

UC Berkeley

The Charles H. Percy Undergraduate Grant for Public Affairs Research Papers

Title

Female Gubernatorial Candidates: Strategies for Overcoming Gendered Perceptions of Viability

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3cf994qn>

Author

Zanobini, Annie

Publication Date

2011-05-31

Undergraduate

**Female Gubernatorial Candidates: Strategies for Overcoming
Gendered Perceptions of Viability**

A Thesis Presented by

Annie Zanobini

Thesis Advisor: Eric Schickler

May 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	4
	<i>Background</i>	4
	<i>Female Governors</i>	6
	<i>Defining Terms</i>	7
	<i>Research Question</i>	8
	<i>Strategies for Success</i>	11
	<i>Thesis Roadmap</i>	13
II.	LITERATURE REVIEW.....	14
	<i>Work on Gender Stereotypes</i>	14
	<i>Limits on Scholarship</i>	23
III.	METHODOLOGY.....	24
	<i>Traits Coded</i>	25
	<i>Issues Coded</i>	26
	<i>Races Selected</i>;	27
IV.	EVIDENCE.....	30
	<i>Male Democratic Races Selected</i>	30
	<i>Races that Focused on Male and Female Issues and Traits</i>	31
	<i>Comparing Male and Female Issue Totals and Traits</i>	32
	<i>Female Democratic v. Democratic Counterparts</i>	33
	<i>Issues: Female Democratic Candidates and Republican Opponents</i>	35
	<i>Issues: Female Democratic Candidates and Democratic Counterparts</i>	36
	<i>Traits: Female Democratic and Republican Opponents</i>	37
	<i>Traits: Female Democratic and Male Democratic Candidates</i>	38
	<i>Conclusion</i>	39
V.	CASE STUDIES.....	41
	<i>Claire McCaskill v. Matt Blunt</i>	41
	<i>Chris Gregoire v. Dino Rossi</i>	45
	<i>Janet Napolitano v. Matt Salmon</i>	48
	<i>Shannon O'Brien v. Mitt Romney</i>	50
	<i>Kathleen Kennedy Townsend v. Robert Ehrlich</i>	52
	<i>Jennifer Granholm v. Dick Posthumus</i>	55
	<i>Myrth York v. Don Carcieri</i>	57
	<i>Kathleen Sebelius v. Tim Shallenberger</i>	58
	<i>Conclusion</i>	60
VI.	CONCLUSION.....	62
	<i>Limitations and Areas for Future Research</i>	63
VII.	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	66

ABSTRACT:

Whereas, most of the research in gender and politics looks at women in Congress, I examine the barriers female gubernatorial candidates face – particularly gender stereotypes. These obstacles may be bigger for women running for executive office than legislative office given the different role perceptions and ideal qualities voters perceive for each office. Gender politics scholars disagree over whether female gubernatorial candidates are more advantaged if they focus on male or female issues during their campaign. There is less debate over whether female candidates should focus on male or female traits; scholars believe focusing on masculine traits is a more advantageous strategy. In order to confront gendered perceptions of viability, female gubernatorial candidates attempt to confront their perceived weaknesses by emphasizing male traits in their advertisements. However, they take advantage of their perceived strengths and focus on female issues in their television advertisements. As more case studies become available, scholars should study how campaign messages change when female gubernatorial candidates run against other female gubernatorial candidates and the effects of gender stereotyping on Presidential candidates.

Female Gubernatorial Candidates: Strategies for Overcoming Gendered Perceptions of Viability

In 2008, Sarah Palin and Hillary Clinton experienced gender stereotyping as the public and the media made comments about how their gender affected their viability for executive office. For instance, two audience members during a Hillary Clinton campaign event in New Hampshire yelled “Iron my Shirt” to which Clinton responded, “Oh, the remnants of sexism are alive and well” (Wheaton 2008). Furthermore, CNBC’s Donny Deutsch praised Sarah Palin for “earning respect through her ability to make men want to mate with her” (Ms. Magazine 2008). Deutsch also claimed that Clinton did not secure the Democratic nomination because she “didn’t put a skirt on” arguing that “if you were gonna sell a new concept, a Woman in Power...you gotta first sell her as a women, before you can sell her as a candidate” (Ms. Magazine 2008). These comments along with a multitude of others made clear that traditional gender stereotypes affects how the public and the media perceive female candidates’ political legitimacy (Ms. Magazine 2008). Voters and the media continue to use gender stereotypes to judge the viability of female candidates. In order to confront gendered perceptions of their viability, female candidates utilize advertisements to overcome their perceived weaknesses or to emphasize their perceived strengths. Utilizing avenues of the media that they can control, like campaign advertising, female candidates have the ability to confront gendered notions of their viability.

Background

It is important to study how female candidates fight against gendered bias on a congressional, gubernatorial and presidential level. Most of the research in gender and politics looks at women in Congress, which focuses on underrepresentation, media bias, campaign strategy, or public policy. My thesis will examine how female gubernatorial candidates portray

themselves to voters in order to overcome gendered perceptions of their suitability for executive office. I will attempt to examine whether female gubernatorial candidates focus on male or female issues and whether they emphasize masculine or feminine traits when they run for Governor.

Because there is not a lot of work on female gubernatorial candidates, it is important to examine how gubernatorial and congressional candidates differ on a variety of relevant dimensions. Furthermore, most of the scholarly work on gubernatorial candidates looks at elections in the 1990s and earlier. One explanation involves 1992, named by the media as “Year of the Woman,” a year in which a large number of women ran for congressional office. This media attention led to a number of studies researching the different barriers faced between men and women seeking political office (Fowler and Lawless 2009, 521). The bulk of this research focused on explaining what barriers exist between men and women running for Congress. Congressional candidates and gubernatorial candidates face different barriers and policy environments given the nature of the office they are running for and therefore they should be studied separately.

Many scholars have examined the differences between men and women running for Congress but running as a Governor differs in fundamental ways. The office of Governor is an executive office and is analogous in many ways to the Presidency. Therefore, findings from studies on House and Senate elections cannot be generalized for governor’s races. The Governor is a unique position because it is a highly visible office, the preeminent elected official in the state, and it often serves as a stepping-stone to the Senate and the White House (Fowler and Lawless 2009, 519). In addition, a governor is one of the few elected officials to serve all of the people in the state. The governor is also an executive office that oversees the implementation

of policy drafted by the state legislature. The office is also unique because the governor shares a sense of crisis like a President, although foreign affairs and national security further separate the offices. While a Governor can command the national guard to serve under a state of emergency, only the president acts as Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces. Furthermore, Governor's retain the focus of the public's attention more than other public officials, they have greater access to the media than other state actors, and they serve as the primary place of governmental action in the state (Barth and Ferguson 2002, 64). Therefore, given the unique position of the Governor in relation to other public officials, it is important to study gubernatorial candidates separately from congressional candidates. However, in both offices women remain underrepresented and it is important to continue to adjust scholar's findings as more case studies become available.

Female Governors

The number of women who have served as Governor is quite limited. For instance, only 34 women have served as governors; 23 were elected in their own right, 3 replaced their husbands, and 8 became governor by constitutional succession, three of which won a full term on their own (Center for American Women and Politics 2011). Of the 34, 19 have been Democrats and 15 have been Republicans (CAWP 2011). In addition, just over 100 women have secured their party's nomination. The first female governor was Nellie Taylor Ross a Democrat in Wyoming, who won a special election in 1925 to replace her husband. However, the first governor elected in her own right was Ella Grasso of Connecticut in 1975 (CAWP 2011). Of the hundred or so women that have run for governor, only a handful ran against another women.

There have only been four instances where a woman ran against another women, two instances in 2010, one in 2002, and once in 1986 (CAWP 2011). The limited number of cases makes it difficult to study how female candidates change their campaign strategy running against

a woman compared to running against a man. However, how women change their campaign strategy when running against another woman can be the subject of future research as more case studies become available. On the other hand, 39 women have served in the Senate while 226 women have served in the House of Representatives (CAWP 2011). Because there are more women who have served and run for Congressional office, the research on women in Congress is more expansive than women who have campaigned for Governor.

Defining Terms

For my work it is important to have a clear understanding of what I mean by gender stereotyping, male and female issues, and masculine and feminine traits. Richard Logan Fox defines gender stereotyping as a term that refers to instances where there is reliance on the traditional notions of male and female sex roles (Fox 1997, xx). In other words, for my research I will refer to the term gender stereotyping as the gendered perceptions of the public, which associate specific traits and competency on issues based solely on that candidate's gender. For instance, voters perceive men and women on more competent on different policy issues.

Fox defines women's issues and men's issues as classifications that refer to those groups of policy issues that female and male policymakers are more likely to prioritize or for which voters have shown a tendency to favor women's or men's leadership (Fox 1997, xx). Women are seen as more competent in policy areas related to health (poverty, health care, AIDS), education, women's issues, and the environment (Kahn, 1996; Fowler, Lawless 2004; Huddy, Terkildsen 1993; Alexander, Anderson 1993). Men are seen as more competent on issues surrounding the military, farm policy, foreign policy, crime, illegal immigration, taxes and the economy (Kahn 1996; Fowler, Lawless 2004; Huddy, Terkildsen 1993; Alexander, Anderson 1993). Voters also perceive men and women as holding different qualities and traits.

Fox defines female traits and male traits as terms that refer to the stereotypes about personal qualities that are usually associated with women and men (Fox 1997, xx). Male traits refer to traits associated with males based solely on their sex are knowledgeable, experienced, decisive, tough, self-confident, assertive, and aggressive (Kahn 1996; Fowler, Lawless 2004; Huddy, Terkildsen 1993; Alexander, Anderson 1993). Female traits, traits associated with women based solely on their sex, are honesty, compassion, integrity, compromising, sensitive, and emotional (Kahn 1996; Fowler, Lawless 2004; Huddy, Terkildsen 1993; Alexander and Anderson 1993). Different scholars, based on their coding scheme, have added and defined a number of issues and traits they associate as male or female or masculine or feminine. Regardless of the exact traits and issues used by scholars, some like Iyengar have argued that women should play to their strengths while others like Kahn and Huddy and Terkildsen have argued that women will be more advantaged by confronting their perceived weaknesses. There is a debate about whether female candidates are more advantaged if they portray female or male issues and my thesis will examine which strategy women gubernatorial candidates take.

Research Question

My research will attempt to examine whether female gubernatorial candidates focus on overcoming perceived weaknesses relating to gender or focus on their perceived gender-related policy strengths. Some limitations of my research include that I do not outline how gender bias translates into electoral success. In other words, I do not focus on whether voters in the end vote against a candidate based on their gender or for reasons associated with gender stereotypes. While my research examines how female gubernatorial candidates frame their message and whether they focus on male or female traits or issues, I do not lay out how that relates to their electoral success. My research cannot explain how gender stereotypes relate to lower or higher

vote margins for female candidates. However, Fowler and Lawless argue in their research that women gubernatorial candidates do suffer a “substantial vote deficit that results from non-observable influences” (Fowler, Lawless, 2009, 519).

My research will indicate that although Kahn argues that male and female candidates are more advantaged if they focus on their perceived weaknesses, female gubernatorial candidates emphasize female issues to emphasize their perceived strengths and male traits to overcome perceived weaknesses. Furthermore, according to Kahn prominent issues in gubernatorial elections tend to complement women’s perceived strong policy areas allowing them to focus their energy on proving their competence on “male issues” (Kahn 1996). While I did not examine the details and code for a favorable or unfavorable policy environment and agenda, it is clear that female gubernatorial candidates emphasize masculine traits to overcome damaging preconceptions of their competence in certain desirable leadership capabilities. Overall, it is important to study the differences between congressional and gubernatorial candidates. While scholars have concluded that Senate candidates focus on their stereotypical strengths in their advertising, gubernatorial candidates focus on their perceived weaknesses (Kahn 1996, Iyengar et. al 1997).

Table 1

Female Gubernatorial Candidates 2002-2004

Claire McCaskill	Missouri	2004	Lost
Christine Gregoire	Washington	2004	Won
Janet Napolitano	Arizona	2002	Won
Kathleen Sebelius	Kansas	2002	Won
Shannon O'Brien	Massachusetts	2002	Lost
Kathleen Townsend	Maryland	2002	Lost
Jennifer Granholm	Michigan	2002	Won
Myrth York	Rhode Island	2002	Lost

My thesis examines how female gubernatorial candidates in 2002 and 2004 have portrayed themselves to voters. I examined eight candidates as case studies to determine how female candidates utilized campaign advertisements to determine whether women focus on confronting their perceived weaknesses or take advantage of their perceived strengths. The candidates I studied and coded political advertisements for are listed in table 1. All of these candidates are Democrats and all ran against a male opponent. Of the female candidates, four lost, four won, and all are from different states. In addition, all ran for open seats, which makes it possible for me to disregard incumbency advantage as a potential confounding variable. The candidates were selected based on competitiveness of race, open seat, election result, year, and data availability.

These case studies were chosen because the Wisconsin Advertising Project provides Portable Document Formats of the general election campaign advertisements for the years 2002 and 2004 from the nation's largest media markets. The Project has data from 2000, 2002 and 2004 congressional, gubernatorial and presidential elections; however, the advertisements are available only for states with large media markets. Therefore, the number of cases available was very limited. This can be problematic because a small number of case studies will allow for limited conclusions. However, it will still allow me to analyze a small number of case studies in detail to see if there is a pattern among female candidates in terms of whether they focus on male or female issues and traits. Furthermore, limited case studies enable me to compare and contrast the elections in detail to discover if all these women have similar campaign strategies to confront gender stereotypes. A more detailed analysis of how the particular states were selected will be explained in section three.

Strategies for Success

One conclusion that gender politics scholars agree on is that voters attribute different policy expertise, traits and characteristics to men and women (Lawless, 2004). In addition, the consensus among gender politics scholars is that voters are more likely to see men as strong, assertive, and confident more than women (Lawless 2004, 479).

Furthermore, scholars tend to agree that the policy environment is also important in explaining the difference between Congressional and gubernatorial races. For instance, Lawless argues that women are advantaged when the policy climate is dominated by "female" issues but are disadvantaged when "male issues" dominate the policy agenda (Lawless, 2004, 480). In a gubernatorial environment, Kahn argues that the policy environment tends to complement women's perceived policy strengths (Kahn 1996). Therefore, according to Kahn, women focus

their message on overcoming their perceived weaknesses by emphasizing their strength on “male issues” and their possession of “masculine” traits. Huddy and Terkildsen agree with Kahn, while Iyengar et. al believes women are more advantaged if they focus on their stereotypical strengths.

Huddy and Terkildsen suggest that women may succeed at the polls because they manage to convince voters they have desirable masculine political strengths (Huddy and Terkildsen 1993, 504). Fowler and Lawless show that male gubernatorial candidates focus more on “women’s issues,” like education, health and child welfare than their female opponents. Iyengar, Valentino, Ansolabehere, and Simon argue that women who campaign on “female” issues” and men that campaign on “male issues” “will enjoy significant electoral advantages” (Iyengar et al. 1997,79). In other words, based on two experiments, Iyengar determined that candidates are more advantaged when they campaign on their perceived strengths (Iyengar et al. 1997, 78). However, Kahn argues that female gubernatorial candidates should and do focus on showing voters that they are strong and knowledgeable on perceived male policy strengths.

There is less debate around whether female candidates are more advantaged if they emphasize male or female traits. Research suggests that the possession of typical masculine traits increases a candidate’s perceived competence across a variety of different issues while typical feminine traits are considered less important for officeholders to possess (Huddy and Terkildsen 1993, 63). Therefore, given the greater value assigned to male traits than female traits, female candidates tend to emphasize male traits. Research suggests that voters punish female candidates if they lack typical masculine traits, especially when seeking higher national or executive office (Huddy, Terkildsen 1993, 504). In addition, reliance on sex stereotypes leads people to view women as less competent overall than men (Huddy and Terkildsen 1993). Interestingly, Alexander and Anderson (1993) found that female challengers are not perceived

more stereotypically or as more feminine than female incumbents (Alexander and Anderson 1993, 538).

Thesis Roadmap

In the rest of this introductory section of my thesis I will outline my research question, its relevance and importance, and define key terms that I will be using throughout the paper.

In the second section, I will review the findings from past studies of gender stereotyping in political campaigns and how female gubernatorial candidates attempt to confront gendered perceptions of their viability.

In the third section, I will present my research design, which will outline how I gathered my data and how I coded for male and female issues and traits.

In the fourth section, I will look at the evidence and the results of coding for male and female candidates. I will compare Democratic female gubernatorial candidates to their Republican opponents and to Democratic male candidates in other states. All case studies examined will be of open gubernatorial seats to avoid incumbency advantage as a factor influencing the election.

In my fifth section, I will examine in detail eight case studies individually and examine the unique factors present in each election. I will explain how each gubernatorial candidate portrayed themselves including whether they focused on female or male traits and issues.

In my concluding section, I will outline the findings and the limitations of my research, potential confounding variables, areas for future research, and what my findings may indicate for other female executive candidates including Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates.

Gender in Gubernatorial Elections: Perspectives on How Gender Stereotypes Influence the Electoral and Campaign Process

The work on gender in American politics falls into four categories: scholars examining what issues or legislation women pursue while in office, why women are underrepresented, media bias, and how female candidates portray themselves. There are two schools of thought examining how gender stereotypes influence how female candidates portray themselves in their campaigns. Some scholars argue that female candidates are more advantaged when they focus on “female issues” and other scholars argue that female candidates are more advantaged when they focus on “male issues.” However, both schools of thought believe that the political environment, or issues dominating the political agenda, is an important factor in explaining what issues female candidates decide to focus on. Among scholars of gender in politics, most agree that gender affects voters’ perceptions of candidates, media portrayal of candidates, and how candidates portray themselves. However, Kahn and Iyengar’s research provides the most useful framework for examining how female gubernatorial candidates are affected by gender stereotypes.

Work on Gender Stereotypes

Kim Fridkin Kahn in *The Political Consequences of Being a Woman* examines how people’s stereotypical views of male and female candidates influence voter’s views, media campaign coverage, and the candidate’s own behavior. Kahn shows that because of these stereotypical views, women candidates have an advantage in some political climates and a disadvantage in others (Kahn 1996, 1). Kahn draws on the research of Sapiro and others, which demonstrated that people attribute different traits, characteristics, and policy expertise to male and female candidates. For instance, women are seen as more competent in policy areas related to health, education, women’s issues and the environment (Kahn 1996, 9). While men are seen as more competent in issues surrounding the military, farm policy, foreign policy and the

economy (Kahn 1996, 9). In addition, people tend to see women as more honest and compassionate, and men as more knowledgeable and stronger leaders (Kahn 1996, 9). These perceptions of candidates have implications for how candidates portray themselves.

Kahn argues that a female incumbent (running for Senate) may want to focus on “female” issues because voter’s gender perceptions could lead them to view the candidate more favorably (Kahn 1996, 73). Kahn claims that prominent issues in gubernatorial elections tend to complement women’s perceived strong policy areas (Kahn 1996). Therefore, candidates tend to focus on one of two strategies: focusing more on their perceived strengths or focusing on disproving their perceived weak policy areas (Kahn 1996, 78). Kahn claims that female gubernatorial candidates are more likely than female Senate candidates to focus their campaign advertisements around “male issues” like crime or the economy. She also argues that women are less likely to engage in negative advertising because “aggressive attacks violate norms about what is considered proper feminine behavior” (Kahn 1996, 77). Kahn concludes that female gubernatorial candidates focus on positive advertisements, discussing personal characteristics in their advertisements, and highlighting “male” traits when describing themselves (Kahn 1996, 83). Furthermore, Kahn argues that female candidates focus on this approach because they think it will make voters view them more favorably. Kahn’s research is useful because it differentiates between how female Senate candidates and gubernatorial candidates utilize campaign strategy to confront gender bias. In addition, Kahn’s framework is useful for assessing how gender stereotypes and media bias affect how women portray themselves to the public. Other scholars also make claims about how voters perceive men and women candidates differently.

In *Gender as a Factor in the Attribution of Leadership Traits*, by Deborah Alexander and Kristi Anderson, the authors asked voters in a survey “tell me whether you think the man or the woman (candidate) would, most of the time, do a better job dealing with the issue when in office” to discover what issues voters perceived men and women candidates were stronger on. Their research was concerned with looking at how voters “think about and evaluate male and female candidates and politicians (Alexander Anderson 1993). Although a majority replied there were no differences between the sexes’ ability to deal with several issues, there was a net difference between males and females on most of the issues that show continued stereotyping of men and women (Alexander Anderson 1993, 535). The survey results indicated that women were expected to do a better job dealing with day care, helping the poor, healthcare, education, and the environment. While voters perceived men as better able to handle policy issues related to military spending, foreign trade, agriculture, arms control and taxes (Alexander Anderson 1993, 535). Their study also asked voters about a candidate’s perceived personality or character trait.

Alexander and Anderson asked voters “tell me whether you would most of the time, associate it (words and phrases) more with the man candidates or women candidate” voters responded that women were associated with “compassionate, more liberal, speaks out honestly, works out compromises, more liberal, and moral” while men were associated with “tough, handles a crisis, emotionally stable, decisive, and more conservative” (Anderson Alexander 1993, 536). Furthermore, Alexander and Anderson suggest that female candidates have to be both feminine and masculine (Alexander and Anderson 1993). Their research suggests that for women to run for office, “they have to bring their traditional skills, capabilities, and vestiges of their role as mother and spouses” and have to demonstrate their “power, toughness, and capacity

to win, traits assumed by most voters to be inherent in most male candidates” (Alexander and Anderson 1993, 542). While Alexander and Anderson do not explicitly state whether female candidates should emphasize male or female issues they indicate the importance of female candidates emphasizing male traits while also proving they possess female traits. Other scholars are less ambiguous about advantageous campaign strategy.

Leonie Huddy and Nayda Terkildsen claim, “female candidates may succeed at the polls because they manage to convince voters that, unlike women in general, they possess desirable masculine political strengths” (Huddy Terkildsen 1993, 504). Similar to Kahn, Huddy and Terkildsen argue the more advantageous strategy for elections is to focus on masculine qualities. Huddy and Terkildsen suggest that voters penalize candidates who demonstrate typical feminine traits but lack typical masculine qualities, as a consequence female candidates focus on counteracting voters’ gender stereotype (Huddy Terkildsen 1993, 504). To conduct their experiment, Huddy and Terkildsen asked 297 respondents about a “good” politician and were randomly assigned to rate a good president, member of Congress, mayor, and local council member. Huddy and Terkildsen found that good politicians who held executive and national-level office - President and mayor -were expected to possess more masculine traits than legislative and local politicians – member of Congress and local council member (Huddy Terkildsen 1993, 508). Huddy and Terkildsen also found that respondents expected national and executive politicians to be confronted by male issues more often while local and legislative politicians, were seen as more likely to confront female issues (Huddy Terkildsen 1993, 511). Overall, they show support that masculine traits and skills are considered as more important for higher types and levels of office (Huddy Terkildsen 1993, 512). This would suggest that female gubernatorial candidates would be more advantaged if they focused male issues than male traits

in their campaign advertisements. Their research suggests that female candidates “can win national office if they convince voters that they possess masculine traits and are competent on male policy issues” (Huddy Terkildsen 1993, 520). Their research like the research of Kahn and Gordon suggest that voters favor masculine traits.

In *How Women Campaign for the U.S. Senate: Substance and Strategy*, Kim Fridkin Kahn and Ann Gordon (1997) examine whether women campaign differently from men (Kahn and Gordon 1997, 59). Their research relied on surveys of campaign managers running US Senate campaigns in 1988, 1990 and 1992. Gordon and Kahn cite the research of Miller Wattenberg, and Malanchuck (1986) to demonstrate that voters favor two types of traits in their politicians: competence and intelligence. Competence is measured through traits like “knowledgeable,” “leadership,” “experience” and “intelligence” while integrity is measured through traits like “honesty,” “morality,” and “trustworthy” (Kahn and Gordon 1997, 63). This research indicated that voters tend to consider male politicians stronger and more knowledgeable leaders and female politicians as more compassionate and honest leaders (Kahn and Gordon 1997, 53). Kahn and Gordon’s research indicated that female congressional candidates were more likely to focus on issues more than personality traits to demonstrate their competence. Furthermore, when discussing issues, female candidates tend to focus on “female issues” like education, health care and the environment instead of “male issues” like the economy or crime (Kahn and Gordon 1997, 63). In addition, when it comes to personality traits, women will try to confront their perceived weaknesses by demonstrating their knowledge and experience in their campaigns instead of their empathy and honesty (Kahn and Gordon 1997, 63).¹ However, Gordon and Kahn cite a 1994 Kahn study that demonstrated that female Senate and gubernatorial

¹ This research was based on information gathered solely from looking at Congressional campaigns not gubernatorial campaigns.

candidates focused on their leadership, experience, and ability more than their male opponents in their advertising (Kahn and Gordon 1997, 63).

In their conclusion, Kahn and Gordon stress that the success of female candidates, based on their perceived strengths and weaknesses, may depend on the policy agenda. For instance, during periods of economic prosperity and international peace, “female issues” may resonate more with voters than during times of economic turmoil and international uncertainty (Kahn and Gordon 1997, 75). Therefore, based on the political climate, female gubernatorial candidates might change their strategy and focus on a different set of issues.

In *Running as a Woman: Gender Stereotyping in Political Campaigns*, Shanto Iyengar, Nicholas A. Valentino, Stephen Ansolabehere, and Adam F. Simon focus on how gender stereotypes influence voters and the ability of female candidates to win elections (Iyengar 1997, 78). Like Kahn, the authors recognize that voters see candidates through a gendered lens, which affects how the media portrays these candidates and how these candidates portray themselves (Iyengar 1997). Iyengar et al. argue that female gubernatorial candidates would benefit from focusing on “female issues,” issues that voters perceive female candidates as more competent to handle than their male counterparts. In addition, they claim that in low information environments, a candidates’ gender becomes more important (Iyengar 1997, 79). For instance, their studies show that women are more likely to be successful if their campaigns focus around issues of women’s rights, unemployment, and education instead of crime and illegal immigration (Iyengar 1997, 78). Voters take female candidates more seriously if they focus on education or women’s issues instead of issues like the death penalty (Iyengar 1997,97). Unlike Lawless and Fox, Iyengar focuses on experiments instead of survey data, looking at campaign issues and voter preferences and the effects of campaign dialogue. Their experiments are useful because

they indicate that gender has an effect on how voters perceive candidates. Their framework is similar to Kahn, in arguing that women will have more success by campaigning on certain issues designated as “female” issues, because voters tend to see women as more competent in certain policy areas.

While Iyengar’s study demonstrates that both Senate and gubernatorial candidates strengthen their campaigns when they focus on “female issues,” Kahn’s research demonstrates that gubernatorial candidates tend to focus their campaigns around “male issues” to address their perceived weaknesses. Kahn argues that gubernatorial candidates are actually more likely to focus their campaign messages to confront bias on issues where voters perceive them as weak compared to their male counterparts like the economy or crime. Kahn claims that women running for governor tend to emphasize “male traits” like experience or toughness, instead of female traits like compassion and integrity (Kahn, 1996, 81). Kahn claims that gubernatorial elections tend to focus on social problems, where female candidates have an advantage. Therefore, many female candidates focus their energy on proving to voters they are strong in areas like the economy and crime. However, both authors do not go into a lot of detail about why gubernatorial candidates have a different strategy than congressional candidates in confronting gender bias. Furthermore, there seems to be a disconnect between Iyengar and Kahn’s findings. For instance, Iyengar identifies that female candidates can strengthen their campaign by focusing on “female issues” while Kahn’s research indicates that females tend to focus on “male issues” to overcome their perceived weaknesses.

In *Women, War, and Winning Elections: Gender Stereotyping in the Post-September 11th* Era, Jennifer Lawless analyzes why the percentage of Americans willing to support a female presidential candidate has decreased in the last few years. Like Kahn, Fox, and Iyengar, she

argues that gender stereotyping pervades the electoral environment (Lawless 2004, 479). However, she argues that if women are advantaged when the political environment favors “female” issues and are disadvantaged when “male” issues are on the political agenda, then the conclusion that “winning elections has nothing to do with the sex of the candidate” must be reconsidered (Seltzer, Newman, and Leighton 1997, 79). Previous scholars have shown that people perceive male and female candidates differently and attribute different strengths to them. In a survey presented by Lawless, respondents were given a list with four “male” characteristics and four “female” characteristics. Then they were asked to choose the four they thought were the most important for political candidates and office-holders to possess (Lawless 1997, 482). Lawless found that “feminine” characteristics were listed less frequently than “male” characteristics, giving an advantage to men (Lawless, 1997). She also found that nearly two-thirds of respondents did not think that men and women were equally able to handle military affairs (Lawless 1997, 483). She believes past scholars should qualify their conclusion that winning elections has nothing to do with the candidates’ sex. She believes this may be the case when domestic policy dominates the political arena but argues that when military issues occupy the agenda, women experience a very biased arena (Lawless, 2004: 487). Therefore, scholars’ conclusion that winning elections has nothing to do with sex needs to be qualified with new evidence suggesting that the political environment can have a bigger impact than once thought. This survey has important implications in analyzing gender in the American political arena and suggests that voters prefer masculine traits in their leaders.

Linda Fowler and Jennifer Lawless in *Looking for Sex in All the Wrong Places: Press Coverage and the Electoral Fortunes of Gubernatorial Candidates*, argue that “women gubernatorial candidates suffer a substantial vote deficit that results from “non-observable

influences” (Fowler and Lawless, 2009: 520). Unlike previous scholars, Fowler and Lawless examine the unique position of running for governor and why running for an executive office may exhibit new challenges and barriers making them less accessible to women (Fowler and Lawless, 2009).

Lawless and Fowler compiled a dataset of media coverage in 27 gubernatorial races from 1990-1997 (Fowler and Lawless, 2009). They found that women received significantly more coverage regarding personal traits, appearance, personality, and marital status (Fowler and Lawless, 2009). In addition, they found newspapers were more likely to describe men as “doers,” meaning men received more coverage for their action and women more for their positions (Fowler and Lawless, 2009). One limit of their study is that it relied solely on newspaper articles. This is potentially problematic when one considers the visibility of gubernatorial elections and how the portrayal of candidates on television might differ from newspaper sources. Given these limits, Fowler and Lawless found that female gubernatorial candidates did less well than their male counterparts, even when controlling for press coverage and contextual effects (Fowler and Lawless, 2004, 524). However, Fowler and Lawless’ research is unique because it looks only at Governor’s races and does not make assumptions about female gubernatorial candidates based on studies of women in Congress. In fact, Fowler and Lawless found that while barriers may have decreased for women running for Congress, women running for Governor face a different political environment with many more barriers. They argue that sex does play a role in election outcome and remains a major obstacle to success in running for governor but operates through unknown mechanisms (Fowler and Lawless 2009, 528)

Limits on Scholarship

Because scholars are just beginning to look specifically at how the media portrays female gubernatorial candidates and how these candidates portray themselves, it is difficult to identify different schools of thoughts. In addition, the majority of female governors were elected in the 1990's and 2000's. This is a problem, because most of the scholarship on media bias and female candidates was written before there were a significant number of female governors. Therefore, most of the scholarship on gender stereotypes in politics focuses on women in Congress. In addition, the same scholars write a lot of the recent and cited scholarship that focuses on gender and female gubernatorial or executive candidates. For instance, Jennifer Lawless has written extensively on gender in the political arena and has even begun looking extensively on gender bias in the 2008 presidential election. Overall, there is a considerable lack of scholarship that focuses on gubernatorial elections, because of the lack of cases in the past.

Conclusion

In conclusion, scholars agree that gender stereotypes play a role in the electoral process. For instance, based on the advantages of the political climate female candidates may focus on "male issues" or "female issues" in their advertisements. Furthermore, voters tend to favor "masculine" traits in their leaders, which lead female candidates to stress more "masculine" personality traits. The research on whether candidates focus on "male issues" or "female issues" indicates that the political climate may affect which issues female gubernatorial candidates focus on in their campaigns. Overall, sex does play a role in the electoral process and the issues and traits that female gubernatorial candidates focus on to confront their perceived strengths and weaknesses.

Methodology: Coding Male and Female Traits and Issues and Examining Races

My thesis will attempt to answer what role gender stereotypes play in the portrayal of female gubernatorial candidates. I will examine how female gubernatorial candidates portray themselves to voters in order to fight gendered perceptions about their leadership capabilities. Gender scholars have shown that voters attribute certain traits to male and female candidates and emphasize that male traits are more desirable in ideal candidates. Furthermore, gender scholars have shown that voters attribute male and female candidates as more competent in certain policy issues based on their sex. My thesis will show that female gubernatorial candidates focus on male traits to overcome gendered perceptions of their viability and focus on female issues to take advantage of their perceived policy strengths. In order to test this, I will utilize campaign advertisements obtained from the Wisconsin Advertising Project to code for male and female issues and traits. I will code and compare female democratic candidates against their male republican opponents and male democratic candidates in other states. By coding television advertisements and examining case studies, my research will show that female candidates focus on male traits and female issues.

Utilizing Iyengar's research, I hypothesize that female gubernatorial candidates focus their campaign messages more on "female issues" when running for Governor. Male issues are issues in which voters see men as more competent and better able to handle than women. These policy issues relate to the economy, taxes, crime, and foreign policy. On the other hand, women are seen as more competent on issues relating to health, education, women's issues, and the environment. Male traits are qualities the public associates with males including aggressiveness, toughness, and strong leadership. Female traits are qualities the public associate with females including compromising, moral, and compassionate. However, Iyengar's research indicates that

female candidates are likely to be more successful if they focus on issues where women are seen as more competent than their male counterparts. In addition, he argues that voters take women more seriously if they focus on “female issues.” I hypothesize that female gubernatorial candidates focus on “female issues” and “male traits” given the traits voters’ value in candidates and the policy environment of a gubernatorial election.

Traits Coded

Male Traits

Analytical	Hardworking
Tough	Strong
Vital	Intelligent
Independent	Strong Leader
Objective	Consistent/Stable
Competitive	Unexpressive
Ambitious	Immoral
Untrustworthy	Decisive
Confident	Insensitive
Aggressive	

Female Traits

Honest	Trustworthy
Moral	Compromising
Compassionate	Gentle
Weak	Passive
Noncompetitive	Biased
Expressive	Emotional
Erratic	Weak Leader
Dependent	

In order to test the research of Kahn and Iyengar, I will examine case studies and look at how female gubernatorial candidates portray themselves through television advertisements. I will code for “male issues” and “female issues” and “male traits” and “female traits.” The above table outlines male and female traits. These traits are qualities voters associate with males and females as outlined by other scholars like Kahn, Lawless, Huddy and Terkilden, and Alexander

and Anderson. No other advertisements, like those stemming from political action groups or independent expenditures will be coded. The idea is to look how the candidates frame themselves, not how interest groups and independent expenditures frame the candidates. The traits will be coded if they are explicitly mentioned or based on the language in the advertisement. For instance, if a candidate mentions they are willing to work with Democrats and Republicans to come up with a plan that works for both, that would be coded as “compromising.”

Issues Coded

Male Issues

Defense/ Security	Economy
Foreign Affairs	Taxes
Budget/ Spending	Energy/Oil
Import/Trade	Business
Crime	Farm
Infrastructure	

Female Issues

Environment	Gay Rights
Abortion	AIDS
Health	Women’s Rights
Civil Rights	Education
Employment/Jobs	Welfare
Care for the Elderly	

Similarly, issues coded as distinctly male or female issues are those defined by Kahn, Lawless, Huddy and Terkildsen, and Alexander and Anderson as those issues associated with male or female candidates. Issues that will be coded as male or female are outlined in the above charts. I used excel spreadsheets to code male and female issues and traits. The rows of my excel sheet were labeled with the name of the advertisement and the columns showed different

traits or issues. I coded by the number of mentions of that issue or trait in that advertisement. I totaled the number of mentions, for male and female traits and issues for each advertisement and the total of all of that candidate's advertisements combined. Furthermore, I examined if the issue mentioned the most had any correlation to their political background in order to examine the effect of political experience on emphasizing certain issues or traits. If any issue was deemed important but did not fit into a specific column, I made a note of the issue in a note column in an excel spreadsheet.

My research makes claims about whether female gubernatorial candidates focus on "male" or "female" issues more often and whether that translates into electoral success or voters' perceptions of candidates. By fully examining case studies, I looked into whether female candidates are strengthening their campaign by focusing on women's issues or whether they are focusing their energy on fighting their perceived weaknesses. This research allowed me to develop an understanding about how gender roles affect how female gubernatorial candidates portray themselves to potential voters.

Races Selected

For my case study, I examined races where a male candidate ran against a female candidate. In the evidences section, I also compared female Democratic gubernatorial candidates to male Democratic gubernatorial candidates who ran in the same years in different states. I did not examine how campaign strategy changes when two female candidates run against each other. In addition, there are only four potential case studies where a female gubernatorial candidate ran against another female gubernatorial candidates in a general election. Therefore, any conclusions about how female candidates run against one another would be very limited. All the cases I coded are female Democratic candidates running against male Republican candidates. By

only looking at these races, I did not have to consider how results changed by party identification. This allowed me to better isolate variables associated with explaining why candidates decided to focus on some issues or traits more than others. However, to determine if there is a difference based on the sex of the candidate, in how they portray themselves, I also compared the female Democratic candidates to male Democratic gubernatorial candidates from other states in the same years.

Overall I analyzed eight case studies, coding for both the male and female candidates. In addition, I coded for Democratic male candidates in order to examine how female and male Democratic gubernatorial candidates utilize campaign strategy in order to rule out the possibility that the differences between female and male candidates are due to party, rather than gender. My research only examined cases from 2002 and 2004 because those are the races available utilizing the Wisconsin Advertising Project Data. The Wisconsin Advertising Project has PDF's of political advertisements for gubernatorial campaigns from 2000-2004 from the nation's 75 largest media markets (Wisconsin Advertising Project 2011). I looked at 2002 races and 2004 races because those were the races where the political advertisements were available from the Wisconsin Advertising Project. In addition, I only looked at advertisements put out by the campaigns for the general election, thus I will only code advertisements that aired after the primary. Furthermore, I did not look at any 2000 races, even though there were three female Democrats who ran against Republicans, because they were in states that do not have large enough media markets and thus the political advertisements for those races were not available. In addition, races in which two female candidates ran against each other were also excluded.

I hypothesized that my research would indicate that because voters prefer masculine traits and characteristics in their leaders and that female gubernatorial candidates focus on proving

they are tough and competent on “masculine issues” during the general election. Jennifer Lawless argued that female candidates do better when domestic policy dominates the agenda but when military issues occupy the agenda there is more gendered bias. The political environment has an effect on female gubernatorial success, especially in contested elections. Therefore, I will examine the political environment and the main issues discussed by both candidates to see if female candidates were more successful in climates where the focus was on domestic policy or economic or criminal policy. This will allow me to say whether a gendered perception in the political environment affects voters’ perceptions of candidates and whether female candidates take advantage of the political environment by addressing military issues or domestic policy.

In conclusion, I will code for “male issues and traits” and “female issues and traits” to discover whether female candidates focus on their perceived weaknesses or their perceived strengths. My small number of case studies may make it difficult to generalize results, but the cases number is small based on the availability of data I was able to obtain. Furthermore, I will utilize case studies to demonstrate that gender stereotypes play a role in how the public perceives candidates and how candidates portray themselves.

Strategies Used in Television Advertisements: Partisan and Gender Explanations

After coding nearly 300 political advertisements, the data reveals that female democratic gubernatorial candidates in 2002 and 2004 focused more on female issues than male issues but focused more on male traits. However, their male Republican opponents more consistently stuck to focusing on male issues while male Democratic candidates, running in open seats in the same years, focused more on female issues. In addition, when comparing female Democratic candidates to male Democrats running in 2002 and 2004 for open seats, it is clear that female Democrats, while running collectively on more female issues, discuss male issues more than their Democratic counterparts and are collectively more split on whether to focus on male or female issues. Furthermore, female Democrats emphasized female traits more and male traits less than male Democrats but not significantly.

Table 2

Male Democratic Races Selected

Scott Matheson	Utah	2004	Lost
Rod Blagojevich	Illinois	2002	Won
John Baldacci	Maine	2002	Won
Roger Moe	Minnesota	2002	Lost
Bill Richardson	New Mexico	2002	Won
Brad Henry	Oklahoma	2002	Won
Doug Racine	Vermont	2002	Lost
Ed Rendell	Pennsylvania	2002	Won

In attempting to isolate sex as a variable that helps to explain if candidates focus more on female or male issues, I compared female Democratic candidates running in 2002 and 2004 to male Democratic candidates running in the same years in different states. All eight male Democratic candidates ran in open gubernatorial seats just like their female counterparts. In addition, states were matched by region, year, and whether the candidate won or lost. I tried to

match these characteristics but due to a limited number of races and available data, there are some disparities between the two groups. For instance, in the eight male Democratic races, there are five wins and three losses instead of four wins and four losses like the female gubernatorial candidates and the races were not as close. Furthermore, due to the availability of political advertisements by the Wisconsin Advertising Project, only one race from 2004, Utah, was selected. However, comparing female Democrats against male Democrats allowed me to isolate party identification and compare the candidates to get a better understanding of how their gender dictates what issues and traits they will focus on. In order to try to compare and make conclusions based on gender, I attempted to control for policy environment, closeness of race and region of country.

Number of Races that Focused on Male and Female Issues and Traits

	Female Issues	Male Issues	Female Traits	Male Traits
Female	5	3	0	7
Male Dems	6	2	0	8
Male Reps	1	7	1	6

* Matt Blunt of Missouri mentions female issues more than male issues

* Dick Posthumus of Michigan mentions female traits more than male traits

* Female traits do not add up to 8 (the number of case studies) because Jennifer Granholm mentions male and female traits equally

*Male Republican traits do not add up to 8, because Matt Salmon mentions male and female traits equally

In comparing male and female gubernatorial candidates from the same party, I found that female candidates are more split about whether to focus their campaigns on male or female issues but mention male issues more than their male Democratic counterparts. Of the eight

female races coded, five mentioned female issues more often (Gregoire, York, Townsend, O'Brien and Napolitano), while three mentioned male issues more often (McCaskill, Granholm and Sebelius). Of the eight Democratic male races coded, six candidates mentioned female issues more often (Matheson, Blagojevich, Minnesota, Richardson, Racine and Rendell), while only two candidates Baldacci and Henry choose to mention male issues more often than female issues. However, for Republicans all candidates but Matt Blunt of Missouri focused on male issues. This indicates that female Democratic candidates are more likely to mention male issues in their advertising than their male Democratic candidates, indicating that gender of the candidate does affect the extent to which a candidate focuses on female issues over male issues. Therefore, female Democratic candidates focus more on male issues than their Democratic counterparts.

Another way to compare the data is to compare the issue and trait totals of female gubernatorial candidates to their male Democratic counterparts and to their Republican opponents.

Table 3.1

Comparing Male and Female Issue Totals and Traits

	Female Issues	Male Issues	Female Traits	Male Traits
Female candidates	57%	43%	29%	71%
Male D candidates	59%	41%	22%	78%
Male R candidates	37%	63%	35%	65%

Female Democratic Candidates Compared to Their Democratic Counterparts

Overall, female Democratic gubernatorial candidates mentioned female issues 137 times or 57% and male issues 105 or 43% in their television advertisements. This data suggests, that female candidates focus on their perceived policy strengths. Even given a favored policy environment in a gubernatorial election, female candidates focus on female issues instead of using the advantage to overcome their perceived weaknesses. When I compare Democratic females to Democratic males I observe that there is less of a difference between female and male issues. While Democratic males mention male issues five times more, they ran more advertisements and the difference between male and female issues is greater. When taking these factors into account and also breaking up the races into how many of the candidates focused on male or female traits, we can see that female gubernatorial candidates actually talk about male issues more than their Democratic counterparts. Both female and male Democrats talk in roughly similar proportions about female and male issues, indicating that partisanship is the main indicator for discussion of male and female issues.

In terms of traits, male Democratic candidates mention male traits three times more than they mention female traits, while female Democratic candidates mention female traits about 40% less than they mention male issues. Female Democratic candidates mention female issues more than their Democratic counterparts but both mention male traits more often. However, both male and female Democrats emphasize male traits, which suggests that neither group sees an advantage in emphasizing female traits in their advertisements.

Female Democratic Candidates Compared to Their Male Republican Opponents

Overall, female Democratic candidates mentioned female issues 57% and male issues 43% while their Republican opponents mentioned female issues 37% and male issues 73%. Republican males focused on their perceived strengths and mentioned female issues significantly less than Democrats of both sexes. In addition, of the total traits mentioned female Democratic candidates mentioned female traits 29% and male traits 71% while male Republicans mentioned female traits 35% of the time and male traits 65%. Furthermore, only one Republican Matt Blunt of Missouri focused on female issues more than male issues 24 to 18 or 57% to 43% Blunt focused his campaign on change and made investing in education and healthcare a priority. The biggest difference between the female Democratic candidates and their Republican opponents is that the Republicans collectively did not differ as much on whether to focus on male or female issues. Republicans focused significantly more on male issues and only one candidate broke that pattern while five female Democrats focused on female issues and three emphasized male issues.

In terms of traits, both female and male Democratic candidates mention male traits far more often than their Republican counterparts, and there is a bigger difference between how often they mention either trait. For example, male Republicans mention female traits approximately half as much as the mention male traits, while female Democrats mention female traits about 40% less as often as they mention male traits. However, two Republicans Posthumus and Salmon emphasized female traits more than male traits but not by very much. Posthumus mentions four female traits to three male traits and Salmon mentions eight female traits compared to four male traits. In comparison, only one female Democrat mentioned female traits as often as male traits, Jennifer Granholm of Michigan who mentioned male traits seven times and female traits seven times.

Table 3.2.

Comparing Issue Mentions between Male and Female Candidates

	Taxes	Crime	Business	Budget	Economy	Health	Education	Jobs	Elderly
Female	9%	14%	8%	5%	2%	18%	17%	14%	6%
Male D	18%	3%	4%	5%	5%	11%	20%	16%	7%
Male R	17%	5%	16%	17%	4%	4%	13%	10%	3%

* The issues listed do not represent an exhaustive list but rather the issues mentioned the most

Comparing the Issues: Female Democratic Candidates and Republican Opponents

Overall, the biggest apparent difference between female Democratic candidates and their Republican opponents is the difference between female issues (health, education, jobs, elderly or care for seniors) and male issues (taxes, crime, business, budget/government spending and the economy). The female Democratic candidates mentioned female issues a lot more than their Republican opponents and the Republican candidates mentioned male issues significantly more than their female opponents. The top three issues for female candidates were health 18%, education 17% and crime 14%². For females a male issue, crime is listed in their top three which indicates the importance that female candidates gave to that issue even if they mentioned female issues more often. On the other hand, the top three issues for male candidates were

² Crime and Jobs are the same percentage in the table, but crime has one more mention than jobs

budget/government spending 17%, taxes 17%, and business 16%. For their Republican opponents, no female issues appeared in the top three mentions of the candidates collectively, which indicates that the Republican males focused more on their perceived strengths than the female candidates. Furthermore, party identification indicates whether a candidate will focus on business and budget deficits, emphasized by Republicans, while Democrats focus more on health. However, these findings are incomplete without data about the issues female Republican candidates emphasize. However, my findings indicated that Democratic women emphasize crime more than men, and this difference can be attributed to their gender not their party.

Comparing the Issues: Female Democratic Candidates and Male Democratic Candidates

The biggest difference between the male and female candidates of the same party is the discrepancy between male issues like taxes, crime and business and female issues like health. Overall, females focus much more on crime than their male counterparts. This may be because so many of the female candidates selected had backgrounds in crime and argued in their advertisements how their background demonstrated that they were tough on crime. Furthermore, male Democrats discussed taxes twice as often as the female candidates. This may also be due to the backgrounds of the candidates. Most of the male Democratic candidates had political backgrounds and argued their experiences demonstrated their responsibility to taxpayers. Interestingly, both male and female Democrats mention male traits more than female traits, which suggests that both feel that focusing on male traits is a more advantageous strategy. While partisanship is the biggest factor that influences whether a candidate focuses on male or female issues, gender dictates which of those issues the candidate will focus more on. For instance, women focus more on crime - mentioned 14% for female Democrats and 3% for male

Democrats and 5% for male Republicans- while men focus more on taxes – 17-18% for male candidates and 9% for female Democrats.

Table 3.3

Comparing Trait Mentions between Male and Female Candidates

	Honest	Moral	Trust	Hard work	Tough	Leader	Consistent	Aggressive
Female	1%	5%	15%	3%	17%	10%	5%	11%
Male D	3%	12%	3%	12%	10%	19%	7%	22%
Male R	11%	13%	4%	13%	7%	31%	4%	1%

*Hard work is hardworking and leader refers to strong leader

* This list is not exhaustive but represents the top 8 traits mentioned

Comparing the Traits: Female Democratic Candidates and Republican Opponents

One of the main differences between female Democratic candidates and their Republican opponents is that females mention more traits than their male opponents. The total percentage of male traits mentioned by female Democratic candidates was 71% and the total percentage of female traits was 29%. The total number of male traits mentioned by male Republican candidates was 65% and the total number of female traits was 35%. When comparing trait percentages it is clear that both candidates mention male traits more often but female candidates mention female traits a third as much while male candidates mention female

traits only half as often. It is clear that female Democrats make a significant attempt to persuade voters they possess male traits more than their Republican opponents.

Furthermore, when examining table 3.3, of the top eight traits mentioned, five were male (hardworking, tough, strong leader, consistent/stable/ and aggressive) and three were female (Honest, Moral/ and trustworthy). Females mentioned the top five male traits 50 times while their male Republican opponents mentioned these traits 40 times. The top three traits mentioned by females were tough 17% trustworthy 15% and aggressive 11% while the top three traits mentioned by Republican males were strong leader 31%, hardworking 13%, moral 13% and honest 11%. Overall, both female Democratic candidates and their Republican opponents prioritized mentioning male traits. However, female Democratic candidates mentioned male traits more often.

Comparing the Traits: Female Democratic Candidates and Male Democratic Candidates

The total number of traits is very similar for male and female Democratic candidates. The total percentage of male traits mentioned by female Democratic candidates was 71% and the total percentage of female traits was 29%. The total percentage of male traits mentioned by male Democratic candidates was 78% and the total percentage of female traits was 22%. Both male and female Democratic candidates mention female issues a third less than male issues in their campaign advertisements. While the total percentages of male and female traits addressed in advertisements are similar, male and female Democrats focused on different specific traits.

While the top three traits mentioned by females were tough 17%, trustworthy 15% and aggressive 11%, the top three traits mentioned by their male counterparts were aggressive 22%, strong leader 19%, hardworking 12%, and moral 12%. While both candidates have one female trait in their top three, male Democratic candidates mention the top five male traits a lot more

often than females 70 – 50. Overall, male Democratic candidates find it more important to emphasize male traits like aggressiveness and strong leadership more than female Democrats. Furthermore, gender dictates that males are more likely to emphasize morality, hard work, and strong leadership while Democratic females are more likely to emphasize trust. However, partisan identification indicates that Republicans emphasize honesty, while Democrats emphasize toughness and aggressiveness. Furthermore, while Democrats emphasize toughness more than male Republicans, female Democrats emphasize toughness 7% more than male Democrats. Overall, Republicans emphasize female traits more than Democrats who focus more exclusively on male traits.

Conclusion

My data indicates that female Democratic candidates focus more on female issues than male issues, but focus more on male issues than their male Democratic counterparts. In addition, Democrats mention traits more than Republicans; female Democrats mentioned traits 105 times while male Democrats mentioned 100 times, and male Republicans mentioned traits 71 times. Therefore, partisanship accounts for whether candidates focus on female or male issues, with Democrats focusing on female issues and Republicans focusing on male issues. On the other hand, gender accounts for what issues and traits candidates focus on. For instance Democratic women emphasize crime and health while men emphasize taxes. Furthermore, female Democrats mention female traits and male issues more than their male Democratic counterparts but not by much. Female Democratic candidates mention male issues 2% more than male Democrats and female traits 7% more than male Democrats. When it comes to traits, regardless of party identification, all candidates find focusing on male traits to be a more advantageous strategy. However, Democrats emphasize male traits more than Republicans, and

male Democrats mention male traits 7% more than female Democrats. However, gender indicates what traits candidates will emphasize; for instance, Democratic females emphasize toughness and trust while males emphasize morality, hard work and strong leadership. Overall, female Democratic gubernatorial candidates emphasize female issues and male traits in their television advertisements.

Examining the Races: Eight Case Studies

The eight case studies presented in the section examine races between a female Democratic candidate and a male Republican with the goal of examining the policy environment or policies dominating the agenda, a candidate's background, and the political environment of the state. The case study section examines potential confounding variables in races to determine what factors influence what issues and traits a candidate decides to focus on during a gubernatorial campaign. The purpose of this section is to have a better understanding of how gender explains what issues and traits men and women focus on compared to other factors. By examining races in detail, I hope to have a better understanding of how gender affects campaign strategy. Furthermore, of the eight female gubernatorial candidates, four (McCaskill, Gregoire, Granholm, and Napolitano) had a background in law enforcement, as a prosecutor or Attorney General and all eight female candidates had held previous elected position. The case studies will demonstrate, that even with backgrounds in crime and law enforcement, female gubernatorial candidates focused more on female issues overall. But as demonstrated in the evidence section, they focused on male issues and male traits more than their Democratic male counterparts. Overall, the case studies are meant to examine how much we can attribute gender compared to other factors in explaining the strategies utilized or issues and traits emphasized in races.

Claire McCaskill v. Matt Blunt

On August 3rd 2004, former prosecutor and State Auditor Claire McCaskill beat Incumbent Governor Bob Holden in the Democratic gubernatorial primary in Missouri (Almanac 2008). In the open gubernatorial election, Democrat Claire McCaskill lost to Republican Matt Blunt, the Secretary of State 48% to 51% (Almanac 2008). While McCaskill's general campaign focused on male issues and traits, Blunt's campaign focused on male traits and female issues.

McCaskill tried to utilize her experience and record to convince Missourians that Blunt lacked the experience and proven effective record to be Governor.

	Female Issues	Male Issues	Female Traits	Male Traits
McCaskill	27%	73%	20%	80%
Blunt	57%	43%	27%	73%

McCaskill was one of three female gubernatorial candidates who chose to focus on male issues instead of female issues. She mentioned issues relating to taxes 32% and crime 42% of the total issues mentioned. Claire McCaskill mentioned male issues 73% and female issues 27% in 12 advertisements that her campaign ran in the general election. Of the total male issues mentioned, crime and taxes were mentioned the most which could indicate that McCaskill choose which issues to focus on based on her previous experience as a State Auditor and former prosecutor.

While confronting gender stereotypes may be one explanation for why female candidates focus on some issues more than others, McCaskill's background could also help explain why she focused on male issues. According to the research of gender scholars, the public sees women as less competent than men on crime. Therefore, McCaskill may have focused on crime to emphasize her experience and previous success as a prosecutor. Therefore, McCaskill may have focused on crime not to overcome perceived weaknesses about her competency on this male issue, but to demonstrate her previous experience and successes as a former prosecutor. However, many of the women running for Governor also had previous experience in law enforcement, which may have helped them get nominated or taken seriously as a gubernatorial

candidate. Therefore, having a background in policy areas, where men are seen as more competent than women, may help gubernatorial candidates overcome gender stereotypes before the election even starts. Having a background where a female candidate addresses male issues may help female gubernatorial candidates overcome gender stereotypes by enabling them to talk credibly about male issues. However, candidates decide whether or not they want to focus on their experience during their campaigns.

Claire McCaskill focused on taxes and crime, two issues that are closely related to her background as a former prosecutor and as state auditor. In discussing taxes, McCaskill states that as state auditor she saved Missouri taxpayers money and utilized audits to spend money wisely. For example, in *Attacks Revised* McCaskill conveys that as a state auditor she issued findings and penalties for bad nursing-homes (*Attacks Revised* 2004). McCaskill decided to utilize her previous political experience and run on her record. McCaskill could have emphasized other issues that she tackled successfully as a state auditor and former prosecutor. However, McCaskill's campaign decided not to focus on health care or education - which as state auditor she mentions in *McCaskill Absurd-* (McCaskill Absurd, 2004). Instead McCaskill decided to utilize her experience to demonstrate her strength on male issues instead of emphasizing how her experience demonstrates her strength on female issues. McCaskill's campaign decided to utilize her former experience to focus on male issues like crime and taxes and took a very aggressive approach to persuade voters of her experience.

In the 12 advertisements that ran in the 2004 Gubernatorial primary, McCaskill's campaign emphasized male traits. McCaskill mentioned male traits 80% and female traits only 20% in her general campaign advertisements. Overall she mentions tough and decisive traits the most; however, both are mentioned only 3 times. In the 2004 general election, Claire McCaskill

emphasized male traits and male issues but lost the Missouri election to Matt Blunt, who focused his advertising on female issues and male traits.

Matt Blunt, the Secretary of State, focused on female issues in the election, mentioning female issues 57% and male issues 43% in the 12 advertisements his campaign aired before the general election. Blunt is the only Republican male in the races examined that focused on female issues more than male issues. Blunt focused on defense 10%, taxes 17%, health 14%, education 19%, jobs 12%, and elderly care 10%. Blunt's background as a Navy Officer may explain why he mentioned defense more than any other candidate. Matt Blunt may have mentioned defense to emphasize his experience as a Naval Officer to demonstrate to voters his toughness and experience in a "leadership role where the orders he gave had real consequences" (New Course 2004). Therefore, Blunt may have emphasized this aspect in order to emphasize his experience rather than to focus on male issues to demonstrate that even at 33, he has the experience to be governor. Blunt could have focused his campaign on male issues, like defense where his background would suggest he would be very strong on these issues, but he emphasized his campaign on female issues. However, Blunt used his experience as Secretary of State to emphasize his strength on issues relating to seniors, education, and healthcare; for instance, he often mentioned he would bring a new direction on "jobs, education, and healthcare" (Delivered 2004). Blunt mentioned these three female issues repeatedly in his advertisements. While McCaskill also emphasized these issues she focused significantly more on taxes and crime while Blunt did not mention crime once in his advertisements.

In his advertisements, Blunt focused on male traits, mentioning male traits 73% and female traits 27% in his 12 advertisements. Of those mentions 41% came from emphasizing that he was a strong leader, 14% came from moral, and 14% came from consistent or stable.

Matt Blunt's campaign slogan was "Leadership, vision, and change" (Bio 2004). When this slogan was mentioned in his advertisements, leadership was coded as male and vision and change were not coded. Because Bob Holden, the incumbent was a Democrat, Blunt utilized his advertisements to stress strong leadership that would lead Missouri in a new direction (Bio 2004). Overall Blunt emphasized being a strong leader who would bring change to Missouri and who would focus on education, health, and jobs.

Matt Blunt focused on female issues in his advertisements and often emphasized his role as Secretary of State in relation to his success and strength on these issues. However, he also had a background as a naval officer, but chose to focus his campaign on female issues instead of emphasizing defense. However, in most of the advertisements where Blunt mentioned education, he did not relate it to his success or experience as Secretary of State. Therefore, a candidate's background may explain why candidates' focus on some issues more than others, but cannot explain why Blunt focused on education. Furthermore, candidate's can decide whether or not to utilize their background to emphasize their experience in some areas over others. In addition, while both Blunt and McCaskill emphasized male traits more than female traits it is important to note that McCaskill mentioned male traits more often. This suggests that while both male and female candidates see emphasizing male traits as a more advantageous strategy, the female candidate mentioned male traits more than her male opponent, suggesting that women find it more important to stress that they possess masculine traits.

Chris Gregoire v. Dino Rossi

In November of 2004, former Attorney General Democrat, Christine Gregoire defeated businessman and former State Senator, Dino Rossi to be Washington's Governor. Even with a background as a prosecutor, Gregoire's campaign focused on female issues and male traits.

Gregoire's opponent, Rossi focused his campaign on male issues and male traits. Gregoire emphasized her perceived policy strengths and won one of the closest races in American history, 48.8730% to 48.8685 % or 129 votes (Almanac Gregoire 2002)

	Female Issues	Male Issues	Female Traits	Male Traits
Gregoire	71%	29%	14%	86%
Rossi	33%	66%	0%	100%

Similar to Claire McCaskill, Chris Gregoire also had a background prosecuting crime as a former attorney general. Unlike McCaskill, Gregoire only discussed crime in one advertisement and does not utilize her experience as attorney general to emphasize her experience as the state's chief law enforcement officer. This indicates that candidates do not just focus on certain issues because of their background and experience but also consciously decide to focus on some issues more than others. In the 10 advertisements ran leading up to the general election, Gregoire's campaign focused on female issues, particularly healthcare 42% and jobs 21% of the total issues coded. In addition, Gregoire discussed her own experience with health insurance costs when she discovered she had breast cancer; however, she only mentions her own experience with the health care system in one advertisement. Gregoire does not focus on healthcare because of her experience with cancer or her experience as attorney general. Gregoire decided to emphasize healthcare as a very important issue she felt confident she could address for Washington. In comparison, in the 13 advertisement's Rossi aired, he only mentioned healthcare once and instead focused on jobs 25%, business 38% and taxes 21%. Rossi emphasized his small

business experience and Gregoire focused on improving services like healthcare without significantly increasing costs.

Dino Rossi, a businessman and former state senator, focused his advertisements on criticizing Chris Gregoire's experience as attorney general and ran on a message of bringing change to Washington. His advertisements criticized Gregoire for being part of the status quo and claimed that she was looking to raise taxes on business that would cost jobs and also charged that Gregoire had mismanaged her office (East Wash Taxes 2004). Rossi ran his campaign as a moderate with business experience who would help businesses grow without raising taxes. Instead of discussing issues like health or education, Rossi utilized his advertisements to criticize Gregoire and focused on business.

Both Rossi and Gregoire mentioned male traits more than female traits. Rossi mentioned "hardworking" the most and Gregoire mentioned "aggressive" and "strong leader." All of Rossi's trait mentions were hardworking, but he only mentioned traits 6 times in his advertisement while Gregoire mentioned traits 14 times in her advertisement. For Gregoire, 86% of the total traits mentioned were male and 14% were female. Therefore, Gregoire found it more advantageous to mention traits more often than her male opponent. Rossi, only mentioned 6 traits overall and never mentioned any female trait.

This case study demonstrates that candidate's do not simply focus on issues they have experience handling. For instance, Gregoire's experience as attorney general and her experience with breast cancer cannot explain why she focused on health care. Candidates decide whether or not to emphasize their experience and decide which issues to highlight using their experience. For instance, Gregoire could have focused more on how her role as attorney general saved the taxpayers money. This suggests that gender is a factor in deciding which issues candidates

emphasize and suggests that candidates believe highlighting some issues over others will improve how viable voters see them. Furthermore, this case study demonstrates that although male and females find it advantageous to focus on male traits more than female traits, females mention traits more often.

Janet Napolitano v. Matt Salmon

In the 2002 Arizona gubernatorial election, former Attorney General Janet Napolitano defeated former Congressman Matt Salmon 46% to 45 % (Almanac Napolitano 2008).

Napolitano emphasized male traits and female issues while Salmon emphasized male issues and male and female traits equally. Salmon was the only male candidate to emphasize male and female traits equally. Napolitano ran on her strong record and experience as attorney general, emphasizing education and toughness.

	Female Issues	Male Issues	Female Traits	Male Traits
Napolitano	58%	42%	33%	67%
Salmon	23%	77%	50%	50%

In Napolitano’s 7 advertisements, the former attorney general stressed education as her top priority. Out of the total issues mentioned in her advertisements, education made up 37% of the mentions; the only other issue mentioned several times was business/business regulation which made up 16% of total mentions. Napolitano used her record as the state’s attorney general to emphasize that she was a tough and aggressive politician using language like “taking on corrupt corporations,” “stood up for our children” and “will fight to get” (Napolitano Stood Up

2002). While Napolitano focused on a perceived female strength, education, she utilized aggressive language to emphasize her political background.

Napolitano's opponent, former Congressman Matt Salmon was also very experienced in government. However, Salmon focused his campaign advertisements on emphasizing male issues significantly more than female issues, almost three times as much. Of the total issues coded for in Salmon's six advertisements, budget/government spending accounted for 36% while taxes accounted for 26%. The small number of advertisements, but large number of coded issues indicates that politicians can mention a lot of policy issues and traits about themselves in a small number of advertisements. Furthermore, Salmon's advertisements focused less on negative campaign advertisements or specific experiences but focused on discussing what issues he planned to address if elected. This type of advertising allows for a large number of issues and traits to be mentioned because the focus is on what he will do in office if elected.

Interestingly, of all the candidates, female and male Republicans and Democrats, Salmon is the only candidate who mentions female traits as often as male traits. Of the female traits mentioned, Salmon focused on honesty, which made up all the female traits coded in his advertisements, which indicates that he made a significant effort to get across to voters that he was an honest person. Because Salmon is the only candidate who utilized the strategy of mentioning female traits as often as male traits, it is clear that not all politicians clearly emphasize male traits more than female traits. Even though Salmon lost, in a very close election, it is clear that politicians do find value in emphasizing female traits like honesty. However, his female opponent, Napolitano found it more advantageous to mention male traits much more often than female traits. In most of the case studies, the female candidates mention male traits more often than their opponent, which indicates that men find it advantageous to mention female

traits more than their female opponents. This indicates that while both females and male emphasize male traits, female democrats mention male traits more often than their opponents.

Shannon O'Brien v. Mitt Romney

In 2002, founder of Bain Capital and member of the 2002 Salt Lake Organizing Committee, Mitt Romney defeated State Treasurer, Shannon O'Brien 50% to 45% (Almanac Romney 2006). O'Brien emphasized female issues and male traits in her advertisements while Romney emphasized male issues and male traits.

	Female Issues	Male Issues	Female Traits	Male Traits
O'Brien	77.5%	22.5%	45%	55%
Romney	37.5%	62.5%	30%	70%

In this election, O'Brien clearly favored focusing on female issues and Romney focused on male issues. Furthermore, both O'Brien and Romney conveyed male traits in emphasizing their qualities and viability to be the next Governor. However, Romney felt it more advantageous to stress male issues. It is also important to note that O'Brien mentioned twice as many traits as Romney and both candidates mentioned the same number of issues in their advertisements. Furthermore, O'Brien focused on conveying to voters that she was tough and would aggressively fight for constituents, using language like "O'Brien will fight for" "stand up for you" "stood up against" "will protect" (O'Brien Vote 2002). Like other female candidates, O'Brien utilized aggressive language to demonstrate that she possessed male traits to voters. For O'Brien, tough and aggressive made up 20% of her overall traits coded while for Romney these traits only made up 10%; instead he focused on emphasizing his leadership style, hardworking,

and honesty. Therefore, it is clear O'Brien emphasized traits more than Romney and wanted to focus on convincing voters she was tough and aggressive. However, like most other races, both candidates mentioned more issues than traits, while O'Brien mentioned more traits than Romney.

Overall, O'Brien mentioned female issues 77.5% of and jobs accounted for 43% of the total mentions, health for 23%, and education for 13%. However, when O'Brien mentioned healthcare it was often in relation to Romney's firm taking away health benefits from workers. For example, O'Brien's campaign ran several negative campaign advertisements attacking Romney's firm for closing a steel plant and robbing workers of their promised health benefits (Romney Employee 2002: Edward Stanger 2002). Therefore, O'Brien focused on healthcare as a way to attack Romney's background, not as an issue to bring up to voters as a way to improve the healthcare system. In addition, it is notable that even though O'Brien worked as the State Treasurer, she did not chose to focus on taxes or the budget but instead on policy issues were females are perceived as stronger like jobs, education, and health. Considering O'Brien's background, it is note-worthy that she only mentioned budget/government spending once and taxes twice. Therefore, past experience cannot explain why O'Brien's campaign focused on male issues. If political and professional experience dictates the issues that gubernatorial candidates' run on, we would expect O'Brien to run on budget and tax issues. These issues tare more directly applicable to her experience as state treasurer; however, we see O'Brien focusing on female issues even though her experience lies in perceived male strengths. O'Brien's race demonstrates that O'Brien picked issues that voters see women as more competent on than men.

The three biggest issues that Romney mentioned in his campaign were taxes 20%, business/business regulation 18% and budget 15%. In this case, Romney sticks to issues that represent his background and perceived policy strengths as a male. However, Romney mentions

jobs 20%, which indicates that job growth was a priority for his campaign. Furthermore, while for O'Brien, health care was made up 23% of her total issues Romney only mentions health or healthcare once. This indicates, that even if the policy environment is favored toward women and domestic policies, it is candidates or campaign managers who define the issues discussed in the campaign. Even with O'Brien mentioning health, education, and jobs, Romney decided to focus on his perceived strengths as well.

This case study demonstrates that a candidate's background or the policy environment does not adequately explain why candidates focus on some issues or traits more than others. Furthermore, while Romney emphasized male traits more than O'Brien, it is important to note that O'Brien stressed toughness and aggressive qualities while Romney stressed that he had a strong leadership style and was hardworking. In addition, O'Brien mentioned traits twice as often as Romney. This case study shows that women may find it more important to stress personality traits more than men and focus on aggressive and toughness. As demonstrated in the evidence section, male candidates find it more advantageous to stress they are hardworking and possess a strong leadership style. Therefore gender explains what traits men and women stress, which are different and not necessarily partisan specific.

Kathleen Kennedy Townsend v. Robert Ehrlich, Jr.

In November 2002, former Congressman Bob Ehrlich defeated Lieutenant Governor, Kathleen Kennedy Townsend 52% to 48% for Governor of Maryland (Almanac Ehrlich 2006). Townsend focused her campaign on female issues and male traits while Ehrlich focused on male traits and male issues. Townsend mentioned male traits three times more than Ehrlich, and tried to get across to voters that she was aggressive and would fight for Maryland. The campaign

advertisements by both candidates focused on gun control, which was not coded for my research unless directly related to crime.

	Female Issues	Male Issues	Female Traits	Male Traits
Townsend	79%	21%	14%	86%
Ehrlich	41%	59%	20%	80%

Townsend focused her campaign on female issues especially education 33%, care for the elderly 18%, and the environment 13%. Townsend also mentioned crime 15%, but mostly in relation to gun laws. Townsend focused her attack advertisements on gun control laws and Ehrlich's position on ballistic fingerprinting. For instance in *Ehrlich NRA*, her campaign points out Ehrlich "voted to repeal the assault weapons ban, opposed current background checks for buying a gun, refuses to support ballistic fingerprinting of assault weapons and other firearms to help police solve crimes" (Ehrlich NRA 2002). Townsend tried to sell Ehrlich as the NRA candidate, which may have resonated with very liberal city voters but did not resonate as much with moderate, rural voters. Furthermore, Townsend tried to paint Ehrlich as an extreme Republican "my opponent has voted with the extreme wing of the Republican Party" (Define Future 2 2002). In the election, Townsend won the Democrats "Big Three" – Baltimore City, Montgomery, and Prince George's but Ehrlich carried everything else by wide margins (Almanac Ehrlich 2002, 3). However, even with gun laws made a big issue in the campaign, Townsend focused on perceived strengths like education and elderly care. This illustrates that even if the policy environment calls for unique issues to be addressed like ballistic fingerprinting, candidates pick which issues to focus on.

Ehrlich focused his campaign on perceived strengths as well and focused on budget/government spending 27%, crime 22%, and infrastructure 11%. Infrastructure is a unique issue compared to other campaigns and demonstrates that the policy environment of the state played a role in explaining why Ehrlich focused on infrastructure. In Maryland, the ICC refers to the Intercounty Connector; Ehrlich used the issue to promise to build and finish the ICC, a project according to Ehrlich that Townsend and Glendening promised to build but have yet to finish (Ehrlich ICC, 2002). Ehrlich also focused on education 22%, which ties with budget issues as the second most addressed issue in his campaign advertisements. Overall, Ehrlich utilized his perceived issue strengths to focus on male issues and traits to run a campaign based on change.

One issue with coding these advertisements is that gun laws were not included in the issues coded; therefore, gun laws were only coded if they were directly related to crime in the context of the advertisement. If gun advertisements were coded as a male issue, Townsend would have more issues that result as male, but not enough to make her shift the results so that male issues outnumbered female issues. Even with this potential problem, it is clear that this race indicates that both candidates attempted to utilize their perceived strengths and emphasize traits voters prefer, male traits in an attempt to gain votes. Furthermore, while the policy environment of the state explains why candidates' emphasize some issues, it cannot explain why Townsend focused on female issues. If the policy environment were the most important factor in explaining what issues candidate's focused on we would expect infrastructure and gun laws, male issues, to be the issues that both Ehrlich and Townsend focused on the most.

Jennifer Granholm v. Dick Posthumus

In 2002, Attorney General Jennifer Granholm defeated Lieutenant Governor Dick Posthumus 51% to 47% for Governor of Michigan (Almanac Granholm 2008). Jennifer Granholm is one of three female gubernatorial candidates that focused on male issues and mentions male and female traits equally. Her opponent Dick Posthumus also focused on male issues; however he mentions more female traits than male traits in his campaign advertisements. Overall, Granholm ran on her experience and success as Attorney General, emphasized her plan to address a range of issues in Michigan, and persuaded voters she possessed a wide range of desirable traits in a candidate. Granholm's campaign is unique due to the variety of traits and issues addressed in her campaign advertisements.

	Female Issues	Male Issues	Female Traits	Male Traits
Granholm	42%	58%	50%	50%
Posthumus	44%	56%	57%	43%

Granholm utilized campaign advertisements to show voters she had a plan to address a variety of important issues. Granholm focused on crime 33%, business 17% and health 17%. However, Granholm did not focus entirely on a few issues, but instead focused on a different issue almost exclusively in each one of her advertisements. While Granholm addressed male issues the most, she often referred back to her strong record as Attorney General to illustrate how tough she was on fighting crime, protecting seniors, and holding companies accountable. In addition, Granholm is the only candidate that emphasizes traits more than issues when trying to persuade voters of her viability to be governor. While Granholm emphasizes trust the most 50%,

she also emphasizes being a strong leader 21% and aggressive 21%. Overall, Granholm emphasizes her strength on a variety of issues and traits to prove that she is a viable candidate. Granholm also argued she was tough and ran on her strong background as attorney general to emphasize that she was equally trustworthy and aggressive.

Posthumus focused on male issues and female traits in his advertising. Of the total issues mentioned, 38% of them were coded for taxes and 19% were coded for the environment. Posthumus emphasized to voters that he refused to raise property taxes and would protect the Michigan outdoors. For total traits, Posthumus emphasized his morality and integrity with 19% of the female traits coded for mentioning moral. Posthumus ran as a blue collar-collared candidate, and emphasized growing up as a farmer in Michigan and attacked Granholm for growing up in California and for wanting to raise property taxes. Overall, in this race, Posthumus focused on emphasizing issues more than traits and emphasizing his morality when discussing his personal traits that made him a viable candidate.

One problem in trying to draw conclusions and present data is that in this race, only a few advertisements came out in the general election that were put out by the candidate. For Posthumus only four advertisements were coded and for Granholm only six were coded; however, candidates can focus on certain traits or issues even in a small number of available general election advertisements. Therefore, in comparing the issues and traits that Granholm and Posthumus focused on, a small number of advertisements are not a problem. Furthermore, Granholm mentioned twice as many traits as Posthumus in her advertisements, which suggests she found it more advantageous to discuss traits, while Posthumus mentioned more issues than Granholm. In most of the examined races, the female gubernatorial candidate mentions more

traits than the male candidate, suggesting that women find it more important than men to emphasize masculine traits.

Myrth York v. Don Carcieri

In 2002, former Businessman and Teacher Don Carcieri defeated State Senator Myrth York for Governor of Rhode Island 55% to 45% (Almanac York 2006). York emphasized female issues and male traits while Carcieri emphasized male issues and male traits in his campaign advertisements. Carcieri ran as a political outsider, he had no experience in public office, but he emphasized the state's budget and education in order to persuade voters of his political viability. In addition, he focused almost exclusively on issues and only mentioned 3 traits, while York mentioned traits four times more.

	Female Issues	Male Issues	Female Traits	Male Traits
York	56%	44%	8%	92%
Carcieri	44%	56%	0%	100%

Carcieri emphasized male issues specifically budget/government spending 44% and taxes 11%. Carcieri also mentioned education 33% and jobs 11% but overall he focused on issues where voters perceive males as more competent on compared to women. However, only four advertisements were coded for Carcieri; furthermore, he does not mention many issues or traits, which makes drawing conclusions from his data difficult. However, with the few advertisement put out by Carcieri for the general election, he makes it clear he has a plan to fix the budget mess and plans on a "big audit" for Rhode Island (Carcieri Big Audit 2002). However, he does not draw on his experience as a CEO to emphasize his ability to make tough and effective spending

decisions. Carcieri discusses his experience as a teacher to emphasize education and his experience as a CEO as demonstrating his leadership capacities but not to discuss spending or budget decisions. Carcieri runs his campaign on a message of cleaning up the state of Rhode Island and getting the budget under control

York emphasized female issues in her advertisements focusing on health 35% and jobs 9%. York also emphasized male issues including crime 18% and budget or government spending 18%. In York's advertising, she stresses that Carcieri's company violated health and safety standards that threatened workers and the environment (York Carcieri CEO 2002). Furthermore, the former state senator and prosecutor utilized her record to emphasize her work on domestic violence and standing up to insurance companies. York emphasizes her toughness and willingness to take on big companies in order to lower health insurance premiums, making it clear that healthcare is the issue she is running on. York focuses on her perceived strengths and demonstrates how she will use male traits (tough, aggressive) to fight policy problems like lowering health insurance premiums.

Kathleen Sebelius v. Tim Shallenberger

In 2002, Insurance Commissioner Kathleen Sebelius defeated state Treasurer Tim Shallenberger, 53% to 45%. Sebelius is one of the three female gubernatorial candidates that focused on male issues and not female issues. Furthermore, Sebelius focused on male traits while her opponent focused on male issues and male traits. Shallenberger's campaign advertisements focused on attacking Sebelius while Sebelius focused on a message of change. In addition, like most female candidates, Sebelius mentioned more traits overall than her Republican opponent.

	Female Issues	Male Issues	Female Traits	Male Traits
Sebelius	39%	61%	40%	60%
Shallenberger	19%	81%	43%	57%

Sebelius focused on budget/government spending 26%, health 22%, crime 13%, taxes 13% and health 13%. Instead of focusing on her perceived issue strengths, Sebelius focused on perceived weaknesses and argued for discipline and accountability of government with strict audits (Fresh Start 2002). She directly addressed the negative advertising strategy of Shallenberger “his personal attacks don’t hurt me, I can take it” (Sebelius Important Challenges 2002). Sebelius emphasized her toughness and trustworthiness to voters when emphasizing desired traits and mentioned more overall traits than Shallenberger.

Shallenberger’s advertisements focused on attacking Sebelius instead of emphasizing his plans for the state and the personal qualities and traits he possessed. Shallenberger attempted to convince voters that Sebelius was not tough on crime, was too liberal, and would raise taxes. The conservative state treasurer focused on taxes 38%, budget/government spending 19%, and crime 19%. He barely discussed any female issues and only mentioned education and jobs once. Shallenberger mentioned his background to argue that he had the ability and experience to cut waste and taxpayer spending, but overall utilized his advertisements to attack Sebelius. Furthermore, both Sebelius and Shallenberger emphasized “tough” and “trustworthy” but Sebelius mentioned that she was tough a lot more. Toughness accounted for 40% of the traits coded for Sebelius and 29% of the traits coded for Shallenberger.

In this race both candidates emphasized male issues and male traits. Sebelius is on the defensive and argued that she was trustworthy and should respect tax dollars and cut department spending (Sebelius Over the Years 2002). Sebelius may have focused on these issues instead of others to confront the negative advertisements of Shallenburger and address specifically the attacks made against her. Therefore, Shallenburger's negative advertising may explain why Sebelius why taxes and budget spending made up 40% of the issues mentioned in all her television advertisements. However, this case study still demonstrates that women mention traits more often than men and are more likely to emphasize male traits.

What the Case Studies Demonstrate

The case studies demonstrate that men and women gubernatorial candidates focus on different issues and traits. For instance, Republican men focus more on taxes, business, and the budget while Democratic women focus more on crime and healthcare. In addition, the case studies demonstrate that women find it more advantageous to discuss character traits and make a bigger effort to emphasize that they possess masculine traits like toughness and aggressive. Furthermore, female Democratic gubernatorial candidates use more aggressive rhetoric in their campaign advertisements than men when discussing male or female issues. The case studies also demonstrate the importance of gender compared to other factors like background or the policy environment.

The case studies show that a candidate's background, previous experience, and the policy environment cannot alone, adequately explain what issues and traits candidates focus on in their television advertisements. For instance, if previous experience explained what issues candidates focus on, we would expect Shannon O'Brien, the former State Treasurer of Massachusetts, to focus on issues surrounding the budget or taxes. However, O'Brien focused on education and

health care, which accounted for 35% while the economy, taxes, and the budget accounted for 12.5% of total issues coded. In addition, the cases studies demonstrate that females focus more on crime and although five of the female gubernatorial candidates have an experience in crime, that experience alone does not explain why they mention crime so often.

Overall, the case studies demonstrate that female Democratic gubernatorial candidates find it more advantageous to mention character traits more than their male Republican opponents. In addition, a candidate's gender can indicate what traits and issues that candidate will focus on in their advertisement. Democratic female gubernatorial candidates focus on proving they are tough and aggressive while Republican men focus on moral, hardworking, honest, and a strong leader. In addition, the case studies echo the findings of the evidence section that female Democratic candidates focus on crime and healthcare while male Republicans focus on budget issues, business, and taxes. Most importantly, the case studies demonstrate that gender is a factor that influences what issues and traits candidates decide to focus in their television campaign advertisements.

Conclusion

In conclusion, female Democratic gubernatorial candidates collectively take advantage of their perceived policy strengths and focus on female issues in their campaign advertisements. However, they focus on male traits to emphasize to voters they possess traits and qualities desired in leaders. On the other hand, their male Republican opponents focus on male issues while male Democratic candidates focus more on female issues. However, when comparing female Democratic candidates to male Democrats running in 2002 and 2004 for open seats it is clear that female Democrats discussed male issues more than their Democratic counterparts. Furthermore, female Democratic gubernatorial candidates mention traits more often than both Republican and Democratic males for Governor.

My research demonstrates that female candidates collectively focus on female issues when running for governor. While Iyengar's research determined that candidates are more advantaged when they campaign on their perceived strengths, my research does not attempt to link campaign strategy to electoral success (Iyengar et al. 1997, 78). Kahn argues that female gubernatorial candidates should and do focus on showing voters that they are strong and knowledgeable on perceived male policy strengths. My research indicates that female gubernatorial candidates focus more on female issues than male issues. However, when looking at the race (not simply the issue totals), female candidates are more split; five female candidates chose to focus on female issues while three focused on male issues. In addition, female gubernatorial candidates focus more on male issues than their male Democratic counterparts. This suggests that female Democratic gubernatorial candidates find it advantageous to mention male issues more because they are women; however, they still mention female issues more than male issues.

In terms of traits, the data was pretty convincing and suggested that all candidates, male and female, Democrat and Republican, find it a more advantageous strategy to focus on male traits in their television advertisements. Huddy and Terkildsen's research suggests that the possession of typical masculine traits increases a candidate's perceived competence across a variety of different issues while typical feminine traits are considered less important for officeholders to possess (Huddy and Terkildsen 1993, 63). This finding is indicative of what my research found when looking at whether candidates focus on male or female traits. For instance, all eight female gubernatorial candidates focused on male traits more than female traits except Jennifer Granholm who mentioned male and female traits an equal number of times. In addition, Democrats focused on emphasizing male traits more than Republicans. Furthermore, female Democratic candidates emphasized more female traits than their Democratic counterparts.

However, gender did play a factor in what issues and traits male and female candidates and Democratic and Republican candidates mention. For instance, female Democratic candidates emphasized toughness and trust while males emphasized morality, hard work and strong leadership. Furthermore, my research indicated that partisanship accounts for whether candidates focus on female or male issues, with Democrats focusing on female issues and Republicans focusing on male issues. On the other hand, gender accounts for what issues and traits candidates focus on. For instance Democratic women emphasize crime and health while men emphasize taxes. Furthermore, female Democrats mention female traits and male issues more than their male Democratic counterparts but not by much.

Limitations and Areas for future research

The biggest limitation on my study was the number of case studies available. Ideally, my thesis would have examined all female gubernatorial races that occurred in the 2000's to add to

the outdated research on governors from the 1990's. In addition, more case studies would have enabled me to make a better conclusion concerning whether female gubernatorial candidates focus on male or female issues. Scholars should also examine what traits and issues Republican female gubernatorial candidates emphasize to have a better understanding about how gender influences what issues and traits candidates focus on. In addition, ideally my study would be able to say something about how campaign message factors into electoral success. However due to the limitation of case studies and a number of confounding variables that I would have needed to account for, that task was too big for my project. However, scholars should consider how campaign message and gender stereotypes affects electoral outcome.

Future research should examine what issues and traits female executive candidates; specifically vice-presidential and Presidential candidates should focus on in their campaign. In order for women to fight gendered notions of their viability, it is important that those gender stereotypes be defined for Presidential candidates. Huddy and Terkildsen claim that typical masculine traits are more central for voters' ideal president than typical feminine traits (Huddy Terkildsen 1993, 504). In addition, because congress members and governors have no direct responsibility for the armed forces or foreign policy, female Presidential candidates may call for candidates to stress toughness (Huddy Terkildsen 1993, 506). Furthermore, scholars should look at how the Presidential policy climate differs from Congress and Gubernatorial campaigns in order to define if female candidates are strengthened or weakened by the policy climate. Scholars should also examine whether female Presidential candidates should focus on foreign policy or a domestic policy agenda. Furthermore, scholars should think about how voters' expectations change in terms of what they view as an ideal candidate on the Presidential level.

The 2008 general election indicated the importance of studying gender stereotypes in politics. When Hillary Clinton cried in New Hampshire, many in the media argued that appearing emotional was a strategy planned by the Clinton campaign. Furthermore, when CNBC's Donny Deutsch, in explaining why Clinton did not win the Democratic primary stated, "if you were gonna sell a new concept, a Woman in Power...you gotta first sell her as a women, before you can sell her as a candidate" (Ms. Magazine, 2008). This quote indicates that there are public and media preconceptions about whether a female executive candidate should portray feminine or masculine traits. In conclusion, gender stereotypes still exist in the media and in the public and future research should look into how gendered notions of viability factor into electoral success.

Works Cited

- Alexander, Deborah and Kristi Anderson "Gender as a Factor in the Attribution of Leadership Traits." *Political Research Quarterly* 1993 46: 527 – 545. Print.
- "Almanac of American Politics 2006 - Gov. Matt Blunt (R) - Missouri." *Almanac of American Politics*. National Journal Group, 22 June 2005. Web.
<<http://nationaljournal.com/pubs/almanac/2006/people/mo/mogv.htm>>.
- "Almanac of American Politics 2008 – Gov. Christine Gregoire (D) – Washington." *Almanac of American Politics 2008*. National Journal Group 2008. Web.
<http://nationaljournal.com/almanac/2008/people/wa/wagv.php>
- "Almanac of American Politics 2008- Gov. Janet Napolitano(D) – Arizona" *Almanac of American Politics 2008* – National Journal Group 2008. Web.
- "Almanac of American Politics 2006 – Gov. Mitt Romney – Massachusetts" *Almanac of American Politics 2006*. National Journal Group 2006. Web.
- "Almanac of American Politics 2006 – Gov. Robert Ehrlich (R)- Maryland" *Almanac of American Politics 2006*-. National Journal Group. June 22, 2005. Web.
- "Almanac of American Politics 2006 – Gov. Jennifer Granholm (D) – Michigan." *Almanac of American Politics 2008* National Journal Group 2008. Web.
- Bob Ehrlich for Maryland Committee. "MD/Ehrlich ICC." *TNS Media*. Maryland, 24 Oct. 2002. Television.
- Carcieri for Governor Committee. "RI/Carcieri Big Audit." *TNS Media*. Rhode Island, 06 Oct. 2002. Television

Fowler, Linda L., and Jennifer L. Lawless. "Looking for Sex in All the Wrong Places: Press Coverage and the Electoral Fortunes of Gubernatorial Candidates." *Perspectives on Politics* September 7.3 (2009). Print.

Fox, Richard L., and Jennifer L. Lawless. "Entering the Arena? Gender and the Decision to Run for Office." *American Journal of Political Science* April 48.2 (2004): 264-80. Print.

Friends of Kathleen Kennedy Townsend. "MD/Townsend Define Future 2." TNS Media. Maryland, 04 Nov. 2002. Television

Friends of Kathleen Kennedy Townsend. "MD/Townsend Ehrlich NRA." TNS Media. Maryland, 25 Oct. 2002. Television

Friends of McCaskill. "GOV/MO McCaskill Absurd." *TNS Media*. Missouri, 15 Oct. 2004. Television.

Friends of McCaskill. "Attacks Revised." *TNS Media*. Missouri, 21 Oct. 2004. Television

Goldstein, Kenneth, and Joel Rivlin. 2005 "Political Advertising in 2002." Combined file (dataset). Final release. Madison, WI: The Wisconsin Advertising Project, The Department of Political Science at The University of Wisconsin-Madison

Goldstein, Kenneth, and Joel Rivlin. 2007. "Presidential advertising, 2003-2004" Combined File [dataset]. Final release. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Advertising Project, The Department of Political Science at The University of Wisconsin-Madison.

"History of Women Governors." *Center for American Women and Politics*. Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers. Web. 2010. <<http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/index.php>>.

Huddy, Leonie and Nadya Terkildsen "The Consequences of Gender Stereotypes for Women Candidates at Different Levels and Types of Office." *Political Research Quarterly* 1993 46: 503

Janet Napolitano for Governor. "AZ/Napolitano Stood Up." *TNS Media*. Arizona, 30 Aug. 2002.

Television

Kahn, Kim F., Gordon, Ann. "How Women Campaign for the U.S. Senate: Substance and Strategy." Ed. Pippa Norris. *Women, Media, and Politics*. New York: Oxford UP, 1997.

59-76

Kahn, Kim F. "Assessing the Media's Impact on the Political Fortunes of Women." Ed. Susan J. Carroll. *Women and American Politics*. New York: Oxford UP, 2003. 173-89. Print.

Kahn, Kim F. *The Political Consequences of Being a Woman*. New York: Columbia UP, 1996.

Print.

Kathleen Sebelius for Kansas Governor. "KS/Sebelius Fresh Start." *TNS Media Kansas*, 28 Oct.

2002. Television

Lawless, Jennifer L., and Richard L. Fox. *It Still Takes A Candidate*. Revised Edition ed. New York: Cambridge UP, 2010. Print.

Lawless, Jennifer L. "Women, War, and Winning Elections: Gender Stereotyping in the Post-September 11th Era." *Political Research Quarterly* September 57.3 (2004): 479-490.

Print.

Missourians for Matt Blunt. "GOV/MO Blunt New Course." *TNS Media*. Missouri, 21 Oct.

2004. Television.

Missourians for Matt Blunt. "GOV/MO Blunt Delivered." *TNS Media*. Missouri, 12 Oct. 2004.

Television

Missourian for Matt Blunt. "GOV/MO Blunt Bio." *TNS Media*. Missouri, 04 Aug. 2004.

Television.

Myrth for Governor. "RI/York Carcieri CEO." TNS Media. Rhode Island, 18 Oct. 2002.

Television.

Rossi for Governor. "GOV/WA Rossi East Wash Taxes." TNS Media. Washington, 25 Oct.

2004. Television.

Sexist Comments Continue Against Sarah Palin & Hilary Clinton." *Ms. Magazine Online / More Than A Magazine - A Movement*. 9 Sept. 2008. Web. Jan. 2011.

<<http://msmagazine.com/news/uswirestory.asp?id=11277>>.

Shannon O'Brien Committee. "MA/O'Brien Edward Stanger." *TNS Media*. Massachusetts, 29, Oct. 2002. Television

The Shannon O'Brien Committee. "MA/O'Brien Romney Employee." TNS Media.

Massachusetts, 25 Oct. 2002. Television

Valentino, Nicholas A., Stephen Ansolabehere, and Adam F. Simon. "Running as a Woman: Gender Stereotyping in Political Campaigns." Ed. Pippa Norris. *Women, Media, and Politics*. By Shanto Iyengar. New York: Oxford UP, 1997. 77-98. Print.

Wheaton, Sarah. "Iron My Shirt." *Politics and Government - 2012 Presidential Watch - The Caucus Blog - NYTimes.com*. NY Times, 7 Jan. 2008. Web. Jan. 2011.

<<http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/01/07/iron-my-shirt/>>.

"Women Candidates for Governor 1970-2010: Major Party Nominees." *Center for American Women and Politics*. Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers. Web. 2010.

<<http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/index.php>>.