

6-2019

The 2018 Elections: Gender, Media Representation, And Campaign Strategies

Emily Bobruff

Union College - Schenectady, NY

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalworks.union.edu/theses>



Part of the [American Politics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bobruff, Emily, "The 2018 Elections: Gender, Media Representation, And Campaign Strategies" (2019). *Honors Theses*. 2273.
<https://digitalworks.union.edu/theses/2273>

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at Union | Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of Union | Digital Works. For more information, please contact digitalworks@union.edu.

*THE 2018 ELECTIONS:
GENDER, MEDIA REPRESENTATION, AND CAMPAIGN STRATEGIES*

BY

EMILY CONSTANCE BOBRUFF

.....

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

HONORS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

UNION COLLEGE

MARCH, 2019

Introduction

My thesis topic is evaluating the accuracy of media representation of candidates in the 2018 gubernatorial and senatorial elections. My research is specifically concerned with the gender equality of the accuracy of media representation of candidates. I went about this by first reviewing relevant recent research within the field of gender and political campaigning. I began my original research by evaluating candidates' campaign strategies, specifically their trait and issue emphasis. I did this by evaluating campaign advertisements found on the YouTube campaign channels of each candidate. I selected a random sample of campaign advertisements and recorded the issue and trait emphasis in each advertisement, finding an average number of mentions of each issue and trait per advertisement. I repeated this process for the 8 gubernatorial candidates and 8 senatorial candidates that I had selected based on their gender, party, state, and election outcome.

After evaluating the candidates' campaign strategies and comparing the impacts of gender, party, and state on strategies, I then moved to researching media representation. I decided to research newspaper articles, specifically either from a top circulating newspaper from the state in which the election was held, or by the most reputable wire service available within the database Nexis Uni. I recorded the issues, traits, tone of headlines, tone of articles, criticism of candidates, and mentions of qualifications to understand the media representation of each candidate within the gubernatorial and senatorial studies. With the information that I gathered from the media analysis, I compared this to the candidates' own strategies that I had found through their campaign advertisements, and I calculated the differences in the ways that the media represents candidates compared with how the candidates represent themselves on the basis of issue and trait representation. I then was able to draw conclusions on the accuracy of media coverage for each senatorial and gubernatorial race within the study. My main conclusions

include that women are not disadvantaged by their gender within media coverage. Also, though gender stereotypes persist to exist within our society, female candidates use campaign strategies to navigate these stereotypes to find success in winning elections.

This research is important as voters view how the media represents candidates as news is pervasive within our society, Equal gender representation within the media is one necessary step in working towards equal gender representation within the United States government. My review of prior research serves to understand why women are not equally represented within United States government. My original research questions the accuracy of gendered media representation in 2018, at this important political time where sexist language is promoted by the President of the United States. I begin my thesis with a review of prior research in the field of gender and campaigning in United States politics, with my literature review in the following chapter.

Chapter 1: An Overview of Gender, Campaigning, and Media

This chapter will serve as a review of the literature within the field of gender and campaigning in United States politics. I first define necessary terminology relating to gender and campaigning. I move to answer the question of if voters stereotype based on gender, and how candidates deal with stereotypes. I then review how men and women are represented within the media, and how gendered media representation has evolved within recent history. Last, I review literature that evaluates why women are not equally represented, and explain what my original research will serve within this field of study.

There are clear gender dynamics in the United States, brought about by historical and cultural circumstances that have over time defined gender roles. The women's movement has pushed for change in gender roles, fighting for equality between the sexes. This is especially important due to our country's serious history of women not being viewed as "fit for political life" (Dolan 2014, 18). The women's suffrage movement helped ratify the 19th Amendment to the United States Constitution, which granted women the right to vote in 1920. This gave way to women becoming more politically active, including running for elected office. Women's representation in elected offices has been an uphill battle, with women trying to enter this male-dominated professional sphere of the United States. Over time, certain factors have led to women's increased representation in elected offices, including more acceptance of women in the workplace. Though the country's climate has shifted in the direction of greater acceptance of women and support for gender equality, there is still room for improvement. Women are still seen as disadvantaged compared to men in many aspects of life including elections, representation within government, equal pay, and levels of respect, and this translates into the general assumption that women's gender harms women as candidates in the United States. It is

through conventional wisdom, a term commonly used throughout gender and election research, that many assumptions are made about how women's gender affects election outcomes.

Conventional wisdom has played a role in shaping how voters and researchers view women in politics in the United States. Conventional wisdom, in summation, is the assumption that female candidates' gender holds them back in elections due to persisting sexism in politics and the campaigning process (Dolan 2014). According to Kathleen Dolan (2014, 4), "Conventional wisdom may overestimate the centrality of gendered attitudes and political gender stereotypes in the success or failure of women candidates. While the analysis suggests that stereotypes are not completely irrelevant in elections, there is considerable evidence that women candidates are not routinely hampered or harmed by them." Gender norms in the United States are something that has been socially constructed to have specific expectations about individuals based on their sex. However, as women have worked towards moving away from the home and becoming more involved in rigorous careers, women are now seen as more capable of being leaders, "conventional wisdom may have been true at one time, but not anymore" (Brooks 2013, 109). However, modern literature contradicts this belief. Prior to reviewing literature on gender and elections, I subscribed to the conventional wisdom line of thinking that women's gender greatly hinders women in elections. However, the literature I reviewed widely supports the hypothesis that women's gender does not necessarily harm candidates in the sense of gender stereotypes, but that gender plays a nuanced role in campaigning across offices.

Danny Hayes and Jennifer Lawless (2016) point out that there are reasons for public opinion to lean in favor of thinking that women face negative impacts of gender stereotypes; women generally have less representation than men in office, and the United States has never had a female president. Today, women hold 23.4% of the seats in the House of Representatives and 25% of the seats in the U.S. Senate (Kurtzleben 2018). This is an improvement from 2016,

when women held only 20% of U.S. Senate seats and 19% of seats in the House of Representatives (Hayes and Lawless 2016). Though the number of seats held by women in Congress is lower than that held by men, things are improving. Hayes and Lawless (2016, 6) conclude from their research that “When they do run, women do just as well as men.” In order to understand why this is, Dolan (2014, 14) claims that we must “reevaluate the influence of political gender stereotypes in the real world.”

This literature review will serve to review the work that has already been completed on the impacts of gender in campaigning over time. This review will help provide background for my original research on the 2018 gubernatorial and senatorial elections, and how candidates of different genders, parties, and states strategize based on issues and traits. My original research later in this thesis will also include an analysis of how well the genders are represented within the media. The information provided in this literature will serve as an understanding of what has happened within gender and campaigning as well as gender representation within the media, and my original research will later detail modern gender campaigning strategies and media representation.

Gender Stereotyping: Do Voters Gender Stereotype?

Gender stereotypes exist—however, they do not tend to have a negative effect on women candidates in elections. Stereotyping is defined through social psychology theory as the “process by which people, through either direct experience or other exposure, develop beliefs about the characteristics of social groups” (Dolan 2014, 22). Thus, gender stereotypes are beliefs about the characteristics of men and women based on people’s experience with or exposure to people of gender groups. When voters see candidates, this is one aspect of the candidates that the voters observe and could use to evaluate candidates; however, this is not the only or even the main aspect through which voters judge candidates. Due to the history of women being seen as

subordinate to men through gender stereotypes and women being placed in a lower social standing by men, it makes sense that conventional wisdom assumes that gender stereotypes would harm women in elections. However, this is not so. In fact, gender stereotypes serve to benefit female candidates if used strategically.

Examples of gender stereotypes include women being seen as less tough, less assertive, and less leadership-oriented than men, which leads voters to believe that women may be less tough on military defense and handling terrorism (Brooks 2013). While these attributes are not positive, there are also a number of positive gender stereotypes that are applied to women, including the qualities of being caring, compassionate, and honest, which lead voters to believe that women candidates can be effective politicians, good with diplomacy and focus on education (Brooks 2013). According to Dolan (2014, 31), “For every place there is a concern about women based on stereotypes, there are an equal number of advantages women have based on stereotypes that are valued by voters.” Carroll and Fox (2014) conclude that gender shapes the ways candidates appeal to voters and the ways voters respond to candidates. While there is an existence of gender stereotyping from voters, the mere presence of gender stereotyping does not indicate that there are negative impacts on women candidates (Brooks 2013, 68).

When voters assess candidates, gender is not the only characteristic through which voters evaluate a candidate’s aptitude for office. Women candidates are not hindered by gender stereotypes because factors other than gender simply matter more to voters, “Voters' views of candidates are shaped almost entirely by long-standing party attachments, leaving little room for sex to matter. At a moment in which the divisions between parties are as large as they have been since Reconstruction, partisanship and ideology dominate the way the public evaluates candidates” (Hayes and Lawless 2016, 8). Voters evaluate candidates more based on their party affiliation and issue focus than gender. In addition to party affiliation, Dolan (2014, 33) points

out additional factors that voters are more concerned with than candidate gender, including incumbency, campaign spending, and electoral competitiveness. Positive gender stereotypes assist female candidates, while negative gender stereotypes can harm female candidates, thus, gender is a factor in women's success.

While gender stereotyping has begun to have some positive impacts within positive stereotypes for female candidates in recent years, gender stereotypes did used to gravely work against female candidates. Kim Fridkin Kahn (1996, 131) focuses on elections for U.S. senatorial and gubernatorial races throughout the 1980s; she found at that time that "Women's access to political office may be limited by people's stereotypical views of women's capabilities and liabilities. Stereotypical views hamper women in their campaigns for higher political office." Women attempted to combat this negative use of gender stereotyping by voters to evaluate female candidates by playing up positive "women's issues" including "education, health care, and other social issues" (Kahn 1996, 132). In 1984, Geraldine Ferraro ran as the Democratic vice presidential nominee, and recounts having many unprecedented difficulties due to "the novelty of her gender" (Brooks 2013, 59). Ferraro makes the point that, "At the time I ran, there were no women in political leadership, so people had nothing to compare me to" (Brooks 2013, 59). However, 34 years have passed since Ferraro ran for vice president, and many women have achieved success in entering high political office including governorships, seats in congress, and party leadership positions (Brooks 2013). We still see gender stereotyping in the 2010s, but this is a more nuanced gender stereotyping that can either help or harm female candidates based on their issue and trait emphasis. Kahn's work provides a helpful analysis of gender stereotypes in the 1980s, and we can see through more recent research, including Brooks' work from 2013, how far gender stereotypes have evolved over thirty years. Female candidates are no longer seen as rare novelties in politics.

The way that stereotypes work is through people being exposed to social groups in settings that help shape beliefs of those social groups (Dolan 2014). Since women are now seen in politics much more often than in past decades, it is not shocking to as many voters to see women and negative gender stereotypes of the past play less of a role in how voters evaluate candidates due to the greater acceptance of women in workplaces and government (Dolan 2014). While voters do gender stereotype because gender is often a readily available factor when voters evaluate candidates, gender stereotypes can work either positively or negatively impact female candidates depending on how candidates strategize.

Men's and Women's Campaign Strategies

Researchers have found it important to study female candidates using gender stereotypes in elections through campaign strategies. Political strategies are the deliberate choices that candidates make about what messages they put out into the world (Sheeler 2005). Strategies are communicated through the content of messages in speeches, television advertisements, websites, and social media posts, specifically through the issues that are talked about, the way that issues are framed, and the tone that the candidate takes in these communications with voters.

Researching female candidates using gender stereotypes in elections is important because of the debate surrounding whether or not women face difficulties due to gender stereotypes, which was discussed in the previous section. One way that women candidates can use positive gender stereotypes to their advantage is through their campaign strategies. Sheeler (2005) points out that different mediums of communication help candidates in different ways. Within campaign advertisements, men and women can use issue and trait emphasis to minimize the negative impacts of gender stereotypes. Through campaign advertisements, both male and female candidates can emphasize their personal strengths for issues or traits that are usually perceived as weaker for their gender. This platform allows candidates to highlight the issues that

they want to focus on and to portray the persona that they want voters to view (Panagopoulos 2004).

Campaign strategies can be categorized as masculine or feminine. Feminine strategies refer to focusing on more feminine issues in campaigning, including health care, Social Security, education, the environment, and civil rights (Brooks 2013, 64). Within this work, Brooks (2013) continues to define gendered strategies; feminine strategies also include playing up stereotypically female traits including being caring, compassionate, and honest. Masculine strategies refer to focusing on more masculine issues in campaigning, including military, defense, and the economy. Masculine strategies also focus on playing up agentic traits. Since both men and women employ feminine strategies most frequently, this shows that men and women are campaigning similarly on a strategic level (Carroll and Fox 2014). Male and female candidates discussed mostly the same strategically feminine issues on their websites, which suggests that “issue emphasis is more related to the context of the particular political campaign than on the sex of the candidate” (Carroll and Fox 2014, 259). Gender itself and negative gender stereotypes are not playing as large of a role as conventional wisdom implies; the political climate of the campaign is a more important factor in choosing campaign strategies.

As the two major political parties become more polarized, party tends to shape the issues on which candidates run their campaigns (Hayes and Lawless 2016). In this environment, “there are fewer opportunities for other candidate characteristics, such as sex, to shape the positions that candidates take, the issues they talk about, or the way they portray themselves to voters” (Hayes and Lawless 2016, 19). This is especially true in political advertisements; both male and female candidates overwhelmingly focus on policy issues in their advertisements (Panagopoulos 2004). Panagopoulos concludes that the campaign issue strategies are overall very similar between men and women. However, some differences can still be found in the extent to which female

candidates emphasize issues through their advertisements including “taxes, crime, jobs, and defense,” which are issues that women are stereotypically perceived to have less strength in than men (Panagopoulos 2004, 148). This shows that women are trying to make up for what they are stereotypically thought to be weaker with, and gender stereotypes are thus playing a role in how women are strategizing.

Both men and women decide to highlight their own strengths rather than to negatively discuss their political opponents (Panagopoulos 2004). This is a positive choice especially for women candidates, who are thought of as “the kinder gender”, which makes it “electorally risky for female politicians to behave aggressively” (Enns-Jedenastik, Dolezal, and Müller 2017). It is less in line with voters’ gender norms for women to attack opponents than for male candidates to do so, which is a negative impact of gender stereotypes. Thus, it is beneficial for women to highlight their own strengths rather than to attack their opponents, while males are using the same strategy, even though they wouldn’t be as negatively impacted. Gender is playing a role in how females campaign on the basis of attack ads, as gender stereotypes would negatively impact females if they were to utilize attack ads.

Candidates also use strategies including identity targeting through their political advertisements. Identity targeting is a strategy in which a candidate appeals to certain aspects of someone’s identity, for example, gender (Holman, Schneider, and Pondel 2015). This study supports that both male and female candidates see positive electoral benefits in using identity-based appeals, specifically gender appeals in their campaign advertisements. The ways in which male and female candidates make the appeals are slightly different due to their gender. Females attempt to appeal to males by focusing on stereotypically masculine issues and traits, and males try to appeal to females by focusing on stereotypically feminine issues and traits. Thus, females are utilizing masculine appeals and males are utilizing feminine appeals. Holman, Schneider, and

Pondel's (2015) research focuses on candidates' appeals to females, and found that male candidates use women's appeals to show that they appreciate the women in their lives and that they will fight for women, and female candidates use gender appeals to portray themselves as similar to the female voters and relate to female voters. While the ways in which male and female candidates are making gender appeals is slightly different, both male and female candidates find relatively equal success in using identity-based targeting in their campaign advertisements (Holman, Schneider, and Pondel 2015).

Male and female candidates both employ social media in their campaign strategies, as this medium is growing in relevancy to voters. Since social media as a medium tends to be mostly about creating a personal brand, social media can allow for more focus on candidate's personalities. McGregor, Lawrence, and Cardona (2017) found that male candidates of gubernatorial campaigns found electoral success in personalizing their social media strategies, while female candidates see less benefits in personalizing their social media campaigns. This personalization in campaigns refers to candidates marketing their personal lives rather than their policy positions (McGregor, Lawrence, and Cardona 2017). Thus, women in gubernatorial races succeed via social media the most when they stick to policy-based campaigning.

There are also no gender differences between how much emotional displays harm candidates—anger and crying for both male and female candidates are not received equally well by voters (Brooks 2013). There is no evidence or support that women face more penalties than men in votes if they show emotional displays (Brooks 2013). According to Brooks (2013, 109), “conventional wisdom has always been incorrect and that women have never been more heavily penalized for emotional displays. If recent election cycles have proved anything, it is that the conventional wisdom about campaigns and elections on a range of topics is often faulty.” Overall, there are many factors more important than gender in choosing campaign strategies,

including political party and political climate—this is why there tend to be so few differences in campaigning between men and women. However, gender is still an important factor given the presence of gender stereotypes that exist that males and females work to use to their advantages and work to downplay the effects of negative stereotypes. The increasing similarity in how males and females are campaigning sheds positive light on progress towards gender equality in politics—though there is still much room for improvement.

Men’s and Women’s Coverage in the Media

Coverage in the media of men and women used to be quite unequal, especially in the 1980s midterm elections and all elections prior where the news would “emphasize women’s appearance, personality, and family roles, but focused on men’s professional backgrounds, credentials, and office-holding experience...this tended to undermine female candidates’ qualifications” (Hayes and Lawless 2016, 16). Women used to receive much less news coverage than their male counterparts, which was also problematic and disadvantaged female candidates. Focusing on female candidates’ gender is also beginning to have less news value than it used to, since having women present in politics is no longer a novelty as it used to be, which is a positive advancement for women in politics. Since there are so many more pressing issues to discuss in politics than the existence of females in politics, the differences in media coverage between men and women are much less common than they used to be. One pressing issue in politics is the presence of conflict between political parties, “The high level of partisan conflict in the current era may diminish the role that candidate sex plays in shaping election news” (Hayes and Lawless 2016, 21).

In the 2000 U.S. Senate races, female candidates were mentioned more in newspaper articles than male candidates (Banwart, Bystrom, and Robertson 2003). About 75% of newspaper articles referencing the 2000 U.S. Senate races mentioned male candidates, while

about 97% of articles mentioned female candidates (Banwart, Bystrom, and Robertson 2003). This is impressive improvement from the 1980s when Kahn (1996, 92) found that women candidates in gubernatorial races received less coverage than men, especially in cases of candidates that are not incumbents; male challengers receive three times as much coverage as female challengers, and six paragraphs a day are published about issues for male challengers, compared with only two paragraphs a day regarding female challengers. For senatorial races, Kahn finds very problematic news coverage for women:

Women do not receive the same press coverage as their male counterparts. Female senatorial candidates receive less news coverage and the coverage they do receive concentrates more on their viability and less on their issue positions. Furthermore, the press discussion of the candidates' viability is more negative for women than for men, stressing the women's unlikely chances for victory as well as their lack of significant campaign resources (Kahn 1996, 55).

In the past 34 years since Kahn completed her research, news coverage in terms of quantity has become much more equitable between the genders.

While modern news coverage seems to be about equitable in terms of amount of coverage of male and female candidates, women are still sometimes covered in the media differently than their male counterparts. According to Hayes and Lawless (2016, 90), they “found little in the way of gender differences in the volume or substance of coverage men and women receive. The findings round out a depiction of an environment in which candidate sex is not particularly salient”.

However, Carroll and Fox (2014) found differences in content based on candidate sex, as they found that media also asks female candidates questions that male candidates are not asked about regarding the women politician's familial responsibilities; this is due to the media seeing

women politicians as women first, politicians second while male politicians are simply seen as politicians. This is consistent with the same quality of news coverage as we have seen in the past in the United States. In 1994, news reporters frequently asked New Jersey Governor Christine Todd Whitman, “‘What’s it like to be a woman governor?’ Whitman would ask her press secretary through clenched teeth, ‘How am I supposed to answer that?’” (Braden 1996, 2). Frequent labels of women politicians in the media have included “feisty, spunky, and bitch,” none of which refer to the candidates’ political experience or aptitude for their selected office (Braden 1996, 7). Though in 1996 this was prominent, Hayes and Lawless concluded that these labels are not still used today, as they believe in 2016, the most recent study in this literature review, that sex does not have an impact on the quality or quantity of media coverage.

Women’s appearances were scrutinized in the media in the past as well (Braden 1996). In the 2008 presidential primaries, political cartoon imagery of Hillary Clinton focused on gender-related issues, specifically ridiculing and belittling her for her emotions and appearance (Conners 2010). However, in more recent research, Hayes, Lawless, and Baitinger (2014) argue that even though the media are harsh about and fixate upon female candidates’ appearances, this doesn’t have a negative impact on polls because voters care about other factors more. This type of news coverage that focuses on female candidates’ gender is becoming less valuable, and news is becoming more partisan-focused (Hayes and Lawless 2016). Overall, media coverage of the genders is becoming more equal for campaigns, due to the similarity in issues mentioned and issue mentions within the media, except for in presidential campaigns (Carroll and Fox 2014).

An Even Playing Field? Women are Underrepresented: What Does This Mean?

The majority of my literature review seems to support the claim that female candidates are not harmed by gender stereotypes in elections in that women can utilize gender stereotypes to find success within their elections; however, women are still underrepresented in United States

politics. Though the prospects for women have increased over time, there are many reasons for this persisting unequal gender representation in United States political offices (Burrell 2014). First, women had a later political start in the United States than men; as a result, women have had less time to enter the political sphere, “Structural and institutional conditions make it more difficult for women to enter politics in the first place, as do gender inequities in patterns of candidate recruitment” (Hayes and Lawless 2016, 8). There are a limited number of opportunities for newer candidates in competitive districts, which also serves as a roadblock to women interested in starting a political career (Burrell 2014).

We may not see as many situations with blatant sexist behavior in elections as in the past, however, systemic gender bias in campaigns does contribute to hindering female candidates due to the beginning of the election process (Hayes and Lawless 2016). The whole process of entering the political world in the United States is dominated by men, “Men constituted the vast majority of candidates for governor and Congress in 2012. Most behind-the-scenes campaign strategists and consultants—the pollsters, media experts, fund-raising advisers, and those who develop campaign messages—are also men” (Carroll and Fox 2014, 5). When parties are involved in the recruitment of candidates, not many steps have been taken to specifically recruit women as a strategy to increase women’s representation (Burrell 2014).

The issue here lies with nominating women; once women are nominated, they are as likely as men to have access to party resources, particularly in the more highly competitive races (Burrell 2014). Women candidates, especially those who are pro-choice, also have the opportunity to access funding from women’s PACs, which is incredibly helpful with their campaigning and financing their campaigns (Burrell 2014). Even though women do have this financial assistance from PACs, Burrell supports that:

These factors do not offset such negatives as the paucity of women presenting themselves as candidates and the advantages afforded to incumbents, most of whom are male. Fox (2014, 209) introduces the idea that women's full inclusion will not be possible unless more women run as Republicans, 'as long as the fortunes of women candidates are tied so heavily to one political party, women's movement toward parity in office holding will prove illusory'. Thus, gender continues to matter in political campaigns; fortunately, a multitude of organized efforts are now promoting women's candidacies, and an increasing number of female professionals are joining the world of campaign organizing (Burrell 2014, 240).

The key to increasing women's representation in politics is to have more women run for office (Fox 2014). Due to the great gender differences in political ambition, gender is making a strong impact on women's lack of representation at the beginning of the electoral process (Fox 2014). Many women who would make great candidates never consider running for office; in 2008, 53% of women state legislators said they first sought office because someone suggested it, and only 26% of women state legislators said running for office was their own idea (Sanbonmatsu 2014, 268). The greatest factors contributing to women's underrepresentation in United States politics are the lack of encouragement of female potential politicians, and the presence of incumbent males that leaves minimal space for political opportunities for females. Understanding this concept of why women are having electoral success but are still not seeing equal representation in numbers in office provides important background for my original research in the coming chapters. It is important that we understand why women are not equally represented in office, as this equal representation does not stem from any issues in campaigning or media representation that males do not face—males also have to work around gender

stereotypes to find success in elections, and males and females are receiving more equal representation within the media overtime. This portion of the literature review helps complete the picture of why women are not equally represented yet in politics in the United States, if both genders are impacted by different stereotypes and media representation of recent elections is equal in quality and quantity (Hayes and Lawless 2016).

Conclusion

In conclusion, female candidates face challenges through gender stereotypes, as men do, though the issues that they encounter differ due to differing male and female stereotypes. These political process itself is also a challenge for women, as women as a gender are newer to working in government than men. With a longstanding history of men in political power in the United States, there is not much room for females to enter the world of United States politics. Additionally, women have not been able to work up to higher positions due to their lack of years in politics as well as because of the small pool of women who are high up in United States politics. Women also have issues with motivation to run for political office; this is a societal issue, and we need to focus on encouraging women to see themselves as potential politicians and capable leaders. When women do run, they are just as likely as men to have success in their campaigns and elections. The campaigns that women run are highly similar to that of males, with a larger focus on parties, issues, and incumbency than on gender. The media representation in the past of female candidates in terms of content has definitely not been advantageous to female candidates, and in my original research we will see if this pattern continues or changes, overall evaluating the accuracy of media representation for each gender.

My research going forward will serve to further examine the impacts of gender in the 2018 elections. I will break down my research based on the type of campaigns, including senatorial and gubernatorial races. Looking into campaigns for each type of office, I will seek to

see how candidates represent themselves through their own campaigning through campaign advertisements on their YouTube campaign channels. I juxtapose this research with research on how the media then portrays candidates, and look to see if gender is playing a role in media coverage. I seek to see how previous research corresponds with my modern research of the 2018 elections, which take place at a tumultuous time in the United States due to affective polarization and an increase in sexist language coming from the President of the United States. I begin the next chapter with an evaluation of gubernatorial candidates' strategies.

Chapter 2: Gendered Gubernatorial Campaign Strategies Analysis

In this chapter, I will be examining gubernatorial campaign strategies in the 2018 elections. Through my research, I examined campaign advertisements to observe the content of the campaign platforms. I examined the specific issues raised by male and female candidates to compare the ways that men and women campaigned in the gubernatorial elections that occurred in an increasingly tumultuous political time in the United States. The tensions of the time matter due to the increase of sexist language present in society; this could lead to a change in how male and female candidates campaign. I looked specifically at the 2018 elections for this thesis study to have the most up to date analysis possible, and to understand how the current political climate impacts campaigning, for both male and female candidates, within the gubernatorial elections of 2018.

In this analysis of the gubernatorial campaigns, I examine the strategies of candidates in four races. I selected races that were specifically a female candidate running against a male opponent to directly compare the genders. I wanted to directly compare the genders to be able to see how men vs women campaign in gubernatorial races in each state, to see if the candidates are campaigning similarly in a race or differ based on gender or other factors. I see that potential research bias could occur if I selected, for example, four races in which Democratic women candidates win, because then there is potential that the candidates would have won due to factors including party or state. To attempt to eliminate research outcome bias, I selected four separate races with varying parties and outcomes: one race with a female Republican victor and Democrat male loser; one race with a female Democrat victor and a Republican male loser; one race with a male Republican victor and a Democrat female loser; and one race with a male Democrat victor and a female Republican loser. This variation in party of the females as well as outcome for the females should provide a thorough picture of the election campaigning process and strategies

used in the 2018 gubernatorial elections. This thorough picture would become clear after examining factors including candidate gender, party, home state, and whether or not the candidate won their race. Listed below are the eight candidates whose strategies I analyzed, and corresponding information regarding the race that each candidate competed in, as well as the total number of advertisements that each candidate posted on their YouTube campaign channels for this 2018 election cycle.

Table 2.1 Gubernatorial Candidate Background

Candidate	Gender	State	Party	Win/ Loss	Total Number of Ads	Number of Ads Coded
Kay Ivey	Female	Alabama	Republican	Win	26	8
Walt Maddox	Male	Alabama	Democrat	Loss	17	5
Gretchen Whitmer	Female	Michigan	Democrat	Win	19	6
Bill Schuette	Male	Michigan	Republican	Loss	27	9
Andria Tupola	Female	Hawaii	Republican	Loss	3	3
David Ige	Male	Hawaii	Democrat	Win	4	4
Stacey Abrams	Female	Georgia	Democrat	Loss	18	6
Brian Kemp	Male	Georgia	Republican	Win	26	8

Research Methods for Analyzing Strategies

To select the sample of campaign advertisements, I accessed all eight of the candidates' political advertisements via their YouTube channels to perform my content analysis. I chose to analyze advertisements because advertisements are created by the candidate and their campaign staff to portray the messages that the candidate wants the voters to see. This image includes character traits as well as the issues that the candidate feels passionately about. Advertisements are a great representation of the strategies that each candidate selects for their campaigns. I chose to only analyze advertisements for this study due to the great deal of information that can be garnered from advertisements, and the substantial number of advertisements that are available online. Due to the time constraint of this study, I was unable to analyze additional resources.

For this study, I define a political advertisement as a video produced by the candidate that is under a one-minute time period. Six of the eight candidates produced a significant volume of political advertisements, with nearly twenty or more advertisements each. With this criteria of the one-minute or under running time of advertisements in place, I analyzed a third of the advertisements for the six candidates with large numbers of political advertisements, and all of the advertisements for the two candidates who had each produced only three and four advertisements.

To select the third of the advertisements that would be coded in this study, I compiled a list of all of the advertisements that fit the one-minute criteria for each candidate, without looking at the content of the advertisements. I then used a random number generator to pick a number out of 1, 2, and 3. If the number 1 was selected, I would code every third ad starting with the number 1, so I would code advertisements 1, 4, 7, and so on. The same process was repeated if the numbers 2 or 3 were selected, coding every third ad starting with either the number 2 or the number 3. This method was selected to eliminate any bias in the selection of the ads that would be coded for this study. I analyzed the selected advertisements of each candidates in the study, for a total of 23 advertisements for the 4 female candidates, and 26 advertisements for the 4 male candidates.

To create my coding for the political advertisements, I recorded each time a candidate brought up an issue or character trait within their advertisements. I recorded each time that an issue or trait was used within an advertisement to understand how each candidate used traits and issues for their campaign strategies. The issues that I found within the advertisements include the economy, anti-corruption, protecting monuments, Trump, the Second Amendment, education, healthcare, reproductive rights, infrastructure, human trafficking, immigration, housing, and bipartisanship. The character traits found within the advertisements include honesty, working

hard, growing up rural or gritty, political-correctness, leadership, religiosity, and community service.

I recorded each time these issues and traits were brought up in the political advertisements for each candidate. Since each candidate has a different number of advertisements that I analyzed throughout this study, I had to divide the number of times that each issue or trait was discussed by a given candidate by the number of advertisements that specific candidate had for this study. So for example, when Kay Ivey has a total of 26 ads and I randomly analyzed 8 of her advertisements based on the methods previously described, when I recoded that Ivey talked about the economy and jobs a total of 10 times in her advertisements, I divide this 10 times by her 8 advertisements for a total of 1.25 mentions of the economy and jobs per advertisement. This unit of mentions per advertisement remains consistent throughout this section of my research, for each candidate as well as for each gender and each political party.

I then compared the results of the number of times each issue was discussed by male candidates to the number of times each issue or trait was discussed by female candidates. I did this to see if there is a difference in the ways in which men and women are portraying themselves, to see if gender plays a role in campaign strategies. I also compared the results between Democratic candidates and Republican candidates, to see if party plays a role in campaign strategies. Then, I analyzed my results by state, to see how which issues were discussed by what candidates in each race, to see if the state of the gubernatorial race impacts campaign strategies for candidates.

Content Analysis of Gubernatorial Advertisements: Issues by State

Viewing Table 2.2, the issues that are discussed by candidates in gubernatorial elections tend to vary from state to state. There is very little consistency in the issues that are discussed by candidates in different states. Issues that were discussed by candidates in each state include the

issues of the economy, corruption, and education. Issues that were discussed by candidates in three of the four states include the issues of Trump, healthcare, and bipartisanship. The issues of supporting the Second Amendment and abortion were discussed by candidates in only two states. The issues that candidates in only one state discussed within their campaign advertisements include the issues: protecting monuments, infrastructure, and human trafficking. There is some overlap in issues that are relevant to much of the country, but there are additionally many issues that do not impact the whole country.

Table 2.2 Candidate Issue Representation by State

	Alabama	Michigan	Hawaii	Georgia
Economy/ Jobs	1.85	3.667	1.917	1.583
Anti-Corruption	1.075	1.111	0.5	1.375
Protect Monuments	0.25	-	-	-
Trump	0.25	0.333	-	0.125
Pro-Second Amendment	0.375	-	-	1.125
Education	1.125	1.389	1.917	1.292
Healthcare	0.2	0.833	-	0.792
Abortion	0.125	0.333	-	-
Infrastructure	-	1.5	-	-
Human Trafficking	-	5	-	-
Anti-Immigration	-	-	-	0.625
Affordable Housing	-	-	1	-
Bipartisanship	0.4	0.5	-	0.333
Anti-Gun	-	-	0.25	-

Table 2.2 is a representation of the analysis of the number of times issues were brought up in political advertisements broken down by each state. The blocks with a dash mark indicate that these issues were not discussed in this given state. The values represent the average number of times per advertisement that the candidates in each state brought up the given issue.

Some topics were less relevant to all of the gubernatorial elections, and were more relevant to specific elections, as with the nature of differing issues in differing states. For example, in Hawaii, the issue of affordable housing was discussed by both the female Republican and the male Democratic candidates due to this pressing issue that Hawaii faces as a result of their booming tourism industry. With the desire of the wealthy to expand the tourism industry and more wealthy individuals deciding to move to Hawaii, real estate prices and the cost

of living have become unattainable for native Hawaiians whose families have lived in the state for generations. Hence, it makes sense that this was the only election that I studied where affordable housing was discussed, and discussed by both candidates.

Additionally, the gubernatorial candidates of Michigan were the only candidates to bring up the issue of infrastructure in their advertisements. This is a highly state-specific issue that is important in Michigan, as both candidates discusses fixing the roads in emphatic language and images, showing the crumbled roads of Michigan and discussing how these damaged roads impact Michiganders financially. Car insurance rates, replacing windshields, and the transportation issues that arise from outdated and crumbling infrastructure were also discussed within the advertisements of both Michigan gubernatorial candidates, and by no other candidates mentioned in this study. This issue emphasis by state continues to support that the state that the election is held within does contribute to the campaign strategies of each candidate.

While state contest is certainly a factor in campaigning strategies, some issues are highly applicable in many states throughout this country. In Alabama, Michigan, and Georgia, the most discussed issues by far are the economy and jobs. In Hawaii, the most discussed issues by far were the economy and jobs as well as education, which was found to have 1.917 mentions per campaign advertisement for the two candidates in Hawaii. The economy and job prosperity are prevalent issues throughout our country. Voters throughout the United States are concerned about wages, losing jobs to countries overseas, and technology replacing the need for human employees. Since this issue is applicable to so many people, this issue shows that though many races have unique facets that require candidates to tailor their strategies to their state given the nature of the governor's office, some issues remain to be nationwide problems.

Traits by State

Issues are more heavily emphasized throughout the gubernatorial campaign ads than traits are. Candidates from all four states mentioned the traits of honesty and working hard in their advertisements, though the extent to which the candidates emphasized these traits varied from state to state. Candidates from Michigan brought up the trait honesty 0.167 times per advertisement, while candidates from Alabama brought up this trait 0.7 times per advertisement, which is a difference of 0.533 mentions per advertisement. Gubernatorial candidates in Georgia also emphasized working hard more than all other states, with the biggest difference in mentions with candidates from Alabama at 0.85 mentions per advertisement. There is some overlap in trait emphasis, but the extent to which gubernatorial candidates from different states emphasize these traits does vary.

Table 2.3 Candidate Trait Representation by State

	Alabama	Michigan	Hawaii	Georgia
Honest	0.7	0.167	0.333	0.417
Tough/ Hard Working	0.65	1.333	0.75	1.5
Growing Up Rural/ Gritty	0.125	0.111	-	0.125
Anti-Political Correctness	0.125	-	-	0.375
Leadership	0.375	0.5	0.25	0.5
Religion	-	-	-	0.375
Service	-	-	1.333	-

The values in Table 2.3 represent the average number of times per advertisement that the candidates in each state brought up the given trait.

There are also many states that do not emphasize the same traits. Only Alabama, Michigan, and Georgia bring up the characteristic of growing up rural or gritty. These three states both have significant rural areas that vote, while Hawaii is much less rural based in demographics. Gubernatorial candidates from states with rural presences can try to appeal to rural voters and not seem like an out of touch politician. It then makes sense that candidates from Hawaii would not use this trait to try to relate to voters, as their rural base is less prominent.

Candidates from Alabama and Georgia were the only gubernatorial candidates that focused on their anti-political correctness. This trait makes sense for candidates from southern states that are typically catering to a right-wing anti-politically correct audience. This desire to not be politically correct is big in the south as the south tends to push against progress and liberal behaviors, like using politically correct or sensitive language. To impress upon voters in these southern states that the candidates are not out of touch politicians, they emphasize their anti-politically correct behavior.

Gubernatorial candidates from Georgia were the only candidates in the study to bring up their religiosity. Religion is a staple in southern culture, and Brian Kemp played into his intense religiosity in his advertisements. To compete with Kemp and appeal to the same voter base, Abrams also focused on her family's religious background in her advertisements. This form of advertising was unique to Georgia, and makes sense given the culture of the southern state.

Candidates from Hawaii were the only gubernatorial candidates to emphasize community service. With the environmental devastation and lack of opportunities for native Hawaiians, gubernatorial candidates emphasized helping their state by volunteering within the community. This was the most emphasized trait within Hawaiian candidates' advertisements by far, as the need for service within this state is great. Due to the great differences present between trait usage of gubernatorial candidates from different states, the state of the race does appear to play a role in the trait strategies that gubernatorial candidates use in their advertisements.

Gender and Issue Emphasis

The issues discussed by candidates of each gender didn't differ as significantly as the issues discussed by candidates from different states, though there are some differences in how the candidates of different genders emphasize issues. This remains consistent with a previous study performed by Kim Fridkin Kahn (1996, 80) as she found that there were "only slight

differences in the issue emphasis of male and female candidates for governor. Overall, men and women gubernatorial candidates stress issues that differ only marginally.” Candidates of both genders discussed mostly the same issues, with only some deviation. The greatest differences found between how men and women campaign based on issues is in how they emphasize education and corruption in politics. There was a -0.334 mentions per advertisement difference in how often men vs women brought up the issue of anti-corruption, meaning that men emphasized anti-corruption stances in their advertisements more than their female counterparts. There was a 0.239 mentions per advertisement difference in the number of times candidates of different genders discussed the issue of education, as women pushed this issue more than men in their advertisements. These differences in mentions per advertisement do indeed suggest slight differences in terms of how genders are emphasizing issues. Overall, there are great similarities in the frequency to which male and female gubernatorial candidates discuss issues within their campaign advertisements, with some differences. There were only a few differences in terms of the issues that one gender talked about and the other gender did not discuss within their political advertisements.

Table 2.4 Issue Mentions per Advertisement by Gender

	Women's Issue Mentions per Ad	Men's Issue Mentions per Ad	Differences in Mentions per Ad
Anti-Corruption	0.435	0.769	-0.334
Education	0.739	0.5	0.239
Pro-Second Amendment	0.13	0.346	-0.216
Anti-Immigration	-	0.192	-0.192
Infrastructure	0.304	0.115	0.189
Economy/ Jobs	1.261	1.115	0.146
Bipartisanship	0.217	0.077	0.14
Affordable Housing	0.13	-	0.13
Family	0.347	0.462	-0.115
Human Trafficking	0.043	0.154	-0.111
Protect Monuments	0.087	-	0.087
Abortion	0.043	0.115	-0.072
Trump	0.087	0.154	-0.067
Anti-Guns	-	0.038	-0.038
Healthcare	0.261	0.231	0.03

The issues of protecting monuments, immigration, anti-guns and affordable housing were the four issues that only one gender discussed within their advertisements. Of these four issues, the greatest difference in issue representation between the genders for issues that were only mentioned by one gender was for the issue of immigration, as men mentioned anti-immigration stances 0.192 times per advertisement while no women included this issue within their advertisements. The smallest difference in issue representation of the issues that are only discussed by one gender was for the issue of affordable housing. Women only brought up affordable housing 0.13 times per advertisement, while men never mentioned this issue.

Only women talked about protecting monuments, and this was only one female candidate, the candidate Kay Ivey from Alabama. Only one man discussed immigration, the male

candidate from Georgia, Brian Kemp. Andria Tupola was the only candidate to discuss affordable housing within her campaign advertisements. David Ige was the only male candidate to discuss the anti-guns stance. Though each of these four issues was only discussed by one gender, these four issues were also only discussed within the gubernatorial advertisements for one state each. Thus, the location of the gubernatorial elections could also be the driving force in this choice of campaign style. It is not clear, for these three issues, whether gender or state of the election plays a bigger role in why the candidates chose to emphasize these issues.

Kahn (1996) supports that female candidates focus on bolstering the faith of the voters in their capabilities of dealing with fiscal issues, including the economy and job creation. The most common issue talked about by all candidates analyzed in the study, with the exception of the candidates from Hawaii, was the issue of the economy and job creation. In Hawaii, the issues of education and job creation were tied for candidate David Ige with education for the most commonly discussed topics within his advertisements. Andria Tupola, the Republican candidate from Hawaii, discussed community service more than she discussed the economy and jobs, with family, education, and the economy and jobs tied for the second most commonly discussed issues within her political advertisements. Though women are greatly emphasizing the economy, so are the male gubernatorial candidates. Women discuss the economy and job growth 0.146 times more per advertisement than males do, which is slightly more. Consistent with Kahn's research from over twenty years ago, women are bolstering the faith of the voters in their capabilities of dealing with fiscal issues by strongly emphasizing the economy and job growth in their advertisements.

The two females that won their elections, Governor Kay Ivey of Alabama and Governor Gretchen Whitmer of Michigan discussed the economy and jobs in their political advertisements more than the two losing females, Andria Tupola and Stacey Abrams. Ivey discussed the

economy and jobs at 1.25 mentions per advertisement, Whitmer discussed these issues at a rate of 2 times per advertisement, Tupola discussed these issues 0.667 times per advertisement, and Abrams discussed these issues 0.833 times per advertisement. Thus, there is potential that emphasizing proficiency in dealing with fiscal matters to a great extent helped the female candidates that won their elections. There are some gender differences in issue strategies, but there is also much overlap in how candidates of different genders advertise their issue strategies.

Gender and Trait Emphasis

As the state of the gubernatorial race plays a role in how gubernatorial candidates emphasize traits, so does the gender of the candidate. The greatest difference between the traits that men and women emphasized was for the trait of leadership. There was a 0.353 difference in the number of times per advertisement men and women discussed leadership. The next largest difference in trait emphasis is for the trait of religiosity, where women emphasized this trait 0.276 times more per advertisement than men did. The rest of the differences for trait mentions per advertisement were under 0.2 mentions per advertisement. Though there are still some differences in the extent to which genders emphasize different traits, there is still much more overlap between gender emphasis of traits than how candidates from different states emphasized traits within their advertisements.

Table 2.5 Trait Mentions per Advertisement by Gender

	Women's Issue and Trait Mentions per Ad	Men's Issue and Trait Mentions Per Ad	Differences in Mentions Per Ad
Leadership	0.391	0.038	0.353
Religiosity	0.391	0.115	0.276
Honest	0.304	0.115	0.189
Service	0.174	-	0.174
Tough/ Hard Working	0.609	0.462	0.147
Anti-Political Correctness	0.043	0.115	0.072
Growing Up Rural/ Gritty	0.043	0.077	0.034

Only one woman discussed service in her campaign advertisements; this is the candidate Andria Tupola from Hawaii. This difference in trait emphasis for the trait of service was the only trait that one gender emphasized that the other did not. This also suggests a slight difference in how genders are representing traits within their advertisements. However, this difference in only one trait being mentioned by one gender and not the other is a much smaller difference than found for how candidates from different states represent gender. Of the traits emphasized, only 3 of the traits emphasized were mentioned by candidates from all 4 states in the study, while 3 of the traits emphasized were mentioned by 2 or less states in the study. While there is a difference in the extent to which genders emphasize traits in their advertisements, there is a greater difference in how candidates from different states emphasize traits.

Party and Issue Emphasis

When the data collected for this study is organized to break down the number of times issues were mentioned by party rather than by gender, we see much greater differences. This means that there are much greater inconsistencies in strategies between Democrats and Republicans than exist between men and women. One of the greatest inconsistencies between Democrats and Republicans in these races was the issue of education. Democrats mentioned education at a frequency of 1.143 times per advertisement, while Republicans only mentioned education at 0.214 times per advertisement. This means that there is a difference of 0.929 mentions per advertisement. Republicans did not emphasize education as much as Democrats did, but Republicans did place a heavier emphasis on anti-corruption within their advertisements, mentioning anti-corruption 0.857 times per advertisement, while Democrats mentioned anti-corruption 0.286 times in their advertisements. This is a difference of 0.571 mentions, which is also a greater difference than for any issue between men and women.

Table 2.6: Issue Mentions per Advertisement by Party

	Democrats' Issue Mentions per Advertisement	Republicans' Issue Mentions per Advertisement	Differences in Mentions Per Ad
Education	1.143	0.214	0.929
Anti-Corruption	0.286	0.857	0.571
Pro-Second Amendment	-	0.429	0.429
Bipartisanship	0.333	-	0.333
Infrastructure	0.333	0.107	0.226
Trump	-	0.214	0.214
Anti-Immigration	-	0.179	0.179
Healthcare	0.333	0.179	0.154
Abortion	-	0.143	0.143
Affordable Housing	-	0.107	0.107
Human Trafficking	0.048	0.143	0.095
Protect Monuments	-	0.071	0.071
Anti-Gun	0.048	-	0.048
Family	0.429	0.393	0.036
Economy/ Jobs	1.19	1.179	0.011

Between Democrats and Republicans, the issues with more differences in mentions than 0.353 times per advertisements are the issues: anti-corruption, pro-Second Amendment, and education. Though between genders there are 4 issues that only candidates from one gender mentions, there are 8 issues that candidates of only one party mention within their advertisements. These differences contribute to indicating that partisanship plays a greater role in campaign strategies than gender does in campaign issue strategies.

Party and Trait Emphasis

The character trait with the greatest difference in mentions per advertisement between men and women was the trait of leadership, with a difference of 0.353 mentions per advertisement. Between Democrats and Republicans, the traits with more differences in mentions than 0.353 times per advertisements are the traits of tough and hard-working and anti-political correctness. There is only 1 trait that candidates of only one gender emphasize within their advertisements, and there are 4 traits that candidates from only one party emphasize within their advertisements. This also supports that party plays a greater role in campaign trait strategies than gender does. There is less of an overlap in trait emphasis between parties than genders, and there are also greater differences in the number of trait mentions per advertisements for candidates of different political parties as well.

Table 2.7: Trait Mentions per Advertisement by Party

	Democrats' Trait Mentions per Advertisement	Republicans' Trait Mentions per Advertisement	Differences in Mentions Per Ad
Tough/ Hardworking	0.81	0.321	0.489
Anti-Political Correctness	-	0.413	0.413
Leadership	0.333	0.107	0.226
Service	-	0.143	0.143
Growing Up Rural/ Gritty	-	0.107	0.107
Honest	0.143	0.25	0.107
Religiosity	-	0.107	0.107

Conclusion

In gubernatorial elections, the state in which the election is held as well as the political party of the candidate have a greater impact on candidates' campaign strategies for issue emphasis. The only issues that were discussed by all eight gubernatorial candidates in the study were the issues of the economy, job growth, and education. It makes sense that these issues overlapped for all of the candidates, as the economy and education are shared issues that are

important to all states within the United States. The only issue that was discussed in advertisements by candidates in all 4 states but not all 8 of the candidates was the issue of corruption, which is also a hot-button issue in the country given the general lack of trust in the government in 2018. Issues that were only mentioned in one state include affordable housing and fixing infrastructure. Affordable housing is a huge Hawaii-specific issue because of the booming tourism industry—native Hawaiians cannot compete with the influx of new businesses and inhabitants that are driving the cost of living and housing up. The roads are a large issue in Michigan due to the extreme weather that Michigan experiences, and many holes and cracks in the roads that destroy Michiganders' cars and increase car insurance prices. There is some overlap in the issue emphasis of candidates between states, though there is not a lot. The state in which the gubernatorial election is held is a great factor in how candidates choose to campaign based on issue.

There are some gender differences present in how gubernatorial candidates choose to campaign on issue emphasis. Only females discussed the issues of protecting monuments, affordable housing, and service in their advertisements. Though only females discussed these issues, the issues of protecting monuments and affordable housing fall more into the category of state-based issues, as the issue of affordable housing directly relates to Hawaii, and the issue of protecting monuments directly relates to Alabama. Only male candidates discussed the issues of immigration and the Second Amendment within their advertisements. These two issues are example of gender playing a role in campaign strategies, as the issues of immigration and guns directly relate to defense, a stereotypically male issue. Males additionally focused more on anti-corruption than females. Females focused on educational issues more than males did in their campaign advertisements, and the issue of education is a stereotypically feminine issue. These

differences in issue representation in campaign advertisements show small gender differences in campaign strategies.

Partisanship also plays a great role in campaign strategies for gubernatorial candidates in the 2018 elections. Democrats focus on education in advertisements at 0.929 times more per advertisement than Republicans do. Republicans focused more on the issues of anti-corruption and pro-Second Amendment within their advertisements. The pro-Second Amendment stance is a very partisan issue as it is one of the core beliefs that many Republicans hold that Democrats widely do not support. Democrats are the only candidates who focused on the issues of bipartisanship and gun control within their advertisements. The issue of bipartisanship makes sense for the Democrats to support because at the time of this election cycle, the Republicans hold the seat in the executive office and additionally held both house and senate majorities; thus, Democrats would want to see cooperation between the two parties to have some of their agenda desires met. Democrats are also typically in favor of increased gun control, whereas Republicans are not. Republican candidates were the only candidates who supported the issues of Trump, pro-life, anti-immigration and affordable housing. While the affordable housing issue is once again more of a state based issue for Hawaii, the issues of supporting Trump, pro-life, and anti-immigration are typically Republican issues. Differences in issue representation in campaign advertisements show significant partisanship differences in campaign strategies.

The state in which the gubernatorial election is held plays a role in the traits that candidates use in their campaign strategies. Hawaiian candidate Andria Tupola was the only candidate to emphasize the issue of service in her campaign advertisements, as Hawaii's school systems, homeless shelters, and environmental protection are all in need of service. Georgian gubernatorial candidates Abrams and Kemp emphasized the trait of religiosity. Candidates from southern states Ivey and Kemp both emphasized the trait of anti-politically correctness.

Gubernatorial candidates from Michigan, Georgia, and Alabama all focused on the traits of growing up in a rural environment in order to connect with their great number of voters in rural areas. Thus, the climate and culture of the state in which the gubernatorial elections are held does play a role in trait emphasis in campaign strategies.

There are some small gender differences in how candidates of different genders emphasize traits in their advertisements. Female candidates focused on their leadership and religiosity more than male candidates, which is a gender difference. All traits that were emphasized within gubernatorial campaign strategies were utilized by both males and females with the exception of the trait service. The gender differences in trait representation are smaller than the differences in trait representation between candidates from different states, but the gender differences are still present for trait representation.

For trait selection, Republican candidates were the only gubernatorial candidates who emphasized the traits of growing up rural, anti-political correctness, religiosity, and service. The traits of rural, anti-political correctness, and religiosity tend to line up with the Republican party's values. Democrats focused more on portraying themselves as hardworking within their advertisements. Democrats and Republicans campaign differently on the basis of traits, with only 3 traits mentioned by candidates from both parties.

Now that the ways in which gubernatorial candidates campaigned in the 2018 elections have been analyzed, I will move to evaluate in the next chapter how senatorial candidates campaigned in the 2018 midterm elections. I will later analyze how both gubernatorial and senatorial candidates are represented within the media, and see if these campaign strategies analyzed in this chapter are accurately represented by the media. My later analysis will provide insight into the accuracy of media representation for each candidate of a different gender, state, and political party.

Chapter 3: Gendered Senatorial Campaign Strategies Analysis

In this chapter, I will be examining senatorial campaign strategies in the 2018 elections. Through my research, I examined campaign advertisements to observe the content of each campaign platform following the same research procedure and methods used in the gubernatorial strategies chapter. I will examine how candidates of different genders, parties, and states emphasize issues and traits within their campaign advertisements. Listed in Table 3.2 are the candidates that I included in this senatorial campaign strategies analysis.

Table 3.1 Senatorial Candidate Background Information

Candidate	Gender	State	Party	Win/Loss	Number of Ads	Ads Analyzed
Marsha Blackburn	Female	Tennessee	Republican	Win	176	8
Phil Bredesen	Male	Tennessee	Democrat	Loss	24	7
Jacky Rosen	Female	Nevada	Democrat	Win	41	7
Dean Heller	Male	Nevada	Republican	Loss	52	8
Heidi Heitkamp	Female	North Dakota	Democrat	Loss	55	8
Kevin Cramer	Male	North Dakota	Republican	Win	20	7
Debbie Stabenow	Female	Michigan	Democrat	Win	16	5
John James	Male	Michigan	Republican	Loss	36	7

Content Analysis: A Discussion of Advertisements for Senate Races by State

A common theme of issues has prevailed throughout each political advertisement observed, with occasional deviation. Some topics were less relevant to all of the senatorial elections, and were more relevant to specific elections, as with the nature of differing issues in differing states. As seen in Table 3.1, while candidates from each state consistently talked about the economy, jobs, and home state values to a great extent, the candidates from each state tended to focus on very different issues overall. For candidates from Tennessee, the three most common issues discussed in advertisements outside of the economy, jobs, and home state values were bipartisanship, taxes, and Trump. For candidates from Nevada, the three most commonly discussed issues were the economy, healthcare, and bipartisanship. For Candidates from North

Dakota, the three most discussed issues outside of the previously mentioned most common issues were healthcare and family, with trade and senior citizens tied. Candidates from Michigan emphasized the economy, the military, and Michigan values the most. While there is some overlap in the issues discussed, overall, there is great variation between the states in the issues in which senatorial candidates discussed through their campaign advertisements.

Table 3.2 Issues in Advertisements by State

	Tennessee	Nevada	North Dakota	Michigan
Home State Values	1.875	0.982	2.482	2.114
Jobs/ Economy	1.643	2.161	2.821	3.543
Bipartisanship	1.393	1.679	0.625	-
Taxes	1.286	1.536	1	-
Trump	1.268	1.107	0.286	0.143
Pro-Republican Majority	0.875	-	-	0.857
Brett Kavanaugh	0.625	-	-	-
Military	0.571	0.696	-	2.429
Sexual Assault/ Harassment	0.571	0.5	0.625	-
Agriculture	0.571	1.25	-	0.8
Trade	0.571	-	1.232	0.8
Defend Constitution	0.5	-	-	0
Healthcare	0.393	1.857	1.571	1.2
Pro-Second Amendment	0.375	-	-	0.714
North Korea	0.143	-	-	-
Seniors	0.143	0.571	1.232	-
Build Wall	0.125	-	-	-
Immigration	0.125	0.286	0.286	0.571
Hillary Clinton	0.125	0.25	-	-
Education	-	0.286	-	0.857
Family	-	1.054	1.482	1.029
Crime	-	0.125	-	-
Support First Responders	-	-	0.75	-
Bill Clinton	-	-	0.5	0.6
Pro-Life	-	-	0.714	1.143
Terrorism	-	-	-	0.286
Kid Rock	-	-	-	0.571

Though the issues that the candidates in each state discuss in their advertisements aren't completely consistent with the other states, the issues that the candidates are discussing are mostly issues that concern the entire country, rather than individual states. The exception that I found to this was in the use of home state values. Through the advertisements, home state values tends to be a blanket term describing more of a culture of a state rather than state specific issues, as seen in the gubernatorial campaign analysis. Overall, the issues discussed in senatorial campaign advertisements are country-wide issues more so than was seen in the gubernatorial campaigns analysis.

While there was some overlap throughout the states in the issues in which each candidate discussed, I found less overlap in the characteristics in which the candidates used to portray themselves. There were no characteristics that candidates from all four of the states brought up within their advertisements. The only characteristics that candidates from three of the four states used in their advertisements were the characteristics of hardworking and attacking Democrats/liberals. The characteristics that candidates from two of the four states used in their advertisements were honesty, fighting for rights, and traveling to constituents or caring about constituents. The other eight characteristics brought up in the political advertisements studied were only discussed by candidates in one of the four states. There is little overlap found in the characteristics that candidates portray within their advertisements between the states studied. Thus, the state that the senatorial race takes place plays a more significant role in advertising strategies for use of traits than for issues discussed.

Table 3.3 Characteristics and Traits in Advertisements by State

	Tennessee	Nevada	North Dakota	Michigan
Calls Opponent Liar	0.286	-	-	-
Morals	0.143	-	-	-
Hardworking	0.714	0.857	1.589	-
Honest	-	0.714	-	0.543
Fighter for Rights	-	-	1.036	1.657
Listens	-	-	0.25	-
Attack Democrats	0.875	0.5	0.286	-
USA Chants	0.125	-	-	-
Travel to Constituents/ Constituent Care	0.429	0.25	-	-
Faith	-	-	-	0.429
Stand for USA	-	-	-	0.429
Race/Racism	-	-	-	0.286
Warrior	-	-	-	1.143

Issues by Gender

Generally, I found only small variations in how the genders campaigned by issue in the senatorial elections. Big differences I found include the issues of healthcare, home state values, pro-life abortion views, the military, taxes, Trump, and Bill Clinton support. Females discussed home state values 2.061 times more per advertisement than males did, and females also discussed healthcare 3.593 times more per advertisement than males did. Females brought up Trump 1.16 times more per advertisement than males did. Females also mentioned support from Bill Clinton 1.1 times per advertisement, and men did not mention this issue at all. Males discussed pro-life stances 1.857 times more per advertisement than females did, and males also discussed the military 2.554 times more per advertisement than females did. Males also discussed taxes 1.25 times more per advertisement than females did. For the vast majority of issues in the advertisements analyzed in this study, there was a less than 1 time per advertisement difference in how many times females vs males discussed each issue in their advertisements.

This data supports that females and males aren't campaigning that differently in terms of the issues they are discussing in their advertisements, though there are still some gender differences present in the extent to which candidates of different genders emphasize some issues within their advertisements.

Table 3.4 Issues in Advertisements by Gender

Issues	Females	Males	Differences
Healthcare	4.307	0.714	3.593
Military	0.571	3.125	-2.554
Home State Values	4.757	2.696	2.061
Pro-Life	-	1.857	-1.857
Taxes	1.286	2.536	-1.25
Trump	1.982	0.822	1.16
Bill Clinton	1.1	-	1.1
Bipartisanship	2.304	1.393	0.911
Trade	1.425	0.571	0.854
Support First Responders	0.75	-	0.75
Jobs/ Economy	5.436	4.732	0.704
Brett Kavanaugh	0.625	-	0.625
Education	0.286	0.857	-0.571
Kid Rock	-	0.571	-0.571
Defend Constitution	0.5	-	0.5
Immigration	0.411	0.857	-0.446
Sexual Assault/ Harassment	0.625	1.071	-0.446
Agriculture	2.05	2.392	-0.342
Pro-Second Amendment	0.375	0.714	-0.339
Terrorism	-	0.286	-0.286
Family	1.654	1.911	-0.257
North Korea	-	0.143	-0.143
Build Southern Border Wall	0.125	-	0.125
Hillary Clinton	0.125	0.25	-0.125
Crime	-	0.125	-0.125
Seniors	0.946	1	-0.054
Pro-Republican Majority	0.875	0.857	0.018

It does make sense that the issue of health care is discussed significantly more by women than by men, as this issue is stereotypically seen to be an issue that females are knowledgeable about and care about. It also makes sense that males discuss the military more than women do, as this is a stereotypically male-dominant topic. Males are taking more pro-life stances than women in their advertisements, which is also consistent with gender stereotypes. The amount of time that females and males discuss other stereotypically female issues including education, family, and sexual assault don't tend to differ significantly between candidates of these two genders, which suggests a divergence from gender stereotypes. The amount of time that females and males discuss stereotypically male issues including trade, the economy, immigration, pro-Second Amendment, terrorism, and crime don't tend to differ significantly between candidates of these two genders, which also suggests a divergence from gender stereotypes when choosing what issues to emphasize in campaign advertisements. Though there are some gender differences in issue emphasis in advertisements, there is a great amount of overlap as well, and great similarities in how candidates of different genders are strategizing based on issues.

Issues By Party

While we see some differences in the ways that the genders advertise in terms of the issues that they each discuss, there are more differences in the ways that the two dominant political parties in the United States advertised for the 2018 senatorial elections. In Table 3.5 we see that there are greater differences in the number of times that the parties bring up each issue in their advertisements when compared to the data on gendered campaigning. Differences in the number of times that each party discusses issues are seen for the issues of healthcare, bipartisanship, taxes, home state values, trade, jobs and the economy, pro-life abortion views, pro a Republican majority, the military, support from Bill Clinton, and pro-Second Amendment. These issues are, of course, highly contentious issues that the two parties tend not to see eye to

eye on. Additionally, within the data for the parties, we see many more blanks in Table 3.5, showing that there are 14 issues that only one party discusses in their political advertisements for the senatorial races. For gender, there are 10 issues that only one gender discussed in their political advertisements, as seen in Table 3.5. Given the greater extent of the differences and the number of issues that was only discussed by one political party, political party is observed to have played more of a role in advertising strategies in terms of the issues discussed in the political advertisements for the senatorial races.

Table 3.5 Issues in Advertisements by Party

	Democrats	Republicans	Differences
Healthcare	4.2	0.821	3.379
Bipartisanship	3.197	0.5	2.697
Taxes	0.572	3.25	-2.678
Home State Values	4.882	2.571	2.311
Trade	1.996	-	1.996
Jobs/ Economy	6.079	4.089	1.99
Pro-Life	-	1.857	-1.857
Pro Republican Majority	-	1.732	-1.732
Military	1.142	2.554	-1.412
Bill Clinton	1.1	-	1.1
Pro-Second Amendment	-	1.089	-1.089
Trump	1	1.804	-0.804
Agriculture	2.621	1.821	0.8
Support First Responders	0.75	-	0.75
Sexual Assault/ Harassment	1.196	0.5	0.696
Immigration	0.286	0.982	-0.696
Brett Kavanaugh	-	0.625	-0.625
Education	0.286	0.857	-0.571
Kid Rock	-	0.571	-0.571
Defend Constitution	-	0.5	-0.5
Hillary Clinton	-	0.375	-0.375
Terrorism	-	0.286	-0.286
Family	1.654	1.911	-0.257
Seniors	1.089	0.857	0.232
North Korea	0.143	-	0.143
Crime	-	0.125	-0.125
Build Southern Border Wall	-	0.125	-0.125

Traits by Gender

There fewer differences for the two genders in the number of times per advertisement they bring up character traits than there were for the issues that each gender discusses, as 14 of the issues were only discussed by candidates of one gender, and 9 of the traits are only discussed by candidates of one gender. The only trait that there was a more than one time per advertisement difference in how often the genders bring up character traits was for the trait of

being a warrior, which females did not include at all, whereas males used this trait 1.143 times per advertisement. Given that the majority of the differences in how the genders discuss traits in their advertisements falls under a 1 time per advertisement differential, there appears to be not that great of a difference in how many times per advertisement the genders bring up each given trait. However, there are 9 issues that only one gender discusses out of the total 13 traits observed, which does suggest that there is a difference in the traits that are being discussed, even if the final difference is not a large quantity. The traits that are only emphasized by men include being a warrior, caring for constituents, faith, standing for the national anthem, calling opponent a liar, race, and morals. The only stereotypically masculine trait that only men emphasize is the trait of being a warrior. The traits that only females emphasized include listening and encouraging “USA” chants.

Table 3.6 Characteristics and Traits in Advertisements by Gender

Traits	Females	Males	Differences
Warrior	-	1.143	-1.143
Honest	1.114	0.143	0.971
Travel to Constituents/ Constituent Care	-	0.679	-0.679
Faith	-	0.429	-0.429
Stand for USA	-	0.429	-0.429
Fighter	1.55	1.143	0.407
Hardworking	1.732	1.428	0.304
Calls Opponent Liar	-	0.286	-0.286
Race/Racism	-	0.286	-0.286
Listens	0.25	-	0.25
Morals	-	0.143	-0.143
USA Chants	0.125	-	0.125
Attack Democrats	0.875	0.786	0.089

Since both female and male candidates are using both stereotypically male and female characteristics in their advertising, but the gender of the candidate does still play some role in the traits used in the candidates’ advertisements. Females use the more stereotypically female traits

of honesty and being good listeners, while they also use a number of traits that are not associated with females, including being a fighter, hardworking, chanting “USA,” and attacking Democrats. Males in their advertisements are seen to use the stereotypically female traits of honesty, constituent care, faith, morals, and discussing the social issue of race, while also using stereotypically male traits of being a warrior, a fighter, working hard, calling opponents liars, and attacking Democrats. The mix of the stereotypical traits used by both genders as well as the small number of differences in the number of times per advertisement that the candidates employ each trait supports that gender does play some role in how candidates of each gender strategized for their political advertisements in the 2018 senatorial elections.

Traits by Party

In analyzing the traits employed by each party, it is apparent that there were 9 instances where only one party discussed the observed traits. However, for the party analysis, we see three traits with a greater than one mention per political advertisement difference in the number of trait mentions for the traits hardworking, attacking Democrats, and being a warrior. While overall the differences in terms of numbers of mentions per advertisement aren’t significantly large, the types of traits that each party employs is consistent with their party values. Democrats mention being hardworking, honest, fighting for rights, listening, constituent care, and morals, which tend to be in line with Democratic party values in the current political time of fighting for rights and affective polarization (Hayes and Lawless 2016). Republicans in this study mentioned being hardworking, a warrior, a fighter, attacking Democrats, honesty, faith, standing for USA rituals, discussing race, constituent care, and chanting “USA,” which are also generally consistent with the Republican values of the current political time as well (Hayes and Lawless 2016).

Table 3.7 Characteristics and Traits in Advertisements by State

	Democrats	Republicans	Differences
Hardworking	2.446	0.714	1.732
Attack Democrats	-	1.661	-1.661
Warrior	-	1.143	-1.143
Honest	1.114	0.143	0.971
Faith	-	0.429	-0.429
Stand for USA	-	0.429	-0.429
Fighter	1.55	1.143	0.407
Calls Opponent Liar	0.286	-	0.286
Race/Racism	-	0.286	-0.286
Listens	0.25	-	0.25
Travel to Constituents/ Constituent Care	0.429	0.25	0.179
Morals	0.143	-	0.143
USA Chants	-	0.125	-0.125

Given the slightly greater differences in the number of trait mentions per advertisement and the partisan-consistent traits mentioned in advertisements, party does seem to have more of an impact of advertising strategies than gender does. However, party also plays much more of a role in strategizing about issues mentioned than it did for traits used in the political advertisements, as the small differences in trait advertising do not compare to the much more significant differences in issue advertising.

Conclusion

There is a great deal of overlap in the issues that senatorial candidates from each state in this study campaign on, and very few differences. Tennessee candidate Blackburn was the only candidate to discuss the issue of building a southern border wall, though Blackburn only focused on this issue 0.125 times per advertisement, which is quite a small number of issue mentions. Tennessee candidate Blackburn was also the only candidate to show open support for the confirmation of Brett Kavanaugh, support defending the constitution, and discuss North Korean relations. Nevada candidate Rosen was the only candidate to emphasize the issue of crime.

Heitkamp of North Dakota was the only candidate to support first responders in her advertisements. James of Michigan was the only candidate to focus on the issues of terrorism and support from Kid Rock. The majority of the same issues are focused on in senatorial election advertisements for candidates from each state included in this study. While the majority of the representation of issues is fairly similar, there are a few exceptions in which the state where the senatorial election race is held plays a role in campaign issue emphasis.

There are some issue emphasis differences based on gender. Female candidates focused on the issues of healthcare, state based issues, Trump, Clinton, and bipartisanship considerably more than their male counterparts did. The only stereotypically feminine issue out of these issues is the healthcare emphasis, as women are seen as caring individuals, bipartisanship, and prioritize health. Male candidates most strongly emphasized the issues of the military, pro-life, and taxes in their advertisements. All three of these issues are stereotypically male political issues. For the rest of the issues included in this study, both female and male candidates discuss to a similar extent the stereotypically feminine issues of education, family, and sexual assault. Though these issues are stereotypically feminine, both male and female candidates emphasized these issues in their advertisements. For stereotypically masculine issues, both genders discuss the issues of terrorism, pro-Second Amendment, North Korean relations, the southern border wall, and crime a very similar amount within their campaign advertisements, even though these issues are seen as stereotypically masculine issues. Though there are some notable gender differences in how senatorial candidates choose their campaign issue strategies, there is also much overlap of men discussing stereotypically feminine issues and females discussing stereotypically masculine issues in their campaign advertisements.

There are large partisan differences in campaign issue strategies in the 2018 senatorial elections. Of the 27 issues represented in the advertisements, 14 of the issues are only discussed

by candidates from one party. Democrats focus more on the issues of healthcare, bipartisanship, home state values, trade, the economy, and support from Bill Clinton. Of these issues, the most stereotypically Democratic issues are the issues of healthcare reform and support from Bill Clinton (Hayes and Lawless 2016). Republicans discuss the issues of taxes, pro-life, pro-military, pro-Republican Congress majority, and pro-Second Amendment, and Democrats do not discuss these issues within their advertisements. The issues of pro-life, pro-Republican majority, taxes, the military, and pro-Second Amendment are all very stereotypically Republican issues to support (Hayes and Lawless 2016). There are great partisanship differences in campaign issue strategies for senatorial elections.

There is little overlap in the characteristics that senatorial candidates from different states employ within their campaign advertisements. There are no characteristics that candidates from all states brought up in their advertisements. Candidates from three of the states emphasize the traits of working hard and attacking Democrats. Traits that candidates from only two of the states emphasize include honesty, fighting for rights, and caring for constituents. Of the 13 traits emphasized in senatorial advertisements, this is not much trait representation overlap between candidates of different states. The state from which the senatorial candidate comes from plays a role in how candidates decide to campaign on the basis of traits for senatorial campaigns.

The gender of the senatorial candidates does play a role in the trait emphasis in their political advertisements. The majority of traits that candidates employ in their advertisements are only mentioned by one gender. The gender differences, though numerous in traits, are small in the actual differences in mentions per advertisement; all of the traits except for one utilized in the senatorial campaign advertisements had less than a one mention per advertisement difference between the genders. Male candidates represent themselves within their advertisements with the traits: warriors, caring about constituents, religiosity, patriotism, calling opponent a liar, race,

and morals. The only stereotypically male trait out of these traits that the males use to represent themselves is the trait of being a warrior. Males also placed more of an emphasis on traits in their advertisements than females did. Females represent themselves with the traits of being good listeners, and leading “USA” chants. The traits of being a good listener and honesty are stereotypically female traits. Females also discussed the traits of being a fighter, hardworking, and attacking Democrats more than men did in their advertisements. There are gender differences present when senatorial candidates select their trait representation for their advertisements. Men are also employing some stereotypically masculine traits, while females employ a stereotypically feminine trait.

Party definitely plays a role in senatorial candidates’ trait representation within their advertisements. Democrats represent themselves as more hardworking, honest, being more of a fighter, and caring for constituents more so than Republicans do. Republican senatorial candidates are the only candidates to focus on the traits of attacking Democrats, being a warrior, religiosity, race, and patriotic displays. Democratic candidates are the only candidates to represent themselves as good listeners, calling opponents liars, and having good morals. There are minimal similarities between how Democratic and Republican senatorial candidates strategize based on traits, but overall partisanship plays a role in how candidates formulate campaign trait strategies.

In the coming chapters, I will analyze how the media represents each candidate in this study, and compare with the data from this chapter to see if candidates of each gender were accurately portrayed in the media for the senatorial elections of 2018. I will begin with the media representation of gubernatorial candidates in the next chapter, and the chapter that follows will analyze media representation of senatorial candidates.

Chapter 4: Media Coverage of Gubernatorial Races Analysis

In this chapter, I will be examining the way in which the media covered gubernatorial candidates' in the 2018 elections. Through my research, I examined online newspapers through the database NexisUni to observe the content of the newspaper articles written on the gubernatorial candidates in each state. I examined the specific issues discussed in each article as well as the traits used to describe each candidate. In this analysis of gubernatorial campaign news coverage, I examine the news coverage of the same candidates from Chapter 2. My goal of this chapter is to compare candidates' strategies with the media representation of candidates. This is important to see if the media is accurately representing campaign messages and the candidates. This analysis is necessary to see if any factors including the gender of the candidate or the party of the candidate impact the accuracy of the media coverage. If one of these factors is impacting the accuracy of the media coverage, this could be problematic for gender and partisan equality in the news. The purpose of this chapter is to see if the media is biased towards accurately representing a gender or party in the most recent gubernatorial elections.

Research Methods for Analyzing Newspaper Articles

To select the sample of newspaper articles, I accessed all of the articles available on the gubernatorial candidates in this study that were available on the database NexisUni. For this study, I define a newspaper article as a work of writing produced by a newspaper labeled under the section designated news. I selected specifically newspaper articles that were published by either the top circulating newspaper in the given state that is available through NexisUni or published by the most reputable wire service. For the candidates from Georgia, I utilized newspaper articles from The Atlanta Journal Constitution. For the candidates from Alabama, I collected articles from the wire service The Associated Press. Articles for the candidates from Michigan came from The Detroit News. For the candidates from Hawaii, I found articles from

the wire service called Newstex. The articles that I selected specifically were published within the date range of October 6, 2018 through November 6, 2018. I selected the date range encompassing the month leading up to the November 6th election to narrow the selection pool of articles, specifically ensuring that the information provided on the candidates would be relevant to the 2018 gubernatorial elections. Each of the candidates had a significant number of search results, so I analyzed 16 articles for each candidate to create a large enough selection of articles to create a representative sample of the information that voters consumed within the month leading up to the 2018 gubernatorial elections. To choose each specific article out of the search results, I followed the same method as used in the gubernatorial strategies chapter for picking the random newspaper articles.

The coding process I utilized in this research is based off of Kim Fridkin Kahn's coding from her work in *The Political Consequences of Being a Woman: How Stereotypes Influence the Conduct of Political Campaigns*. I utilized a system of recording how many sentences in which a candidate was discussed with a certain issue or trait. To find the average number of issue and trait mentions per article, I divided the number of total times each issue and trait was brought up in reference to a candidate by the number 16, representing the 16 total articles that I coded. I then compared the number of times each issue or trait was discussed within the newspaper articles to the number of times each issue or trait was brought up within the candidates' own campaign video advertisements from the analysis in Chapter 2. After completing these analyses, I calculated the difference in the number of times each issue or trait was discussed by the newspaper media and the candidates themselves, and came up with the difference in how the candidates represent themselves through their campaign advertisements compared with how the newspaper media represented the candidates in the month leading up to the 2018 gubernatorial elections.

I also coded other relevant information from each article, including the average length of all of the articles for candidates in each state, the sex of the authors, the percent of mentions of each candidate in the total number of headlines, the tone of the headlines in which the candidates are mentioned, percent of mentions of each candidate in the lead sentences of the articles, the overall tone of all of the articles for each state, the amount of criticism that each candidate received, and the percent of articles in which qualifications of each candidate are mentioned. The average length of the articles was taken from the total number of articles for both candidates in each state, providing one average number per gubernatorial race. The percent of mentions that each candidate has within headlines is also taken from the total number of articles for each race. The tone of headlines can be positive, negative, or neutral. I define a positive headline as a headline that speaks positively of a candidate, whether it be in reference to a candidate having success, doing a positive action or having a positive trait. A negative headline is a headline that speaks negatively of a candidate, the candidate failing at something, doing a negative action, or having a negative trait. A neutral headline is a headline that is more informational and matter-of-fact, and does not make a judgement about a candidate.

The tone of an article can be classified as positive, negative, neutral, or mixed. The tone of the article is combined for both candidates, as articles mention both candidates. A positive tone is defined as the tone of an article that emphasizes positive feelings about a candidate or lists the positive attributes or actions of candidates. A negative tone is defined as the tone of an article that emphasizes negative feelings about a candidate or lists the negative attributes or actions of candidates. A neutral tone writes about candidates in a way that is factual and unbiased, including listing candidates' ideas, discussing campaign information, and reporting on campaign events. An article with a mixed tone is classified as an article that includes both positive and negative tones.

Criticism of candidates was also recorded. Criticism either came from the opponent of the given candidate, or an outside source. Criticism is defined as any statement that disapproves of an opinion, action, or belief of a candidate. Additionally, I recorded the qualifications of each candidate. Each candidate's positive qualifications can include examples from prior elected office, prior appointed office, and other miscellaneous qualifications. The candidates' lack of qualifications was also recorded; this is defined as any statement that suggests that the candidate is not fit for the gubernatorial position.

Georgia Gubernatorial Candidate Representation

To research gender representation of gubernatorial candidates, I first compared the candidates on the basis of numerical representation within newspaper articles. In Table 4.1, we can see that half of the articles researched for the Georgia gubernatorial candidates were written by men, whereas around a fifth of the articles were written by women, and a third of the articles were written by both a man and a woman. Republican victor Brian Kemp was mentioned around 6 percentage points more in article headlines than Abrams. While Abrams' representation within newspaper headlines was completely neutral, Kemp had mostly neutral coverage with some notable negative headline coverage. The two candidates were equally represented in the percentage of articles in which they were mentioned in the lead sentence of the news article.

Table 4.1: Georgia Gubernatorial Candidate Article Contents

	Stacey Abrams	Brian Kemp
Average Article Length (Sentences)	38.563	
Sex of Authors	Male 50%, Female 18.75%, Both 31.25%	
Percent of Mentions in Headline	31.25%	37.50%
Tone of Headlines with candidate mentioned	100% Neutral	16.67% Negative 83.33% Neutral
Percent of Mentions in Lead Sentence	25.00%	25.00%
Tone of Articles	12.5% Positive, 25% Negative, 50% Neutral, 12.5% Mixture	
Percent of Articles Criticized by Opponent	18.75%	25.00%
Percent of Articles Criticized by Outside Source	25.00%	31.25%
Qualifications of Candidate	Prior Office 12.5%, Other 25% Lack of 6.25%	Other 12.5% Lack of 12.5%

Abrams criticized Kemp in about 6 percentage points more articles than Kemp criticized Abrams. Kemp was additionally criticized by other sources around 6 percentage points more than Abrams was. This data suggests that Kemp was criticized a bit more within the newspaper coverage than Abrams was. Articles additionally discussed many fewer of Kemp's qualifications for governor, as Abrams had positive qualifications discussed in 37.5% of the articles sampled, and only 6.25% of articles pointed to a lack of qualifications. Kemp's positive qualifications were only discussed in 12.5% of newspaper articles, while his lack of qualifications was discussed in the same amount of newspaper articles. With this data, it is observed that Abrams' positive qualifications were discussed in 25 percentage points more of the newspaper articles than Kemp's qualifications were. While Abrams saw slightly fewer mentions in headlines than Kemp, Abrams' coverage overall was more positive than Kemp's coverage within the newspaper articles.

Abrams' Representation: Newspapers vs Advertisements

While Stacey Abrams' overall numerical representation within the newspaper articles is more positive than that of her opponent, the extent to which Abrams' newspaper article representation reflects that of her campaign advertisements is less accurate. There are notable differences between the newspaper representation and candidate self-representation to be seen throughout this chapter, notably that the newspapers discuss many more traits within the articles than the candidates do within their advertisements. Additionally, the newspaper articles tend to highlight less favorable traits about the candidates than the candidates portray within their advertisements. For example, Abrams is described as attacking Kemp in a little over one and a third sentences per article. This is less flattering than how Abrams portrays herself, as she avoids verbally attacking her opponent within her advertisements.

Table 4.2: Stacey Abrams' Newspaper and Advertisement Trait Representation

Stacey Abrams Traits (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Attacks Opponent	1.2857	0	1.2857
Tough/ Hardworking	0	1	-1
Leadership	0	0.5	-0.5
Race	0.3571	0	0.3571
Liberal/ Far Left	0.2857	0	0.2857
Qualified	0.2143	0	0.2143
Out of State Donors	0.2143	0	0.2143
Honest	0	0.167	-0.167
Small Donors	0.1429	0	0.1429
Grassroots	0.1429	0	0.1429
Smart	0.0714	0	0.0714
Caring	0.0714	0	0.0714
Inclusive	0.0714	0	0.0714
Moral	0.0714	0	0.0714

For all tables in this chapter, the values in the newspaper representation column represent the number of sentence mentions per article. The values in the candidate representation column represent the number of mentions per advertisement. The values in the difference column represent the average difference in mentions between the newspapers and the advertisements. The positive values in the difference column represent that the newspapers have more mentions of the given trait, and the negative values represent that the advertisements have more mentions of the trait.

Abrams focuses on her positive attributes, as she represents herself as tough or hardworking about one time per advertisement on average. However, none of the newspaper articles discussed Abrams as tough or hard working. Abrams also discussed her leadership skills on average 0.5 times per advertisement, or every other advertisement; the newspapers did not discuss Abrams as a leader. The last trait that Abrams emphasized through her advertisements was the trait of honesty, while at a very low rate per advertisement. Since the newspapers do not mention the trait of honesty, there is a difference in this trait representation.

In the analysis of Abrams' representation, we see no explicit overlap between the traits discussed in the newspaper articles and the traits that she chose to represent within her

advertisements. The newspapers focused on the positive traits of Abrams being qualified, having lots of small donors, being smart, inclusive, caring, and having good morals, though these traits are all discussed at a very low frequency. The articles do bring up the issue that many of Abrams' financial supporters are based from outside of the state of Georgia, pointing that Abrams isn't representing the interests of Georgia as much as the interests of other states. Newspaper articles also refer to Abrams as liberal, in a negative context, given that Georgia is typically a red state as well as the term liberal as a noun being used by conservatives to increase affective polarization between the two major parties. Constituent Gary Dodson used the term liberal to describe Abrams as he explained why he would not vote for Abrams, "'Because she's a liberal. And anyone that Hillary Clinton supports? That kind of sums it up right here. It's all the liberal things that she supports'" (Bluestein and Estep 2018). In this situation, the way in which Abrams is being described as liberal is negative due to the negative tone and the suggestion that if constituents are anti-Hillary Clinton that they should not vote for Abrams because of their shared liberal ideals. This form of representation within the newspaper articles could have negatively served Abrams' campaign.

It is important to note that though the majority of the differences between the numerical newspaper trait representation and the numerical advertisement trait representation are mostly under one mention difference per trait, there is still a disparity between the traits that the newspaper articles use to describe Abrams and the traits which Abrams uses to represent herself.

Abrams' issue representation within newspaper articles was a bit more in line with that of Abrams' campaign advertisements. Compared with no overlap in traits represented between the articles and Abrams' advertisements, we see 4 issues that both the newspapers and Abrams' advertisements discuss. The issues of the economy, healthcare, education, and family are all represented within Abrams' advertisements and the newspaper articles describing the issues

Abrams’ cares about. The economy is most accurately represented by the newspaper articles, only mentioning the economy about a third times more per article than Abrams did per advertisement. Healthcare is discussed more frequently within the articles than Abrams brings up this issue within her advertisements. Abrams mentions both education and family more in her advertisements than the articles do. Abrams focuses on education almost one time more per advertisement than is represented within the articles. Additionally, Abrams mentions family twice as much in her advertisements as was mentioned in the articles—however, the actual numerical disparity of the representation is quite small.

Table 4.3: Stacey Abrams’ Newspaper and Advertisement Issue Representation

Stacey Abrams Issues (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Healthcare	1	0.167	0.833
Education	0.4286	1.167	-0.7384
Anti-Corruption	0	0.5	-0.5
Criminal Justice	0.4286	0	0.4286
Bipartisanship	0	0.333	-0.333
Economy	1.1429	0.833	0.3099
Obama Support	0.2857	0	0.2857
Family	0.2143	0.5	-0.2857
Anti-Trump	0.2143	0	0.2143
Access to Voting	0.2143	0	0.2143
Immigration	0.0714	0	0.0714
LGBTQ	0.0714	0	0.0714
Voter Turnout	0.0714	0	0.0714

Though issue representation of Abrams’ platform is more accurate than the representation of her traits, there is still disparity between how the newspaper articles represent Abrams’ issues and how Abrams represents her issues within her political advertisements, as there are 9 out of 13 issues discussed within either articles or advertisements, but not both. Abrams tends to emphasize issues like anti-corruption and bipartisanship that are less controversial, while issues

that are more stereotypically supported by liberals including support from Obama, anti-Trump, pro-immigration, and pro-LGBTQ rights are mentioned within newspapers but not within Abrams' advertisements.

Kemp's Representation: Newspapers vs Advertisements

Brian Kemp's trait representation follows a similar pattern to Abrams' trait representation; there is very little overlap in the traits that both the newspaper articles and the campaign advertisements represent. The only two traits that overlap between the articles discussing Kemp and Kemp's own advertisements are the traits of attacking his opponent and religiosity. The representation of Kemp's traits of religiosity and attacking Abrams are represented quite accurately between the articles and the advertisements, with both traits having less than a 0.32 trait mention disparity in representation.

Table 4.4: Brian Kemp's Newspaper and Advertisement Trait Representation

Brian Kemp Traits (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Tough/ Hardworking	0	0.5	-0.5
Anti-Political Correctness	0	0.375	-0.375
Religion	0.0625	0.375	-0.3125
Honest	0	0.25	-0.25
Underdog	0.25	0	0.25
Attack Opponent	0.3125	0.5	-0.1875
Negative	0.1875	0	0.1875
Multitasker	0.125	0	0.125
Out of Touch	0.125	0	0.125
Growing Up Rural/ Gritty	0	0.125	-0.125
Weak	0.0625	0	0.0625
Old Money	0.0625	0	0.0625
Successful	0.0625	0	0.0625
False Promises	0.0625	0	0.0625
Good Manager	0.0625	0	0.0625
Mean	0.0625	0	0.0625

As is consistent with Abrams' representation, both the articles about Kemp and Kemp's advertisements focus heavily on issues. Of the 16 traits used to describe Kemp, 14 of these traits are only mentioned in either the articles or the advertisements, but not both. Kemp also only focuses on what he views as positive traits, including being hardworking, anti-political correctness, honest, and growing up in a rural setting. The newspapers have a mix of both positive and negative traits used to represent Kemp. Positive traits include being a multitasker, successful, and a good manager. Negative traits that the newspaper articles employed to describe Kemp include being negative, out of touch, weak, coming from an old money family, making false promises, and being mean. Due to the great difference in the way that Kemp chooses to represent himself as very positive compared with how the newspaper articles depict Kemp as somewhat positive with many negative attributes, the representation of issues between Kemp's personal agenda and the viewpoint of the articles is quite different. Similar to the accuracy of Abrams' issue representation, Brian Kemp's issue emphasis is also better represented by the newspaper articles than his trait emphasis was. Of the 17 issues discussed within the articles and advertisements regarding Brian Kemp, 7 issues are represented by both the newspaper articles and Kemp's campaign advertisements. The issues of the economy, Trump, healthcare, education, immigration, family, and the Second Amendment are all represented by both the articles and the advertisements on Kemp. The majority of these issues are represented accurately in terms of the frequency of their representation, with the exception of the issues of the economy, Trump, and the Second Amendment. Kemp discusses the economy and Donald Trump less per advertisement than the newspapers do per article, with the newspapers mentioning the economy 1.5 times more per article than Kemp mentions per advertisement. The newspapers also mention Trump 0.75 times more per article than Kemp mentions per advertisement. Newspapers also do not represent Kemp's affinity for the Second Amendment to the extent that Kemp does within his political

advertisements. Kemp mentions supporting the Second Amendment and gun rights over one time more per advertisement than the newspapers mention per article.

Table 4.5: Brian Kemp's Newspaper and Advertisement Issue Representation

Brian Kemp Issues (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Economy	2.25	0.75	1.5
Pro-Second Amendment	0.0625	1.125	-1.0625
Cyber Security	0.9375	0	0.9375
Anti-Corruption	0	0.875	-0.875
Trump	0.875	0.125	0.75
State Based Issues	0.5	0	0.5
Education	0.4375	0.125	0.3125
Immigration	0.3125	0.625	-0.3125
First Responders	0.125	0	0.125
LGBTQ	0.0625	0	0.0625
Voter Turnout	0.0625	0	0.0625
Civil Rights	0.0625	0	0.0625
Black Voter Registration	0.0625	0	0.0625
Health Care	0.625	0.625	0
Family	0.125	1.125	0

It is notable that Kemp does not mention cyber security within his advertisements, though this issue is brought up within the newspaper articles. Kemp likely did not bring up the issue of cyber security within his advertisements due to his perceived lack of capability of dealing with voter cyber security issues and voters rights as the Secretary of State of Georgia, as outlined by a newspaper article discussing hacking issues (Niesse 2018). Though Kemp's issue representation, similar to Abrams', was more accurate between the articles and his advertisements than Kemp's representation of his traits were, there are still notable differences in the way that Kemp represents himself compared to how the media represents Kemp.

Alabama Gubernatorial Candidate Representation

In the articles written about Alabama's gubernatorial candidates, both candidates are represented equally in terms of the percentage of articles in which their names are mentioned in the headlines. However, Walt Maddox had more favorable headline coverage, as a third of the headlines utilized a positive tone, and two thirds of the headlines included a neutral tone referring to Maddox. Governor Ivey received a favorable tone in 16% of the headlines that she was mentioned in, while a third of the headlines employed a negative tone, and 50% of the headlines remained neutral. Maddox was also mentioned 6% more in lead sentences of articles than Kay Ivey was. Maddox criticized Ivey 12.5% more than she criticized Maddox. Maddox received no criticism from outside sources, and Ivey received criticism from outside sources in almost 20% of the articles surveyed for the gubernatorial candidates from Alabama.

Table 4.6: Alabama Gubernatorial Candidate Article Contents

	Kay Ivey	Walt Maddox
Average Article Length (Sentences)	30.8125	
Sex of Authors	Male 12.5%, Female 50%, Unspecified 37.5%	
Percent of Mentions in Headline	37.50%	37.50%
Tone of Headlines with candidate mentioned	Positive 16.67%, Negative 33.33%, Neutral 50%	Positive 33.33%, Neutral 66.67%
Percent of Mentions in Lead Sentence	37.50%	43.75%
Tone of Articles	Positive 12.5%, Negative 12.5%, Neutral 68.75%, Mixture 6.25%	
Percent of Articles Criticized by Opponent	37.50%	25%
Percent of Articles Criticized by Outside Source	18.75%	0%
Qualifications of Candidate	Prior Office 50%, Other 6.25%, Lack of 18.75%	Lack of 6.25%

Though Maddox's numerical representation seems mostly positive, Ivey did have an edge up given her incumbency as governor, and 50% of the articles touted her experience in office. Overall, Ivey's positive qualifications were discussed in 56.25% of the articles coded for Alabama, though almost 20% of the articles also did point out a lack of qualifications, likely due to the fact that she stepped into the role of governor because of the previous governor being

forced to step down following a scandal. Maddox had no articles discuss his qualifications for governor, though 6.25% of the articles pointed out a lack of qualifications. Overall, Maddox has more favorable positive representation and less negative representation within the newspaper articles than Ivey does.

Ivey's Representation: Newspapers vs Advertisements

In Ivey's advertisements, she pushes the traits of being steady, trustworthy, and attacking her opponent Maddox; these three traits are represented very well by the newspaper articles. Both Ivey's advertisements and the newspaper articles mention the trait of trustworthiness an average of 0.5 times per article and advertisement, respectively. The newspapers also accurately depict the traits of attacking Maddox and steadiness, with each of the two traits having a difference of under 0.2 trait mentions per article or advertisement.

Table 4.7: Kay Ivey's Newspaper and Advertisement Trait Representation

Ivey Traits (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Ivey's Health	2.0714	0	2.0714
Leadership	0	0.375	-0.375
Liar	0.2142	0	0.2142
Attacks Opponent	0.5714	0.375	0.1964
Steady	0.0714	0.25	-0.1786
Old	0.1429	0	0.1429
Growing Up Rural/ Gritty	0	0.125	-0.125
Anti-Political Correctness	0	0.125	-0.125
No-nonsense	0.0714	0	0.0714
Trustworthy	0.5	0.5	0

One trait that has a great difference in representation between how Ivey represents herself and how the newspapers represent Ivey is in the representation of Ivey's health. Rumors of Ivey having a stroke provided opportunity for Maddox and the media to attack Ivey's character, as Ivey did not disclose her medical information to constituents following a trip to the emergency

room. Though Ivey and her doctor insist that she did not have a stroke but rather had altitude sickness, newspapers discussed this on average in over 2 sentences per article. Ivey did not discuss this matter in any political advertisements. Other than the matter of Ivey's health, Ivey's trait representation in the newspaper articles is very fair. Of the 10 traits used to describe Ivey within the articles and the advertisements, 3 of the 10 traits are represented in a similar fashion between the articles and the advertisements.

Ivey's data supports that newspapers and advertisements represent issues similarly to each other. Of the 11 issues discussed regarding Kay Ivey's campaign, 6 of the issues are represented by both the newspaper articles as well as in Ivey's political advertisements. The issues of the economy, the Second Amendment, Trump, pro-life views, and education are all represented very similarly between the articles and the advertisements. The issue of corruption is also discussed in both the articles and advertisements discussing Ivey, however, Ivey places a greater emphasis on corruption in her advertisements than the newspapers do when discussing Ivey.

Table 4.8: Kay Ivey's Newspaper and Advertisement Issue Representation

Ivey Issues (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Corruption	0.2142	0.875	-0.6608
Pro-Second Amendment	0.0714	0.375	-0.3036
Emergency Declaration/ Weather	0.2857	0	0.2857
Support First Responders	0.2857	0	0.2857
Economy	1	1.25	-0.25
Protect Monuments	0	0.25	-0.25
Trump	0.0714	0.25	-0.1786
Constituent Care	0.1429	0	0.1429
Pro-Life	0.0714	0.125	-0.0536
Education	0.0714	0.125	-0.0536

Though 5 of the 11 issues are not discussed in both the articles and advertisements, Ivey's issues are still well represented between the two resources. The largest difference between number of issue mentions in articles and number of issue mentions in advertisements is for the issue of corruption, with a difference of 0.6608 more mentions per advertisement. Since all other issues have a difference of less than 0.3 mentions between articles and advertisements, Ivey's newspaper article representation overall closely resembles that of her issue self-representation within her political advertisements.

Maddox's Representation: Newspapers vs Advertisements

Maddox's traits are not very similarly represented between the newspaper articles in which he is mentioned and his own political advertisements. Maddox only has one trait mentioned within both the articles and the advertisements. Maddox attacks his opponent Ivey in both newspaper articles and political advertisements. However, Maddox is presented as attacking Ivey more in the newspaper articles than he actually does within his political advertisements.

Table 4.9: Walt Maddox's Newspaper and Advertisement Trait Representation

Walt Maddox Traits (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Attacks Opponent	1.5454	0.8	0.7454
Underdog	0.5454	0	0.5454
Positive/ Optimistic	0.4545	0	0.4545
Tough/ Hardworking	0	0.4	-0.4
Progressive	0.3636	0	0.3636
Constituent Care	0.3636	0	0.3636
Lying Liberal/ Liar	0.2727	0	0.2727
Young	0.2727	0	0.2727
Honest	0	0.2	-0.2
Sporty	0.1818	0	0.1818
Fresh	0.1818	0	0.1818
Shameless	0.0909	0	0.0909
Desperate	0.0909	0	0.0909

Within Maddox's advertisements, he describes himself as hardworking, honest, and attacks Ivey. However, within the newspaper articles, Maddox is additionally described as an underdog, progressive, a lying liberal, shameless, and desperate. Maddox, like the other gubernatorial candidates in this study, avoids using any language that may sound negative while representing himself in his advertisements, but the newspaper articles continue to represent both positive and negative traits of candidates. While Maddox is described negatively, he is also described as positive, caring for constituents, young, and fresh. The newspaper articles and the political advertisements continue to show lower levels of representation for traits than for the issues, as candidates including Maddox avoid negative language and viewpoints in political advertisements.

Maddox's issues are more similarly represented between the articles and advertisements than Maddox's traits were, in terms of the number of issues represented by both the newspaper articles and the advertisements. Of the 9 issues discussed in the articles or the campaign advertisements, 5 of the issues were discussed in both platforms.

Table 4.10: Walt Maddox's Newspaper and Advertisement Issue Representation

Walt Maddox Issues (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Education Lottery	1.909	1	0.909
Healthcare	1.0909	0.2	0.8909
Environment	0.5454	0	0.5454
Bipartisanship	0.0909	0.4	-0.3091
Economy	0.7272	0.6	0.1272
Corruption	0.0909	0.2	-0.1091
Pro-Life	0.0909	0	0.0909
Pro-Second Amendment	0.0909	0	0.0909
Family	0.0909	0	0.0909

While the issues mentioned are well represented, the issues of the education lottery and healthcare are mentioned by the newspaper articles more frequently than they are discussed

within Maddox's campaign advertisements. Other than these two issues nearing a difference of 1 mention per article or advertisement, the majority of the issues remain under a 0.5 difference in mentions, which shows overall pretty similar issue representation between the newspaper articles and Maddox's political advertisements. Ivey's issue representation was a bit more accurate than Maddox's, but this does not discount the favorable overall representation that Maddox had within the newspaper articles, and similar issue representation between Maddox's advertisements and the articles that mentioned Maddox.

Michigan Gubernatorial Candidate Representation

In the articles written about Michigan's gubernatorial candidates, both candidates are represented equally in terms of the percentage of articles in which their names are mentioned in the headlines. However, Gretchen Whitmer had more favorable headline coverage, as 14.28% of her headlines were positive, with 14.28% including a negative tone and 71.44% remaining neutral. Bill Schuette received no headlines with a positive tone, and also received negative toned headlines in 14.28% of the headlines that Schuette was mentioned in. The rest of Schuette's headlines were neutral. The two candidates were also represented equally in their percentage of mentions in lead sentences. While Whitmer was criticized more by Schuette than vice versa, Schuette was criticized more by outside sources than Whitmer was throughout the articles.

Table 4.11: Michigan Gubernatorial Candidate Article Contents

	Gretchen Whitmer	Bill Schuette
Average Article Length (Sentences)	39.0625	
Sex of Authors	Male 62.5%, Female 31.25%, Both 6.25%	
Percent of Mentions in Headline	43.75%	43.75%
Tone of Headlines with candidate mentioned	Positive 14.28%, Negative 14.28%, Neutral 71.44%	Negative 14.28%, Neutral 85.72%
Percent of Mentions in Lead Sentence	31.25%	31.25%
Tone of Articles	Positive 31.25%, Negative 25%, Neutral 37.5%, Mixture 6.25%	
Percent of Articles Criticized by Opponent	25%	12.50%
Percent of Articles Criticized by Outside Source	12.50%	18.75%
Qualifications of Candidate	Prior Office 6.25%, Other 12.5%, Lack of 6.25%	Lack of 18.75%

The representation for Whitmer is more favorable than for Schuette. In addition to more positive headlines and less outside criticism than Schuette has, Whitmer is also recognized for positive qualifications, totaling 18.75% of articles that mention Whitmer's positive qualifications. Of the articles surveyed, 6.25% of the articles discuss a lack of Whitmer's qualifications, though Schuette is described to lack qualifications for governor in 18.75% of the articles surveyed for the 2018 Michigan gubernatorial race. Based on the higher levels of positivity and more frequent discussion of qualifications, Whitmer had more favorable representation within the media than Schuette did.

Whitmer's Representation: Newspapers vs Advertisements

Gretchen Whitmer's traits do not overlap much between newspaper representation and candidate self-representation through political advertisements. The only trait that is mentioned in both the articles and the advertisement is Whitmer's trait of attacking her opponent, Schuette. The extent to which Whitmer portrays the trait of attacking Schuette is portrayed at a very similar frequency between the articles and the advertisements, with less than a 0.1 average mention difference between the articles and the advertisements.

Table 4.12: Gretchen Whitmer's Newspaper and Advertisement Trait Representation

Gretchen Whitmer Traits (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Tough/ Hardworking	0	1	-1
Leadership	0	0.5	-0.5
Support Running Mate	0.2308	0	0.2308
Honest/ Trustworthy	0	0.167	-0.167
Corporate Puppet	0.0769	0	0.0769
Caring	0.0769	0	0.0769
Aggressive	0.0769	0	0.0769
Confident	0.0769	0	0.0769
Fight for Rights	0.0769	0	0.0769
Attack Opponent	0.7692	0.833	-0.0638

Similar to the other candidates running for governor of their states, Whitmer focuses on her positive traits of working hard, leadership, and honesty in her own advertisements. The newspaper articles represent both Whitmer's negative and positive traits. Whitmer is negatively described as aggressive and a corporate puppet; however, these two traits are hardly mentioned within the articles, with average mentions of less than 0.1 mentions per article for both traits. Whitmer is positively described within the newspaper articles as caring, confident, and fighting for constituents' rights. These positive attributes are also only mentioned less than 0.1 mentions per article. Whitmer paints herself in a very favorable light, contributing to notable differences with the traits of hardworking and leadership. Due to the lack of overlap between traits mentioned in both newspaper articles and Whitmer's campaign advertisements, Whitmer's traits are not very similarly represented between the two platforms. Whitmer's issue emphasis is similarly represented between the newspaper articles and her own advertisements, with an overlap of 5 of the 14 issues detailed in the two platforms as seen below in Table 4.13. Whitmer's aspirations of fixing the roads are very closely represented between the articles and her advertisements, with a 0.01 difference in the average number of times that this issue is

discussed between the articles and advertisements. Notable differences in representation can also be found in Table 4.13. Newspaper articles emphasize education, voter turnout, and the Flint water crisis much more than Whitmer does within her advertisements. The issues of the economy, fixing the roads, and family are similarly represented between the articles and the advertisements. Whitmer's issue emphasis overlaps with the issues emphasized in the articles, and the majority of the differences in average issue mentions are under 0.5 mentions per article or advertisement. Whitmer's issues are more similarly represented between the newspaper articles and her campaign advertisements than her traits were.

Table 4.13: Gretchen Whitmer's Newspaper and Advertisement Issue Representation

Gretchen Whitmer Issues (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Voter Turnout	1.6154	0	1.6154
Education	2.4615	1.167	1.2945
Flint Water	1.0769	0	1.0769
Healthcare	0.1538	0.833	-0.6792
Bipartisanship	0	0.5	-0.5
Economy	2.3077	2	0.3077
Anti-Trump	0.3077	0	0.3077
Family	0.2308	0.5	-0.2692
Biden Support	0.2308	0	0.2308
Obama Support	0.2308	0	0.2308
Anti-Human Trafficking/ Rape	0	0.167	-0.167
Low Income Assistance	0.1538	0	0.1538
Fix Roads	1.1538	1.167	-0.0132

Schuetz's Representation: Newspapers vs Advertisements

Bill Schuetz's traits are for the most part not strongly emphasized within his campaign advertisements as well as within the newspaper articles surveyed in this study. The only overlapping trait is the trait of attacking his opponent, which is consistent with several of the other candidates within this study. All of the traits other than the attacking his opponent trait fall

under a 0.3 average mention per article and advertisement, and thus also have very small differences between the newspaper trait mentions and the advertisement trait mentions. Though the representation difference values are small, the traits that Schuette represents within his advertisement are very different from the traits that the newspaper uses to describe Schuette. Schuette describes himself as hardworking and from a rural background, while the newspaper articles describe Schuette as abusing power, a corporate puppet, and an underdog. Schuette's traits, similar to Whitmer's, are not similarly represented between the newspaper articles and his political advertisements.

Table 4.14: Bill Schuette's Newspaper and Advertisement Trait Representation

Bill Schuette Traits (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Attacks Opponent	0.7143	1.333	-0.6187
Tough/ Hardworking	0	0.333	-0.333
Abuses Power	0.2857	0	0.2857
Justice	0.2857	0	0.2857
Growing Up Rural/ Gritty	0	0.111	-0.111
Watchdog	0.0714	0	0.0714
Corporate Puppet	0.0714	0	0.0714
Underdog	0.0714	0	0.0714

In addition to Schuette's traits being represented differently between the articles and his advertisements, Schuette's issues are also facing great disparity in representation as well. Of the 14 issues discussed in the newspaper articles or the political advertisements, only 4 issues are represented in both the articles and the advertisements. The issues of the economy and Trump are represented similarly between the articles and the advertisements, with the economy having a 0.4 difference in mentions between the two platforms and the issue of Trump having less than a 0.1 difference in mentions.

Table 4.15: Bill Schuette's Newspaper and Advertisement Issue Representation

Bill Schuette Issues (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Voter Turnout	1.6429	0	1.6429
Education	1.7143	0.222	1.4923
Anti-Corruption	0	1.111	-1.111
Fix Roads	1.4286	0.333	1.0956
Flint Water	0.9286	0	0.9286
Anti-Human Trafficking/ Rape	0	0.444	-0.444
Criminal Justice	0.4286	0	0.4286
Economy	2.0714	1.667	0.4044
Anti-Abortion	0	0.333	-0.333
Healthcare	0.0714	0	0.0714
Immigration	0.0714	0	0.0714
Trump	0.3571	0.333	0.0241

The issues of education and fixing the roads are represented in both the articles and the campaign advertisements, but are not represented at a similar frequency. Voter turnout and anti-corruption are other notable issues that are not similarly represented between the articles and the advertisements. Since 10 of the 14 issues are not represented by both the newspaper articles and Schuette's campaign advertisements, in addition to a great number of notable differences between how often issues are mentioned in each platform, Schuette's campaign issues are not similarly represented between the newspaper articles and his campaign advertisements. Whitmer has both more favorable news representation as well as more similar issue representation between her campaign advertisements and the extent to which the newspaper articles discuss the same issues.

Hawaii Gubernatorial Candidate Representation

In the articles written about Hawaii's gubernatorial candidates, incumbent David Ige has more favorable representation. Ige is represented in about 20% more headlines than Tupola is, and of the headlines that Ige is mentioned in, 50% include a positive tone, and 50% remain

neutral. Tupola’s headlines include a positive tone in 20% of the headlines, and remain neutral in 80% of the headlines. Ige is also represented in about 20% more lead sentences than Tupola is. The two candidates were equally criticized by each other, though Ige faced 12.5% more criticism from outside sources than Tupola did. The competitors received the same amount of discussion on lack of qualifications, but Ige’s positive qualifications were mentioned in over 30% more articles than Tupola’s positive qualifications were. Tupola didn’t have negative coverage, but David Ige’s coverage is much more positive and favorable.

Table 4.16: Hawaii Gubernatorial Candidate Article Contents

	Andria Tupola	David Ige
Average Article Length (Sentences)	34.1875	
Sex of Authors	Male 93.75%, Female 6.25%	
Percent of Mentions in Headline	31.25%	50%
Tone of Headlines with candidate mentioned	Positive 20%, Neutral 80%	Positive 50%, Neutral 50%
Percent of Mentions in Lead Sentence	37.50%	56.25%
Tone of Articles	Positive 43.75%, Negative 31.25%, Neutral 18.75%, Mixture 6.25%	
Percent of Articles Criticized by Opponent	12.50%	12.50%
Percent of Articles Criticized by Outside Source	6.25%	18.75%
Qualifications of Candidate	Prior Office 12.5%, Other 25%, Lack of 6.25%	Prior Office 62.5%, Other 6.25%, Lack of 6.25%

Tupola’s Representation: Newspapers vs Advertisements

In addition to Tupola’s coverage being less glowingly positive than Ige’s, Tupola’s traits are also not similarly represented between her campaign advertisements and the newspaper articles that mention Tupola. Of the 10 traits used to describe Tupola in the articles and in her advertisements, there is no overlap in any of the traits. Additionally, there are notable differences in the extent to which traits are represented, with 4 of the 10 traits having a greater than 1.0 difference in average mentions for representation. The traits of empowering people, attacking Ige, and being an underdog are all greatly discussed by newspaper articles referring to Tupola, but Tupola doesn’t focus on any of these traits in her advertisements. Tupola focuses on her service to the community, and this is not mentioned in any of the newspaper articles. Tupola’s

traits are not similarly represented between her advertisements and the way that she represents herself within the campaign advertisements.

Table 4.17: Andria Tupola's Newspaper and Advertisement Trait Representation

Andria Tupola Traits (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Service	0	1.333	-1.333
Empowering People	1.125	0	1.125
Attacks Opponent	1	0	1
Underdog	1	0	1
Strong	0.5	0	0.5
Communication	0.375	0	0.375
Change/ Progress	0.375	0	0.375
Honest/ Trustworthy	0	0.333	-0.333
Amazing	0.125	0	0.125
New	0.125	0	0.125

In addition to Tupola's traits not being similarly represented between the newspaper articles and her political advertisements, her issues are also not similarly represented between the two platforms. Only 4 of the 14 issues are represented in both the newspaper articles and Tupola's advertisements. Of those four, the issue of the economy is not similarly represented between the articles and the advertisements, as the articles mention Tupola's stances on the economy over 2 times more per article than Tupola mentions in her advertisements. Other notable differences include the disparities in representation for the issues of the environment and voter turnout. The minimal consistency in representation between the newspaper articles and the political advertisements for both Tupola's traits and her issues support that Tupola's campaign strategies were not being well represented by the media.

Table 4.18: Andria Tupola's Newspaper and Advertisement Issue Representation

Andria Tupola Issues (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Economy	2.75	0.667	2.083
Environment	1.875	0	1.875
Voter Turnout	1.5	0	1.5
Affordable Housing	1.375	1	0.375
Education	1.125	0.667	0.458
Family	0.625	0.667	-0.042
Healthcare	0.625	0	0.625
Anti-Trump	0.125	0	0.125
Trump	0.125	0	0.125
Immigration	0.125	0	0.125
Domestic Violence	0.125	0	0.125
Emergency Preparedness	0.125	0	0.125

Ige's Representation: Newspapers vs Advertisements

Of the thirteen traits used to describe Ige found in this analysis, there are no traits that are mentioned in both the political advertisements and the newspaper articles. For Ige, the majority of his traits are positive, even though there is no overlap in the traits. The only trait that could be seen as potentially negative is Ige's trait of attacking Tupola, which he rarely does at a frequency of 0.1429 mentions per article. The representation of Ige's traits in the newspaper articles do not line up with the traits Ige portrays in his advertisements, and thus the representation is not similar. David Ige represents himself positively, as did the newspaper articles, but the representation is still not similar between the articles and the campaign advertisements.

Table 4.19: David Ige's Newspaper and Advertisement Trait Representation

David Ige Traits (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Tough/ Hard Working	0	0.75	-0.75
Fights for Safety	0.3571	0	0.3571
Transparent	0.2857	0	0.2857
Leadership	0	0.25	-0.25
Supports Women	0.2143	0	0.2143
Familiar	0.2143	0	0.2143
Attack Opponent	0.1429	0	0.1429
Advocate	0.1429	0	0.1429
Understanding	0.0714	0	0.0714
Accepting	0.0714	0	0.0714
Comfortable	0.0714	0	0.0714
Protector	0.0714	0	0.0714
Integrity	0.0714	0	0.0714

Similar to Tupola, Ige's issue representation is also not similar between his campaign advertisements and the newspaper article information. Of the 17 issues tied to Ige in this study, only 3 issues are brought up in both Ige's advertisements and the newspaper articles. The issues of the economy, education, and family are all mentioned in both the articles and the advertisements. The differences for all three issues all fall above 0.6 differences on average per article mention or per advertisement mention. The newspaper articles reference the economy more than Ige does, and Ige emphasizes education and family in his political advertisements much more than the newspaper articles do. Ige's traits and his issues are represented very differently by both the newspaper articles and his own political advertisements.

Table 4.20: David Ige's Newspaper and Advertisement Issue Representation

David Ige Issues (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Environment	0.8571	0	0.8571
Pro-LGBTQ	0.7143	0	0.7143
Family	0.0714	0.75	-0.6786
Economy	1.8571	1.25	0.6071
Education	0.6429	1.25	-0.6071
Anti-Corruption	0	0.5	-0.5
Cyber Security	0.5	0	0.5
Native Peoples	0.3571	0	0.3571
Affordable Housing	0.2857	0	0.2857
Anti-Second Amendment	0	0.25	-0.25
Immigration	0.2143	0	0.2143
Healthcare	0.2143	0	0.2143
Women's Reproductive Rights	0.2143	0	0.2143
Anti-Trump	0.1429	0	0.1429
Support First Responders	0.0714	0	0.0714

Both of the Hawaiian gubernatorial candidates are represented differently in the media than they represent themselves in their advertisements. Since both of the candidates are not very accurately represented in the media, yet Ige has more positive representation within the media, Ige has the more favorable representation, even though his traits and issues don't match between what the newspapers write about Ige and how he represents himself within his campaign advertisements.

Conclusion

In gubernatorial campaigns, men and women are not represented that differently. I find consistencies between how candidates in each state are represented in the media. In Hawaii, both candidates are represented positively, though incumbent David Ige is represented more positively and more frequently. Both candidates in Hawaii did not have overlap with how they represented their own traits and how the newspaper articles represented their traits. Andria Tupola and David

Ige's issues that they emphasize in their advertisements are both not really represented in the newspaper articles written about them. For the Hawaiian gubernatorial candidates, there were not gender disparities in how the candidates were represented within the news; both candidates were represented mostly favorably, though incumbent Ige saw slightly more positive representation. Hawaii was the only state in which both candidates did not have good overlap between how the candidates represent their own issues in their advertisements and how the newspaper articles represent the extent of discussion of candidates' issues.

In Michigan, Gretchen Whitmer was represented more favorably and accurately within the newspaper articles. Gretchen Whitmer's headlines were more positive, and there was a great focus on her positive qualifications throughout the articles, whereas no articles discussed any positive qualifications for Bill Schuette. Bill Schuette was greatly criticized by outside sources, and Whitmer was minimally criticized by outside sources, but was greatly criticized by Schuette. There was a great focus on Bill Schuette's lack of qualifications in the race, also serving to hinder Schuette. Both candidates' traits were not represented consistently between the newspaper articles and their own advertisements. Gretchen Whitmer's issues were accurately represented between the articles and her advertisements, while Bill Schuette's issues were not represented equally between the articles and his advertisements. Schuette also represents himself much more favorably than the newspaper articles do. For Michigan, Gretchen Whitmer has significantly more favorable and accurate media representation of her campaign strategies.

In Alabama's gubernatorial race, both candidates receive much unfavorable representation. Incumbent Kay Ivey's headlines were more negative than Walt Maddox's, and Ivey is criticized much more than Maddox is within newspaper articles. Kay Ivey did have an advantage with her positive qualifications, as her time in office is touted throughout a significant portion of the newspaper articles. Kay Ivey's issues are well represented between her

advertisements and the articles discussing her campaign, though her traits do not overlap much between the articles and her advertisements. Walt Maddox's traits are also not well represented, and there is a great focus on Maddox being inexperienced and liberal. Walt Maddox's issues are pretty accurately represented, similar to Kay Ivey. Both candidates received different kinds of unfavorable representation, and similar levels of representation between their issue emphasis and their trait emphasis. Gender does not appear to be giving advantages to any candidates within Alabama's gubernatorial race, but party played more of a role in this race.

In Georgia's gubernatorial media coverage, Stacey Abrams received less criticism than her opponent. Stacey Abrams' headlines featured more positive tones, though she is mentioned slightly less in headlines than Brian Kemp is. Brian Kemp's representation in newspaper articles includes many more negative tones in both the headlines of the articles and the traits discussed within the articles. For both candidates, their traits are not represented similarly between their own advertisements and the newspaper articles. Both candidates also had more accurate representation of their issue emphasis. Stacey Abrams is represented slightly more favorably than Kemp because of the positivity of her representation, but the candidates' traits and issues were represented pretty equally, with the exception of Brian Kemp portraying himself much more positively through his traits than the newspaper articles portrayed him.

In conclusion, women do not appear to have disadvantages in their media representation in gubernatorial elections on the basis of their gender. An advantage that comes into play in media representation is incumbency, as seen with the positive qualifications of David Ige and Kay Ivey seen throughout the newspaper articles. For gubernatorial campaign strategy representation in the media, women have neither advantages nor disadvantages based on their gender alone in 2018.

Chapter 5: Media Coverage of Senatorial Races Analysis

In this chapter, I will be examining how the media covered senatorial candidates' strategies in the 2018 midterm elections. Through my research, I examined newspaper articles following the same method as outlined in Chapter 4 on the gubernatorial race media coverage. For candidates from Michigan, articles from The Detroit News were analyzed. For candidates from North Dakota, articles from The Bismarck Tribune were analyzed. For candidates from Nevada and Tennessee, articles from The Associated Press were analyzed. Instead of choosing eight articles per candidate and a total of sixteen articles for race, I decided after completing the analysis of the first state's senatorial candidates in this section of the study that a smaller pool of articles would still encompass any patterns that could be drawn from the original sixteen articles per state race. Thus, in this chapter, for the states of North Dakota, Nevada, and Tennessee, I randomly selected four articles per candidate and eight articles per senatorial race. This decision was made after analyzing sixteen articles for the senatorial candidates from Michigan, as I decided that analyzing the sixteen articles was superfluous.

Michigan Senatorial Candidate Representation

In Table 5.1, we can see how the two senatorial candidates from Michigan compare in their newspaper representation. Incumbent Debbie Stabenow received 25 percentage points less of headline coverage than John James, but James' headline coverage was quite negative, while Debbie Stabenow's headline coverage was never negative, with 40% positive headlines and 60% neutral headlines. Stabenow also received 25 percentage points less of lead sentence mentions than James. James criticized Stabenow 37.5 percentage points more than Stabenow criticized James, and both candidates received equal levels of criticism from outside sources within the newspaper articles.

Table 5.1: Michigan Senatorial Candidate Article Contents

	Debbie Stabenow	John James
Average Article Length (Sentences)	30	
Sex of Authors	81.25% Male, 12.5% Female, 6.25% Both	
Percent of Mentions in Headline	31.25%	56.25%
Tone of Headlines with candidate mentioned	40% Positive, 60% Neutral	22.22% Negative, 77.78% Neutral
Percent of Mentions in Lead Sentence	37.50%	56.25%
Tone of Articles	12.5% Positive, 25% Negative, 50% Neutral, 12.5% Mixture	
Percent of Articles Criticized by Opponent	50.00%	12.50%
Percent of Articles Criticized by Outside Source	12.50%	12.50%
Qualifications of Candidate	Prior Office 50%, Other 12.5% Lack of 18.75%	Other 25% Lack of 25%

Though numerically James is mentioned in more articles, the quality of his representation is not favorable. James' headlines are negative in about a quarter of his headline mentions, and neutral in the remaining headlines. James also has positive qualifications mentioned in 25% of articles, and his lack of qualifications is discussed within 25% of the articles as well. Stabenow has positive qualifications mentioned in 62.5% of articles, and her lack of qualifications is only mentioned in 18.75% of articles. Though James is represented more frequently in article headlines and lead sentences, James' coverage is overall much less favorable than Stabenow's. James has no positive headlines, a plethora of negative headlines, and is described to have a lack of qualifications in a quarter of the articles surveyed.

Stabenow's Representation: Newspapers vs Advertisements

Similar to what we saw within the gubernatorial media representation analysis, both candidates and newspapers are not heavily emphasizing traits in their representation of the candidate. However, Stabenow emphasizes her traits even less than the small amount that the newspaper articles do. There is an overlap between the two traits that Stabenow employs within her advertisements, for the traits of advocacy and honesty. Also similar to what was observed within the gubernatorial data analysis, Stabenow only represents herself with positive traits. The traits that are used by the newspaper to describe Stabenow are a close mix of positive and

negative traits. Positive traits include being likeable, caring for constituents, working hard, being positive, grateful, honest, and having good communication skills. The negative traits that the newspaper articles use to represent Stabenow include attacking James, being corrupt, out of touch, a hinderance, hyper-partisan, and elite. These six positive and six negative traits mentioned within the newspaper articles provide a different view of Stabenow than she chooses to present within her campaign advertisements.

Table 5.2: Debbie Stabenow's Newspaper and Advertisement Trait Representation

Debbie Stabenow Traits (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Attack opponent	0.7857	0	0.7857
Likeable	0.3571	0	0.3571
Corrupt	0.2857	0	0.2857
Constituent care	0.2857	0	0.2857
Hardworking	0.2143	0	0.2143
Out of touch	0.2143	0	0.2143
Hinderance	0.1429	0	0.1429
Advocate/ Fighter	0.1429	0.8	-0.6571
Positive	0.0714	0	0.0714
Grateful	0.0714	0	0.0714
Communication	0.0714	0	0.0714
Hyper-partisan	0.0714	0	0.0714
Elite	0.0714	0	0.0714
Good character	0.0714	0	0.0714
Honest	0.0714	0.4	-0.3286
Proud	0.0714	0	0.0714

Overall, Stabenow's traits are not discussed to a great extent within the newspaper articles in this study. The most frequently discussed trait within the newspapers, attacking her opponent, is not brought up at all within Stabenow's campaign advertisements. Of the two traits that are brought up within both the articles and the advertisements, the trait of honesty is pretty closely represented, with Stabenow employing this trait in her advertisements only 0.3286 times

more per advertisement than is brought up within the newspaper articles. We see a greater difference in how the newspapers and advertisements represent Stabenow's trait of being an advocate and fighter for her constituents, as Stabenow brings this trait up almost once every advertisement, while on average the trait is brought up within newspaper articles 0.1429 times per articles. Stabenow's trait representation is not very similar between her campaign advertisements and the way that the newspaper articles represent these traits.

Stabenow's issue representation is not very consistent between her campaign advertisements and the newspaper articles. Of the 17 issues discussed by the newspaper articles or within the campaign advertisements, only 4 issues are featured in both the articles and the advertisements. Additionally, of the 4 issues that are represented in both the articles and the advertisements, there are great differences in the extent to which each platform emphasizes the issues. Stabenow emphasizes the issues of the economy, Michigan based issues, healthcare, and agriculture much more than the newspaper articles emphasize these issues when discussing Stabenow. Issues that Stabenow emphasizes that the newspaper articles do not touch on at all include trade, family, and support from President Bill Clinton.

Table 5.3: Debbie Stabenow's Newspaper and Advertisement Issue Representation

Debbie Stabenow Issues (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Economy	0.6429	2.4	-1.7571
State Based Issues	0.2143	1.4	-1.1857
Healthcare	0.2143	1.2	-0.9597
Trade	0	0.8	-0.8
Agriculture	0.0714	0.8	-0.7286
Family	0	0.6	-0.6
Bill Clinton Support	0	0.6	-0.6
Anti-Trump	0.3571	0	0.3571
Environment	0.3571	0	0.3571
Bipartisan	0.2857	0	0.2857
Anti-Kavanaugh	0.2143	0	0.2143
Fix Roads	0.1429	0	0.1429
Immigration	0.1429	0	0.1429
Biden Support	0.1429	0	0.1429
Mental Health	0.0714	0	0.0714
Sanders Support	0.0714	0	0.0714
Polarization	0.0714	0	0.0714

The great disparity between the mean number of times that the newspaper articles discuss issues and the mean number of times that Stabenow discusses issues within her campaign advertisements support that Stabenow's newspaper article representation is not in line with Stabenow's own personal campaign strategies that she portrays within her campaign advertisements. Since the accuracy of Stabenow's trait representation within newspaper articles is also very weak, Stabenow's campaign strategies are not being accurately represented within the media.

James' Representation: Newspapers vs Advertisements

John James' traits that he portrayed within his campaign advertisements were not well represented within the newspaper articles. Only 2 of the 19 traits used to discuss James in this

study were found within both the newspaper articles and James' political advertisements. The trait of race was represented very accurately, with less than a 0.1 difference in average trait mentions between the articles and the advertisements. The trait of being tough and a fighter is not as well represented, with James stressing this trait much more within his advertisements than the newspapers did.

Table 5.4: John James' Newspaper and Advertisement Trait Representation

John James Traits (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Attacks opponent	1.2308	0	1.2308
Warrior	0	1.143	-1.143
Tough/ Fighter	0.1538	0.857	-0.7032
Veteran	0.6923	0	0.6923
Faith	0	0.429	-0.429
Stand for USA	0	0.429	-0.429
Businessman	0.3077	0	0.3077
Inexperienced	0.3077	0	0.3077
Off-color remarks	0.2308	0	0.2308
New ideas	0.1538	0	0.1538
Leader	0.1538	0	0.1538
Honest	0	0.143	-0.143
Guts	0.0769	0	0.0769
Hero	0.0769	0	0.0769
Grateful	0.0769	0	0.0769
Moral	0.0769	0	0.0769
Energetic	0.0769	0	0.0769
Liar	0.0769	0	0.0769
Race	0.2308	0.286	-0.0552

Of the traits that were mentioned in only one of the two platforms, notable differences were seen for the traits of being a warrior, a veteran, and verbally attacking Stabenow. The newspaper articles bring up the traits of attacking his opponent and being a veteran a lot, while James does not represent these traits within his advertisements. James stresses the trait of being a

warrior frequently within his advertisements, and the newspaper articles do not stress this trait at all in reference to James.

James additionally only represents himself with positive traits, similar to his opponent Stabenow. The newspaper articles focus on many of James' positive attributes, but also highlight negative traits that include being inexperienced, making off-color remarks, and being a liar. This directly conflicts with the way that James represents himself as an honest warrior who is religious and stands for the national anthem. James' trait representation between the newspaper articles and his own political advertisements is not consistent and does not very accurately encompass James' campaign strategies for his traits.

John James' issue representation is also not consistent between his campaign advertisements and the newspaper articles. Within the articles about James and the advertisements produced by James, 20 issues are emphasized and only 4 of the issues are found within both the newspaper articles and James' campaign advertisements. Of these four issues, the only issue that is accurately represented by the newspaper articles in terms of the number of times the issue is brought up is the issue of immigration. For immigration, there is less than a 0.2 difference in the mean number of times that the platforms discuss James and immigration. The issue of celebrity support from Kid Rock is brought up less in the newspaper articles than within the campaign advertisements, as James mentions this support almost 0.5 times more per advertisement than is mentioned within the articles. The issues of Trump and the economy are not well represented by the newspaper articles, as James mentions economic issues 0.75 times more than newspaper articles do. The newspaper articles place a heavier emphasis on James' support of Trump than James does within his own advertisements. James barely mentions Trump, with an average of 0.143 times per advertisement, while the newspaper articles devoted an average of 1.6154 sentences per article to James' support and approval of Trump.

Table 5.5: John James' Newspaper and Advertisement Issue Representation

John James Issues (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Military	0	2.429	-2.429
Trump	1.6154	0.143	1.4724
Pro-Life	0	1.143	-1.143
Education	0	0.857	-0.857
Pro-Republican Majority	0	0.857	-0.857
Economy	0.3846	1.143	-0.7584
State Based Issues	0	0.714	-0.714
Pro-Second Amendment	0	0.714	-0.714
Kid Rock Support	0.0769	0.571	-0.4941
Family	0	0.429	-0.429
Pence Support	0.3846	0	0.3846
Swastika	0.3077	0	0.3077
Terrorism	0	0.286	-0.286
Breastfeeding	0.2308	0	0.2308
Voter Turnout	0.2308	0	0.2308
Fix Roads	0.2308	0	0.2308
Immigration	0.3846	0.571	-0.1864
Healthcare	0.1538	0	0.1538
Environment	0.1538	0	0.1538
Kavanaugh	0.1538	0	0.1538

James greatly emphasized the issues of the military, pro-life views, education, being in favor of a Republican majority in the senate, Michigan based issues, and supporting the Second Amendment; these are the majority of the issues that James discussed within his campaign advertisements. These issues that James heavily emphasized were not at all discussed within the newspaper articles. James did not discuss the eight issues of support from Pence, swastikas in advertisements, anti-breastfeeding in public, voter turnout, fixing roads, healthcare, the environment, and supporting Brett Kavanaugh within his advertisements. Though these 8 issues were not heavily emphasized within the newspaper articles, the extent to which issues are not

found within both articles and advertisements support that James’ campaign strategies for issues are not accurately represented within media coverage.

North Dakota Senatorial Candidate Representation

In Table 5.6, we can see how the two senatorial candidates from North Dakota compare in their newspaper representation. Incumbent Heidi Heitkamp received 12.5 percentage points more headline coverage than Cramer, and the tone of her headlines was much more positive than that of Cramer’s headlines. Two-thirds of Heitkamp’s headlines were positive, and the remaining third were neutral in tone while Cramer’s headlines were half neutral and half negative.

Heitkamp was also mentioned in 12.5 percentage points more lead sentences than Cramer was.

Cramer and Heitkamp criticized each other in the same percentage of articles, and outside sources criticized Cramer 12.5 percentage points more than they criticized Heitkamp.

Table 5.6: North Dakota Senatorial Candidate Article Contents

	Heidi Heitkamp	Kevin Cramer
Average Article Length (Sentences)	22.5	
Sex of Authors	37.5% Male 25% Female, 37.5% Unspecified	
Percent of Mentions in Headline	37.50%	25%
Tone of Headlines with candidate mentioned	66.67% Positive, 33.33% Neutral	50% Negative, 50% Neutral
Percent of Mentions in Lead Sentence	62.50%	50%
Tone of Articles	37.5% Positive, 12.5% Negative, 50% Neutral	
Percent of Articles Criticized by Opponent	37.50%	37.50%
Percent of Articles Criticized by Outside Source	25%	37.50%
Qualifications of Candidate	Prior Office 25%, Other 25%, Lack of 25%	Other 25%, Lack of 37.50%

Table 5.6 details the representation of the two senatorial candidates from North Dakota. This table represents how the two candidates are represented within the 8 articles from North Dakota.

Heitkamp has more positive qualifications mentioned in the newspaper articles, with 50% of the articles featuring positive qualifications and 25% of articles mentioning a lack of qualifications. Cramer’s positive qualifications were only discussed in 25% of articles, and his lack of qualifications was brought up in 37.5% of articles, which is 12.5 percentage points more articles than Heitkamp’s lack of qualifications were discussed in. Based on the more positive

tones, greater representation in headlines and lead sentences, less criticism, and more positive qualifications, incumbent Heitkamp received more favorable representation within newspaper articles. Though Heitkamp received more favorable media representation, she did not win reelection.

Heitkamp's Representation: Newspapers vs Advertisements

Heitkamp's trait representation is highly inconsistent between her campaign advertisements and the newspaper articles. Twenty-one traits are used to describe Heitkamp through articles and advertisements, but there is no overlap between the traits mentioned in the newspaper articles and the traits that Heitkamp uses to portray herself in her campaign advertisements.

Table 5.7: Heidi Heitkamp's Newspaper and Advertisement Trait Representation

Heidi Heitkamp Traits (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Attack Opponent	1	0	1
Hardworking	0	0.875	-0.875
Fighter	0	0.75	-0.75
Tense	0.5714	0	0.5714
Apologetic	0.4286	0	0.4286
Helper	0.2857	0	0.2857
Pleasant Personality	0.2857	0	0.2857
Liberal	0.2857	0	0.2857
Out of Touch	0.2857	0	0.2857
Listens	0	0.25	-0.25
Not Smart	0.1429	0	0.1429
Integrity	0.1429	0	0.1429
Courage	0.1429	0	0.1429
Defensive	0.1429	0	0.1429
Moderate	0.1429	0	0.1429
Powerful	0.1429	0	0.1429
Caretaker	0.1429	0	0.1429
Consistent	0.1429	0	0.1429
Catholic	0.1429	0	0.1429
Moral	0.1429	0	0.1429
Vulnerable	0.1429	0	0.1429

Eight of the traits used to describe Heitkamp in the newspaper articles are negative, while all of the traits that Heitkamp uses to represent herself are positive traits. Newspaper articles note that Heitkamp attacks her opponent, is tense, is apologetic for violating the privacy of sexual assault victims, is liberal, out of touch, not smart, defensive, and vulnerable. Heitkamp represents herself as hardworking, a fighter, and a good listener, which directly conflicts with the content of and significant number of negative traits used to describe Heitkamp in the newspaper articles. Due to the lack of overlap in traits discussed in the articles and advertisements as well as the

contrasting messages that each use of traits provides, Heitkamp's campaign strategies for her use of traits are not accurately represented within media coverage.

Some of Heitkamp's issues emphasized within her political advertisements are similarly represented within the newspaper articles. For the issue of healthcare, both Heitkamp's advertisements and the newspaper articles discuss this issue 1 time per advertisement and article, which signifies equal representation with a difference of 0 between the two platforms. The issue of trade is decently well represented, with Heitkamp mentioning trade 0.3393 times more per advertisement than the newspaper articles did per article. Other issues that are featured in both the articles discussing Heitkamp and Heitkamp's campaign advertisements include the economy and bipartisanship, though these issues were both mentioned by Heitkamp more in her advertisements than the newspapers represented in their articles. Between the articles and advertisements, Heitkamp is linked to 18 issues, only 4 of which were discussed in both the newspaper articles and Heitkamp's advertisements.

Table 5.8: Heidi Heitkamp's Newspaper and Advertisement Issue Representation

Heidi Heitkamp Traits (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Attack Opponent	1	0	1
Hardworking	0	0.875	-0.875
Fighter	0	0.75	-0.75
Tense	0.5714	0	0.5714
Apologetic	0.4286	0	0.4286
Helper	0.2857	0	0.2857
Pleasant Personality	0.2857	0	0.2857
Liberal	0.2857	0	0.2857
Out of Touch	0.2857	0	0.2857
Listens	0	0.25	-0.25
Not Smart	0.1429	0	0.1429
Integrity	0.1429	0	0.1429
Courage	0.1429	0	0.1429
Defensive	0.1429	0	0.1429
Moderate	0.1429	0	0.1429
Powerful	0.1429	0	0.1429
Caretaker	0.1429	0	0.1429
Consistent	0.1429	0	0.1429

Notable differences in issue representation can be seen for the issues of women's reproductive rights, victim privacy, North Dakota state issues, agriculture, supporting first responders, sexual assault, family, and support from President Bill Clinton. The newspapers frequently mentioned women's reproductive rights as well as Heitkamp violating sexual assault victims' privacy, which Heitkamp did not discuss within her advertisements. Heitkamp emphasized North Dakota issues, agriculture, supporting first responders, preventing sexual assault, family, and support from Bill Clinton, which the newspaper articles did not mention at all. Both Heitkamp's issue representation and trait representation in the newspaper articles are

very weak, and support that Heitkamp's campaign strategies that she wanted to portray were not accurately represented in the media.

Cramer's Representation: Newspapers vs Advertisements

Kevin Cramer's trait strategies are better represented by the newspaper articles than Heitkamp's trait strategies were. Two of Cramer's three traits emphasized in his campaign advertisements were also emphasized within newspaper articles to a similar extent. The traits of attacking Heitkamp and being an advocate or fighter for constituents had mean differences under 0.15 for trait representation between newspaper articles and Cramer's advertisements. Cramer's only trait from his advertisements that is not represented within the newspaper articles is the trait of working hard, which Cramer mentioned an average of 0.714 times per campaign advertisement.

Table 5.9: Kevin Cramer's Newspaper and Advertisement Trait Representation

Kevin Cramer Traits (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Hardworking	0	0.714	-0.714
Calm	0.4286	0	0.4286
Attacks Opponent	0.4286	0.286	0.1426
Advocate/ Fighter	0.1429	0.286	-0.1431
Spineless	0.1429	0	0.1429
Snarky	0.1429	0	0.1429
Dismissive	0.1429	0	0.1429
In Charge	0.1429	0	0.1429
Comfortable	0.1429	0	0.1429
Strong	0.1429	0	0.1429
Not Independent	0.1429	0	0.1429

The majority of the traits that are only mentioned in the newspaper articles are mentioned less than 0.15 times per article. Of these traits that are mentioned at a low frequency in the newspapers, four of the traits are negative: the traits spineless, snarky, dismissive, and not independent. While it is important to note that these traits are inconsistent with the traits that

Cramer represents within his advertisements, the traits that are mentioned within both the campaign advertisements and the newspaper articles are represented pretty well. The most significant trait that Cramer does not emphasize but that newspaper articles do emphasize is the trait of being calm; though this is not explicitly mentioned by Cramer within his advertisements, this is a positive attribute that works to favorably represent Cramer within the newspaper articles.

There is much more overlap between the newspaper articles and Cramer's advertisements for Cramer's issues that he emphasized within his campaign. Of the 11 issues emphasized between the articles and the advertisements, 6 of the issues were emphasized by both the newspaper articles and Cramer's advertisements. Of these six issues, the only issue that was represented accurately in terms of the number of mentions between the newspaper articles and the advertisements was the issue of supporting farmers, which had less than a 0.15 difference in average number of mentions per article or advertisement. The issue of pro-life or anti-abortion was represented decently by the newspaper articles, with about a 0.43 difference in mentions between the two platforms. The issues of Trump, healthcare, the economy, and North Dakota based issues were not accurately represented by the newspaper articles, with differences of over 0.7 mentions per platform for each of these issues. The issue of the economy has the largest mention disparity by far for any of the issues mentioned by both the articles and the advertisements, with an average of 1.4281 more mentions per advertisement than per article.

Table 5.10: Kevin Cramer's Newspaper and Advertisement Issue Representation

Kevin Cramer Issues (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Economy	0.1429	1.571	-1.4281
Trump	1.4286	0.286	1.1426
Trade	1	0	1
Taxes	0	1	-1
Seniors	0	0.857	-0.857
Family	0	0.857	-0.857
Healthcare	1.2857	0.571	0.7147
State-Based Issues	0.1429	0.857	-0.7141
Anti-Abortion	0.2857	0.714	-0.4283
Immigration	0	0.286	-0.286
Farmers	0.4286	0.571	-0.1424

Of the issues not mentioned in both the articles and Cramer's advertisements, notable differences in representation can be seen for the issues of trade, taxes, seniors, and family. The articles mention trade one time per article, while Cramer does not discuss trade in his advertisements. Cramer greatly emphasizes tax ideas, senior issues, and family issues within his advertisements, though these issues are not discussed at all within newspaper articles.

Though there is some disparity in the representation of Cramer's traits and issues, this difference is much less extreme than the difference in how Heitkamp represents her traits and issues compared with how the newspaper articles do not represent her strategies. Though Cramer's issue and trait representation is moderately good, Cramer's media coverage is still substantially more accurate in representing his strategies than Heitkamp's media coverage does for her strategies. Cramer's strategies are decently well represented by the media, while Heitkamp's strategies are not well represented by the media at all.

Nevada Senatorial Candidate Representation

The candidates for the senate seat from Nevada were both very positively represented in headlines, though Jacky Rosen was mentioned in more headlines as well as more lead sentences

than incumbent Dean Heller was. Rosen was not at all criticized by Heller, and Heller was criticized by Rosen in one out of every four articles. Heller was also criticized by outside sources in 37.5 percentage points more of articles than Rosen was. Rosen is much more positively represented in newspaper articles than Heller, and she is also less criticized.

Table #5.11: Nevada Senatorial Candidate Article Contents

	Jacky Rosen	Dean Heller
Average Article Length (Sentences)	26.375	
Sex of Authors	37.5% Male, 37.5% Female, 25% Unspecified	
Percent of Mentions in Headline	25%	12.5%
Tone of Headlines with candidate mentioned	100% Positive	100% Positive
Percent of Mentions in Lead Sentence	25%	12.5%
Tone of Articles	25% Positive, 25% Neutral, 50% Mixture	
Percent of Articles Criticized by Opponent	0%	25%
Percent of Articles Criticized by Outside Source	25%	62.5%
Qualifications of Candidate	Prior Office 37.5%, Other 37.5%, Lack of 12.5%	Prior Office 12.5%, Other 25%, Lack of 50%

Rosen's qualifications are also more favorably represented by newspaper articles, with 75% of articles mentioning Rosen's positive qualifications, and only 12.5% of articles mention her lack of qualifications for the senate seat. Dean Heller has much more negative representation of his qualifications, with 50% of articles pointing to his lack of qualifications as a candidate. Only 37.5% of articles mention Heller's positive qualifications, which is half the amount of articles that emphasize Rosen's positive qualifications as a candidate. Based on greater levels of positive qualifications mentioned, greater representation within headlines and lead sentences, and lower levels of criticism than her opponent, Rosen is represented much more favorably within the newspaper articles surveyed for this study.

Rosen's Representation: Newspapers vs Advertisements

Jacky Rosen did not emphasize many traits in her campaign advertisements, but the two traits that she did emphasize include working hard and being sincere or honest. The traits of sincerity and honesty are represented in both the newspaper articles and Rosen's campaign

advertisements, though at differing frequencies. Rosen brings up sincerity and honesty about 0.57 times more per advertisement than is discussed within the newspaper articles, which is a notable disparity. However, it is still important that this trait was mentioned within both newspaper articles and Rosen’s political advertisements.

Table 5.12: Jacky Rosen’s Newspaper and Advertisement Trait Representation

Jacky Rosen Traits (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Hardworking	0	0.857	-0.857
Sincere/ Honest	0.1429	0.714	-0.5711
Attack Opponent	0.2857	0	0.2857
Constituent Care	0.2857	0	0.2857
Far left	0.2857	0	0.2857
Right Direction	0.1429	0	0.1429
Computer Programmer	0.1429	0	0.1429
Software Consultant	0.1429	0	0.1429
Female Activist	0.1429	0	0.1429

Rosen strongly emphasized her trait of working hard in her campaign advertisements, yet this trait was not represented within newspaper articles at all. Rosen emphasized her skill of working hard about 0.86 times per advertisement, which means that this trait was emphasized in most of her advertisements but none of her newspaper articles. This supports some disparity in trait representation between the newspaper articles and Rosen’s campaign strategies. Of the traits that were mentioned only in the newspaper articles and not in Rosen’s campaign advertisements, none of the traits were mentioned more than 0.2857 times per article. This signifies some disparity in trait representation, but not a huge difference. Overall, Rosen’s trait strategies were somewhat accurately represented within the media coverage, and the majority of Rosen’s trait coverage in the media was positive.

Rosen’s issue coverage in the media is not very representative of her issue coverage within her advertisements. The only issues that are addressed in both the newspaper articles and

Rosen's campaign advertisements are the issues of healthcare and opposing Trump. Rosen discusses healthcare 1 time more per advertisement than within the newspaper articles. Rosen also voices more opposition to Trump within her campaign advertisements, with a difference of 0.4284 mentions. Of the 15 issues that are brought up in articles discussing Rosen as well as Rosen's campaign advertisements, only having 2 issues overlap between the articles and the advertisements is not signifying accurate strategy representation within the media's portrayal of Rosen.

Table 5.13: Jacky Rosen's Newspaper and Advertisement Issue Representation

Jacky Rosen Issues (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Bipartisanship	0	1.429	-1.429
Economy	0	1.286	-1.286
Celebrity Support	1	0	1
Healthcare	0.8571	1.857	0.9999
Spanish Language	0.8571	0	0.8571
State Based Issues	0	0.857	-0.857
Sanders Support	0.5714	0	0.5714
Kamala Harris Support	0.5714	0	0.5714
Military	0	0.571	-0.571
Seniors	0	0.571	-0.571
Family	0	0.429	-0.429
Anti-Trump	0.4286	0.857	-0.4284
Education	0	0.286	-0.286
Immigration	0	0.286	-0.286
Infrastructure	0.1429	0	0.1429

Economy01.286-1.286State Based Issues00.857-0.857Military00.571-0.571Seniors00.571-0.571Family00.429-0.429Taxes00.286-0.286

Of the 13 issues that are only mentioned in either the newspaper articles or Rosen's campaign advertisements, the majority of the issues are brought up a substantial number of times in each respective platform. Rosen heavily emphasizes the issues of bipartisanship, the economy, Nevada based issues, the military, seniors, and family within her advertisements, while these

issues are not brought up at all within the newspaper articles surveyed in Nevada. The newspapers heavily emphasize celebrity support, use of the Spanish language in campaigning, and support from Bernie Sanders and Kamala Harris, while Rosen does not emphasize any of these issues in her campaign advertisements. Rosen's trait strategies are somewhat well represented within her media coverage, but her issue strategies are not well represented at all.

Heller's Representation: Newspapers vs Advertisements

Similar to Rosen, Heller did not emphasize many traits in his campaign advertisements. For the two traits that Heller did emphasize in his advertisements, these traits were also mentioned in the newspaper articles surveyed. For the trait of constituent care, there was a difference of 0 mentions, signifying that this trait is represented to the same extent within the newspaper articles and Heller's campaign advertisements. For the trait of attacking Rosen, Heller employed this trait 0.25 times more per advertisement than this trait was mentioned in the articles. For the traits that Heller was trying to represent within his advertisements, the newspaper articles captured these traits very accurately.

Table 5.14: Dean Heller's Newspaper and Advertisement Trait Representation

Dean Heller Traits (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Spineless	0.5	0	0.5
Fighter	0.25	0	0.25
Puppet of President	0.25	0	0.25
Attacks Opponent	0.25	0.5	-0.25
Vulnerable	0.125	0	0.125
Inconsistent	0.125	0	0.125
Name Recognition	0.125	0	0.125
Constituent Care	0.25	0.25	0

Of the traits that were mentioned within newspaper articles but not within candidate advertisements, the biggest difference was found for the trait of being spineless. This was brought up 0.5 times per article, but was not employed by Heller in his campaign advertisements

as this is a negative trait. For the other traits mentioned only in newspaper articles, there were a mix of both positive and negative traits. Positive traits included being a fighter, and having name recognition. The trait of being a fighter was mentioned 0.25 times per article, and name recognition was discussed 0.125 times per article. Negative traits used to describe Heller in the newspapers include being a puppet of Trump, being vulnerable, and inconsistent. These traits were also all mentioned 0.25 times per article or less. The media representation of Heller's traits was overall pretty good, with the exception of the representation of his negative traits.

The media representation of Heller's issues was much less representative of Heller's issue strategies that were discussed in his campaign advertisements. Of the 18 issues mentioned in the articles that talk about Heller and in Heller's campaign advertisements, only 2 issues are mentioned in both of the platforms. The issue of the economy is represented perfectly, with a difference of 0 mentions. The issue of Trump is not represented very accurately within the media, as Heller only brings up Trump 0.25 times per advertisement, yet the newspaper articles reference Heller being pro-Trump 1.625 times per article. This is a sizeable disparity in issue representation for the issue of Trump. It is also important to note that the vast majority of issues are only mentioned by either the newspaper articles or Heller's campaign advertisement, suggesting that the media representation of Heller's issues is not consistent with Heller's campaign strategies regarding issues.

Table 5.15: Dean Heller's Newspaper and Advertisement Issue Representation

Dean Heller Issues (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Trump	1.625	0.25	1.375
Agriculture	0	1.25	-1.25
Taxes	0	1.25	-1.25
Healthcare	1	0	1
Trump Jr Support	0.875	0	0.875
Ivanka Trump Support	0.625	0	0.625
Family	0	0.625	-0.625
Latino Turnout	0.5	0	0.5
Sexual Assault/ Harassment	0	0.5	-0.5
Spanish Language	0.375	0	0.375
Bipartisanship	0	0.25	-0.25
Hillary Clinton	0	0.25	-0.25
Anti-Abortion	0.125	0	0.125
Immigration	0.125	0	0.125
State Based Issues	0	0.125	-0.125
Military	0	0.125	-0.125
Crime	0	0.125	-0.125
Economy	0.875	0.875	0

Newspapers heavily focused on the issue representation of healthcare, support from Donald Trump Jr., support from Ivanka Trump, and Latino voter turnout, while Heller did not discuss any of these issues within his campaign advertisements. Within Heller's advertisements, he focused on agriculture, taxes, family, and sexual assault—none of which were mentioned within the newspaper articles. The media representation of Heller's traits is pretty accurate, however, the media representation of Heller's campaign strategies for issues is very inaccurate due to the fact that the majority of the issues only were discussed in either the articles or the advertisements. When there was rare overlapping in issues, the issue of supporting Trump was found to have a large difference in representation, as the newspaper articles placed much heavier

emphasis on this issue. The only issue that was well represented by the media was the issue representation of the economy.

Tennessee Senatorial Candidate Representation

Senatorial candidates from Tennessee were represented equally in the number of headlines that they were mentioned in, but Phil Bredesen's headlines were 100% positive, while Blackburn's headlines were 50% negative and 50% neutral. Blackburn was mentioned in 12.5 percentage points more lead sentences than Bredesen was. Both candidates were equally criticized by each other, but Blackburn received 12.5 percentage points more criticism from outside sources than Bredesen did. Though Blackburn was mentioned in more lead sentences than Bredesen, her media representation is less favorable due to the great presence of negative tones and greater level of criticism from outside sources.

Table 5.16: Tennessee Senatorial Candidate Article Contents

	Marsha Blackburn	Phil Bredesen
Average Article Length (Sentences)	32.375	
Sex of Authors	25% Male, 12.5% Female, 12.5% Both, 50% Unspecified	
Percent of Mentions in Headline	25%	25%
Tone of Headlines with candidate mentioned	50% Negative, 50% Neutral	100% Positive
Percent of Mentions in Lead Sentence	37.5%	25%
Tone of Articles	12.5% Positive, 25% Negative, 62.5% Neutral	
Percent of Articles Criticized by Opponent	25%	25%
Percent of Articles Criticized by Outside Source	25%	12.5%
Qualifications of Candidate	Prior Office 37.5%, Other 12.5%, Lack of 37.5%	Prior Office 37.5%, Other 12.5%

Each candidate's positive qualifications were represented equally within the newspaper articles. Bredesen did not have any negative qualifications mentioned in the articles. Blackburn's lack of qualifications were discussed in 37.5% of the newspaper articles surveyed for Tennessee, which could have been problematic for Blackburn, though she ultimately won the race. Bredesen's media representation is much more positive than Blackburn's, and he was also criticized much less within his representation in the media.

Blackburn's Representation: Newspapers vs Advertisements

Blackburn's trait representation, though very negative, is actually quite representative of her trait emphasis in her campaign advertisements. Of the two traits that Blackburn emphasized within her campaign advertisements, the trait of attacking her opponent was mentioned by both the articles and the advertisements to a great extent, with only a 0.125 difference in mentions per article or advertisement. The other trait that Blackburn emphasized was extreme patriotism through leading "USA" chants, though she only emphasized this issue 0.125 times per campaign advertisement. This trait was not discussed in the newspaper articles, but the net difference for the USA chants is 0.125, which is quite small.

Table 5.17: Marsha Blackburn's Newspaper and Advertisement Trait Representation

Marsha Blackburn Traits (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Anti-Gender Equality	0.5	0	0.5
Attack Opponent	1	0.875	0.125
Aggressive	0.125	0	0.125
Terrifying	0.125	0	0.125
Very Conservative	0.125	0	0.125
USA Chants	0	0.125	-0.125

A trait of significance that Blackburn does not discuss within her advertisements but that is discussed within the newspaper articles is the issue of anti-gender equality. Blackburn is accused of being anti-gender equality and women's rights on average 0.5 times per article. Blackburn did not include this trait in her campaign advertisements, likely because this trait is typically not a positive trait. Other traits that were discussed within newspaper articles only are the traits of being aggressive, terrifying, and very conservative. Each of these traits were discussed on average 0.125 times per article, which is not a lot of mentions. Blackburn's trait representation in the media is pretty representative of her trait strategies that are represented within her own senatorial campaign advertisements.

Blackburn's issue representation within the media is pretty consistent with how Blackburn's issue strategies within her campaign advertisements. Of the issues mentioned in both the articles and her campaign advertisements, minimal differences in representation were found for the issues of Trump, pro-Second Amendment, pro-Border Wall, pro-Brett Kavanaugh confirmation, the economy, and healthcare. This is an impressive amount of issues to have pretty well represented within the newspaper articles.

Table 5.18: Marsha Blackburn's Newspaper and Advertisement Issue Representation

Marsha Blackburn Issues (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Opioids	3	0	3
Taxes	0	1	-1
State Based Issues	0	0.875	-0.875
Pro-Republican Majority	0	0.875	-0.875
Sexual Misconduct	0.625	0	0.625
Defend Constitution	0	0.5	-0.5
Economy	0.125	0.5	-0.375
Pro Kavanaugh	0.25	0.625	-0.375
Pro Life	0.375	0	0.375
Space Force	0.25	0	0.25
Trump	0.875	1.125	-0.25
Bipartisanship	0	0.25	-0.25
Pro-Second Amendment	0.5	0.375	0.125
Border Wall/ Immigration	0.375	0.25	0.125
Healthcare	0.125	0.25	-0.125
Hillary Clinton	0	0.125	-0.125

Issues that were highly represented in newspaper articles but not in Blackburn's campaign advertisements are the issues of opioids and sexual misconduct. Blackburn additionally emphasized the issues of taxes, Tennessee based issues, supporting a Republican majority in the senate, and defending the constitution. Due to the number of issues that are well represented within the media and the majority of issues having small differences in

representation between the articles and the advertisements, Blackburn's issue strategies are pretty well represented within the media. Since Blackburn's trait strategies were also well represented within the media, it is supported that Blackburn's campaign strategies are accurately represented within media coverage.

Bredesen's Representation: Newspapers vs Advertisements

Phil Bredesen's trait coverage in the media was less consistent with his trait strategies than was the case for his opponent. Of the four traits that Bredesen emphasizes, the only trait to be brought up within both the newspaper articles and Bredesen's campaign advertisements was the trait of attacking Blackburn. This trait was represented pretty well with a difference of under 0.15 mentions per article or advertisement. Though Bredesen only had one trait accurately represented by the media, the coverage of Bredesen's traits was still quite positive. The only trait that was used in a negative way within newspaper articles is the trait liberal, used to create issues for Bredesen's campaign in an affectively polarized and traditionally red state. Bredesen is described to be liberal within the news, and this is seen as a negative trait in Tennessee where within a rally for Marsha Blackburn, Trump said that liberals "want to destroy the country with high taxes and illegal immigration, as well as divisive politics" (Associated Press 2018). Though there were differences in the traits that the newspaper articles and Bredesen emphasized, the rest of the traits used to describe Bredesen were positive. Bredesen's media coverage of his trait strategies was not great, but it was still good.

Table 5.19: Phil Bredesen's Newspaper and Advertisement Trait Representation

Phil Bredesen Traits (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Hardworking	0	0.714	-0.714
Constituent Care	0	0.429	-0.429
Listens	0.2857	0	0.2857
Liberal/ Democrat	0.2857	0	0.2857
Centrist	0.2857	0	0.2857
Morals	0	0.143	-0.143
Attacks Opponent	0.4286	0.286	0.1426

Though there are redeemable qualities to Bredesen's trait representation in the media, the same cannot be said for Bredesen's issue representation in the media. Of the 22 issues discussed in reference to Bredesen, only 3 were mentioned in both newspaper articles and Bredesen's political advertisements, and only 1 issue was accurately represented in the frequency at which the issue was represented. The most well represented issue in Bredesen's media coverage is the issue of sexual misconduct, which Bredesen only mentions less than 0.15 times more in advertisements than is discussed in newspaper articles. The other two issues that are discussed in both newspaper articles and Bredesen's advertisements are the issues of bipartisanship and Trump. Both issues are emphasized much more within the newspaper articles than they are within Bredesen's advertisements.

Table 5.20: Phil Bredesen's Newspaper and Advertisement Issue Representation

Phil Bredesen Issues (Mean)	Newspaper Representation	Candidate Representation	Difference
Economy	0	1.143	-1.143
Taylor Swift Support	1	0	1
State Based Issues	0	1	-1
Trump	1.1429	0.143	0.9999
Drug Prices	0.8571	0	0.8571
Opioids	0.7143	0	0.7143
Pro-Kavanaugh	0.5714	0	0.5714
Military	0	0.571	-0.571
Agriculture	0	0.571	-0.571
Trade	0	0.571	-0.571
Gun Control	0.4286	0	0.4286
Taxes	0	0.286	-0.286
Michael Bloomberg	0.2857	0	0.2857
North Korea	0	0.143	-0.143
Seniors	0	0.143	-0.143
Healthcare	0	0.143	-0.143
Personal Finances	0.1429	0	0.1429
Space Force	0.1429	0	0.1429
Anti-Border Wall	0.1429	0	0.1429
Pro-Women's Reproductive Rights	0.1429	0	0.1429
Bipartisanship	1.2857	1.143	0.1427
Sexual Misconduct	0.4286	0.571	-0.1424

The newspaper articles also strongly emphasize the issues of support from Taylor Swift, drug prices, opioids, supporting Brett Kavanaugh's confirmation, and supporting increased gun control. All of these issues are decently to very controversial, so it makes sense that Bredesen would not discuss these issues within campaign advertisements. Issues that Bredesen heavily emphasized that the newspapers did not discuss include the economy, Tennessee based issues, the military, agriculture, and trade. Given that only 1 of Bredesen's 22 issues was accurately

represented within the media, and the majority of the issues are discussed by either the articles or the campaign advertisements, it is supported that Bredesen's issue strategies are not accurately represented within the media.

Conclusion

In Michigan, Stabenow saw much more positive representation for headlines, lead sentences, and positive qualifications than her opponent. Stabenow was attacked by James a lot, but the criticism from outside sources of the two opponents was equal. While James was mentioned in over half of the headlines and lead sentences, the tones used to describe James were only negative or neutral, with no positive tones at all. James faced much more coverage on his lack of qualifications for the senatorial seat than Stabenow did. Both of the candidates in Michigan had low accuracy in the representation of their trait strategies and their issues strategies in the media.

In the race for North Dakota's senate seat, incumbent Heitkamp was represented in more headlines and lead sentences than her opponent, and was also represented with more positive tones than Cramer. Heitkamp's positive qualifications were also mentioned more frequently than Cramer's. Cramer was represented with many more negative tones than Heitkamp, faced more outside criticism, and had more articles focusing on his lack of qualifications. Cramer found favorable representation in the greater accuracy of his issue and trait representation compared to Heitkamp's issue and trait representation. Cramer was more accurately represented in the media, and also ultimately beat the incumbent Heitkamp in the senatorial race.

In Nevada, Rosen garnered much more positive media representation through headline mentions, lead sentence mentions, not facing criticism from her opponent, and facing much less criticism from outside sources than Heller did. Rosen's headlines were also 100% positive, further contributing to her favorable media representation. Rosen also had more articles focus on

her positive qualifications than Heller did. Heller was featured in more articles that focused on his lack of qualifications for the senatorial seat. Rosen's trait strategies are somewhat well represented within her media coverage, but her issue strategies are not well represented within the media at all. Heller's trait strategies are also pretty accurately represented, and Heller's issue strategies were not well represented either.

In Tennessee, Marsha Blackburn was mentioned in more lead sentences than her opponent, but her media representation is less favorable due to the great presence of negative tones and great level of criticism from outside sources. Bredesen's media representation was much more positive than Blackburn's, and he was also criticized much less than Blackburn. Marsha Blackburn's trait strategies as well as her issue strategies are both very accurately represented in the media. Though the tone of a lot of her coverage was negative, Blackburn's strategies were accurately represented by the media and Blackburn ultimately won the senate seat. Bredesen's trait representation in the media was not as strong as Blackburn's, though it was not too bad. Bredesen's issue representation in the media was very inaccurate, with very little overlap in issues discussed by Bredesen and the media, as well as the great differences in the extent to which Bredesen and the media emphasized different issues. Bredesen was represented less favorably, and lost the senatorial race.

The two states with similar representation accuracy of the trait and issue strategies of the candidates were the states of Michigan and Nevada. In Michigan, the candidates trait and issue strategies were represented with similar inaccuracy, though Stabenow was represented more positively, and Stabenow ultimately won the race. In Nevada, the candidates trait and issue strategies were represented with similar accuracy, which often meant inaccuracy; Rosen had more positive representation, and Rosen won the senate seat. Both of the victors from these two races were Democrats.

For the other senate races, representation was not equal for the candidates. In North Dakota, Cramer was more negatively represented in tones but more accurately represented in terms of his trait and issue strategies, and beat the incumbent Heitkamp. In Tennessee, Blackburn was less positively represented in the media but more accurately represented for her trait and issue strategies, and also ultimately won. In both of these elections, the Republican won after being more accurately represented in a traditionally red state. It cannot be said whether the red state effect or the greater accuracy of media representation strategies is the reason why these two Republicans won these senate seats.

Women do not appear to have disadvantages in their media representation in senatorial elections on the basis of gender. Women in senatorial races were represented much more positively than men were in the media. Neither men nor women were represented more accurately in the media; for two of the races both candidates were inaccurately represented for the Tennessee race the female candidate was represented more accurately and for the North Dakota race the male candidate was represented more accurately. An advantage that could come into play is incumbency, though incumbent Heitkamp lost her senate race in this midterm election cycle. For senatorial campaign strategy representation in the media, women's gender is not found to play a role in the accuracy of their media representation in 2018.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

My overall thesis goals were to evaluate how gubernatorial and senatorial candidates campaigned in the 2018 elections, and to see how the media represented the candidates. The purpose for this thesis was to see if women are being as accurately represented within the media as their male counterparts. Though Hayes and Lawless (2016, 90) concluded that they found “little in the way of gender differences in the volume or substance of coverage men and women receive” for the congressional media study that they performed, I was concerned that in 2018 media representation would become problematic for women, and that the media would less accurately represent female candidates than male candidates. I found this research necessary as I had concern about the representation of women in the media due to the current President of the United States is using copious sexist language and criticizing the media. The topic I studied is important because women need to be represented accurately in the media for their campaign messages to be portrayed to their voters. Representation within politics is not equal between male and female genders, and I have concern that if women are not represented well within the media that the United States would regress further in our gender equality progress. However, I found that gender does not disadvantage women in media representation, and in most cases, the accuracy of female candidates’ representation is similar to that of their male counterparts. It is important to continue to monitor the representation of women in the media to ensure that an increase of sexist language from the current President of the United States does not have a negative impact on women running for elected office.

Connecting to my literature review, my thesis results support that of Brooks (2013) and Dolan (2014) in that gender does play a role in how candidates strategize in their campaigns, yet that women are not often hampered by gender or gender stereotypes. There has been an increase in representation of women in congress since Hayes and Lawless’ (2016) research, with more

women in both the House of Representatives and U.S. Senate than ever before (Kurtzleben 2018). The media representation I found through my research represents Hayes and Lawless' (2016) conclusions in that the quality and quantity of media representation is not impacted by gender. This supports that women's media representation has improved for female gubernatorial candidates, and even more so for female senatorial candidates, which is a big improvement from 1996 at the time of Kahn's media research for the same levels of office. Following the conclusion of McGregor, Lawrence, and Cardona (2017), the female candidates have found success as they emphasize issues much more than traits, which is similar to how the male candidates campaign as well. The media in 2018 as found through my original research does emphasize traits more than the candidates themselves do, but this is consistent for both males and females. I also found that similar to Banwart, Bystrom, and Robertson (2003), women are not underrepresented in the media, as in my research women and men were both mentioned in the majority of articles that I analyzed within their state. Overall, things are getting better for women in campaigning, though women still navigate gender stereotypes in a way that helps them find electoral success. Women are indeed running just as well as men (Dolan 2014), and media representation not hindering women is allowing for more strides towards equal representation.

While my research did a thorough job of examining gender strategies and media representation, I did have some limitations to my research. One limitation was that I only researched gubernatorial and senatorial candidates. I would have liked to analyze races for the seats in the House of Representative, as women in recent times have found much success in winning seats in the House of Representatives. However, with the vast number of races in which women were running for House of Representatives, I was concerned that any sample I would randomly select would not be able to properly capture trends for campaign strategies and media coverage accuracy. If I were to have more people involved on a research team or much more

time to research this field, I would take this research in the direction of adding the House of Representatives races to this research.

Another limitation was that I only surveyed advertisements for my campaign strategies analysis. Other resources that could have been surveyed and could be surveyed in future research include candidate debates, speeches, campaign websites, and social media pages. I selected advertisements for this analysis because the candidates are making conscious choices given that campaign advertisements typically last under a 1 minute time period, so the issues and traits demonstrated within that short time period are the issues and traits that the candidate most strongly wants to represent. Another limitation was the roughly 25 week time constraint on this study, and a lack of a team of graduate students to code a larger sample size of advertisements and newspapers as well as a larger sample of platforms that could include those previously mentioned, as well as television news broadcasts, website news, and social media news for the media accuracy analysis. Given a larger team of researchers and longer time period for research, a larger news analysis could be performed in the future. However, I am confident in my conclusions given the nature of newspaper articles and the widespread reach that newspaper articles have in each state in this study. Additionally, the issue of incumbency could also provide another interesting layer to this research in the future, though I made the conscious choice for this research to focus more on issues and traits regarding how campaign advertisements use the issues and traits and how accurately the media represents the candidates' uses of such strategies. In conclusion, my research provided great insight into the accuracy of gender representation in the media for the 2018 elections, adding valuable research to the field of gender representation in United States politics.

Bibliography

- Associated Press. 2018. "The Latest: Trump, Obama give closing arguments for midterms." *Nexis Uni: Washington*.
- Banwart, Mary Christine, Dianne G. Bystrom, and Terry Robertson. 2003. "From the Primary to the General Election: A Comparative Analysis of Candidate Media Coverage in Mixed-Gender 2000 Races for Governor and U.S. Senate." *American Behavioral Scientist* 46(5): 658–76.
- Bluestein, Greg, and Estep, Tyler. 2018. "AJC Digging Deeper Georgia Voting; Partisan shifts put Gwinnett and Brooks counties in the election spotlight." *Nexis Uni: The Atlanta Journal Constitution*.
- Braden, Maria. 1996. *Women Politicians and the Media*. Lexington, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky.
- Brooks, Deborah Jordan. 2013. *He Runs, She Runs: Why Gender Stereotypes Do Not Harm Women Candidates*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Burrell, Barbara. 2014. "Political Parties and Women's Organizations: Bringing Women into the Electoral Arena." In *Gender and Elections: Shaping the Future of American Politics*, Third Edition, ed. Susan J. Carroll and Richard L. Fox. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carroll, Susan J., and Fox, Richard L. 2014. "Introduction." In *Gender and Elections: Shaping the Future of American Politics*, Third Edition, ed. Susan J. Carroll and Richard L. Fox. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Connors, Joan L. 2010. "Barack Versus Hillary: Race, Gender, and Political Cartoon Imagery of the 2008 Presidential Primaries." *American Behavioral Scientist* 54(3): 298–312.
- Dolan, Kathleen. 2014. *When Does Gender Matter? Women Candidates and Gender Stereotypes in American Elections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Enns-Jedenastik, Laurenz, Martin Dolezal, and Wolfgang C. Müller. 2017. "Gender Differences in Negative Campaigning: The Impact of Party Environments." *Politics & Gender* 13(01): 81–106.
- Fox, Richard L. 2014. "Congressional Elections: Women's Candidacies and the Road to Gender Parity." In *Gender and Elections: Shaping the Future of American Politics*, Third Edition, ed. Susan J. Carroll and Richard L. Fox. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hayes, Danny, and Lawless, Jennifer L. 2016. *Women on the Run: Gender, Media, and Political Campaigns in a Polarized Era*. New York, New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Hayes, Danny, Jennifer L. Lawless, and Gail Baitinger. 2014. "Who Cares What They Wear? Media, Gender, and the Influence of Candidate Appearance." *Social Science Quarterly* 95(5): 1194–1212.
- Holman, Mirya R., Monica C. Schneider, and Kristin Pondel. 2015. "Gender Targeting in Political Advertisements." *Political Research Quarterly* 68(4): 816–29.
- Kahn, Kim Fridkin. 1996. *The Political Consequences of Being a Woman: How Stereotypes Influence the Conduct of Political Campaigns*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kurtzleben, Danielle. 2018. "A Record Number of Women Will Serve in Congress." *NPR: All Things Considered*.
- McGregor, Shannon C., Regina G. Lawrence, and Arielle Cardona. 2017. "Personalization, Gender, and Social Media: Gubernatorial Candidates' Social Media Strategies." *Information, Communication & Society* 20(2): 264–83.
- Niese, Mark. 2018. "Allegations of hacking come at 11th hour." *Nexis Uni: The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*.
- Panagopoulos, Costas. 2004. "Boy Talk/Girl Talk: Gender Differences in Campaign Communications Strategies." *Women & Politics* 26(3-4): 131–55.
- Sanbonmatsu, Kira. 2014. "Women's Election to Office in the Fifty States: Opportunities and Challenges." In *Gender and Elections: Shaping the Future of American Politics*, Third Edition, ed. Susan J. Carroll and Richard L. Fox. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sheeler, Kristina Horn. 2005. "Gender and Candidate Communication: VideoStyle, WebStyle, NewsStyle." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 8(04): 701–4.