

**Gender and Resistance to Media Coverage:
the Dynamics of Leader Evaluations
in the 1993 Canadian Election**

by

Elisabeth Gidengil
Department of Political Science
McGill University

Joanna Everitt
Department of Political Science
University of New Brunswick

Paper presented at the International Association of Media and Communication Research,
Barcelona, Spain, July 2002.

Does gender condition acceptance of media messages about male and female candidates? Drawing on insights from the media effects literature and the gender identity literature we argue that it does. This argument is tested using data from the 1993 Canadian election. With a high-profile woman running for the country's top executive office, this election offers an all too rare opportunity to examine sex-of-leader effects in a real-world setting. The truly propitious circumstance of this election (for scholars, at least) is that the woman in question was leading the Conservative Party in a fight for the Canadian right against a rival right-wing party led by a man. This means that the leaders' basic ideological orientation is effectively controlled in our analyses.

Moreover, the rolling cross-section design of the campaign-wave of the 1993 Canadian Election Study¹ enables us assess the impact of media messages in real time by combining individual-level survey data with daily media quantities. Our study thus approximates a kind of natural experiment with the daily news coverage representing the introduced treatment. Few other countries and election campaigns have offered such an opportunity to explore the interaction between gender, media coverage and leadership evaluations.

The Conservative Party leader was Kim Campbell, Canada's first female prime minister (albeit briefly). During the 1993 election her party suffered a massive hemorrhaging of support to Preston Manning's Reform Party. The Conservatives had begun the campaign almost neck and neck with the Liberals, only to see their support collapse. They ended the campaign with a mere 16 percent of the popular vote. There is no shortage of explanations for this stunning defeat, not least an inept campaign, the massive unpopularity of the Conservative government under former leader Brian Mulroney, and the emergence of not one, but two, new regional parties. Campbell, though, blamed her electoral woes squarely on the media. As the party's first female leader, she explained, she had been determined to do politics differently. The media, in her view, were just not ready for this: "new politics, old media."²

There was certainly evidence of sex-differentiated media coverage during the 1993 campaign (Gidengil and Everitt, 1999; 2000). Indeed, it became the stuff of editorial comment.³ The coverage was not simply asymmetrical, but gendered. Television coverage of the leaders' debates, for example, focused disproportionately on confrontational displays of behavior on Campbell's part. This was apparent in both metaphorical reconstructions of the debates (Gidengil and Everitt 1999) and in the selection of sound bites (Gidengil and Everitt, 2000). And there is evidence that negative media coverage damaged Campbell's image as a leader (Mendelsohn and Nadeau 1999). What interests us is whether negative media coverage of Campbell had more effect on men than on women.

Our argument that gender conditions the impact of media messages puts a gender spin on John Zaller's resistance axiom (1992). According to this axiom, viewers can be expected to resist messages that are at odds with their own predispositions. Gender identity could provide one such source of resistance. Like ethnic or regional identity, gender identity is a form of social identity. Tajfel (1981, 255) defines social identity as "that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his [*sic*] knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with

the value and emotional significance attached to that membership. Social identity theory focuses on the impact of that identity on social perceptions and attitudes. The central idea is that people seek a positive social identity by comparing their group to relevant outgroups. The effect of this process of social comparison, and the need for positive differentiation that motivates it, is to heighten perceived ingroup-outgroup differences. Thus, Greene (1999a, 1999b), for example, reports that partisan social identity increases the perceived differences between parties and candidates and leads people to behave in a more partisan manner. Turner (1987) emphasizes that the functioning of the social self-concept is situation-specific, becoming salient as a function of an interaction between the characteristics of the perceiver and the situation (43). Social identity will become particularly relevant when both ingroup and outgroup members are included in the comparison. In the context of an election, then, gender identity is most likely to come into play and have an effect on perceptions when the campaign features both male and female candidates.

A number of experimental studies have examined whether men show a pro-male bias and women show a pro-female bias in evaluating candidates for office. While sex differences have been apparent in reactions to male and female candidates in simulated races (Sigelman and Sigelman 1982; Sigelman et al. 1986; Lewis and Bierly 1990), the empirical results have proved inconclusive and inconsistent when it comes to which sex is biased against which. It is not clear, however, that the experimental results necessarily generalize to real-world settings. It is one thing to evaluate a fictitious candidate on the basis of a written speech and quite another to react to real candidates in an actual campaign.

There are very few studies that have examined the interaction between the sex of the candidate and the sex of the voter in the real world of electoral politics. The strongest evidence of sex-of-voter effects in actual elections comes from Plutzer and Zipp (1996) and Banducci and Karp (2000). Plutzer and Zipp (1996) found that the sex of the voter had a significant impact on voting for women candidates in statewide races in the US, even controlling for party identification, previous presidential vote, race and family income (Plutzer and Zipp 1996; cf. Cook 1994). They attributed this effect to gender identity, inferring that a sense of group solidarity creates a tendency for women to vote for women and men to vote for men. Banducci and Karp (2000) went on to test the gender identity hypothesis in parliamentary elections in Australia, Britain, Canada, and New Zealand. They found that in most cases the parties with female leaders tended to do better among female voters than among male voters. And, except for Margaret Thatcher in Britain, women rated female leaders more positively on average than men did. Consistent with the gender identity hypothesis, the effects of gender were mediated by leadership evaluations in every case but one for the women leaders.⁴ Finally, in Canada, O'Neill (1998) has demonstrated that women rated the two female leaders⁵ more favorably than men did in the 1993 Canadian Election and that this was a factor in drawing some female recruits to both parties.

If gender identity also conditions acceptance of media messages about male and female leaders, women will be less likely to accept negative messages about a female leader or positive

messages about a male leader, while the reverse will be true for men. Analyzing relative evaluations of Campbell and Manning enables us to provide a strong test of this hypothesis about the interaction between gender, media coverage and leader evaluations. While one is a woman and the other a man, both led parties of the right. This permits some control of confounding factors like ideology and issue positions and thus makes it easier to disentangle any sex-of-leader effect. If the gender identity/resistance hypothesis is valid, we would expect negative media coverage of Campbell to have had more effect on men than on women because women would be more resistant than men to negative messages about a leader who is a woman. Conversely, we would expect positive coverage of Manning to have less effect on women than on men because women would be more resistant to positive messages about a leader who is a man.

Method

The data on leader evaluations are taken from the 1993 Canadian Election Study. The campaign wave of this study was based on a rolling cross-section design which enables us to link daily media coverage to leader evaluations. Leader evaluations were measured using a 0 to 100 scale on which 100 represented a very positive feeling towards the leader and 0 reflected a very negative feeling. Respondents who had answered "not at all" when asked how well informed they felt about the leader were not asked to provide a rating. The Reform Party did not have a serious electoral presence in Canada's predominantly French-speaking province and so Quebec respondents were not asked to rate Preston Manning. Accordingly, the analysis is restricted to Canada outside Quebec.

The data on media coverage are derived from a content analysis of nightly newscasts on the CBC, Canada's public broadcasting network. This follows conventional practice in studies of television news coverage in Canada (Johnston et al. 1992; Taras 1993; Mendelsohn 1993; 1996; Mendelsohn and Nadeau 1999). It reflects CBC's dominant share among those who report watching any national television news (Johnston et al. 1992, 114-5)⁶ and the fact that analyses that have compared the CBC with other networks and/or types of media have typically found similar trends in coverage (Wagenberg et al., 1988; Frizzell and Westell, 1989; Nevitte et al. 2000). The content analysis was conducted by the National Media Archive at the Fraser Institute in Vancouver.⁷

The actual media quantities are based on the balance of positive and negative horse-race coverage. Horse-race coverage focuses on "who is ahead, who is behind, who is gaining, who is losing, what campaign strategy is being followed, and what the impact of campaign activities is on the candidate's chances of winning" (Joslyn 1984, 133). In Canada, as elsewhere, television news coverage is preoccupied with the horse-race in general and with the leaders' abilities as campaigners in particular. Indeed, the "leaders and the horse-race become interchangeable" (Mendelsohn 1993, 160). An analysis of news frames used in the first week's coverage of the 1993 campaign confirmed this pattern: the focus was "...on what leaders did, what their tactical motivations were for doing it, and on understanding their actions and statements as a reaction to their standings in the polls" (Mendelsohn 1996, 18; cf. Mendelsohn and Nadeau 1999). Studies in

the United States have found that media coverage of women candidates is even more likely to focus on the horse-race aspect (Kahn 1992; Kahn and Goldberg 1991; but see Smith 1997), with the women often being held up to harsher media standards than their male counterparts (Kahn and Goldenberg 1991; Robinson and St. Jean 1991).

Research on priming would lead us to expect horse-race coverage to have a significant impact on evaluations of party leaders (Ansolabehere, Behr, and Iyengar 1991). The more the media focus on the viability of the leader's party, the more accessible--and hence more relevant--that information will be in voters' summary evaluations of the leader. Both experimental (Brady 1984) and survey-based (Bartels 1985, 1988) studies have demonstrated the link between the nature of media coverage and perceptions of candidate viability. And Brady and Johnston (1987) and Bartels (1988) have gone on to show that voters' evaluations of candidates are indeed closely tied to the candidates' viability. Viability seems to serve as an information shortcut for voters. As Mendelsohn (1996) writes with respect to media frames, "Whether campaign events go well... provides a simple, though questionable, metaphor: how well a leader can run the campaign indicates how well he or she will be able to run the government" (13).

This leaves the question of how to operationalize the media variables. We repeat the analysis with two different operationalizations. The first is simply the preceding day's value (in other words, the amount of positive horse-race coverage minus the amount of negative horse-race coverage).⁸ However, based on a modeling of the impact of media messages, Fan (1988) concludes that "...the impact of a mass media message decreases exponentially with a half-life of only one day" (5) and that most such messages will have minimal effects. He argues that "...it is more useful to think of a series of persuasive messages having a powerful cumulative effect..." (133). This is intuitively plausible. If the tone of coverage varies between positive and negative from night to night, we would expect the impact on leader evaluations to be minimal, certainly less than a few successive nights of consistently negative or consistently positive coverage. Accordingly, our second measure is a cumulative one that involves aggregating days of coverage. Lacking *a priori* reasons to favor any particular aggregation, we experiment with different aggregations, beginning with the two preceding days, then the three preceding days, and so on, ending with the preceding six days.⁹

Results

Figures 1a and 1b track evaluations of Campbell and Manning across the entire campaign. The tracking employs a five-day moving average in order to smooth out the random "noise" caused by the small daily samples sizes. In order to ease interpretation, the leader ratings have been re-scaled to run from minus 50 to plus 50, with 0 indicating neutral feelings about the leader. As Figure 1a shows, Campbell's popularity ebbed among women and men alike, but it is apparent that men's ratings of Campbell--and Manning--shifted much more than women's did as the campaign evolved. Men came to like Campbell much less and Manning much more than they did at the start of the campaign. Indeed, men's evaluations of Campbell went from favorable to unfavorable, while their evaluations of Manning did just the reverse (though his popularity

among men was beginning to fall by the end of the campaign). Figure 1c highlights the contrasting dynamic in women's and men's relative evaluations of the two leaders. The moving averages now track the difference between Campbell's and Manning's ratings for women and men, respectively. The campaign started with women and men both evaluating Campbell more favorably than Manning, and when Campbell began losing ground to Manning over the opening two weeks, she did so among both groups, but then the gap between women and men began to widen. By the final two weeks of the campaign, Manning had overtaken Campbell in popularity among men, but always lagged behind Campbell among women.

[Figure 1 about here]

Such a graphic divergence in relative evaluations suggests that the sex of the voter did indeed matter. But what role did media coverage play in this process? We begin to answer this question by tracking the balance of horse-race coverage across the campaign. This is done by subtracting the amount of negative coverage each party received from the amount of positive coverage. Figures 2a and 2b show the five-day moving averages for both leaders' parties across the campaign, along with the daily values. Coverage of the Campbell campaign was consistently negative in tone.¹⁰ Indeed, there was only a single day (September 28) of demonstrably positive coverage. Coverage of the Manning campaign, on the other hand, was almost always positive, with only two days (September 20 and October 13) of clearly negative coverage.

[Figure 2 about here]

In order to assess whether this differential media coverage had an impact on leader evaluations, we regressed evaluations on the daily coverage quantities. Our two dependent variables were ratings of Campbell and Manning on a 100-point scale. The analyses were repeated using first the preceding day's balance of media coverage and then each of the cumulative measures. Controls were included for party identification, education, and region. It could be that voters were evaluating the two leaders not on the basis of their sex, but on the basis of their partisanship (see Zipp and Plutzer 1985; Plutzer and Zipp 1996). In other words, men may have reacted more positively toward Manning and more negatively toward Campbell as the campaign progressed, not because one is a man and the other a woman, but simply because of the parties they were leading. Accordingly, we controlled for the respondents' partisanship in order to avoid confounding the effects of sex and party and to determine whether media coverage had an impact net of partisan predispositions.¹¹ It is also important to assess whether media coverage had an effect independent of education. To the extent that media attention is related to education, there is a risk of confounding the effects of the media with social background unless education is controlled for (Joslyn and Ceccoli 1996). Finally, given the strong Western Canadian dimension to Reform's appeal, we have included a control for region. All of the controls took the form of dummy variables.¹²

[Table 1 about here]

The results are presented in Table 1. As predicted, negative horse-race coverage has a stronger effect on men's evaluations of Campbell than on women's evaluations. The more negative the coverage of Campbell's campaign, the less favorably men rated her. The impact of coverage is clearly cumulative. It takes at least two days' of coverage to have a significant effect on ratings. While coverage has a greater effect for men, women were not impervious to negative coverage of the Campbell campaign. In the women's case, though, only one of the media effects reaches conventional levels of statistical significance. The results for Manning are even more clearcut. There is no indication that media coverage had an effect on women's evaluations of Manning. More positive coverage did little or nothing to persuade women to rate Manning more favorably. For men, on the other hand, successive days of positive coverage induced a significant shift in their evaluations of Manning. It took more days of coverage to have this impact on Manning's ratings than was the case for Campbell's ratings, a difference that may be attributable to the fact that coverage of the Manning campaign was less intense. The Manning campaign averaged 17 horserace statements per day of the campaign, compared with 30 for the Campbell campaign.

The media effects are not trivial. The cumulative scores for the balance of coverage are sufficiently large that their observed effects could make for appreciable shifts in leader evaluations. For Campbell, the average for the preceding three days of coverage (the period which had the greatest effect on her evaluations) was minus 30, while the average for the preceding six days for Manning was plus 19. Clearly, Campbell was handicapped by the negative coverage of her campaign, especially when it came to appealing to male voters, while Manning was helped by the positive tone of his campaign coverage, at least among men. The asymmetry of these effects supports the argument that gender identity conditions acceptance of media messages. Women resisted positive messages about the male leader and proved to be less accepting of negative messages about the female leader. Men, by contrast, were more accepting of negative messages about the female leader and positive messages about her male counterpart.

This leaves the question of what it was about Campbell that men--and, to some extent, women--came to like less, and what it was about Manning that men came to like more. The rationale for linking horse-race coverage to leader evaluations (see above) suggests that perceptions of the quality of leadership may play a mediating role. According to this line of reasoning, negative horse-race coverage (in other words, negative viability assessments) leads voters to see the leader as providing weak leadership and this, in turn, leads to a less favorable overall evaluation. Positive coverage would have the reverse effect. Testing for this causal link involves first examining the dynamic impact of trait ratings on overall leader evaluations in order to determine which traits were critical in voters' changing evaluations of the leaders and then entering those traits into the equations reported in Table 1. If the traits do indeed mediate the relationship between horse-race coverage and overall evaluations, then the media coefficients should shrink.

Simply regressing overall evaluations on trait ratings would confound the across-time variation produced by the campaign with the cross-sectional variance resulting from differences

in voters' social background characteristics, partisan attachments and issue positions. Accordingly, we split trait ratings into their "time-series" and "cross-sectional" components (Johnston et al. 1992, Johnston and Brady 2001). The time-series component is simply the respondent's trait rating for the day of interview, while the cross-sectional component is the difference between the respondent's trait rating and the mean value for the day of interview for all respondents (Johnston and Brady 2001).¹³ The two dependent variables are, again, leader ratings on a 0 to 100-point scale, while the traits are measured on a 0 to 3 scale, where 3 means the trait described the leader very well and 0 means the trait did not describe the leader at all well. Controls were again included for education, region, and party identification (see above).

[Table 2 about here]

What matters most for the purpose of assessing the impact of campaign coverage are the dynamic effects of trait ratings. As Table 2 shows, changing perceptions of leader traits during the course of the campaign did indeed affect overall evaluations of the leaders. Interestingly, the trait that had the greatest dynamic impact on re-evaluations of Campbell was not her leadership ability, but the growing perception that she was untrustworthy. Among women and men alike, a one-point increase in her perceived untrustworthiness diminished her overall evaluation by 11 or 12 points. This finding is interesting on two counts. First, media reports had been rife with charges of lack of candor and evasiveness surrounding Campbell's supposed secret plan to cut social programs. Second, experimental studies have found trustworthiness to be one of the stereotypically feminine traits ascribed to hypothetical female candidates (see, for example, Huddy and Terkildsen 1993a, 1993b; Leeper 1991). Gender stereotyping is most likely to occur when information is sparse (Kahn 1992; Sapiro 1981/2). It may be that such judgements are particularly likely to be revised as voters are exposed to more information over the course of the election campaign.

Changing perceptions of Campbell's trustworthiness figured in both women's and men's re-assessments of her. Where women and men parted company was in what else mattered. For women, re-evaluations of Campbell's leadership qualities were also a factor, albeit a weaker one, in their overall reassessments. As women's evaluations of Campbell's leadership ability decreased, they came to rate her less favorably overall. For men, on the other hand, changing perceptions of Campbell's leadership ability did not play a significant role. While we should not over-interpret this difference, it is in line with studies in hypothetical settings which have indicated that women are more likely than men to base their judgments of female candidates on the stereotypically masculine quality of mastery (Mueller 1986; Huddy and Terkildsen 1993b). For men, the other critical trait was perceived arrogance. As men's perceptions of Campbell's arrogance increased, their overall rating of her decreased. Tellingly, there is no hint of this trait playing any role at all in women's re-evaluations of Campbell. This same asymmetry is also evident in the evaluative dynamics for Manning. Changing perceptions of Manning on the arrogance dimension help account for fluctuations in men's overall evaluations of Manning, but were simply not a factor for women. In fact, all of the dynamic effects were weak and unstable

for women. This is not surprising. As we saw in Figure 1b, women's overall ratings of Manning showed much less movement across the campaign than men's.

This still leaves the question of whether the impact of horse-race coverage was mediated via these changing trait assessments. To answer this, we regressed leader evaluations on both the daily media quantities and the traits identified as significant in Table 2. We selected the media quantities on the basis of the results reported in Table 1, choosing the cumulative measure that had the strongest impact on leader evaluations.¹⁴ In order to control for cross-sectional variation in the trait ratings, we included a measure of the difference between the respondent's rating and the mean rating for the day of interview, as before. Controls were also included for education, region and party identification. Table 3 reports both the original media effects and the media effects when trait ratings are added to the model. Comparing the two sets of effects enables us to assess the extent to which the impact of media coverage was mediated via a reassessment of leader traits.

[Table 3 about here]

As Table 3 shows, the expectation that the effects of horse-race coverage would be mediated via reassessments of key traits is only supported in the case of men's re-evaluations of Campbell. The critical trait turns out to be perceived arrogance. Adding dynamic evaluations of arrogance to the equation reduces the cumulative impact of horse-race coverage to insignificance. Indeed, the coefficient is now smaller than its standard error. Reassessments of Campbell's trustworthiness, on the other hand, do nothing to diminish the impact of horse-race coverage. This finding is repeated for women's evaluations of Campbell and men's evaluations of Manning. If negative horse-race coverage led women to like Campbell somewhat less, it was apparently not because that coverage led them to rate her leadership abilities or trustworthiness less favorably. Similarly, if positive horse-race coverage caused men to like Manning more it was not because that coverage led them to see him as lacking in arrogance. One inference from these findings is that the effects of horse-race coverage were direct.¹⁵ In other words, negative horse-race coverage, in and of itself, led women to like Campbell somewhat less, while positive coverage led men to like Manning more. A fuller understanding of the relationship between media coverage, trait perceptions and leader ratings requires a content analysis that focuses on media references to leader traits. What does seem clear from this analysis of the dynamic impact of trait perceptions is that changing perceptions of leadership abilities are not a critical factor in explaining the impact of horse-race coverage on overall evaluations.

Conclusion

Our central proposition about gender, media coverage and leader evaluations was supported. As the 1993 Canadian election campaign progressed, men came to like Campbell less and Manning more. As predicted, these re-evaluations of the two leaders could be linked to differences in the coverage of their respective campaigns. The more negative the coverage of Campbell's campaign, the less favorable men's ratings of Campbell became. Positive coverage of

Manning's campaign had the reverse effect. The more positive the coverage, the more highly men rated Manning. Women, on the other hand, appeared to be more resistant to these media messages. Positive coverage had no effect on their ratings of Manning, and the effect of negative coverage of the Campbell campaign was much less in evidence than it was among men.

This pattern of results is consistent with the argument that gender identity conditions the acceptance of media messages about male and female political leaders. It suggests that women tend to resist negative messages about a female leader and positive messages about her male counterpart, whereas men are readier to accept these messages. Obviously, though, it is premature to generalize on the basis of a single experience. In particular, we need to know what happens when the pattern of gender-differentiated coverage is reversed: are women readier to accept positive messages about a female leader and negative messages about a male leader, and do men now prove the more resistant? What we can conclude at this point is that the use of a rolling cross-section in conjunction with daily media tracking provides a powerful design for assessing the dynamic impact of media coverage.

References

- Ansolabehere, Stephen, Roy Behr, and Shanto Iyengar. 1991. "Mass Media and Elections", *American Politics Quarterly* 19: 109-39.
- Banducci, Susan A. and Jeffrey A. Karp. 2000. "Gender, Leadership and Choice in Multiparty Systems", *Political Research Quarterly* 53:
- Bartels, Larry M. 1985. "Expectations and Preferences in Presidential Nominating Campaigns", *American Political Science Review* 79: 804-15.
- 1988. *Presidential Primaries and the Dynamics of Public Choice* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Brady, Henry E., and Richard Johnston. 1987. "What's the Primary Message: Horserace or Issue Journalism", in Gary R. Orren and Nelson W. Polsby, eds., *Media and Momentum* Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.
- Cook, Elizabeth Adell. 1994. "Voter Responses to Women Candidates", in Elizabeth Adell Cook, Sue Thomas, and Clyde Wilcox, eds., *The Year of the Woman: Myths and Realities* Boulder: Westview.
- Fan, David P. 1988. *Predictions of Public Opinion from the Mass Media: Computer Content Analysis and Mathematical Modeling* New York: Greenwood.
- Frizzell, Alan, and Anthony Westell. 1989. "The Media and the Campaign", in Alan Frizzell, Jon H. Pammett, and Anthony Westell, eds., *The Canadian General Election of 1988* Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 75-90.
- Gidengil, Elisabeth, and Joanna Everitt. 1999. "Metaphors and Misrepresentation: Gendered Mediation in News Coverage of the 1993 Canadian Leaders' Debates", *Press/Politics* 4(1): 48-65.
- 2000 "Filtering the Female: Television News Coverage of the 1993 Canadian Leaders' Debates", *Women & Politics* 21(4): 105-31.
- Greene, Steven. 1999a. "The Psychological Foundations of Partisanship: Affect, Cognition, and Social Identity in Party Identification", paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Atlanta.
- 1999b. "Understanding Party Identification: A Social Identity Approach", *Political Psychology* 20: 393-403.

Huddy, Leonie, and Nayda Terkildsen. 1993a. AGender Stereotypes and the Perceptions of Male and Female Candidates@, *American Journal of Political Science* 37: 119-47.

-----1993b. AThe Consequences of Gender Stereotypes for Women Candidates at Different Levels and Types of Office@, *Political Research Quarterly* 46: 503-25.

Johnston, Richard, André Blais, Henry E. Brady, and Jean Crête. 1992. *Letting the People Decide: Dynamics of a Canadian Election*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

-----André Blais, Henry E. Brady, Elisabeth Gidengil, and Neil Nevitte. 1996. AThe 1993 Canadian Election: Realignment, Dealignment, or Something Else?@ paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco.

-----and Henry E. Brady. 2001. AThe Rolling Cross-Section Design@, *Electoral Studies* (in press).

Joslyn, Richard. 1984. *Mass Media and Elections* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

-----and Steve Ceccoli. 1996. AAttentiveness to Television News and Opinion Change in the Fall 1992 Presidential Campaign@, *Political Behavior* 18: 141-70.

Kahn, Kim Fridkin. 1992. ADoes Being Male Help? An Investigation of the Effects of Candidate Gender and Campaign Coverage on Evaluations of US Senate Candidates@, *Journal of Politics* 54: 497-517.

-----and Edie N. Goldenberg. 1991. AWomen Candidates in the News: An Examination of Gender Differences in US senate Campaign Coverage@, *Public Opinion Quarterly* 55: 180-99.

Leeper, Mark Stephen. 1991. AThe Impact of Prejudice on Female Candidates: An Experimental Look at Voter Inference@, *American Politics Quarterly* 19: 248-61.

Lewis, Kathryn E., and Margaret Bierly. 1990. AToward A Profile of the Female Voter: Sex Differences in Perceived Physical Attractiveness and Competence of Political Candidates@, *Sex Roles* 22:1-12.

Mendelsohn, Matthew. 1993. ATelevision's Frames in the 1988 Canadian Election@, *Canadian Journal of Communication* 18: 149-71.

-----1996 . ATelevision News Frames in the 1993 Canadian Election@, in Helen Holmes and Davis Taras, eds., *Seeing Ourselves: Media Power and Policy in Canada* second edition. Toronto: Harcourt Brace, 8-22.

- and Richard Nadeau. 1999. AThe Rise and Fall of Candidates in Canadian Election Campaigns@, *Press/Politics* 4(2): 63-76
- Mueller, Carol. 1986. ANurturance and Mastery: Competing Qualifications for Women's Access to High Public Office?@ *Research in Politics and Society* 2: 211-32.
- National Media Archive. 1993. AElection '93: What Role Did Television Play in the Outcome?@ *On Balance* 6: 1-8.
- Nevitte, Neil, André Blais, Elisabeth Gidengil, and Richard Nadeau. 2000. *Unsteady State: The 1997 Canadian Federal Election*. Don Mills: Oxford University Press.
- Northrup, David, and Anne Oram. 1994. *The 1993 Canadian Election Study, Incorporating the 1992 Referendum Survey on the Charlottetown Accord: Technical Documentation*. Toronto: Institute for Social Research, York University.
- O'Neill, Brenda. 1998. AThe Relevance of Leader Gender to Voting in the 1993 Canadian National Election@, *International Journal of Canadian Studies* 17: 105-30.
- Plutzer, Eric, and John F. Zipp. 1996. AIdentity Politics, Partisanship, and Voting for Women Candidates@, *Public Opinion Quarterly* 60: 30-57.
- Robinson, Gertrude, and Armande Saint-Jean. 1991. AWomen Politicians and Their Media Coverage@, in Kathy Megyery, ed., *Women in Canadian Politics: Toward Equity in Representation*. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 127-69.
- Sapiro, Virginia. 1981/82. AIf U.S. Senator Baker Were A Woman: An Experimental Study of Candidate Images@, *Political Psychology* 2: 61-83.
- Sigelman, Carol K., Lee Sigelman, Dan B. Thomas, and Frederick D. Ribich. 1986. AGender, Physical Attractiveness, and Electability: An Experimental Investigation of Voter Biases@, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 16: 229-48.
- Sigelman, Lee, and Carol K. Sigelman. 1982. ASexism, Racism, and Ageism in Voting behavior: An Experimental Analysis@, *Social Psychology Quarterly* 48: 467-75.
- Smith, Kevin B. 1997. AWhen All=s Fair: Signs of Parity in Media Coverage of Female Candidates@, *Political Communication* 14: 71-82.
- Tajfel, Henri. 1981. *Human Groups and Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taras, David. 1993. AThe Mass Media and Political Crisis: Reporting Canada's Constitutional Struggles@, *Canadian Journal of Communication* 18: 131-48.

Turner, John C. 1987. *Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self-Categorization Theory* Oxford: basil Blackwell.

Wagenberg, R.H., W.C. Soderlund, W.I. Romanow, and E.D. Briggs. 1988. ACampaigns, Images, and Polls: Mass Media Coverage of the 1984 Canadian Election@, *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 21: 117-28.

Zaller, John. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zipp, John F., and Eric Plutzer. 1985. AGender Differences in Voting for Female Candidates: Evidence from the 1982 Election@, *Public Opinion Quarterly* 49: 179-97.

Table 1

The Impact of Horse-race Coverage on Leader Evaluations

	Campbell		Manning	
	Women	Men	Women	Men
Previous day	.08 (.06)	.06 (.05)	-.06 (.09)	.04 (.08)
Previous 2 days	.05 (.04)	.08 (.03)**	.02 (.08)	.08 (.07)
Previous 3 days	.07 (.03)*	.08 (.03)**	-.00 (.07)	.02 (.06)
Previous 4 days	.04 (.02)	.07 (.02)**	.04 (.06)	.09 (.05)
Previous 5 days	.03 (.02)	.05 (.02)**	.00 (.06)	.13 (.05)**
Previous 6 days	.03 (.02)	.05 (.02)**	.03 (.06)	.16 (.05)**
N =	(1151)	(1317)	(835)	(1141)

* p<.05 ** p<.01

Note: the column entries are unstandardized OLS coefficients, with the standard errors shown in parentheses. Controls were included for education, region and party identification. Leader evaluations were measured on a 0 to 100 scale.

Table 2: The Dynamic Impact of Trait Perceptions on Leader Ratings

1. Campbell			
	Women	Men	
Arrogance	-1.56 (2.88)	-8.40 (2.66)**	
Compassion	3.53 (3.59)	-0.68 (3.85)	
Intelligence	-3.11 (4.20)	1.88 (4.00)	
Leadership	8.55 (4.10)*	4.82 (3.12)	
Trustworthy	12.52 (3.97)**	11.54 (3.43)***	
Speaks for women	-2.27 (4.49)	4.15 (2.94)	
N	(912)	(1090)	
2. Manning			
	Women	Men	
Arrogance	-2.36 (4.30)	-8.46 (3.23)**	
Compassion	4.70 (5.64)	4.06 (4.67)	
Intelligence	-1.15 (5.73)	4.12 (4.54)	
Leadership	3.22 (5.94)	2.15 (4.24)	
Trustworthy	6.70 (5.67)	4.09 (4.52)	
Speaks for women	5.04 (4.16)	0.69 (3.39)	
N	(558)	(844)	
	* p<.05	** p<.01	*** p<.001

Note: the column entries are unstandardized OLS coefficients, with the standard errors shown in parentheses. Controls were included for education, region, party identification and cross-sectional variation in trait perceptions (the respondent's score minus the average for the day of interview). Leader evaluations were measured on a 0 to 100 scale, while traits were measured on a 0 to 3 scale.

Table 3: The Dynamic Impact of Traits
on the Relationship between Horse-race Coverage and Leader Evaluations

Campbell	Horse-race coefficient
1. Men	
Previous 2 days' coverage	.08 (.03)**
Controlling for:	
Arrogance	.02 (.03)
Trustworthiness	.09 (.03)**
2. Women	
Previous 3 days' coverage	.07 (.03)*
Controlling for:	
Leadership	.06 (.03)*
Trustworthiness	.07 (.03)*
Manning	
1. Men	
Previous 5 days' coverage	.13 (.05)**
Controlling for:	
Arrogance	.11 (.05)*

* p<.05

** p<.01

Note: the column entries are unstandardized OLS coefficients, with the standard errors shown in parentheses. Controls were included for education, region, party identification and cross-sectional variation in trait perceptions (the respondent's score minus the average for the day of interview). Leader evaluations were measured on a 0 to 100 scale, while traits were measured on a 0 to 3 scale.

Endnotes

We would like to thank Tim Sinke and Matthew Henniger for their research assistance. This research was supported by the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Fonds FCAR.

1. The total sample was broken up into 45 replicates, one for each day of fieldwork. Release and clearance of replicates was controlled in order to make the day of interview effectively a random event. Differences between days of interview were thus solely the product of sampling error and of intervening events (including, potentially, shifts in media coverage). 3,775 interviews were completed during the campaign, for a response rate of 65 percent. The Institute for Social Research at York University conducted the fieldwork. The study was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the principal investigators were Richard Johnston, André Blais, Henry Brady, Elisabeth Gidengil, and Neil Nevitte. Further information on the study may be found in Northrup and Oram (1994).

2. "Campbell not making many personal plans after Oct. 25 election," *The Gazette*, October 12, 1993, p. A8.

3. See "Liberals go after 'protest' vote," *The Globe and Mail*, October 9, 1993, p. A6.

4. They found much more mixed support, though, for the hypothesis that evaluations of female leaders would have more impact on vote choice for women than for men.

5. The other female leader was Audrey McLaughlin of the left-leaning New Democratic Party.

6. During the 1988 campaign, less than one-third reported watching no CBC national news. Unfortunately, the question about television news sources was not repeated in the 1993 Canadian Election Study.

7. The reported inter-coder reliability quotient (based on a random sample of 15 percent of the stories) for the content analysis of campaign coverage was 0.87 (National Media Archive, 1993, 4). We are grateful to the National Media Archive for making the results of their content analysis available to us. The Archive does not bear any responsibility for the analyses and interpretations presented here.

8. Mendelsohn and Nadeau (1999) report that the same day's coverage had a statistically significant, albeit weak, effect on Campbell's image as a strong leader in their time-series analysis. It seems counter-intuitive that a 10 p.m. newscast would have an impact on respondents who would mostly have been interviewed earlier in the evening. Mendelsohn and Nadeau attribute the effect to the fact that the nightly newscast would partly pick up "old" news that had already been reported in the day's newspaper or on the 6 p.m. news. When we tested for same day horse-race coverage, we found no effects on overall ratings of either Campbell or Manning.

9. Mendelsohn and Nadeau (1999) report that negative shocks, defined as coverage that was more negative than the average across the campaign, had more impact on ratings of Kim Campbell as a "strong leader" than the same day's coverage. They reasoned that viewers are so used to seeing negative portrayals of political leaders that it takes unusually negative coverage to have an effect on opinion. However, we found no such effect when it came to overall ratings of Campbell and Manning. It should be noted that Mendelsohn and Nadeau used a time-series design, with data aggregated by day of interview.

10. The balance of horse-race coverage was negative on 39 of the 47 days of the campaign. This is in line with Mendelsohn and Nadeau's (1999) finding, using their own content analysis, that the balance of coverage of Kim Campbell was negative on 32 days out of the 43 coded. Previous studies have found that women are often held up to harsher media standards than their male counterparts (Kahn and Goldenberg 1991; Robinson and St. Jean 1991). Since our comparison involves only two leaders, we are not in a position to assess whether coverage of Campbell's campaign was subject to such gender biases. It could simply be that she ran a singularly inept campaign and the media were merely reflecting that reality. It is worth noting, though, first, that coverage of the Campbell campaign was consistently negative even before the decline in the Conservative vote share became apparent and, second, that the media themselves remarked on the asymmetrical treatment. See "Liberals go after 'protest' vote," *The Globe and Mail*, October 9, 1993, p. A6.

11. Given the decline in Conservative partisanship between the 1988 and 1993 elections (Johnston et al. 1996), we repeated the analyses using vote in the previous federal election as an alternative measure of partisan predisposition. The results for the impact of media coverage were not materially affected, though the impact of the social background characteristics on leader evaluations was strengthened.

12. The dummy variables were: party identifier; did not complete high school; university-educated; and Western resident.

13. There is, of course, potential collinearity between these two components (see Johnston and Brady 2001). To the extent that standard errors may be inflated, our test should be regarded as a conservative one.

14. Regardless of the chosen operationalization of horse-race coverage, taking account of the dynamic impact of perceived arrogance in the Campbell equation has more effect on the horse-race coefficient than does perceived trustworthiness. Similarly, the dynamic measure of perceived arrogance in the Manning equation has similar effects on the horse-race coefficient whether the previous five days' or the previous six days' coverage is used.

15. Two other inferences are, of course, possible, namely, error in the measurement of the traits and unmeasured traits.