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The Distorted Mirror: Press Coverage of Women Candidates for Statewide Office

Kim Fridkin Kahn
Arizona State University

Voters see the political landscape largely through the eyes of the news media. In races for statewide office, where direct contact with politicians is rare, citizens receive most of their news about the campaign from state newspapers. Voters' dependence on the press for political information may be problematic for women running for office. A content analysis of newspaper coverage in 47 statewide campaigns between 1982 and 1988 shows that the press differentiate between male and female candidates in their campaign coverage. These differences are more dramatic in U.S. Senate races, but the differences are still evident in gubernatorial contests. In senatorial races, women receive less campaign coverage than their male counterparts and the coverage they receive is more negative—emphasizing their unlikely chances of victory. In both senatorial and gubernatorial races, women receive consistently less issue attention than their male counterparts. Furthermore, the news media seem more responsive to the messages sent by male candidates. The media's agenda more closely resembles the agenda issued by male candidates in their televised political advertisements. These systematic differences in press treatment of male and female candidates may hinder women as they strive for statewide elective office.

Most people do not experience politics directly. Instead, their perceptions of the political world are shaped largely by the news media's representations. Yet because many significant events take place daily and news organizations cannot cover all of these events, newspeople must be selective. As a result of this selectivity, the news media shape, rather than mirror, the political landscape. The news media's ability to shape political reality is especially potent during electoral campaigns where citizens rely almost exclusively on the media for their political information. In this paper, I examine how accurately the news media represent the candidates they cover by looking at whether the news media treat male and female candidates differently. If the media differentiate between male and female candidates in their coverage of campaigns, this difference may influence the decisions of voters.
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The media may cover male and female candidates differently for a number of reasons. First, gender differences in news coverage may reflect stereotypes newspeople hold about male and female candidates. So, for instance, reporters may stress a female candidate’s compassion, while emphasizing a male candidate’s competence because reporters, like other voters, may believe that certain personality traits are more characteristic of women, while other traits are more characteristic of men (see Gallup 1984; National Women’s Political Caucus 1987; Sapiro 1982, for evidence of sex stereotyping among voters).

Second, differences in news coverage of male and female candidates may be driven by organizational incentives active in news organizations. Like other organizations, news organizations use standard operating procedures and rules to make their reporting more efficient (e.g., Epstein 1973; Sigal 1973). For instance, newswomen rely on “standards of newsworthiness” when selecting among various potential news items, and one of these standards is novelty. Since women candidates are relatively rare, reporters and editors may view them as especially newsworthy, and therefore women may receive more news attention than their male counterparts.

Finally, gender differences in news coverage of male and female candidates may reflect differences in the campaign strategies of men and women. Men and women may conduct their campaigns differently, and gender differences in press coverage may simply mirror these differences. In this paper, I test whether gender differences in press patterns reflect differences in the campaigns of men and women candidates by comparing the content of news coverage with the content of the candidates’ own campaign communications.

Relying on theories of voting, we can speculate about how gender differences in news presentations influence people’s voting decisions. First, an important criteria for vote choice in electoral campaigns is recognition of the opposing candidates. Although candidate recognition is not an issue at the presidential level, it can be consequential in subpresidential contests where candidates are less widely known (see Goldenberg and Traugott 1984; Mann and Wolfinger, 1980). Since variations in the quantity of news coverage can influence recognition rates (Goldenberg and Traugott 1984; Goldenberg and Traugott 1987), gender differences in the amount of press attention can have important electoral consequences. For example, if women receive less coverage than men, then voters may be less likely to recognize women candidates and voters may therefore be less likely to support women candidates at the polls.

After recognition has been achieved, a candidate still needs to be positively evaluated. Evaluations of candidates can be influenced by these four factors: (1) the voter’s party identification (e.g., Campbell, Converse, Miller, and Stokes 1960; Markus and Converse 1979); (2) evaluations of the candidates’ issue stands (e.g., Markus and Converse 1979; Page and Jones 1979); (3) evaluations of the candidates’ personality (e.g., Markus 1982); and (4) assessments of the candidates’ viability (e.g., Bartels 1987; Brady and Johnston 1987). Media coverage of
campaigns can influence each of these dimensions of candidate evaluation. Therefore, if the news media differentiate between male and female candidates in their campaign coverage of issues, party, traits, and the horserace, these differences may influence people's impressions of male and female candidates. For instance, if the press focus more extensively on policy matters for male candidates, voters may come to believe that male candidates are more knowledgeable about issues than their female counterparts. Similarly, if the coverage of the horserace is more pervasive and more negative for women candidates, then people may develop more negative impressions of women candidates.

Gender differences in news coverage are unlikely to be equally consequential in all electoral contests. Instead, because the influence of the news media grows with the size of the constituency (Goldenberg and Traugott 1984; Goldenberg and Traugott 1987), gender differences in news coverage are potentially more important in national and statewide elections than in local contests. In particular, in statewide races for governor and U.S. Senate because of the good “media market fit” (Goldenberg and Traugott 1987) and the competitiveness of these contests (Abramowitz 1980; Jacobson 1987; Pireson 1977; Sabato 1983; Westye 1983), media coverage is more prevalent and gender differences in news attention may be important.

Although both gubernatorial and senatorial races are likely to generate more press coverage than local contests, the two offices differ in a number of important ways that may influence patterns of news coverage. First, press coverage may differ because the relevant issue domains for the two offices differ. While U.S. senators deal with foreign policy and national security issues along with other issues of national and international consequence (Sabato 1983; Stein 1990), governors deal more extensively with statewide concerns such as education and health (Sabato 1983; Seroka 1980; Tidmarsh, Hyman, and Sorkin 1984). These two alternative issue domains correspond to the stereotypical strengths of male and female candidates. Female candidates are viewed as more competent at dealing with education, health, and environmental issues, while men are considered better able to deal with foreign policy and defense issues (e.g., Gallup 1984; National Women's Political Caucus 1987; Sapiro 1982). Given these alternative issue domains and corresponding stereotypes, news coverage patterns may be different for these two offices.

Similarly, differential rates of success for women candidates in U.S. Senate and gubernatorial campaigns may influence news coverage patterns. Women have been about four times as successful in winning governorships than winning seats in the U.S. Senate, and this significant difference in success rates for these two offices may influence press coverage of these statewide campaigns. Since women can stress their stereotypical strengths in races for governor, and because they are more successful at winning governorships, news coverage of female gubernatorial candidates may be more favorable than news coverage of female senate candidates.
Given the differences between these two statewide offices, I will examine gender differences in campaign coverage of both senatorial and gubernatorial elections.

DATA AND METHODS

To investigate whether the news media differentiate between male and female candidates in their campaign coverage—and whether the magnitude of these differences varies in gubernatorial and senatorial races—I examine campaign coverage in 47 statewide races. If the news media do distinguish between male and female candidates in their coverage, these differences may reflect alternative campaign strategies of male and female candidates. To examine this possibility, I compare press coverage of the campaigns with the candidates' own political advertisements.

Sample of Races

The data reported here are drawn from a content analysis of newspaper coverage of 26 U.S. Senate races and 21 gubernatorial races between 1982 and 1988.\(^1\) The choice of these years maximizes the number of women candidates selected and avoids extending back so many years that coverage patterns no longer represent current practice.\(^2\) To draw the sample of races, the populations of U.S. Senate and gubernatorial races were stratified by the type of race and the competitiveness of the race.\(^3\) Each type of race was divided into one of seven types: (1) Male Incumbent v. Female Challenger, (2) Male Incumbent v. Male Challenger, (3) Female Incumbent v. Male Challenger, (4) Female Incumbent v. Female Challenger, (5) Male v. Male in an Open Race, (6) Male v. Female in an Open Race, and (7) Female v. Female in an Open Race. The competitiveness of the race was measured by final vote return; competitive races were those where winners won less than 65% of the vote, and noncompetitive races were those where the winner's share of the vote was at least 65%. The stratification of races by these two variables yielded 14 possible categories of races. For each of these categories, three races were randomly selected for analysis, if available.\(^4\)

---

1. Only general election races between two major party candidates have been included in the sample. The news media may also be influential in nomination campaigns because voters have little information about the competing candidates, and they cannot rely on party as a cue when voting. Yet primary campaigns receive significantly less press attention than general election campaigns. For example, Goldberg and Traugott (1987), in their study of senate elections, find that general election campaigns receive twice as much coverage as primary campaigns.

2. To increase the number of competitive races with female candidates, three additional races were included in the sample: the 1982 U.S. Senate races in Missouri and New Jersey and the 1983 Kentucky race for governor.

3. The senatorial and gubernatorial races were sampled separately.

4. For some categories of races, three races did not exist. In these instances, all available races were included. For example, there is only one competitive race with a female incumbent facing a male challenger (Type 3) in the population of U.S. Senate races (1982–1988), so this single race is included in the sample.
The newspapers chosen for analysis were whenever possible those with the largest circulation in the state. These major newspapers were chosen because of their potential impact on large numbers of people in the state. Yet the largest papers, because they are more professional, may be less likely than smaller papers to differentiate between male and female candidates in their coverage, and therefore the present sample may underrepresent gender differences in news patterns. For the content analysis of news coverage, every day from September 1 through the day of the election was analyzed. Any item in the newspaper that mentioned either candidate was considered, including news articles, columns, editorials, and "news analysis" articles.

Choice of News Medium

Newspapers were chosen for analysis for both substantive and practical reasons. On the substantive side, there is considerable evidence that newspapers carry more information about state-level campaigns than local television news (Goldenberg and Traugott 1987; Westlye 1991), and that people receive more information about statewide races from newspapers than from television (Clarke and Fredin 1978). Furthermore, Westlye (1991) explains that, compared with local broadcast news, "newspapers present an amount of information that more closely approximates what campaigns are issuing" (45). On the practical side, newspapers are routinely saved on microfilm, making them easily accessible for analysis. In contrast, tapes of local television news are seldom available after a campaign, which makes the examination of television news much more difficult.

Development of Coding Scheme

 Voting theories from political science as well as psychological theories regarding sex stereotyping guided the development of the content analysis codesheet. To begin, news characteristics known to be significant for electoral success were analyzed. As an example, we know that people's evaluations of a candidate's viability can influence their overall evaluations of the candidate and, ultimately, their vote decisions (Bartels 1987; Brady and Johnston 1987). Because newspeople may view female candidates as less viable than male candidates, the discussion of a female candidate's viability may be more extensive (and more negative). To explore this possible gender difference in news coverage, the content analysis examined the

---

5 The largest circulating newspapers in Texas and Colorado could not be obtained so the state papers with the second largest circulation (The Houston Post and The Denver Post) were analyzed instead. A complete listing of the sample of races and the corresponding newspapers is available upon request.

6 In those cases where the state primary was held after September 1, coding began the day after the primary.
amount of horserace coverage each candidate received as well as the press's assessment of the candidate's viability.\textsuperscript{7}

Second, given past research on sex stereotyping, we expect news coverage of male and female candidates to vary in systematic ways. For instance, we know that people believe that male and female candidates are competent in alternative issue areas. Male candidates, for example, are considered better able to deal with foreign policy, while females are considered better equipped to deal with issues related to education (e.g., Gallup 1984; Sapiro 1982). Since reporters and editors may hold these stereotypes and may reflect these views in their coverage of candidates, the content analysis examined the substance of issue coverage for male and female candidates.\textsuperscript{8}

If gender differences in news coverage exist, they may be driven by reality, sex stereotypes, or by the standard operating procedures employed by news organizations. Yet regardless of the cause, gender differences in news attention can influence people's perceptions of male and female candidates and eventual vote choice.\textsuperscript{9}

\textit{Political Advertisements of Candidates}

In addition to the data on press coverage, I have also analyzed the candidates' own campaign advertisements.\textsuperscript{10} Because they are completely controlled by the candidate and the candidate's campaign, political advertisements represent the candidate's own "presentation of self" (Kaid and Davidson 1986). By examining the spot advertisements, we can look at what the candidates choose to emphasize in their campaigns.\textsuperscript{11} In addition, by comparing the candidates' television

\textsuperscript{7} The coding for the newspaper content analysis was done by the author and two research assistants (who were unaware of the purpose of the study). Intercoder reliability was assessed at random intervals during the coding process. Intercoder agreement averaged 92\% with agreement never falling below 85\% and reaching as high as 100\% for some content categories.

\textsuperscript{8} A copy of the content analysis codesheet is available upon request.

\textsuperscript{9} Although survey work has failed to find a consistent gender bias in voting (e.g., Darcy, Welch, and Clark 1987), this work has focused almost exclusively on local races for the U.S. House and state legislative offices. Yet the gender of the candidate may play a more powerful role in statewide races where the news media and candidate-centered characteristics are more influential and other factors, like incumbency, are less important (e.g., Abramowitz 1988; Goldenberg and Traugott 1987).

\textsuperscript{10} I have selected television political advertisements for analysis instead of newspaper advertisements because television ads are considered significantly more effective in swaying voters' opinions and they are used much more frequently during statewide and national campaigns (Goldenberg and Traugott 1984; Jacobson 1987; Lutz 1988). Goldenberg and Traugott (1987) report, for example, that more than half of all campaign expenditures are devoted to the production and placement of television advertisements in senate campaigns.

\textsuperscript{11} The author coded all commercials in the sample. To ensure the reliability of the coding, two checks were performed. First, I coded a sample of articles twice—once at the start of the coding process and once near the end. This reliability check revealed that coding remained stable; reliability coefficients were greater than 98\% on most measures, never falling below 94\%. Second, intercoder reliability was checked by having a coder unfamiliar with the objectives of the study analyze a random sample of political ads. Intercoder agreement for this sample of ads averaged 96\%.}
commercials with the press coverage of the campaign, we can look at the correspondence between the candidate's message and the news media's message. Advertisements were analyzed for 72% of the candidates included in the newspaper analysis; the sample includes 693 advertisements for 68 candidates.

RESULTS

Quantity of Campaign News

Media treatment of male and female candidates may differ in a number of important ways, but one potentially important difference is the sheer quantity of news coverage. First, as discussed earlier, standards of newsworthiness (Epstein 1973; Graber 1989) may lead reporters and editors to consider female candidates as especially newsworthy. Female candidates may therefore receive more press attention than their male counterparts. On the other hand, if newspeople hold certain stereotypes that lead them to view women as less viable, women candidates may actually receive less news coverage.

The results of the content analysis of news coverage suggest that women candidates do receive less press attention, but only in races for the U.S. Senate. While more than 95 paragraphs about male U.S. Senate candidates are published each week, fewer than 79 paragraphs a week are written about the senatorial campaigns of women candidates. This gender difference in the amount of news coverage occurs in both competitive and noncompetitive races. Similarly, the gender difference in news attention is not a mere reflection of status differences for men and women; female Senate candidates continue to receive less coverage than their male counterparts, regardless of their status as incumbents, challengers, or candidates in open races. In contrast, women do not consistently receive less coverage in gubernatorial races than their male counterparts. Overall, 113 paragraphs a week are written about both male and female gubernatorial candidates.

12 In drawing these comparisons, we must remain cautious since we are comparing two different mediums, each with its own unique characteristics and constraints (Epstein 1973; Sigal 1973). For example, the nature of the television medium places a premium on simple messages with interesting visuals while longer, more complicated messages can be presented more effectively in print.

13 The correspondence between the sample of races included in the news analysis and the sample of races included in the political ad analysis is not perfect because (1) some of the candidates examined in the newspaper study did not use televised spot ads and (2) televised spot ads could not be obtained for all the candidates in the newspaper study. The political ads for this study were provided by the Political Commercial Archive at the University of Oklahoma.

14 The candidate—as opposed to the race—is the unit of analysis for all of the analyses in this article.

15 This difference is not statistically significant (p < .10). Although the sample of candidates examined here does not represent a random sample from a larger population, statistical tests have been provided since the candidates can be conceptualized as a sample representing a larger theoretical population of candidates.

16 For data analysis, races are divided into two levels of competitiveness based on preelection ratings published in the Congressional Quarterly special election issue. Preelection ratings are used instead of
These results suggest that voters may have a more difficult time acquiring information about female senatorial candidates as opposed to female gubernatorial candidates. This lack of available information may result in an electoral disadvantage for women candidates running for the U.S. Senate. Since the quantity of news coverage is positively related to voters’ recognition of candidates (Goldenberg and Traugott 1984), and since voters are unlikely to vote for a candidate whom they do not recognize (Jacobson 1987), voters may be less willing to vote for women candidates in senate campaigns.

Substance of Campaign News

News coverage of campaigns not only affects candidate recognition rates, but also determines the quality of information available to potential voters. By examining the substance of news coverage in statewide elections, we can see what people are likely to learn during campaigns. If the substance of news coverage varies with the gender of the candidate, then the voting calculus used by citizens is also likely to vary for male and female candidates.

Horserace Coverage in the News. Since assessments of a candidate’s issue positions, traits, and viability all influence voting decisions (e.g., Bartels 1987; Brady and Johnston 1987; Markus 1982; Markus and Converse 1979; Page and Jones 1979), news information about these evaluation dimensions are likely to influence vote choice. Turning first to viability concerns, reporters and editors may hold certain stereotypes regarding the electability of women candidates. In particular, because female candidates have traditionally been less viable than their male counterparts, the press may focus more intensely on horserace issues (e.g., who is ahead or behind in the polls, who has the stronger campaign organization) when covering women for statewide office. Although women are less likely than men to win their senatorial and gubernatorial contests, women Senate candidates have been far less successful than women gubernatorial candidates.17 Given the poorer performance of female senatorial candidates, the gender difference in horserace emphasis may be more impressive in senatorial contests than in gubernatorial contests.

The results of the content analysis shows that in U.S. Senate campaigns, the press does focus more extensively on the horserace when covering female candidates. Twenty-seven percent of all articles written about female U.S. Senate candidates discuss the horserace, while only 21% of the articles about male candidates

the final vote tally because these preelection ratings are likely to represent the electoral environment that reporters are representing in their coverage of the campaigns. The final vote tally, on the other hand, may not correspond to the actual competitiveness of the campaign. Preelection ratings and the final vote tally are highly correlated: there is a 90% correspondence between the final vote and CQ preelection ratings for this sample of races.

17Between 1970 and 1988, only 11% of all female candidates for U.S. senator were elected while almost four times as many (40%) female gubernatorial candidates were successful.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Senate Races</th>
<th>Gubernatorial Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Candidates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Candidates</td>
<td>21%***</td>
<td>(5,708;40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Candidates</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>(1,378;12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competitive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Candidates</td>
<td>22%*</td>
<td>(4,271;26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Candidates</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>(847;6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noncompetitive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Candidates</td>
<td>17%**</td>
<td>(1,437;14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Candidates</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>(531;6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incumbents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21%**</td>
<td>(1,954;15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>(254;2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challengers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19%**</td>
<td>(1,606;11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>(602;6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open-Race Candidates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>(2,148;14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>(522;4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Horserace coverage includes any discussion of a candidate’s chances of winning, including comparisons of the candidates’ organizations, discussion of poll results, and discussion of the candidates’ performance in campaign debates. Entries are the percentage of articles devoted to the horserace with the number of articles coded for each candidate type and the number of candidates in parentheses.

*The p-value is based on the difference in proportions test: **indicates p < .01, *indicates p < .05.

mention horserace issues (see table 1). While the magnitude of this gender difference is not great, these differences are remarkably consistent and occur for all types of senatorial candidates, women in competitive and noncompetitive races receive more horserace coverage than their male counterparts, as do female incumbents, challengers, and females running in open races.

As expected, gender differences in horserace coverage do not occur in gubernatorial contests. The print media do not differentiate between male and female candidates when discussing horserace issues in gubernatorial campaigns. Fifteen percent of all articles about gubernatorial candidates, regardless of the sex of the candidate, focus on the horserace.

Since voters are exposed to more horserace information for female U.S. Senate candidates, voters may weigh viability concerns more heavily when developing overall evaluations of these candidates (Iyengar and Kinder 1987). But the
TABLE 2
PRESS ASSESSMENTS OF THE CANDIDATE’S VIABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Senate Races</th>
<th>Gubernatorial Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (S.D)*</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Candidates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Candidates</td>
<td>3.1 (0.64)*c</td>
<td>971;40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Candidates</td>
<td>2.5 (0.88)</td>
<td>289;12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incumbents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.5 (0.42)*</td>
<td>351;15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.7 (0.67)</td>
<td>49;2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challengers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.4 (0.61)*</td>
<td>252;11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.1 (0.61)</td>
<td>28;6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open-Race Candidates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.9 (0.45)</td>
<td>368;14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.0 (0.46)</td>
<td>112;4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9 (0.76)*</td>
<td>272;15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 (0.63)</td>
<td>110;5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Press viability assessments were rated on a four-point scale where 4 denotes “likely winner,” 3 denotes “competitive,” 2 denotes “somewhat competitive,” and 1 denotes “sure loser.”

*Entries are mean viability assessments by the press with the standard deviation in parentheses.

Entries are the number of articles that mention the candidates’ viability, followed by the number of candidates.

The p-value is based on the t-statistic: *indicates p < .01.

actual content of the horserace information is also consequential. If male and female candidates receive the same amount of horserace coverage (as they do in gubernatorial races), and if the content of this information is more negative for female candidates, then subsequent evaluations of these candidates may also be negative.18

If reporters are informed by the historical experience of women candidates, then horserace coverage may be more negative for women candidates and especially for women candidates for U.S. Senate.19 The data presented in table 2 show that women do receive more negative viability assessments than their male counterparts, but these differences are both substantively and statistically more impressive in senatorial elections. For example, in senatorial races women are more

18 The importance of voters’ viability assessments for overall evaluations of candidates and eventual vote choice has been documented for presidential primary voting (Bartels 1987; Brady and Johnston 1987). Because information levels are low in statewide general elections, like presidential primaries, viability assessments may be an important component of overall candidate evaluations in these statewide contests.

19 To test this proposition, every press assessment of a candidate’s viability was rated on a scale from 1 to 4 with 1 indicating “sure loser,” 2 indicating “somewhat competitive,” 3 indicating “competitive,” and 4 indicating “likely winner.”
likely to be described as "somewhat competitive" (2.5) in their bids for election while men are usually considered "competitive" (3.1).20

Although women candidates in U.S. Senate races generally receive less favorable press ratings, this pattern does not hold for open races. In these non-incumbent races, male and female U.S. Senate candidates receive approximately the same viability ratings, while women candidates in gubernatorial races are viewed as somewhat less viable than their male counterparts. Since most women candidates for governor run in open races, and since women senatorial candidates rarely compete in these contests, the disadvantage in press assessments in gubernatorial campaigns may be electorally significant.21

The news media differentiate between men and women in their reporting of the horserace. Perhaps because they are relying on the historical experience of women candidates, reporters focus on viability issues when covering female candidates. This is especially the case for female senatorial candidates, and the characterization of the horserace discussion is usually more negative for these female candidates. Given these patterns of findings, voters who look to the news media for information may come to believe that women candidates are less electable, and they may be less likely to vote for these candidates.

Press Coverage of Issues. Citizens think about policy considerations, in addition to the candidates' viability, when evaluating competing candidates for statewide office (e.g., Abramowitz 1981; Hinckley, Hofstetter, and Kessel 1974; Wright and Berkman 1986). Because of its control over campaign information, the news media can influence the significance of issues during elections (e.g., Iyengar and Kinder 1987; MacKuen 1981). Attention to issues in the news may vary for male and female candidates, with reporters discussing policy less frequently for female candidates because viability concerns may take priority. We expect this to be the case in U.S. Senate races. If attention to policy issues is different for male and female candidates, then the public's ability to become informed may vary with the gender of the candidate. As the data in table 3 show, journalists do distinguish between male and female candidates in their reporting of policy.22 In both senatorial and gubernatorial races, women receive less issue coverage than their male counter-

20These gender differences in viability assessments in Senate races do not simply reflect "real" differences in the campaigns of male and female candidates. Even when one controls for the competitiveness of the campaign, women candidates continue to receive less favorable viability ratings. For example, among noncompetitive Senate candidates, female candidates are considered less competitive (1.98) than their male counterparts (2.44) (p < .01).

21For the population of races between 1984 and 1988, 44% of the female candidates for governor ran in open seats while only 18% of the female candidates for senator ran in these nonincumbent contests.

22Policy is defined as any reference to a candidate's issue positions or issue concerns. For example, if an article describes Senator Alan Cranston's concern about the drug problem—even if no mention is made of Cranston's specific suggestions regarding the problem—the article would be counted as mentioning Cranston's concern about the drug issue.
TABLE 3

AVERAGE NUMBER OF PARAGRAPHS PUBLISHED ABOUT ISSUES EACH WEEK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Senate Races</th>
<th></th>
<th>Gubernatorial Races</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (S.D.)*</td>
<td>N*</td>
<td>Mean (S.D.)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Candidates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Candidates</td>
<td>26.8 (15.1)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39.9 (20.0)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Candidates</td>
<td>21.9 (12.7)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.1 (15.1)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Candidates</td>
<td>26.7 (13.4)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47.0 (21.9)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Candidates</td>
<td>23.7 (24.2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42.7 (8.6)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challengers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Candidates</td>
<td>23.6 (14.5)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43.7 (18.0)*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Candidates</td>
<td>16.7 (8.1)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.7 (4.4)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-Race Candidates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Candidates</td>
<td>29.3 (17.7)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.9 (18.3)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Candidates</td>
<td>28.8 (12.9)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42.1 (9.4)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Entries are the mean number of paragraphs published about issues each week with the standard deviation in parentheses.

bEntries are the number of candidates included for each candidate type.

cThe p-value is based on the t-statistic; *indicates p < .01.

parts, and in some instances the differences are quite significant, both statistically and substantively.\textsuperscript{23}

The tendency of the press to play down issue concerns for women candidates is remarkably consistent. In fact, the issue coverage of female candidates lags behind male candidates in seven of the eight comparisons displayed in table 3.\textsuperscript{24} There are at least three possible explanations for this pattern of findings, and they correspond to the three reasons offered at the start of this paper. First, newspapers may believe that women are less competent at dealing with the major issues of the day, so their views on these issues are considered less newsworthy. Second, there is the

\textsuperscript{23}When we compare the percentage of articles which mention issues, we find the same gender differences in coverage. In both senate and gubernatorial races, the percentage of articles mentioning issues is significantly smaller for women candidates (p < .01).

\textsuperscript{24}While women consistently receive less issue coverage than men, this pattern is least striking among open seats. In open Senate races, virtually the same amount of coverage is given to the issue priorities of male and female candidates. In gubernatorial races, women in open races receive somewhat more issue coverage than their male counterparts. Given that many women candidates for governor run in open races, this more equitable coverage may help women candidates in gubernatorial races. In Senate races, on the other hand, the equitable issue coverage in open races may be largely inconsequential since women candidates rarely compete in these types of races.
practical consideration of how much space to allot for the discussion of issues since journalists may prefer to emphasize other sorts of campaign news when covering women. Finally, coverage of issues for women may be less extensive because women may talk about issues less frequently in their campaigns.

I explicitly test this third explanation by examining the candidates’ own campaign communications. When we compare the amount of issue discussion in the candidate’s own campaign communications with the amount of issue coverage in the news, we find that gender differences in issue coverage is not a reflection of the candidates’ own campaign messages. Men do not spend more time describing their issue positions in their advertisements. In fact, women are more likely than men to talk about issues in their campaign advertisements; 65% of all advertisements by female candidates mention policy concerns, while only 58% of male candidates’ advertisements do.25 This greater concern with issues for female candidates occurs in both senatorial and gubernatorial races.26

Given the scarcity of issue coverage for women candidates, it is important to examine the types of issues that do receive media attention. Do reporters, for example, emphasize the same sorts of issues for all candidates, or are there predictable gender differences in the substance of issue coverage? Based on research on sex stereotypes, I categorize issues as “male” issues or “female” issues (Gallup 1984; National Women’s Political Caucus 1987; Rosenwasser et al. 1987; Sapiro 1982). “Male” issues are those issues where men are considered more competent (e.g., defense, foreign policy), while “female” issues are those issues where women are seen as superior (e.g., health, education policy). The discussion of issues will vary with the gender of the candidate if (1) reporters and editors hold the same stereotypes as their readers, or (2) if male and female candidates emphasize different issues in their electoral campaigns.

The discussion of issues by the media does vary with the sex of the candidate in senatorial races. In particular, “female” issues are discussed more extensively for women who are running for the U.S. Senate.27 “Female” issues are mentioned 40% of the time for female candidates, but less than one-third of the time (30%) for male candidates ($p < .01$). Overall, however, “female” issues receive relatively little attention (32%) when compared with the coverage of “male” issues (68%).

In gubernatorial races a different pattern emerges. Overall, “female” issues receive a great deal more news attention (51%), and these issues are not emphasized

---

25 This difference is not statistically significant ($p < .10$).

26 As noted above, advertising data is not available for all the races in our newspaper sample. Given that the newspaper sample and the advertising sample are not based on the same races, differences in the correspondence between these two mediums reflect differences in the samples. To check for this possibility, I have reanalyzed the newspaper sample for those races where ads are available. This reanalysis, based on races where news data and advertising data are both available, reveals the same pattern of findings. Male candidates continue to receive more issue coverage in the news when compared to their female counterparts.

27 This pattern holds when we control for the status of the candidates.
more for female candidates (45%) than for male candidates (53%). Differences in the offices of governor and U.S. senator are probably responsible for these differences in issue emphasis. Such “male” issues as foreign policy and defense are simply not relevant for gubernatorial candidates, while these issues are more critical for potential U.S. senators.

Are the gender differences in policy discussion a reflection of the candidates’ own campaign messages? The data in table 4, which compares the content of political advertisements with the content of campaign coverage, suggest that the correspondence between the issues presented in the news and the issues highlighted in the candidate’s advertisements is greater for male candidates in both senatorial and gubernatorial races. For example, in U.S. Senate races male candidates’ advertisements mention “male” issues more than 70% of the time, and news coverage of their candidacies reflects this devotion to “male” issues. For female senatorial candidates, on the other hand, there is considerable incongruity between what the candidates are saying and what the newspapers are reporting.

The greater correspondence between the news media’s agenda and the agenda of male candidates may reflect a bias of the news media, or it may reflect real differences in the campaigns of men and women candidates. On the one hand, if reporters hold stereotypes about men and women candidates, they may consider male candidates more “legitimate” and may listen and report their rhetoric more faithfully. On the other hand, differences in the correspondence between the press and the candidates’ messages may reflect real differences in the campaigns of men and women candidates. Male candidates, for example, may be more effective campaigners than their female counterparts, which may account for differences in media coverage of their campaigns.

Yet regardless of the cause, gender differences in campaign coverage can have important electoral consequences. Since voters’ priorities are flexible and susceptible to media influence (e.g., Iyengar and Kinder 1987; MacKuen 1981), candidates

---

28 This pattern holds when we control for the status of the candidates.

29 Again, when we limit our examination of news coverage to those races where ads are available, we continue to find greater correspondence between news and political ads for male candidates—in both senate races and gubernatorial races. In the reduced sample of senate races, for example, 71% of the male candidates’ issue coverage is devoted to “male” issues, while 72% of their ads talk about “male” issues (n.s.). For women, 53% of their news coverage is devoted to “male” issues, while “male” issues are discussed only 43% of the time in their ads ($p < .10$). (Unless otherwise noted, $p$-values are based on the differences in proportions test.)

30 The greater correspondence between the male candidates’ agenda and the news media’s agenda may partly be a function of status differences between male and female candidates. I explicitly test this by looking within status categories—although the number of cases in some status categories is very small. Yet, when comparisons can be made, the similarity between what the candidates are saying and what the media are reporting is greater for male candidates. For example, male governors discuss “male” issues 49% of the time in their ads and 51% of their issue coverage in the news is devoted to “male” issues (n.s.). Female governors, on the other hand, talk about “male” issues 63% of the time in their ads but only 43% of their news coverage is devoted to “male” issues ($p < .05$).
### Table 4
A Comparison of the Content of Newspapers and Televised Political Advertisements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues in News Coverage</th>
<th>Senate Races</th>
<th>Gubernatorial Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Candidate</td>
<td>Female Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Male&quot; Issues</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Female&quot; Issues</td>
<td>30%&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>40%&lt;sup&gt;1,1.5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9,327;40)*</td>
<td>(2,264;12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues in Televised Political Advertisements</th>
<th>Senate Races</th>
<th>Gubernatorial Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Candidate</td>
<td>Female Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Male&quot; Issues</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Female&quot; Issues</td>
<td>28%&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>57%&lt;sup&gt;3,5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(269;29)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(82;10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits in News Coverage</th>
<th>Senate Races</th>
<th>Gubernatorial Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Candidate</td>
<td>Female Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Male&quot; Traits</td>
<td>62%&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>55%&lt;sup&gt;8,11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Female&quot; Traits</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1,434;40)</td>
<td>(388;12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits in Televised Political Advertisements</th>
<th>Senate Races</th>
<th>Gubernatorial Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Candidate</td>
<td>Female Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Male&quot; Traits</td>
<td>68%&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>78%&lt;sup&gt;9,11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Female&quot; Traits</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(98;29)</td>
<td>(23;10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Cells-sharing superscripts are significantly different from each other at the specified p-value. The difference in proportions test was used to calculate statistical significance. "Male" issues include foreign policy, defense spending, arms control, foreign trade, farm issues, and the economy; "female" issues include day care, helping the poor, education, health care, women's rights, drug abuse, and the environment. "Male" traits include: independent, objective, strong leader, insensitive, aggressive, ambitious, tough; "female" traits include passive, sensitive, gentle, weak leader, and compassionate.

<sup>a</sup>Entries are the number of "male" and "female" issue (trait) paragraphs coded, followed by the number of candidates.

<sup>b</sup>Entries are the number of "male" and "female" issue (trait) mentions coded, followed by the number of candidates.

<sup>1,2,5,10,11,12</sup> p < .01; <sup>6,7,8</sup> p < .05; <sup>4,9</sup> p < .10.
who can dominate the media’s agenda will be more successful in influencing the public’s agenda. Candidates are likely to emphasize their strengths in their campaign appeals, therefore, candidates who can control the media’s agenda may have an easier time winning elections.

Overall, the patterns of issue coverage shown here suggest that the correspondence between the campaign messages of the candidates and the news coverage of the campaigns is greater for male candidates. Although women talk about issues more than their male counterparts, reporters actually cover issues less frequently for female candidates. Similarly, the substance of the issue discussion in the news more clearly echoes the campaign messages sent by male candidates.

**Personality Traits in the News.** Just as assessments of a candidate’s viability and issue positions influence citizens’ vote choices, so do judgments about a candidate’s character (Abelson, Kinder, Peters, and Fiske 1982; Markus 1982). Voters may be more likely to evaluate the personality of candidates if trait information is readily accessible during campaigns. Yet in news coverage of statewide races, we find only scant attention given to the personality traits of candidates. In the newspapers analyzed, only about five paragraphs a week were published about the candidates’ personality characteristics, while issues received six times as much attention (31 paragraphs a week).

Discussion of character traits for U.S. Senate candidates is sparse for both male and female candidates; fewer than 15% of all articles mention the candidate’s personality traits. In races for governor, the attention given to personality traits is somewhat more common for female candidates (21%) than for male candidates (15%).\(^{31}\) This greater emphasis on personality for female gubernatorial candidates holds for all types of candidates: incumbents, challengers, and candidates running in open races.\(^{32}\)

This focus on personal characteristics for female gubernatorial candidates is echoed in the candidates’ campaign communications. In their political advertisements, women candidates for governor talk about their personality traits (e.g., their leadership ability, their integrity) somewhat more often than their male counterparts.\(^{33}\) Women discuss their personal traits in 55% of their advertisements, while male candidates talk about traits in 49% of their advertisements.

More generally, information about a candidate’s personal character is more common in campaign advertisements than in news coverage. The candidates are more likely than reporters to stress their own personal strengths—or to attack their opponents’ personal weaknesses—in their television advertisements. While fewer than 20% of the articles about statewide campaigns mention traits, 39% of

---

\(^{31}\) This difference is statistically significant \((p < .05)\).

\(^{32}\) In each case, the gender difference in trait coverage is statistically significant \((p < .10)\).

\(^{33}\) When we restrict our examination of news coverage to races where ads have been analyzed, we continue to find that female candidates for governor receive more trait attention in the news than their male counterparts.
the political advertisements examined discuss the candidates’ personal attributes \( (p < .01) \). The emphasis on traits in television ads may be a reflection of the medium—messages about an individual’s character may be easier to convey with a visual medium like television than with a print medium.

Even though the personality traits of competing candidates are not a major source of news in statewide campaigns, the substance of this trait discussion may vary with the gender of the candidate. If journalists hold stereotypes about men and women, the coverage of the candidates’ personal qualities may reflect this bias. Or the candidates themselves may stress different traits in their campaign appeals. Male and female candidates may stress these alternative personality characteristics in their campaign messages if (1) they share the same sex stereotypes as the journalists and voters, or (2) if they believe it will be effective strategically to stress alternative trait dimensions.

To examine the substance of trait coverage by the press, we can divide traits into two categories based on the sex stereotyping literature (e.g., Ashmore and Del Boca 1979; Ruble and Ruble 1982). “Male” traits are those traits that are seen as characteristic of men (e.g., strong leader, knowledgeable, intelligent) while “female” traits are those traits which are consistently associated with women (e.g., warm, compassionate, honest). Using this categorization, we find no differences in trait coverage for male and female gubernatorial candidates. In the senatorial cases, however, there is somewhat more discussion of “male” traits for men (62\% versus 55\%; \( p < .05 \)).

In general, reporters discuss “male” traits more frequently than “female” traits, perhaps because they consider these traits more relevant for statewide office. They may think, for instance, that questions about a candidate’s leadership are more important than questions about a candidate’s compassion. Yet by emphasizing these “male” traits and by making them salient to the public (e.g., Iyengar and Kinder 1987), reporters may encourage voters to develop more favorable impressions of male candidates.

Women may be able to alter voters’ stereotypes by emphasizing “male” traits in their own campaign communications. If, for example, women act “unstereotypically” and demonstrate their leadership ability and their strength, then voters may revise their views of “typical” male and female candidates. According to their campaign advertisements, women do act “unstereotypically,” stressing “male” traits far more frequently than “female” traits (see table 4). In fact, in both senatorial and gubernatorial races, women are more likely than their male counterparts

---

34 As before, when we limit the examination of news coverage to those races where ads are available, we find that the discussion of personality traits is more common in advertisements than in news coverage.

35 This difference holds when we control for the status of the candidate.

36 Reporters, who are predominantly male, may feel more comfortable discussing “male” traits. When I examine this possibility explicitly, I fail to find a relationship between the sex of the reporter and the content of the trait discussion.
to stress "male" traits. Yet the data in table 4 also show that news coverage more faithfully represents the campaign messages presented by male candidates. The correspondence between the message presented in the advertisements and the coverage provided in the news is clearly higher for male candidates—in both senatorial and gubernatorial races.\(^{37}\) Again, this may be because male candidates are more effective campaigners, or it may be that reporters pay more attention to what male candidates are saying.\(^{38}\)

By stressing their stereotypical weaknesses and talking almost exclusively about "male" traits, women may be trying to dispel voters' preconceptions about the "typical" female candidate (e.g., women are weak leaders). Yet this strategy can have only limited success because reporters are less responsive to the messages presented by women candidates.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Voters see the political landscape largely through the eyes of the news media. In races for statewide office, where direct contact with politicians is rare, citizens receive most of their news about the campaign from state newspapers. Voters' dependence on the press for political information may be problematic for women running for office. The results of this study suggest that the news media differentiate between male and female candidates in their coverage of statewide campaigns. These differences are more dramatic in U.S. Senate races, but differences are still evident in gubernatorial contests.

In U.S. Senate races, women receive less campaign coverage than their male counterparts, and the coverage they receive is more negative—emphasizing their unlikely chances of victory. In both senatorial and gubernatorial races, women receive consistently less issue attention than their male counterparts. These differences in media treatment may hurt women as they strive for statewide elective office. The lack of press attention and the scarcity of policy information are potential roadblocks for women candidates because citizens are unlikely to vote for candidates with whom they are unfamiliar. Furthermore, the abundance of negative

\(^{37}\)If we restrict news coverage to those races where ads are also available, we continue to find greater correspondence between news and political ads for male candidates—in both Senate races and gubernatorial races. In the reduced sample of gubernatorial races, for example, 65% of the male candidates' trait coverage is devoted to "male" traits while 64% of their ads talk about "male" traits (n.s.). For female candidates in gubernatorial contests "male" traits account for 65% of all trait coverage in the news while "male" traits are emphasized 81% of the time in their campaign ads (\(p < .10\)).

\(^{38}\)As before, we can look within status categories to see if the male advantage in media coverage is purely a function of status differences. Because trait coverage is scant, the comparisons for each category are based on very small numbers. Yet when comparisons can be made, we find greater similarity between what male candidates talk about in their advertisements and what journalists report in the newspaper. For example, among Senate challengers, male candidates mention "male" traits 68% of the time in their ads while reporters discuss "male" traits 67% of the time in their news coverage (n.s.). Female challengers for the U.S. Senate emphasize "male" traits 85% of time in their own campaign communications while news reports of their candidacies mention "male" traits only 56% of the time (\(p < .05\)).
information published about the viability of female senatorial candidates may color voters' evaluations, making voters reluctant to endorse these candidates at the polls.

Furthermore, the results of this study suggest that the news media are more responsive to the messages sent by male candidates. Reporters are more likely to emphasize the personality traits and policy areas discussed by male candidates. This gender difference in attention to the campaign messages of statewide candidates may dampen the electoral prospects for women candidates. Women may adopt different campaign strategies because these alternative strategies may be more effective for their unique candidacies. Yet by potentially muting the campaign messages of women candidates, differences in press treatment may hamper women in their quest for statewide office.
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