The First Woman Presidential Candidate in US

Qualitative content analysis of gender stereotypes in the media framing of Hillary Clinton by *The New York Times* during the Presidential Elections in 2016

Master thesis by Andriana Boyrikova
Student number: s2972212
Handed in on 02 February 2016

Supervisor: dr. Ilja van den Broek
Second reader dr. Scott Eldridge
MA Journalism
University of Groningen

"So now women think they are capable of holding the highest office in the land.
It's bad enough that we allow these female creatures to operate automobiles.
Imagine what would happen if one of them became president!
Let's keep the women at home where they belong".

(Falk 2007, 31)

ABSTRACT

The aim of the present research was to find out an answer to the question if any gender stereotypes were at play in Hillary Clinton's coverage by the most prominent quality newspaper in the US – *The New York Times*, throughout the Presidential Elections in 2016 and, if yes, to examine what role they played in the building of Clinton's image. This phenomenon is worth-investigating since this year's US presidential elections presented a historical precedent in American politics by having the first woman in American politics nominated as a presidential candidate by a major political party. In order for the present study to be conducted properly it grounded its theoretical part on gender theory and on the theory of media framing. It also traced American history back to its origins in order to acquire a clear picture of what the role of gender stereotypes in politics has been during the years and how things have evolved in time. For the sake of a subjective interpretation of the content of the text data, the present research made use of qualitative analysis in its empirical part. The main finding of the present research is that gender stereotypes did play a substantial role in the media coverage of Hillary Clinton by the *NYT*. The "first", the "woman", the "wife", the "mother", and the "appearance" stereotypes turned out to play a significant role in the building of her image. Although they all had very complex and at times even conflicting implications and uses in the analyzed textual framework, they had one main common feature – they played the role of stressing Clinton's gender and presenting her as a woman first and foremost. The conclusion of the present research is that gender can be deemed as a persistent part of Hillary Clinton's coverage by the *NYT* during the Presidential Elections in US in 2016 and that it not only defined a political candidate but also presented her as exceptional due to her gender.

Key words: gender, gender stereotypes, women, politics, US politics, Hillary Clinton, US Presidential Elections, *The New York Times*, framing, media framing, gender theory, Grounded Theory, qualitative content analysis.

TABLE OF CONTENS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The process of writing this thesis was one of the biggest challenges in my whole educational life. Having graduated from a Bachelor's in English and American Studies (done in Bulgaria), I was really overwhelmed when it came to doing my own research here. I was afraid of the unknown, I did not believe in myself, and I was certain I would never be able to do it in the proper way. Many times I was too self-conscious, I felt that I was not good enough at writing and doing research and that I was just not smart enough for this. Then, however, during the gradual process of reading, writing, and editing I learned something. I learned that if one wants to be a researcher, one should not quit. I learned that doing research is not about being smart – it is about being curious, always asking why and how, being persistent and consistent, being hard-working, and definitely not being a quitter. I also learned that one has to be patient if one wants to achieve good results. Good results just do not come easily. I also learned that research is a fascinating thing. It gave me the opportunity to explore a topic of great interest to me and find out things. Things, which I genuinely hope, will be interesting or useful (maybe?) to someone else. This is how in the end it turned out that this thesis not only taught me how to conduct a proper research and actually enjoy the whole process, but it also gave me the great opportunity to get to know myself. And for all this, I am forever thankful.

This thesis would not have been possible without the help of my supervisor, Ilja, who would always swiftly check my drafts and give me the feedback I needed in order transform my poorly written drafts into something which makes sense. If it was not for her, I would have probably submitted some poorly structured piece of ramblings which would not have been even close to a real research. Ilja taught me how to improve my writing, how to write as a researcher, and most of all, how to think as a researcher and for this I am grateful. So, thank you, Ilja!

I also want to thank my mum who was not physically next to me during the process of writing my thesis but who was always there on Skype or on the phone, ready to absorb all my negativity, bursts of anger, and whining that I cannot do it. She would always encourage me and make me look on the bright side of the things. So, thank you, mum!

Last but not least, I want to thank Arjen for his constant support. He was always there for me – all the times when I was depressed that my thesis was not good enough, when I wanted to improve it but did not know how, when I stayed in the library for weeks, skipping weekends and friends' gatherings, when I was unsociable, gloomy, aggravated, mad, nervous, quarrelsome, oversensitive... He was always there for me, smiley and supportive. So, thank you, Arjen!

INTRODUCTION

The topic of women in politics has always been a fascinating area of academic research as well as an inseparable part of media coverage and even of everyday discussions. A significant body of works in the field of gender and politics reveals that women politicians face challenges trying to fight gender stereotypes in the masculine arena of politics (Falk 2007; Jamieson 1995; Kahn, 1996). Then, it can be claimed that gender stereotypes do play significant role in regard to female politicians. However, there is one aspect of this field of research which is not sufficiently explored and this is the area regarding the role of gender at the US presidential arena. Since US presidency presents one peculiar tendency, particularly that US is a country where a "*traditional masculinity has been a hallmark of the American presidency*" (Anderson 2002, 124), it can be regarded as worth examining how a woman who runs for US president is depicted and whether her gender and any subsequent gender stereotypes are part of her portrayal. Although there are previous studies which have set off on exploring women presidential candidates in US (Falk 2007; Falk 2010), their findings do not build a sufficient foundation for future research in the field of gender and US presidency. Furthermore, studies of such nature, focusing on comparisons between male and female US presidential candidates and putting emphasis on the presence and lack of particular gender stereotypes, cannot serve as a scholarly illustration of what images these presidential candidates are attached to in regard to their gender. Therefore, a research which delves into uncovering more on how women presidential candidates in US are presented in terms of gender stereotypes and particularly on what images they receive by media coverage should be more than welcomed in the academic field examining gender and US presidency.

Hence, it comes as no surprise that the purpose of the present research is exactly this – to examine how one particular woman presidential candidate in US is depicted in terms of gender stereotypes present in her media coverage, and more importantly, what an image she is attached to on the basis of these gender stereotypes. Another main reason for the conduction of the present research is the cultural and societal framework of this year's elections which has important historical implications. The Presidential Elections in 2016 present a profound opportunity for researchers to investigate on how Hillary Clinton was framed as a presidential candidate and whether any gender stereotypes were particularly salient in her portrayal by media at a historical time for US politics. What is exceptional about the Presidential Elections in 2016 is that they mark a moment in American history having the first woman elected as a presidential candidate by a major political party – the Democratic Party. Clinton's nomination by the Democrats was framed by media as "'*the biggest crack' in glass ceiling*" (*CNN*, 27 July, 2016) and Clinton herself was framed as "*a historic nominee*" (*NYT*, 26 July, 2016). Thus, delving into the way this historical candidacy was presented by media and how Clinton herself was depicted throughout the Presidential Elections can certainly contribute to the academic field of gender and politics and also bring to some important conclusions on how a particular female presidential candidate is presented at a time of a historical precedency in US politics.

Another important aspect of this research is the candidate who is being examined. Hillary Clinton is a prominent political figure in US and an inseparable part of numerous academic studies. She is the 67th United States Secretary of State, the New York US Senator, the First Lady of US, and, now, the Democratic Party's nominee for President of US in the 2016 elections. Clinton is not only the first woman to lead the presidential ticket of a major political party but also one who "*remains the favourite to become the next President*"[1]. In short, she is a distinguished political figure in American politics, a prominent face in the media world, a touchstone for women in American politics, and last but not least, a subject of discussion and examination in many studies. Throughout the years she has been attached to various titles and descriptions – "*political spouse*" (Edwards 2011, 157), "*a bitch and a witch*" (Lim 2009, 254), or even the "*Ice Queen*" (Curnalia and Mermer 2014, 31), to name just a few. Her image has always been connected to gender stereotypes and feminism (Parry-Giles 2000, 207), therefore, any further examination of a female political figure which makes such a solid amount of academic literature on gender and politics can be regarded as meaningful. What is also notable about exploring Clinton's presentation during the elections in 2016 is the historical aspect of her candidacy. When going back in American history, other examples of women who have run for presidency in US can be found - Victoria Woodhull[2] (1872), Belva Lockwood (1884), Margaret Smith (1964), Shirley Chisholm (1972), Patricia Schroeder (1987), Lenora Fulani (1988), Elizabeth Dole (2000), and Carol Moseley Braun (2004) (see Falk 2007). Hence, there were other women in US before Hillary Clinton who ran for presidency but it is an irrefutable fact that Clinton is the first nominated by a major party, namely the Democrats, and this is what adds further significance to her as both a woman and a presidential candidate, and transforms her into an interesting subject to be researched.

Then, the aim of the present research is to examine Hillary Clinton at the time of this presidential precedent in US political history and find out if any gender stereotypes were present and/or salient in the way was she was presented. The research, however, is not going to end with this but will take one step further from previous research and strive to uncover how these gender stereotypes built the actual image of Hillary Clinton. Thus, the ultimate goal of the research is to ascertain what an image she was attached to in terms of the gender stereotypes which were at play in her media depiction. The endeavors of the present research can be brought together in the following research question:

RQ: Did any gender stereotypes appear as present in the coverage of Hillary Clinton by *The New York Times* during the Presidential Elections in 2016 and how did they frame her image?

_____

[1]CITYA.M. website. This quote is from 10 February 2016. It should be taken into consideration that the present research began in July 2016, while the Presidential Elections were at their height, and ended in January - three months after Donald Trump was elected President. For this reason, quotes like this one, describing Clinton as the probable winner in the elections, can be encountered.

[2]It is important to note here that when Victoria Woodhull ran for presidency in 1872 before the women's suffrage, she was considered as the first woman candidate nominated for the United States presidency. She was the nominee of the Equal Rights Party.

In order for the research to be conducted, it selected one national newspaper – *The New York Times*, and conducted a qualitative content analysis of its articles in the time framework between 1 February 2016 (the beginning of the US presidential primaries and caucuses) and November 2016 (the end of the US presidential elections). The goal of the research was to exhaustively analyze the coverage of that particular newspaper and uncover any salient gender stereotypes, emphasis on Clinton's gender, and interconnections between them, and conclusively, come up with an overall image of Clinton in regard to these stereotypes. The present research deemed it reasonable enough to resort to the newspaper articles of *NYT* since it is one of the oldest newspapers in US, it is a winner of 117 Pulitzer Prizes, more than any other news organization, and has long been regarded within the industry as a national newspaper of record. Another reason is that no previous research in the area of gender and politics has been based on a qualitative content analysis of articles solely by *NYT*. Hence, *NYT* provides an interesting case study which can bring to light some noteworthy and original findings to the field of gender and politics.

Last but not least, before moving on to the outline of the present paper, another essential component of the research should be highlighted and this is the media framing part which presents the core theoretical ground of the present research. Since the aim of the present research is to examine the media coverage of one particular newspaper, this theory was considered as most suitable for both the overall purpose of the research and also for its method of gathering and analyzing data – qualitative content analysis. Moreover, the research aims at ultimately uncovering Clinton's image as presented by the gender stereotypes at play in her newspaper coverage and the theory of framing invariably supports such a line of research since at its core media framing is about constructing images and giving meaning to those images (Hallahan 1999, 222).

The present paper will begin with a concise introduction to the topic of women's rights and empowerment in US history. It will shed light on the developments regarding women in politics throughout the last century and it will also discuss some scholarly findings from previous research on why women's career in American politics is impeded. It will also enumerate some female presidential candidates in US history and deliberate on how they were covered by media at the time they were running for president. Lastly, the chapter will focus on the candidate been examined, Hillary Clinton, and reflect on the different stereotypical ways she has been presented throughout the years as well as the most recurrent gender stereotypes which have been attached to in her media coverage.

Then, the paper will continue with its core theoretical foundation and elaborate on the theory of gender stereotypes and the media framing theory. Chapter 2 will elucidate what a stereotype is, move on to explicate what gender is and why it is such a substantial field of academic literature and research and introduce the gender schema theory, which is necessary for understanding the nature of gender and gender stereotypes. The Chapter will further with reflecting on why gender stereotypes have such a big influence on women in politics and what role they play in women's political lives. The theoretical part of the paper will end with a

discussion of media framing and what a significant role frames play in shaping political candidates to the public.

Chapter 3 will present the research design and the methodology of the paper. Since the present research choose to resort to inductive qualitative content analysis as a way of analyzing its data, it is going to elaborate on this choice of a method of data collection and data analysis and also explicate on what exactly it is going to look for in the *NYT* articles. Moreover, the process of coding gender stereotypes in media framing and data analysis in the present research was guided by the Grounded Theory approach and for this reason some justification will be given on why the research deemed this approach as suitable for its empirical part. Lastly, the Chapter will elucidate on the practicalities of conducting the research itself and on its research sampling.

The paper will continue with Chapter 4 where an analysis of the *NYT* articles will follow. The Chapter will present its findings regarding what stereotypes were used in the newspaper coverage of Hillary Clinton and elaborate on the meanings, implications, secondary meanings, and uses of these stereotypes as well as on the interconnections between them and the main role they played in the building of Clinton's image. The Chapter will also ground these elaborations on specific examples extracted from the coded articles and reach a conclusive answer to its *RQ*.

Ultimately, the paper will end with contemplating on the overall research and on what it has achieved. It will also reflect on its weaknesses and on what could have been improved during the whole process of conducting the research. The Conclusion will also summarize the main findings of the research and relate them to the theoretical foundation and, on the basis of this, will draw its final conclusion. Lastly, it will suggest ideas for future research and for how the present research can be expanded.

CHAPTER 1
WOMEN IN US POLITICAL HISTORY

Women in US political life is a multifaceted topic of research which has incited many scholars to discuss whether women should pursue a career in politics, what obstacles they encounter on their way to holding office, and in what ways women politicians are presented by media. Diversified as it is, this area examining the interaction between gender and politics is even more worth exploring now at a moment when America is on the fringe of electing a woman for the first time in history for its highest elected office in the United States. Therefore, an examination of this precedent in American politics is more than warranted. For the purpose of the present research a review of the American history tracing back women empowerment will follow as well as a discussion of scholarly findings on why women's career in American politics is generally impeded. Then some light will be shed on some of the most prominent historic female US presidential candidates, how they were covered by media at the time they were running for president as well as on what implications this had for women in politics in general. Lastly, a review of Hillary Clinton's political life will follow focusing not only on her political career but also on her media coverage throughout the years.

1.1   Women's rights and women's gradual empowerment in US history

Most of the academic literature examining the topic of women in politics highlights the ways in which women trying to get into public life used to face social assumptions and regulations which ideologically guarded their access into particular public spaces and socially sanctioned them when they violated the expected gender rules (McDowell 1996, 39). That is, women were forbidden entrance into any form of public life due to particular gender presuppositions and they were socially condemned when breaking them. For instance, in the period of mid-1800s when Victoria Woodhull - the first woman to run for president of the United States, was running for presidency, women could not vote and had not held any kind of national office (Falk 2007, 151). In her book "Women for President: Media Bias in Eight Campaigns" Falk (2007) relates how in the mid-1800s women found it extremely difficult to act politically at all (pp.151). Even if women were brave enough to try to engage in any kind of politics, they often encountered verbal abuse. Women were not allowed to enter restaurants after 6:00 pm, unless accompanied by a man, and they could barely found accommodations when travelling alone. Women's only role was to get married and give birth to children and once they were married they suffered "civil death". This meant that a woman "was considered property, had no civil standing, lost ownership over her possessions, and legally could be beaten by her husband" (Falk, 2007, 51). As illustrated, women were relegated to the family and the home sphere and they were not given the rights to act publicly, let alone politically.

Tracing US history back to its origins, a lot can be found in terms of how society confided women to the private realm while men could act for themselves in the public sphere (Holman

2015, chapter 1, 6). Home was considered a woman's place whose boundaries women were not allowed to cross over. Furthermore, women were thought as not having any talents apart from homemaking and child-raising (Idem). This was the prevailing attitude towards women not only at the onset of US history and in the Victorian age but also in later years when they kept being accepted only as mothers and wives responsible for family bonds and religious devotion and unfit for taking part in political life (Parry-Giles 2014, 6). Ever since the Victorian age, the home had been called the "woman's sphere" (Edwards 1997, 3).

The main role women were relegated to was to create a sanctuary, a home, which meant that women inhabited the private sphere in contrast to men who were representatives of the public world – the masculine world (McDowell 1996, 39). Women were supposed to play the role of the "angel in the house" (Palczewski 2005, 374). Exploring the subject of the women's and men's space, Falk (2007) discusses that historically homes used to be built on the concept of men working in the public world while women were supposed to stay in "the private realm of the home" (pp31). Sometimes the depreciating attitudes toward women even took the form of leaving out the wives of political candidates when writing the political candidates' biographies (Parry-Giles 2014, 5).

It is interesting to elaborate on why women were relegated to the realm of home and family and condemned from the public space. One reason might be because they were considered unfit to participate in the public space due to their "selflessness and purity" (Edwards 1997, 3). Another and more reasonable explanation might be what the communication scholar Kathleen Jamieson (1988) offers. She goes back to the time of Aristotle and before and cites Paul in the Christian Bible: "I permit no woman to teach or have authority over men; she is to keep silent. For Adam was formed first, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became the transgressor. Yet women will be saved through bearing children" (Timothy 2:9-15, cited in Falk 2007, 32). Henceforth, women had been denounced as sinful since the creation of manhood and they had been relegated to giving birth as their only option of salvation. Therefore, Christian dogmas might be considered as the root of the unequal status of women's rights where women are deliberately pushed aside from any form of public life, let alone political life, and expected to take care of the home and their children while their husbands, who are considered the strong and skilled ones, are free to build their professional careers in any field they long for.

It might be that this biblical idea played a major role for the segregation of women and for their being defined as weak and not capable of dealing with public life. A-woman-is-a-mother-first-and-foremost notion was propagated into people's mindsets and it might be the incentive for statements such as the following one made by Elizabeth Dole herself: "I think the most important career a woman can have is that of a mother raising fine young future citizens" (Falk 2007, 34). Interestingly enough, she made this observation while having a resume including two Cabinet posts, a seat on the Federal Trade Commission, and a seat on the Red Cross.

It was not until the early nineteenth century before things changed for women. Women's social positions underwent a radical change – women were not only wives and mothers anymore, they could take part in reform activities which paved their way to politics (Edwards 1997, 5). In 1848 at Seneca Falls, the famous first women's rights convention, men and women assembled and unanimously agreed that "the male monopoly of the pulpit" should be overthrown and women had to have equal access to all kinds of professions (Gidlow 2011, 7). Due to the rise and development of many women's rights organizations and feminist groups fighting for the social, civil, and religious rights of women, women were given a public voice. Eventually, this widespread action and also the demand for women's suffrage which began to gather strength in the 1840s led to a decline in the separation between the public and private spheres and to the women's engagement in political processes (Holman 2015, 7).

A worth mentioning historical moment for all women in US political history was when Argonia, Kansas, elected Susanna Salter in 1887 and she became the first woman to hold elected office in the United States (Holman 2015, 7). Her election brought broad attention to Argonia from journalists, supporters, and women's rights advocates and it freed women from holding their sole role of the "angel in the house". What should be accentuated here is that prior to 1884 no woman in all US history was ever elected to public office and none was allowed to serve in the military, either (Falk 2007, 107). Later, in 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s freedom movements dramatically expanded the opportunities for women – women were allowed access to higher education, military service, and the variety of professions available at that time (Gidlow 2011, 8).

What is worth observing here is that during Senator Margaret Smith's campaign for a president in 1964, which was almost one century after the event in Argonia, Kansas, the same sentiments of boosting women's competences and strengths were being spread. In a letter to a newspaper editor at that time the following could be read:

 "*There are many women capable of taking the place of men (which has been proven time and time again) in high office, in industry, education, science, politics and other areas… When one reads history, even kings and emperors have been successful, because of their wives – and what better example of truly great leadership is there when we mention England's Queen Victoria?*" (Rowe 1964, cited in Falk 2007, 46).

What this letter points out is that the notion of women being as powerful as men and having equal qualities and skills started being disseminated in the American society as early as the 1800s and kept being spread more than one century later. Such sentiments gradually led to the eventual empowerment of women who were freed from playing the roles of a mother and a wife and who were given the freedom to take part in the political life of their country.

In reality, however, women were not given formal access to politics immediately – at first they engaged in various informal activities mainly related to local politics, voluntary activities, and social reform activities (Baker 1984, 635). Women were taking part in voluntary associations, and lobbying organizations, providing services for the poor, homeless,

and orphaned, and gradually reforming public institutions (Holman 2015, 7). According to Gidlow (2011) with the time women's representation in higher office was increasing (pp158). For instance, in the early 1940s fewer than a dozen women were serving in Congress while in the early 1960s the number reached twenty and continued to grow. Moreover, she highlights the names of Bella Abzug, Shirley Chisholm, Elizabeth Holtzman, Barbara Jorda, Pat Schroeder, and Geraldine Ferraro who held high national profiles in 1970s and were frequently in the news due to the way they were dealing with feminist and race issues. Gidlow (2011) summarizes that in the time framework of late 1990s and early 2008 gender empowerment in politics had grown steadily (pp160). Moreover, the 1990s was a very important decade for women in U.S. politics due to a steady women's political advancement. Nineteen ninety-two was dubbed "The Year of the Woman" as the number of women elected to the U.S. Congress nearly doubled (Anderson 2002, 105). In addition, more and more women were elected as state governors throughout the decade.

Later, in 2008, seven women held key positions: Hillary Clinton was the secretary of state, Kathleen Sebelius - the secretary of health, Janet Napolitano - the secretary of homeland security, Hilda Solis, the first Hispanic woman in the Cabinet - the secretary of labor; Christina Romer – the chairperson of the Council of Economic Advisors, Lisa Jackson - administrating the Environmental Protection Agency, and Susan Rice - the ambassador to the United Nations (Gidlow 2011, 160). There were also two women appointed to the United States Supreme Court - Sonia Sotomayor, the court's first Latina woman, and then Elena Kagan (Idem). In light of all these names, it can be concluded that women's power was gradually but firmly increasing since more and more females were holding high political positions in comparison to the past where none did.

1.2 Women's impeded political development in 21st century

Being a continued and arduous process, women's gradual empowerment and advancement in political office triggers controversial scholarly reactions even nowadays. According to Deborah Cameron (2006) there are still gender expectations present in contemporary contexts such as women's need to temper "their talk with men" in order to avoid "face threat in professional encounters" (cited in Parry-Giles 2014, 14). Hence, despite all the years of gradual empowerment of females, gender expectations keep hampering their professional lives and careers nowadays. As Falk (2007) observes the "role conflict" is one of the main reasons for women's low acceptance in political life (pp5). What she means is that the stereotypical role of a woman raising children and housekeeping is what people usually relate womanhood with. Falk (2007) continues that this "role conflict" hinders women from political advancement (pp.5). What is even worse, though, is the fact that press coverage presents female candidates in those expected roles, highlighting their personal lives and family responsibilities rather than their political achievements (Idem). This is how women are constantly "reminded that their primary duties and responsibilities lie in the domestic and not the political sphere" (Idem).

However, it is not only the gender expectations that impede women's political development. There is also a double bind which invariably follows them in their efforts to reach political freedom and equality. The double bind requires that "women must prove that they are 'man enough' for the job, while at the same time demonstrate that they are not too aggressive, angry, or tough" (Jamieson 1995, cited in Dubriwny 2013, 37). To put it simply, women have to be feminine because these are expectations based on their gender while at the same time they should not be too feminine because they also have to show they are strong enough to be political leaders. Hence, women have to show that they are strong enough in order to be part of the political world but more often than not this leads to a contradiction of the gender expectations how an authentic woman should act and behave (Parry-Giles 2014, 181). As burdensome as the double bind is, Jamieson (1995) calls it a balance of femininity and competence that women have to strive for (cited in Dubriwny 2013, 37). She furthers with an example from history where women "who exercised their brains and brawn in public were though, active, analytic, decisive, competent, and masculine; those who exercised their uteruses with the attendant responsibilities in the private sphere were identified as nurturant, passive, warm, and feminine" (Idem). In short, women who tried to show their competence and independence were considered strong but masculine, while women who exposed mainly their womanly side were seen as feminine and more prone to occupy the private sphere – the space of their homes and families. It is evident how difficult it was and it still is for women to take a balanced position in the double bind and be both feminine but also expressive of their knowledge and qualification.

Similarly, Dubriwny (2013) states that "Female candidates for elected office must strive to find a balance between the masculine and feminine" (pp38). She gives an example of an unsuccessful attempt to reach this balance of femininity and masculinity with Elizabeth Dole's presidential campaign in 2000 where she failed because of using a too feminine style "with her 'Liddy stroll'" and her way of "casually guiding the public rather than commanding them" (Ibidem, 39). Dubriwny (2013) discusses that Dole's presidential candidacy was short-lived because her feminine style did not present her as a challenger – what a president is supposed to be, which consequently weakened her credibility as a candidate (pp39). The case of Dole is indicative of what happens to female candidates when not being able to follow the double bind and this explicates what hindrances women encounter due to their womanhood. Yet, women do not easily reconcile with these obstacles. One instance of resistance to this masculinity/femininity double bind is what Pat Schroeder, the first woman elected to Congress from Colorado, stated in the early 1970s: "Yes, I have a uterus and a brain, and they both work" (Jamieson 1988, 69).

Apart from the gender expectations and the double bind which women need to adjust to, another evidence that the current political situation for women in US is impaired is what Parry-Giles (2014) states: "[politics] is still construed as a masculine political world, reinforcing the political legitimacy (and thus authenticity) of men over women in the political arena" (pp197). What is meant here is that women invariably face the unconscious assumption that politics is a masculine profession and it is not a place for women. Parry-Giles (2014) concludes that a lot more should be done before women can be accepted as equal

players in the political arena and not be faced with any kinds of threats for performing outside the long-held womanhood gender roles (pp197). What can be extracted from such scholarly statements is that women are considered as an abnormal constituent of the political life of their country just because they are women and not men regardless of their education, diligence, or skills. One example of how women who want to enter the "masculine political world" (Parry-Giles 2014, 197) are viewed is what Edgar Berman - Senator Hubert Humphrey's physician, argued at one of the sessions of the Democratic Party Committee meetings in 1970s: "[…] raging hormonal influences caused by the menstrual cycle and menopause should exclude women from executive responsibility" (Jamieson 1995, 53). These words are striking because they exemplify how women are unfairly segregated on the basis of their gender and the natural changes due to their gender.

In like manner, Dolan (2014) states that it is ingrained in most political observers and even scholars that a woman candidate is a woman first and that being a woman shapes her candidacy and this only proves what a crucial role gender plays in women's lives (pp8). Hence, despite the high offices women hold nowadays, women tend to be associated first and foremost with their gender and this keeps hindering their political empowerment. An example illustrative of the roadblocks which women face 21st-century politics is how Lisa Madigan who became the first female attorney general for Illinois in 2003 was asked whether she could be both a good governor and a good mother (Dolan 2014, 4). This incidence exemplifies how expected gender roles are ingrained in the ways women are viewed by society. Moreover, Dolan (2014) concludes that the evolution of women's integration into American politics is still in progress (chapter 2, 2). Likewise, Gloria Steinem – an American feminist, journalist, and social and political activist who became nationally recognized as a leader and a spokeswoman for the feminist movement in the late 1960s and early 1970s, points out: "Gender is probably the most restricting force in American life" (Gidlow 2011, 69). For some scholars such statements might sound a bit far-fetched, whereas for others they might be illustrative of the current situation for women in US politics. What is certain, however, is that there has been a slow but steady women's empowerment in US which is to be further enhanced in the future (Gidlow 2011, 151).

That being said, it is worth mentioning that there is also research examining the reasons for the impeded political empowerment of women in US which refutes the formerly discussed scholarly findings that women politicians are restrained due gender expectations, the double bind, and the fact that politics is considered a "masculine" space. One example of such research is Lawless and Fox (2010) who claim that the main reason why women are underrepresented is not because they are not as skilled and strong as men or because they are unsuccessful but because they do not run as often as men do (cited in Dolan 2014, 6). Hence, it might be the case that one of the reasons why women politicians are overlooked is because there are not that many of them running for office and the total number of men participating in politics simply surmounts them. Another interesting point which should be taken into consideration is Dolan's (2014) observation that there is too much focus on the candidate's sex and its impact and at the same time the traditional influences on elections such as political party, incumbency, and campaign spending are pushed aside while they are actually in

operation regardless of the sex of the candidates (pp17). Hence, it might be assumed that another reason why women are not elected as often as men for political positions might be because of prerequisites such as their party or the way they handle their campaign and not solely because of their gender. Last but not least, Seltzer, Newman, and Leighton (1997) claim that "women who run for office win at the same rate as similarly situated men" which can suggest that the way women are presented as political candidates is not necessarily a result of their gender and the following from it gender expectations (cited in Dolan 2014, 4).

1.3 Women for president – eight campaigns and media coverage

On the whole, the issue of women entering politics has been a recurrent topic of discussions ever since the beginning of American history. After decades of being restricted only to their home and family space, women have gradually received political recognition. At present 104 women have seats in the Congress, 21 – in the Senate, 83 – in the US house, 74 work as Statewide Executives, 1,832 work in State Legislature, 442 – in the State Senate, 1,390 – in the State House, 262 are mayors of cities with a population of more than 30,000 people, and 19 are mayors of the 100 largest cities in America (*Centre for American Women and Politics 2016*, January 2017). Although the prevalence of males over females in terms of seats is prominent, the number of political offices held by women nowadays would not have been even plausible three centuries ago. What would have been even less apprehensible is a prospect of a woman for president. The president of US is considered one of the world's most powerful people and the one leading the world's contemporary superpower. Furthermore, the role includes being the commander-in-chief of the world's most expensive military with the largest nuclear arsenal and being the head of state of the nation with the largest economy. The office of the US president is unlike other political offices since it has both legislative and ceremonial functions (Anderson 2002, 124).

"*The U.S. presidency combines the functions of chief executive and legislative leader with symbolic functions analogous to those of a monarch. As head of state, symbol of the nation, a figurehead who represents the country at home and abroad, the presidency is idealized, and its occupants and their families become models or culture types*" (Anderson 2002, 124).

Once Dr. Malvina Wormser – a character from Sinclair Lewis's novel "Ann Vickers" written eighty-three years ago, exclaimed: "Do I think a woman'll ever be President? How do I know?" (Gidlow 2011, 149). Eighty-three years ago the prospect of a female president was not conceivable. Yet, today America is on the verge of electing a woman for its commander-in-chief. It is true that eighty-three years is a rather long span of time but the essential point here is that the once improbable prospect of a woman for president has become a reality. It is interesting, though, to ponder on why electing a woman for US president is such an unobtainable notion. Women have been leaders of nations throughout the whole world, including countries such as Turkey, Ireland, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka, not to mention Canada, France, and England, yet "[…] in the United States, which considers itself the most advanced

democracy in the world, no woman has ever held the presidency or the vice presidency" (Falk 2007, 3). Here Falk (2007) raises the important point that US differs from other countries in the world in terms of never having elected a woman for its president. One reason for this might be the people's outdated beliefs, the media instilling gender stereotypes to its public, or because not sufficiently qualified woman has run for the presidency so far. In order for an answer to such a question to be found, some attention should be paid on the history of women who have run for US presidency, what problems they have encountered in their campaigns, and how they were covered by media throughout the years.

For this purpose the present research is going to discuss the findings of Erika Falk's book "Women for President: Media Bias in Eight Campaigns" (2007), where she examined the campaigns and the media coverage of eight women presidential candidates from American political history. The choice of elaborating on one particular solid research which goes through a timespan of more than a century over the choice of examining several separate pieces of research is justified since the present research wants to focus on the concrete findings of one well-conducted and substantial longitudinal study rather than on findings from various pieces of research focusing on shorter time spans and fewer presidential candidates. In her research Falk (2007) aimed at finding answers to three major questions: first, if there were subtle or overt ways in which the press had covered women candidates over time; second, if the press mitigated or on the contrary, enhanced existing stereotypes and gender roles about political women, and third, whether the way the press covered women candidates affected women's decisions to run for office. The answers to the first two questions of her research are paramount to the present research since they will outline how media have covered women running for US president throughout the years and this will give some important theoretical insights for the conduction of the empirical part of the research.

In her research Falk (2007) analyzed the press coverage of "the eight most prominent women who have run for president of the United States": Victoria Claflin Woodhull (1872), Belva Bennett Lockwood (1884), Margaret Chase Smith (1964), Shirley St. Hill Chisholm (1972), Patricia Scott Schroeder (1987), Lenora Branch Fulani (1988), Elizabeth Dole (2000), and Carol Moseley Braun (2004) (pp.7). Falk's choice of candidates is justified since they represent seven different decades and three centuries and five of them ran for the nomination of one of the two major parties. This makes her research substantial and her findings crucial for the present research since they will show whether there were changes over time in terms of how women running for US president were presented by media.

Having extensively examined the eight presidential candidates' campaigns, Falk (2007) drew the conclusion that in the analyzed period between 1872 and 2004 most press accounts portrayed women as "'unnatural' in the political sphere and 'incompetent' as leaders" (pp14). She summarized that even though the number of women in public office had increased steadily in the past 130 years, gender kept being the most conspicuous part of women's coverage. According to her findings, the media coverage of the women candidates was gendered and it presented them through the lens of gender stereotypes where, for instance, women's clothing was still highlighted which was not the case with men's clothing.

Furthermore, Falk (2007) enumerated all the long-held gender stereotypes she found throughout her research: women's appearance, bodies, clothes, and age, family and relationships, emotionality and tendency to be concerned about trivial matters, as well as a consistent omission of women's professional titles. On the basis of these she concluded that "[…] women candidates are treated differently" (pp153). The reason for this, according to her, was their gender which was invariably emphasized. The persistent focus on their gender reinforced the division between the sexes and the idea that men and women could never be equal (pp97). In short, in spite of a woman's qualities and competence, her gender is more relevant and important to politics, while this is not the case with men (pp152).

Another important finding from Falk's (2007) research is her justification for the gendered media coverage of the presidential candidates. She found out that although women took part in a sphere which was previously restricted only to men, the public "may still believe that men and women are different or that women should take care of family and be objects of visual attention" (pp74). What is meant by this is that despite the social changes and the women's advancement in politics, women have not come as far as it is believed in terms of their liberation from gender stereotypes. Falk's conclusion is that no matter whether "[…]there are more women in political office now than there were 130 years ago and whereas women now vote, women are still vastly underrepresented in political positions of power" (pp74). Hence, despite the decades of women's empowerment, they might still be perceived as the ones inferior to men.

After the conduction of her longitudinal research published in 2007, Falk published an updated version of it including the presidential campaign of 2008 where Hillary Clinton had a very close race with Barak Obama for the nomination of the Democratic Party. In her book "Women for President - Media Bias in Nine Campaigns" (2010) she drew a similar conclusion to her previous research stating that the women candidates who had run for president from 1872 to 2008 were treated differently from their men counterparts by media (pp183). What is more, she found it worrisome that in 2008 there was still a lack of progress in the media coverage of women running for president and that they were still depicted as the ones who had to take care of the family and the home (Idem). In short, the findings of her new research drew a similar parallel to her previous research from 2007 explicating a little progress in the fair treatment of women presidential candidates and a gendered media portrayal of women presidential candidates.

On the basis of Falk's findings from her two pieces of research and due to the fact that the present research is examining gender stereotypes in the newspaper coverage of Hillary Clinton, the present research deems it necessary to shed some light on how she has been presented by the media throughout the years and if any conspicuous gender stereotypes have been used for the building of her public image.

1.4 Hillary Clinton and media gender hostility

Hillary Clinton grew up in an era of few opportunities for women but revealed strength and tenacity building a solid political career and becoming a famous US politician who has been part of US politics for four decades already. A former first lady, a US senator, a secretary of state, and a political figure with more than forty years of political experience, Hillary Clinton is the first woman nominated for president by a major US political party in the whole history of US. Thus, she proves many generations and scholars wrong that women cannot work as hard as men and have a lasting political career. Due to her active political roles she has been in the spotlight for a long time and a solid research can be found regarding the amalgam of her gender and political achievements.

First, Clinton has "a long history of trailblazing" (Gidlow 2011, 2). She graduated from Yale Law School which was not very common for girls at that time and became the first former First Lady to run for office as well as the first woman elected to a statewide office in New York (Idem). Once a girl rejected by the Harvard Law School, fifty years later Clinton became a woman who "has motivated and invigorated feminist political communication scholarship more than any other person in contemporary politics" (Edwards 2011, 157). Furthermore, being an influential female political figure in US, Clinton has attracted a lot of media attention during the years. For instance, the feminist legend Betty Friedan - the leading figure in the women's movement in US in 1960s-1970s, called Clinton's media coverage "a massive Rorschach test of the evolution of women in our society" (pp157). In short, Hillary has been at the center of media attention for many years and she also embodies what defines the intersection of gender studies and contemporary political communication scholarship (pp157).

To begin with, academic literature has often described Hillary Clinton as a "polarizing and controversial figure" (Edwards 2011, 157). The main reason for this is the way media present her. A recurrent frame that has been attached to her during the years is that of a "bitch" (Dubriwny 2013, 36). What is more, she has been depicted as a "castrating bitch ex-wife" by many ostensibly neutral journalists (Gidlow 2008, 144) and she was once called a "bitch" by Glenn Beck himself in his nationally syndicated radio show (pp70). During Clinton's campaign for senator her opponent's supporters also called her a "bitch" in statements like "How do we beat that bitch?" (pp70). In an attempt to elaborate on the implication of using the word "bitch" when talking about Clinton, Parry-Giles (2014) explained that this was neither flattering nor empowering but only a way of typecasting strong political women as inhuman and unemotional (pp196). Hence, it can be surmised that because women are typically related to the roles of a mother and a wife, when they do not conform to these roles they tend to be associated with negatively connoted words depicting them as unemotional, cruel, or cold. Hence, Clinton's media representations as a "bitch" generate the image of an atypical female behavior. What is more, the "bitch" frame is only a small part of the media gender hostility against Clinton. She has been recurrently presented as too cold, hard-edged, and unlikeable to serve as an admirable first lady or a viable elected official (Parry Giles

2014, 179). Her personality has been presented as "polarizing and unappealing - a personality at odds with traditional prescriptions of authentic womanhood and expectations of a successful political leader" (pp179).

It is important to note that such hostile media depictions of Hillary Clinton have been mainly triggered as a reaction of her nonconformity to the expected gender roles of a caring mother and a wife. Clinton's political image has been repeatedly framed as a political intruder violating the protocol of presidential campaigning or as an anomalous candidate's wife rejecting the space of home and domesticity in favor of feminist principles (Parry-Giles 2014, 20) There is a whole linguistic and visual stock of frames that authenticate Clinton as a feminist and as a woman violating the traditions of womanhood (pp20). Hence, due to Clinton's perseverance in making a political career she has been framed as a feminist unauthenticating the principles of womanhood. One reason for such negative framing of her might be that the political sphere is still regarded as an underlying masculine space and when a woman interferes into it this is presented as a violation of national propriety and authentic womanhood (Parry-Giles 2014, 180). For example, during her years as senator, Clinton's eagerness to manage war and foreign policy attached to her frames such as "a polarizing force" and "a radical feminist who attracted debate and inspired animosity" (Parry-Giles 2014, 189). The reason for this might be that since wives of candidates, and most of all – first ladies, are expected to function as models of American womanhood (Anderson 2002, 18), Clinton was also expected to conform to these roles and by not following these models, she opened herself to numerous hostile labels.

Apart from the "bitch" frame, many other negatively-loaded frames reflecting the media anxiety towards Clinton's nonconformity to the expected gender roles have been attached to her such as "calculating radical feminist", "Lady Macbeth", "a creature who has been shorn of her claws" (Gardetto 1997, 229), "unattractive", "scolding", "strident" (Gidlow 2008, 87) "shrill," "aggressive," "nutcracker", and "unsexed", to name just a few (pp161). It is evident that all these examples have one thing in common and it is to present Clinton's strong political figure as inhuman, unemotional, and last but not least, abnormal. Besides, Clinton's gender has been persistently highlighted and also ridiculed with the effect to present her in the light of a woman and not a politician with solid political experience. One example is how Rush Limbaugh – an American talk show host and writer, used an intentional close-up of Clinton's wrinkles "some kind of puffy-faced bad-hair-day outtake" to juxtapose it to a photo of Sarah Palin, declaring that she is "hot" (Gidlow 2008, 144). This obnoxious example aiming to belittle Clinton's political history and present her as an ordinary old woman is not the only one. A much more offensive example bordering to rhetoric and visual violence against Clinton during her time as US senator is what a South Park episode, aired in March 2007, showed: terrorists penetrated into Clinton's vagina in order to accomplish a successful mission of defusing a weapon hidden there (Parry-Giles 2014, 186). This crude mockery of Clinton has an important implication. The idea that terrorists entered and hid a device in her vagina selecting a woman senator as their target of terrorism and using sexual violence as their mode of political expression is to belittle Clinton's competence as a politician and stress her gender as her main weakness. This was aired in one of the most popular American Award-

winning sitcoms - South Park, and this serves as an illustration of how much attention is paid on Clinton's gender and how openly it can be derided.

In short, Clinton has been subjected to vehement misogyny since the moment she entered politics - her clothes have been scrutinized numerous times, her hairstyles mocked, and her laugh caricatured (Gidlow 2008, 70). The numerous media examples focusing on Clinton's gender and behavior and ridiculing her appearance or competence on the basis of her gender trigger the idea that politics is for men and women who try to become part of it will become a target of ridicule for being incompetent and abnormal political candidates. Dolan (2014) draws a similar conclusion stating that Hillary Clinton is an epitome of all the challenges that women in politics face in combating gender stereotypes (pp3).

That being said, there can also be found examples of media coverage of Clinton depicting her in a more neutral and humane way. For instance, once she was caught weeping during her campaign for senator and media immediately framed her as "showing humanity and that she really cared" (Gidlow 200, 161). Another instance is when Clinton approached the end of her tenure as US secretary of state and media presented her as one of the most powerful and popular political leaders in the country (Parry-Giles 2014, 193). Another example of media coverage highlighting Clinton's political strengths and achievements is when the American writer and journalist Lisa Miller called Clinton "authentic, authoritative leader" (Parry-Giles 2014, 196). Moreover, at the onset of the Clinton-Lewinsky scandal in early 1998 Clinton stood at her husband's side and then she was visually and verbally framed as a faithful and supportive wife, which is a role consonant with the historical notions of authentic womanhood (Parry-Giles 2014, 22). During this period she was further called "a ceremonial emissary representing her country" and "the rescuer of her husband" (pp22).

Other examples of Clinton's media coverage throughout the years can be found and discussed but what is essential here is not to enumerate frames depicting her in a particular way but to conclude on what implication this overall media framing had. There was one conspicuous feature which was recurrent in all formerly discussed examples of Clinton's media coverage and this was her gender. Her gender was part of the examples condemning her as a politician and ridiculing her competence as well as of the ones highlighting her experience and political qualities. Be it in her presentation as a feminist, Lady Macbeth, a weeping woman, or unattractive and old, her gender was invariably emphasized. Notwithstanding the positive or negative implications of the media frames used to build Clinton's image throughout the years, her gender was an inseparable part of her portrayal and this is what matters the most.

CHAPTER 2
GENDER STEREOTYPES AND MEDIA FRAMING

The present Chapter is going start with a review of what a stereotype is and how stereotypes affect humans' perception and interpretation of the world. Then, it is going to move on what gender and gender schema theory are and how they are essential for the understanding and interpretation of gender stereotypes. A discussion on the ways gender stereotypes influence women in politics will follow, highlighting some important examples from academic literature in the field. Lastly, the concept of framing theory will be examined and some conclusions will be drawn regarding the interrelation between media framing and its effect on women in politics.

2.1   What is a "stereotype"?

Tracing back the etymology of "stereotype", the following can be found:

1798 – "method of printing from a plate",
1817 – "a stereotype plate",
1850 – "image without change",
1922 – "preconceived and oversimplified notion of characteristics typical of a person or group" (Houghton 2014, 8).

When referring to some modern definitions, the Oxford English Dictionary defines a stereotype as a "widely held but fixed and oversimplified image or idea of a particular type of person or thing" (Bordalo, Gennaioli, and Shleifer 2014, 1). What is persistent in both the etymology and the definition of a stereotype is that it is an idea or a notion that is formed beforehand and it does not change. What is more, some scholars state that stereotypes can even be considered "ubiquitous" because they cover all kinds of groups - racial groups ("Asians are good at math"), political groups ("Republicans are rich"), genders ("male drivers are aggressive"), demographic groups ("Florida residents are elderly"), and activities ("flying is dangerous") (pp1). From a psychological point of view, stereotypes are defined as "mental representations of real differences between groups […] allowing easier and more efficient processing of information" (Bordalo, Gennaioli, and Shleifer 2014, 1). In short, stereotypes can be defined as tools helping people to digest information by highlighting differences between groups. Kathleen Dolan (2014) further defines stereotypes as "a time-saving device that people employ in cognitive tasks when they have relatively little information about an object or a situation" (pp17) Similarly, Fiske, Lin, and Neuberg (1999) explain that stereotypes help people categorize others while providing them with a "wealth of information at little cognitive cost". (pp236) To put it simply, stereotypes serve as a tool for sorting out information in a short period of time and helping people process new information easily.

According to social psychologists stereotyping is the process of thinking about one member of a group and then conjuring up a portrait of him/her based on what the other people in the group are like (Macrae, Stangor, and Hewstone 1996, 3). Stereotyping can be resembled to generating an oversimplified impression of the characteristics of a particular group on the ground of the so called "pictures in the head" which facilitate people's understanding of the world (pp3). Social psychology formulates that stereotypes help individuals develop beliefs about the characteristics of specific social groups. Hence, this explicates the positive nature of stereotyping as a help to people to view their social world and ascribe particular characteristics to various phenomena (pp3). However, stereotypes can also have an impairing influence on individuals such as generating discrimination. In their study on stereotypes and stereotyping Macrae, Stangor, and Hewstone (1996) presented an example of a Catholic woman in Northern Ireland who was denied an admission to a major university because of her religion and this instance exemplifies how stereotyping can have a negative aspect such as arising discrimination (pp4). Hence, one problem with stereotyping is that individuals who discriminate others (like the Catholic woman who was discriminated in the example) have negative beliefs about the target of their discrimination and all these negative beliefs are ensued from the "same" pictures in their heads (pp4). Stereotyping generates immediate assumptions based on the characteristics of the others in the group and this can lead to hasty propositions and also discrimination. Apart from this, however, stereotypes can serve as a handy tool of generating expectations about people's behaviours, beliefs, or characteristics. With the help of stereotypes people can form particular expectations and beliefs about the unknown on the basis of previous knowledge about a particular group (Sanbonmatsu 2003, 576).

As a whole, providing one straightforward and clear definition of stereotypes and stereotyping is a burdensome task. Scholars from a range of disciplines such as sociology, psychology, linguistics, and media studies have tried to capture the nature of stereotypes in their interpersonal, intercultural, international, and interracial relationships (Houghton 2014, 9). A complex notion as it is, stereotyping has one main trait which is shared in all its different definitions in the various disciplines which study it. This conspicuous trait is that it is based on differences between groups, hence, it allows for the easier and more efficient processing of information (Bordalo, Gennaioli, Shleifer 2014, 1). Therefore, stereotypes allow for the quick assessment of groups or separate individuals by highlighting the differences between them.

No discussion of stereotypes can be thorough without mentioning the person to whom the term "stereotype" owes its creation – the American writer Walter Lippmann. In his book "Public Opinion" (1922) Lippmann makes a detailed description of the cognitive limitations that people encounter when trying to comprehend their sociopolitical and cultural environment, thus, leading them to apply a stock of general stereotypes in order to understand a complex reality. In his book Lippmann (1922) discusses how public opinions actually consist of pictures inside people's heads and that these pictures guide people in their dealings with the world outside (pp18). He also reveals how stereotypes affect public opinions and how these individual opinions "are crystallized into what is called Public Opinion" (pp19). Public opinions are the pictures inside men's heads, "the pictures of themselves, of others, of

their needs, purposes, and relationship" (pp18). Further, Lippmann (1922) elaborates how exactly the "pictures in our heads" are reinforced:

"*In some measure, stimuli from the outside, especially when they are printed or spoken words, evoke some part of a system of stereotypes, so that the actual sensation and the preconception occupy consciousness at the same time. If what we are looking at corresponds successfully with what we anticipated, the stereotype is reinforced for the future, as it is in a man who knows in advance that the Japanese are cunning and has the bad luck to run across two dishonest Japanese*" (pp54).

What Lippmann's main idea about stereotypes is that they are a form of perception that precedes the use of reason and imposes a certain character on people's senses before the information reaches the mind and gets processed (pp96).

Being a tool of quick and intuitive assessment of groups which can easily put people into categories, stereotypes can also be detrimental to society due to the fact they may cause distorted judgement and biased behaviour such as inter-group conflicts and discrimination (Bordalo, Gennaioli, and Shleifer 2014, 1). Stereotypes can also be problematic because "[they] affect judgements of individuals in an assimilative fashion", which is illustrative of men and women been judged on the basis of gender stereotypes (Biernat and Kobrynowicz 1999, 77). In cases when little is known about a target person besides their gender they are generally judged on the basis of their femaleness or maleness (pp77). This is even true when only the names of the people are provided explicating how stereotypes influence people's perceptions of other people when they have not been even provided with a visual picture of them (pp77). What is more, according to Murphy and Taylor (2011) stereotypes actually pose a threat to individuals by mistreating and denigrating them (pp16). For example, in situations where individuals are mainly evaluated in terms of particular explicit or subtle characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, race, or age their social identity is valued in accordance with these characteristics and this can elicit a stereotype threat to them (pp16).

To sum up, stereotypes can be considered as a handy tool of providing information for making inferences about others when other information is not available and this can be useful and time-saving for people. However, stereotypes can also have detrimental influence to people by categorizing them on the ground of some characteristics while ignoring others, thus, providing untrue or inaccurate information about them.

2.2 Gender and gender schema theory

As the present research is examining gender stereotypes it is necessary that they are discussed in detail but before that the notion of gender should be elaborated on. In doing so it is important to first differentiate the concept of gender from the concept of sex since more often than not the two are used interchangeably. Gender is the social construction of biological sex,

distinguished from sex, which is a biological marker (Holman 2015, 6). This means that sex encompasses the biological differences and the procreative functions of men and women while gender entangles the behavioural differences between women and men where those behavioural differences are social constructs. These social constructs are created by men and women themselves and are a matter of culture (pp4). To put it simply, females and males acquire a gender identity corresponding to socially defined constructs. Thus, men and women behave according to this identity and they are expected to perform their roles in line with the social roles and tasks assigned to this identity (pp4). Yet, Haeley (2014) provides another interpretation of sex and gender. Sex, or biological sex, includes "physical attributes such as external genitalia, sex chromosomes, gonads, sex hormones, and internal reproductive structures" (pp1). Sex is the assignment of maleness and femaleness at birth (pp1). Gender, on the other hand, he describes as something far more complicated. It is the complex interrelationship between an individual's sex, that is – their biology, one's internal sense of self as male, female, both or neither, that is - gender identity, and one's outward presentations and behaviours related to that perception, that is - gender expression (pp1). Together, these three dimensions – gender biology, gender identity, and gender expression, produce one's actual sense of gender, both in how people experience their own gender as well as how others perceive it (pp1).

Talking about gender, Davis, Evans & Lorber (2006) further differentiated the concept of gender from the concept of sex, defining gender as encompassing the consideration of bodies influenced by the social and cultural environments within which they exist (pp35). In their research on gender they pointed out that the distinction between sex and gender was necessary already in the second-wave feminism (1960s) where the notion of gender thrived and transformed into a broad and intellectually fertile domain (pp35). However, the separation of the two concepts took some time. As Christine Delphy stated in her research, the concept of gender remained tied to the concept of sex for a long time, it "seemed to cling onto its daddy [sex]" (cited in Davis, Evans & Lorber 2006, 36). It was not until the rise of feminism in 1950s-1960s that the distinction between sex and gender had originally been proposed, theorized, and consequently adopted by the feminist movement (pp36). Ever since various definitions of the two notions can be found in academic literature but the essential difference between the two is that sex refers to biological differences and gender to characteristics that a society or culture delineates as masculine or feminine.

Moreover, Healey (2014) stated that gender is all around us (pp2). Although individuals are not aware of its ever-present nature, gender always surrounds them. Healey (2014) explained how gender is actually taught to people from the moment they were born (pp2). He continues that gender expectations and messages bombard people throughout their whole lives. Many influences such as upbringing, culture, peers, schools, community, media, and religion shape the individuals' understanding of this core aspect of the self. According to Healey (2014) the way a person learned and interacted with gender as a young child directly influenced how they viewed the world later in their lives (pp2). In short, gender is mainly socially constructed and like many other social constructs it is closely monitored and reinforced by society. What Healey (2014) concludes is the following:

"Practically everything in society is assigned a gender – toys, colours, clothes and behaviours are just some of the more obvious examples. Through a combination of social conditioning and personal preference, by age three most children prefer activities and exhibit behaviours typically associated with their sex. Accepted social gender roles and expectations are so entrenched in our culture that most people cannot imagine any other way. As a result, individuals fitting neatly into these expectations rarely if ever question what gender really means" (pp2).

This idea that children learn about what it means to be male and female from their surroundings and that they adjust their behaviour to fit in the gender norms and expectations of the community where they live in refers to a whole theory in psychology which is called gender schema theory.

Gender schema theory was formally introduced by Sandra Bem in 1981 as a cognitive theory to explain how individuals become gendered in a society and how gender characteristics and roles are maintained and transmitted in a society. In order to elaborate on the complexity of gender schema theory, some insight is needed on what a schema is. Hence, "a schema is a framework that serves to organize and direct understanding of incoming information" (Hudak 1993, 280). Schemas are a construct for understanding how information is perceived and organized (pp280). Therefore, schemas can be considered as a handy tool for helping people process the flow of information. When it comes to defining gender schema theory, Bem (1982) provides a thorough explanation of it. According to her, gender schema theory is an account of how sex-typed and non-sex-typed individuals process gender-related information and how sex-typed individuals are schematic with respect to gender (pp1982). What is meant by "schematic" here is "[…] having readiness to sort information into categories on the basis of some particular dimension despite the existence of other dimensions that could serve equally as well as a basis for categorization" (pp1192). Then, being schematic with respect to gender means sorting attributes and behaviours into masculine and feminine categories despite their differences on various dimensions (pp1192). According to gender schema theory being gender schematic implies that "the gender connotations of both masculine and feminine stimuli will be especially salient" (pp1193). To put it simply, Bem's gender schema theory encompasses the idea that individuals become gendered in a society on the basis of gender associated information which is predominantly transmitted through the society by a way of schemata, which serves as a handy tool for helping people assimilate the information easily. Gender schema theory explains and assists the organization of this gender knowledge.

Moreover, Bem's (1983) theory postulates how children "learn" about their gender. According to her theory, a child becomes "masculine" and "feminine" at a very early age and this is a universal and important process of acquiring sex appropriate preferences, skills, attributes, and behaviours which show how this particular child matches the societally and culturally defined expectations to which they have to respond (pp598). What is on the basis of gender schema theory is that a child encodes and organizes information about themselves according to the culture's definitions of maleness and femaleness (pp603). Then, these

definitions are mediated by the child's own cognitive processing which is also derived from the gender practices and expectations of the society (pp603). In short, the whole process of allocating gender roles and gender attributes is "a learned phenomenon" (pp603). Therefore, it is not difficult to relate the origin of gender stereotypes and why they are ingrained in people's society and culture.

Bem's gender schema theory serves as essential foundation for gender stereotypes elucidating where they originate from at a psychological level. However, Bem's pivotal research can be considered as rather old since it dates back to 1981-1983. Thus, a more recent research on gender schema theory should also be taken into consideration. For instance, Palomares (2004) who also studied gender schematicity defined gender schemata as cognitive structures that predispose individuals to process information in terms of the cultural definitions of gender (pp562). In his study he postulated that gender schematic individuals, also referred to as sex-typed individuals, view themselves as prototypically gendered and prefer using gender appropriate behaviors, actively avoid gender inappropriate behavior (Palomares 2004, 563). Therefore, individuals tend to not only process information in ways consistent with what is expected from their gender but also behave in ways consistent with the group prototype (pp563). According to Palomares (2004) gender schema theory gives a thorough answer to the behaviors of men and women and to why they exhibit similarities and differences (pp556). Furthermore, it makes it possible to accurately predict how a person will behave in particular situations when only knowing the person's gender (pp556). In short, according to gender schema theory gender is a salient cognitive schema attributing the social roles, behaviours, and characteristics of individuals in a society.

What is more, in her research on gender schema Hudak (1993) argued that gender influences the individuals' perceptions of themselves and that gender stereotypes influence the perceptions of the others (pp280). She supported the importance of gender schemata in the development of gender roles and the proposition that the individual differences of being more or less gender schematic are initiated during childhood (pp281). She agreed that there was an association between gender role classification and the tendency to employ gender over other categories as a "recall strategy" (pp281). What is meant by a "recall strategy" is the schemata that are relied on for recall (pp282). To put it simply, people make use of these stocks of organized knowledge about the world which they have acquired from previous experience and with their help they manage to inundate the flow of new information (Major & Coleman 2008, 317). This is also where the interrelation between gender stereotypes and schemata lies – stereotypes are the functional equivalent of schemata, they are generalized beliefs about groups of people that influence the thinking about these groups of people and they tend to produce systematic biases in processing information (Hudak 1993, 282). In short, through schematic thinking people are able to easily acquire and process new information in their daily interactions while at the same time those schematas produce stereotypical beliefs and expectations in society which lead to creation and allocation of gender roles, gender behaviours, and gender attributes to people.

2.3 Gender stereotypes and their influence on women in politics

Having shed light on the origin of gender stereotypes at a cognitive and psychological level, the present research is going to discuss the role of gender stereotypes in women's political lives. Before moving on to this discussion, however, it is important to differentiate the concept of gender stereotypes from the concept of gender traits since the two notions are more often than not erroneously used as synonyms. Gender traits are all internal and external characteristics such as clothes, hairstyle, body language, posture, believes, emotions, acts, and ways of thinking that define a person. For example, a woman's compassion and warmth are gender traits which are usually associated with the gender role of a caretaker whereas a man's rationality and toughness are gender traits associated with the gender role of a financial supporter or a pursuer of a career (Huddy and Terkildsen 1993, 121) In contrast, gender stereotypes are assumptions about people's traits, skills, and abilities; they are socially and culturally grounded judgements about people's nature and capabilities (Dolan 2014, chapter 2, 3). Gender stereotypes attribute differing psychological traits to men and women (Campus 2013, 11). For instance, "bitchy" is a stereotype that Anderson (2002) used to describe Hillary Clinton (pp106). Yet, the gender traits ascribed to this stereotype are pushy, meddlesome, and cold-blooded (pp106). Another example is the gender stereotype "mother" that Carlin & Winfrey (2009) used in their discussion of types of gender stereotypes and to which they ascribed the gender traits of being caring and understanding as well as emotional and associated with maternal responsibilities (pp328).

According to social psychology gender stereotypes are among the most pervasive and persistent stereotypes that people hold mainly because a person's sex is one of the first things that people encounter about others (Dolan 2014, chapter 2, 6). Gender stereotypes are also "as prevalent as they are because gender is a socially relevant category that shapes almost every facet of human life" (pp6). Moreover, they provide individuals with a handy tool of sorting information and developing evaluations, thus, simplifying their interactions with the world (Dolan 2014, chapter 2, 7). What is more, Cramer, Million and Perreault (2002) described gender stereotypes as "the most salient cognitive schematic of our social world" since they represent people's societal expectations of male and female appropriate behaviours, roles, and emotions (pp165). Since gender stereotypes are incessantly transmitted through cultures people accept their expected gender roles and even believe that these roles come naturally (pp165). Even children's books, cartoons, movies, magazines, and television programmes depict men and women in stereotypical ways, allocating particular gender roles to them (pp165).

In Campus' (2013) view gender stereotypes are the main prerequisite for the historical disjuncture between women and power or politics (pp3). Therefore, due to the existing gender stereotypes male successful leadership and masculine characteristics still prevail while gender equality has yet to come in contemporary society (Campus 2013, 4). Likewise, according to Sanbonmatsu (2003) gender stereotypes have played a role historically in limiting women's opportunities in the political arena (pp577). Political research has produced numerous

findings that confirm that voters look at women candidates and women officeholders from a gendered perspective, ascribing certain stereotypical competencies and personality characteristics to them (Dolan 2014, chapter 2, 3). For instance, women political candidates and officeholders are generally viewed as more compassionate and honest as well as warmer and more expressive than men whereas men are viewed as more competent, decisive, and stronger leaders (pp3). In short, due to gender stereotypes and the ensuing gender traits and expected gender roles which are subtly transmitted in cultures and societies, people form particular images about both male and female candidates and draw particular evaluations about them.

Much of the existing literature on the impact of gender stereotypes on women candidates points out that gender stereotypes have a negative impact on women politicians (Dolan 2014, chapter 2, 16). Research demonstrates that people see women and men in gender-stereotyped ways, that they value "male" traits more than "female" ones, and that the decision to support or oppose women candidates is influenced by these stereotyped beliefs (Dolan 2014, Huddy and Terkildsen 1993). Moreover, in her research Dolan (2013) states that "one of the major pillars in the story of the status of women candidates for elected office in the United States is that voters rely on gender stereotypes to evaluate these women and their suitability for office" (pp96). Hence, it is a fact that one of the reasons why women are underrepresented in US politics is because of gender stereotypes. Likewise, according to Kahn (1996) women's access to political office may be limited due to people's stereotypical views (pp131) In short, gender stereotypes impede women political careers and further complicate their candidacies by making them look for ways to overcome these stereotypes.

That being said, the problem with gender stereotypes and their effect on women politicians is not so straightforward and one-sided. In her research Dolan (2013) employed data from 3,150 US adults and drew a conclusion which confronts the formerly discussed scholarly findings. Her research challenged previous data and found out that voters did not rely heavily on gender stereotypes when evaluating and voting for women candidates. She discussed that voters were influenced by other factors such as political party and incumbency regardless of the gender of the candidate. At the same time, Dolan's (2013) research concluded that while it was clear that stereotypes could sway people's impressions of women candidates, it was less clear whether this swaying was more positive or negative (pp105). Scholarly opinions on that vary. There is research which agrees that gender stereotypes and the focus on the candidate's gender actually make people fail to see their set of skills or policy competencies which make them viable candidates (Huddy and Terkildsen 1993). According to other research, however, both men and women in politics are generally perceived as successful leaders indicating that the gender stereotypes of men and women are weakened when more information is provided about them (Heilman 1989, cited in Corcoran 2009, 6). To sum up, the effects of gender stereotypes on women in politics can be a quite controversial topic of research unfolding that gender stereotypes can affect women political candidates in a negative way, impairing their qualities and competencies for viable leaders, while at the same time this can be avoided by providing thorough information about the candidates – both male and female.

When discussing gender stereotypes it is also necessary to highlight the difference between sexism and gender stereotypes since most often than not the two concepts are used interchangeably but they actually have different implications. First, sexism is a systematic way in which people overvalue men and undervalue women which has different manifestations such as men being paid higher salaries than women or men's professions being regarded as more prestigious than women's (Falk 2007, 155). However, gender stereotypes work in a different way. They attribute to men and women different traits, behaviours, roles, and areas of competence (pp155). For instance, most people believe that women are better at raising children than men while men are better members of the armed forces than women (pp155). Then, sexism can be considered as something more systematic than gender stereotypes. Sexism is ingrained into whole institutions, for example, in educational systems, in governments, in different kinds of organizations, or in media while gender stereotypes are socially constructed believes about how individuals from a particular gender should behave and look (pp155). However, sometimes the difference between the two can be blurred in the cases where a gender stereotype is also considered systematic. For instance, the gender stereotype that a woman should be first and foremost a mother who builds a family and takes care of the coziness of the home rather than a successful and prosperous woman who builds her own career can be regarded as quite systematic and pervading in women politician's depictions. Yet, it is different form sexism because it does not generate discrimination on the basis of the woman's gender.

Before closing the theoretical foundation of the present research, some light should be shed on another major component of the research - media framing. Elaborating on media discourses about women politicians will help for a better understanding of how media construct women politicians.

2.4 Media framing and gender

Examining media framing is essential since media are considered the main source of keeping people informed. Thus, the way media frame women is illustrative of the way people view women as candidates. Cramer, Million and Perreault (2002) claim that "gender stereotypes are subtly transmitted through media portrayals" (pp165). Therefore, it is logical to surmise that if media use gendering in their representation of women this will inevitably make people view them through the lenses of gender stereotypes. What is more, Lippmann (1922) wrote that news media are powerful forces in shaping the "pictures in our heads" because "the world we have to deal with politically is out of reach, out of sight, out of mind" (pp18) Media portrayals are even more important in presidential campaigns because unlike lower-level races where interpersonal contact plays a central role most of what people know about any candidate in a presidential contest is learned from media (Falk 2010, 2). In short, what makes media framing so powerful and worth-examining is that "[it] plays an integral role in a campaign by framing, shaping, ignoring, or presenting the candidates to the public" (pp2).

Before delving into media framing theory, it should be clarified that the concept of frame and the concept of framing can be used interchangeably as Entman (1993) explicated that their connotation is roughly the same (pp52). He defined frames in the following way:

"*[A frame] repeatedly invokes the same objects and traits, using identical or synonymous words and symbols in a series of similar communications that are concentrated in time. These frames function to promote an interpretation of a problematic situation or actor and (implicit or explicit) support of a desirable response, often along with a moral judgement that provides an emotional charge*" (Entman, Matthes, and Pellicano 2009, 177).

What is essential in this quote is that frames get stored in memory and when triggered they invoke particular interpretations which provide meaning to particular events or chunks of information. Frames show the ways in which influence over the human consciousness is exerted by the transfer of information from one location such as speech, news report, or texts to that consciousness (Entman 1993, 51). Entman (1993) provided a thorough definition of framing which reads as follows:

"*Framing essentially involves selection and salience. To frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described*" (pp52).

To put it simply, frames highlight some bits of information and in this way increase their salience. Salience is what makes one piece of information "more noticeable, meaningful, or memorable to audiences" (pp53). Hence, frames highlight particular aspects of information from a topic, thus, making them more notable to people and in this way the people receive the particular information in a way assisting them to process it and absorb it. Therefore, frames can be considered as a tool for assisting people when selecting and processing chunks of information.

Entman (1993) postulated the four main functions of framing:
- to define problems – to determine what a causal agent is doing with what costs and benefits;
- to diagnose causes – to identify the forces creating the problem;
- to make moral judgments – to evaluate causal agents and their effects;
- to suggest remedies – to offer treatments for the problems and predict their likely effects (pp52).

Yet, according to him a single sentence may perform more than one of these four framing functions while many sentences in a text may perform none of them and a frame in any particular text may not necessarily include all four functions. One of the essential aspects of frames, however, is that they determine whether people observe and, if yes, how they understand and remember a problem as well as how they evaluate and choose to act upon it (Entman 1993, 53) Kahneman and Tversky (1984) further discussed that frames select and

call attention to particular aspects of reality which automatically means that frames simultaneously direct attention away from other aspects of the reality described (cited in Falk 2007, 26). Thus, frames can be defined not only by what they include but also by what they exclude. The omission of potential problem definitions, explanations, evaluations, and recommendations may be as important as their inclusion when guiding a particular audience. What is essential is that frames are a powerful mechanism for people's selection and comprehension of information and they can divert people's attention from one aspect of an item of information to another. Thus, they are a powerful tool of guiding people and organizing people's belief systems.

Being a vast field of research in political and media science, framing theory consists of many aspects that are worth exploring, yet, the present research wants to steer clear of going into details about the different types of framing. The research is going to focus on media framing and how media present information to its public since this will help in understanding better how media construct the images of women politicians in US. Media framing is an essential part in the field of media since "[media frame news] from a particular perspective so that some aspects of the situation come into close focus and others fade into the background" (Graber 2002, 173). Hence, media framing chooses what aspects of particular information to put to the front and which ones to leave out. Then if media framing is capable of altering information and presenting it to the public while at the same time media are considered the major source of information (Callaghan and Schnell 2005, 2), then this illustrates how media can change people's beliefs and views by selecting one side of a problem or one aspect of a reality. Then apart from being only tools of helping people process information, frames influence citizens' evaluations of political actors and alter the criteria by which political candidates are judged (pp2).

In addition, as media are an important information transmitter they play an essential role in forming people's judgements and beliefs. Studies on framing reveal that the way the mass media portray issues actually affects how people understand social reality (Falk 2007, 26). Yet, when it comes to presidential campaigns, media portrayals are even more important (Falk (2007, 2). This is so because in presidential contests most of what people know about any candidate is learned from the media (pp2). Media and the way they frame the candidates play an essential role in their public's mental representations of the world, their understanding of the social reality they live in, and last but not least – their acts and behavior. Even more, media have the power to construct particular ideas as conceptions, for example, what is a woman and what is a political woman (pp28).

The power of media frames also lies in the fact that they can be defined as gendered discourse (Parry-Giles 2014, 16). For instance, in her study on gender bias Falk (2009) stated that reporters and editors approached women candidates with different frames in mind and the first one was the "woman frame" (pp228). This means is that if a reporter approaches a story with the idea that the story is about a woman they might think and write about ideas that they relate to women (pp228). For instance, if women are generally associated with their beauty and appearance, their looks will be more likely to be relevant and important when a reporter

covers a story about a female political candidate (pp228). Moreover, media framing of women politicians is not only gendered but also subjective (pp229). This is so because media treat women in ways which reinforce traditional gender norms. For instance, women who engage in non-stereotypical activities, that is political activities, receive less exposure than men engaging in the very same activities (pp229). In this way the stereotypical behaviours are highlighted while the counter-stereotypical behaviours are diminished (pp229). Therefore, media frame women who run for political office as "outside their natural sphere" (pp229). Hence, gender is articulated and this influences the ways the public will view the women candidates.

CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

After having traced back women political empowerment in American history and touched upon the theories of gender stereotyping and media framing essential for the present research, Chapter 3 will explicate what methodology and method of analysis it is going to use, how it is going to conduct the analysis itself, and last but not least, what exactly it is going to look for in the articles of *NYT*. Up to the present chapter 1t was reiterated that the research would aim for gender stereotypes articulated in media framing. Yet, it was never put plainly how those gender stereotypes were going to be detected and recognized as such in the articles. Thus, the present Chapter will elaborate on all these methodological questions and present a research design of the paper.

3.1 Inductive Qualitative Analysis and Grounded Theory

The research tool that is going to assist the conduction of the present research is inductive qualitative analysis. This choice can be justified in several ways. First, the present research is going to examine articles, that is - texts, thus, the collection and analysis of verbal data is a must - words should be analyzed and the relations between them should be elaborated on. Then it is anticipated that qualitative content analysis should be used in the present research looking for particular patterns in media texts since it is a process of "subjective interpretation of the content of text data through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns" (Hsieh & Shannon 2005, 1278). Second, qualitative coding attaches labels to segments of data that depict what each segment is about (Charmaz 2006, 5). Qualitative coding distills data and sorts them by providing a handle for making comparisons with other segments of data (Idem). This constant comparing between the segments of analysis is an essential part when designing the categories of gender stereotypes throughout the analysis because it ensures that there is not going to be merging between the separate categories and each and every one of them will have particular dimensions differentiating it from the rest. What is more, qualitative coding is the first step in moving beyond concrete statements in the data to making analytic interpretations (Charmaz 2006, 43). Thus, coding facilitates how data are selected, separated, and sorted in order to be analyzed and it transforms an abstract idea into a segment of data that can be interpreted.

Last but not least, the present research has decided to resort to induction rather than to deduction because it aims at creating its own codes by defining what can be observed in the data rather than using preconceived categories. Codes are going to be recognized in the process of scrutinizing the data and defining meanings within it. The research is not going to rely on predetermined codes, it is going to move from text examples found in the articles to patterns that can be later interpreted. In short, with the inductive analysis the examples are going to be encountered before any rules are inferred. This is an active coding in which data can be interacted with in numerous ways leading to the thorough exploration of texts

themselves. Inductive analysis allows for freedom and creativity in coding as well as for encountering codes that might not be recognized if deduction is used. However, it is essential to highlight here that using induction does not necessarily mean that the research is going to discard all previous theories and examples of gender stereotypes in media encountered so far. All instances of gender stereotypes used in media framing that have already been discussed in Chapter 1 and II are going to be kept in mind when coding and analyzing the data. Furthermore, Table 1 presents a summary of some of the most prominent and appropriate for the purpose of the present research gender stereotypes, which have been traced in previous academic research:

Gender stereotype	Description
1. "first"	Persistent frame depicting every woman who has run for a president as "first" (despite all the previous women who already have run), thus, de-normalizing women in this political field.
2. "bitchy"	Frame depicting women as being pushy, meddlesome, ambitious, and not complying to the role of a submissive mother and wife.
3. "seductress", "sex object"	Frame including everything from clothing and appearance, being seen as a sex object, behaving or speaking in ''feminine'' ways, to being the victim of sexual harassment.
4. "mother"	Frame depicting women as caring and understanding, compassionate and honest, viewing them as unable to perform a leadership role, identifying them with "emotional matters" (crying or emotional outbursts), involving images of scolding, punishment, or shrewish behavior.
5. "pet", "child"[1]	Frame depicting women as weak, naïve, or unprepared to handle a difficult task without a man's help, treating women in a childlike manner and diminishing their capacity to fulfill leadership functions.
6. "iron maiden"	Frame depicting women as too masculine and as being ridiculed due to exhibiting too many masculine traits and not being feminine enough.
7. - "foxy" - "barracuda", "old bat", "shrew", "cow"	Animals frame depicting women as less human: - focusing on appearance and sexuality of young women - depicting women who grow older as old and too aggressive.
8. "feminist"	Frame depicting women as rhetorically violent, sexually cold, violating authentic

	womanhood, allegedly masculine, rejecting traditional womanly duties in the home and flouting gender tradition.
9. "scorned wife"	Frame depicting women as standing by their men, accepting marital humiliation, as well as rescuers of their husbands and their moral compasses.

Table 1. Examples of prominent gender stereotypes found in previous research[2]

The gender stereotypes presented in Table 1 can be regarded as a handle of the induction analysis since they are some of the most common stereotypes of professional women as well as the most recurrent ones found in Hilary Clinton's media coverage. For this reason they are going to be taken into account when coding, yet, they are not going to be forced on the data. Although the induction nature of the present research does not allow for emanating and applying preconceptions throughout the process of analyzing data, it should be kept in mind that every research should strive to be multi-faceted and thorough and this does not mean forsaking prior ideas which already exist in literature. On the contrary, such examples can only expand the research as long as they are not forced on the data and the researcher stays open-minded for all new codes and interpretations that can be retrieved from the data. In short, applying solely deduction, or working with a priori categories, is first, more difficult since such borrowed categories are harder to find, fewer in number, and in the end they turn out to be not as rich and enough in number as expected, and second, more burdensome, since in the long run they may turn not be relevant and not exactly designed for the purpose, which may lead to their respecification. This is why induction is going to be applied in the data analysis of the research, yielded by some relevant examples of gender stereotypes found in previous academic research.

In addition, the process of coding gender stereotypes in media framing and data analysis is going to be guided by the Grounded Theory approach, discovered and first articulated by Glaser and Strauss in 1967. The reasons for this are numerous. To begin with, Grounded Theory entrenches the discovery, the generating of a theory from data, which have been systematically obtained and analyzed in research (Glaser and Strauss 1967, 1). The foundation of grounded theory is generating a new theory by explaining data - grounded theory is derived from data and not from formulaic rules or testable existing theories (Ibidem, 4-7). The Grounded Theory Institute, run by Glaser, defines the approach as follows: "Grounded Theory is an inductive methodology (…) It is a general method. It is the systematic generation of theory from systematic research. It is a set of rigorous research procedures leading to the emergence of conceptual categories (…)". Grounded Theory can be used with either qualitative or quantitative data (Grounded Theory Institute 2013). The defining components of Grounded Theory practice can be summarized as follows:

---

[1] See Wood (1994, pp264–265).

[2] See Falk (2007, pp35); Anderson (2002, pp106); Carlin & Winfrey (2009, pp327-328); Parry Giles (2014, pp180-196).

• Simultaneous involvement in data collection and analysis

• Constructing analytic codes and categories from data, not from preconceived logically-deduced hypotheses

• Using the constant comparative method, which involves making comparisons during each stage of the analysis

• Advancing theory development during each step of data collection and analysis

• Memowriting to elaborate categories, specify their properties, define relationships between categories, and identify gaps

• Sampling aimed toward theory construction.[3]

The underlying part of Grounded Theory is that it requires simultaneous data collection and analysis. What is meant by this is that the collection, coding, and analysis of data should be done together as much as possible from the beginning of the research to its end. Another essential aspect of this approach is the incessant application of comparative analysis. That is, the researcher does not wait until data are completely collected to begin data analysis; instead, data collection and analysis occur simultaneously so that the analyzed data guide subsequent data collection. During the data analysis process, an incident should be compared and contrasted with other incidents. Researchers need to make comparisons between empirical data and concept, between concept and categories, among data, and among categories. The purposes of comparative analysis are to obtain accuracy of evidence in the conceptual category and to establish the generality of a fact (see Glaser and Strauss 1967, 1-14; Cho and Lee 2014, 1-4).

Last but not least, the main stages coding in Grounded Theory should be shortly discussed since they are interrelated with the conduction of the present research. Table 2 explicates them as follows:

Stage of coding	Description
1. Open coding	Initial discovery of categories and their properties. Interpretive process where data are broken down analytically. It includes comparison between incidents in terms of similarities and differences, giving conceptual labels to those incidents, and grouping the incidents together into categories.
2. Focused coding	The second major phase of coding. The process of coding to synthesize and explain larger segments of data. It uses the most significant and/or frequent codes to sift through large amounts of data. It requires making decisions about which initial codes make the most analytic sense to categorize the data incisively and completely.
3. Axial coding	The process of exploring the relationships among categories, relating categories with

	their subcategories, and testing the relationships against data.
4. Theoretical coding	The process of theorizing the relationships among substantial codes. At the end, a theory, a set of theoretical propositions, is generated.

Table 2. Stages of coding in Grounded Theory.[4]

Having touched upon the main pillars of Grounded Theory, it becomes palpable that the present research is going to be guided, both theoretically and empirically, by the empirical research itself since Grounded Theory allows for the constant going back and forth through data and getting new insights and interpretations. The present research is not going to test theoretical hypotheses and prove or disprove them, it is aiming at building its own theory based on a precedent in history, where no previous literature applies – in particular, what gender stereotypes are at play in the media framing of a woman running for president in US.

3.2 Research design

The empirical part of the research is going through several stages by starting with gathering data from the texts and writing down the analysis while simultaneously reflecting on the entire process. Yet, the research process is not going to be that linear since Grounded Theory allows for the going back and forth through data, generating new ideas, and choosing a new analytic direction when necessary. In order for the research to be extensive and not to miss any essential data that can be coded, it is going to apply line-by-line coding, which prompts for the study of every single line in the text. Line-by-line coding allows for generating new ideas and information and also for having a fresh look on the data. In the first round of the empirical research open coding (see Table 2) is going to be applied during which codes will be attached to the text. Throughout this stage the research is going to make an extensive use of close reading of the data, comparing codes that emerge from the text, and drawing similarities and differences between them. Then, a second round of coding (focused coding) follows where the most significant or frequent of the inductive codes are going to be used for sifting through the large amount of data. The focused coding will facilitate the decisions about which of the initial inductive codes make the most analytic sense to categorize the data thoroughly. Throughout the rounds of coding, the research is going to stick to the main components of Grounded Theory – that is to remain open to the material, to stay close to the data, to keep the codes simple and precise, and to compare data with data (Charmaz 2006, 50). At the end of the empirical research, the generation of theory should be reached since the research does not intend to test hypotheses or verify facts. The research will aim to generate a theory explaining a particular phenomenon – gender stereotypes of a woman running for president, in a specific context – media framing of *NYT*.

----

[3]Glaser and Strauss (1967, pp10); see also Charmaz (2006).
[4]Based on Corbin and Strauss (1990), Charmaz (2006), see also Glaser and Strauss (1967).

Since no theory about gender stereotyping of a woman running in the US presidential elections exists in academic literature, clearly because this is a precedent in American political history, the research will strive to generate a theory about it. Yet, the present research does not exclude one main pitfall of its methodology – that despite the time-intensive coding process, no substantial theory may be found in the end. Another weakness of the empirical research might be that it is not going to make an extensive use of memoing due to the large amount of data to be analyzed. Keeping theoretical notes is a must in every research because they help the researcher to keep track of their data collection and help them generate new and fresh ideas. However, due to the big number of articles that are going to be analyzed, the present research is not going to present elaborate memos but it will provide an extensive analysis of its findings is Chapter 4.

Last but not least, some light should be shed on the research sampling. The research is going to apply purposive sampling – it is going to select only articles which have Hillary Clinton as their main theme. The search terms used in LexisNexis when retrieving the *NYT* articles are "Hillary Clinton and Clinton and Presidential Elections" with "Clinton" as a search term in the headline. The articles that are going to be analyzed are equally distributed over the period February 1st – November 11th. This time period has been chosen since February 1st was the beginning of the Presidential Primaries and 12th November was a few days after the President-elect was announced, which will provide for a broader picture of what gender stereotypes are at play at the very beginning of the presidential elections, during the campaign, and after the end of the elections. As far as the articles that are going to be coded are concerned, the research will need to leave out a big number of articles that do not have Hillary Clinton as a main theme of discussion – articles, discussing mainly Donald Trump and mentioning Clinton, are not going to be coded; articles, focused on Clinton's email controversy only mentioning Clinton, are not going to be coded; articles about Obama, only mentioning Clinton, are not going to be coded. In the end a total number of 136 articles is retrieved. Due to the qualitative and time-intense nature of the research, which requires several rounds of coding and in-depth analysis and interpretation, it is not possible for a bigger number of articles to be analyzed, which, of course, can be considered as a another methodological weakness of the study. Yet, the research prefers to analyze 136 articles extensively rather than analyzing a few hundred articles ineffectively and incompletely.

Having presented its method of analysis, methodology which will guide the empirical research, and research design, the present paper is ready to move on to discussing its findings from the empirical research.

CHAPTER 4
ANALYSIS

The present Chapter will analyze the findings of the empirical research and will try to find an answer to the *RQ* of the research. Since the research is of qualitative nature it will discuss the most conspicuous gender stereotypes which were recorded throughout Clinton's coverage in *NYT* and delve into their implications. It will also draw a comparison between the uses of the different stereotypes and reach a conclusion on how they were actually used throughout the coverage and how this influenced Clinton's image. Ultimately, the present research will try to answer the question how Hillary Clinton was framed in terms of gender stereotypes by *NYT* and what an image she was attached to by the newspaper coverage.

Although the present research used induction throughout the coding process, it did not discard examples of gender stereotypes which had been previously recorded in other research. During the analysis most of the gender stereotypes which served for building the theoretical basis of the paper and which were illustrated in Chapter 1 and II were encountered as present in the analyzed articles and they are going to be discussed in terms of their use, implications, and an overall building of Clinton's image. During the induction process of coding and analyzing the articles no new gender stereotypes in particular were recorded. What is meant by new here is that no categories differing from the ones based on the already discussed previous research appeared in the texts. So, although the research did not aim at coding and interpreting predetermined categories in its empirical part, it ended up with the very same gender stereotypes discussed in the theoretical foundation of the paper. However, it is of paramount importance to state that it is the implications these gender stereotypes had and the way they were used in the texts that matter in qualitative research. It is the implications and the use of these gender stereotypes that built the particular image of Clinton in the *NYT* coverage and this is the reason why they are going to be examined and discussed in the present Chapter. Although it might seem that these findings in a way overlap with findings of previous studies on gender stereotypes in media coverage of women in politics, this is untrue. The gender stereotypes found in Clinton's coverage in *NYT* presented her in a very specific way and built one rather complex and contradictory image which cannot at any cost be limited to her simply being framed as a woman, a mother, and a wife. Thus, all recorded gender stereotypes will be separately elaborated on in terms of how they present Hillary Clinton and why they make the present research distinct from previous ones.

The stereotype "first" was noted as the most recurrent one, permeating Clinton's coverage in various contexts and having the role of accentuating the historical nature of her candidacy. The "woman" stereotype was also present in the newspaper coverage but played a very controversial role. Its persistent use in the *NYT* articles built two opposing images of Clinton, images which clashed but at the same time were used next to each other throughout the whole coverage. Part of the "woman" stereotype occurrences praised Clinton for being an accomplished politician while being a woman whereas the rest highlighted her gender and played the role of effacing her political achievements. The "wife" stereotype presented a

rather complicated relationship between a wife and a husband and highlighted Clinton's extraordinariness both as a presidential candidate as well as Bill Clinton's wife. The "mother" stereotype was also made use of by *NYT* and it had the role of building Clinton's image as an atypical mother presented through the perspective and the context of her daughter, her husband, and her voters who are mothers. Last but not least, the "appearance" stereotype had occurrences of Clinton's age, clothes, and hair. The age occurrences presented Clinton as too old and unsuitable to be a US president. The clothes occurrences served to highlight her femininity, and the hair occurrences combined the two by emphasizing both her old age and her gender, thus, presenting her as an old woman not fit for being the commander-in-chief. In short, all gender stereotypes which were encountered throughout the analysis contributed for a diverse and even contradictory picture of Clinton's image which is worth delving into.

4.1   The "first" – historic candidate or just a woman

As already mentioned, the "first" stereotype was most persistently used from all other stereotypes found in Clinton's coverage in *NYT*. A quick reminder of its description follows here: "Persistent frame depicting every woman who has run for a president as "first" (despite all the previous women who already have run), thus, de-normalizing women in this political field" (Falk 2007, 35). What is striking about the nature of this stereotype is that it depicts every next woman running for president as the "first" one, despite the fact that this is factually untrue. What is even more striking, though, is that when one flips through the *NYT* articles and comes across all the numerous mentions of Clinton being "*the nation's first female president*" (*NYT*, 10 November, 2016); "*the first woman in the Oval Office*" (*NYT*, 6 November, 2016); "*the first woman with a real shot at the presidential nomination*" (*NYT*, 29 July, 2016), one starts to believe that she is actually "the first one" in history. Tracing back American history, however, will immediately confront her "firstness" by enlisting the following other "first" women who ran for president in US:

-       **Victoria Woodhull (1872**) - the first woman to run for President of the United States as the candidate for the Equal Rights Party;
-       **Margaret Chase Smith (1964)** – she ran for the Republican ticket in 1964 against Barry Goldwater and became the first woman ever to receive more than one vote at a major party convention;
-       **Shirley Chisolm (1972)** - the first black woman elected to Congress in the United States who later announced her bid for the presidency under the Democratic Party;
-       **Patsy Matsu Takemoto Mink (1972)** - the first woman elected to Congress for the state of Hawaii, as well as the first elected female of an ethnic minority from any state, who ran in the Oregon primary for the 1972 election as an anti-Vietnam War candidate for the Democratic ticket;
-       **Linda Jenness (1972)** – she ran for election that same year on the Socialist Workers Party ticket;

-       **Elizabeth Dole (2000)** - both presidential and vice presidential nominee, she had an impressive political career of her own;

-       **Carol Moseley Braun (2004)** - the first female African-American Senator, the first African-American U.S. Senator for the Democratic Party, the first woman to defeat an incumbent U.S. Senator in an election, and the first female Senator from Illinois, she was also the candidate for the Democratic nomination during the 2004 U.S. presidential election;

-       **Michele Bachmann (2012)** - a candidate for the Republican nomination in the 2012 U.S. presidential election.

The reason why this list takes place here is to disclose that in terms of historical accurateness there were other women before Hillary Clinton who ran for presidency. Although it is true that Clinton is the first woman to receive the presidential nomination from a major political party, her "firstness" recurrently presented by the *NYT* articles becomes delusive at some point, fostering the idea that she is a unique candidate because she is "the first" in the whole history of US presidency. The numerous occurrences of the "first" stereotype gradually obscure the fact that Clinton succeeded a whole line of women who had run for the US presidency. Furthermore, her candidacy is more often than not referred to as "*breakthrough*" or "*making history*" (*NYT*, 27 July, 2016) and "*crossing a historic barrier*" (*NYT*, 8 June, 2016). Again, although it is true that she is the first woman to be nominated by a major party, she is not the first ever to run for a president, and this is what the implication of the persistent use of the "first" stereotype actually is. Therefore, through the repetitive occurrences of the "first" stereotype, Clinton is presented as someone outstanding who is breaking history. Her extraordinariness as a female presidential candidate keeps being accentuated in various forms. For instance:

 "*When folks talk about a revolution, the revolution is electing the first woman president of the United States.*" (*NYT*, 6 February, 2016).

This sentence explicates that Clinton's candidacy is even viewed as some kind of a repudiation of the established status quo. So, Clinton is called a "*historic nominee*" (*NYT*, 27 July, 2016) and her candidacy is called "*the revolution*" which explicitly focuses on the extraordinariness of Clinton's running for US presidency. Owing to her gender, her candidacy for president is accentuated as historic and unique, that is "first", which in a way undermines all candidacies of women preceding her.

As a matter of fact, this "first" stereotype has another aspect, which goes hand in hand with the one of Clinton's historical candidacy and extraordinariness, and this is the woman reference. All mentions of Clinton as the "first" were invariably followed by mentions of her gender – that she is a woman, a female candidate. In this way her gender is emphasized and it comes as no surprise that various gender characteristics and roles follow from that. One instance is the following:

"*"More humor, first woman, ass kicker and coloring her hair," Jennifer Palmieri advised, referring to a line in which Mrs. Clinton says she would not have to worry about her hair going gray in the White House*" (*NYT*, 11 October, 2016).

References to typically womanly features such as colouring one's hair are not uncommon when going through Clinton's mentions as the "first" woman. What is striking, however, is how they go next to references of Clinton presenting her as outstanding and unique and as someone breaking historical barriers. This invariably generates an amalgam of two clashing pictures of her – that of a trailblazer in American history and that of an ordinary woman. A perfect example which illustrates this two-sided image of her is the following one:

"*She would be the latest in a long line of Yale graduates and accomplished lawyers to lead the country, but she would also be the first mother and grandmother to be commander in chief, decades after women became heads of state elsewhere*" (*NYT*, 29 July, 2016).

Here Clinton's political accomplishments are intertwined with the expected gender roles of every woman – being a mother and grandmother. This triggers the idea that no matter her education or her political fulfillments, she will invariably be associated with her gender, even at a moment when she makes history. Hence, the use of the "first" stereotype serves not only to stress the outstanding nature of her candidacy, thus, her personal extraordinariness, but also to highlight her gender. Clinton is depicted as a unique political candidate, as if she is the first of its kind in the whole history of US presidency, whereas at the same time she is depicted as a woman just like all other women - a woman who is a mother and grandmother and who needs to colour her when she gets old. In short, the "first" stereotype triggers two rather conflicting implications which serve to present the complex image of a woman who breaks barriers and makes history due to her being a woman.

4.2 The "woman" - praised and condemned for being a woman

One of the most complex stereotypes which triggered the most contradictory implications from all recorded gender stereotypes was the "woman" stereotype. The "woman" stereotype, which served to explicitly note Clinton gender, worked at two incompatible levels of meaning, thus, triggering quite conflicting implications. To begin with, one of the main uses of the "woman" stereotype strived to present Clinton as an exceptional candidate due to her gender. This invariably relates to what was discussed at the very beginning of the present Chapter where the "first" stereotype depicted a historical candidate whose extraordinariness was due to the complex amalgam of her gender and political accomplishments. Just like with this implication of the "first" stereotype, the "woman" stereotype triggered the idea that she is an eminent political figure owing to the fact that she is a female presidential candidate. Not infrequently was she referred to as "*the country's most admired woman*" (*NYT*, 29 July, 2016), "*this incredible woman*" (*NYT*, 3 March, 2016), and "*the most famous woman in the world*" (*NYT*, 10 November, 2016). The reason behind such depictions is obvious – she is the 67th US

secretary of state, a U.S. senator from New York, first lady of US, and now she is the Democratic Party's nominee for president of US. It is evident that she has a long and solid political career owing to her competence and ambition.

Furthermore, she is a political influencer in a country where a woman has never held the post of a commander-in-chief. Thus, it is not surprising that she is presented through the use of phrases such as "*the most famous*", "*the most admired*" or "*incredible*" in the articles. Again, comparing the "first" stereotype and the "woman" stereotype explicates that both highlight Clinton's exceptionality with the only difference that the "woman" stereotype stressed her gender, by making use of the words "woman" and "female", while the "first" focused on her being the first in history.

The following example illustrates Clinton's extraordinariness due to what she has accomplished as a woman:

"*Mrs. Clinton's name on the ballot in November would be another milestone in the quest for women's rights, which, as she noted years ago, are human rights. This achievement is worth cheering by all, regardless of party, because it further opens the door to female leadership in every sphere*" (*NYT*, 8 June, 2016).

Here she is presented as not just one of the many women in politics but as the trailblazer for all women in US. The uniqueness of her candidacy is further intensified by the use of the word "*milestone*" as well as by the fact that her achievement should be appraised by all political parties since it is not only a political achievement but a historic one, too. What is essential about this use of the "woman" stereotype is that it focuses both on Clinton's gender as well as on her political accomplishments. It does not work only to highlight her gender but also to put emphasis on her fulfillments. Thus, her gender and her political career are in a way equated contributing to her exceptionality. Another example where her political accomplishments are equated with her gender and even presented as more prominent than her womanhood is the following one:

"*Despite her strong support among older women, Mrs. Clinton is not universally seen as a transformative figure for her gender. Some voters regard her as a Clinton first, a perennial politician second and a woman third*" (*NYT*, 9 June, 2016).

What is noteworthy in this example is that the "*woman*" occurrence here serves to disclose that not everyone considers Hillary Clinton as a woman first. Thus, although she is a woman, she is not "*universally*" regarded as a woman only. Her political accomplishments are not denounced due to the fact that she is a woman who is running for US presidency. On the contrary, her political career is equated with her gender but in a way which presents her accomplishments in politics as more outstanding than her gender. This example implies the image of a woman who is well recognized due to her long political career and not due to her gender. Yet, the reference to her gender is still there, signifying that no matter her long years in politics and her well-recognized name she will always be defined and referred to as a

woman, too. In short, examples like the above ones present Clinton's candidacy as something unique mainly because of the complex amalgam of her long years in US politics and her gender. In some cases her gender is highlighted more than her political accomplishments while other times it is her political career which is given more prominence, but what is always an inseparable part of her is her gender.

That being sad, the "woman" stereotype had another main implication which worked against the presentation of her gender as an advantage transforming her candidacy into a milestone in American history. This implication triggered the idea that Clinton was condemned for being a presidential candidate due to her gender. Surprising as it may seem, both conflicting implications were present in the text and they triggered even more contradictory inferences. Depictions of Clinton as a unique and outstanding candidate due to her gender merged with depictions of her as not competent enough due to this very same gender. However, sometimes the idea that she was unsuitable for the presidency because of her gender outweighed the idea that she is a unique and historic figure in American politics due to her womanhood. Thus, despite the complex interplay of the opposing implications, the one presenting Clinton's gender as a disadvantage rather than as an advantage dominated the newspaper coverage. What is most conspicuous about it is that it presented Clinton as incompetent political candidate due to the fact that she is a woman. Her political experience and accomplishments were not presented as important, sometimes they were even not mentioned, and her gender was implicitly presented as the main reason for her unsuitability of being the next US president. Furthermore, she was depicted as outstanding and as a possible winner of the elections only due to her gender. One example which explicates this is the following:

"*Mrs. Clinton was leading in the Democratic race because of her gender*" (*NYT*, 28 April, 2016)

It is evident here that Clinton's gender is presented as the main reason for her success at the presidential elections. The omission of her political experience and political posts she has previously hold further adds to the idea that she is an outstanding and unique presidential candidate mainly due to her gender and not because of what she has achieved as a politician.

Another example which illustrates how Clinton's gender is depicted as her disadvantage is the following one:

"*Mrs. Clinton lacked the stamina to be president, a comment that many women viewed as sexist*" (NYT, 2 October, 2016).

This example serves to highlight the fact that Clinton is a woman and being a woman is not necessarily associated with being tough and tenacious. The quote implies that due to her gender she is not regarded as suitable for the presidency. This idea is further intensified by quotes taken from the time framework following the end of the elections and discussing the reasons for Clinton's defeat:

"[…] *this so-called ambition gap is because women are less likely to be encouraged or recruited to run, underestimate their own abilities, assume they need to be more qualified than men and view politics as sexist. Now, Mrs. Clinton's loss may lend credence to those doubts*" (*NYT*, 10 November, 2016).

Although this example talks more broadly about women in politics, it is crucial for the discussion of the "woman" stereotype since it expresses the probability ("*may*") that Clinton's failure to win and become the next US president can be rooted in her gender and the fact that she is not qualified enough. Another instance from the articles, which further adds to this point, is the following one:

"*As it became clear on Tuesday night that Mrs. Clinton would lose to Donald J. Trump, supporters cast blame on everything from the news media to the F.B.I. director's dogged pursuit of Mrs. Clinton over her personal emails, and to a deep discomfort with electing a woman as president*" (*NYT*, 10 November, 2016).

What is interesting here is that Clinton's gender is directly associated as a cause for her defeat and put right next to her email controversy which implicitly triggers the idea that her gender is as big a reason for her not to win as her most notorious political misdeed. This certainly can make one ponder on the gravity of her gender as her main disadvantage in winning the elections.

To sum up, the "woman" stereotype builds on the ever conflicting line presenting Clinton as both praised and condemned for being a woman and this furthers the contradictory nature of her image by depicting her as either an outstanding candidate and a historic political player or as an unsuitable to be president due to the fact that she is a woman. Moreover, her womanhood is also presented as one of the reasons why she did not win the elections. Despite the complexity of all the "woman" occurrences, however, one sole aspect of Clinton's image crystalizes – she is a woman, first and foremost, and despite her political achievements and career she is presented as the "woman" who makes history or the "woman" who is not suitable to be president because she is a woman. In short, she is the "woman" and this is where all other interpretations and presentations of her image stem from.

4.3 The "wife" – the complexity of Hillary and Bill Clinton's relationship

Another worth elaborating finding from the analysis of the *NYT* articles is the use of the "wife" stereotype. This stereotype sheds a lot of light on how Clinton was framed by the newspaper since it has very interesting and contradictory implications regarding her relation with her husband, hence, worth analyzing depictions of her as a wife. Although it might be the case that the "wife" stereotype tends to be considered as clear and straightforward enough when recorded as present in a particular text and that it can be assumed as solely stressing the gender role of being a wife when used in the depiction of a particular woman, this does not go

for the present research. The image of Hillary Clinton, built to a big extent on the basis of the "wife" stereotype, is a multi-layered and a complex one which cannot be in any way limited only to the role of a wife. There are contradictory implications at play which entangle Clinton's image and certainly do not present her in a simple and straightforward way.

To begin with, Hillary Clinton's relation to the former president Bill Clinton was an inseparable part of the *NYT* articles. The fact that she is Bill Clinton's spouse took different forms and was present in various contexts. What is essential is that this invariable connection of Hillary Clinton to her husband served to imply her dependency on her husband. Although their marriage is an undeniable fact and although Bill Clinton was once president of the US (15 years ago to be precise), reading through articles constantly mentioning Hillary Clinton's marital relation fosters the idea of a woman dependent on her husband. Such mentions also highlight the fact that it is inevitable for a woman to be referred to as a wife despite how much she has achieved in her professional career. One prominent example from the articles highlighting exactly this implication is the following one:

"*Mrs. Clinton savored the biggest night of her extraordinary journey from lawyer, wife and first lady to senator, secretary of state and, now, the first woman to win a major party's nomination*" (*NYT*, 8 June, 2016).

This quote explicates how the role of being a wife is intertwined with all Clinton's political roles. Despite her all accomplishments, Clinton is still framed as a wife together with all her other titles. This might uphold two separate connotations – first, women have the power and the ability to be both successful in their careers and successful in building their family as wives and mothers, and second, women are always related to their expected gender roles in spite of their professional achievements. What these two connotations have in common is that the "wife" aspect is unalterably there. Be it in relation to her political career or solely presenting her as Bill Clinton's spouse, the "wife" aspect is there, reverberating the expected gender role of a being someone's marital partner.

It is evident, however, that the "wife" stereotype is of a complex nature since it not only presents the candidate as someone's wife, but it also touches upon her political achievements. This invariably implies of degrading Clinton's achievements in politics. The reiteration of Clinton's being Bill Clinton's wife throughout the articles cultivates the idea that what she has accomplished in her career is in a way owing to her spouse who happens to be a former president of US. An instance from the analyzed texts which mirrors this research contention is the following one:

"*It's not surprising that the first serious female presidential contender would be someone attached to a famous male name. For most of our history, women who rose in American politics were generally filling in for a deceased (or sometimes indicted) husband. (...) It's a new world order Hillary has always championed. But the way she's running her campaign isn't doing the new world any favors. Bill isn't the only man overshadowing her political life.*

Hillary has also been campaigning as a sort of Barack Obama surrogate who'll carry on the president's legacy for another term or two" (*NYT*, 19 May, 2016).

Clearly, Hillary Clinton's political career here is presented as a product of her marriage to a strong and powerful man, a former president of US. Her accomplishments are distinctly belittled by the use of phrases such as "*attached to a famous male name*". Clinton's deprecation is enhanced even more by the mention of another male figure in her life who "*overshadows*" her political career. Hence, not only is she depicted as a weak and dependent spouse relying on her husband's achievements through the recurrent mentions of her husband and her marriage in the articles, but she is also presented as a candidate reliant on the male president she will succeed. Examples like the above one explicate how the use of the gender stereotype "wife", even without directly mentioning the word "wife", serves to belittle her whole political career and achievements.

Another curious use of the gender stereotype "wife", which points out how adding something where it is actually not needed can trigger important connotations, is how some of the mentions of Bill Clinton and the references to Hillary Clinton as his "wife" were used in context where they were not necessary – that is, where they did not add to the main idea of the paragraph. This accentuates the present research contention that they played the role of stressing Clinton's unsuitability for president and depicting her as dependent on her husband. One example supporting this argument is the following one:

"*If elected, Mrs. Clinton would become the 45th president of the United States, as well as the first to be married to a former president, Bill Clinton, the nations's 42nd*" (*NYT*, July 29, 2016).

Clearly, the mention that Clinton will be "*the first to be married to a former president*" is not essential here and does not add any meaning to the initial statement that she can become "*the 45th president of the United States*". What can be inferred from this particular use of the "wife" stereotype is that no matter that Hillary Clinton has reached the highest step of the political ladder, she will always stay Bill Clinton's wife. Examples like this one connote that even when she has the chance of becoming one of the most powerful leaders in the whole world, she will invariably be followed by mentions of her marital status or her spouse.

Another example which presents in a similar way the intricate nature of the use and the implications of the "wife" stereotype is the following one:

"*Hillary Diane Rodham Clinton, who sacrificed personal ambition for her husband's political career and then rose to be a globally influential figure, became the first woman to accept a major party's presidential nomination on Thursday night, a prize that generations of American women have dreamt about for one of their own*" (*NYT*, 29 July, 2016).

The obvious interrelation between Clinton's affiliation to her husband and her trailblazing deed of running for US president is obvious here. Again, the implications are that being a woman is invariably followed by references to being a wife, having a husband, and taking

care of a family even when it comes to a moment in history when she has the real chance to become the next president of US. It is interesting, though, how this paragraph evolves. Starting by a strong accentuation of Hillary's wifely submissiveness to let go of her personal ambitions and follow her husband, a very sudden twist follows describing her as a "*globally influential figure*" which puts the finishing touches of her description by stressing the uniqueness of her candidacy. Her affiliation to her husband and her extraordinary political achievement are intertwined in a peculiar way which arises contradictory inferences – on the one hand, there is the idea that she is a woman and a wife but despite this she made an exceptional career to be remembered in history, while on the other hand, the initial mention of her compliance to her husband alludes to a weakness and subordination. Again, Clinton's relationship to her husband is not a plain one and it definitely does not build a simple image of Hillary as the typical "wife".

All that being said, the present analysis needs to discuss another quite contradictory aspect of the "wife" stereotype. As already stated, this stereotype does not hold a simplistic nature, therefore, it does not trigger one clear and straightforward connotation. On the contrary, it works with opposing implications and this is what makes it so interesting to be explored. As already exemplified, Bill Clinton was an inseparable part of Clinton's coverage, but what is noteworthy is that in some cases he was presented as the one assisting his wife in her presidential campaign and as the one who has a job thanks to her. This immediately triggers two opposing implications – the first one is that he is presented as the inferior one of the two spouses, helping his wife to become president since now she is the presidential candidate and not he, whereas the second one is that he is helping her with her campaign because he was the US president once and he is the more competent and knowledgeable one of the two. Both of these reflections have an equal representation in textual examples in the articles and this gives some food for thought why it is so. On the one hand, a picture of equality between the two spouses is depicted – they both have reached the most powerful political office in the world, they both have the skills, competence, and ambition to achieve what they did. On the other hand, however, their equality is constantly undermined by mentions of Hillary's being a "wife" or by mentions depicting Bill as her assistant in her campaign. A closer look at the following example proves the complexity of the way their relationship is presented:

"*It's easy to see why his wife's campaign is giving him a major role. His political skills are legendary. And he's the spouse, for heaven's sake. Presidential candidates always rely on their families to fill out the schedule, show up where they can't, spread good cheer.*

But we all know this is different. Campaigning in Kentucky - where her husband is more popular than she is - Hillary Clinton told voters that Bill would be "in charge of revitalizing the economy" in her administration" (*NYT*, 19 May, 1990).

Here the marital relation between the two is evident, yet, it is presented in a perplexing way. On the one hand, Bill is the one assisting Hillary with her campaign, the one who has a job thanks to her. On the other hand, he is the more popular one, the one who is the real help to Clinton due to his political past and career. This mingle of contradictory connotations only

adds to the complexity of the "wife" stereotype. It builds an image of a wife reliant on her more skillful, competent, and popular husband while at the same time it builds the other one of a strong and self-sufficient presidential candidate who provides a job for her husband. The interrelation of these two opposing images is infiltrated in the coverage and serves to enhance the idea that being a "wife" is not always what many consider it to be – subordination, inferiority, and dependency. Another example further illustrates this:

"*She lacks her husband's keen political instincts and persuasive talents as a campaigner. But she is more direct and disciplined*" (*NYT*, 25 July, 2016).

The two spouses are compared in terms of their qualities. Hillary Clinton's skills in campaigning are equated to Bill Clinton's ones and this gives the feeling that they are equal political players despite their gender. But this is immediately questioned by the mention of "*her husband*". One starts wondering why Clinton's husband is mentioned in this instance and whether it is necessary at all to compare the two of them since they are not opponents running against each other, thus, it is pointless to draw a parallel between their strengths and weaknesses. This is how the stereotype "wife" functions at two levels – on the surface it presents that the spouses as independent and equal individuals while at a deeper level it generates the idea that there is actually no need for Bill Clinton to be mentioned and for the two of them to be compared. This only serves to enhance Hillary's dependency on her husband, thus, the inevitability of her husband to be left out of her coverage.

Another example triggering a similar contradictory implication is the following one:

"*"She's not her husband," Ms. Nance-Holt said in an interview. "She's her own woman"*" (*NYT*, 14 April, 2016).

Again, Hillary Clinton is compared to her husband but this time the purpose is to stress her independence from Bill Clinton as well as her ability to stand on its own. Yet, it is thought-provoking how while her strength, qualities, and independence are attempted to be highlighted, her relationship to her husband keeps being reiterated. It is quite challenging to accept a woman as self-reliant and strong when she keeps being mentioned in comparison to her husband. When one reads about a woman who tends to be associated in various ways with her husband, one is more prone to believe in her dependency on him rather than on her independency, even if the intention of the text is to create an image of a strong and self-sufficient woman. These were not the only examples depicting a very complex and contradictory picture of a wife and a husband or of a presidential candidate and a former president. More were indicated throughout the coding but it is not going to add a lot to the present discussion if they just get listed and summarized. What is essential here is to highlight the incompatible nature of the way the relationship between Hillary Clinton and Bill Clinton is presented and ponder on why it is so.

It can be reasonable to claim that since Hillary Clinton is running for president the articles will try to depict her as a strong and competent candidate. At the same time, however, she

happens to be the wife of a former president, who became notorious for his love affair scandals and impeachment, and it should not be surprising that he will also be mentioned in the newspaper articles. Here is where all contradicting implications stem from – it is intricate to depict a female presidential candidate without mentioning her husband who is also a former president and without comparing the two. So, in the end it might turn out that the whole complexity of the "wife" stereotype can be actually reasoned – it is difficult to build a comprehensive image of Hillary Clinton as a "wife" because the social and historic context is complex itself. She is the "first" woman nominated by a major party and the "first" who has the real chance of becoming president in a country which has never had a woman for a head of state. At the same time she is a married woman and her husband happens to be a former president of US, hence, it should not come as a surprise that he will take part in the building of her image. Lastly, the complex presentation of their relationship where sometimes she is presented as the stronger and independent one and where other times she is depicted as the one relying on her husband, can only be attributed to the contradiction that, on the one hand, her candidacy is a precedence in the whole American history, while on the other hand, she is a woman married to a former president. Thus, she cannot be depicted either as only a presidential candidate or as only a woman, and these two sides of her image will clash and give rise to contradictory and complex examples like the ones formerly discussed.

4.4 The "mother" – a picture conceived through the imagery of other people

Another stereotype which was recorded throughout the analysis of the articles was the "mother" stereotype. Although Clinton's mentions of being a "mother" definitely did not make a big part of her coverage - only few examples were recorded throughout all analyzed articles, they were still present and they will not be omitted from the present research just because of their low number of occurrences. As the present research is of qualitative nature and not quantitative one, the number is not essential, while the context and the implications are. What is particularly interesting about the use of the "mother" stereotype is the context where it was used. The main distinctive types of context where the "mother" occurrences were recorded were when Clinton was described as a "mother" from the perspective of her husband, in the presence of her daughter, and in the context of other mothers – her voters.

Apart from this, there were also few examples where Hillary Clinton defined herself as a mother. This is rather curious since she is running for US president and referring to such a gender stereotype herself can only serve to undermine her as a qualified candidate. Mothers are not usually associated with running for president and it is interesting why she relates herself to this stereotype. One reason might be that she wants to be viewed in this stereotypical way in order to be accepted as a more natural candidate. As discussed in the theoretical foundation of the present research, women who do not meet the stereotypical expectations of society of being mothers and child bearers are condemned by the community (Parry-Giles 2014). Thus, it will not be unreasonable to claim that Clinton might be referring to herself as a "mother" in order to present herself in a way which will make her a more

amiable and acceptable candidate and as one not to be condemned by her voters. Since women in politics tend to be presented as mothers (Dolan 2014, 1-4), it is not unusual that Clinton wants to present herself as such. In addition, the fact that the overall coverage by *NYT* lacks a solid presentation of Clinton as a "mother" can only support the argument that she is a candidate who is not typically associated with this gender stereotype. Since this in a way breaks the societal norms, it is possible that she herself tries to put herself in a framework which presents her as an acceptable candidate due to her "motherhood". An interesting example which supports this argument is the following one:

"*Mrs. Clinton would spend years trying to soften her image, to contort herself into the more traditional first lady persona of devoted wife and mother*" (*NYT*, 6 November, 2016).

Owing to Clinton's media presentation as a candidate not associated with the image of a mother throughout the years, she has been labeled as a cold and ambitious woman who cares only about her career instead of as a mother taking care of her child (Parry-Giles 2014, 179). It is even more interesting that the present research also recorded some examples of her being described as "*a very practical, pragmatic person*" (*NYT*, 29 October, 2016), "*cold*" (*NYT*, 13 October, 2016), "*calculating*" (*NYT*, 23 August, 2016), and "*steely and even hawkish*" (*NYT*, 29 July, 2016). The way such occurrences describe her is certainly not even close to the warm and caring picture of a mother. Then, it can be surmised that due to the fact that she tends to be presented as a more atypical female candidate she uses the "mother" stereotype in order to "*soften*" her own image and make herself a more acceptable female presidential candidate.

Going further into the analysis, the most noteworthy aspect of the "mother" stereotype is the context where the "mother" occurrences were recorded. An interesting finding is that most of these mentions were not explicitly stated in the text. They were conceived through the use of other people. One example is how Clinton was presented when surrounded by other mothers – her voters. Be it by delivering speeches to mothers, speaking with mothers, trying to help mothers, or talking about mothers, the mothers were an inseparable part of the newspaper articles. Then, it can be assumed that although Clinton was not explicitly presented as a "mother", she was implied as such by being presented as surrounded by mothers or by talking about mothers and their rights. These regular mentions of Clinton being surrounded by mothers or talking to mothers distantly allude to her own image of a "mother" although it does not trigger it explicitly. For example:

"*Sitting onstage with mothers who had lost children to clashes with the police or guns, Mrs. Clinton checked off the statistics. "We lose 90 people a day to gun violence, that is 33,000 Americans a year," she said. "If anything else, a disease were killing 33,000 Americans a year, we would come together and say 'How do we deal with this?'"*" (*NYT*, 30 March, 2016).

Here it can be claimed that although she is not explicitly referred to as a mother, there is a distant allusion to her motherhood due to the fact that she is surrounded by mothers and talking with them. Another example which supports this idea is the following one:

"*Mrs. Clinton shows a different side when she is around the mothers. She talks less and seems more maternal, growing teary and turning to Scripture in response to the women's pain.*" (*NYT*, 14 April, 2016).

In this case, the "mother" aspect of her image is not implied but explicitly presented through the use of descriptions such as *more maternal*" and "*teary*" which invariably allude to a warm and caring mother image. Hence, it will not be untrue to state that such textual occurrences of Clinton being surrounded by mothers or talking with mothers implicitly associate her with her own motherhood.

Another worth mentioning context where references to Clinton as a mother were recorded is the context of her husband and her daughter. In contrast to the context of the mothers voters, where the "mother" reference was only implied, in the case of Clinton's husband and daughter her image as a mother was explicitly triggered. One example illustrating the way the "mother" stereotype was generated in the context of Clinton's husband is the following one:

"*Yet as Mr. Clinton recounted his wife's well-chronicled professional accomplishments, he also tried to paint a portrait of a mother who is not as well known. Recounting the day they moved their daughter, Chelsea, into her freshman dorm at Stanford University, Mr. Clinton recounted how Mrs. Clinton kept looking for "one more drawer to put that liner paper in," reluctant to say goodbye to her only child*" (*NYT*, 27 July, 2016).

This presents itself as a rather interesting example intertwining two stereotypes in its two-sentence structure. On the one hand, it touches upon the "wife" stereotype and the intricate relationship between Hillary and her husband, while on the other hand it depicts Clinton as a loving and compassionate mother. It is interesting that the example starts with a reference to an image of a mother which is "*not as well known*". This immediately links to the formerly discussed atypical image of Clinton as a "*cold*" and "*calculating*" political figure. What is even more striking, however, is that it is actually Clinton's husband who promotes a warmer image of her as a mother. Then there is the implication that she is a mother but not a well-known mother and her love and care for her only child need to be promoted by her husband. However, such generalizations cannot be made only on the basis of one single example. The present research contention is that the above example has contradictory implications due to the fact that it touches upon two stereotypes at the same time.

When it comes to occurrences of Clinton's daughter, the references of Clinton as a mother are again evident:

"*Democrats roared with passion and pride as a beaming Mrs. Clinton took the stage after her daughter, Chelsea, introduced her as an American who was inspired by her own mother's impoverished childhood and had faced personal and professional choices that defined generations of women*" (*NYT*, 29 July, 2016).

There are no implications and hidden allusions here, Hillary Clinton is explicitly depicted as a mother in the presence of her daughter and this is one of the very few examples where such a direct reference to the "mother" stereotype was made.

In short, the "mother" gender stereotype was made use of by *NYT* and it built the image of Clinton as a "mother" but in a rather peculiar way. The gender stereotype was not recorded as explicitly recurrent in the newspaper coverage but it was mainly triggered and extracted at a deeper and more connotative level. It was recurrent in several particular contexts and each of them had a specific implication. In the context of Clinton depicting herself as a mother, there were the implications that media portray her as a "*cold*" person and she needs to "*soften*" her image in order to be accepted by people. In the context where Clinton was depicted as surrounded by mothers, her "mother" aspect was distantly alluded to but never explicitly mentioned. In the context of Clinton's husband, there was the interplay of the "wife" stereotype with the "mother" stereotype, leading to contradictory inferences, but still playing the role of highlighting her motherhood. Lastly, in the context of her daughter, Clinton's motherhood was explicitly stated without any conflicting implications. What can be concluded from all these occurrences and consequent implications is that Clinton was depicted as a mother but in an unusual way. She was depicted as a mother through the imagery of other people – her husband, her daughter, and all the other mothers – her voters.

4.5   The "appearance" stereotype – too old and feminine to be president

Before ending the analysis on the gender stereotypes found in the *NYT* articles, some attention should be paid on the least recurrent stereotypes which were recorded throughout the coverage. As stated earlier in this Chapter, the present research is of qualitative nature and numbers here are not as important as meaning and context. Yet, it still makes a difference whether a particular stereotype permeates the newspaper's coverage or just appears now and then. For instance, no comparison can be drawn between the use of the "first" stereotype, which appeared in almost every article, and the "appearance" stereotype, which had only few occurrences altogether. Despite this low number of occurrences, however, the present research will not omit the "appearance" stereotype from its analysis because by leaving it out, it can miss some important meanings and implications which can add to answering the main question of the study. This stereotype had three main representations – mentions of Clinton's age, clothes, and hair. Although at a denotative level of interpretation they all had quite clear functions in the text, at a deeper level of analysis they triggered worth examining implications which certainly added to the overall image of Hillary Clinton.

To begin with, Clinton's age was explicitly made use of throughout the articles by *NYT*. Its main use was in the context of Clinton's pneumonia disease. Since Clinton had some serious problems with her health around two months before the elections, it comes as no surprise that this took a lot of media attention. Moreover, her age was invariably mentioned together with her health problems presenting the picture of an old frail woman who is not suitable for the

presidency. However, this use of the age occurrences cannot be regarded as a representation of a gender stereotype since it concerns her health condition and not a single gender characteristic. For this reason all these age occurrences are going to be left out from the analysis since they do not serve the purpose of the present research which is to look for and analyze gender stereotypes. Yet, they deserve to be mentioned since in a way they built on the "appearance" stereotype by enhancing Clinton's presentation as an old and feeble lady.

Clinton's health, though, was not the only context where her age was mentioned. Several more mentions of her age were recorded throughout the articles and what is most interesting about them is the context where they were used. These references to Clinton's age were used in a context where they did not add to the main idea of the paragraph. One example which is illustrative of this is the following:

"*Declaring that the nation was at "a moment of reckoning," Mrs. Clinton, 68, urged voters to reject the divisive policy ideas and combative politics of the Republican nominee, Donald J. Trump. She offered herself as a steady and patriotic American who would stand up for citizens of all races and creeds and unite the country to persevere against Islamic terrorists, economic troubles, and the chaos of gun violence*" (*NYT*, 29 July, 2016).

When one reads an example like this, one starts wondering why Clinton's age is mentioned in this case when it does not add to the main idea of the sentence at all. The paragraph is about the incompatible difference between Clinton and her Republican opponent, Donald Trump, about her vision for the future US policy, and it does not relate to her health or anything else which requires the mention of her age. What is even more interesting in this example is that it is only Clinton's age which is mentioned while it is the two presidential candidates who are discussed. Thus, it is the present research contention that this use of the age stereotype in a context where it does not add to the main idea of the paragraph only serves to present Clinton as a too old political figure to be the next US president.

Another example which further supports this point is the following one:

"*The photos from the event, with Mrs. Clinton, 68, beaming next to Mr. Castro, 41, turned out so well that cable networks often show the campaign's images of the two together on screen when Mrs. Clinton calls in for phone interviews*" (*NYT*, 20 June, 2016).

Although here it is not only Clinton's age which is mentioned like in the former example, it can be assumed that this reference to Clinton being "*68*" and Mr. Castro being "*41*" serves as some kind of a comparison between the two and in a way highlights her advanced years. Although these can be regarded as only assumptions the fact that her age is mentioned without being necessary for contributing to the main idea of the paragraph cannot be ignored and this certainly has the role of highlighting her advanced years.

Furthermore, apart from the occurrences of Clinton's age in the context of her health and in context where they were not necessary for the building of the main idea of the paragraph, one

more example was recorded which is worth discussing for the purpose of the present research. What is noteworthy about it is that it makes use of two separate stereotypes at the same time. One example is the following:

"*"What does it mean that she's not up to it? It could be 'she's a woman and you know what happens when a woman gets older.'"*
Mrs. Clinton has generally laughed off questions about her fitness, often reminding skeptics that she logged nearly a million miles as secretary of state" (*NYT*, 17 August, 2016).

The most interesting part of this example is that Clinton's age is directly associated with her gender in a way which generates an intentional slight to Clinton's image. It is Kathleen Hall Jamieson, a communications professor at the University of Pennsylvania, who explicitly mocks at Clinton's advanced years and alludes to what the effect of being an "*old*" woman are. Therefore, a woman makes an ill-humoured joke about another woman's age and this leaves one pondering on the hint of what actually happens when "*a woman gets older*", forgetting that this woman in question is actually one of the two possible winners at the presidential elections as well as a former US secretary of state. Although this is in a way reminded later "*she logged nearly a million miles as secretary of state*", it does not sound solid enough but more like Clinton's justifying her health and fitness for the presidency. This only serves to enhance the inference that Clinton's age mentions present her as less suitable for president. Furthermore, the above example makes use of the "woman" stereotype which has the role of highlighting Clinton's gender, thus, presenting her more in light of being a woman than being the US presidential candidate and a former secretary of state. Hence, what can be summarized from the occurrences of Clinton's age in the text is that they all had the implication of highlighting her advanced years. Be it in a context where they were not necessary for the main idea of the paragraph or in a context together with another gender stereotype at play, the age mentions played the function of stressing on Clinton's age and implying that she is too old to be president.

Another representation of the "appearance" stereotype was Clinton's clothes mentions. Although it did make the smallest amount of stereotypes recorded in the overall *NYT* coverage (Clinton's clothes had two mentions altogether), it played role in building Clinton's image. To begin with, the clothes occurrences, in contrast to the age occurrences, did not have any hidden implications. They worked only at a denotative level pointing out Clinton's clothes. However, what is curious is that all these mentions had one thing in common and this was the context in which they were used. One example of a mention of Clinton's clothes is the following:

"*"That's why I'm with her," she added, using Mrs. Clinton's campaign slogan. The artist's backup dancers even wore blue pantsuits, a la Mrs. Clinton*" (*NYT*, 2 November, 2016).

It is evident here that the reference to Clinton's clothes does not have any implications different from its main function – to highlight her way of clothing. What is worth noting, however, is that her clothes are mentioned without necessarily adding to the main idea of the

paragraph. Since the paragraph from where this example was taken describes Beyonce's concert, which was held to rally voters for Clinton, it is deemed unnecessary by the present research to allude to Clinton's way of clothing when talking about a musical performance and stage dancers. When her clothes are mentioned in a context where they are irrelevant to the main idea of the text, they simply work to highlight Clinton's femininity.

Another similar example is the following one:

"*Mrs. Clinton's 1993 interview with The New York Times Magazine, in which she expounded on the "politics of meaning" and her Methodism and New Age beliefs, was met with widespread ridicule. It has often been cited as a reason for Mrs. Clinton's reluctance to discuss her spiritual side. She even resisted wearing white for years after the magazine's cover portrayed her as a saintly figure*" (*NYT*, 29 July, 2016).

Here again Clinton's clothes are mentioned in a context where they are irrelevant. The paragraph discusses Clinton's religion and religious beliefs, thus, it comes as a bit of a surprise that her way of clothing is mentioned at all. The paragraph continues with the health care collapse during her time as a First Lady of US and it is even more questionable why her clothes are mentioned at all in such type of a context. Since it is irrelevant to associate one's religion with one's clothes, especially when the whole context is of a sober tone, it is the present research belief that the only justification for this mention of Clinton's clothes here is the relation between her religion and the "*saintly figure*" which the magazine has attached to her image. However, despite this relation between the two, it is still the present research contention that this mention of Clinton's clothes, similarly to the previously discussed example, is irrelevant to the context and its role is just to stress on her femininity. It is not unreasonable to conclude that when a woman's clothes are mentioned in a context where they do not add to the wholesome idea of the paragraph, they just aim to accentuate her femininity. Hence, what can be concluded from the mentions of Clinton's clothes is that although they made only a very small part of the newspaper coverage, they had the function of highlighting Clinton's gender especially in contexts where this was not needed at all.

Last but not least, besides Clinton's age and clothes, her hair was also mentioned throughout the *NYT* coverage. All these mentions were actually about her "*graying hair*", which makes its examination even more interesting since it touches upon an amalgam of two stereotypes. On the one hand, the mentions of Clinton's "*graying hair*" served to highlight her femininity, since hair and hairstyles are generally associated with women, while on the other hand, they put emphasis on her age, or more specifically, on her advanced age since gray hair is a distinctive feature of old people. Therefore, the mentions of Clinton's hair had the general effect of emphasizing both Clinton's gender and her age. One example which illustrates this is the following:

"*The emails reveal interminable debate on matters both large (such as Mrs. Clinton's splashy June 2015 campaign rollout speech on Roosevelt Island in New York City) and small (such as whether she should make a crack about her graying hair)*" (*NYT*, 11 October, 2016).

What is striking in this example is that it puts on a par the serious issue of Clinton's email controversy and her "*graying hair*". It sounds a bit like derision that a mention of her presidential campaign in New York City is put right next to a reference to her "*graying hair*". Although it might be assumed that the main idea of the sentence is to deliberately generate this derision by comparing the two "*matters*" in order to show how serious the scandal with her emails is and that all kind of information can be found in her email server including even information relating to such trifle issue as her hair, there can be triggered another implication here. There is the implied idea that as long as she is a woman her gender will invariably follow her in all possible forms – be it by directly mentioning her womanhood or by references to her clothes, age, and even "*graying hair*". Furthermore, the equation of her presidential campaign and her hair also has the implication of deprecating the adequateness of her candidacy. When one reads this sentence, one is left with the image of a woman who is worried about her graying hair and not with the image of a political figure capable of dealing with real political issues. This idea is further enhanced by the way the example continues:

"*"More humor, first woman, ass kicker and coloring her hair," Jennifer Palmieri advised, referring to a line in which Mrs. Clinton says she would not have to worry about her hair going gray in the White House*" (*NYT*, 11 October, 2016).

Clinton's hair is again presented as an issue she should worry about which is a direct reference to her femininity. The discrepancy between her presidential candidacy and her gender, or particularly, her "*hair going gray*", is even more explicit here where the allusion to her historic candidacy is put right next to her "*colouring her hair*". This example serves to prove the present research contention that the mentions of Clinton's "*graying hair*" have the function to belittle the seriousness of her candidacy and present her in the light of a woman and not in the light of a possible US president.

Although the "appearance" stereotype did not make a big part of *NYT* coverage, it played an important role in the building of Clinton's image. First, the age mentions highlighted her advanced years and depicted her as too old to be president. Second, the clothes mentions which were only recorded in context where they were not relevant to the main idea of the text rounded off the picture of a woman. Lastly, the mentions of Clinton's "*graying hair*" put the finishing touches to Clinton's image presenting her as a woman in her advanced years who should worry about her graying hair. In short, although these three representations of the "appearance" stereotype were used in different types of context and had different meanings, they all had the same function. They worked to build the image of a woman and not the image of a presidential candidate.

CONCLUSION

The present research tried to find an answer to the question what gender stereotypes were used in Hillary Clinton's media coverage in the presidential elections in 2016 by the national newspaper of record – *The New York Times*. The ultimate goal of the research was to identify what an image she was attached to on the basis of these stereotypes. Since the present research probed into an area which is not much examined, its findings can be regarded as important to the academic field of women in US presidency. The major pieces of research which have extensively examined the area of female presidential candidates in US are the longitudinal studies of Erika Falk (2007, 2010) where she tried to find out if media are gendered and if media present women running for president in a biased and stereotyped way. The findings of her both studies which went back to the very origins of US history in a way overlap with the findings of the present research which examined the presidential elections in 2016. It is interesting to find out that the gender stereotypes which were once present in the media coverage of the very first woman who ran for president of US in 1872 were also recorded in the coverage of another woman who ran for president almost one century and a half later. In Falk's (2007) longitudinal analysis of how media frame women running for US president she ascertained that gender kept being the most conspicuous part of women's coverage (Falk 2007, 151-158). This is also true for the findings of the present research – gender was an inseparable part of the newspaper coverage of Clinton. Be it by highlighting the uniqueness of her candidacy due to her gender, or by explicating her relationship to her husband, thus, presenting her as a wife, or by relating her to trifle issues such as her clothes or graying hair, gender was a conspicuous part of *NYT* coverage.

The similarities between the findings of the research exploring presidential campaigns back to 19th century and the findings of the research examining a candidate running in 21st century do not end here. In her study, Falk (2007) enumerated all the long-held gender stereotypes which she found throughout her research: women's appearance, bodies, clothes, and age, family and relationships, emotionality and tendency to be concerned about trivial matters, as well as a consistent omission of women's professional titles (pp53). All these "long-geld stereotypes" were also recurrent in the framing of Hillary Clinton. A big part of Clinton's depiction was based on her relationship with her husband and although it was not presented as a straightforward relationship where she is her husband's subordinate the essential thing is that she was invariably related to her husband in various ways. Although Clinton's appearance did not make a big part of the newspaper coverage it was still recorded as present and the mentions of her age, clothes, and graying hair had the role to emphasize her femininity and present her as a woman and not a presidential candidate. In short, there is a rather big resemblance between what Falk (2007) found out in her study examining 19th and 20th century and what the present research found exploring a woman running for president in 21st century.

However, despite the striking similarities in the findings, there were also some differences. Yet, this is comprehensible since if two studies differing in the time framework and the subjects which they examine have exactly the same findings, these findings can be considered as futile and the research itself does not add to the academic field of gender and politics. One

main difference is that the consistent omission of women's professional titles which was a recurrent stereotype in the coverage which Falk (2007) analyzed was not a category which was examined in the present research. If the present research had analyzed whether Clinton's titles were present in the NYT coverage this would have contributed to one more complete picture of her image. Hence, this can be considered as a weakness of the present research and can serve as a category to be examined in future research on women presidential candidates in US. Another aspect where the findings of the two researches alter is that Falk's (2007) study found out that the women presidential candidates were persistently depicted as mothers and as ones who had to take care of the family (pp74). It can be claimed that the present research has a similar finding to the extent that it recorded occurrences of Clinton as a mother, however, they are few and most importantly, not explicit. The "mother" gender stereotype was triggered through the use of the imagery of other people – Clinton's husband, daughter, and other mothers – her voters. Thus, it can be concluded that although the "mother" stereotype was present in the newspaper coverage of *NYT* it certainly did not play a major role in the building of Clinton's image presenting her as someone who had to take care of her family. Its function was mainly to accentuate Clinton's gender and present her as an atypical mother.

Another use of the "mother" stereotype which has some important implications is the occurrences where Clinton referred to herself as a mother. Again, these mentions did not make a big part of the newspaper coverage, but they were recorded as present which is noteworthy. The implications of this use of the "mother" stereotype were that Clinton tried to present herself in a stereotypical, thus, more acceptable way to her voters. Then, there was the idea that women political candidates who violate the expected gender roles are condemned by society (Parry-Giles 2014, 20). As Parry-Giles (2014) discussed in her book, Clinton's political image had been framed as "a political intruder violating the protocol of presidential campaigning or as an anomalous candidate's wife rejecting the space of home and domesticity in favor of feminist principles" (pp20) Clinton has been persistently framed as an abnormal woman due to her political ambitions and accomplishments. Then, it comes as no surprise that occurrences where she tried to "soften" her image were recorded in the *NYT* newspaper coverage (*NYT*, 6 November, 2016). Moreover, she has been attached to descriptions such as "*calculating*", "*cold*", or "*aggressive*" (Gardeto 1997, 229; Gidlow 2008, 87). Similar descriptions of Clinton were recorded as present in the coverage of *NYT*: "*a very practical, pragmatic person*" (*NYT*, 29 October, 2016), "*cold*" (*NYT*, 13 October, 2016), "*calculating*" (*NYT*, 23 August, 2016), and "*steely and even hawkish*" (*NYT*, 29 July, 2016). However, the purpose of the present research was to analyze the image of Hillary Clinton based only on the gender stereotypes which were at play in the newspaper coverage, thus, it did not take into consideration other descriptions of Clinton. The research did not code descriptions of Clinton's personality or behaviour as well as general descriptions of her, which can be considered as a weakness of the study since if it had coded and analyzed descriptions of such nature, then it would have ended up with a much more complete image of Clinton relating not only to the active gender stereotypes in her coverage but to all kinds of descriptions of her. This would have certainly contributed to a more thorough and detailed image of her. Then, this can serve as an important note to future studies examining the image of Hillary Clinton where she can be examined not only in terms of the gender stereotypes present in her media

framing but in terms of personal characteristics, behaviour, and all types of descriptions contributing to her overall image.

Another worth mentioning finding of the present research is the "first" stereotype which was the most persistently used one in the *NYT* coverage. According to its original definition its use is to de-normalize women who have previously run for presidency by framing every next woman running for president as "first", thus, effacing the ones who already did (Falk 2007, 35). Part of the "first" stereotype which was recorded and analyzed in the present research resembled this definition, however, its main function in the text was different. The "first" stereotype in *NYT* coverage in 2016 presented Clinton as a unique and historic candidate due to her gender. This most recurrent stereotype served to build the image of a historic figure who is exceptional due to her gender. Although some of the implications of the "first" stereotype served to degrade Clinton's political achievements and present her as unique mainly in light of her gender, and although sometimes the persistent use of the "first woman in history" triggered the idea that she is actually the first in history who has run for president and this is factually inaccurate, as a whole the stereotype built the overall image of Clinton as an exceptional and unique candidate who is outstanding due to her gender and not due to what she has achieved in politics. Although the "first" stereotype has been recorded as present in previous research (Falk 2007, 2010) and it is not the first time it has been used in the media coverage of a woman running for president, what is distinct in this case is that it was used as main foundation in the building of Clinton's image as depicted by *NYT*.

As already discussed, gender was an integral part in the depiction of Hillary Clinton. This is not surprising since a lot of previous research indicates that women in politics are depicted in terms of gender stereotypes (Anderson 2002, Dolan 2914, Falk 2007, Falk 2010, Gidlow 2011). Moreover, a big part of academic literature on Hillary Clinton points out that she is usually depicted in terms of gender stereotypes (Edwards 2011, Gardetto 1997, Gidlow 2011, Parry-Giles 2014) What is important here, however, is to elaborate on why gender stereotypes still play such a big role for women in politics. It can be claimed that in the past, when women did not have many rights and women's advancement and empowerment were far from where they are now, it was more plausible for a woman to be presented mainly in terms of her gender. The question is why in 2016 when women are considered equal to men, when they have equal rights and hold the same offices as men, when they receive similar salaries and run for higher political offices, a woman running for president in the country considered the most democratic one in the world is presented as an exceptional and historic candidate because of her gender. She is called a "*historic candidate*" because she is a woman and not because she has forty years of political experience and political titles such as US senator, US secretary of state, or US first lady. Then, the only reasonable explanation for this can be found in what Parry-Giles (2014) describes as "the ultimate of masculine spaces" (pp197). According to her a US presidential contest is "the ultimate of masculine spaces [which] no woman had successfully traversed before" (pp197). Then, if the US presidential elections are considered the main pillar of the masculine political world, it is no surprise that when a woman enters this space she will be mainly presented in terms of her gender in the masculine space. Yet, another reason might be that Clinton has been subjected to persistent stereotyping sometimes

bordering to misogyny throughout the years (Gidlow 2008, 70). Then, again, it should not be striking that at a moment when she runs for US president this stereotyping is an integral part of the way she is presented. Last but not least, in might be the reason that despite all the years of gradual women's empowerment women are still regarded inferior to men in some areas of public life, specifically, in the political world. Then, despite the centuries of fighting for women rights and recognition, women still face challenges in combating gender stereotypes in elections (Dolan 2014, 3). Then, it can be concluded that Hillary Clinton was presented as a woman first and foremost during the presidential elections in 2016 just because she is a woman and no matter her political achievements her gender will be invariably highlighted. Just like Dolan (2014) concludes that "a woman candidate is a woman first and that being a woman shapes her candidacy and this proves what an essential role women's sex plays" (pp8), the present research can conclude that Clinton was presented "a woman first" and this is where all other interpretations stem from.

The present research findings can serve as foundation for future research delving into the ways Clinton is framed by media in terms of gender stereotypes by comparing the ways she was framed during her presidential campaign in 2008 and in 2016. For the sake of a more complete picture of the ways she was depicted, more media outlets could be analyzed such as the five daily newspapers in US. Another interesting future research which can add to the academic field of gender and politics can be a comparison between the ways women running for president in different countries are framed. For example, a research comparing the ways Angela Merkel is depicted in this year's elections in Germany with the ways Hillary Clinton was framed in the presidential elections in 2016 by several US media outlets can be conducted. Such a kind of research encompassing more than one country can certainly benefit the academic area examining gender and politics. Last but not least, for the sake of a complete picture of the ways "first" women in US are depicted, a longitudinal research tracing the media coverage of women who have been previously considered as "first" can be conducted. In this way more light will be shed on whether such "first" women tend to be presented as unique and historic due to their gender, like Clinton was.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Karrin. 'The first lady: A site of 'American Womanhood.' In *Inventing a Voice: The Rhetoric of American First Ladies of the Twentieth Century*. Edited by Molly Meijer Wertheimer, 2004.

Anderson, Karrin. 'From spouses to candidates: Hillary Rodham Clinton, Elizabeth Dole, and the gendered office of U.S. president.' Rhetoric & Public Affairs, Vol. 5, No. 1, 105-132, 2002.

Anselmi, Dina L., and Anne L. Law. *Questions of gender: perspectives and paradoxes*. Boston: McGraw-Hill, 6th ed., 1998.

Baker, Paula. 'The Domestication of Politics: Women and American Political Society, 1780-1920.' Oxford University Press, Vol. 89, No. 3, 620-647, 1984.

Bem, Sandra. 'Gender schema theory and self-schema theory compared: A comment on Markus, Crane, Bernstein, and Siladi's "Self-schemas and gender"'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 43, No. 6, 1192-1194, 1982.

Biernat, Monica and Diane Kobrynowicz. 'A shifting standards perspective on the complexity of gender stereotypes and gender stereotyping.' 1999.

Bordalo, Pedro, Nicola Gennaioli, and Andrei Shleifer. 'Stereotypes.', Cambridge, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2014.

Callaghan, Karen, Frauke Schnell, and Robert Entman. *Framing American Politics*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 2005.

Campus, Donatella. *Women Political Leaders and the Media*, 2013.

Carlin, Diana B. & Kelly L. Winfrey. 'Have you come a long way, baby? Hillary Clinton, Sarah Palin and sexism in 2008 campaign coverage.' Communication Studies, Vol. 60, No. 4, 326–343, 2009.

Charmaz, Kathy. *Constructing Grounded Theory. A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. SAGE Publications, 2006.

Cho, J. Y. and Eun-Hee Lee. 'Reducing Confusion about Grounded Theory and Qualitative Content Analysis: Similarities and Differences.' *The Qualitative Report*, 19(32), 1-20, 2014.

Cramer, Kenneth, Erin Million, and Lynna Perreault. 'Perceptions of Musicians: Gender stereotypes and social role theory.' Psychology of Music, 164-174, 2002.

Corcoran, Mayia. 'Evaluating the Negative Impact of Gender Stereotypes on Women's Advancement in Organizations.' 2009.

Curnalia, Rebecca, and Dorian Mermerhe. 'The "Ice Queen" Melted and It Won Her the Primary: Evidence of Gender Stereotypes and the Double Bind in News Frames of Hillary Clinton's "Emotional Moment."' *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication*, Vol. 15, No. 1, 26–32, 2014.

Davis, Kathy, Mary Evans & Judith Lorber. *Handbook of Gender and Women's Studies*, 2006.

Dolan, Kathleen. *When does gender matter? Women Candidates and Gender Stereotypes in American Elections*, 2014.

Dolan, Kathleen. 'Gender Stereotypes, Candidate Evaluations, and Voting for Women Candidates: What Really Matters?' Political Research Quarterly, 2013.

Dubriwny, Tasha N. 'Feminist for president: Hillary Clinton, feminism, and the 2008 Democratic primaries.' Women & Language, 36(2), 35-56, 2013.

Edrwards, Janis. 'The 2008 Gendered Campaign and the Problem with "Hillary Studies"'. Rhetoric & Public Affairs, Vol. 14, No. 1, 155–168, 2011.

Edwards, Rebecca. *Angels in the Machinery: Gender in American Party Politics from the Civil War to the Progressive Era*, 1997.

Entman, Robert. 'Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm.' Northwestern University, 1993.

Entman, Robert, Jorg Matthes, and Lynn Pellicano. 'Nature, Sources, and Effects of News Framing.' In *The Handbook of Journalism Studies*, 2009.

Falk, Erika. *Women for President: Media Bias in Eight Campaigns*, 2007.

Falk, Erika. 'Gender Bias and Maintenance: The Press Coverage of Senator Hillary Clinton's Announcement to Seek the White House.' In *Gender and Political Communication in America: Rhetoric, Representation, and Display*. Edited by Janis L. Edwards, 2009.

Falk, Erika. *Women for President - Media Bias in Nine Campaigns*, 2010.

Fiske, S. T., Lin, M., & Neuberg, S. L. 'The continuum model: Ten years later', 1999.

Gardetto, D. G. 'Hillary Rodham Glinton, symbolic gender politics, and the New York Times: January-November 1992.' Political Communication, 14, 225-240, 1997.

Gidlow, Liette Patricia. *Obama, Clinton, Palin: Making History in Election 2008*, 2011.

Glaser, Barney and Anselm Strauss. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory. Strategies for Qualitative Research*. University of California San Francisco Medical Center, 1967.

Graber, Doris. *The Power of Communication: Managing Information In Public Organizations*, 2002.

Jamieson, Kathleen Hall. *Eloquence in an Election Age: The Transformation of Political Speechmaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Jamieson, Kathleen Hall. *Beyond the double bind. Women and Leadership*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Hallahan, Kirk. 'Seven models of framing: Implications for public relations.' Journal of Public Relations Research, Vol. 11, Issue 3, 205-242, 1999.

Healey, Justin. 'Sexual orientation and gender identity.' Thirroul, N.S.W. Spinney Press, 2014.

Holman, Mirya R. *Women in Politics in the American City*, 2015.

Houghton, Stephanie. 'Researching the Stereotypes of People Around Me: An Introductory Thesis Writing Course for International Students.' Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014.

Hsieh, H.F. and Shannon, S. E. 'Three approaches to qualitative content analysis.' Qualitative Health Research, 15(9), 1277-1288, 2005.

Hudak, Mary. 'Gender schema theory revisited: men's stereotypes of American women', 1993.

Huddy, Leonie and Nadya Terkildsen. 'Gender Stereotypes and the Perception of Male and Female Candidates.' American Journal of Political Science, Vol. 37, No. 1, 119-147, 1993.

Kahn, Kim. *The political consequences of being a woman: How stereotypes influence the conduct and consequences of political campaigns*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.

Lawless, Jennifer, and Richard Fox. *It Still Takes a Candidate: Why Women Don't Run for Office*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Lim, Elvin. 'Gendered metaphors of women in power: the case of Hillary Clinton as madonna, unruly woman, bitch and witch.' In *Politics, Gender, and Conceptual Metaphor*. Edited by Kathleen Aherns. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2009.

Lippmann, Walter. *Public opinion*. New York: Free Press, 1922.

Macrae, Neil, Charles Stangor, and Miles Hewstone. *Stereotyping & Stereotypes*. 1996.

Major, Lesa & Renita Coleman. 'The Intersection of Race and Gender in Election Coverage: What Happens When the Candidates Don't Fit the Stereotypes?'. Howard Journal of Communications, 19:4, 315-333, 2008.

McDowell, Linda. 'Spatializing Feminism: Geographic Perspectives.' In *Bodyspace: Destabilizing Geographies of Gender and Sexuality*. Edited by Nancy Duncan. Routledge, 28-44, 1996.

Murphy, Mary, and Valerie Taylor. 'The role of situational cues in signaling and maintaining stereotype threat.' In *Stereotype Threat: Theory, Process, and Application*. Oxford Scholarship Online, 2012.

Palczewski, Catherine H. 'The Male Madonna and the Feminine Uncle Sam: Visual Argument, Icons, and Ideographs in 1990 Anti-Woman Suffrage Postcards.' Quarterly Journal of Speech, 365-394, 2005.

Palomares, Nicholas. 'Gender schematicity, gender identity salience, and gender-linked language use.' Human Communication Research, Vol. 30 No. 4, 556–588, 2004.

Parry-Giles, Shawn J. *Hillary Clinton in the News: Gender and Authenticity in American Politics*, 2014.

Pearson, Joanna and Donna Rouner. 'The 2008 elections and the role of gender among young voters.' Journal of Civil Rights and Economic Development, Issue 2, Vol. 24, 2009.

Sanbonmatsu, Kira. 'Political Knowledge and Gender Stereotypes.' American Politics Research 31, No. 6 (2003): 575-594, 2003.

Wood, Julia. *Gendered lives: Communication, Gender, and Culture*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Inc., 1994.

http://www.cityam.com/234274/us-presidential-election-2016-bookies-slash-odds-on-donald-trump-to-become-next-president-after-winning-new-hampshire-primary, 10-02-2016.

http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/current-numbers, 01-2017

http://edition.cnn.com/2016/07/26/politics/democratic-convention-roll-call-day-two/,27-07-2016.

https://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/27/us/politics/dnc-speakers-sanders-clinton.html?_r=0,26-07-2016.