength was her emotional rapport with voters was once again stressed during the first presidential debate. On that occasion, Bachelet "appeared somewhat nervous, but her strength was in her direct appeal to voters" (Canal 13, 2005d). Indeed, she was "quite more at ease and confident that in the debate with Alvear" ("Planteamientos de los candidatos," 2005). According to pollster Marta Lagos, Bachelet "was able to show the undecided elites that she could hold on her own" (Megavisión, 2005d), while another pundit claimed that she did a great job "tuning into

her constituents" (Megavisión, 2005d). However, a handful of analysts thought that while "she didn't appear anxious, she seemed distant" (C. Salinas, 2005d).

The warning posited by the media about Bachelet's lack of substance seemed to be reflected in a November poll that showed her fall "in the majority of her personality traits and in evaluation of her ability to solve the country's most important problems" ("Bachelet cae 6 puntos y suma de Piñera y Lavín la supera," 2005). Considering how much copy was dedicated to ponder whether Bachelet could actually govern the country—or how in her case charm trumped skills—such a drop should not be a surprise, and yet it was presented as evidence that people were not really convinced of her ability to be president. Everyone praised her congeniality, and her competitors in the presidential race argued that she had more humanity than political preparation ("Bachelet, la abanderada atípica de la coalición," 2005).

It is a sharp contrast to Hillary Clinton, with reports constantly reminding that Clinton was—not "could be"—"ice cold" and sometimes "her dark sides emerges and threatens to undo the good she is trying to achieve" (Brooks, 2008a). Her own advisers suggested that "she needs to start showing 'more heart than head' at large rallies" (Healy, 2008b). On the other hand, there were plenty of "young voters expressing a preference for her as a leader who speaks to their heads, not their hearts" (Cowan, 2008). As one Yale student suggested, "just because she doesn't have the charisma doesn't mean she wouldn't be better [than Obama as president]" (Cowan, 2008). In this perspective, Clinton may come off as calculating, but that was because "she's strategic

and weighs all options and is not quick to jump to conclusions" (Cowan, 2008), which was regarded as a good thing.

Bachelet's feminine style may have been praised, but this does not mean her gender was not an issue or was always cast in a positive light. A *Qué Pasa* story stressed that her inner circle—"whom she listened to with confidence and shared intimacy"—was comprised of a group of women that according to a male source, included "women that men wouldn't dare to ask out. Strong, self-sufficient, they've endured hard times, and it's obvious. Survivors" (Torres, 2005). Conversely, another pervasive and predominant frame in the Chilean media discourse was that Bachelet's soft demeanor made her look weak. The *fairer sex*—in Spanish labeled *sexo débil,* or literally "the weak sex"—served as a schema to interpret Bachelet's style. Thus, while her *feminine* leadership was an asset, it was different enough for commentators and reporters to ponder whether a soft demeanor was a good quality to have in the presidential seat. Thus, during the Concertación debate "the candidates demonstrated to all Chile that they are not capable to head the country" (Krajljevic, 2005), and even when comparing the skills of Bachelet and Alvear, the comparison favored the latter (e.g., R. Correa, 2005d). In the words of Francisco de la Maza, from an opposing party,

> [Bachelet] doesn't have the strengths of [then president Ricardo] Lagos or [former Minister of Interior José Miguel] Insulza. At any moment the political contingent can make her pay [for that] or she could make mistakes. Also there is what this kind of contest means, with the pressures, the debates and the escalation in these four months of what will be a meat grinder. I have my doubts that Michelle Bachelet can handle this, because I've experienced it, and it's very difficult. (Espinosa, 2005)

Likewise, asked about how she would deal with neighboring Argentina and that country's failure to comply with a gas-supply deal with Chile, she insisted that "with that country we have worked based on a dialogue, and the relationships goes beyond gas [trade]," which was labeled as a "weak stance" ("Evaluación pesimista del país marca discurso de los candidatos," 2005). Along those lines, Piñera said,

> [Bachelet] is kind, intelligent, an asset. But I insist: it takes more than this to be president. It takes leadership, courage, will, and strength to make decisions in difficult moments. And I think that when she was minister, she didn't demonstrate these qualities. (Barría, 2005)

Further, while public officials where not allowed to campaign for Bachelet during office hours, several would join her at other times. The President Lagos' wife—who held a symbolic position, but did not serve any official post in the administration—did accompany Bachelet, which was heavily criticized by opposing parties. The common theme in this criticism was that Bachelet's shortcomings were evident and she needed all the help she could get to face the other candidates (e.g., Valenzuela, 2005). Piñera himself argued that as a president, "when [Bachelet] is confronted with a dilemma, 'she has to resolve it with her own leadership, personality, understanding and experience. And that's where the problem is'" (Yáñez, 2005).

If Bachelet needed to toughen up, Clinton had enough toughness to serve an army. Indeed, she was someone that needed to stress "her softer side" (NBC, 2007b), and warm up, as she was a person portrayed as "either an amoral ice queen or a control-freak dragon lady" (Hornaday, 2007). More so, she was not even liked by other women,

whom she scorned in the past (see Romano, 2007). She had "to turn around her image" if she wanted to get elected (Balz, 2007a)—or so everybody said. She needed to "strengthen her appeal to women" (Kornblut, 2007b), as her lack of feminine identification made her unelectable.

However, the very same discourse that urged Clinton to soften and warm up questioned both the authenticity of the behavior or the effectiveness of her "performance." As *Time* acknowledged, candidates in general try to "hide behind consultants or façades" (Halperin, 2008b) and "being on the campaign trail is all about smiling for the cameras" (ABC, 2008a), while "their worry lines, hoarse voices and unguarded reactions were on full display" (Halperin, 2008b). Yet, the focus was on Clinton's lines, voice and reactions, as she had "to be careful not to cross the line and sound shrill" (ABC, 2008c); she was the one that "now was all smiles" (ABC, 2008d), even if the smile was fake. According to *The New York Times*, she had to "master a low, hushed tone—almost a whisper—that she and her consultants have been trying to perfect for months" (Healy, 2008e). However, she "still sometimes shout[ed]" (Healy, 2008e).

What was at fault was her character, which did not seem to meet the standards set by the media, regardless of how smart or competent Clinton was. By the time the long and grueling primary campaign was over, the race "may have left no doubt about the depth of her intelligence, the strength of her will and the power of her ideas," but "left many Americans with nagging doubts about her character because the greater blame for the campaign's negativity fell" on her ("It's over. Now it begins," 2008).

Indeed, her "intellectual capabilities are truly outstanding," but throughout the campaign she "morphed into something of a pistol-packing mama" (Applebome, 2008a). She was "defiant until the end of the race (Zernike, 2008), devilishly stealing the spotlight" (Dowd, 2008d) and doing "everything in her power to upstage [Obama's] moment" (Watson, 2008). For all this talk about her lack of gracefulness, when Clinton officially ended her campaign, she did it "with a forceful promise to elect Sen. Barack Obama" and used "generous and, at times, soaring terms" to support him and his candidacy. "It was a final, emotional end to a year-and-a-half-long effort" (Kornblut, 2008b). Even if it "was a clearly personal moment for Mrs. Clinton, it was a political one as well" (Nagourney & Leibovich, 2008; see also NBC, 2008j). ABC went on to explain that she waited three days for her concession because of "emotional processing," as she needed to "wrap [her] heart around" her loss (ABC, 2008l).

Since early on in the discourse, there were frequent commentaries about Clinton being the first woman with a good shot at the presidency, but also stressing doubt about whether she could actually pull it off. As a Washington Post editorial said, "the question about Hillary Clinton may not be so much whether a woman can win the presidency but whether this woman can" ("Hillary is in," 2007) and in *The New York Times* a college student was quoted saying, "You also want to consider, is she the right woman to be the first woman president?" (Bumiller, 2007). Indeed, the argument in these media discourses—either implied or actually stated—was that the problem is not Hillary Clinton's gender, but Hillary Clinton herself. However, the context of much of the

criticism and the commonsensical arguments used to explain it has deep roots in sexism and what feminist scholarship has questioned as hegemonic practices.

Take the following example,

> Instead of the usual voter complaints about choosing among unattractive options, there are meditative conversations about Senator Barack Obama's freshness versus Gov. Bill Richardson's international resume versus John Edwards's commitment to the underprivileged versus the historic prospect of Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton's becoming the first female president. (Kantor, 2008b)

Arguments like these show how much Clinton was defined by her gender instead of other qualifications. Barack Obama could have become—and indeed, he did become—the first African American president, but that was the trait used to present his case above; and Clinton had an extensive political resume as well as a well-documented commitment to gender issues and health care. Yet, the parallel used in the previous paragraph focuses on the fact that she was a female—and all that her gender entailed—rather than any other attribute or appeal. Similarly, *The New York Times* stressed that the "'calculating' senator from New York has to reassure voters that she won't degenerate into a feminine hysteric if she is elected to the White House" (Howley, 2008), thus relying on a word choice—hysteric—that is both vague in its warning but also very loaded when in comes to referring to supposedly irrational, out-of control-women. Other loaded word choices called Clinton the "debate dominatrix," with "no need to talk herself into manning up," but yet one who cannot give a "manly yes or no answer" to a certain question, one who "has inspired ambivalence, resentment and even

loathing among women" (Bumiller, 2007); and "woman enough to take these attacks like a man" (R. Marcus, 2007).

Likewise, op-ed writer Maureen Dowd went to the extent of saying that Clinton's "off-putting qualities, [e.g.,] her opportunism, her triangulation, her ethical corner-cutting, her shifting convictions from pro-war to anti-war, her secrecy, her ruthlessness—are the same ones that make people willing to vote for a woman" (Dowd, 2007). The author, however, offered no evidence to back up such a statement, nor did she explain why these qualities are off-putting when it comes to Hillary Clinton. Add to that gratuitous advice from the likes of Anna Wintour, the editor of *Vogue*, who said the then-Senator from New York "should loosen up and stop dressing like a man" (Trebay, 2008) if she wanted to win the race.

Despite comments like these, the media discussion kept bringing up the fact that Clinton's shortcomings did not have to do with her gender, but her persona. "Clinton is a creature of her husband" (Richard Cohen, 2008b), the argument went, "a baggage . . . she'll be stuck with . . . the rest of the way" (Robinson, 2008b). Once again, voters expressed their discomfort with this particular female candidate: "I'd like to vote for a woman, but not the woman we have running" (Slevin & Lydersen, 2008). At best, she and her husband were one and the same—or, as it is referenced multiple times, "Billary" (King, 2008)—and at worst, she was "an inferior byproduct of her husband and somehow responsible for her husband's sins" (Senkowski, 2008). Likewise, her "political success can be traced to sympathy stemming form her husband's affair with

Monica Lewinsky" (Kurtz, 2008a). Further, one letter writer argued that Clinton's "burden" was not her sex, but her husband, just like it was for Al Gore (Gruber, 2008).

Her sex may have not been a burden, then, but her gender was clearly a defining characteristic of the candidate, who was constantly framed in terms of how womanlike—or un-womanlike—she was. Thus, *Time* magazine's James Carney reported,

> Hillary Clinton is often compared with the conniving Lady Macbeth (by her enemies) or with the fierce and nurturing Roman goddess Juno (by her supporters). But these days she feels most like Cassandra, desperate to make the case for why she is staying in the race for the Democratic nomination. (Carney, 2008)

The gendered lens by which Clinton's image and demeanor were presented is further exemplified with an incident at Obama's former church. A priest had to apologize for his invited sermon in which he intended to expose white entitlement, and "mimic[ked] a tearful [Clinton]" (Harris, 2008) who was "weeping over 'a black man stealing my show'" (Murray & Harris, 2008), mocking once again the fact that when upset or trying to get their way, women end up crying. A parody of the Philadelphia debate in *The New York Times* also had her "weeping quietly" (Brooks, 2007).[35]

The media discourse also allowed for criticism of how the coverage presented the female candidate. As *The Washington Post*'s Richard Cohen wrote in an op-ed piece, "this person [Clinton] of no mean achievement has been witchified, turned into a

---

[35] Columnist Maureen Dowd cited a few lines from Spencer Tracy in Adams's Rib: "Here we go again, the old juice. Guaranteed heart melter. A few female tears, stronger than any acid" (Dowd, 2008b).

shrew, so that almost any remark of hers is instantly interpreted as sinister and ugly" (Richard Cohen, 2008a). Another author from the *Post* stated that her own interest in Clinton's campaign went up "every time someone on cable television called her a bitch or a pimp" (Hirshman, 2008).

One of the main strategies in the media discourse to address Clinton's emotional management consisted of descriptions rich in qualifiers—especially adverbs—and hyperbole, marking Clinton's demeanor apart from that of other politicians. Thus, Clinton was not only calculating or ambitious but was "*perpetually* calculating, triangulating and cold" (Klein, 2007b), "*radically* liberal, *ruthlessly* ambitious, or *ethically* compromised" (Kurtz, 2007), "*too* politically polarizing" (Balz, 2007b), "*too* negative" (Penn, 2008), "*too* cautious" (Ponnuru, 2008), "*too* elliptical" (Poniewozik, 2008), "*too* careful and calculating in this campaign" (Klein, 2007b), but only "smart *enough*" (Healy, 2007a). Similarly, she was described as "*characteristically* measured and *noticeably* upbeat" (Kornblut, 2008a), "*normally* disciplined" (Broder, 2008b), and having the "presumed ability to work long hours" (Richard Cohen, 2008b). She also had "*outbursts*" and threw "*angry* claims" (NBC, 2008b), appeared to be "*relentlessly* cheery going door-to-door with her daughter" (ABC, 2008d), and sometimes looked "*determinedly* cheerful [and] *remarkably* perky" (G. Collins, 2008c). This kind of language strategy was rarely present to refer to Obama, and non-existent in the Chilean media discourse. These words served to mark Clinton as different and highlight her performance. They also convey a sense that everything she did had special connotations or ulterior motives.

Within the frame of charm trumping skills, the so-called Bachelet effect—a moniker for her charisma and empathic connection with the polity—seemed to puzzle a wide array of analysts in the media, who could not explain why the former Minister of Defense was so popular, even when her credentials did not seem outstanding. Indeed, it would seem that Bachelet was "protected by a magic aura, enticing to the public and confusing to her opponents" (Cortés, 2005), but according to a *Qué Pasa* analyst, rather than a mystical phenomenon, "what the public notices is Bachelet's natural earthiness, her total lack of pomposity, her distance from the 'sacred' political rituals, her comfort with the informal, her simple and normally relaxed treatment of problems" (Cortés, 2005).

Bachelet herself insisted she was "not a traditional candidate" ("Lavín apunta a Lagos," 2005)—arguably, to project seriousness and credibility—an image that Piñera tried to undermine by returning to the basics of politics—stump speech and ideas— while "reinforcing his own image of somebody that could govern the country" ("Piñera activa estrategia para arrebatar voto popular a Lavín," 2005). More so, by the end of the Chilean campaign and in the days leading up to the election, the appeal of Bachelet among voters was once again at the center of debate, with messages that her candidacy marked a new era in the country, reinforcing the idea that she was "an atypical nominee" which prevailed until the end of the campaign (e.g., "Bachelet, la abanderada atípica de la coalición," 2005). She was breaking every mold of traditional politics not only because of her gender and newcomer status in politics, but as a victim of Pinochet's right-wing dictatorship who had successfully moved on from any bitterness

and ill will. Thus, she was described as "the image of all of us who suffered even the indescribable during the dictatorship, learned in pain and banished the bitterness" (E. Correa, 2005).

In contrast, Hillary Clinton's problem is that she was polarizing *because* of her "political savvy" (Nagourney & Bumiller, 2007). Her political strength and acumen, while acknowledged, were considered actually detrimental, a remnant of old politics, to the extent that "she became a caricature: too smart, too strong, too assertive, too rational, too competent" (Wilson, 2008). *Time*'s Joe Klein at least admitted that it was "hard not to admire the sheer pellucid quality of her intelligence" (Klein, 2007b)—but that may not have been enough to get her to the White House as her political machine and record opened the door to "question her credibility" (ABC, 2007c). For instance, John Edwards accused her of not being "straight" and lacking "consistency" (Kornblut & Balz, 2007b). While *The Washington Post* acknowledged that such portrayals of Clinton had a lot to do with a "pre-existing caricature—one that she is both secretive and calculating in her quest to win" (Kornblut & Balz, 2007a), they did little to dismiss the notion that this politician was "scary," as RNC chairman Mike Duncan called her in that piece.

After the Philadelphia debate—and her first major campaign setback—she may have found "herself a bit on the defensive" (ABC, 2007c), after enduring "relentless jabs [that] struck a nerve" (ABC, 2007c). This is, Clinton was/became vulnerable because of the apprehension she generated among voters—never mind that such a tough person would not melt in a crisis. She was also presented as "disingenuous" and thus,

lacking the proper judgment for enabling Bush's Iraq invasion (Nagourney & Bumiller, 2007), to the point that she had "defend[ed the] indefensible" and showing quite "a spine of steel to stand up on national television and explain why it was a good idea to vote for a bellicose Senate resolution on Iran" (G. Collins, 2007).

Along the lines of the Bachelet phenomenon, several discursive constructions posited that Bachelet's charming personality satisfied the media need for likeable and amiable characters, to the extent that her popularity and her campaign were considered a media product for the masses—appealing and content-light. For instance, on the eve of the Concertación debate, it was expected that Bachelet "would appeal to media conditions" ("Alvear busca acortar ventaja de Bachelet," 2005), as she was "aware that this is her strength" and what "gives her an ample lead in the polls" (Arthur, 2005b). She was not even that "ambitious" about the debate—indeed, the consensus was that she lacked assertiveness and avoided being specific in her proposals (e.g. Valdés & Lob, 2005). Thus,

> Bachelet bases her popularity on the sentiments and empathetic attraction she arouses in a significant part of the voting public. Her photogenic leadership is not based on her oral capabilities nor in a demagogic seduction of the masses after a given ideological project, nor even in the offer of substantive change in the material conditions of a significant part of the population, but in the approachability and warmth she gives off. (Dockendorff, 2005)

Further, "there is an emotional phenomenon (surrounding Bachelet) that is very difficult to explain. There is an emotional commitment, but it's a media event that could collapse" (Arthur, 2005b). The argument seemed to be that she was a great media

phenomenon—appealing to the masses on sheer likeability and warmth. Bachelet "is so successfully charming that even [suggesting raising taxes] seems like a good idea [coming from her]" (D. Gallagher, 2005a).

And yet, there were a few accounts that acknowledged that such an interpretation was a too-simple way to frame Bachelet's appeal to voters: In the words of one of her campaign advisers,

> [Bachelet] has a spontaneity that is in tune with what it happening in Chile. It bothers me a lot that people say it's because of her likeability, although she also is very likeable. It seems unfair to me to attribute her success to her empathy." (R. Correa, 2005e)

Far from being a media favorite, the majority of the discourse on Clinton revolved around the attention contenders, voters, analysts and experts put on how she acted (but not necessarily what she said). Everybody talked about how Clinton was seen and perceived, her image, her character, and her demeanor, and how being a public person did not go well with her private and rather secretive personality. The argument was that she was too private for a person in the public arena, and in addition, one that did not fit the mold for females. Her being a cold, ambitious and strong woman translated, in the eyes of the media, into a phony person, with questionable integrity and a penchant for secrecy.

Clinton and Clinton's performance was under everybody's microscope. While research suggests that female politicians are usually the subject of much media attention just because of their gender, the media discourse regarding Clinton tended to stress that

the over-analysis of her persona was just a part of the process. Thus, the media's scrutiny was an "expected up-close-and-personal attention" (Balz, 2007b), with a media-vetting process "appropriately . . . front and center in this campaign" (Klein, 2007a). Not surprisingly, then, any reaction from her gave way to detailed description, as an incident in December where reportedly Clinton "was furious: She did not yell, but her voice, serious and deep, bristled with irritation over how things were going for her in Iowa" (Baker & Kornblut, 2008).

While in the minority, a few accounts in the discourse questioned the treatment the media gave to Clinton. For example, John McCain, the Republican candidate, argued that the press was not entirely fair to her: "The media often overlooked how compassionately she spoke to the concerns and dreams of millions of Americans, and she deserves a lot more appreciation than she sometimes received," McCain said (Cooper, 2008). *Washington Post*'s op-ed contributor Ana Marie Cox argued that everything Clinton did was second-guessed in the media—a dominant frame in the campaign coverage analyzed:

> If she cried, surely it was because her campaign had focus-grouped the tears. If she exaggerated sniper fire, it was only because she thought she could get away with it . . . Few commentators allowed that she might be motivated by something as human as pride or as simple as unfounded optimism. (Cox, 2008)

By late March 2008, amidst the calls from the media and the Democratic leaders for Clinton to just "go away" (G. Collins, 2008a) and "surrender already" (Dowd, 2008e), Clinton's comments that she had to dodge sniper fire while landing at the Tuzla

177

airport in Bosnia in the mid 1990s was presented as the epitome of how desperate she was and how conniving the former First Lady could get in order to get votes. She eventually apologized, with "Clinton sheepishly admitting that she 'misspoke' after archived CBS News footage showed her calmly walking off the plane with her daughter, Chelsea, then a teenager, at an arrival ceremony that offered no sign of gunfire" (Akers & Kane, 2008b). However, "Clinton's fairy tale" (Rich, 2008b) "raised serious questions not just about the rationale" of such statement, "but also about her willingness to adhere to the truth" (Milbank, 2008e).

As such, the idea that she was unapologetically fake and phony permeated the discourse about her campaigning and her presidential bid. More troublesome was the implication in the media texts that she really, really wanted to win the nomination, to the point that her ambition impaired her judgment. "Her campaign gives the impression of being wiling to do anything it takes—anything—to win the nomination," said opinion writer Eugene Robinson in *The Washington Post* (2008a). Robinson added that "Hillary Clinton is a brilliant woman whose many exemplary qualities are obscured by a campaign that fights as if it couldn't care less about collateral damage it might inflict," and reminded the candidate that what "people want this time is a real person, rather than an image or a strategy" (Robinson, 2008a). Clinton "made up the Bosnian sniper fire in an attempt to show that she [was] tougher than Barack Obama" (Roger Cohen, 2008)— but the incident clearly backfired. The claims about the sniper fire not only showed how far she was willing to go to get elected, "but also how her view of United States policy has been colored by her run of the presidency" (Heyman, 2008). Frank Rich, op-ed

178

writer for *The New York Times* posited that this was perplexing, and questioned "why would so smart a candidate play political Russian roulette with virtually all the bullet chambers loaded?" (Rich, 2008b). The answer, in the media discourse, was that in her quest for the Oval Office, Clinton stopped thinking altogether. The judgment issue was also brought up when stressing that while married to a former president, she had to "assure voters that she would exercise her own judgment if elected" (Kornblut, 2007c)—as prone to error as that (female) judgment could have been.

Bachelet may have relied—perhaps too much—on her empathy and may have been considered a bleeding heart, but her soft demeanor fit the rhetoric of control whereas emotions, even when expressed, are contained. This is, Bachelet was always smiling, but did not laugh stridently; she could get serious, but not overly severe or dense; and she could be upset, but did not have outbursts or breakdowns. More interestingly, her most emotional moments throughout the campaign were for the most part mentioned in passing—if mentioned at all. The Chilean media discourse tended to forgo analyzing specific displays of emotions by Bachelet. One such moment was on the eve of the Bachelet's final campaign rally, when a bus full with supporters had an accident and fell off of a bridge outside Santiago. Bachelet went to the accident site, where she saw the wreck by the river bed and cried at the sight. While labeled as an emotional response, the media paid little attention to Bachelet's reaction and barely mentioned her crying. The television newscasts did not include footage of her tears, and in all the print media, only two photos showed, from afar, Bachelet crying or being consoled by an aide.

179

Further, *El Mercurio*'s account of the accident mentioned close to the end of the story that Bachelet went to the site and "cried when she saw the victims' bodies." The only additional text on the subject is a quote of Bachelet herself: "I can only say that I'm heartbroken" (Águila, 2005a). This particular story had no photo and did not expand on Bachelet's spirits. Another story in the same newspaper had a photo of Bachelet hugging someone with a caption reading "Bachelet's pain: As she arrives at the scene of a tragedy, the candidate for the Concertación cannot contain her grief" ("Presidenciables solidarizan con candidata," 2005). In *La Tercera*, the story mentioned at the very end that "in the river bed she saw the bodies and wept disconsolately, hugging the mayor of [the suburban town of] Buin . . . and her aide" ("Bachelet suspende cierre de campaña tras fatal accidente de partidarios," 2005). A sidebar recounted again that at the site of the accident, "the candidate—emotional—saw the bodies covered with blankets" ("Bachelet suspende cierre de campaña tras fatal accidente de partidarios," 2005). The next day, "sadness and agitation seized . . . the presidential candidate while visiting those injured in the accident" and "visibly affected, Bachelet said 'we are all very sad and focused on supporting the families of the injured and dead'" (Águila, 2005b). She even ran into her mother at the hospital and "visibly affected, they greeted each other and hugged" (Donoso, 2005b). Later that day, attending the wake of one of the victims, "the candidate experienced one of the most difficult moments of the day when she broke into tears while greeting the parents and wife of the late driver" (Águila, 2005b).

That was all the extent of the discourse about her response to the events of the accident, with just briefs references—in simple, few-word terms—to her emotional displays. Admittedly, while the expression of sorrow is comprehensible given the circumstances, the lack of commentary seems to suggest that it was not deemed newsworthy. The Chilean press did not make a deal of it. More so, none of the newscasts included footage of these displays and focused, for the most part, on the safety of highways and the final campaigning efforts of all the candidates. There is was no question regarding the authenticity of her tears, no discussion about the seeming frailty of a woman faced with adversity and emotion, or how this could have been interpreted as another sign of women's weakness in times of crises.

The situation with Clinton was quite different. The "Hillary moment" in New Hampshire was deemed as a "breakthrough" (Healy & Cooper, 2008), something the candidate herself acknowledged when she said, "I felt like we all spoke from our hearts, and I am so gratified you responded" (Healy & Cooper, 2008). The moment was also framed as a sign of the expected fatigue the candidates have to endure while on the campaign trail. In the words of an ABC anchor, "Senator Clinton gave indication of just how much fatigue and emotion plays into running for president" (ABC, 2008e), but also it is when the candidates are "tired [and] under great stress . . . when desperation can seep into the process" (NBC, 2008c).

A few commentators jumped in her favor and suggested that the "rare" moment "when raw humanity flashed across Clinton's face" explained why she was running (Givhan, 2008). Yet, TV critic Alessandra Stanley posited that it was "startling because

it was so out of character" and considered "disconcerting" that *The Daily Show*'s Jon Stewart did not even "make fun of her" (Stanley, 2008b)—as if a Clinton speaking from her heart were something to joke and laugh about.

The incident was also compared to other campaign-breaking incidents, such as "the tearful meltdown" of Edward Muskie in 1972, Dean Howard's "high-pitched ramble" in 2004 (Leibovich, 2008c), or Pat Shroeder's emotional departure from the 1988 Democratic race (Kornblut, 2008d). By lumping these events together—even though her display "fell well short" of those (Kornblut, 2008d)—they were given the same level of importance and gravity, as well as assuming the same negative effects they were attributed with, rather than focusing on what could also be explained as the consequences of the strain of days of campaigning. While a handful of media reports emphasized that Clinton choked up and her voice cracked, but nothing else (e.g., "in fact, she had not cried, but choked up," Baker & Kornblut, 2008), most of them referred to it as a moment involving tears—plural—and crying, despite Clinton not dropping a single tear. From a moment of "tearful emotion [where there were] not crocodile tears, but real ones" (Givhan, 2008) and the "Obama campaign . . . watched [the women's vote] slip away in the track of her tears" (Dowd, 2008b). While *Washington Post* reporter Anne E. Kornblut stressed that "her eyes appeared to well with tears," others mentioned her "teary-eyed confession" (Weisman & Kane, 2008; also Steinheuser, 2008), how she "welled with tears" (Healy, 2008d), or how she broke "the no-tears rule" of campaigning (Steinem, 2008) with "her tears flowing" down her face (Klein, 2008b). Her supporters "saw those tears" (Powell, 2008d) and Maureen Dowd

wondered whether Clinton could "cry her way back to the White House" (Dowd, 2008b). Yet, as one expert explained, "What I heard was that Hillary broke down and cried, but when I watched it on YouTube she wasn't really crying. It had already been exaggerated." (Carey, 2008).

Not surprisingly, it was stressed that "reporters scrambled to assess whether it was a true human moment or a calculated one designed to create a connection with voters" (Kornblut, 2008d), with conservative pundits arguing that Clinton "had contrived her breaking voice and moist eyes" (Weisman & Kane, 2008). Indeed, the incident was described as so out of character that reporters wondered "why was Mrs. Clinton finally letting her guard down" and whether this had been "a spontaneous outburst or a calculated show" (Kantor, 2008a). Further, she was accused of using "her gender to win sympathy" (Kantor, 2008a). Conventional wisdom, it seems, has women relying on tears to get away with their whims, and an unidentified reporter was quoted saying that "crying doesn't usually work in campaigns. Only in relationships" (Dowd, 2008b).

Above all, Bachelet was presented as an emphatic, charismatic, content-empty but emotional laden person, spontaneous and authentic. In the debates, she was expected to show that she "is a caring woman, who understands and listens, who wants a new style of government where the fundamental actors are the people" (Canal 13, 2005a). But concerns of whether she had what it takes to run the nation were often accompanied by a gendered lens that even criticized her sartorial style for not helping her to convey an air of authority. In the words of a fashion critic, during the

183

Concertación debate Bachelet "appeared uncomfortable in that jacket and style . . . It's a friendly look, but not a mark of authority" (J. L. Salinas, 2005). On that occasion, Bachelet "managed to maintain contact with the public, but she made errors that a seasoned politician [like the other contenders] will not excuse . . . suggesting a leadership less effective than what she has shown until now" (Peña, 2005b). Further, "for a person who wants to be president, these weaknesses are noted" (Peña, 2005b). By not projecting "an image that she is in control of the situation" ("Un debate al que le faltó calidad," 2005), she was not looking very presidential.

In August 2005, during a forum on the role of mass media that included all four presidential candidates, the question of Bachelet's leadership skills became the center of the campaign coverage. Historian Alfredo Jocelyn-Holt attended the forum and asked Bachelet to convince him that she was not—as he had come to conclude—just a media product that lacked any political weight and substance. Around those days, new polls showed that Bachelet had lost her absolute majority and that a runoff election was likely, further fostering debate of whether she had what it takes to get elected and be a president.

Jocelyn-Holt recounted the exchange in most news outlets. The historian questioned her ability to be levelheaded, as according to him,

> She [Bachelet] responds angrily and her chin trembles. And it's serious, because it shows she isn't experienced, that as a politician she's not levelheaded enough. I ask myself how many more times as president she is going to get upset. If Mrs. Thatcher had been asked a similar question, she would have responded with more skill and intelligence. (Alam, 2005)

184

While Jocelyn-Holt insisted that his questioning had nothing to do with Bachelet's gender, he went on to say he did not understand why Bachelet's camp reacted with "so much hysteria" to his prodding—using a very derisive term when it comes to women's reactions. In his view, Bachelet did not answer his legitimate question, and considered "unacceptable that in a supposedly pluralist society, profound questions are evaded with easy, emotional outs, with personal attacks on those who express them face to face" (Jocelyn-Holt, 2005). Along those lines, the warning was that emotional appeals may have been an easy way to attract voters, but it was not good enough for much else. Thus, "there is nothing easier to sell, and nothing more attractive or irresistible than emotions. A phrase said with emotion, even if it is the height of stupidity, can conquer almost all the world" (Villegas, 2005). For Bachelet, playing the emotional card may have favored her appeal to voters, but several pundits questioned if this approach was stable and bulletproof. Thus, "clearly her advantage is with her spontaneity and her empathy with voters . . . but at the moment to elect a president, voters want clear and strong proposals more than vagueness" (Beyer, 2005). The argument here was that emotional appeals were not necessarily the best, even though it may have seemed an easy approach to guarantee her victory.

In the words of a letter to the editor, "The questions arisen by Bachelet becoming the next president are not capricious" (Dockendorff, 2005), and thus, the argument went, the citizenry should really ponder if good rapport makes for a good president. This reader also wondered whether these candidates without much experience could consolidate stable levels of support. "At what point do individual aptitudes and

capacities come into play if the emotional reaction aroused by this or that candidate takes precedent for citizens, and therefore, their vote?" he asked (Dockendorff, 2005)

The problem seemed to be that she did not look commanding or as somebody who embodied authority. Cited in *El Mercurio,* political analyst Martín Rodríguez explained,

Bachelet went with a popular support associated with her contribution to political life and the valued attributes of her approachability, her emotionality.

However, over time, Piñera managed to re-validate traditional political attributes, those that are masculine: he embodies the idea of a statesman, more authoritarian.

> As a consequence, part of Bachelet's decline can be explained because people are asking now from her things that were not asked for before; she is asks for the ability to command, for example. (Aravena & Molina, 2005)

This explanation was one of the main arguments from Piñera's campaign to stress that Bachelet did not have what it takes to be president—an argument that was not questioned or delegitimized by the media discourse. Take the following example:

> "[Bachelet] has staked her entire candidacy on showing herself as a warm and welcoming person. "And as the election nears, the people are demanding a presidential candidate with leadership, character, conduct. And it's evident that Michelle Bachelet doesn't have it," said [Piñera's campaign strategist] Rodrigo Hinzpeter. (Aravena & Molina, 2005)

Yet, things seemed quite different to foreigners writing op-ed pieces. One of them argued that that "Chile cultivates an anti-charisma" and that Bachelet "seems as

186

though she were making a deliberate effort to dispense drops of charisma, as if a crazy police officer had a gun to her head and was warning 'beware captivating the audience'" (Vargas Llosa, 2005).

With Clinton, her shortcomings had to do with the lack of charm. She was cast as "the hardworking one, the one who prepares for debates, the one who gets by on grit and a good sense rather than charm" (Ignatius, 2008). Such portrayals gave way to commentaries regarding where those attributes fit better. *Washington Post* op-ed writer Richard Cohen said that everything about Clinton, like "her experience, her indomitability, her presumed ability to work long hours," suggested that "she would make a swell chief of staff, not a great—not merely competent—president" (Richard Cohen, 2008b). The fact that she was breaking the mold for stereotypically female behavior did not help. Commentary by the end of the race stressed that Clinton's campaign may have answered whether "a woman could really serve as commander in chief" ("'We will make history together,'" 2008), but "her campaign didn't resolve whether a woman who seems tough enough to run the military can also seem likable enough to get elected" (G. Collins, 2008b). Similarly, in *The New York Times*, another critic commented, "When Mrs. Clinton made points forcefully, people called her shrill, not bold and determined. When Mitt Romney teared up, he was described as compassionate, while she was labeled weak" (Whitman, 2008).

Admittedly, much of the criticism in the media discourse was in the eye of the beholder, and what may have looked as confidence and self-assurance to one person may look like arrogance and bigheadedness for another. For example, while Clinton

cast herself as very determined, others saw her as aggressive and controlling. Similarly, reporters noted that Clinton said "she wasn't angry at the [Iowa] debate" when she forcefully replied to several jabs at her, "but passionate" (ABC, 2008d). However, these reporters did not follow that up with any source reinforcing that interpretation, just moving on to question whether what she did "is enough" for her to reverse the course of the campaign (ABC, 2008d).

The way Clinton conducted herself during the campaign, the argument went, did not help to improve her image. In the words of columnist Richard Cohen in *The Washington Post*,

> The incessant exaggerations, the cheap shots, the flights into hallucinatory history—that sniper fire in Bosnia, for instance—have turned her into a caricature of what her caricaturists long claimed she already was. In this campaign, Clinton has managed to come across as a hungry hack, a Janus looking both forward and backward and seeming to stand for nothing except winning. (Richard Cohen, 2008a)

Both women showed the strain of the campaign by the end of the race. Bachelet, who tried to convey more substance, started to have "a serious and measured performance, albeit somewhat standoffish . . . However, this moved her away from the sympathy that has won her popular support" ("Debate: la encrucijada del modelo... y del país," 2005). Occasionally the media discourse stressed that the Bachelet phenomenon lost some of its steam, albeit not fully bursting its bubble. As one op-ed writer said, "I found her quiet and I saw a certain nostalgia in her eyes. For her shyness, her

nervousness, were clear. . . she has deflated. Like disappointment were emanating from her words" (Black, 2005).

Right before the second presidential debate in Chile, a new poll by one of the most reputable opinion research companies in the country, revealed that Bachelet standing was dropping and even more, that in the eventuality of a run-off election, she could lose the election. Her attributes also took a dive amid questions regarding why she, the natural heiress of then President Lagos, could not generate the same support that Lagos had—by then, he had close to 70% of approval ratings.

The results from the CEP poll showed that Bachelet still had the majority of approval and vote intention, but the stories were framed in such a way that her candidacy was portrayed as severely at risk and showing "troublesome signs" (C. Salinas, 2005e). If anything, the results from the poll were used as evidence of the causal relationship that equated likeability to vote intention.

Her soft demeanor, rather than qualities, is what seemed to inform these concerns. For instance, political analyst Harald Beyer stressed,

> [It is] the characteristics of her leadership, which to many voters can give the feeling that she is not strong enough to confront complicated matters. In fact, in the latest CEP poll her major weaknesses are her "capacity to make difficult decisions' and 'strength to confront pressures." ("¿Lagos opaca o fortalece a Bachelet?," 2005)

If Bachelet lost her steam, Clinton endured the long race for the Democratic nomination by becoming more relaxed and more carefree, as well as more in touch with her emotional side. Indeed, while visiting the Yale Child Study Center, Clinton had

189

another emotional moment, although not nearly as discussed as the incident in the New Hampshire diner. However, it was enough for her to "show her emotions in New Haven" (Kornblut & Shear, 2008b). She was also aware of the consequences of this kind of displays, as she "raised her left hand to her cheek and brushed something away with her finger. 'I said I would not tear up', she said," (Healy, 2008b). She also was portrayed as more relaxed, as when "she bopped her head and clapped with the music" in a New York rally (Milbank, 2008a).

In a few isolated cases, media accounts did acknowledge that Clinton quitting would have been out of character. "She may irritate people," said *New York Times*' columnist Gail Collins, "but she never gives up" (G. Collins, 2008a). Indeed, she "vowed not to quit" (NBC, 2008h), in an indication of resilience that bordered on cockiness, as when she commented smiling and winking that she happened to like long movies. (ABC, 2008k). Her attitude, in the words of an adviser, is explained in that "she could accept losing [but] she could not accept quitting" (Kaiser, 2008), and while no one believed "Clinton was really having fun at the end of this grueling campaign . . . she bowed out with grace" (ABC, 2008m).

However, for all the bitter feuding in the Democratic party, she visibly relaxed once the final outcome neared. In San Juan, Puerto Rico, she got "downright goofy at times" with a "decidedly improvisational, nothing-to-lose feel" (Leibovich, 2008b). If at the beginning of the race "Clinton kept her guard and kept reporters at arm's length" (ABC, 2008m), eventually she became "more outgoing with voters and the press" (ABC, 2008m). In the words of Gov. Edward G, Rendell of Pennsylvania, "in the last

three months she just relaxed and let it rip [becoming] a happy warrior and people responded to it" (Baker & Rutenberg, 2008). Moreover, she "learned how to be at ease with the working-class, and these people ended up being the throbbing heart of every speech for a candidate who, in the beginning, rarely showed any heart at all" (Klein, 2008a). Further, one of the greatest revelations of the Democratic primary race was "how Hillary found her political soul during the campaign" (Stengel, 2008)—as if she did not have one before running for the nomination.

These discourses also stressed that the criticism Clinton endured was not a gender issue. They also insisted that in order to win, Clinton needed the women's vote, and may have needed to appeal to them on emotional terms, and for instance "her strongest and most emotional appeal yet," was at Wellesley College, Clinton's alma mater (NBC, 2008b) These discursive constructions also suggested—or at least attributed to others the accusation—that she was "playing the gender card" in this battle (ABC, 2007d; NBC, 2007e; R. Marcus, 2007) with men "piling on her" (NBC, 2007e), which was supposedly a setback for female politicians and feminists (R. Marcus, 2007), all the while "she couldn't [give] a manly yes or no answer" to a question about giving driver's licenses to undocumented immigrants (G. Collins, 2007).

The conclusion was that Clinton, even as a "strong and a credible female candidate" (ABC, 2007b), could not really "win over the nation" (ABC, 2007a). She had become a "polarizing force" (NBC, 2007a). Indeed, she was "the most polarizing Democrat" (Will, 2008a) and "a lighting rod for negative feelings across both parties" (Magid, 2008), "evasive" and not "trustworthy" (NBC, 2007d). "Her negatives were so

high" (Greenhouse, 2007) that she was not electable—regardless of the fact that she got almost 18 million votes during the democratic primaries.

The discourse also contended that Clinton paled in comparison to Barack Obama or her own husband. Indeed, Sen. Robert Menendez was quoted in *The Washington Post* admitting that "put up against Obama [was not] a juxtaposition that benefits Hillary very well" (Kornblut, Weisman & Kane, 2008), while *Time*'s Joe Klein argued that Clinton may have been trailblazing the road for female politicians, but she was not "nearly as charming as her husband and seemed way tougher" (Klein, 2007b).

Bachelet was the target of a similar critique issued by another presidential contender, Joaquín Lavín, who argued that while Bachelet had "many qualities, like her empathy and congeniality, but did not have the leadership gravitas of [then president] Ricardo Lagos" (Herrera, 2005). Analysts argued that this may have to do with machismo, but even her advisers admitted that "matters like the border conflict with Peru—when voters sense a fight they tend to look for strength and security, culturally masculine traits—don't help her" (Montes & Sepúlveda, 2005).

In both countries the mediated discourse occasionally included these kinds of references to conventional ideas of presidential figures. These messages stressed that what people may expect in a president and what the female candidates had to offer might not match, and offered different arguments about what makes a good government head.

Along the arguments and themes used to discuss the emotional management of both Michelle Bachelet and Hillary Clinton, the discourse also tapped into normative ideals of presidents and their behavior—often times within questions of whether Bachelet and Clinton *looked like* or *sounded like* presidential figures. Such discussion was more extensive in the U.S. media discourse than in the Chilean one. While the U.S. sample included more news stories, the proportion of news copy addressing notions of appropriate presidential-like behavior was higher than in the Chilean sample. Arguably, the fact that both Clinton and Obama represented a breakthrough in American politics—either a gender or a racial one—regardless of which candidate ended up being the Democratic nominee, fostered that discussion.

In the case of the Chilean media discourse, most of the arguments focused on the idea that Bachelet's soft demeanor did not fit entirely with Chilean citizens' notion of a president as someone in control and commanding. For instance, Bachelet's "feminine" leadership may have been described as one of her characteristics, but contenders and critics alike constantly criticized her as not being assertive enough. More so, when polls showed that less than a month before the elections the "evaluation of some of her abilities to solve some of the most important problems in the country" had dropped, while Piñera had "an important increase in both his personal qualities as well as his skills to deal with issues" ("Bachelet cae 6 puntos y suma de Piñera y Lavín la supera," 2005), several analysts explained that this had to do with Bachelet's lack of assertiveness, as more voters where seeing that for all her congeniality, she did not

convey authority and readiness as other candidates. Further, Bachelet's performance in several debates—nervous, sometimes confusing, making mistakes and giving contradictory answers—did not project "the image of someone in control of the situation, a fundamental characteristic in a regime so focused on the presidential figure as Chile's" ("Un debate al que le faltó calidad," 2005).

Indeed, another candidate, Joaquín Lavín, mentioned how then president Ricardo Lagos was known for being assertive and quite confrontational whenever there had been diplomatic issues at hand, and then went on to say that unlike Bachelet, he himself "better embodies the image that most Chileans have of what a president should be" (Valdés & Lob, 2005). Similarly, Bachelet's "advantage is with her spontaneity and her empathy with voters . . . but at the moment to elect a president, voters want clear and strong proposals more than vagueness" (Beyer, 2005).

Piñera being a successful businessman—one with experience managing several companies and businesses—sent a stronger image of control and assertiveness (e.g., D. Gallagher, 2005b). However, Piñera was also warned that "in addition to a stellar manager, Chileans want a president that can protect them and knows how to sympathize with their problems" (Navia, 2005a). Conversely, Piñera's critics say that he was an unpredictable character and that made him unelectable. "In a country that values stability and governability so much, he offers neither" (R. Correa, 2005b).

In any case, columnist Carlos Peña argued in *El Mercurio* that "politics is, sadly enough, not a merit contest" (Peña, 2005c). Analyst and columnist Fernando Villegas reminded in *Qué Pasa* that "the true politician has an aura of passion, of emotion than

enraptures crowds and wins hearts, because in politics there is nothing easier to sell, and nothing more attractive or irresistible than emotions" (Villegas, 2005).

In the case of the U.S. media discourse, even when the reporters did not seem to have a clear-cut idea of how a president should be or act, it is clear that at least Obama *looked like it.* As NBC said, his victory speech in Iowa "looked almost presidential," in "a marked contrast to the established old guard surrounding Hillary Clinton" (NBC, 2008a). The implication, thus, is that she did not look presidential. Above all, Obama spoke "like a leader" (Giarruso, 2008), and while he "looked and sounded . . . presidential he did not come across as tough," which Hillary did ("From across the ocean and across the street, all weigh in on the meaning of Iowa," 2008).

Similarly, Obama's speech on race, labeled as "a moment of truth" ("Moment of truth," 2008), a "treatise on faith, hope and charity" (Milloy, 2008), a "great meditation on race" (Krauthammer, 2008b), and "a blunt and personal speech" (Murray & Balz, 2008), was not only "quintessentially American" but in the same league as "speeches by Lyndon B. Johnson, John F. Kennedy and Abraham Lincoln" (Scott, 2008), once again illustrating that Obama at least *looked* and *sounded* presidential. As *The Washington Post* summarized, "it was the kind of speech Americans should expect of a presidential candidate or president" (Balz, 2008c): ambitious, lofty, gritty, honest and unnerving.

Moreover, Obama's "sort of quiet, unsolicited honesty" may not work "in our rude, noisy politics, but it certainly is far more presidential than the dodging and fudging that you get from most candidates" (Klein, 2007a). In *The New York Times*, President Kennedy's speechwriter Ted Sorensen stressed: "'The most important quality

for a president . . . is his [sic] qualities as a leader who can mobilize people, inspire them, galvanize them, arouse them to action" and because he had all of these abilities, "Obama [would] be a success as president" (Applebome, 2008b).

Indeed, Obama was "very good" and "very smooth" and had charisma," and thus if elected he would have the qualities "not only to win elections but to lead" (Weiserman, 2008a). Having confidence and being knowledgeable made him "a leader" in the eyes of voters (Stewart, 2008), and he had shown, "in one appearance after another, a capacity to make people feel good about their country again" (Herbert, 2008b).

While a minority of analysts argued that character does matter when it comes to presidential hopefuls (Broder, 2008b) and that both Clinton and Obama were "smart, appealing and politically gifted" (Herbert, 2008c), it was Clinton who made a mistake thinking that "this would be an election where experience would be the decisive factor" (Akers & Kane, 2007). According to political strategist Matthew Dowd, Americans reward "candidates who truly have a succinct, credible, authentic and passionate message" (quoted in Broader & Healy, 2007), and this time that candidate was Barack Obama, as he was "smart, hard-working, charismatic, good-looking and a whiz at fund-raising" (Herbert, 2008b).

Further, Obama fit the "dream of a cool, smart, elegant, reasonable, literary, witty, decent, 'West Wing' sort of president" (Dowd, 2008f)—never mind that such a president was a work of fiction. Conversely, Clinton may have come across as tough enough to be commander in chief despite being a woman ("'We will make history

together,'" 2008), but did not look presidential. For instance, "regardless of the excellent New Hampshire outcome for Mrs. Clinton, such a self-regarding emotional display is hardly the type of character trait one desires to see in a presidential candidate—man or woman" (Ruland, 2008), and "running for president is very much about presenting command and authority" (Nagourney, 2008a). Thus, "victimhood is not a sufficient criterion for being president" (Grossman, 2008).

The metacoverage of the campaigns admitted there was a little bit of Obamania in the media, with the Senator for Illinois as the "media's odds-on favorite"—even for the conservative media (Kurtz, 2008b)—and an acknowledgement that "the journalistic scrutiny usually visited on instant front-runners has been replaced by something akin to a standing ovation" (Kurtz, 2008b). However, there was little consideration of the fact that Clinton may not look or sound presidential because there has not ever been a female-looking president. That said, about a tenth of the stories analyzed did acknowledge the gendered lens used to evaluate those running for office. For instance, "not one male president seeking power gets called power hungry, and that is what you have to be to want to run for president. How come it is O.K. for a man but not a woman?" (Sewell, 2007).

More so, for all his qualities and presidentialness, Obama made mistakes throughout the race, as in his relationship with Rev. Jeremiah Wright. *New York Times* columnist Nicholas Kristof wondered how Obama "who seems so reasonable, should enjoy the company of Mr. Wright, who seems so militant, angry and threatening" (Kristof, 2008a), and another columnist posited how was it possible that "a man who

197

[had] made judgment the centerpiece of his presidential campaign [showed] so little of it in this matter" (Richard Cohen, 2008c). The candidate lacked judgment and "while he may not be a man who hates . . . he chose to walk with a man who does" (Gerson, 2008). The lesson here was that a president should know better.

Such considerations, however, ignored the fact that a woman running a viable campaign—and in the case of Chile, a successful one—changes the political game, thus requiring a shift in cultural notions of what a leader looks and sounds like, and what leadership entails.

Chapter 9. Discussion

The two cases studied here, Chile's Michelle Bachelet and the United States' Hillary Clinton, serve as a framework for an examination of female politicians' emotional attributes as portrayed in the news media. The discursive constructions in the media of these female candidates' shows of emotions while they tried to break the political glass ceiling inform public meanings of gendered motifs in the ascription of emotions and political leadership.

The mediated discourse analyzed in this dissertation suggests the media favor determined understandings for a woman's place and role, thus reinforcing socially-shared and culturally-bound meanings about gendered identities. Such findings are in line with past research that shows women politicians are viewed differently than their male counterparts. Furthermore, the comparative approach used in the study design reinforces the latency of sexism and the pervasiveness of gendered readings in the portrayal of candidates running for the highest office, supporting the idea that women are held up to cultural feminine ideals. At the same time, the findings show that gendered expectations operate differently in the United States and Chile.

This chapter offers a summary of the findings as well as an interpretation in light of a feminist theoretical perspective. It also discusses the implications of these findings from a comparative standpoint.

MICHELLE BACHELET: THE MELLOW BLEEDING HEART

Bachelet's soft demeanor and congenial personality was at the core of her portrayal in the Chilean media discourse. Described as charming, amiable and gentle, she was compared with a tender mother. A single mother of three, Bachelet compared running a country to running a household the way many homemakers—female and otherwise—do on a daily basis. Such attribution seemed to work in her favor, as polls stressed that voters favored her warmth and congeniality.

The rapport with the polity, however, seemed to puzzle some in the media, with discourses stressing that as charming and kind as Bachelet was, she had yet to exhibit consistent leadership skills or a resume reflecting enough experience for a position like that of president. Thus, one of the main arguments used in news media coverage was that "being nice" has nothing to do with "being presidential" and Bachelet needed to better combine her charisma with her platform if she really expected to get elected. From former presidents to pundits, the message articulated in Chilean media was that her charm and congeniality were to be considered a starting point, but not the main tool to hold the highest office.

More than criticism, this kind of argument was presented as a warning, calling citizens to beware of the alluring-but-untested Bachelet. She did not seem to offer guarantees of holding authority and commanding a whole country on her own. The call for caution, thus, was that her quiet and soft-spoken demeanor—typical feminine traits—may not serve the country best. That is, femininity does not seem to entail political efficacy.

200

That said, the media discourse also stressed that Bachelet's empathic and caring persona was authentic and not a performance aimed at getting votes. Her concern for other people's miseries, and her meek attitude, were in line with traditional gender roles that cast women as naturally non-aggressive and compassionate. This worked to her advantage, as she was deemed credible and trustworthy—even though some questioned her electability.

Her main male competitor, Sebastián Piñera, also exhibited gender-appropriate traits. Ambitious, confident, assertive and gutsy, the main argument against him becoming president was not a question of skills or his ability to convey authority, but the conflict of interests that may result from him being a prominent and multimillionaire businessman. However, he also was portrayed as too opportunistic and wily, too self-centered to always have the country's best interests at heart. This discourse, however, did not question Piñera's suitability for office, but whether he would always put the country's benefit above his own.

More importantly, the media discourses followed a gendered logic when portraying the candidates. The female candidate was presented as soft, light, and motherly, whereas the male candidate was a seasoned politician—assertive, authoritative and ambitious—as well as a non-nurturing breadwinner. Even if such portrayals were accurate—reflecting these candidates' actual demeanor—the discursive construction on which they were based tapped into gendered understandings. In other words, women *are supposed* to be caring and soft, and men *are expected* to be assertive and non-nurturing.

While the media discourse constantly warned that Bachelet would need to toughen up were she to become president, overall the way she was portrayed was rather favorable. The discussion about her emotional traits seldom went beyond a few attributed quotes and invited columns. Most of the analysis or interpretation of her persona focused on the idea that her charm trumped any skill or experience deficiency she might have had, but that did not transition into negative traits. For instance, Bachelet might have been deemed by some critics as too soft or emphatic, but she was not characterized as "being emotional," or "loosing control of her emotions." During the few moments in the campaign where she choked up or openly cried, the media discourse briefly mentioned that she had been visibly affected, but did not frame the debate in terms of Bachelet being overtaken by emotion.

In other words, Bachelet was granted the right to be emotional without people questioning her resolve. Arguably, the fact that these displays of contained emotions fit with her feminine character, which helped this favorable portrayal. Her emotional management served as a reinforcement that she was a woman, one that stayed within the boundaries of traditional female traits. This ultimately framed her as different—indeed, her gender was salient and evident for everyone—but not inherently inferior to a rational man.

HILLARY CLINTON: THE EMASCULATING ICE QUEEN

Clinton was defined as unsentimental and utterly emotionless, which ultimately made her unlikeable and unelectable. Instead of being an emoter, she was deemed an

android. The argument was that she was un-sensitive, and therefore unfeminine *and* inhuman, as if the only possibility for a woman to be human is by portraying traditional femininity—including "being emotional." By not being womanly, Clinton became a source of uneasiness for the media, and the media discourses were quick to point that her steeliness was highly damaging for her own presidential aspirations.

The fact that Clinton exhibited traditionally male emotional attributes—e.g., ambition, confidence, and aggressiveness—did not help her case, as she was described as disruptive and inappropriate. Thus, her whole persona was considered a challenge to society and such an alienating force that not even her own peers—other women—felt comfortable in her presence. Her coldness and "unfeminine" traits were seen as defining characteristics that conveyed neither femininity nor presidentialness. Her platform and credentials lost visibility amid the debate of how tough, distant and uninspiring she was.

Not surprisingly, then, the media discourse was constantly undermining and overanalyzing Clinton's every move, to the extent that everything she did was considered part of a calculated performance and scripted façade. This portrayal did not favor Clinton, who came off as resentful, harried and too sharp *for a woman*. Her mannerisms were subject to much media attention—as if they were relevant for the presidential office—and even fleeting moments like her so-called emotional moment in New Hampshire were deemed as both coldly calculating and wimpy.

The conflicting standards under which she was judged seemed impossible to anybody to live up to, and the widespread criticism in the mediated discourse further supported the idea that an ambitious woman bidding for the presidential office was out

of place. While there was some acknowledgement of the negative tone in the media coverage of Clinton—especially in op-ed pieces in *The Washington Post*—issues of sexism were mostly disregarded under the idea that the problem with Clinton was her off-putting persona and not her gender.

Clinton's emotional restraint did not fare well in comparison to Barack Obama, whose charisma and passionate approach wooed voters and the media alike. Cool and levelheaded, Obama managed to convey an enthusiastic message of hope and change that contrasted with the ultra-cold and pragmatic approach of Clinton. More importantly, he conveyed an authority and grit that according to media discourses were reminiscent of previous presidents. He might not have been a seasoned politician, but he *looked* and *sounded* presidential, and that made him a natural leader.

Gender roles seemed more stringent and pervasive in the U.S. media discourse than Chile. Clinton's distant demeanor was perceived as deviant and was thus fodder for several analyses and much interpretation discussing her personality; conversely the moments were she was "emotional" served as debate for her suitability for the job.

As such, Clinton was caricaturized and demonized for not complying with gendered expectations of how women should be. While Obama was described as unifying because of his race, Clinton was presented as alienating because of her sex. Even her better attributes (e.g., her intelligence, competence and political savvy) were deemed insufficient for the Oval Office. The commentary on Clinton and her presidential bid were not only quite critical, but also often personal and nasty, stressing the discomfort she generated by breaking the mold of politicians. Further, Clinton

choking-up briefly in New Hampshire served to mock her vulnerability and doubt her sincerity. The dilemma for Clinton ended up being that regardless of whether her emotional displays were genuine or political, she was in a no-win situation.

Thus, Clinton was not allowed to embrace the masculine virtues of toughness and resolve, despite their prevalence in the (male-dominated) political realm. Without a dose of hyper-feminine attributes, she was deemed unfeminine and polarizing, which informed a negative portrayal of Clinton as a lesser candidate in comparison with Obama.

THE QUESTION OF FEMININE LEADERSHIP

When running for office, does being a woman make a difference? The literature consistently has shown that female politicians are subject to gender-specific scrutiny and negative gender distinctions in the media. Scholars like Erika Falk (2008; 2009) have found that at least in the United States, the media promote the idea that women's emotionality makes them incompetent leaders, while others have argued that this would be a better and more peaceful world if more women lead nations (see Hoogensen & Soldheim, 2006; also see Woods, 1992, cited by Ross 2002).

When it comes to candidates' emotional management, this dissertation's findings show that the media discourses in two different countries defined male and female candidates as markedly different beings. Even when the messages were not presented with a gendered lens, the texts in the media constantly asserted that women bring a differential approach to politics, as they seem to have a different way to do all

205

things political in comparison to men, be it running a campaign, engaging citizens, dealing with conflict, or eventually being presidents. The ultimate message is that women in politics are indeed different.

Moreover, gender was an important common denominator in the way Bachelet and Clinton were portrayed, with different outcomes for each presidential hopeful. Thus, while for Chile's Michelle Bachelet being a woman did not hurt her presidential bid, in the case of Hillary Clinton being a woman did not help her any. This does not mean Clinton lost because she was a woman or that Bachelet succeeded in her quest because of her gender—such explanation goes beyond the scope of this dissertation— but in both cases their gender was a prominent schema used to appraise them. Gender was not the factor that made or broke the campaign in either country, but as these findings show, gender ideologies continue to play into the political process.[36] In Chile, gendered assumptions in the media discourse ended up benefiting Bachelet; in the United States, stringent gender roles were detrimental to Clinton's bid and added to the uphill battle that was the media discourse that insisted she was neither likeable nor electable. In other words, for Bachelet it was more socially acceptable to show feminine traits, like being kind, soft and emphatic, whereas for Clinton, the seeming failure to comply with socially desirable attitudes for women made her the target of mockery, distrust and gratuitous advice.

---

[36] Arguably many issues played into the campaign. Human interest on Obama and Bachelet —relative newcomers with appealing life stories— might have also informed in part the tone and type of coverage both candidates got. However, other candidates who could have benefit for such human-interest component, such as Chile´s Tomás Hirsch, did not receive much coverage, positive or otherwise.

Bachelet's soft demeanor and typically female but controlled expressivity reinforced her appeal to voters and prompted a positive media portrayal that stressed her empathy, congeniality and seemingly genuine concern for other people's miseries. However, and in line with Ross' (2002) argument, such messages construct women as intrinsically good and "naturally" more principled than men. The outcome of such beliefs is that women may be *too good* for entering the political arena.

Her leadership was deemed "feminine" and "light" and marked her as qualitatively different than those male contenders in the race. Her leadership was that of a tender mother and homemaker who nurtures her children to be the best they can be. She was likeable and charming, without stridency. When crying, as in the wake of the bus accident at the end of the campaign, she was described as "visibly affected" or that she could not "contain her grief," but there were no questions about her being vulnerable, frail or "emotional." More importantly, the media analysis ignored her display of emotions and both newspaper photos and television images forwent depicting the specific moments in which Bachelet cried, choked up or expressed sorrow or anger. Admittedly, it is possible that in an effort to avoid being considered misogynists the media opted to not discuss the topic, as it could be seen in bad taste to criticize a mourning and sad Bachelet. However, the fact that the option to not focus on these emotional displays was across the board in the Chilean news outlets analyzed suggests that rather than caution with a potentially conflictive issue, the media considered the whole thing not newsworthy—either because it fit with how women are supposed to act,

or because such displays from any person—male or female—were not considered out of the ordinary.

In the case of Hillary Clinton, her androgynous (at best) and un-womanly attitude permeated the media discourses and served as the main argument to dismiss and criticize her. Seen as a disruptive and polarizing force, her steely demeanor went against gendered expectations, which taps into the idea that women engaged in political affairs do not fit cultural expectations. The mostly negative portrayals of Clinton in the media discourse reinforced the idea that women do not really belong in politics, and if they are successful in that venture, they lose their femininity. Hillary Clinton's qualities were perceived as inappropriate for her gender, even if the same qualities—toughness, ambition, and strength—are expected in a leader. That is, a *male* leader.

Clinton's gender served as a condensing and defining symbol of who she was and what she did, including her emotional expression. Moreover, she faced a conundrum as her supposedly unsympathetic and heartless performance was at odds with gendered assumptions for femininity (and ultimately, humanity), but the moments she expressed more "feminine" emotions—i.e., she was "being" emotional—had her *overtaken* by emotion and *losing* control of herself. The very same woman that had enough strength of character for her and her husband suddenly could not take the heat. The overzealous scrutiny of Clinton's persona turned her into a caricature and put the spotlight on the personal rather than the public characteristics of the candidate. That set her apart from the other contenders and reinforced once again that this unwomanly woman was out of place running for president. Further, by focusing on her private

persona, the media discourse offered a narrow image of Clinton and upheld commonly assumed articulations. For instance, and regardless of how power-hungry and politically savvy Clinton was portrayed, she was seldom granted the right to display emotions outside of those expressed with tears.

The overall portrayal ended up reinforcing notions of "proper" roles for women, and Clinton fell so far outside the boundaries of acceptable demeanor and political involvement that columnists and reporters even deemed her laughter disturbing. And yet, despite the persistent trivialization of Clinton, the current Secretary of State got almost 18 million votes throughout the race.

In any case, the candidacies of Bachelet and Clinton put women's leadership in the spotlight. While only one of them succeeded in her presidential bid, both of them helped to shake cultural beliefs about what women can achieve in politics, and show that women can at least run viable campaigns.

CULTURALLY-SANCTIONED SEXISM

Gender is not biologically determined, but culturally constructed. As such, it functions as an organizing category that defines social identities. As shown in this analysis, gendered expectations also serve as a hegemonic force in society, telling women how they are supposed to act and perform in the public life. In this sense, many of the arguments articulated in the mediated discourse on Bachelet and Clinton were disturbing and offered a rich example of how restrictive a force gender can be in both Chile and the United States. These discourses also illustrate the importance of

considering interpretations of femininity and masculinity in electoral politics. The messages about the two main contenders in each country may sometimes be similar, but the attitudes behind them are not.

While in general Bachelet's stereotypically feminine demeanor lent itself for a favorable portrayal, the media discourses in Chile were not free of sexist articulations, albeit covertly. For a culture that holds women—particularly mothers—as the moral reserve of the country, openly attacking a female—especially one described as a tender mother—merely on grounds of her gender could be deemed in bad taste. Accordingly, sexist prejudices are presented in more subtle and indirect ways, with simplistic explanations that tapped into wide generalizations about men and women. For instance, contenders and critics argued that Bachelet did not embody the image that Chileans have of a president, but they fell short of saying that this image is supposed to be male. Similarly, the repeated argument that she needed to toughen up to convey authority or convince the polity that she would not be manipulated by (male) party officials underscored the idea that as a woman she was inherently weak, unable to handle crises, or easy to influence—all without explicitly saying so. In this context, it is not surprising that the historian that questioned Bachelet's credentials said she reacted "with so much hysteria" or that the source who said she was the kind of strong woman that men would not dare to ask out was an unidentified male.

Conversely, in the U.S. case, sexist arguments were more overt all the while accusations of gender biases were denied. For a country that had made important inroads in terms of gender equality, the relentless focus on Clinton's "off-putting"

persona portrayed her as an oddity and relied on stereotypes associated with females. For all the stress on her cold and heartless personality, the underlying assumption was that every woman *must* be compassionate and sentimental; and for all the commentaries about Clinton being too ambitious or too arrogant, the corollary is that she had these traits to a higher degree than it is desirable for any woman.

Likewise, one of the shots taken at Clinton was that she wanted power, as if a woman were not supposed to be openly seeking power. Indeed, the discursive constructions in the U.S. media advanced the idea that running for president is different for a woman. In line with the narrative identified by Vavrus (2002) in the coverage or women entering the political system, the widespread commentary on Clinton's personality and behavior marked her and all women as outsiders of the male norm of politics. Moreover, epithets as "castrating," "emasculating," and "scary" to refer to any woman are not only offensive, but also quite revealing of what was considered fitting to say to refer to Clinton. Such blatant gender prejudice also can be seen as the particular attributes desired in women in U.S. culture—political and otherwise.

GENDERED LENS AND NEWS CRITIQUE

Overall, the findings make clear that the discourse on the emotional management of candidates in Chile and the United States treats males and females differently and that gender becomes an important schema organizing meanings in the portrayal of the candidates. As such, this study offers a finer assessment of gendered media representations. The discursive constructions of the emotional management of

Bachelet and Clinton tended to ignore considerations of different leadership types, or the constricting force that gender stereotypes and assumptions impose in both women and men. In the two countries the mediated discourses favored an adherence to determined gender roles and neutralized women as valid actors on the political stage. Even in the case of Bachelet, with a mostly favorable portrayal, themes stressing that she was content-light and had congeniality as her main quality conveyed skepticism about the candidate's qualifications.

However, not everything was negative and some of the metacoverage of the campaign—this is, what the media said about themselves—critiqued the hostility that seeped into the content and the gendered lens used to portray the candidates. This kind of reflection was more common in the U.S. media, which is not surprising considering the more overt nature of the sexism conveyed in the media discourse, and the more analytical approach in the U.S. sample. For instance, *The Washington Post* admitted that Hillary Clinton generated reactions that were hard to explain or justify, *The New York Times* argued that Clinton and her eventual loss deserved to be treated with more dignity, and *Time* reminded that ambition is a necessary trait of anyone running for office.

That said, the language and context surrounding the discursive construction of women candidates' emotional management may eclipse the underlying outcome of these media representations: emotional displays in electoral politics are a catch-22 for women. As either newcomers or just rarities in the political realm, female politicians

stand out because of their gender and end up having to fulfill varied and often times contradictory expectations about being politicians and women.

Moreover, for all the debate about congeniality, ambition or reason, there is little consideration of the fact that none of these qualities alone win elections. While public discourse practices of emphasizing certain traits of female politicians appear normalized, the actual impact of such gendered coverage remains unknown.

MOVING FORWARD

This dissertation expands the current research literature as a first attempt to integrate cultural influences in the gendered understandings of candidates' emotional management. In doing so, this study sheds light on some forces restricting women's potency in the political realm. When messages in the media de-humanized a tough female to the point of portraying her as an android, or deeming a soft-spoken woman as unable to lead the whole country, the corollary is that women are better out of the realm of policy and politics. Even messages such as female leadership being content-light may seem a less obvious way to criticize a woman entering a male pursuit, but they are a critique nonetheless.

This study aimed to offer a more nuanced assessment of gendered media representations as an expression of cultural understandings and socially-shared meanings. Albeit the analysis focused on two very specific races and the findings could be idiosyncratic to the individuals or races under examination, this study is both grounded in theory and methodologically sound. While oversimplification and

misrepresentation of the findings is a possibility, the gendered assumptions embedded in the discursive constructions of candidates' emotionality are consistent with past feminist, political communication and cross-national research. All these lines of inquiry have found that women are not treated or judged equally to men. Moreover, the consistency of the arguments used in the media discourses in each country further cements the idea that the interaction between gender and emotional management is important when evaluating candidates. The fact that the analysis entailed a close reading of more than 1,600 media pieces also reinforces these findings.

The analysis here does not exhaust the topic. An examination of the effects of these discursive constructions of male and female politicians' emotionality begs further consideration. Evidence from the political communication literature has consistently found that media coverage does matter in electoral politics. Arguably, media portrayals as the one presented in chapter 8 have consequences in how voters see the candidates, but the exact outcomes of such media messages must be measured in order to confirm such media effects.

Moreover, complementation with other methods would also open other avenues of research. As stressed by Stroud and colleagues (2006), emotional displays by politicians are visibly identifiable and even quantifiable, which favors a quantitative approach for the emotional repertoire of candidates. Qualitative research, such as interviews, could tap into newsroom practices, editorial policies, and gatekeeping decisions that define the media contents informing the public discourse on candidates and women. Examination of other realms of mediated discourse—such as blogs,

entertainment media and advertising—also would provide a finer assessment of how communities and individuals make sense of emotions, gender, politics and social identities. An analysis of leadership traits in context, such as constraints and the decision-making environment, can be a helpful approach (see, for example, the work of Bell, Hargrove & Theakston, 1999).

Finally, the comparative design used in this study showed that this is a fruitful approach for research in this topic, and future research should consider expanding the number of countries included in the analysis. Given that in the last five years several Latin American countries have elected a female president for the first time (e.g., Cristina Fernández in Argentina, Laura Chinchilla in Costa Rica, and Dilma Rousseff in Brazil), there is a notable opportunity to explore the role of culture and emotion in women's leadership at the apex of politics in the region.

The findings also suggest that some changes are needed to improve news coverage of women running for elected office, especially at the highest levels. Females are treated differently by the media (and in the media, as well) and steps have to be taken to achieve more equality. That does not mean that women and men candidates always have to be covered exactly the same way, but that reporters should strive for more equanimity when covering women running for office. One basic rule of thumb would be for reporters to ask themselves whether they would do or same the same things if the candidate were a man. Journalists do not seem to consider ambition as a negative trait for men, so why would it be different for women?

215

Additionally, second- and third-tier subjects need to move up to first tier. The coverage of politics entails discussions about candidates' personalities and horseraces, but is also about platforms and stands on issues. Women running for higher office do not run on gender, but on party- and ideology-platforms. Journalists and editors should keep that in mind and make efforts to being fair in the coverage they provide. If anything, they are contributing to the quality of public discourse and should keep in mind that women are as valid and viable as candidates as any other man. This may require sensitivity training—reporters and editor are reflecting on broader cultural ideologies—and while readers may not distinguish between news and opinion, journalists should be better than columnist when it comes to making a fair account of politicians and their campaigns. Media literacy education may also be helpful for reporters and audience members.

Finally, journalists should also resist attempts to manipulate the press by candidates and campaign strategies, who themselves try to tap into gender ideologies and stereotypes if they think it may benefit them. For instance, Bachelet herself embraced that gendered image of homemaker and mother, a portrayal that was echoed in the Chilean press without further consideration.

As this study indicates, media discourses in general rely on gender stereotypes and sexist arguments to portray candidates' emotional expressions. This suggests that despite inroads in terms of equality, gender remains a forceful system of differentiation that organizes social life, with women's gender as a primary cue for interpretation and understanding of their persona. Some of the discourse, however, admitted that the

discussion should go beyond the male/female dichotomy. While the discursive constructions of candidates' emotionality analyzed here suggest that societies still cling to traditional patriarchal understandings in a changing world, with women getting more visibility in the public sphere, there is hope for upcoming changes.

Chapter 10. Conclusion

Women are increasingly running for president and succeeding in this quest. Since the turn of the new millennium, a dozen countries have elected a woman as a head of government or state for the first time. This fact alone makes it important to examine media discourses of female politicians trying to break the last glass ceiling. However, the literature also has pointed out that attitudes toward women as political leaders function as an important obstacle to their empowerment worldwide (see, for example, Inglehart & Norris, 2003), which underscores even more the need for research that explores the multiple factors contributing to this situation.

This qualitative study was a first attempt at exploring the relationship between gender, culture and emotion in the political realm. Using a feminist theoretical framework and a comparative design, it found that discussion of emotional management and female leadership, as embodied by Chile's Michelle Bachelet and the United States' Hillary Clinton, tapped into traditional notions of femininity and marked both women as different.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PUBLIC DISCOURSE AND RESEARCH

The discursive constructions analyzed here reinforced the "emotional woman" stereotype, although to varying degrees.

Falk (2008) concluded in her study of female presidential candidates in the United States that political women needed, among other things, to emphasize traditional masculine characteristics associated with leadership, focus on rationality and avoid

descriptions of being emotional (p. 158-160). She failed to offer, however, a concrete strategy with that goal, and if it is any indication, the example of Hillary Clinton shows that even when women candidates do focus on rationality and are deemed, for the most part, emotionless, they end up being criticized—or become the target of even more extreme criticism. The mere hint that her tear ducts were working generated much hype and more media attention. One way or the other, for female candidates' gender becomes salient.

Surprisingly, the findings also point to gender roles being more stringent in the United States. Chile's machista culture favors male dominance, but also puts great value on femininity and motherhood. Bachelet's demeanor fit both categories and allowed for an open appraisal of the differences of female leadership without labeling it as inferior or insufficient by default. Even though sexist arguments were used to portray and attack Bachelet, these were presented mostly in a covert fashion, a sign perhaps of an implicit acknowledgement that those were not valid grounds for the public discourse, or that they were so deemed so fundamental that they were not questioned.

The negative portrayal of Clinton is more in line with what Vavrus (2002) labeled as postfeminism: an ideology that encourages "women's private, consumer lifestyles rather than cultivating a desire for public life" (p. 2). Rather than being antithetical to feminism, postfeminism posits that issues of gender inequality put forward by the feminist movement are no longer a problem, ultimately rendering invisible women's marginality and misrepresentation. Along these lines, the more overt sexist arguments used in the discursive construction of Clinton and her emotional

management hint at such an ideological understanding. Thus, if Clinton wants to run for office like any other (male) person, *she should take it like a man*—or retreat to private life.

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Females leading major democracies still are rare, and despite women's increased presence in the public arena, women politicians have to endure media portrayals that keep reinforcing traditional images and stereotypes of women that do not match with the role of a political leader.

This study tried to enrich the understanding of politics and the constraints female politicians have to endure in different countries while dealing with media messages about appropriate gender roles, social identities, and acceptable behaviors. In doing so, it confirmed that gender continues to be a powerful organizing system that relegates females to peripheral or secondary status and casts women as essentially different or less than men. In other words, the findings strengthen the explanatory power and scope of feminist communication theory.

Further, the comparative design used in this dissertation served as a means of theory-building. By identifying differences and similarities, the study helped to contextualize and expand extant communication theories.

More importantly, this dissertation's findings support the idea that candidates' emotionality is relevant and noteworthy in media discourses on electoral politics, and thus has political implications. While the study did not explore the possible media

effects, the potential for further exploration and examination of the interconnection of gender, emotions and politics looks very promising. Past research offers evidence that women get elected —at least in Western societies— if they promote conservative values or run at a later stage in their lives —for example, once they have become grandmothers (see Conway, 2000; Delli Carpini & Keeter, 2000; Lawless & Fox, 2010). Interestingly, both Bachelet and Clinton run with a liberal platform and were middle-aged, which sheds light on how embracing feminine traits and emotionality may offer an alternative path for a successful political pursuit.

The reality of the social system is that for female candidates, gender is the primary frame for interpretation of their emotional management and ultimately women's fitness for office. Gender acts as the number one cue to understand women and their emotionality in politics; it also the primary framework informing the media portrayals and the coverage these females receive, beyond their platforms, experience, or background. As suggested by this dissertation's title, this is an early step toward a theory on gender and emotional management in electoral politics. Theory is not static; on the contrary, it is continuously refined and always changing and growing. The cumulative nature of science entails that no single study could provide enough evidence or support for any theoretical statement or approach (Shoemaker, Tankard & Lasorsa, 2004). This study suggests that there still is much to understand about the subject of emotional behavior and gendered assumptions in politics, which makes this line of inquiry worth pursuing. Arguably, feminist communication and political communication research would benefit from it, and while it is hard to predict how much

research can stem from this particular subject, the findings from this dissertation could be just the tip of the iceberg.

As such, both multimethodological and comparative approaches are necessary to expand our knowledge in this area. As shown here, cultural variability lets researchers confirm the validity and reliability of existing notions of observed or expected patterns. Converging methodologies provide a better, more holistic picture for understanding any phenomenon under study.

IN CLOSING

The fact that more voters are choosing a female to lead their countries around the world hints at cultural changes that are opening more doors for females to engage in the world of politics and public affairs. This kind of gender-related research must continue to stress the influence of the mass media in the (mis)construction of women's public images. In addition, further exploration and development and could help ameliorate the so-called "emotional deficit" in communication research and enrich our understanding of role of emotions in normative terms. Considering how masculinized the political arena still is, women seem at a disadvantage when they appear to be loosing control and overreacting to certain pressures, which may undermine their efforts running for office.

References

ABC. (2007a, January 20). World News [Television broadcast].

ABC. (2007b, January 22). World News [Television broadcast].

ABC. (2007c, October, 31). World News [Television broadcast].

ABC. (2007d, November 2). World News [Television broadcast].

ABC. (2008a, January 3). World News [Television broadcast].

ABC. (2008b, January 4). World News [Television broadcast].

ABC. (2008c, January 5). World News [Television broadcast].

ABC. (2008d, January 6). World News [Television broadcast].

ABC. (2008e, January 7). World News [Television broadcast].

ABC. (2008f, , January 8). World News [Television broadcast].

ABC. (2008g, January 9). World News [Television broadcast].

ABC. (2008h, March 18). World News [Television broadcast].

ABC. (2008i, March 20). World News [Television broadcast].

ABC. (2008j, March 21). World News [Television broadcast].

ABC. (2008k, March 28). World News [Television broadcast].

ABC. (2008l, June 4). World News [Television broadcast].

ABC. (2008m, June 8). World News [Television broadcast].

Abelson, R., Kinder, D., Peters, M. D., & Fiske, S. (1982). Affective and semantic components in political person perception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42*(4), 619-630.

Abu-Lughod, L., & Lutz, C. A. (1990). Introducion: emotion, discourse, and the politics of every day life. In C. A. Lutz & L. Abu-Lughod (Eds.), *Language and the politics of emotion* (pp. 1-23). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

223

Achenbach, J. (2008a, January 7). End of the Clinton era? *The Washington Post,* p. A5.

Achenbach, J. (2008b, January 5). On the trail. *The Washington Post,* p. A7.

Águila, F. (2005a, December 7). Bachelet suspende cierre de su campaña. *El Mercurio,* p. C1.

Águila, F. (2005b, December 8). "Éste es un cierre de campaña dramático" [Interview]. *El Mercurio,* p. C13.

Ahumada, S. (2005, December 8). Accidente en río Maipo II [Letter to the editor]. *La Tercera,* p. 2.

Akers, M. A., & Kane, P. (2007, November 1). Dorgan and Demint make up for appearances' sake, but there's no hugging. *The Washington Post,* p. A19.

Akers, M. A., & Kane, P. (2008a, June 5). Was it something he said? *The Washington Post*.

Akers, M. A., & Kane, P. (2008b, March 27). Well, it did happen to somebody. *The Washington Post,* p. A15.

Alam, M. (2005, August 7). "Me pregunto si Bachelet también se va a descolocar como Presidenta" [Interview]. *La Tercera,* p. R3.

Álamo, C. (2005, October 23). "En el debate no se mostró el país real" [Interview]. *La Tercera,* p. R4.

Albritton, M. D., Oswald, S. L., & Anderson, J. S. (2008). Leadership quality and follower affect: a study of U.S. presidential candidates. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 1*(4), 6-22.

Alexander, M. G., & Wood, W. (2000). Women, men, and positive emotions: A social role interpretation. In A. H. Fischer (Ed.), *Gender and emotion: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 189-210). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses. In L. Althusser (Ed.), *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Alvear busca acortar ventaja de Bachelet. (2005, April 27). *El Mercurio,* p. A1.

Amin, H. (2002). Freedom as a value in Arab media: Perceptions and attitudes among journalists. *Political Communication, 19*(2), 125-135.

Anderson, C., & Keltner, D. (2004). The emotional convergence hypothesis. Implications for individuals, relationships, and cultures. In L. Z. Tiedens & C. W. Leach (Eds.), *The social life of emotions* (pp. 144-163). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Applebaum, A. (2007, October 30). Free the running mates. *The Washington Post*.

Applebome, P. (2008a, June 5). Awaiting the return of Clinton. *The New York Times,* p. B1.

Applebome, P. (2008b, January 13). Is eloquence overrated? *The New York Times,* p. D3.

Apuntes del foro en TV. (2005, October 20). *La Tercera,* p. 8.

Aravena, N., & Molina, P. (2005, November 18). Razones tras caída de Bachelet. *El Mercurio,* p. C3.

Aravena, P. (2005, April 30). Michelle, a pesar de todo. *El Mercurio,* p. D6.

Ardizzoni, M. (1998). Feminist contributions to communication studies: Past and present. *Journal of Communication Inquiry, 22*(3), 293-305.

Arthur, B. (2005a, November 17). La noche triunfal de los candidatos en CasaPiedra. *El Mercurio,* p. C4.

Arthur, B. (2005b, April 27). Las apuestas para el primer "cara a cara." *El Mercurio,* p. C3.

Atributos: candidatos mantienen sus ventajas comparativas. (2005, October 23). *La Tercera,* p. R10.

Baber, K. M., & Tucker, C. J. (2006). The social roles questionnaire: A new approach to measuring attitudes toward gender. *Sex Roles, 54*(7-8).459-467

Bachelet cae 6 puntos y suma de Piñera y Lavín la supera. (2005, November 16). *El Mercurio,* p. A1.

Bachelet lanza su programa de gobierno. (2005, October 19). *El Mercurio,* p. A1.

Bachelet suspende cierre de campaña tras fatal accidente de partidarios. (2005, December 7). *La Tercera,* p. 4.

Bachelet, la abanderada atípica de la coalición. (2005, December 7). *El Mercurio,* p. E3.

Bacon Jr., P., & Kornblut, A. E. (2008, March 30). Clinton vows to stay in race to convention. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Baker, P., & Kornblut, A. E. (2008, January 10). Turning it around. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Baker, P. & Rutenberg, J. (2008, June 8). The long road to a Clinton exit. *The New York Times,* p. A1.

Balmas, M., & Sheafer, T. (2010). Candidate image in election campaigns: Attribute agenda setting, affective priming, and voting intentions. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 22*(2), 204-229.

Balz, D. (2007a, January 21). Hillary Clinton opens presidential bid. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Balz, D. (2007b, October 30). Tongues sharpened for debate. *The Washington Post,* p. A6.

Balz, D. (2008a, January 8). Little New Hampshire could hold big significance for both parties. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Balz, D. (2008b, January 10). Pace quickens in wide-open races. *The Washington Post,* p. A10.

Balz, D. (2008c, March 20). Will the answer outlive questions? *The Washington Post,* p. A4.

Balz, D. (2008d, January 9). With echoes of Clinton '92, another "comeback kid". *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Balz, D., & Kornblut, A. E. (2008, June 4). Obama claims nomination. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Balz, D., Kornblut, A. E., & Murray, S. (2008, January 4). Edwards edges Clinton for 2nd. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Barnett, R., & Rivers, C. (2004). *Same difference: How gender myths are hurting our relationships, our children, and our jobs*. New York: Basic Books.

Barría, R. (2005, November 20). "Tenemos listos los 100 primeros días de gobierno" [Interview]. *El Mercurio,* p. D6.

Barrett, A. W., & Barrington, L. W. (2005). Is a picture worth a thousand words?: Newspaper photographs and voter evaluations of political candidates. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics, 10*(4), 98-113.

Barron, J. (2008, March 28). Obama finds street support. *The New York Times,* p. A20.

Barros, C. (2005a, May 21). Juegos de guerra. *Qué Pasa,* 12-14.

Barros, C. (2005b, December 10). Por qué Sebastián Piñera. *Qué Pasa,* 10-11.

Bascuñán, C. (2005, May 27). El gesto de Soledad [Letter to the editor]. *El Mercurio,* p. A2.

Becker, P. (2005, May 18). Candidatura de Piñera II [Letter to the editor]. *El Mercurio,* p. A2.

Bell, D.S., Hargrove, E.C., & Theakston, K. (1999). Skill in context: A comparison of politicians. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 29(3): 528-548.

Bennett, J., & Ellison, J. (2010). Our daughters, ourselves: On 'Women's Equality Day,' a reality check [Weblog post]. Retrieved August 27, 2011, from http://www.newsweek.com/blogs/the-gaggle/2010/08/26/our-daughters-ourselves-on-women-s-equality-day-a-reality-check.html

Bennett, W. L. (2001). *News: The politics of illusion*. New York: Longman.

Benson, R., & Saguy, A. (2005). Constructing social problems in an age of globalization: A French-American comparison. *American Sociological Review, 70*(2), 233-259.

Beyer, H. (2005, April 30). Oportunidades perdidas. *El Mercurio,* p. D11.

Black, J. (2005, October 23). Un baile de máscaras. *El Mercurio,* p. D26.

Blanco, M. (2005, December 8). Accidente en río Maipo I [Letter to the editor]. *La Tercera,* p. 2.

Blumler, J. G., & Gurevitch, M. (1995). *The crisis of public communication*. London: Routledge.

Blumler, J. G., McLeod, J. M., & Rosengren, K. E. (1992). An introduction to comparative research. In J. G. Blumler, J. M. McLeod & K. E. Rosengren (Eds.), *Comparatively speaking: Communication and culture across space and time* (pp. 3-18). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Bohman, J. (1996). *Public deliberation: Pluralism, complexity, and democracy*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Braden, M. (1996). *Women politicians in the media*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.

Brader, T. (2005). Striking a responsive chord: how political ads motivate and persuade voters by appealing to emotions. *American Journal of Political Science, 49*(2), 388-405.

Brescoll, V. L., & Uhlman, E. L. (2008). Can an angry woman get ahead? Status conferral, gender, and expression of emotion in the workplace. *Psychological Science, 19*(3), 268-275.

Broader, J. M., & Healy, P. (2007, January 22). Rush of entries gives 2008 race early intensity. *The New York Times,* p. A1.

Broder, D. S. (2008a, June 5). A victor on his heels. *The Washington Post,* p. A19.

Broder, D. S. (2008b, January 10). Granite state grit. *The Washington Post,* p. A21.

Brody, L. R. (1999). *Gender, emotion and the family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Pres.

Brody, L. R. (2000). The socialization of gender differences in emotional expression: Display rules, infant temperament, and differentiation. In A. H. Fischer (Ed.), *Gender and emotion: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 24-47). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Brooks, D. (2007, November 2). Feel the love. *The New York Times,* p. A27.

Brooks, D. (2008a, February 5). The Cooper concerns. *The New York Times,* p. A23.

Brooks, D. (2008b, January 4). The two earthquakes. *The New York Times,* p. A19.

Bucy, E. P. (2000). Emotional and evaluative consequences of inappropriate leader displays. *Communication Research, 37*(2), 194-226.

Bucy, E. P. (2003). Emotion, presidential communication, and traumatic news: Processing the World Trade Center attacks. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics, 8*(4), 76-96.

Bucy, E. P. (2004). Reckless representation: An exploratory study of citizen expectations and political power. *Journal of Political and Military Sociology, 32*(1), 115-131.

Bucy, E. P. (2007). Appropriate emotion in politics: A communication perspective (Retrieved August 3, 2009 from http://www.unr.edu/organizations/pcr/1701_2007_winter/response_bucy.html

Bucy, E. P., & Grabe, M. E. (2006). Taking television seriously: A sound and image bite analysis of presidential campaign coverage. *Journal of Communication, 57*(4), 652-675.

Bucy, E. P., & Grabe, M. E. (2008). "Happy warriors" revisited: Hedonic ad agonic display repertoires of presidential candidates on the evening news. *Politics and the Life Sciences, 27*(1), 78-98.

Bucy, E. P., & Newhagen, J. E. (1999). The emotional appropriateness heuristic: Processing televised presidential reactions to the news. *Journal of Communication, 49*(4), 59-79.

Bucy, E. P., & Newhagen, J. E. (1999). The micro- and macrodrama of politics in television: effects of media format on candidate evaluations. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media 43*(2), 193-210.

Bumiller, E. (2007, November 2). Wellesley alumna comes home to stump. *The New York Times,* p. A20.

Burger, J. (2008, June 7). What matters in party politics [Letter to the editor]. *The Washington Post,* p. A14.

Burgoon, J. K. (1992). Applying a comparative approach to expectancy theory. In J. G. Blumler, J. M. McLeod & K. E. Rosengren (Eds.), *Comparatively speaking: Communication and culture across space and time* (pp. 53-69). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Burgoon, J. K., & Hale, J. L. (1988). Nonverbal expectancy violations: Model elaboration and application to immediacy behaviors. *Communication Monographs, 55*(1), 58-79.

Burrow, S. (2005). The political structure of emotion: From dismissal to dialogue. *Hypatia, 20*(4), 27-43.

Butler, J. (1999). *Gender trouble: feminism and the subversion of identity* (10th anniversary ed.). New York: Routledge.

Buzzanel, P. M., Sterk, H. M., & Turner, L. H. (Eds.). (2004). *Gender in applied communication contexts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Byerly, C. M., & Ross, K. (2004). Introduction. In C. M. Byerly & K. Ross (Eds.), *Women and media. International perspectives*: Blackwell Publishing.

Byerly, C. M., & Ross, K. (Eds.). (2004). *Women and media. International perspectives*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Byerly, C. M., & Ross, K. (2006). *Women and media. A critical introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Campbell, S. (1994). Being dismissed: The politics of emotional expression. *Hypatia, 9*(3), 46-65.

Campusano, M. (2005a). Lavín apuesta a sacar dividendos. *El Mercurio,* p. C7.

Campusano, M. (2005b, December 9). Piñera mira hacia la segunda vuelta. *El Mercurio,* p. C5.

Campusano, M. (2005c, August 4). Piñera reenfoca su campaña. *El Mercurio,* p. C4.

Campusano, M. (2005d, April 29). Renace optimismo de Lavín tras el foro de Alvear y Bachelet. *El Mercurio,* p. C5.

Campusano, M., & Camhi, J. (2005, May 15). Piñera entra a la definición presidencial. *El Mercurio,* p. C4.

Canal 13. (2005a, April 28). Teletrece [Television broadcast].

Canal 13. (2005b, April 29). Teletrece [Television broadcast].

Canal 13. (2005c, May 25). Teletrece [Television broadcast].

Canal 13. (2005d, October, 20). Teletrece [Television broadcast].

Canal 13. (2005e, October 21). Teletrece [Television broadcast].

Canal 13. (2005f, November 17). Teletrece [Television broadcast].

Canal 13. (2005g, November 18). Teletrece [Television broadcast].

Candidata oficialista define impuestos y se acerca a Lagos. (2005, November 17). *La Tercera,* p. 6.

Candidatas evitan confrontarse y enfatizan historias personales. (2005, April 28). *La Tercera,* p. 1.

Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Fraley, R. C., & Vecchione, M. (2007). The simplicity of politicians' personalities across political context: An anomalous replication. *International Journal of Psychology, 42*(6), 393-405.

Cardwell, D. (2008, January 10). Obama swipes at Clinton, but he takes aim at Bush. *The New York Times,* p. A26.

Carey, B. (2008, January 13). The crying game, and the political herd. *The New York Times,* p. D3.

Carlin, D. B., & Winfrey, K. L. (2009). Have you come a long way, baby? Hillary Clinton, Sarah Palin, and Sexism in 2008 campaign coverage. *Communication Studies, 60*(4), 326-343.

Carney, J. (2008, April 7). Still in it to win. *Time,* 171-14*,* 32-35.

Carney, J., & Sullivan, A. (2008, March 31). The origin of Obama's pastor problem. *Time,* 171-13, 38-41.

Carter, C., Branston, G., & Allan, S. (1998). Setting new(s) agendas: An introduction. In C. Carter, G. Branston & S. Allan (Eds.), *News, gender and power* (pp. 1-9). New York: Routledge.

Carter, C., & Steiner, L. (2004). Introduction In C. Carter & L. Steiner (Eds.), *Critical readings: Media and gender* (pp. 1-10). Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Carter, C., & Steiner, L. (2004). Mapping the contested terrain of media and gender research. In C. Carter & L. Steiner (Eds.), *Critical readings: Media and gender* (pp. 11-35). Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Carter, K., & Spitzack, C. (1989). Introduction In K. Carter & C. Spitzack (Eds.), *Doing research on women's communication: Perspectives on theory and method* (pp. 1-8). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Cavallo, A. (2005a, November 20). La primera vuelta anticipada. *La Tercera,* p. R9.

Cavallo, A. (2005b, November 17). Poco, casi nada. *La Tercera,* p. 9.

Chang, T. K., Berg, P., Ying-Him Fung, A., Kedl, K. D., Luther, C. A., & Szuba, J. (2001). Comparing nations in mass communication research, 1970-97. A critical assessment of how we know what we know. *Gazette, 63*(5), 415-434.

Chappell, L. (2007). Comparing political institutions: Revealing the gendered "logic of appropriateness". *Politics & Gender, 2*(2), 223-235.

Cheney, L. (2007, January 23). Retreat isn't an option. *The Washington Post,* p. A17.

Chinkin, C. (1999). A critique of the public/private dimension. *European Journal of International Law, 10*(2), 387-395.

Churchill, M. C. (2008, January 5). To the editor [Letter to the editor]. *The New York Times,* p. A14.

Cirksena, K., & Cuklanz, L. (1992). Male is to female as ___ is to ___: A guided tour of five feminist frameworks for communication studies. In L. F. Rakow (Ed.), *Women making meaning: New feminist directions in communication* (pp. 18-44). New York: Routledge.

Citrin, L. C., Roberts, T.-A., & Frederickson, B. L. (2004). Objectification theory and emotions: A feminist psychological perspective on gendered affect. In L. Z. Tiedens & C. W. Leach (Eds.), *The social life of emotions* (pp. 203-223). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Clayman, S. E. (1995). Defining moments, presidential debates, and the dynamics of quotability. *Journal of Communication, 45*(3), 118-146.

Clift, E., & Brazaitis, T. (2000). *Madam President. Shattering the last glass ceiling.* New York: Scribner.

Clinton in hot seat at debate. (2007, October 31). *The New York Times,* p. A2.

Clinton's count doesn't add up. (2008, June 3). *The Washington Post,* p. A4.

Cohen, Richard (2008a, June 3). A campaign to hate. *The Washington Post,* p. A15.

Cohen, Richard (2008b, February 5). Hail to the chief of staff. *The Washington Post,* p. A19.

Cohen, Richard (2008c, March 18). Obama's pastor problem. *The Washington Post,* p. A19.

Cohen, Roger (2008, March 27). Imagined snipers, real challenges. *The New York Times,* p. A27.

Coleman, R., & Banning, S. (2006). Network TV news' affective framing of the presidential candidates: Evidence for a second-level agenda-setting effect

through visual framing. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 83*(2), 313-328.

Coleman, R., & Wu, D. (2006). More than words alone: Incorporating broadcaster's nonverbal communication into the stages of crisis coverage theory—evidence from September 11th. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 50*(1), 1-17.

Collins, G. (2007, November 1). Everybody vs. Hillary. *The New York Times,* p. A27.

Collins, G. (2008a, March 27). The uncle Al election. *The New York Times,* p. A27.

Collins, G. (2008b, June 7). What Hillary won. *The New York Times,* p. A17.

Collins, G. (2008c, January 5). What would Hillary Rodham do? *The New York Times,* p. A15.

Collins, R. (1984). The role of emotion in social structure. In K. R. Scherer & P. Ekman (Eds.), *Approaches to emotion* (pp. 385-396). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Comando oficialista organiza sobrio acto de cierre de campaña. (2005, December 8). *La Tercera,* p. 9.

Comandos analizan efecto en la agenda política a pocos días de la elección. (2005, December 7). *La Tercera,* p. 6.

Connell, I., & Mills, A. (1985). Text, discourse and mass communication. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse and communication: New approaches to the analysis of mass media discourse and communication*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

¿Con quiénes compite Lavín? (2005, May 15). [Editorial] *El Mercurio,* p. A3.

Conway, M. M. (2000). Gender and political participation. In S. Tolleson-Rinehart & J. J. Josephson (Eds.). *Gender and American politics. Women, men, and the political process* (pp. 48-63). Armonk, N.Y. : M.E. Sharpe.

Cooper, M. (2008, June 4). McCain distances himself from Bush and jabs Obama. *The New York Times,* p. A21.

Copeland, L. (2008a, June 5). Finding a date for Nov. 4. *The Washington Post,* p. C1.

Copeland, L. (2008b, January 4). Joe Biden, seeing no way to lose what is most important. *The Washington Post,* p. C1.

Copeland, L. (2008c, March 20). What makes Hillary tick? Her schedule doesn't say. *The Washington Post,* p. C1.

Cordero, G. (2005, November 19). Bachelet: se acabó el mito. *La Tercera,* p. 2.

Correa, E. (2005, December 10). Por qué Michelle Bachelet. *Qué Pasa,* 12-13.

Correa, R. (2005a, November 20). Bachelet sale a encarar a Lavín y Piñera. *El Mercurio,* p. D10.

Correa, R. (2005b, May 29). El nuevo escenario para Michelle Bachelet. *El Mercurio,* p. D9.

Correa, R. (2005c, May 29). La caída de Alvear, según Zaldívar [Interview]. *El Mercurio,* p. D4.

Correa, R. (2005d, May 15). "Para competir es indispensable polemizar" [Interview]. *El Mercurio,* p. D13.

Correa, R. (2005e, April 30). "Yo soy algo más que el hijo de Lagos" [Interview]. *El Mercurio,* p. D12.

Correa, T. (2005, May 18). Cómo complica Piñera a la Concertación. *El Mercurio,* p. C3.

Cortés, A. (2005, August 13). Bachelet no es un fenómeno. *Qué Pasa,* 22-23.

Cowan, A. L. (2008, February 5). Mrs. Clinton has support in stronghold of Obama. *The New York Times,* p. B4.

Cox, A. M. (2008, June 8). What went wrong: Divided she fell. *The New York Times,* p. A14.

Cramer, J., & Creedon, P. (2007). Introduction: We've come a long way, maybe... In P. Creedon & J. Cramer (Eds.), *Women in mass communication* (3rd ed., pp. 3-8). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Creedon, P., & Cramer, J. (2007). Our conclusion: Gender values remain, inequity resurges, and globalization brings new challenges. In P. Creedon & J. Cramer (Eds.), *Women in mass communication* (3rd ed., pp. 275-282). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Davis, S. N., & Greenstein, T. N. (2009). Gender ideology: Components, predictors, and consequences. *Annual Review of Sociology, 35,* 87-105.

Deaux, K. (2000). Gender and emotion: Notes from a grateful tourist. In A. H. Fischer (Ed.), *Gender and emotion: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 301-318). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Debate: la encrucijada del modelo… y del país. (2005, October 23). [Editorial] *El Mercurio,* p. A3.

Delli Carpini, M. X. & Keeter, S. (2000). Gender and political knowledge. In S. Tolleson-Rinehart & J. J. Josephson (Eds.). *Gender and American politics. Women, men, and the political process* (pp. 21-47). Armonk, N.Y. : M.E. Sharpe.

Denzin, N. (1990). On understanding emotion: The interpretative-cultural agenda. In T. D. Kemper (Ed.), *Research agendas in the sociology of emotions* (pp. 85-116). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Derman, D., & Ross, K. (2003). Introduction. In K. Ross & D. Derman (Eds.), *Mapping the margins. Identity Politics and Media*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Devere, H., & Davies, S. G. (2006). The Don and Helen New Zealand Election 2005: a media a-gender? *Pacific Journalism Review, 12*(1), 65-85.

Devitt, J. (2002). Framing gender on the campaign trail: Female gubernatorial candidates and the press. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 79*(2), 445-463.

Díaz, W., Saldivia, M., Sallaberry, J. P., & Canales, P. (2005, April 28). Debate sin enfrentamientos y con énfasis en historias personales. *La Tercera,* p. 4.

Di Mare, L. (1992). Rhetoric and women: The private and the public spheres. In L. A. M. Perry, L. H. Turner & H. M. Sterk (Eds.), *Constructing and reconstructing gender: The links among communication, language, and gender* (pp. 45-50). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Dionne Jr., E. J. (2007, January 22). How Obama vs. Clinton shapes up. *The Washington Post,* p. A19.

Dionne Jr., E. J. (2008a, January 10). A shocker, in hindsight. *The Washington Post,* p. A21.

Dionne Jr., E. J. (2008b, June 5). Clinton, conceding little. *The Washington Post,* p. A19.

235

Dionne Jr., E. J. (2008c, February 5). Salvation show. *The Washington Post,* p. A19.

Dockendorff, A. (2005, August 6). Liderazgo de Bachelet I [Letter to the editor]. *La Tercera,* p. 3.

Donoso, M. (2005a, December 9). Accidente carretero marca discurso de Bachelet en cierre de campaña. *La Tercera,* p. 6.

Donoso, M. (2005b, December 8). Bachelet visitó a heridos y familiares de fallecidos. *La Tercera,* p. 9.

Donoso, M. (2005c, April 29). Cautela en comando de Bachelet, pese a encuestas. *La Tercera,* p. 11.

Donovan, J. (1992). *Feminist theory. The intellectual traditions of American Feminism*. New York: Continuum.

Dow, B. J., & Condit, C. M. (2005). The state of the art in feminist scholarship in communication. *Journal of Communication, 55*(3), 448-478.

Dowd, M. (2007, October 31). Hillary la française, Cherchez la femme? *The New York Times,* p. A27.

Dowd, M. (2008a, March 19). Black, white & gray. *The New York Times,* p. A19.

Dowd, M. (2008b, January 9). Can Hillary cry her way back to the White House? *The New York Times,* p. A19.

Dowd, M. (2008c, February 6). Darkness and light. *The New York Times,* p. A19.

Dowd, M. (2008d, June 4). She's still here! *The New York Times,* p. A25.

Dowd, M. (2008e, March 30). Surrender already, Dorothy. *The New York Times,* p. A12.

Dowd, M. (2008f, January 6). Voting for a smile. *The New York Times,* p. A12.

Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*(2), 233-256.

Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J., & Makhijani, M. G. (1995). Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*(1), 125-145.

Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. . *Psychological Bulletin, 111*(1), 3-22.

236

Edelstein, A. S. (1983). Communication and culture: The value of comparative research. *Journal of Communication, 33*(3), 302-310.

Edwards, S. (2005, May 28). Piñera y los conflictos del dinero. *Qué Pasa,* 24-26.

Ekman, P. (1984). Expression and the nature of emotion. In K. R. Scherer & P. Ekman (Eds.), *Approaches to emotion* (pp. 319-343). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ekman, P. (1997). Should we call it expression or communication? *Innovation, 10*(4), 333-344.

Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. (1969). The repertoire of nonverbal behavior: categores, origins, usage, and coding. *Semiotica, 1*(1), 49-98.

Ekman, P., & Scherer, K. R. (1984). Questions about emotion: an introduction. In K. R. Scherer & P. Ekman (Eds.), *Approaches to emotion* (pp. 1-11). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

El empresario que logró el sueño de ser candidato. (2005, December 7). *El Mercurio,* p. E5.

Elias, N., & Dunning, E. (1986). *Quest for excitement: Sport and leisure in the civilising process*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

El momento más complejo, según los comandos. (2005, October 23). *La Tercera,* p. R3.

Elecciones en juego. (2005, October 22). *Qué Pasa,* 16-23.

Ellis, J. (2009). The performance on television of sincerely felt emotion. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 625*, 103-115.

"En Bachelet hay mucha huella de Alvear". (2005, May 25). [Interview] *La Tercera,* p. 6.

Encuestas: percepciones y tendencias. (2005, November 20). [Editorial] *El Mercurio,* p. A3.

Entman, R. (1993). Framing: Toward a clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication, 43*(4), 51-58.

Espinosa, S. (2005, May 29). "Lo que marca Piñera no va a variar mucho" [Interview]. *El Mercurio,* p. D11.

Esser, F. (2008). Dimensions of political news cultures: Sound bite and image bite news in France, Germany, Great Britain, and the United States. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics, 13*(4), 401-428.

Esser, F., & D'Angelo, P. (2006). Framing the press and publicity process in U.S., British, and German general election campaigns: A comparative study of metacoverage. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics, 11*(3), 44-66.

Esser, F., & Pfetsch, B. (2004). Meeting the challenges of global communication and political integration. The significance of comparative research in a changing world. In F. Esser & B. Pfetsch (Eds.), *Comparing political communication. Theories, Cases, and Challenges* (pp. 384-410). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Esser, F., & Pfetsch, B. (2004). Meeting the challenges of global communication and political integration. The significance of comparative research in a changing world. In F. Esser & B. Pfetsch (Eds.), *Comparing political communication. Theories, cases, and challenges* (pp. 384-410). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Evaluación pesimista del país marca discurso de los candidatos. (2005, October 20). *La Tercera,* p. 5.

Exit, sort of, Sen. Clinton. (2008, June 5). [Editorial] *The Washington Post,* p. A18.

Falk, E. (2008). *Women for president: Media bias in eight campaigns.* Chicago: University of Illionios Press.

Falk, E. (2009). Press, passion, and Portsmouth: Narratives about "crying" on the campaign trail. *Argumentation and Advocacy 46*, 51-63.

Fernández, O. (2005, October 20). Fundamentos de Lavín [Letter to the editor]. *La Tercera,* p. 2.

Fineman, S. (2004). Getting the measure of emotion —and the cautionary tale of emotional intelligence. *Human Relation, 57*(6), 719-740.

Fischer, A. H. (Ed.). (2000). *Gender and emotion: Social psychological perspectives.* Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Fischer, A. H., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2000). The relations between gender and emotions in different cultures. In A. H. Fischer (Ed.), *Gender and emotion:*

Social psychological perspectives (pp. 71-94). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Fiske, J. (1996). *Media matters*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Fivush, R., & Buckner, J. P. (2000). Gender, sadness, and depression: The development of emotional focus through gendered discourse. In A. H. Fischer (Ed.), *Gender and emotion: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 232-253). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Fox, R. L., & Lawless, J. L. (2011). Gendered perceptions and political candidacies: A central barrier to women's equality in electoral politics. *American Journal of Political Science, 55*(1), 59-73.

Franceschet, S. (2005). *Women in politics in Chile*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Franks, D. D., & Gecas, V. (1992). Current issues in empotion studies and introduction to chapters. In D. D. Franks & a. V. Gecas (Eds.), *Social perspectives on emotion* (Vol. 1, pp. 3-24). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Fraser, N. (1993). Rethinking the public sphere. In S. During (Ed.), *The cultural studies reader* (2nd ed., pp. 518-536). London/New York: Routledge.

Frijda, N. (2007). *The laws of emotion*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Frijda, N., Manstead, A. S. R., & Fischer, A. H. (2004). Epilogue. In A. S. R. Manstead, N. Frijda & A. H. Fischer (Eds.), *Feelings and emotions: The Amsterdam Symposium* (pp. 455-467). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

From across the ocean and across the street, all weigh in on the meaning of Iowa. (2008, January 6). *The New York Times,* p. A4.

Gal, S. (2002). A semiotics of the public/private distinction. *Differences: Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies, 13*(1), 77-95.

Gallagher, D. (2005a, April 29). Alvear y Bachelet. *El Mercurio,* p. A3.

Gallagher, D. (2005b, May 27). En torno al Piñerazo. *El Mercurio,* p. A3.

Gallagher, M. (1992). Women and men in the media. *Communication Research Trends, 12*(1), 1-36.

Gallagher, M. (2001). *Gender setting: New agendas for media monitoring and advocacy*. New York: Palgrave.

Ganguly, K. (1992). Accounting for others: feminism and representation. In L. F. Rakow (Ed.), *Women making meaning: New feminist directions in communication* (pp. 60-79). New York: Routledge.

Garey, A. (1999). *Weaving work and motherhood*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Genovese, M. A. (Ed.). (1993). *Women as national leaders*. London: Sage.

Genovese, M. A., & Thompson, S. (1993). Women as chief executives: Does gender matter? In M. A. Genovese (Ed.), *Women as national leaders* (pp. 1-12). London: Sage.

Gerson, M. (2008, March 19). A speech that fell short. *The Washington Post,* p. A15.

Giarruso, G. (2008, January 5). To the editor [Letter to the editor]. *The New York Times,* p. A14.

Gibbs, N., & von Drehle, D. (2008, January 21). The voter's revenge. *Time, 171-3,* 24-39.

Gidengil, E., & Everitt, J. (2000). Filtering the female: Television news coverage of the 1993 Canadian leaders' debates. *Women & Politics, 21*(4), 105-131.

Gidengil, E., & Everitt, J. (2003a). Conventional coverage/Unconventional politicians: Gender and media coverage of Canadian leaders' debates, 1993, 1997, 2000. *Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue canadienne de science politique, 36*(3), 559-557.

Gidengil, E., & Everitt, J. (2003b). Talking tough: Gender and reported speech in campaign news coverage. *Political Communication, 20*, 209-232.

Giner, C., & Bezanilla, C. (2005, May 21). Episodios del conflictivo estilo Piñera. *Qué Pasa,* 6-10.

Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making and unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Givhan, R. (2008, January 8). A chink in the steely façade of Hillary Clinton. *The Washington Post,* p. C1.

Glaser, J., & Salovey, P. (1998). Affect in electoral politics. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 2*, 156-172.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual*. New York: Pantheon.

Grabe, M. E., & Bucy, E. P. (2009). *Image bite politics : news and the visual framing of elections*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Graber, D. (2004). Mediated politics and citizenship in the twenty-first century. *Annual Review of Psychology, 55*(1), 545-571.

Gramsci, A. (1971). History of the subaltern classes. In Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith (Eds.), *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* (pp. 52-58). New York: International Publishers.

Gramsci, A. (1971). The concept of "ideology". In Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith (Eds.), *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* (pp. 375-378). New York: International Publishers.

Greene, M. (2008, January 3). Whose 'terrible tragedy' in Pakistan? [Letter to the editor]. *The Washington Post,* p. A18.

Greenhouse, S. (2007, November 1). Union gives endorsement to clinton. *The New York Times,* p. A24.

Gross, K., & Brewer, P. T. (2007). Sore losers: News frames, policy debates, and emotion. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics, 12*(1), 122-133.

Grossman, D. (2008, January 10). To the editor [Letter to the editor]. *The New York Times,* p. A14.

Gruber, F. (2008, January 10). To the editor [Letter to the editor]. *The New York Times,* p. A14.

Guerra, G. (2005, December 9). Bachelet llama a ganar en primera vuelta. *El Mercurio,* p. C4.

Gurevitch, M., & Blumler, J. G. (2004). State of the art of comparative political communication research. In F. Esser & B. Pfetsch (Eds.), *Comparing political communication. Theories, Cases, and Challenges* (pp. 325-343). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, J. A., Carter, J. D., & Horgan, T. G. (2000). Gender differences in nonverbal communication of emotion. In A. H. Fischer (Ed.), *Gender and emotion: Social*

psychological perspectives (pp. 97-117). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Hall, S. A. (1975). Introduction. In A. C. H. Smith (Ed.), *Paper voices: The popular press and social change, 1935-1965* (pp. 11-24). London: Chatto and Windus.

Hallin, D. C., & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing media systems: Three models of media and politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halperin, M. (2008a, April 7). Exclusive: Clinton vows to push. *Time, 171-14,* 36-37.

Halperin, M. (2008b, January 14). Iowa's finish line. *Time, 171-2,* 32-35.

Hanitzsch, T. (2008). Comparative journalism studies. In K. Wahl-Jorgensen & T. Hanitzsch (Eds.), *The Handbook of Journalism Studies* (pp. 413-427). New York: Routledge.

Hanitzsch, T. (2008). Comparing journalism across cultural boundaries: State of the art, strategies, problems, and solutions. In M. Loffelholz & D. Weaver (Eds.), *Global journalism research: Theories, methods, findings, future* (pp. 413-427). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Harding, S. (1987). Introduction. Is there a feminist method? In S. Harding (Ed.), *Feminism and Methodology* (pp. 1-12). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Harp, D. (2008). News, feminist theories and the gender divide. In P. Poindexter, S. Meraz & A. Schmitz Weiss (Eds.), *Women, men, and news: divided and disconnected in the news media landscape* (pp. 267-279). New York: Routledge.

Harp, D., & Bachmann, I. (2008). News judgment: The framing of contemporary motherhood in the United States. *Media Report to Women, 36*(3), 8-14.

Harris, H. R. (2008, June 5). As Obama severs ties, county pastors voice dismay. *The Washington Post,* p. G1.

Hauser, C. (2007, October 30). Rivals go after Clinton over Social Security and donations. *The New York Times,* p. A20.

Hayes, D. (2005). Candidate qualities through a partisan lens: A theory of trait ownership. *American Journal of Political Science, 49*(4), 908-923.

Hays, S. (1996). *The cultural contradictions of motherhood*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Healy, P. (2007a, January 21). Announcement sends race into high gear. *The New York Times,* p. A27.

Healy, P. (2007b, January 22). Clinton opens her campaign with health insurance plan. *The New York Times,* p. A14.

Healy, P. (2007c, January 21). In a field of heavy hitters, no sure thing. *The New York Times,* p. A27.

Healy, P. (2007d, January 23). On web, voters question Clinton directly. *The New York Times,* p. A16.

Healy, P. (2008a, March 21). Clinton treats Obama pastor with extreme caution. *The New York Times,* p. A18.

Healy, P. (2008b, February 5). For Clinton the speaker, the smaller the better. *The New York Times,* p. A16.

Healy, P. (2008c, January 10). Her message, and moment, won the day. *The New York Times,* p. A1.

Healy, P. (2008d, January 8). On eve of primary, Clinton's campaign shows stress. *The New York Times,* p. A1.

Healy, P. (2008e, January 3). Staying on message. *The New York Times,* p. A19.

Healy, P., & Broder, J. M. (2008, January 5). Campaigns on each side retool as they head for next round. *The New York Times,* p. A1.

Healy, P., & Cooper, M. (2008, January 9). Clinton is victor, defeating Obama; McCain also wins. *The New York Times,* p. A1.

Healy, P., & Zeleny, J. (2008, January 6). At debate, two rivals go after defiant Clinton. *The New York Times,* p. A1.

Hebdige, D. (1979). *Subculture: The meaning of style*. London/New York: Routledge.

Heins, V. (2007). Reasons of the heart: Weber and Arendt on emotion in politics. *The European Legacy, 12*(6), 715-728.

Heise, D. R. (1989). Effects of emotion displays on social identification. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 52*(1), 10-21.

Heldman, C., Carroll, S. J., & Olson, S. (2005). "She brought only a skirt": Print media coverage of Elizabeth Dole's bid for the republican presidential nomination. *Political Communication, 22*(3), 315-335.

Herbert, B. (2008a, January 12). Of hope and politics. *The New York Times,* p. A15.

Herbert, B. (2008b, January 5). The Obama phenomenon. *The New York Times,* p. A15.

Herbert, B. (2008c, February 9). Where's the big idea? *The New York Times,* p. A15.

Herrera, M. (2005, November 20). "Quien no se ha ganado el corazón de los pobres nunca será presidente" [Interview]. *El Mercurio,* p. D8.

Heyman, J. (2008, March 27). To the editor [Letter to the editor]. *The New York Times,* p. A26.

Hillary is in. (2007, January 22). [Editorial] *The Washington Post,* p. A18.

Hirshman, L. (2008, June 8). When dreams collide. *The Washington Post,* p. B1.

Hitchon, J. C., & Chang, C. (1995). Effects of gender schematic processing on the reception of political commercials for men and women candidates. *Communication Research, 22*(3), 430-458.

Hitchon, J. C., Chang, C., & Harris, R. (1997). Should women emote? Perceptual bias and opinion change in response to political ads for candidates of different genders. *Political Communication, 14*(1), 49-69.

Hoar, N. (1992). Genderlect, powerlect, and politeness. In L. A. M. Perry, L. H. Turner & H. M. Sterk (Eds.), *Constructing and reconstructing gender: The links among communication, language, and gender* (pp. 127-136). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Hochschild, A. R. (1979). Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structure. *American Journal of Sociology, 85*(3), 551-575.

Hoogensen, G., & Solheim, B. O. (2006). *Women in power. World leaders since 1960.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

hooks, b. (1994). *Feminist theory: From margin to center* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Hornaday, A. (2007, January 21). Throwing her hat on the web. *The Washington Post,* p. D1.

Houston, M. (1992). The politics of difference: Race, class, and women's communication. In L. F. Rakow (Ed.), *Women making meaning: New feminist directions in communication* (pp. 44-59). New York: Routledge.

Howley, K. (2008, January 5). It takes a family (to break a glass ceiling). *The New York Times,* p. A15.

Huddy, L., & Gunnthorsdottir, A. H. (2000). The persuasive effects of emotive visual imagery: superficial manipulation or the product of passionate reason? *Political Psychology, 21*(4), 745-778.

Huddy, L., & Terkildsen, N. (1993). Gender stereotypes and the perception of male and female candidates. *American Journal of Political Science, 37*(1), 119-147.

Huddy, L., & Terkildsen, N. (1993). The consequences of gender stereotypes for women candidates at different levels and types of office. *Political Research Quarterly, 46*(3), 505-525.

Huneeus, C. (2003). *Chile, un país dividido: la actualidad del pasado*. Santiago: Catalonia.

Hurtado, A. (1989). Relating to privilege: Seduction and rejection in the subordination of white women and women of color. *Signs, 14*(4), 833-855.

Ibáñez, F. (2005, April 29). Debate I [Letter to the editor]. *El Mercurio,* p. A2.

Ignatious, D. (2008, February 7). Choosing among generations. *The Washington Post,* p. A21.

Inglehart, R., & Norris, P. (2003). *Rising tide: Gender equality and culture change around the world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

In their own words. (2008, January 9). [Speech transcript] *The New York Times,* p. A15.

Inside the times. (2008, June 8). [News summary] *The New York Times,* p. A2.

It's over. Now it begins. (2008, June 5). [Editorial] *The New York Times,* p. A28.

Iyengar, S., & Kinder, D. R. (1987). *News that matters*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Iyengar, S., & Reeves, R. (Eds.). (1997). *Do the media govern? Politicians, voters, and reporters in America*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jamieson, K. H. (1995). *Beyond the double bind: Women and leadership*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Janesick, V. J. (2000). The choreography of qualitative research design: Minuets, improvisations, and crystallization. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 379-399). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Janesick, V.J . (1994). The dance of qualitative research design. In Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds). *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 209-219). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jankelevic, J. (2005, April 30). Debate I [Letter to the editor]. *La Tercera,* p. 2.

Jansz, J. (2000). Masculine identity and restrictive emotionality. In A. H. Fischer (Ed.), *Gender and emotion: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 166-182). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Jerit, J. (2004). Survival of the fittest: Rhetoric during the course of an election campaign. *Political Psychology, 25*(4), 563-575.

Jocelyn-Holt, A. (2005, August 13). ¿Por qué tanta histeria? *Qué Pasa,* 10-11.

Johnston, D., & Swanson, D. (2006). Constructing the "Good Mother": The experience of mothering ideologies by work status. *Sex Roles, 54*(7-8), 509-519.

Jones, J. M. (2008). Hillary's stock still high among Democrats. *Gallup Corporation* Retrieved December 14, 2009, from http://www.gallup.com/poll/109837/Hillarys-Stock-Still-High-Among-Democrats.aspx

Kahn, K. F. (1994). The distorted mirror: Press coverage of women candidates for statewide office. *Journal of Politics, 54*(1), 154-173.

Kaiser, R. G. (2008, June 5). A run for the ages? *The Washington Post,* p. C1.

Kane, P., & Weisman, J. (2008, January 4). The conventional wisdom defied. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Kantor, J. (2008a, January 9). A show of emotion that reverberated beyond the campaign. *The New York Times,* p. A14.

Kantor, J. (2008b, January 3). For Democrats, too many good picks; for Republicans, an easier path. *The New York Times,* p. A20.

Kellner, D. (2000). Habermas, the public sphere, and democracy: A critical intervention. In L. E. Hahn (Ed.), *Perspectives on Habermas* (pp. 259-288). Chicago: Open Court Press.

Kelly, J. R., & Hutson-Comeaux, S. (1999). Gender-emotion stereotypes are context specific. *Sex Roles, 40*(1/2), 107-120.

Kelly, J. R., & Hutson-Comeaux, S. (2000). The appropriateness of emotional expression in women and men: The double-bind of emotion. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 15*(3), 515-528.

Kemper, T. D. (1984). Power, status, and emotions: A sociological contribution to a psychophysiological domain. In K. R. Scherer & P. Ekman (Eds.), *Approaches to emotion* (pp. 369-383). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kinder, D. R. (1986). Presidential character revisited. In R. R. Lau & D. O. Sears (Eds.), *Political cognition* (pp. 233-255). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Kinder, D. R. (1994). Reason and emotion in American political life. In R. C. Schank & E. Lange (Eds.), *Beliefs, reasoning and decision-making* (pp. 277-314). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

King, C. I. (2008, February 9). The running-mate roundup. *The Washington Post,* p. A15.

Kinsley, M. (2008, January 14). Why they really run. *Time, 171-2,* 72.

Kirouac, G., & Hess, U. (1999). Group membership and the decoding of nonverbal behavior. In P. Philippot, R. S. Feldman & E. J. Coats (Eds.), *The social context of nonverbal behavior* (pp. 182-210). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Kitch, C. (1997). Changing theoretical perspectives on women's media images: The emergence of patterns in a new area of historical scholarship. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 74*(3), 477-489.

Klein, J. (2007a, November 12). Hit her again! *Time, 170-20,* 12.

Klein, J. (2007b, November 19). What Hillary believes. *Time, 170-21,* 22-23.

Klein, J. (2008a, June 16). Can Hillary unite the party? *Time, 171-24,* 26-27.

Klein, J. (2008b, January 21). How Hillary learned to trust herself. *Time, 171-3,* 22-23.

Klein, J. (2008c, March 31). Obama's challenge—and ours. *Time, 171-13,* 31.

Kleinginna, P. R., & Kleinginna, A. M. (1981). A categorized list of emotion definitions, with suggestions for a consensual definition. *Motivation and Emotion, 5*(4), 345-379.

Knopf, M. E., & Boiney, J. A. (2001). The electoral glass ceiling? Gender, viability, and the news in US Senate campaigns. *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy, 23*(1/2), 79-103.

Kohn, M. L. (1989). Introduction. . In M. L. Kohn (Ed.), *Cross-national research in sociology* (pp. 17-31). Newbury Park: Sage

Kolb, M. (2008, March 27). To the editor [Letter to the editor]. *The New York Times,* p. A26.

Kornblut, A. E. (2007a, January 23). Clinton dives in media waters. *The Washington Post,* p. A2.

Kornblut, A. E. (2007b, January 22). For the Clinton candidacy, a soft launch. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Kornblut, A. E. (2007c, October 30). In his wife's campaign, bill Clinton is a free agent. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Kornblut, A. E. (2008a, June 4). Clinton ends primary season with an unanswered question. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Kornblut, A. E. (2008b, June 8). Clinton urges backers to look to November. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Kornblut, A. E. (2008c, June 2). Clinton wins easily in Puerto Rico. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Kornblut, A. E. (2008d, January 8). "It's not easy," an emotional Clinton says. *The Washington Post,* p. A9.

Kornblut, A. E., & Bacon Jr., P. (2008a, March 29). Clinton resists calls to drop out. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Kornblut, A. E., & Bacon Jr., P. (2008b, June 7). Clinton to publicly withdraw, support Obama. *The Washington Post,* p. A6.

Kornblut, A. E., & Balz, D. (2007a, November 1). Clinton regroups as rivals pounce. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Kornblut, A. E., & Balz, D. (2007b, October 31). Clinton's foes go on the attack. *The Washington Post*.

Kornblut, A. E., & Balz, D. (2008a, March 20). Clinton presses Obama on efforts for revotes in Florida and Michigan. *The Washington Post,* p. A4.

Kornblut, A. E., & Balz, D. (2008b, January 6). Underdog Clinton goes after Obama. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Kornblut, A. E., & Layton, L. (2008, February 6). Voters don't share Kennedys' ardor for Obama. *The Washington Post,* p. A21.

Kornblut, A. E. & Murray, S. (2008, January 7). Clinton, Romney on offensive as pivotal contest draws near. *The Washington Post*, p. A1.

Kornblut, A. E., & Shear, M. D. (2008a, January 8). Obama carries momentum to N.H. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Kornblut, A. E., & Shear, M. D. (2008b, February 5). Two races, one big day. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Kornblut, A. E., Weisman, J., & Kane, P. (2008, January 5). Clinton's supporters question her strategy. *The Washington Post,* p. A7.

Koziak, B. (1999). Homeric 'Thumos': The early history of gender, emotion, and politics. *Journal of Politics, 61*(4), 1068-1091.

Krajljevic, A. (2005, May 16). Alianza por Chile III [Letter to the editor]. *El Mercurio,* p. A2.

Krauthammer, C. (2008a, January 11). A sneer, a tear, a comeback. *The Washington Post,* p. A17.

Krauthammer, C. (2008b, March 21). The speech: a brilliant fraud. *The Washington Post,* p. A17.

Kring, A. M. (2000). Gender and anger. In A. H. Fischer (Ed.), *Gender and emotion: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 221-231). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Kristof, N. D. (2008a, March 20). Obama and race. *The New York Times,* p. A27.

Kristof, N. D. (2008b, March 27). Obama, Clinton—and echoes of Nader? *The New York Times,* p. A27.

Krook, M. L. (2010). Why are fewer women than men elected? Gender and the dynamics of candidate selection. *Political Studies Review, 8*(2), 155-168.

Krugman, P. (2008, March 28). Loans and leadership. *The New York Times,* p. A23.

Kuklinski, J., Riggle, E., Ottati, V., Schwartz, N., & Wye, R. (1991). The cognitive and affective bases of political tolerance judgments. *American Journal of Political Science, 35*(1), 1-27.

Kunin, M. M. (2008, January 11). Who's ready for a female president? *The Washington Post,* p. A17.

Kupperbusch, C., Matsumoto, D., Kooken, K., Loewinger, S., Uchida, H., Cohn, C. W., et al. (1999). Cultural influences on nonverbal expressions of emotion. In P. Philippot, R. S. Feldman & E. J. Coats (Eds.), *The social context of nonverbal behavior* (pp. 17-44). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Kurtz, H. (2007, January 22). Campaign allegation a source of vexation. *The Washington Post,* p. C1.

Kurtz, H. (2008a, February 9). Chelsea remark earns MSNBC correspondent a suspension. *The Washington Post,* p. C1.

Kurtz, H. (2008b, January 8). Even conservative media chorus sings Obama's praises. *The Washington Post,* p. C1.

La primera muestra de vulnerabilidad. (2005, April 30). *La Tercera,* p. R5.

Labott, S. M., Martin, R. B., Eason, P. S., & Berkey, E. Y. (1991). Social reactions to expression of emotions. *Cognition & Emotion, 5*(5/6), 391-417.

LaFrance, M., & Hecht, M. A. (1999). Option or obligation to smile: The effects of power and gender on facial expression. In P. Philippot, R. S. Feldman & E. J. Coats (Eds.), *The social context of nonverbal behavior* (pp. 45-70). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

¿Lagos opaca o fortalece a Bachelet? (2005, November 19). *Qué Pasa,* 20-23.

Landman, T. (2008). *Issues and methods in comparative politics: An introduction* (Vol. Routledge). New York: New York.

Larraín, J. (2005). *¿América Latina moderna?: globalización e identidad*. Santiago: LOM.

Las claves del primer debate Alvear-Bachelet. (2005, April 28). *La Tercera,* p. 6.

Lau, R. R., & Sears, D. O. (1986). An introduction to political cognition. In R. R. Lau & D. O. Sears (Eds.), *Political cognition* (pp. 3-10). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Lavín apunta a Lagos, Piñera no remonta, Bachelet evita promesas y Hirsch ataca el modelo. (2005, October 20). *La Tercera,* p. 6.

Lawless, J. L., & Fox, R. L. (2010). *It still takes a candidate: Why women don't run for office*. Leiden: Cambridge University Press.

Lazarus, R. S. (1984). Thoughts on the relations between emotion and cognition. In K. R. Scherer & P. Ekman (Eds.), *Approaches to emotion* (pp. 247-257). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lazarus, R. S. (1991). Cognition and motivation in emotion. *American Psychology, 46*(4), 352-367.

Lazarus, R. S. (2001). Relational meaning and discrete emotion. In K. R. Scherer, A. Schorr & T. Johnstone (Eds.), *Appraisal processes in emotion: Theory, methods, research* (pp. 37-67). New York: Oxford University Press.

Leach, C. W., & Tiedens, L. Z. (2004). Introduction. A world of emotion. In L. Z. Tiedens & C. W. Leach (Eds.), *The social life of emotions* (pp. 1-16). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

LeDoux, J. E. (1995). Emotion: Clues from the brain. *Annual Review of Psychology, 46*(1), 209-235.

Leibovich, M. (2008a, January 8). Clinton goes face to face with the public as Obama plays not to lose. *The New York Times,* p. A14.

Leibovich, M. (2008b, June 2). Far from her party's bitter feuding, a breezy island weekend for Clinton. *The New York Times,* p. A15.

Leibovich, M. (2008c, January 3). Not just voter fatigue; Candidates mischime In. *The New York Times,* p. A1.

Levy, R. I. (1984). The emotions in comparative perspective. In K. R. Scherer & P. Ekman (Eds.), *Approaches to emotion* (pp. 397-412). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lim, T. C. (2006). *Doing comparative politics*. Boulder, CO: Rienner.

Lithwick, D. (2008, January 21). Viewpoint: The tracks of her tears. *Time, 171-3,* 39.

Loke, J., Harp, D., & Bachmann, I. (2011). Mothering and governing: How news articulates hegemonic gender roles in the case of Governors Jane Swift and Sarah Palin. *Journalism Studies, 12*(2), 205-220.

Lowry, R. (2007, November 12). Viewpoint: The world of Hillary hatred. *Time, 170-20,* 39.

Lueck, T. L. (2004). Like newsroom, like classroom: Women journalism educators temper the times. *American Journalism, 20*(4), 83-104.

Lutz, C. A. (1990). Engendered emotion: gender, power and the rhetoric of emotional control in American discourse. In C. A. Lutz & L. Abu-Lughod (Eds.), *Language and the politics of emotion* (pp. 69-91). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Lutz, C. A., & Abu-Lughod, L. (Eds.). (1990). *Language and the politics of emotion*. Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Macdonald, M. (1995). *Representing women: Myths of femininity in the popular media*. London: Arnold.

MacKinnon, C. (1982). Feminism, marxism, method, and the state: An agenda for theory. *Signs, 7*(3), 515-554.

Magid, M. (2008, June 3). To the editor [Letter to the editor]. *The New York Times,* p. A22.

Makus, A. (1990). Stuart Hall's theory of ideology: A frame for rhetorical criticism. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 54*, 503-523.

Manstead, A. S. R. (1991). Emotion in social life. *Cognition & Emotion, 5*(5/6), 353-362.

Manstead, A. S. R., Fischer, A. H., & Jakobs, E. B. (1999). The social and emotional functions of facial displays. In P. Philippot, R. S. Feldman & E. J. Coats (Eds.), *The social context of nonverbal behavior* (pp. 287-313). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Manstead, A. S. R., Frijda, N., & Fischer, A. H. (Eds.). (2004). *Feelings and emotions: The Amsterdam Symposium*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Manstead, A. S. R., Frijda, N., & Fischer, A. H. (2004). Introduction. In A. S. R. Manstead, N. Frijda & A. H. Fischer (Eds.), *Feelings and emotions: The Amsterdam Symposium* (pp. 1-4). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Marcus, G. E. (2000). Emotions in politics. *Annual Review of Political Science, 3*(1), 221-250.

Marcus, G. E., & MacKuen, M. (1993). Anxiety, enthusiasm and the vote: the emotional underpinnings of learning and involvement during presidential campaigns. *American Political Science Review, 87*(3), 688-701.

Marcus, R. (2007, November 2). Damsel in the debate. *The Washington Post,* p. A21.

Marcus, R. (2008a, January 5). The magnetism of a message. *The Washington Post,* p. A17.

Marcus, R. (2008b, January 9). The man who won't go away. *The Washington Post,* p. A15.

Marler, P. (1984). Animal communication: Affect or cognition? In K. R. Scherer & P. Ekman (Eds.), *Approaches to emotion* (pp. 345-365). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Marotta, M. (2005). Beyond maternalism: Women and the spaces of political leadership. *White House Studies, 5*(4), 477-488.

Masters, R. D., & Sullivan, D. G. (1993). Nonverbal behavior and leadership: Emotion and cognition in political information processing. In S. Iyengar & W. J. McGuire (Eds.), *Explorations in political psychology* (pp. 150-182). Durham: Duke University Press.

Masters, R. D., Sullivan, D. G., Lanzetta, J. T., McHugo, G. J., & Englis, B. G. (1986). The facial displays of leaders: Toward an ethology of human politics. *Journal of Social and Biological Structures, 9*, 319-343.

Matsumoto, D. (2006). Culture and Nonverbal Behavior In V. L. Manusov & M. L. Patterson (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of nonverbal communication* (pp. 219-236). Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mayer, R. K. (2001). What to expect from electoral expectations. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics, 6*(3), 71-89.

Mayerhoffer, E., Maurer, P., & Pfetsch, B. (2008). *Political communication culture in Western Europe: Does system matter for the professional orientations of*

journalists and political actors? Paper presented at the International Communication Association.

McCombs, M. E. (2004). *Setting the agenda: The mass media and public opinion.* Malden, MA: Polity Press.

McCombs, M. E., López-Escobar, E., & Llamas, J. P. (2000). Setting the agenda of attributes in the 1996 Spanish general election. *Journal of Communication, 50*(2), 77-92.

McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 36*(1), 176-187.

McKenzie, N. F. (2008, January 11). To the editor [Letter to the editor]. *The New York Times,* p. A18.

McHugo, G. J., Lanzetta, J. T., Sullivan, D. G., Masters, R. D., & Englis, B. G. (1985). Emotional reactions to a political leader's expressive displays. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48*(6), 1513-1529.

Mcquillan, J., Greil, A. L., Shreffler, K. M., & Tichenor, V. (2008). The importance of motherhood among women in the contemporary United States. *Gender & Society, 22*(4), 477-496.

Megavisión. (2005a, April 28). Meganoticias [Television broadcast].

Megavisión. (2005b, April 29). Meganoticias [Television broadcast].

Megavisión. (2005c, May 25). Meganoticias [Television broadcast].

Megavisión. (2005d, October 20). Meganoticias [Television broadcast].

Méndez, R. (2005, November 17). Un buen debate: ganó la gente. *El Mercurio,* p. C7.

Mendus, S. (2000). *Feminism and emotion: Readings in moral and political philosophy.* Houndmills: Macmillan.

Merida, K. (2008, January 7). Primary school: in N.H., it's for all. *The Washington Post,* p. C1.

Mesquita, B., & Markus, H. R. (2004). Culture and emotion. Models of agency as sources of cultural variation in emotion. In A. S. R. Manstead, N. Frijda & A. H. Fischer (Eds.), *Feelings and emotions: The Amsterdam Symposium* (pp. 341-358). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

254

Meyers, M. (Ed.). (1999). *Mediated women: Representations in popular culture*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Milbank, D. (2008a, February 6). For Clinton, a lively dead heat. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Milbank, D. (2008b, June 4). In defeat, Clinton graciously pretends to win. *The Washington Post,* p. A3.

Milbank, D. (2008c, January 3). Obama has to hope cheers equal votes. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Milbank, D. (2008d, January 9). She lives. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Milbank, D. (2008e, March 27). They shoot e-mails, don't they? *The Washington Post,* p. A3.

Milloy, C. (2008, March 19). Invited to wrestle in a racial mud pit, Obama soars above it. *The Washington Post,* p. B1.

Molina, P. (2005, May 15). Terremoto Piñera despierta a la oposición. *El Mercurio*, p. C3.

Moment of truth. (2008, March 19). [Editorial] *The Washington Post,* p. A14.

Montes, R., & Sepúlveda, E. (2005, November 20). El terremoto, los 21 días finales y la segunda vuelta. *El Mercurio,* p. D4.

Mora, C. (2006). The meaning of womanhood in the neoliberal age: Class and age-based narratives of Chilean women. *Gender Issues, 23*(2), 44-61.

Mr. Obama's profile in courage. (2008, March 19). [Editorial] *The New York Times,* p. A18.

Murray, S. (2008, June 4). A moment of triumph, with a little disbelief. *The Washington Post,* p. A6.

Murray, S., & Balz, D. (2008, March 19). Obama urges U.S.: "Move beyond our old racial wounds". *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Murray, S., & Harris, H. R. (2008, June 2). Priest again apologizes for remarks in sermon. *The Washington Post,* p. A4.

Murray, S., & Kornblut, A. E. (2008, June 3). Obama is poised to clinch victory. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Mulvey, L. (1975). Visual pleasure and narrative cinema. *Screen, 16*(3), 6-18.

Nagourney, A. (2008a, June 4). After grueling battle, Obama claims nomination. *The New York Times,* p. A1.

Nagourney, A. (2008b, March 20). Clinton facing narrower path to nomination. *The New York Times,* p. A1.

Nagourney, A. (2008c, March 29). Endorsement points up obstacles for Clinton. *The New York Times,* p. A1.

Nagourney, A. (2008d, January 9). To fight another day. *The New York Times,* p. A1.

Nagourney, A., & Bumiller, E. (2007, October 31). In 7th round, a pitched debate: Clinton hears it from her rivals. *The New York Times,* p. A1.

Nagourney, A., & Leibovich, M. (2008, June 8). Clinton ends bid with clear call to elect Obama. *The New York Times,* p. A1.

Nagourney, A., & Zeleny, J. (2008, March 22). First a tense talk with Clinton, then Richardson backs Obama. *The New York Times,* p. A1.

Navia, P. (2005a, October 20). Espectáculo sin gol. *La Tercera,* p. 9.

Navia, P. (2005b, April 28). Ganó Lavín. *La Tercera,* p. 8.

NBC. (2007a, January 20). Nightly News [Television broadcast].

NBC. (2007b, January 22). Nightly News [Television broadcast].

NBC. (2007c, October 30). Nightly News [Television broadcast].

NBC. (2007d, October 31). Nightly News [Television broadcast].

NBC. (2007e, November 1). Nightly News [Television broadcast].

NBC (2008a, January 4). Nightly News [Television broadcast].

NBC (2008b, January 6). Nightly News [Television broadcast].

NBC (2008c, January 7). Nightly News [Television broadcast].

NBC (2008d, January 9). Nightly News [Television broadcast].

NBC (2008e, March 18). Nightly News [Television broadcast].

NBC (2008f, March 21). Nightly News [Television broadcast].

NBC (2008g, March 29). Nightly News [Television broadcast].

NBC (2008h, March 31). Nightly News [Television broadcast].

NBC (2008i, June 5). Nightly News [Television broadcast].

NBC (2008j, June 7). Nightly News [Television broadcast].

Neblo, M. A. (2007). Philosophical psychology with political interest. In W. R. Neuman, G. E. Marcus, M. MacKuen & A. N. Crigler (Eds.), *The affect effect: Dynamics of emotion in political thinking and behavior*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Neuman, W. R., Marcus, G. E., MacKuen, M., & Crigler, A. N. (Eds.). (2007). *The affect effect: Dynamics of emotion in political thinking and behavior*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Newton-Small, J. (2008, April 7). Campaign insider. *Time, 171-14,* 19.

Nierman, A. J., Thompson, S. C., Bryan, A., & Mahaffey, A. L. (2007). Gender role beliefs and attitudes toward lesbians and gay men in Chile and the U.S. *Sex Roles, 57*(1/2), 61-67.

Niven, D., & Zilbe, J. (2001). Do women and men in Congress cultivate different images? Evidence from congressional web sites. *Political Communication, 18*, 395-405

Norris, P. (Ed.). (1997). *Women, media, and politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Norris, P. (1997). Introduction. In P. Norris (Ed.), *Women, media, and politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Norris, P. (1997). Women leaders worldwide: A splash of color in the photo op. In P. Norris (Ed.), *Women, media, and politics* (pp. 149-165). New York: Oxford University Press.

Norris, P. (2002). *Democratic Phoenix: Reinventing political activism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Norris, P. (2004). Global political communication: Good governance, human development and mass communication. In F. Esser & B. Pfetsch (Eds.),

Comparing political communication. Theories, cases, and challenges (pp. 115-150). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Obama carefully shifts focus. (2008, June 3). *The New York Times,* p. A2.

Op-Extra: Selections from Opinion Online. (2008, January 13). *The New York Times,* p. A14.

Oransky, M., & Marecek, J. (2009). "I'm not going to be a girl": Masculinity and emotions in boys' friendships and peer groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 24*(2), 218-241.

Orrego, C. (2005, May 16). Alianza por Chile II [Letter to the editor]. *El Mercurio,* p. A2.

Pantti, M., & Van Zoonen, L. (2006). Do crying citizens make good citizens? . *Social Semiotics, 16*(2), 205-224.

Pantti, M., & Wieten, J. (2005). Mourning becomes the nation: television coverage of the murder of Pim Fortuyn. *Journalism Studies, 6*(3), 301-313.

Parker, A. (2010, November 6, 2010). 2010 faltered as a new "Year of the Woman" in politics. *The New York Times,* p. A15.

Pateman, C. (1989). *The disorder of women: Democracy, feminism and political theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Penn, M. (2008, June 8). What went wrong: The problem wasn't the message—it was the money. *The New York Times,* p. A14.

Pennebaker, J. W., & Roberts, T.-A. (1991). Towards a his and hers theory of emotion: Gender differences in visceral perception. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 11*(3), 199.

Peña, C. (2005a, October 23). El debate de la desigualdad. *El Mercurio*.

Peña, C. (2005b, April 30). El debate que no fue. *El Mercurio,* p. D10.

Peña, C. (2005c, May 29). Espíritus en la DC. *El Mercurio,* p. D14.

Peña, C. (2005d, May 16). Piñera, el posmoderno. *El Mercurio,* p. C6.

Peña, C. (2005e, October 20). Un debate ingrávido. *El Mercurio,* p. C6.

Pérez de Arce, H. (2005, May 18). Angustiada imploración. *El Mercurio,* p. A3.

Perry, L. A. M., Turner, L. H., & Sterk, H. M. (Eds.). (1992). *Constructing and reconstructing gender: The links among communication, language, and gender*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Pew Research Center for the People & the Press. (2010, September 12). Americans Spending More Time Following the News. Retrieved September 10, 2010, from http://people-press.org/report/652/

Pfetsch, B., & Esser, F. (2004). Comparing political communication. Reorientation in a changing world. In F. Esser & B. Pfetsch (Eds.), *Comparing political communication. Theories, cases, and challenges* (pp. 3-22). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Pfetsch, B., & Esser, F. (2008). Conceptual challenges to the paradigms of comparative media systems in a globalized world. *Journal of Global Mass Communication, 1*(3/4), 118-131.

Philippot, P., Feldman, R. S., & Coats, E. J. (Eds.). (1999). *The social context of nonverbal behavior*. Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Philippot, P., Feldman, R. S., & Coats, E. J. (1999). Introducing nonverbal behavior within a social context In P. Philippot, R. S. Feldman & E. J. Coats (Eds.), *The social context of nonverbal behavior* (pp. 3-14). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Piñera activa estrategia para arrebatar voto popular a Lavín. (2005, August 5). *La Tercera,* p. 7.

Piñera potencia perfil de candidato ponderado. (2005, October 21). *La Tercera,* p. 4.

Piñera se plantea cómo unica alternativa de la alianza. (2005, November 17). *La Tercera,* p. 7.

Planalp, S. (1999). *Communicating emotion: Social, moral, and cultural processes.* Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Planteamientos de los candidatos. (2005, October 20). *El Mercurio,* p. C5.

Plutchick, R. (1984). Emotions: A general psychoevolutionary theory. In K. R. Scherer & P. Ekman (Eds.), *Approaches to emotion* (pp. 197-219). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Poniewozik, J. (2008, February 18). Hillary's SNL strategy. *Time, 171-7,* 22.

Ponnuru, R. (2008, February 18). The price of overconfidence. *Time, 171-7,* 40.

Porter, E. J. (2006). Can politics practice compassion? *Hypatia, 21*(4), 97-123.

Potter, J. W. (1996). *An analysis of thinking and research about qualitative methods*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Powell, M. (2008a, June 4). Calm in the swirl of history. *The New York Times,* p. A1.

Powell, M. (2008b, February 6). Northeast delivers 2 big prizes for Clinton. *The New York Times,* p. E1.

Powell, M. (2008c, June 2). Obama, awaiting a new title, carefully hones his partisan image. *The New York Times,* p. A18.

Powell, M. (2008d, January 9). Retooled campaign and loyal voters add up. *The New York Times,* p. A14.

Presidenciables solidarizan con candidata. (2005, December 7). *El Mercurio,* p. C6.

Prividera, L. C., & Howard, J. W. I. (2006). Masculinity, whiteness and the warrior hero: Perpetuating the strategic rhetoric of U.S. nationalism and the marginalization of women. *Women and Language, 29*(2), 29-37.

Programme, U. N. D. (2010). *Human Development Report 2010. The real wealth of nations: Pathways to human development*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Propuestas parecidas y mensajes cruzados. (2005, November 17). *El Mercurio,* p. C6.

Prysby, C. (2008). Perceptions of candidate character traits and the presidential vote in 2004. *Political Science & Politics, 41*(1), 115-122.

Rakow, L. F. (1986). Rethinking gender research in communication. *Journal of Communication, 36*(4), 11-26.

Rakow, L. F. (1989). Feminist studies: The next stage. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 6*(20), 209-215.

Rakow, L. F. (1992). The field reconsidered. In L. F. Rakow (Ed.), *Women making meaning: New feminist directions in communication* (pp. 3-17). New York: Routledge.

Rakow, L. F. (Ed.). (2002). *Women making meaning: New feminist directions in communication*. New Yotk: Routledge.

Rakow, L. F., & Kranich, K. (1991). Women as sign in television news. *Journal of Communication, 41*(1), 8-23.

Rakow, L. F., & Wackwitz, L. A. (Eds.). (2004). *Feminist communication theory: selections in context*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rapoport, R. B., Metcalf, K. L., & Hartman, J. A. (1989). Candidate traits and voter inferences: An experimental study. *Journal of Politics, 51*(5), 917-932.

Redlawsk, D. P. (Ed.). (2003). *Feeling politics: Affect and emotion in political information processing*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Redlawsk, D. P., & Lau, R. R. (2003). I like him, but...: Vote choice when candidate likeability and closeness on issues clash In D. P. Redlawsk (Ed.), *Feeling politics: Affect and emotion in political information processing*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rich, F. (2008a, January 13). Haven't we heard this voice before? *The New York Times,* p. A12.

Rich, F. (2008b, March 30). Hillary's St. Patrick's day massacre. *The New York Times,* p. A13.

Rich, F. (2008c, June 8). One historic night, two Americas. *The New York Times,* p. A12.

Rich, F. (2008d, January 6). They didn't stop thinking about tomorrow. *The New York Times,* p. A13.

Richards, B. (2004). The emotional deficit in political communication. *Political Communication, 21*, 339-352.

Robinson, E. (2007, January 23). Throwing their blogs into the ring. *The Washington Post,* p. A17.

Robinson, E. (2008a, March 28). Collateral damage. *The Washington Post,* p. A19.

Robinson, E. (2008b, February 5). The baggage Hillary bears. *The Washington Post,* p. A19.

Rodgers, S., Kenix, L. J., & Thorson, E. (2007). Stereotypical portrayals of emotionality in news photos. *Mass Communication & Society, 10*(1), 119-138.

Rodriguez-Mosquera, P. M., Fischer, A. H., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2004). Inside the heart of emotion: On culture and relational concerns. In L. Z. Tiedens & C. W. Leach (Eds.), *The social life of emotions* (pp. 187-202). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Romano, L. (2007, January 21). Far from a hindrance, gender could be key for Clinton. *The Washington Post,* p. A6.

Romano, L. (2008, January 5). Mum's the word. *The Washington Post,* p. C1.

Rosaldo, R. (1977). The rhetoric of control: Ilongots viewed as natural bandits and wild Indians. In B. A. Babcock (Ed.), *The reversible world: Symbolic inversion in art and society* (pp. 240-257). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Rosenberg, D. V. (1990). Language in the discourse of the emotions. In C. A. Lutz & L. Abu-Lughod (Eds.), *Language and the politics of emotion* (pp. 162-185). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Rosenberg, S. W., Bohan, L., McCafferty, P., & Harris, K. (1986). The image and the vote: The effect of candidate presentation on voter preference. *American Journal of Political Science, 30*(1), 108-127.

Ross, K. (2002). *Women, politics, media. Uneasy relations in comparative perspective*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Ross, K. (2004). Women framed: The gendered turn in mediated politics. In C. M. Byerly & K. Ross (Eds.), *Women and media. International perspectives* (pp. 60-76): Blackwell Publishing.

Ross, K., & Sreberny, A. (2000). Women in the house: Media representations of British politicians. In A. Sreberny & L. v. Zoonen (Eds.), *Gender, politics and communication* (pp. 79-99). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Rubin, H. (2008, January 10). To the editor [Letter to the editor]. *The New York Times,* p. A14.

Rubio, L. (2005, November 19). "El peor error que puede comenter la Alianza es clonar a los dos candidatos" [Interview]. *La Tercera,* p.!0.

Ruland, P. (2008, January 10). To the editor [Letter to the editor]. *The New York Times,* p. A14.

Ryan, B. (1992). *Feminism and the women's movement: Dynamics of change in social movements. Ideology and activism*. New York: Routledge.

Saarni, C. (1998). Issues of cultural meaningfulness in emotional development. *Devolopmental Psychology, 34*(4), 647-652.

Saarni, C. (1999). *The devolopment of emotional competence*. New York: Routledge.

Saarni, C., & Weber, H. (1999). Emotional displays and dissemblance in childhood: implications for self-presentation. In P. Philippot, R. S. Feldman & E. J. Coats (Eds.), *The social context of nonverbal behavior* (pp. 71-105). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Salinas, C. (2005a, May 17). Bachelet: fuga de votos a Piñera "es política ficción". *El Mercurio,* p. C6.

Salinas, C. (2005b, April 29). El malestar DC y el alivio de la izquierda. *El Mercurio,* p. C4.

Salinas, C. (2005c, April 28). En un clima no confrontacional, ambas candidaturas se dieron por ganadoras. *El Mercurio,* p. C4.

Salinas, C. (2005d, October 20). Lavín marcó mayores diferencias en el foro. *El Mercurio,* p. C4.

Salinas, C. (2005e, November 16). Piñera sube en percepción de atributos. *El Mercurio,* p. C6

Salinas, J. L. (2005, April 28). El look: Bachelet lució conservadora. *El Mercurio,* p. C5.

Sanbonmatsu, K. (2003). Political knowledge and gender stereotypes. *American Politics Research, 31*(6), 575-594.

Saslow, E. (2008, March 18). Congregation defends Obama's ex-pastor. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Saslow, E., & Mummolo, J. (2008, June 5). Elation is tinged with incredulity. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Scharrer, E. (2002). An "improbable leap": A content analysis of newspaper coverage of Hillary Clinton's transition from first lady to Senate candidate. *Journalism Studies, 3*(3), 393-406.

Scherer, K. R. (2005). Unconscious processes in emotion: The bulk of the iceberg. In P. M. Niedenthal, L. F. Barrett & P. Winkielman (Eds.), *The unconscious in emotion* (pp. 312-334). New York: Guilford.

Scherer, K. R. (2005). What are emotions? And how can they be measured? *Social Science Information, 44*(4), 695-729.

Scherer, K. R., & Ekman, P. (Eds.). (1984). *Approaches to emotion*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Scheufele, D. A. (2000). Agenda-setting, priming, and framing revisited: Another look at cognitive effects of political communication. *Mass Communication & Society, 3*(2), 297-316.

Scott, J. (2008, March 19). A candidate chooses reconciliation over rancor. *The New York Times,* p. A14.

Sebastián Piñera y RN "con los brazos abiertos". (2005, May 25). *El Mercurio,* p. C7.

Seelye, K. Q., & Powell, M. (2008, March 29). Surprise backing from senator reflected frustration and desire for healing. *The New York Times,* p. A12.

Seligman, M. E. P. (1990). *Learned optimism*. New York: Knopf.

Semetko, H. A., Blumler, J. G., Gurevitch, M., & Weaver, D. (1991). *The formation of campaign agendas: a comparative analysis of party and media roles in recent American and British elections*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Senkowski, A. (2008, February 9). Coverage, comment—and condescension [letter to the editor]. *The Washington Post,* p. A13.

Sewell, A. (2007, November 1). To the editor [Letter to the editor]. *The New York Times,* p. A26.

Sheafer, T. (2007). How to evaluate it: the role of story-evaluation tone in agenda setting and priming. *Journal of Communication, 57*(1), 21-39.

Shepard, R. (2009). Confronting gender bias, finding a voice: Hillary Clinton and the New Hampshire crying incident. *Argumentation and Advocacy 46*, 64-77.

Sherman, N. (2004). Virtue and emotional demeanor. In A. S. R. Manstead, N. Frijda & A. H. Fischer (Eds.), *Feelings and emotions: The Amsterdam Symposium* (pp. 441-454). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Shields, S. A. (2000). Thinking about gender, thinking about theory: Gender and emotional experience. In A. H. Fischer (Ed.), *Gender and emotion: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 3-23). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Shields, S. A. (2002). *Speaking from the heart. Gender and the social meaning of emotion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Shields, S. A., & Koster, B. A. (1987). Emotional stereotyping of parents in child rearing manuals, 1915-1980. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 52*(1), 44-55.

Shields, S. A., & MacDowell, K. A. (1987). "Appropriate" emotion in politics: Judgments of a televised debate. *Journal of Communication, 37*(1), 78-89.

Shire, E. (2008, March 30). To the editor [Letter to the editor]. *The New York Times,* p. A14.

Shomaker, P. J., Tankard, J. W., & Lasorsa, D. L. (2004). *How to build social science theories*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Shweder, R. A. (2004). Deconstructing emotions for the sake of comparative research. In A. S. R. Manstead, N. Frijda & A. H. Fischer (Eds.), *Feelings and emotions: The Amsterdam Symposium* (pp. 81-97). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Simon, A. (1994). Judgments of a woman's emotions. The influence of observer attitudes. . *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24*(3), 251-259.

Slevin, P., & Lydersen, K. (2008, February 6). Battling over the home turf. *The Washington Post,* p. A28.

Smith, C. R., & Hyde, M. J. (1991). Rethinking 'the public': The being-with-others. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 77*, 446-466.

Smith, J. L., Paul, D., & Paul, R. (2007). No place for a woman: Evidence for gender bias in evaluations of presidential candidates. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 29*(3), 225-233.

Sokolon, M. K. (2006). *Political emotions: Aristotle and the symphony of reason and emotion*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press.

Solomon, R. C. (1993). *The passions: Emotions and meaning of life*. Indianapolis: Hackett.

Somit, A., & Peterson, S. A. (1998). Biopolitics after three decades: A balance sheet. *British Journal of Political Science, 28*, 559-571.

Sparrow, B. H. (1999). *Uncertain guardians*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Spitzack, C., & Carter, K. (1989). Research on women's communication: The politics of theory and method. In K. Carter & C. Spitzack (Eds.), *Doing research on women's communication: Perspectives on theory and method* (pp. 11-39). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Sreberny, A., & Van Zoonen, L. (Eds.). (2000). *Gender, politics and communication*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Sreberny-Mohammadi, A., & Ross, K. (1996). Women MPs and media: Representing the body politic. *Parliamentary Affairs, 49*, 103-115.

Staley, C. C., & Schockley-Zalabak, P. (1989). Triangulation in gender research: the need for converging methodologies. In K. Carter & C. Spitzack (Eds.), *Doing research on women's communication: Perspectives on theory and method* (pp. 242-261). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Stanley, A. (2008a, March 29). Obama communicates, even without words. *The New York Times,* p. A13.

Stanley, A. (2008b, January 9). Stewart (angsty) and Colbert (not) return, gazing at navels and news. *The New York Times,* p. E1.

Stearns, P. N. (1992). Gender and emotion: a twentieth-century transition. In D. D. Franks & a. V. Gecas (Eds.), *Social perspectives on emotion* (Vol. 1, pp. 127-160). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Stearns, P. N., & Stearns, C. Z. (1985). Emotionology: clarifying the history of emotions and emotional standards. *American Historical Review, 90*(4), 813-836.

Steeves, H. L. (1987). Feminist Theories and Media Studies. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 4*(2), 95-135.

Steinem, G. (2008, January 8). Women are never front-runners. *The New York Times,* p. A23.

Steiner, L. (2008). Critiquing journalism: Feminist perspectives relevant to contemporary challenges. In P. Poindexter, S. Meraz & A. Schmitz Weiss

(Eds.), *Women, men, and news: divided and disconnected in the news media landscape*. New York: Routledge.

Steinheuser, J. (2008, January 11). A new Clinton, going door to door in Nevada, asks for help. *The New York Times,* p. A16.

Stengel, R. (2008, June 16). The big stories. *Time, 171-24,* 2.

Stewart, N. (2008, March 18). A candidate who mirrors their lives. *The Washington Post,* p. C1.

Stroud, L. R., Glaser, J., & Salovey, P. (2006). The effects of partisanship and candidate emotionality on voter preference. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 25*(1), 25-44.

Sullivan, D. G., & Masters, R. D. (1988). "Happy warriors": Leaders' facial displays, viewers' emotions, and political support. *American Journal of Political Science, 32*, 345-368.

Swanson, D. L. (1992). Managing theoretical diversity in cross-national studies of political communication. In J. G. Blumler, J. M. McLeod & K. E. Rosengren (Eds.), *Comparatively speaking: Communication and culture across space and time* (pp. 19-34). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Swanson, G. E. (1971). Frameworks for comparative research: Structural anthropology and the theory of action. In I. Vallier (Ed.), *Comparative methods in sociology: Essays on trends and applications* (pp. 141-202). Berkeley: University of California Press.

The Ferraro choice. (1984, July 13). [Editorial] *The Washington Post,* p. A16.

The political road ahead. (2008, January 5). [Editorial] *The New York Times,* p. A14.

Thoits, P. A. (2004). Emotion norms, emotion work, and social order. In A. S. R. Manstead, N. Frijda & A. H. Fischer (Eds.), *Feelings and emotions: The Amsterdam Symposium* (pp. 359-378). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, S. (1997). Why gender matters: The perceptions of women officeholders. *Women & Politics, 17*(1), 27-53.

Tiedens, L. Z., & Leach, C. W. (Eds.). (2004). *The social life of emotions*. Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Tironi, E. (2005a, May 17). La hora de Piñera. *El Mercurio,* p. A3.

Tironi, E. (2005b, May 28). La OPA de Sebastián y el café de soledad. *Qué Pasa,* 16-19.

Tomkins, S. S. (1984). Affect theory. In K. R. Scherer & P. Ekman (Eds.), *Approaches to emotion* (pp. 163-195). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tomkins, S. S. (1991). *Affect, Imagery, Consciousness* (Vol. 4). New Yorl: Springer.

Torres, X. (2005, May 14). Todas las mujeres de Bachelet. *Qué Pasa,* 6-12.

Trebay, G. (2008, February 5). Selling us ice in the winter. *The New York Times,* p. B8.

Tripp, A. M. (2007). Why so slow? The challenges of gendering comparative politics. *Politics & Gender, 2*(2), 249-263.

Troyer, L., & Robinson, D. T. (2003). Contributions of a sociological perspective on affect to the study of political action. In D. P. Redlawsk (Ed.), *Feeling politics: Affect and emotion in political information processing* (pp. 47-56). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Trujillo, A. (2005, August 4). Críticas de historiador indignan a Bachelet. *El Mercurio,* p. C4.

Tuchman, G. (1978). Introduction: The symbolic annihilation of women by the mass media. In G. Tuchman, A. K. Daniels & J. W. Benet (Eds.), *Hearth and home: Images of women in mass media* (pp. 3-38). New York: Oxford University Press.

Un debate al que le faltó calidad. (2005, April 29). [Editorial] *La Tercera,* p. 3.

Una candidatura que nació fuerte, pero no logró tomar vuelo. (2005, May 25). *La Tercera,* p. 7.

Una inyección de ánimo que llegó a tiempo. (2005, April 30). *La Tercera,* p. R4.

Valdés, S., & Lob, M. (2005, April 29). "La gente se dio cuenta que Bachelet y Alvear no son Ricardo Lagos". *La Tercera,* p. 8.

Valdés, S., & Mujica, E. (2005, April 30). "Hay que evitar la tentación de convertir a las candidatas presidenticales en hombres" [Interview]. *Qué Pasa,* 16-18.

Valentino, N. A. (1999). The contingent effects of campaign news frames on participation and confidence in government. *Political Communication, 18*, 347-367.

Valenzuela, C. (2005, November 18). Encuesta CEP. *La Tercera,* p. 2.

van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.). (1985). *Discourse and communication: New approaches to the analysis of mass media discourse and communication*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

van Dijk, T. A. (1988). *News as discourse*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

van Gorp, B. (2007). The constructionist approach to framing: Bringing culture back in. *Journal of Communication, 57*(1), 60-78.

van Zoonen, L. (1994). *Feminist Media Studies*. London: Sage.

Vargas Llosa, Á. (2005, October 23). El debate visto desde América Latina. *La Tercera,* p. R16.

Vavrus, M. D. (1998). Working the senate from the outside: The mediated construction of a feminist political campaign. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication, 15*(3), 213-235.

Vavrus, M. D. (2002). *Postfeminist news: Political women in media culture*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Villegas, F. (2005, May 14). El chico listo. *Qué Pasa,* 18-23.

Vingerhoets, A., & Scheirs, J. (2000). Sex differences in crying: Empirical findings and possible explanations. In A. H. Fischer (Ed.), *Gender and emotion: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 143-165). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Wackwitz, L. A., & Rakow, L. F. (2007). Got theory? In P. Creedon & J. Cramer (Eds.), *Women in mass communication* (3rd ed., pp. 257-271). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Watson, D. (2008, June 5). To the editor [Letter to the editor]. *The New York Times,* p. A28.

"We will make history together." (2008, June 8). *The Washington Post,* p. A11.

Weisman, J. (2008a, January 7). GOP doubts, fears 'post-partisan' Obama. *The New York Times,* p. A1.

Weismann, J. (2008b, March 21). Michigan ends revote bid. *The Washington Post,* p. A6.

Weismann, J. (2008c, March 22). Richardson throws support to Obama. *The Washington Post,* p. A5.

Weismann, J., & Balz, D. (2008, June 5). Clinton pullout likely Saturday. *The Washington Post,* p. A1.

Weismann, J., & Kane, P. (2008, January 9). Conventional wisdom hits the reset button. *The Washington Post,* p. A10.

Weldon, S. L. (2007). The structure of intersectionality: A comparative politics of gender. *Politics & Gender, 2*(2), 235-248.

Wentworth, W. M., & Ryan, J. (1992). Balancing body, mind, and culture: the place of emotion in social life. In D. D. Franks & a. V. Gecas (Eds.), *Social perspectives on emotion* (Vol. 1, pp. 25-46). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Westen, D. (2008). *The political brain: The role of emotion in deciding the fate of the nation*. New York: PublicAffairs.

White, M. (1999). Representation of facial expressions of emotion. *American Journal of Psychology, 112*(3), 371-381.

Whitman, C. T. (2008, June 8). What went wrong: Boys on the bias. *The New York Times,* p. A14.

Wierzbicka, A. (1999). *Emotions across languages and cultures: diversity and universals*. Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Wilder, L. D. (2008, June 8). What went wrong: No exit. *The New York Times,* p. A14.

Will, G. F. (2008a, June 6). For Obama, a ticket test. *The Washington Post,* p. A19.

Will, G. F. (2008b, January 6). Iowa's histrionic hucksters. *The Washington Post,* p. B7.

Williams, K. (2008, January 6). Seeing beyond gender, despite shared struggles. *The Washington Post,* p. A9.

Wilson, H. (2008, June 8). What went wrong: Hermione Clinton. *The New York Times,* p. A14.

Winsky Mattei, L. R. (1998). Gender and power in American legislative discourse. *Journal of Politics, 60*(2), 440-461.

Wirth, W., & Kolb, S. (2004). Designs and methods of comparative political communication research. In F. Esser & B. Pfetsch (Eds.), *Comparing political communication. Theories, cases, and challenges* (pp. 87-113). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wirth, W., & Schramm, H. (2005). Media and emotions. *Communication Research Trends, 24*(3), 3-39.

Witt, L., Paget, K. M., & Matthews, G. (1994). *Running as a woman: Gender and power in American politics*. New York: Free Press.

Yáñez, N. (2005, November 19). Bachelet: "No necesito madrinas ni padrinos". *El Mercurio,* p. C4.

Yáñez, N., & Álvarez, R. (2005, December 7). Nuevo enfrentamiento DC y comando Piñera. *El Mercurio,* p. C4.

Zammuner, V. L. (2000). Men's and women's lay theories of emotion. In A. H. Fischer (Ed.), *Gender and emotion: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 48-70). Cambridge/Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Zeleny, J. (2008, March 30). The game's not over, Clinton backers agree. *The New York Times,* p. A18.

Zeleny, J., & Healy, P. (2008, January 7). Not so fast, Clinton says about Obama momentum. *The New York Times,* p. A16.

Zernike, Kate (2008, June 4). Clinton discusses what she wants, but not what she will do. *The New York Times,* p. A18.

Vita

Ingrid Bachmann Cáceres received a B.A. in Journalism (2000) and an M.A. in Linguistics (2005) from the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile. She entered the doctoral program in the School of Journalism at the University of Texas at Austin in 2006. Her research interests include gender, political communication, and news narratives. Upon graduation she will resume her teaching and research activities at the College of Communication at the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile.

Permanent address: ingridbachmann1@gmail.com

This dissertation was typed by the author.

272