

Style over Substance?
A Content Analysis of the Gendered Style of Political Pundits on the "Big Five"

Megan A. Ancarrow

Thesis submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
In
Communication

Robert E. Denton, Jr., Chair
John C. Tedesco
Beth M. Waggenpack

May 2, 2016
Blacksburg, VA

Keywords: political pundits, gendered rhetorical style, Theory of Cultural Dimensions, Big Five
Sunday talk shows

Style over Substance?
A Content Analysis of the Gendered Style of Political Pundits on the "Big Five"

Megan A. Ancarrow

ABSTRACT

It is well known that males dominate politics, both in elected positions and in the media as political pundits (Melber, 2011). Is it the masculine style that is appealing to society? Do popular political pundits (male and female) emulate this masculine style in order to appeal to and persuade their audience? Through a content analysis of the rhetoric of six specified political pundits, it is hypothesized that both males and females are more likely to incorporate masculine styles of rhetoric, and those who display more masculine style traits will be more acceptable to the general audience leading to more airtime and appearances across networks. Through the analysis of the programs' 2013 transcripts, the communicative style of both male and female political pundits of the top five news programs from the big five networks will be studied: ABC's *This Week* with George Stephanopoulos, CBS's *Face the Nation* with Bob Schieffer, CNN's *State of the Union* with Candy Crowley, *Fox News Sunday* with Chris Wallace, and NBC's *Meet the Press* with Chuck Todd.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my thesis committee members for their support and guidance of my project. First, I wish to thank Dr. Bob Denton for providing encouragement and advice throughout. His support and inspiration was monumental in helping me to develop this thesis. Additionally, I would like to thank Dr. John Tedesco for his contributions to this thesis, as well as my graduate education. I would also like to thank Dr. Beth Waggenpack for her help on this thesis, in the classroom, and with her guidance in planning my path in academia. I am extremely grateful for the support offered from this committee during this past year.

I would also like to thank other members of the Communication department, including Dr. Jimmy Ivory, Dr. Nneka Logan, and Ms. Brandi Quesenberry who have all helped shape me into a better scholar and teacher. I would also like to thank Kendall Livick and Dr. Brandy Faulkner who encouraged me to pursue this degree.

To my cohort, thank you not only for the encouragement, but for the laughs and the experiences. From first plane rides, to days spent in Shanks, to spontaneous trips to Elrod's, it has truly been a joy working with each and everyone of you.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family and friends. To my friends, thank you for your support, encouragement, and enthusiasm throughout my graduate work. To my family, thank you as well for all of constant support and for making this opportunity possible for me. I couldn't have done it without you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction and Justification	1
Chapter 2: Review of Literature	4
Political Punditry	4
The Big Five	8
Theory of Cultural Dimensions	13
Gendered Rhetorical Style	17
Feminine Rhetorical Theory	19
Masculine Rhetorical Style	25
Issue Ownership Theory	28
Chapter 3: Description of Artifact and Method	32
Methods	32
Pundits Chosen	39
Months Chosen and Issues Analyzed	41
Hypotheses	44
Chapter 4: Analysis and Results	46
Inclusion and Confrontation	49
Inclusion	49
Confrontation	51
Relation and Independence	53
Relation	53
Independence	55

Feeling and Fact	56
Feeling	56
Fact	58
Dialogue and Decision	60
Dialogue	60
Decision	61
Chapter 5: Discussion	64
Summary of Results	64
Limitations	66
Theoretical and Practical Implications	67
Suggestions for Future Research	68
Chapter 6: Conclusion	70
References	71

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Characteristics of Masculine and Feminine Rhetorical Styles	27
Table 2. <i>Masculine and Feminine Issues</i>	30
Table 3. Pundits' Use of Rhetorical Styles	46
Table 4. Rhetorical Style by Issue	48

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND JUSTIFICATION

Political punditry is a field that is both respected and mocked (Weinstein, 2016). While often compared to journalists, political pundits not only report the news, they analyze it and give their opinions on the political, socio-political, and current events happening around the world. Although millennials have shifted to new forms of media to get their news (Pew Research Center, 2015), the majority of Americans born during the “baby boom” era get their knowledge from the mass media (Nimmo & Combs, 1992), which in turn forms their worldviews. Pundits are the artists that help to create these worldviews.

Whether they are referred to as “political commentators,” “talking heads,” “political pundits,” or “political analysts,” these individuals are defined as the “learned authorities that claim to have mastered the mystery of politics” (Nimmo & Combs, 1992, p. 11). For the purpose of this thesis, these individuals will be referred to as political pundits, the media authorities who are considered knowledgeable to interpret their news and give their opinions. Usually brought in to talk about their expertise in a certain field, pundits are often recognized in the field of sports, technology, social science, medicine, and politics, among others. The thesis will focus on political pundits.

This thesis consists of a content analysis of the transcripts of the first episode of each month of 2013 (excluding February and May) from ABC's *This Week* with George Stephanopoulos, CBS's *Face the Nation* with Bob Schieffer, CNN's *State of the Union* with Candy Crowley, *Fox News Sunday* with Chris Wallace, and NBC's *Meet the Press* with Chuck Todd. These shows are considered the “Big Five,” as they are the most recognized political talk show programs that feature a panel of pundits (Savillo, 2015). In addition, because they are

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

scheduled on Sunday mornings, these shows set the agenda for the week for other political talk shows.

The content analysis will focus on the communicative styles of six featured pundits, specifically analyzing whether they are using masculine or feminine styles of communication, and if that varies across genders. The pundits chosen for analysis are William (Bill) Kristol, Karl Rove, George Will, Peggy Noonan, Neera Tanden, and Amy Walter. These pundits were selected because they are the only pundits within the time frame who appeared on multiple networks throughout 2013. It is hypothesized that both male and female political pundits will take on a masculine rhetorical style and communicative approach consisting of harsher language, more interruptions, and name calling strategies, due to the masculine setting of the talk show environment of these programs (as cited in Ahagen & Nilsson, 2013).

The analysis of these transcripts will be completed using a two-part strategy. The first stage will explore the pundits' use of gendered rhetoric by analyzing the transcripts of each of the five shows of the first week of the month from January 2013-December 2013, noting instances of the pundits engaging in masculine or feminine rhetorical styles. This time frame was chosen because it was a non-election year; therefore, the issues discussed on the show were more likely to include topics of current events such as gun control, civil rights, and the economy, rather than campaign strategy as the only topic discussed, limiting what can be studied. This will be done through an analysis of whether the rhetoric differs in terms of confrontation or inclusion, distance or relation, facts or emotion, and decisive or dialogical rhetoric between male and female pundits (as cited in Ahagen & Nilsson, 2013). The second stage will expand on how these pundits used gendered rhetoric, and examines the use of a masculine or feminine style of rhetoric in line with the issue that the pundit is discussing. From this two-stage analysis, a final

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

discussion will focus on the potential advantages and disadvantages of using masculine and feminine rhetorical styles in punditry.

While literature has explored the gendered rhetorical style of female politicians (Blankenship & Robson, 2005; Campbell, 1989; Jamieson, 1988; Mral, 1999; Parry-Giles, 1996; Perry, 2005; Wood, 2009), a gap exists in regards to gendered rhetorical style effects on the success of a political pundit. To further understand the role of gendered rhetoric in political punditry and possibly serve future pundits in developing their rhetorical strategies, this study seeks to investigate what form of gendered rhetorical style employed by pundits who have been asked to appear on multiple networks. The next chapter provides an overview on the role of political punditry, the importance and influence of the “Big Five” in contemporary political discourse, issue ownership theory, the elements and characteristics of gendered communication, and concludes with a description of Geert Hofstede’s theory of cultural dimensions (1983) that provides the theoretical foundations of this study.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter provides a broad overview of political punditry, the theory of cultural dimensions, gendered rhetorical style, and issue ownership theory. Understanding the field of political punditry sets the stage for the current study, as it is a field that has encompassed a multitude of media channels (newspapers, radio, television, Internet) over time. Bridgette Mral states that the choice of persona is dependent on the culture and context of norms and that concept of competition is generally exclusively male and culturally constructed (as cited in Ahagen & Nilsson, 2013). Therefore, it is important to examine the effects of a society's culture on the values of its members and how these values relate to behavior; so, an overview of the theory of cultural dimensions will be conducted. It is also important to study masculine and feminine rhetorical styles of communication, as past studies have shown an overwhelmingly large representation of male pundits over female pundits represented on political talk shows. Issue ownership theory will round out the literature review to understand the difference in masculine and feminine political issues.

Political Punditry

For most people, political knowledge is constructed through the mass media, not through an individual's direct experience (Johnson-Cartee, 2005). This creates "mediated mosaics" with which individuals attend to, filter through their own perceptual screens, and then discuss with others. This process leads to what Nimmo and Combs (1992) have defined as a mass-mediated reality that socially constructs meaning through traditional mass media. Political punditry identifies with this contemporary phenomenon, namely, the proliferation and power of discourse through the mass media.

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

As society has become more complex, people are often confronted by news that deals with issues that they are typically uninformed about. To help make sense of these puzzling events, society, even elites, “seek out people with a reputation for special knowledge about what is going on; in other words, elites turn to those ‘who know.’ They seek out pundits” (Nimmo & Combs, 1992, p. 448). Because of this, the role that the news plays in constructing an individual’s knowledge on these issues is critical because the complexities of modern life have caused even the most erudite to turn to mass media for guidance. Defined by Merriam-Webster as “a person who makes comments or judgments, especially in an authoritative manner; critic or commentator,” a pundit gives opinions on the social and political happenings of the world (Pundit, 2015). The term *pundit* was introduced into the English language by the early Nineteenth Century and was derived from the ancient Indian language Sanskrit *pandita* for "scholar, learned man," and adapted to Hindi as *pandit*, an honorific title first applied to a Brahman with a profound knowledge of Sanskrit, Hindu law, and ancient wisdom (Nimmo & Combs, 1992). Now, punditry is regarded as a big business. Pundits are regarded as a source of political power and influence, transforming public debate from what politicians say about issues, to what pundits say politicians should say about issues (Nimmo & Combs, 1992). Pundits are now starting to become recognized as their own specialized field within political communication.

While political pundits come from many backgrounds such as academia, politics, campaigns, and other related professions, many start their career in journalism, reporting the news objectively, not analyzing or commenting on it. Numerous political observers, including journalists, retired politicians, ex-bureaucrats, bureaucrats, entertainers, and teachers, make punditry a profession or hobby, insisting that they and their opinions be taken more seriously

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

than any others (Nimmo & Combs, 1992). According to Lippman (1992), political punditry is a specialized form of journalism; a report of raw material after it has been stylized. Pundits inform society of the news and also explore and analyze it, vocalizing their opinions and giving the audience ways in which to see the world. “The facts are not simple, and not at all obvious, but subject to choice and opinion” [...] “the function of news is to signal an event, the function of truth is to bring to light the hidden facts, to set them in relation with each other, and make a picture of reality on which men can act” (Lippman, 1922, p. 358). Essentially, even if reporters fulfill a vital societal function by occasionally bringing parts of the world outside the newsroom into light, there is still the need for academics and other experts, such as pundits (Bro, 2015).

Though not always recognized by the viewing public, there is a clear distinction between the “news,” the facts about important or recent events (reported by journalists) and “views,” the opinions of the news (analyzed by pundits). Because of this, pundits are often compared to journalists who convey the news; however, they also have the opportunity of interpreting it in an authoritative, opinionated manner. Political pundits have become a widely used source for describing and discussing politics in many different news organizations (Bro, 2015).

Even though it is not a requirement, many political pundits have a special knowledge of or experience in topics such as campaigns, war, or the economy. These pundits give their opinion in various media channels such as blogs, articles, interviews, radio talk shows, and television programs. Pundits qualify to be interviewed and participate in the roundtable forums and discussions due to the reputation they possess of an expertise in a political area(s) (Nimmo & Combs, 1992). Within political television programs, pundits are brought in with their specialty as a focus; however, they participate in roundtable discussions with the programs host and other

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

pundits and guests to discuss topics including political news and current events. In these roundtable or panel discussions, a variety of pundits are asked questions by the host of the show and the pundits then engage in a discussion with each other.

As punditry is becoming a knowledge industry that demands recognition, Bro (2015) and Nimmo and Combs (1992) have focused on this popularization and the importance of the political commentator, proposing that punditry has become the “fifth estate” of American politics, descending from the pundits of ancient times. First pundits became the “Towers of Babel” where the oral tradition of communicating began to shape out a political identity and culture. Within this culture arose a new sort of power of political intelligence. This power class was made up of priests, scribes, prophets and “learned men” who were deemed intellectuals as they held the power to interpret discourse. This was seen as a special skill that was denied to ordinary people.

In 2015, sixty percent of Americans reported that their primary source of information came from the news media (Mitchell, Gottfried & Masta, 2015). While millennials tend to get information from newer forms of media, the audiences of Sunday morning political talk shows typically consist of white males who are over 50 years old (Pew Research Center, 2012). The ideological demographic of each show is largely dependent on the network. In addition, socio-demographic factors affect how much political news is consumed, as those with higher degrees of education, occupational stature, and economic means generally follow more political news. While technology has allowed for more people to get their political news through new forms of technology (i.e., through social media sites and the Internet) political news is still largely consumed through commercial networks and cable programming channels such as FOX, CNN, CBS, NBC, and ABC. These networks host the “Big Five” Sunday morning talk shows.

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

The “Big Five”

In order to understand the context where these pundits are featured, it is important to have an overview of the Sunday morning political talk shows on which these pundits appear. There are five major Sunday morning talk shows that are referred to as the “Big Five.” These are ABC’s *This Week* with George Stephanopoulos, CBS’ *Face the Nation*, CNN’s *State of the Union*, *Fox News Sunday*, and NBC’s *Meet the Press*. These shows play a vital role in American politics and culture by making the news that sets the agenda for the week through a focus on the current events that occurred during the week, specifically political and socio-political topics (Savillo, 2015). These include discussions on public policy, national security, military and foreign affairs, and the economy, as well as any other hot button issues that are making headlines. While these shows feature a main host, they also feature national leaders as guests brought on to discuss politics and public life. These interviews take the shape of one-on-one interviews with the program’s moderator that typically focus on one particular topic, as well as roundtable discussions that focus on multiple-topic debates that include a panel of other featured pundits.

The format of these shows typically consists of a panel of pundits who discuss current events and politics, moderated by the host of the show. While Waldman (2014) considers such programs “boring,” he noted that in the Washington media world, there is no more rarefied spot for both hosts and guests than that of Sunday talk shows. He also notes that an appearance on one of these shows “instantly brands one as an important person whose opinions are worth listening to” (Waldman, 2014, p.1). Waldman also argues that Sunday talk shows hold the powerful accountable. He states that the powerful people that are invited onto the show are asked

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

relentless “gotcha” questions; however, the powerful are able to handle this with their carefully planned messages.

There is little diversity in the race and gender makeup of these programs. Melber (2011) argues that most anchors, producers, and writers in television news are women, yet the vast majority of prime time hosts, who dominate campaign coverage and frame presidential debates, are white men. That includes all the Sunday morning hosts, all the prime time hosts on MSNBC, and all but one of the prime time hosts on CNN and FOX. Although this statement is referring to prime time hosts, there is still diversity in the demographics of roundtable pundits.

In 2013, *Media Matters*, a non-profit progressive research and information center, conducted a study of the guests that appeared on ABC's *This Week* with George Stephanopoulos, CBS' *Face the Nation* with Bob Schieffer, Fox's *Fox News Sunday* with Chris Wallace, NBC's *Meet the Press* with David Gregory, CNN's *State of the Union* with Candy Crowley, and MSNBC's *Up with Steve Kornacki* and *Melissa Harris-Perry*. Overall, they found that conservatives appeared as guests more often than liberals on those broadcast Sunday morning political talk shows. *Fox News Sunday* was predominantly slanted toward the right in terms of pundits, while ABC's *This Week* was the only program to feature as many liberals as conservatives. They also found that white, right-wing men were 29 percent of all guests, while left-wing men were just about half that amount. More liberals of color were guests than conservatives of color. In regards to individual programming, three of the four Sunday shows devoted more solo interview time to Republicans. *Fox News Sunday*, *Face the Nation*, and *Meet the Press* each gave more of their time for solo interviews to Republicans.

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

In 2014, *Media Matters* also conducted a detailed review of the guests who appeared on “the Big Five” Sunday morning political talk shows from January 5 through December 28 of that year. These shows, ABC's *This Week* with George Stephanopoulos, CBS' *Face the Nation* with Bob Schieffer, Fox's *Fox News Sunday* with Chris Wallace, NBC's *Meet the Press* with Chuck Todd, and CNN's *State of the Union* with Candy Crowley, often have the power of setting the media and political agenda of the week (Savillo, 2015). *Media Matters* reviewed every edition during 2014 and found that men continued to dominate these Sunday morning talk shows. Guest appearances for all five programs were coded for gender, ethnicity, partisanship or ideology, in addition to whether guests appeared in solo interviews, whether they were journalists, administration officials, or elected officials. This study found four recurring themes: (1) that white men dominated guest lineups; (2) roughly three in four guests on the Sunday shows were men; (3) Sunday show guest lists were extremely white; and (4) neutral guests dominate everywhere but *Fox* (Media Matters, 2014).

As stated, white men were the largest proportion of all guests on all shows. Specifically, 67 percent of guests on *Face the Nation* were white men, 65 percent on *Fox News Sunday*, 59 percent on *Meet the Press* and *This Week*, and 55 percent on *State of the Union*, an inaccurate representation compared to the actual general population, which is only comprised of 32 percent of white males (Savillo, 2015). In comparison to census data, white women were underrepresented on all five shows and minority guests rarely appeared. In 2014, in regards to female minority guests, no Latinas and only one African-American woman appeared on *Fox News Sunday* during the entire year, *Face the Nation* hosted one Latina all year, and *Fox News Sunday* was the only show to host any Middle Eastern women (one). Baitinger (2015) also addressed the question of why there are so few women on the Sunday morning talk shows on

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

her *Washington Post* blog, “Monkey Cage.” She answered, “I find that women tend to appear infrequently on the shows because of journalistic norms- such as the desire by the networks to create balance and conflict or to interview the sources they believe possess political power. Because women are less likely than men to possess these characteristics, they are less likely to appear on the Sunday shows” (Baitinger, 2015, p.1).

Men were also found to be considerably over-represented in one-on-one interviews. This gave the guest singular the opportunity to promote his political ideas without having to address challenges from other guests. Specifically, *State of the Union* had 74 percent of solo interviews with white males, *Fox News Sunday* had 72 percent, and *This Week* had 68 percent. In regards to solo interviews, women were less represented than male minorities (Savillo, 2015). These male guests were also largely neutral (24 percent) or conservative (23 percent). Neutral white women made up the next largest demographic of guests with 10 percent representation. In addition, conservative white men were given almost three out of every ten solo interviews.

In regards to the individuals who frequently appeared on these Sunday shows, eight of the eleven most frequently visiting guests were white Republican males. The guest that appeared on these shows the largest amount of times was Republican Mike Rogers, who was a Michigan Congressman and chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence during the term of the study, with 29 total appearances.

As shown by this data, men outnumbered women on each of the five shows. On *Face the Nation* and *Fox News Sunday*, 77 percent of all guests were men. *State of the Union*, *Meet the Press*, and *This Week* followed with 74, 73, and 73 percent (Savillo, 2015), respectively. As stated earlier, the large majority of guests were white. *Face the Nation* was the least diverse, with 88 percent of white guests on their show. *Fox News Sunday* had 87 percent white guests, *Meet*

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

the Press had 78 percent, *This Week* had 77 percent, and *State of the Union* was the most diverse with 74 percent white and 26 percent non-white.

The study also showed that guests who were neutral in ideology (neither conservative or liberal) were the most predominant on all shows except for *Fox*, who had 45 percent of Republican guests, compared only 22 percent Democrat guests. However, Democratic elects and administration officials held a slight advantage over Republicans (Savillo, 2015). On *Fox News Sunday*, 60 percent of guests were Republican who currently held elected positions. *Meet the Press* was the exact opposite, with 60 percent of their guests being Democratic elects. *Face the Nation* brought in slightly more Republicans, while *This Week* and *State of the Union* hosted more Democrats.

Media Matters also looked into the ideology of the journalists on the program, finding that while most journalists on *This Week*, *Face the Nation*, *Meet the Press*, and *State of the Union* didn't define themselves as ideological, more journalists were more likely to be conservative than liberal. Some limitations of the study are that the researchers only looked at who was on the show, and they didn't explore any further to see what was actually said when the guests appeared on the show.

It is important to study what political pundits are invited as guests on these shows, because the staggering number of white males that dominate the shows skews the information that is presented (Edwards, 2014). When there is only one demographic represented, only one point of view is shown. Edwards (2014) quoted Ilyse Hogue, NARAL Pro-Choice America president in her study. Hogue stated that the conversation is "defined by the people who get to tell their stories, so when we look at 13 white men in a hearing committee we know how narrow a slice of America is represented in these stories. Where are the women? Until we have people in

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

the media who look like what America looks like- women, people of color, doctors- we're not going to get the policies we need, and the ones real Americans support" (Edwards, 2014, p. 2).

In a similar study to the ones conducted by *Media Matters*, Baitinger (2015) also found that women were featured less than men, through a study where she analyzed the guests of the Big Five from January 2009 to December 2011. After factoring for repeat appearances by pundits, she found that men comprise almost 75 percent of the guests featured, with equally consistent representations for each of the five shows when broken down individually. She noted the reason for these gender differences in representation, finding that women tend to appear infrequently on the shows based on the following:

Journalistic norms- such as the desire by the networks to create balance and conflict or to interview the sources they believe possess political power. Because women are less likely than men to possess these characteristics, they are less likely to appear on the Sunday shows (Baitinger, 2015, p.1).

It is also important to consider that the primary audience for these shows are older males, which could also account for the prevalence of males on the shows (Pew Research, 2012). Essentially, these gender findings are important and highlight the fact that women in the pool of potential guests are less likely to have the "attributes and experiences that make them seem newsworthy" (Baitinger, 2015, p.1). This concept of newsworthiness comes from the values found within the theory of cultural dimensions.

Theory of Cultural Dimensions

The Theory of Cultural Dimensions was developed by Geert Hofstede in 1983. The theory was developed from a comprehensive study of how values in the workplace are influenced by culture. Hofstede analyzed a large database of employee values scores collected by

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

International Business Machines (IBM) Corporation between 1967 and 1973. From his initial studies and later additions to their results, he developed a model that identifies four primary dimensions to assist in differentiating cultures: power distance; individualism; masculinity; uncertainty avoidance and long-term orientation.

This theory is a system of cross-cultural communication that describes the effects of a society's culture on the values of its members, and how these values relate to behavior, using a structure derived from factor analysis. Cross-cultural organization research is used to increase groups' awareness of value systems that are different than their own, showing the way people in different countries perceive and interpret their world. This original model was developed from a worldwide survey of employee values by IBM between 1967 and 1973. These 116,000 questionnaires about the work related value patterns of matched samples of industrial employees in 50 countries and three regions at two points in time identified four universal categories for characterizing societies. These dimensions were (1) power distance, the degree to which the less powerful members of a society accept and expect that power is distributed unequally; (2) uncertainty avoidance, the degree to which the members of a society feel uncomfortable with uncertainty and ambiguity; (3) individualism, a preference for a loosely-knit social framework in which individuals are expected to take care of only themselves and their immediate families v. collectivism, a preference for a tightly-knit framework in society in which individuals can expect their relatives or members of a particular in-group to look after them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty; and (4) masculinity, a preference in society for achievement, heroism, assertiveness and material rewards for success v. femininity, a preference for cooperation, modesty, caring for the weak and quality of life. These characterizing dimensions are used to

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

explain the different ways of structuring organization. Different motivations of people within organizations, and different issues people and organizations face within society.

The extent of this paper will focus on the masculinity-femininity (task orientation versus person orientation) dimension, as Hofstede has identified masculinity as highly prevalent in the United States. Hofstede defined masculinity as a “preference in society for achievement, heroism, assertiveness, and material rewards for success” (“The Hofstede Centre,” 1983, para. 5).

Masculinity indicates the “relative importance in the country of the job aspects earnings, recognition, and advancement and challenge and the relative unimportance of manager, cooperation, desirable area and employment security” (Hofstede, 1983, p. 53). This is in line with the dominant patterns of sex roles and the job aspects of males versus females that exist in nearly all societies, even those that are non-literate, where boys are socialized toward assertiveness and self-reliance and girls are socialized toward nurturance. This is contrasted with femininity, which is the “preference for cooperation, modesty, caring for the weak and the quality of life” (“The Hofstede Centre,” 1983, para. 5). Women in these societies tend to display different values. In feminine societies, women share modest and caring views equally with men.

In masculine societies, women are more empathetic and competitive, however still notably less empathetic than the men, leading to a recognized gap between male and female values. This relates specifically to the role of politics and punditry as the Hermes data states that “not only do men and women in the same job emphasize different job aspects, but that countries also differ along these same lines. In some countries all respondents, both men and women, emphasize job aspects that are usually associated with the male role” (Hofstede, 1983, p.55). In these more masculine countries, the gap between the values for men and women is wider.

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

The Masculinity Index (MAS) applies to countries as social systems, not specifically to the individuals within the countries. Hofstede identified that the problem with this division of mankind into two sexes and what represents the appropriate role for men is that this tends to become the concept of their own role a model for society as a whole. The United States has a high masculinity score of 62, which indicates that the country will be driven by competition, achievement, and success. Winning defines success, with this idea starting in childhood and continuing throughout adulthood. The United States has a high masculinity drive as well as one of the most “individualists” drives in the world, which means that its citizens tend to show masculinity drive individually and they show this drive up front and display accomplishments. Therefore, the goal isn’t only to be successful, but to be able to show off that success (Hofstede, 1983). Specifically, the United States has a power distance score of 40, individualism score of 91, masculinity score of 62, uncertainty avoidance score of 46, long-term orientation score of 26, and indulgence score of 68. Hofstede also notes that in the United States:

It is believed that a certain degree of conflict will bring out the best of people, as it is the goal to be ‘the winner.’ As a consequence, we see a lot of polarization and court cases. This mentality nowadays undermines the American premise of ‘liberty and justice for all.’ Rising inequality is endangering democracy, because a widening gap among the classes may slowly push Power Distance up and Individualism down (“The Hofstede Centre,” 1983).

Therefore, the fundamental issue of masculinity is what motivates people. Wanting to be the best is masculine, while liking what you do is feminine.

The theory of cultural dimensions was developed to be applied in studies of work values and cultural values (Hofstede, 1983). This thesis focuses on the masculine aspect of gender

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

differences in society; therefore, gendered rhetorical style, feminine rhetorical theory, and masculine rhetorical style will be discussed below.

Gendered Rhetorical Style

Gender has been studied across many fields but has been prominent in the area of politics. There are gender norms and expectations within society, and there are “genderlect traits” found interwoven in rhetoric. Masculine and feminine rhetorical styles have been studied by many different researchers (Blankenship & Robson, 2005; Campbell, 1989; Jamieson, 1988; Mral, 1999; Parry-Giles, 1996; Perry, 2005, Wood, 2009) with a focus on differences in the gendered rhetorical styles.

Modern ideas about masculinity and femininity are made up of clusters of attributes that define the characteristics that are thought to be traits of men and women, respectively (Winter, 2010). The expectations of masculinity have led to assumptions of the status quo of political leadership and citizenship, which still defines so much of society. Edwards (2009) recognized politics as a gendered space, wherein symbolic and rhetorical constructs and functions of gender in the words, actions, representations, and performances in the political sphere. Within political communication, gender is something that is performed and displayed through self-presentation, representation, and rhetoric (Edwards, 2009).

Rhetoric is a tool that influences all day-to-day situations and reflects what people agree with in society. Rhetoric can be defined as “centering on the idea of influence; the way we use verbal and nonverbal signs to affect other people” (Brummett, 2000, p. 2). Rhetoric is also defined as “the study of the means by which symbols can be used to appeal to others, to persuade. The potential for this persuasion exists in the shared symbolic and socioeconomic experience and channel it in certain directions” (Campbell, 1989, p. 2). People in positions of

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

political power are subsequently actors in engaging in that rhetoric that shapes the influence of the public's opinions, essentially in an attempt to persuade.

Tannen (1986) coined Genderlect Theory, the concept of how miscommunication occurs all the time between men and women. Genderlect is the notion that male-female conversation is cross-cultural communication is described as a set of characteristics that are gender related to one's speaking (Hofstede, 1983; Tannen, 1986). Masculine and feminine styles of discourse are best viewed as two distinct cultural dialects rather than as inferior or superior ways of speaking. Men's report talk focuses on status and independence, while women's seeks human connection. Women are seeking human connection and intimacy and males are focused on status, and working hard to preserve their independence. Tannen (1986) observed these qualities by scrutinizing the conversation of representative speakers from both the feminine and masculine cultures to determine their core values.

Genderlect theory sees masculine and feminine communication styles as two different cultural dialects, neither of which is more superior to the other. Genderlect states that these forms of communication are simply different in their focus. Masculine discourse is based on building status and independence, while feminine conversation is used as a way to build relationships and connections (Tannen, 1986). Genderlect may also be used to construct individual and group personae, as well as style. While genderlect may also have other parameters that it takes into account, such as class, education, or background, it essentially describes one's style of speaking based on gender.

Tannen (1986) argues that genderlect styles are at the root of a large portion of the miscommunication between men and women. She says that this is because boys grow up following these three rules: 1) communicate to assert ideas, opinions, and identity; 2) use talk to

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

solve problems or develop a strategy; and 3) speak in a way that attracts attention to oneself. On the other hand, girls are taught to: 1) use communication to create and maintain relationships; 2) involve others in conversations and respond to their ideas; and 3) show sensitivity to others and to relationships (Tannen, 1986). These rules show that females value rapport talk, while males value report talk.

Communicative style is revealed through patterns of behavior and is based on individual style that is mediated by context, time, and situation (Wadsworth, Patterson, Kaid, Cullers, Malcom, & Lamirand, 1987). Men and women have many distinctive differences within their communicative styles. Styles of masculine speech and feminine speech have been observed to differ in their form, topic, content, and use. Hass (1979) stated that typically men are more loquacious and directive, using more nonstandard forms and referring more to time, space, quantity, destructive action, physical attributes, physical movements and objects. Women, on the other hand, are often more polite, more supportive, and expressive, especially in talking about the home and the family. Women also use more words that imply feeling, evaluation, interpretation, and psychological state.

Feminine Rhetorical Style

Literature has suggested that there is a problem for women in politics, as there is a double bind created by a largely masculine political landscape (Jamieson, 1995). This double bind assumes that women are unable to negotiate the personal and political femininity with public discourse. Creating a space for language and meaning is very difficult for women to do in the current masculine political system (Taylor, 2011). Woman's language, as described by Lakoff (1973), states that the marginality and the powerlessness of women is reflected in both the ways women are expected to speak, and the ways in which women are spoken of. Specifically, she

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

found that women rely more often on milder forms of vocabulary, whereas men rely on stronger tools of discursive power, including profanity. Women are also likely to use adjectives representing their emotion, rely on tag questions or verbal hedging to express uncertainty, and opt for more polite forms in asking for something. In addition, masculine style is often more impersonal, whereas feminine prefers a more personalized forms of communication (Kessler, 2013).

When women stray from their expected rhetorical styles, they are at risk for being branded as aggressive, tough, and brash; these are qualities that are praised for men and looked down on for women. On this matter, Edwards (2009) stated that “the major initial work that expressed the rhetorical perspective of gender and politics centered on recoveries of the ‘lost voices’ of women in American history who have spoken on behalf of suffrage and other reform movements” (p. xii). Females who take on masculine issues or communicate in a masculine style stray from the gender stereotype, which can make the woman regarded as brash, or even “bitchy” (Anderson, 1999). Alternatively, females who appear too feminine are categorized as inept for these masculine positions. In addition, Bystrom (2004) noted that while males and females can use both masculine and feminine styles, women have less autonomy to combine the styles. Because of this catch, it is important to explore what happens when females violate these rhetorical norms and expectations. Therefore, this thesis seeks to examine if this holds true in regards to political pundits.

Karlyn Korhs Campbell (1989) is credited with articulating feminine rhetorical style. Kathleen Hall Jamieson (1988), Barry Brummett (2000), Sonja Foss and Cindy Griffin (1995), Brigitte Mral (1999) and others have contributed to what is now considered feminine rhetorical style. Feminine rhetorical style has been largely used in the analysis of political discourse, as

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

well as in the analysis of television shows, the feminist movement, presidential, races and more. It is important to note that “feminine” refers to gender, not sex, and that both men and women may employ feminine style. Campbell (1989) initiated the discussion of feminine rhetorical style by explaining that early female rhetors had no choice but to utilize a form of masculine style because they faced a clear double bind. Early female rhetors had to follow the requirements that were apparent in masculine rhetorical styles, but they also had to justify their right as a woman to speak publicly. Therefore, not only did women have to consider the context of their speeches, they also had to contemplate the delivery (Campbell, 1989). Foss and Griffin (1995) add to the discussion by noting that, “women have not had the opportunities to speak and write that men have had. The ideas of women have not been treated with the same degrees of seriousness as the idea of men” (Foss and Griffin, 1995, p. 19).

Interestingly, several scholars and other political analysts have suggested that people are more likely to accept “women who represent us,” rather than women who take charge and run things on their own. Stereotypically, leading requires aggression, initiative, expertise, and reason, all masculine traits (Anderson & Sheelor, 2005). With that being said, women are expected to act in a certain way that appeases feminine and masculine standards. The pervasiveness of the term “bitch” in political culture is something that has held women back from asserting their commentary and opinions, through fear of being labeled negatively. This “bitch” metaphor is used frequently within the public sphere for women leaders who transgress boundaries and disrupt expectations in ways the media and general public resist (Anderson & Sheelor, 2005, p. 28).

Feminine rhetorical style is characterized as personal, excessive, and disorganized. This feminine style is personal, as it uses anecdotes and examples, is inductive, and encourages

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

identification between a speaker and their audience (Parry-Giles, 1996). Campbell (1989) has defined six characteristics that encompass feminine rhetoric. She first described feminine rhetoric as having “personal style.” This means that the rhetoric is focused heavily on personal experience, anecdotes, and other examples in order to communicate. She also stated that women typically style their rhetoric inductively, that is to say that they often make generalizations within their speech. Feminine rhetoric also invites the audience members into the rhetoric, asking them to compare their own experiences to the speaker’s, while also treating the audience members as equals whose own experiences are knowledgeable. Lastly, Campbell noted that in doing this, feminine rhetoric works to create a sense of commonality with their audience. While these characteristics generally note a feminine style of rhetoric, it is not all encompassing and just because it is termed “feminine” style, it doesn’t mean that all females talk this way. Rhetors can also adapt their communication styles dependent on the conditions surrounding the rhetoric.

Campbell (2001) noticed that in order to soften the societal outcry against their participation in the public dialogue, women developed a rhetorical style that emerged out of the experiences that they had as women and adapted to the attitudes and experiences of female audiences which exemplified their roles of mothers and housewives. These women also mentored each other, contributing expert advice through trial and error, which produced a particular style of feminine discourse. These characteristics rely heavily on personal experience and anecdotes. It tends to be structured inductively, inviting audience participation, which includes the process of testing principles against audience experience. They addressed audience members as peers, and recognized authority based on experience, while also creating identification with the experiences of the audiences and those described by the speaker with the goal of rhetoric as empowerment.

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

Blankenship and Robson (1995) expanded Campbell's work by identifying 5 characteristics of feminine style, which they argue have redrawn the line between public and private spheres. These are: (1) basing political judgments on concrete, lived experiences; (2) valuing inclusivity and the relational nature of being; (3) conceptualizing the power of public office as a capacity to "get things done" and to empower others; (4) approaching policy formation holistically; (5) moving women's issues to the forefront of the public arena.

Wood (2009) also expanded on Campbell's literature by identifying seven characteristics of feminine communication used by women and some men. First, rhetors engage in conversation to share about themselves and learn about others. A second feature is establishing equality between people. A third characteristic is supporting others, typically by expressing emotions to show understanding of one's situations or feelings. Fourth is that a conversational maintenance work that involves efforts to sustain the conversation. Fifth is responsiveness through eye contact and prompt response. The sixth feature of feminine communication is speaking in a personal, concrete style through the use of details, personal disclosures, and concrete reasoning. The seventh and final characteristic of feminine communication is tentativeness. In sum, these seven characteristics are sharing about oneself, establishing equality, showing emotion or feeling, sustaining the conversation, responsiveness, speaking in a personal style, and tentativeness.

The feminine style of political communication based in television is a style that is "personal, excessive, disorganized, and unduly ornamental; as well as oppositional to the masculine style of political communication that is "factual, analytic, organized, and impersonal" (Jamieson, 1988, p. 76). Jamieson (1988) argues the reason that television fits into this effeminate style, or showing characteristics regarded as typical of a woman, is because television invites a personal, self disclosing style that draws public discourse out of a private self which

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

means that political speakers must assume a more feminine style of communication. Mral argues that the female rhetoric tradition is as interchangeable as the male tradition has been, highly dependent on the temporal context (as cited in Ahagen & Nilsson, 2013). Although Jamieson (1988) states that television calls for a more self-disclosing feminine style, it is important to consider whether this holds true in the masculine, fast-paced setting of panel discussions on political talk shows.

Dow & Tonn (1993) examined feminine style and political judgment, focusing specifically on the rhetoric of Ann Richards, an American politician and the 45th governor of Texas. They stated that women are encouraged to exhibit communicative patterns that correspond to the tasks that women are expected to perform in the private life, while communicative patterns for men reflect their roles in public life. Feminine communication is characterized as concrete, participatory, cooperative, and related to relationship maintenance. Therefore, women are encouraged to display behavior in the private sphere because they have been perceived as ill-fitted to the competitive, task oriented, or deliberative behavior of the public sphere. It is argued that female politicians must operate in the “ultimate public deliberative context, where feminine communicative strategies would be less valued and adaptations to masculine communicative patterns would be more useful” (Dow & Tonn, 1993, p. 288). It was argued by Campbell (2001) that the feminine style arose in response to a non-traditional audience that was inexperienced in public deliberation; however, Dow & Tonn (1993) assert that the analysis of contemporary discourse that exhibits feminine styles can omit the barriers between public and private discourse, which illustrates how feminine style can function to offer alternative modes of political reasoning. This assumes that feminine styles can be helpful

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

in the political process instead of harmful as once thought. These characteristics differ from masculine rhetorical style as detailed below.

Masculine Rhetorical Style

Bystrom (2004) defined masculine rhetorical style through four characteristics. She stated that masculine communicators use more deductive reasoning and logic, often citing their own expertise. In deductive reasoning, the speaker is going from a general case to a more specific instance. In citing one's own expertise, the speaker is attempting to add credibility to the arguments that he or she is making. In masculine style, the rhetor also tends to use expert authority to back up claims. In using expert authority, the speaker is once again attempting to add credibility by citing a specialist. Masculine speakers are more likely to use impersonal examples within their rhetoric, whereas feminine rhetorical style uses personal narrative and anecdotes in its rhetoric. Masculine style is also more direct, assertive, and tough. It has been found that men are more dominant in speech, with more verbal attacks and acts of interruption (as cited in Ahagen & Nilsson, 2013). Jespersen (1964) observed that women's speech was more conservative than males, as males tend to be more likely to use and coin new terms and puns, use slang words and expressions, and implement profanity and obscenity. It has also been found that men are much more likely to interrupt than women.

Down and Tonn (1993) state that masculine communication reflects masculine roles in public life and is therefore characterized as abstract, hierarchal, dominated and oriented toward problem solving. This public communication primarily produced by males has "served as the model for good speech" (Dow & Tonn, 1993, p. 288). This shows the value that has been placed on masculine communicative style.

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

In 1999, Bridgette Mral stated that the difference in masculine and feminine rhetoric is a choice between the typically “male” contest and conflict style, and the typically “female” discussion and consensus style. Men tend to adopt the male style and women tend to adopt the female style as a result of cultural expectations (as cited in Ahagen & Nilsson, 2013; Hofstede, 1983). Thus, Mral constructed four dimensions of masculine and feminine rhetorical style (as cited in Ahagen & Nilsson, 2013). The first dimension is the balance between inclusion and confrontation; the second one is the relation and distance the speaker displays towards his audience; third are the displays of feeling and focus on fact; and fourth is the difference in priority in regards to dialogue and decision. The four dimensions are to be seen as ideal types or points of references. Inclusion is a dimension of feminine style where the speaker tries to identify with the audience as being the same as him or her, while confrontation is a dimension of masculine style as it is more excluding to the audience and other groups. Relation is a dimension of feminine style, of seeking of informal closeness, while distance is separating the speaker from the audience by formality. This informal language consists of personal pronouns such as “I”, “you” or “we” or when the speaker expresses his or her own opinion, such as stating “I believe.” These statements are forms of verbal hedging, words or phrases that make a statement less forceful or assertive (Nordquist, 2015). Formal language uses conjectures and markers such as “therefore,” “accordingly” and “subsequently.” The feminine style of rhetoric focuses more on feeling rather than on fact, while the masculine style of speech focuses on the transmitting of fact. The dialogue dimension is another feminine feature that is characterized by invitations to discussion through the use of inclusive choice of words in order to consider the possible solutions of a problem. The decision dimension is typically a masculine feature, where the reaching of a solution is more significant and is often accomplished through informing of the

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

audience. Research shows that men are more dominant in speech, with more verbal attacks and acts of interruption (as cited in Ahagen & Nilsson, 2013). In sum, feminine rhetorical style is made up of inclusion, relation, feeling, and dialogue; whereas masculine rhetorical style is made up of confrontation, independence, fact, and decision (as cited in Ahagen & Nilsson, 2013).

These four dimensions will be used as the basis for analysis, with characteristics noted by other scholars (Blankenship & Robson, 1995; Campbell, 1989; Dow and Tonn, 1993; Foss and Griffin, 1995; Jamieson, 1995; and Perry and Giles, 1996). Table 1 shows the operationalization of masculine and feminine style used for analysis.

Table 1.

Characteristics of Masculine and Feminine Rhetorical Styles

<u>Label</u>	<u>Characteristics</u>	<u>Counterpart</u>
M1: Confrontation	Direct; Assertive; Interruptive; Name-calling; Slang; Obscenity	Inclusion
F1: Inclusion	Personal Experience; Extended Narrative; Similarities; Group identity	Confrontation
M2: Independence	Impersonal examples; Formal language	Relation
F2: Relation	Seeking informal closeness; Informal language	Distance
M3: Fact	Deductive reasoning; Logic; Use of numbers	Feeling
F3: Feeling	Conversational tone; Expressing emotion; Informal language; Anecdotes	Fact
M4: Decision Dimension	Using one's own credibility or expertise	Dialogue Dimension
F4: Dialogue Dimension	Invites audience participation; Inductive arguments	Decision Dimension

This schema has been used by Ahagen & Nilsson (2013) to study the rhetorical styles of male and female representatives of Sweden and the United States, to see whether typical differences in speech between men and women could be found in a typically norm dominated

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

sphere such as foreign policy. The researchers explored this question by establishing the specifics of the difference in speech between the genders and later comparing speeches held at the UN by male and female representatives of Sweden and the U.S, finding that that there were only minor differences in speech between genders existed within the speeches held at the UN.

In sum, feminine style consists of inclusion, relation, feeling, and dialogue. These characteristics include using feeling and emotion, using personal experiences, extended narrative, and anecdotes, creating arguments deductively, and inviting audience participation. One of the questions that formed this thesis speculated about the role of specific issues causing a shift in feminine or masculine style, therefore following is an overview of issue ownership theory.

Issue Ownership Theory

Issue ownership theory was developed through a 1980 case study by John Petrocik (1996). This theory of voting emphasizes the role of campaigns in setting the criteria for voters to choose between candidates expecting candidates to emphasize issues on which that are advantaged and their opponents are well regarded (Petrocik, 1996). The theory of issue ownership finds a campaign effect when a candidate “successfully frames the vote choice as a decision to be made in terms of problems facing the country that he is better able to ‘handle’ than his opponent” (Petrocik, 1996, p. 826). Handling is the ability to resolve a problem that is of concern to voters.

Petrocik (1996) explored the perception of issue ownership by voters. As stated, issue ownership is the theory that Republicans are better suited to handle certain issues and Democrats are better suited to handle others. He found that Republicans “owned” economic issues, foreign policy and defense, and social issues. Foreign policy and defense issues include reaching nuclear

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

arms agreements, dealing with international terrorism, maintaining a strong defense, increasing U.S. influence, and conducting foreign affairs (Petrocik, 1996, p. 832). Economic issues consist of reducing the deficit, dealing with foreign imports, promoting growth and prosperity, taxes, controlling government spending and inflation (Petrocik, 1996, p. 832). Social issues concerned promoting moral values, reducing the drug problem, crime, and the environment (Petrocik, 1996, p. 832). Democrats own social welfare issues such as fair policies to all, protecting social security, improving health care and education, and helping the middle class, homeless, elderly, and poor.

Shifts in political parties over gender occurred in the 1970's during the polarization of political elites over the Equal Rights Amendment. By the 1980's parties had developed specific standpoints over women's issues and feminist groups were formed within the Democratic Party. These developments have been reinforced by the gendered connotations of the issues owned by each of the political parties. Winter (2010) examined gender and American's explicit and implicit images of the political parties. He states that during the past three decades, Americans have come to view the parties in gendered terms of masculinity and femininity. This is in line with issue ownership theory as it is demonstrated empirically that "these connections between party images and gender stereotypes have been forged at the explicit level of the traits that Americans associate with each party, and also at the implicit level of unconscious cognitive connections between gender and party stereotypes" (Winter, 2010, p. 587). The connection between masculinity and femininity between political parties has shown shifts in men and women's roles in society. This has led to a development of American's images of gendered characteristics in political parties, so that Democrats are considered the more feminine party and Republicans are more masculine. Findings suggest that even when gender is not explicitly in

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

play, citizens' ideas about masculinity and femininity may still shape political evaluations more broadly than might otherwise be expected (Winter, 2010). It is established that gender stereotypes can shape issue opinion and candidate evaluation. See Table 2 for a list of masculine and feminine issues.

Table 2.

Masculine and Feminine Issues

Masculine Issues	Feminine Issues
Economy: Reducing the deficit, taxes, spending, inflation	Social Welfare: Fair policies, social security, healthcare, education
Social Issues: Moral values, drugs, crime, environment	
Politics	
Foreign Policy & Defense: Nuclear arms, International relations and foreign affairs, Defense	

Political punditry is the art of giving opinions on the political happenings of the world. Political punditry can be observed on the Big Five, a set of talk shows that feature a group of pundits participating in roundtable or panel discussions of current events and politics. The issues that are covered on these talk shows include economy, foreign and domestic relations, and social issues, all masculine issues; and health care, education, and fair policies, feminine issues defined by issue ownership theory (Petrocik, 1996). The theory of cultural dimensions (Hofstede, 1983) states that the United States is masculine driven in terms of cultural values; therefore, it is important to study gendered rhetorical styles to analyze the communicative styles that political pundits use.

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

Previous literature of gender and political behavior has focused on the gender gap in partisan identification and public opinion, or differences in reaction to male and female candidates (Winter, 2010). In regards to political talk shows, literature has focused on the demographic make up of featured guests in terms of gender, race, and often ideology. Therefore, because a current gap in literature exists regarding political pundits and gendered rhetorical style, this thesis served to investigate what form of gendered rhetorical style pundits who have been asked to appear on multiple networks employ. Following is a description of artifact and method.

CHAPTER 3: DESCRIPTION OF ARTIFACT AND METHOD

Methods

First, transcripts from the first week of each month of 2013 were downloaded from each networks' transcript archive on their website. Out of 60 possible shows available on the Big Five Sunday talk shows during 2013, 22 episodes were analyzed. These included eight from ABC's *This Week*, three from CBS's *Face the Nation*, two from CNN's *State of the Union*, seven from *Fox News Sunday*, and two from NBC's *Meet the Press*. The number of episodes for each show was dependent selected pundit appearances on the network's show during 2013. After transcripts were downloaded, pundits who appeared on each roundtable were listed and final pundits that were selected were those who appeared on multiple networks during the selected time frame. This resulted in six pundits (Bill Kristol, Karl Rove, George Will, Peggy Noonan, Neera Tanden, Amy Walter) selected who appeared on 22 episodes which constituted ten months of the year.

The stylistic qualities of featured roundtable political pundits through the content analysis of the Big Five Sunday morning political talk shows in 2013 were analyzed, looking for pundits' use of masculine and feminine rhetorical styles. These stylistic qualities include Campbell (1989) and Jamieson's (1995) noted characteristics of feminine and masculine rhetorical styles were nested into four main themes identified by Mral (as cited in Ahagen & Nilsson, 2013). Table 1 showed the operationalization of these rhetorical styles and their characteristics that will be used for analysis.

This schema has been used by Ahagen & Nilsson (2013) to study the rhetorical styles of male and female representatives of Sweden and the United States, to see whether typical differences in speech between men and women could be found in a typically norm dominated

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

sphere such as foreign policy finding that that there were only minor differences in speech between genders existed within the speeches held at the UN.

A content analysis was conducted on the transcripts of these five shows. A content analysis is a research methodology that examines word or phrases within a wide variety of texts. It is “any technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages” (Holsti, 1969, p. 14). A content analysis was conducted in the hopes of finding characteristics of masculine and feminine rhetorical styles within the transcripts from the Big Five. To support claims of “more” or “less” of characteristics of masculine and feminine rhetorical styles, there was a need to quantitatively analyze the content. Quantitative content analyzes are useful when researching the frequency of specific content of a speech or text (Ahagen & Nilsson, 2013).

Many different scholars have contributed to what constitutes feminine style. Therefore, the four major themes of masculine and feminine style identified by Mral (as cited in Ahagen & Nilsson, 2013) will be used for analysis. These four themes were chosen as they encompass a large majority of what different scholars constitute as the differences in gendered rhetoric. These four themes will also be operationalized to include subcategories and characteristics to incorporate the contributions by Blankenship & Robson (1995), Campbell (1989), Dow and Tonn (1993) Foss and Griffin (1995), Jamieson (1995), and Perry and Giles (1996). See Table 1 (p. 32).

The first dimension is the balance between inclusion and confrontation; second is the relation and distance the speaker displays towards his/her audience; third is the displays of feeling and focus on fact; and fourth, the difference in priority in regards to dialogue and decision. The four dimensions are to be seen as ideal types or points of references. Masculine

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

subcategories were defined with the letter M and a following number. The letter F as well as a number identified feminine subcategories. What follows is an overview of the masculine and feminine rhetorical styles and the subcharacteristics for analysis.

Inclusion is a dimension of feminine style where the speaker tries to identify with the audience as being the same as them. The opposite of inclusion is confrontation. Tannen (1990) explains that women tend to view relations symmetrically, viewing themselves as similar to other people, while men view their relation to other people in a hierarchical fashion. Subcategory F1 is the use of personal experience and extended narrative to establish inclusion (Blakenship & Robson, 1995; Campbell, 1989; Jamieson, 1988; Perry-Giles, 1996). This occurs when the rhetor tends to share about their selves and their lived experiences through extended narrative and details in order to identify themselves as the same as the audience (Perry-Giles, 1996). The inclusion element of the feminine style of rhetoric will be identified by the undertone of symmetry, the similarities displayed, and the use of personal narrative with language identifying the speaker with the audience of the speech directly or through a metaphor or group identity (Ahagen & Nilsson, 2013; Mral, 1999; Tannen 1990). An example of this would be if a pundit told a story regarding his time as a staff member in the White House or when he met a foreign politician.

Confrontation is a dimension of masculine style, as it is more excluding and aggressive relationship to the audience and other groups. Subcategory M1 is the characteristic of being direct and assertive (Hass, 1979). In this the rhetor does not fluff his language; instead giving firm, matter of fact answers. Essentially the rhetor is being blunt in his response. In addition, the rhetor is interruptive, tending to cut off the other people involved in the conversation. This category also consists rhetoric that includes slang, obscenity, or verbal attacks such as name-

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

calling (Jespersen, 1964). Instances of confrontation will be observed in interruptions, slang, obscenity, and verbal attacks.

Relation is a dimension of feminine style, seeking of informal closeness. Distance is the masculine counterpart to relation. This informal language consists of personal pronouns such as “I”, “you” or “we” or when the speaker expresses their own opinion, such as stating “I believe.” Subcategory (F2) is empowering the audience by encouraging them to participate in conversation. The feminine style of relation will be identified through phrases such as “I,” “you,” “we” and “I believe, “I think.” In using these phrases, the rhetor states his own belief as a possibility, rather than fact through verbal hedging. Verbal hedging, is defined by Bruce (2010) as:

A rhetorical strategy. By including a particular term, choosing a particular structure, or imposing a specific prosodic form on the utterance, the speaker signals a lack of a full commitment either to the full category membership of a term or expression in the utterance (content mitigation), or to the intended illocutionary force of the utterance (force mitigation) (p. 210).

Lakoff (1973) associated hedging with un-clarity, vagueness, and approximation and states that it is affected by gender. To show their femininity, women tend to adopt an unassertive style of communication and remove their statements of declarative force (Lakoff, 1973). Feminine style encourages participation; therefore, within relation pundits can use verbal hedging to state his or her own beliefs as more of a possibility rather than fact, to encourage others to chime in with their own opinion (Dow & Tonn, 1993). Because political punditry is based largely on pundits expressing their opinions on various issues and topics, it is likely that the use of relation will be frequent.

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

Independence, created through the distancing of the speaker from the audience by formality, is a characteristic of masculine style. The use of formal language is an active rhetorical distancing of the audience by the speaker and therefore is an indicator of masculine distance style (as cited in Ahagen & Nilsson, 2013). Subcategory M2 is employment of impersonal examples (Bystrom, 2004; Jamieson, 1988). Whereas feminine rhetorical theory has an emphasis in the rhetor sharing about himself through personal narrative, masculine rhetorical style is developed through impersonal examples. These examples could consist of pundits retelling stories that have happened to other people, or giving examples that are not personal to the pundit their self. Formal language is found within independence and is seen when the pundit lacks casual grammar and uses connectors and markers such as “therefore,” “accordingly” and “subsequently” (Ahagen & Nilsson, 2013).

The feminine style of rhetoric focuses more on feeling rather than on fact. The presence of emotion, caring, and feeling in rhetoric is often seen as a feminine attribute (as cited in Ahagen & Nilsson, 2013; Tannen 1990) Therefore, subcategory F3 consists of speaking in a conversational tone, expressing feeling and emotions (Hass, 1979). This is done through using informal language and anecdotes. Expressing feelings and using informal language allows the audience to feel comfortable in the conversation, a phenomenon also supported by Campbell (1973).

The masculine style of speech focuses on the transmitting of fact. Subcategory M3 is the use of deductive reasoning and logic (Bystrom, 2004, Jamieson, 1988. This includes the characteristics of decision dimension, or convincing through portrayals of fact. In doing this, the rhetor is attempting to convince his audience that what he is saying is right through the use of logic through numbers and facts (Hass, 1979). Deductive reasoning is embodied in this

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

masculine characteristic as the rhetor attempts to persuade his audience by explaining that if it is true for the general, it is true for the specific. In using deductive reasoning and logic, the pundit uses dates and quantities as data to set up the argument by convincing through fact, and then explains what that then means in a specific case.

Dialogue dimension is another feminine feature that is characterized by invitations to discussion through the use of inclusive choice of words in order to consider the possible solutions of a problem. Decision dimension is the opposite of this characteristic. Tannen (1990) determined that there is a difference of what a discussion should lead to between genders. For males, a decision or a solution is the most important thing, while women tend to focus on the discussion itself as a way to build closeness and to understand the problem to reach the best solution. Therefore, invitations to discussion are often more present when women speak, through inclusive language that initiates a discussion. Subcategory F4 also consists of creating arguments inductively (Campbell, 1989; Perry-Giles, 1996). This is taking something specific and making it more general. Subcategory F4 also invites audience participation through requests and questions. This establishes equality with the audience through the use phrases such as “you know?” to engage. In doing this, the rhetor creates an open space for discussion.

Decision dimension is a typically a masculine feature, where the reaching of a solution is significant and is often reached through convincing and informing the audience. Subcategory M4 is the masculine characteristic of citing one’s own expertise or citing an expert authority. In doing this, the rhetor is using other examples from someone credible, or using his own credibility, to back up their statements (Bystrom, 2004). In addition, males tend to imply expertise and inform the audience of the truth through one-sided argumentation by stating what action is the right one (Tannen, 1990). The decision element is evident by portraying of absolute

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

solutions without any contemplation or option of objection (Ahagen & Nilsson, 2013, Dow & Tonn, 1993). Examples of this would be found in a statements such as, “As the former president of this company...” or “John Smith, current CFO of that company, says that our interest charges are hundreds of billions of dollars a year and our tax revenues are ten times that much.” By adding credibility of expertise to these statements, the rhetor is showing that their statements have a sound backing.

In sum, Mral identifies that feminine rhetorical style is made up of inclusion, relation, feeling, and dialogue; masculine rhetorical style is made up of confrontation, independence, fact, and decision (as cited in Ahagen & Nilsson, 2013). These four dimensions have been operationalized to include subcharacteristics developed by other scholars (Blankenship & Robson, 1995; Campbell, 1989; Dow and Tonn, 1993; Foss and Griffin, 1995; Jamieson, 1995; and Perry and Giles, 1996) and will be used as the basis for analysis.

Instances of these themes and subcategories were measured through a content analysis of 22 episodes from the Big Five during 2013. The five shows that were chosen are part of a series of Sunday morning political talk shows referred to as the “Big Five.” The Big Five are (1) ABC's *This Week* with George Stephanopoulos, (2) CBS' *Face the Nation* with Bob Schieffer, (3) Fox's *Fox News Sunday* with Chris Wallace, (4) NBC's *Meet the Press* with Chuck Todd, and (5) CNN's *State of the Union* with Candy Crowley. These shows are important because they feature pundits in a roundtable discussion where they are able to express their opinions on current events. The pundits who appear on these Sunday morning talk shows are considered political elites, and because the shows appear on Sunday mornings, they largely influence the agenda for the week of what issues other political shows will cover (Savillo, 2015). The first weekend in each of the months of 2013 were analyzed. The only months not included in the

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

study were February and May because none of the selected pundits appeared on any of the five shows during that month.

Pundits Chosen

Six political pundits were chosen for analysis, three males and three females. The males included Bill Kristol, Karl Rove, and George Will. Females included Peggy Noonan, Neera Tanden, and Amy Walter. In choosing pundits for analysis they had to meet certain criterion. First these pundits must be defined as just that, pundits who were featured during the roundtable discussion. Guests who were featured during the roundtable discussion who had other occupations (i.e., hosts, professors, etc.) were not considered for analysis, as pundit is not their primary role. One of the most important considerations for selecting the pundits to be studied was be their “success” and “popularity” as a pundit. Therefore, transcripts from the first episode of each month for each network were analyzed to first gather the names of these pundits and then pundits for analysis were chosen based on how often these pundits are brought onto these panel discussions throughout 2013, with the pundits being chosen as those who appeared on multiple shows on multiple networks. Other considerations such as ideology, race, and other professions were not taken into account when the pundits were selected. It is also important to note that there was not equality in terms of pundit appearances, male and female representation, or network transcripts within the timeframe selected for analysis. Below is a brief profile of each pundit selected for analysis.

Bill Kristol is a Caucasian neoconservative political analyst and commentator. He is the founder and editor of the political magazine the *Weekly Standard* and a political pundit on several major networks. Kristol is also a regular on ABC’s special events and election coverage. Kristol led the Project for the Republican Future, where he helped formulate the strategy that

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

produced the 1994 Republican congressional victory before starting the *Weekly Standard* in 1995 (*The Weekly Standard*, 2016).

Karl Rove is a Caucasian Republican political pundit and policy advisor. He was Senior Advisor and Deputy Chief of Staff during President George W. Bush's administration until he resigned in 2007. Rove has also headed the Office of Political Affairs, the Office of Public Liaison, and the White House Office of Strategic Initiatives. He is credited with the 1994 and 1998 Texas gubernatorial victories of George W. Bush and Bush's 2000 and 2004 presidential campaigns (*Fox News*, 2016).

George Will is a Caucasian conservative newspaper columnist and political pundit. He is also a Pulitzer Prize–winner. In 1976, Will won the Pulitzer Prize for commentary, for his newspaper columns, and acquired awards for his *Newsweek* columns. Will has served as a contributing analyst with ABC News and has been a regular member of ABC's *This Week* on Sunday mornings since 1981. Prior to entering journalism, Will taught political philosophy at Michigan State University and the University of Toronto, and served on the staff of U.S. Senator Gordon Allott. Before becoming a columnist for *Newsweek*, Will was the Washington editor of the *National Review*, a leading conservative journal of ideas and political commentary (*The Washington Post Company*, 1998).

Peggy Noonan is a Caucasian political pundit. She is also an author of several books on politics, religion, and culture, and a weekly columnist for *The Wall Street Journal*. Noonan was a producer of CBS News in New York and an adjunct professor of journalism at New York University. Noonan was also a speech writer and the Special Assistant to President Ronald Reagan during his time in the White House. She is a trustee of the Manhattan Institute, a conservative American think tank (*Wall Street Journal*, 2015).

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

Neera Tanden is an Asian/Indian political pundit and the president and CEO of Center for American Progress and the Center for American Progress Action Fund, a progressive public policy research and advocacy organization. Tanden has served in both the Clinton and Obama administrations, as well as think tanks and presidential campaigns. Tanden has also served as the senior advisor for health reform at the Department of Health and Human Services, working on President Obama's health reform team (*Center for American Progress*, 2016).

Amy Walter is a Caucasian political analyst, currently serving as national editor of *The Cook Political Report* that provides independent, non-partisan analysis of U.S. elections. Walter is the former political director of ABC News and is currently and exclusive panelist on NBC and PBS. From 1997 to 2007, Walter served as Senior Editor of *The Cook Political Report* where she covered the White House (*The Cook Political Report*, 2015).

Months Chosen and Issues Analyzed

Overall, 22 episodes from ABC, CBS, CNN, FOX and NBC were selected for analysis. Below is an overview of what issues were covered during the months selected for analysis and whether that issue is considered more masculine or more feminine based on Petrocik's (1996) issue ownership theory. Refer to Table 2 for the perceptions of issue ownership developed by Petrocik that were used for analysis.

The main issue covered during roundtable discussion for January included the fiscal cliff dilemma. The fiscal cliff refers to more than \$500 billion in tax increases and spending cuts that were scheduled to take affect after January 1, 2013 if President Obama and the House Republicans did not reach an alternative deficit-reduction deal. This issue was classified as economy, a masculine issue (Petrocik, 1996.) The Sandy Hook Elementary School shootings also brought up the 2nd Amendment, and therefore gun control was also a topic discussed. This

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

was also classified as a masculine issue (Petrocik, 1996). Politics were also briefly brought up and classified as a masculine issue (Petrocik, 1996). Pundits featured this month were George Will, Neera Tanden, and Bill Kristol.

March consisted of the masculine issue of politics, specifically presidential campaigns. Immigration, classified as a masculine issue was also discussed (Petrocik, 1996). The economy, a masculine issue, was also covered (Petrocik, 1996). Bill Kristol was the only pundit featured during March.

April focused on many issues. Political campaigns were discussed, with pundits being asked how they thought that prospective nominees would do in the presidential race. As mentioned, politics was classified as a masculine issue (Petrocik, 1996). Foreign relations, classified as a masculine issue, was brought up with pundits discussing the missile crisis in North Korea (Petrocik, 1996). As well, the budget, debt ceiling, and economy were discussed, and were also classified as masculine (Petrocik, 1996). Education, classified as a feminine issue, was also discussed during roundtable discussion (Petrocik, 1996). Pundits featured during this month were George Will and Amy Walter.

The transcripts from June focused on a plethora of issues including taxes and the economy (masculine), the Tea Party (categorized as politics which is masculine), immigration (masculine), and the implementation of Obamacare (health care feminine) (Petrocik, 1996). Karl Rove and Amy Walter were the pundits featured for this month.

During July there was a setback for the White House with the healthcare law, Obamacare, which led to the discussion of healthcare at the roundtable (categorized as feminine) (Petrocik, 1996). Immigration (masculine) was discussed as the pundits analyzed an immigration bill being considered (Petrocik, 1996). Pundits featured this month were George Will and Amy Walter.

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

August also consisted of many issues. The scandal with former U.S. Representative, Anthony Weiner, was discussed and was categorized as politics, a masculine issue (Petrocik, 1996). The rift within the Republican party over representation was also brought up; also classified as politics, masculine (Petrocik, 1996). Terrorism (classified as foreign relations, masculine) was discussed after a decision was made to close all embassies from Algeria to Bangladesh after a terror threat was made (Petrocik, 1996). George Will, Neera Tanden, Peggy Noonan, and Bill Kristol were featured this month.

In September, pundits discussed foreign relations (masculine), specifically the launching of military strikes against Iraq (Petrocik, 1996). Pundits featured during this month were Peggy Noonan and Bill Kristol.

The economy and politics (both masculine) were the focus of October (Petrocik, 1996). Considerations of raising the debt limit were discussed, as well as the possibility of a government shutdown. This conversation shifted to the divide between the Republican and Democratic parties, classified as politics, masculine (Petrocik, 1996). George Will and Karl Rove were featured during this month.

November consisted of a lengthy discussion over the implementation of Obamacare, classified as healthcare, feminine (Petrocik, 1996). This discussion also shifted to the divide between the political parties (masculine) as well as who would go far in the election (Petrocik, 1996). Peggy Noonan, Karl Rove, and Bill Kristol were featured during the month of November.

December consisted of similar topics as did November. Pundits featured during this month were Peggy Noonan, Bill Kristol, and George Will, who discussed Obamacare, feminine and foreign relations, masculine (Petrocik, 1996).

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

February and May were not analyzed, as none of the chosen pundits were featured on any of the five networks during those months.

Hypotheses

The aim of this thesis is to examine gendered rhetorical styles of male and female political pundits on the Big Five talk shows. This will be achieved by exploring two hypotheses:

H1: Masculine style will be the overall dominant style used by both male and female pundits.

As the Theory of Cultural Dimensions (Hofstede, 1983) stated, the United States is a masculine driven country. This means that as a country, the United States holds its values in masculine traits, especially in the workplace. Jamieson (1995) stated that television mediates a feminine style due to televisions' invitation of a personal, self-disclosing style that draws public discourse out of a private self which means that political speakers must assume a more feminine style of communication. In addition, studies have shown that female politicians tend to use a more masculine style of communication to fit the style of the role, so it is important to consider the rhetorical styles that pundits are using. Therefore, it is hypothesized that because political punditry is also a male-dominated field, masculine rhetorical style will be the dominant style used by both male and female pundits.

H2: The issue being discussed will be the driving factor of the pundit's choice of rhetorical style; therefore, it is hypothesized that masculine issues will call for masculine styles and feminine issues will call for feminine styles.

It is hypothesized that masculine issues will encourage the pundits to implement masculine forms of rhetorical style, and that for feminine issues, pundits will use feminine

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

rhetorical styles. This hypothesis stems from the notion that the situation suggests the context of the language used. Therefore, type of topic will influence the style of rhetoric used.

This study consisted of a two-part analysis. The first stage explored the pundits' use of gendered rhetoric by analyzing the transcripts of each of the five shows of the first week of the month from January 2013-December 2013, noting instances of the pundits engaging in the aforementioned masculine or feminine rhetorical styles defined by Campbell (1989) and Bystrom (2005). This time frame was chosen because it was a non-election year, therefore a variety of issues were discussed, rather than just campaigns or political strategy. The second stage expanded on how these pundits used gendered rhetoric and examines the effect of a masculine or feminine style used on the effectiveness as a pundit, specifically in line with the issue that the pundit is discussing.

This analysis explored the style of rhetoric used by six different pundits, as well as whether or not the discussion is focused on a masculine or feminine political issue. An analysis of whether the rhetoric differs in terms of confrontation or inclusion, distance or relation, facts or emotion, and decisive or dialogical rhetoric between male and female pundits will occur (as cited in Ahagen & Nilsson, 2013). This is important because it will show the rhetorical style that is used by frequent appearing pundits on different networks.

CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS & RESULTS

Notions of masculine rhetorical style and feminine rhetorical style by the selected pundits were examined through a content analysis of the transcripts of the 22 selected episodes using Mrals' (1999) characteristics of masculine and feminine style operationalized to include other scholars contributions (Blankenship & Robson, 1995; Campbell, 1989; Dow and Tonn, 1993; Foss and Griffin, 1995; Jamieson, 1995; and Perry and Giles, 1996). A content analysis was conducted to interpret and code material found with the transcripts into the aforementioned masculine and feminine rhetorical styles. Table 3 shows a breakdown of the number of times each style was used by each pundit.

Table 3
Pundits' Use of Rhetorical Styles

<u>Pundit</u>	M1	M2	M3	M4	F1	F2	F3	F4	Totals
Bill Kristol	12	11	9	4	2	36	4	5	83
Karl Rove	17	13	9	4	0	26	6	3	78
George Will	15	21	22	7	2	23	4	7	101
Peggy Noonan	4	4	1	1	3	17	4	5	39
Neera Tanden	5	1	2	1	2	12	0	2	25
Amy Walter	3	3	4	2	0	9	3	2	26

Hypothesis 1 predicted that masculine style would be the overall dominant style used by both male and female pundits. In order to answer Hypothesis 1, the transcripts were analyzed through a content analysis looking for instances of the operationalization of Mral's characteristics of feminine and masculine styles (as cited in Ahagen & Nilsson, 2013).

Hypothesis 1 was not supported, as masculine and feminine rhetorical styles were used almost equally, with feminine style used 177 times, two more than masculine (175). Overall, instances

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

of gendered rhetorical style themes were found 352 times throughout 22 episodes. To break down each characteristic, relation (F2) was found 123 times, confrontation (M1) was found 57 times, independence (M2) was found 53 times, fact (M3) was found 47 times, dialogue dimension (F4) was found 24 times, feeling (F3) was found 21 times, decision dimension (M4) was found 18 times, and inclusion (F1) was found 9 times.

Gendered style characteristics were found in almost exact equal amounts as masculine rhetorical characteristics were found 175 times and feminine rhetorical styles were found 177 times. This finding disproved hypothesis 1, which stated, “Masculine style will be the overall dominant style used by both male and female pundits.” Instead, feminine characteristics were used more often, and the feminine characteristic relation was the most used rhetorical style characteristic.

Hypothesis 2 evaluated whether the issue being discussed had an effect on the gendered rhetorical style used by the pundit. With Petrocik’s (1996) issue ownership theory as a foundation, it was hypothesized that masculine issues would call for a masculine style of rhetoric and feminine issues would call for a feminine style. In order to answer Hypothesis 2, instances of gendered rhetorical styles identified by Mral (as cited in Ahagen & Nilsson, 2013) were observed and then categorized into masculine and feminine issues based on Petrocik’s (1996) issue ownership theory based on what topic the pundits were discussing.

Many political issues were found within the analysis. Issues concerning the economy, gun control, politics, immigration, foreign relations/military, education, and healthcare were all discussed during roundtable discussions. Because five of those seven issues are classified as masculine issues (economy, gun control, politics, immigration, foreign relations/military) and only two are classified as feminine (education and health care) masculine issues were discussed

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

more frequently, with 316 out of the 352 instances of rhetorical style being found in discussing masculine issues. See Table 4 for a chart showing these categorizations.

Table 4

Rhetorical Style by Issue

<u>Issue</u>	M1	M2	M3	M4	F1	F2	F3	F4	<u>Totals</u>
Economy	13	11	11	3	0	20	1	2	61
Gun control	1	2	2	1	0	1	1	0	8
Politics	23	23	11	10	7	68	13	16	169
Immigration	2	4	3	1	0	7	3	0	20
Foreign Relations/Military	8	11	9	3	1	19	3	2	56
Education	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Healthcare	8	2	9	1	0	10	1	4	35
Totals	56	53	45	19	8	123	22	24	352

Note: M1 = Confrontation, F1 = Inclusion; M2 = Independence, F2 = Relation; M3 = Fact, F3 = Feeling; M4 = Decision, F4 = Dialogue.

As stated, it was found that feminine characteristic two (F2), relation, was the most implemented tool by both male and female pundits. Overall, characteristics of relation including creating identification and empowering the audience through phrases such as “I,” “we,” “I believe,” “I think” was found to be used 85 times by male pundits and 38 times by female pundits. Bill Kristol used this tactic the most for male pundits. Peggy Noonan used it the most for female pundits. Characteristic F1, the use of personal experience and extended narrative, was found the least (nine times) throughout analysis. Many pundits did not use this rhetorical characteristic at all. Following is an overview of the frequency of usage and examples of how each rhetorical style was used by the pundits, broken down by feminine characteristic and masculine counterpart.

Inclusion and Confrontation

Inclusion

Feminine characteristic one (F1) was the use of personal experience and extended narrative. This is done through the rhetor sharing about his or her self and lived experiences as well as the implementation of many details. Inclusion is incorporated as a way to extended narrative to create identification with the audience.

Kristol stated,

I was in grad school in '77 or '78 with Gerald Ford who had lost the presidency to Jimmy Carter. I voted for Gerald Ford, many losing candidates I voted for, I thought he would be much better than Jimmy Carter. He would have been. But I also remember watching the -- you know, in grad school and thinking, you know, that is not the future of the Republican Party and I kind of had -- I must say, with all due respect to Governor Romney I sort of had that feeling watching him today, too (*Fox News Sunday*, March 2013).

This comment was made by Bill Kristol, regarding a question asked to him by Chris Wallace concerning Mitt Romney's return to the public stage at the Conservative Political Action Conference. Kristol first began his response considering how Romney would do and then switch into personal narrative. By bringing up what he had experienced in the past, he was then able to communicate this story and experience to the question that was asked by comparing Jimmy Carter, Gerald Ford, and Mitt Romney. In using this narrative in his response, Kristol was also able to implement the strategies of relation by expressing his own opinion, as well as feeling, by expressing his own feelings.

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

Kristol also stated,

But this is a difficult position. I was in the first Bush White House in 1990. There were people who did not want us to go to Congress to get authorization for the First Gulf War” ... “To be fair, when I was in the Bush White House, that first Bush White House, we screwed up everything in September, October, November, in terms of the presentation (*Meet the Press*, September 2013).

These two different statements made by Kristol shows another way that personal narrative can be used by pundits. While it may seem that this statement could be taken as decision dimension by Kristol citing his own expertise, it is instead a narrative tactic because he is able to use that experience to create identification. In the first statement, Kristol is responding to David Gregory’s statement quoting Secretary John Kerry, “What I heard Secretary Kerry say today is even if Congress says no, the president will say yes. He's decided. He's launching military strikes. He also said, ‘If Assad were to use weapons again, United States might strike again’” (*Meet the Press*, September 2013). By bringing up his time in the Bush Sr. presidency, he is also able to show that the decision that was being made, whether or not to launch military strikes, is a difficult one that faces both support and objection, depending on who is involved. In doing this, he shows that he can understand the tough decision at hand, due to the experience and events that he has been a part of.

In Kristol’s second statement, he is doing something similar; however, he is also using inclusion by showing that through experience he knows how easy it is to “screw things up.” In this response, he was answering the question of whether or not he thought that Secretary Kerry was hung out to dry after President Obama flip-flopped on him. By having his response consist

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

of inclusion, Kristol is able to show that his experience has allowed him to relate personally to the topic being discussed and explain it better to the audience through narrative.

Noonan commented,

Yeah he was beginning his big 7-day bus tour of New Jersey, you know, to end on Election Day. I found him to be an example of the lost joy, the lost pleasure of politics. He's out there having fun. They love him. He's going to win by, we don't know, 20, 25, whatever, points. He is feeling triumphant, that is a rare thing to see in a Republican these days. So it was wonderful to witness him (*This Week*, November 2013).

George Stephanopoulos stated, “Peggy Noonan, you spent some time with Governor Christie this week,” (*This Week*, November 2013) and Noonan responded with the above narrative. While her narrative tells the story of Christie on the political tour, the focus is on how she observed that time as she was there with him. Instead of speaking for Christie, she instead tells her story of involvement.

Inclusion is a tool within feminine rhetorical style that allows a pundit to use personal experience and extended narrative to create identification with his or her audience. This tool allows the pundit to use their own experience to build credibility, while also using that credibility as a way to connect with the audience to create a group identity. Although inclusion was the least used tool by pundits, Peggy Noonan used this tactic three times, the most of any pundit.

Confrontation

Masculine characteristic one (M1) is the characteristic of being direct and assertive. This is done through interruption, as well as the use of puns, slang, and obscenity. Verbal attacks such

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

as name-calling are also present in this characteristic. In doing this, the rhetor is asserting their dominance over the other people in the conversation. Will stated,

Well, for all of the talk about hurting Republicans, I'll tell you six Republicans who benefit from a current unpleasantness in Washington. They live in Trenton, New Jersey, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, Austin, Texas, Madison, Wisconsin, Indianapolis, Indiana and Columbus, Ohio. They are Republican Governors Christie, Jindal, Perry, Scott Walker, Mike Pence and John Casey. Because they are going to -- all of them contemplate running for president I suspect, and they're going to have one great argument on their side- I wasn't part of that (*Fox News Sunday*, October 2013).

While George Will was not directly verbally attacking the host or any of the other pundits involved in the roundtable discussion, this statement still shows the characteristic of being direct and assertive. By using phrases such as "I'll tell you," and "I wasn't part of that" he is firm in his language.

Rove commented, "Yeah, first of all, I want to dispute your analysis of Virginia as being reliably Republican" (*Fox News Sunday*, October 2013). In this example, Rove first interrupts the other pundit that was speaking to interject his point of view, and then lets the other speaker know that he disagrees with what they are saying. In this characteristic the pundit is asserting their dominance over the other speakers. Confrontation was the second most frequently used characteristic used by pundits, found 57 times in analysis. Karl Rove implemented this tactic the most out of all of the pundits.

Inclusion, a feminine characteristic, was used least by pundits, only observed nine times throughout the transcripts. Inclusion is the characteristic of using personal examples and extended narrative. However, confrontation, a masculine characteristic was the second most

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

frequently used characteristic used by pundits, found 57 times in analysis. While confrontation was found largely by both sexes, males incorporated this characteristic more frequently while females incorporated more inclusion tactics.

Relation and Independence

Relation

Feminine characteristic two (F2) is creating identification and empowering the audience. In doing this, the rhetor is attempting to create identity and inclusivity through relation and phrases such as “I,” “we,” “I believe,” “I think.” The use of “I think” was strong throughout each of the pundits’ rhetoric, with many sentences and opinions beginning with or including, “I think.” Using this form of verbal hedging allows the audience to also state their response, which helps achieve identity and inclusivity. Tanden was quoted as saying, “So we should negotiate now. We should negotiate around the sequester. We should actually not negotiate around on the debt limit. We should have a negotiation” (*State of the Union*, January 2013).

Neera Tanden’s response to the topic of the fiscal cliff deal shows many things regarding the tactic of relation used by pundits. In this statement alone, Tanden uses the phrase “we should” four times before expressing her opinion of what she thinks should be done. In doing this, she is expressing her own opinion; however, she is relating her opinion back to what is good for everyone by using the phrase, “we should.” Walter stated,

And that's the positioning not just for this budget, and for a big grand bargain, which I still think is going to be very difficult to get. But what about even if we have to get to the immediate, which is another debt ceiling vote here coming up very soon. I think that's the immediate (*State of the Union*, April 2013).

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

In this statement, Amy Walter is addressing the budget, and expressing her own opinion on the topic. She first explains that she thinks a big grand bargain would be difficult to get, and that the debt ceiling vote is immediate. In her statements, she uses the phrase, “I think” twice which is meant to allow the rhetor to state their response not as fact, but as opinion, that is open for discussion.

Kristol commented,

And I wish we had intervened and he could've intervened a year ago, two years ago, I think we would've had better options. But given where we are now, there was really no strong reason not to go to Congress and good reasons to go. I think he did the right thing. I think we'll have a healthy national debate for the next week or two (*Meet the Press*, September 2013).

Kristol's comments are similar to a mix of both Tanden's and Walters'. He is once again, talking about the military strikes discussion; however, this time he is using different strategies. Instead of relying on personal experience to create inclusion and identification, Kristol instead expresses what he wishes what would have happened, what he thinks would have been better and then transitions to what he thinks about the current situation. By doing this, he is giving his own opinion, but also acknowledging that the issue will be a current topic of debate.

As shown, the tool of using relation in rhetoric allows the pundit to express their own opinion while also keeping the floor open for discussion and not shutting others out. Relation was observed the most of all of the themes, 123 times throughout the transcripts, with Bill Kristol using the tactic most often.

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

Independence

Masculine characteristic two (M2) is the use of impersonal examples. Instead of using the feminine characteristic of narrative and personal examples, masculine rhetoric uses impersonal examples to relate to their audience. Within masculine characteristic two (M2) is also the use of formal language. This consists of proper grammar and the use of connectors. Walter stated,

This is a president, who of course, wants to be able to leave behind an economy that is growing. Well and an economy that is growing that he can say, I came in in 2008 at the very depths, I'm leaving with it, on its way up and the only thing standing in my way is congress (*State of the Union*, April 2013).

In this example, instead of using her own personal narrative, Walter instead provides an example of what she thinks President Obama wants his narrative to be. Therefore, she is not revealing anything about herself to connect with the audience, instead using an impersonal example.

Kristol commented,

Think of the governors who have become president, Ronald Reagan, Bill Clinton, George W. Bush. They all had national agendas, Reagan obviously the conservative agenda, Clinton the New Democrat agenda, George W. Bush compassionate conservatism. They spent a lot of time thinking about what does the country need; what does nation need? (*Face the Nation*, December 2013).

These two comments made by Rove and Kristol are fairly similar. By referencing the 1995 shutdown and then relating it to the current topic, Rove is able to use an impersonal example to help support the point that he is making. Then by addressing past governors who became president, Kristol was then able to relate that to the topic at hand to once again support his point.

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

Independence was the third most frequently used tactic by pundits, appearing 53 times throughout the transcripts. Bill Kristol used independence most frequently of all the pundits.

Both relation and independence were observed frequently throughout the transcripts, with relation the most observed tactic used by pundits, both male and female. Bill Kristol used both of these tactics the most out of the pundits. It is important to note that relation was found frequently, largely due to the consideration of verbal hedging and that the phrase “I think” is found within the characteristic of relation and many pundits began their statements with the phrase.

Feeling and Fact

Feeling

Feminine characteristic three (F3) is the characteristic of speaking in a conversational tone. This characterization included expressing emotion to understand feelings, expressing their own feelings, and using anecdotes, examples, and informal language. Kristol said, “I thought watching your interview with him, I was reminded of his decency, and he's an impressive man and I'm proud to have voted for him” (*Fox News Sunday*, March 2013).

In this statement, Kristol is referring to voting for Mitt Romney. While he implements other feminine tactics, specifically inclusion and relation, Kristol is also implementing feeling within his rhetoric. By first setting up his response by first using these other two tactics, he is able to then display his feelings of pride of voting for Romney.

Walter commented,

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

So, the fear- if I'm a Republican is, you spend so much time on this, you bring the president's approval rating- you're bringing the president's approval rating down, but you're not bringing Republicans approval rating up (*Fox News Sunday*, June 2013).

As shown above, statements of feeling also often include statements of other themes. In this example, inclusion is also used, however, fear over not bringing the Republican's approval rating up, even if the president's is being brought down, is the theme that she is trying to relate and make the audience understand. By incorporating the feeling of fear, Walter as a pundit is able to use emotions and a conversational tone show understanding of what Republicans are feeling.

Rove stated,

He doesn't want to be the guy who goes out and says, well, after all this happy talk about the spending and deficits and how everything is hunky-dory, that he needs \$1 trillion more in authority to get himself through the next year (*Fox News Sunday*, October 2013).

In this example, Karl Rove is implementing more of the conversational tone aspect of using feeling as a pundit while speaking about the president and the debt crisis. His informal language, "hunky-dory," and conversational tone, "he doesn't want to be the guy who goes out and says, well, after all this happy talk," allows Rove to state his opinion informally on what is going on without being disrespectful or insulting the president.

Using emotions, conversational tones, and informal language are all ways that pundits are able to address and create feelings within their rhetoric through a feminine style. While this wasn't shown often throughout analysis, it was still found 21 times, with Rove using this style most frequently. Using conversation tones and emotions are ways in which speakers are able to connect with their audience in an informal way.

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

Fact

Fact, masculine characteristic three (M3), is the use of deductive reasoning and logic through the use referencing numbers and using fact to convince. The use of deductive reasoning, going from general to specific, and using numbers is meant for the statement to be taken as fact. In deductive reasoning the rhetor reasons from general information to specific information (i.e., if true for the general it is true for the specific). The use of fact was often found in the rhetor using specific numbers to reference things such as time, money, and people. In using this tactic, the rhetor is attempting to attach a specific number to a vague generalization. There were many examples of this characteristic found as detailed below. Will stated, “The fact is 496,000 people left the workforce. We have the lowest workforce participation right, since 1979, which cannot be explained by the baby boomers retiring” (*This Week*, April 2013).

Walter also said,

But what's interesting, I find, is, it's not just that Americans are war weary about engaging militarily, XFM (ph) America actually sent an interesting note the other day saying, they've a hard time getting actual contributions for humanitarian aid. They've only gotten \$140,000 in aid. They are trying to raise \$53 million. They've got \$4 million for Darfur in one year. They have \$140,000 for Syria. So, the case is still- I mean it's one thing to try to make the case militaristically, the sale on a humanitarian basis is having a hard time getting through to Americans (*Fox News Sunday*, June 2013).

Walter also stated,

I think the bigger problem is that the IRS has more traction. This issue has more traction, because of what the IRS now is in control of, which is the Affordable Care Act,

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

Obamacare. This is why this issue for Americans, it's not just simply Americans don't like the IRS, it's that this is going to be some -- this is an institution that is now going to be playing a more significant role in the lives of Americans going forward even than they are right now. That makes it much more difficult to just sort of push this away as a one off and getting control of the IRS, proving that this is an institution that can do this well. If they couldn't handle making 60,000 applications saying they're overburdened by 60,000 applications, what's going to happen when most Americans are going to have to go through this process in order to get their healthcare, or to get, you know, on the list for getting subsidies (*Fox News Sunday*, June 2013).

Tanden commented,

You know, the president was able to fulfill his promise of getting the rates to 39.6, and it has substantial revenues. I think the big issue going forward is whether it's going to be a balanced package between revenue and savings. And I would say, you know, it's something that gets lost in this debate, is that we've already had \$1.7 trillion in savings. These additional revenues come together with that. That's over \$2 trillion of deficit reduction that we've already had (*State of the Union*, January 2013).

Rove commented,

I mean let's put this in perspective, the individual market is being affected, but let's just remember about- there are about 150 million people who get insurance through their employer. 90 million of them are going to be unaffected, because those plans are not subject to ObamaCare, those are self-funded plans that are governed by another law called ERISA. So, there is about 60 million plans there, 15 million in the individual market, so a total of about 75 million. In 2010, the Department of Health and Human

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

Services said at least 14 million people are going to lose their coverage. That would be 20 percent of the people in America who are governed by ObamaCare, who today have health insurance, would lose it. Other estimates are as high as nearly 50 percent of people who have health coverage subject to ObamaCare are going to lose it. That is- and that's going to be rolling out over the next year (*Fox News Sunday*, November 2013).

In all of these examples, the rhetor starts with a general topic or issue, and then uses specific data and numbers as facts to back up their statements. This was found 47 times throughout analysis, with George Will implementing the strategy most often.

The use of feelings and emotion within rhetoric through a feminine style was found infrequently with the transcripts, with Rove using this style most frequently. Using conversation tones and emotions are ways in which speakers are able to connect with their audience in an informal way. It is possible that emotions and feelings were not prominent within the text due to the fact that emotion is seen more in vocal tone and expression which could not be coded for in analysis. Fact was largely found throughout analysis, with the appearance of numbers and deductive reasoning to help support claims.

Dialogue and Decision

Dialogue

Feminine characteristic four (F4) is the process of creating arguments inductively, going from something specific to something general. Within feminine characteristic four (F4) is also the invitation of audience participation through requests and questions. In doing this, the rhetor is establishing equality and also uses tendencies such as tentativeness or uncertainty, and employs phrases such as “you know?” informally. Verbal hedging is also apparent in dialogue dimension.

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

For example, Kristol said, “It is happening. But I don't think it's a- do you think it's a great political victory for Democrats two years out that John Boehner is having squabbles in his caucus now?” (*Fox News Sunday*, January 2013).

In this comment by Kristol, he is beginning to state his opinion by saying “I don't think;” however, he then switches his comment to ask the other pundits what their opinion is. In doing this, the floor is open for more opinions, rather than trying to convince or persuade through perceived fact. Kristol also stated, “Think a month ago: How crazy is it for Ted Cruz to say that we should delay the individual mandate? How crazy is it for Republicans to say that premiums might go up?” (*Meet the Press*, November 2013).

Both of these comments made by Kristol are questions that he was directing to other members of the discussions. As he is speaking to the other members of the roundtable he is asking questions to get either their point of view or even their rebuttal. Either way as a pundit and a rhetor, he is opening the floor for discussion. Dialogue dimension was the second to last frequently used rhetorical style, appearing only 24 times throughout. George Will used the style most frequently.

Decision

Decision dimension, masculine characteristic four (M4) is the act of citing one's own expertise or referencing outside authority. In doing this, the rhetor is adding to the credibility of the statements being made by referencing something that shows their reliability or brings in the statements of another in order to add outside support.

Will stated, “Pat Toomey says, look, our interest charges are about \$300 billion a year, our tax revenues are 10 times that much. We can pay the interest charges if we prioritize and

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

don't pay something else" (*This Week*, January 2013). As Will references the statements of Toomey, and American businessman and politician, he is using the statements of someone considered an expert to help prove his point. Decision dimension was the second to last most frequently used characteristic by pundits, appearing 18 times throughout analysis.

Both dialogue dimension and decision dimension were observed infrequently throughout the transcripts. Males used both of these tactics more frequently than females. In regards to decision dimension, citing outside expertise was found more often than a pundit citing their own expertise. The use of questions was found most frequently in dialogue dimension.

It is also important to note that these characteristics were not all mutually exclusive, and many characteristics were used at the same time. For example, Kristol stated,

To be fair, when I was in the Bush White House, that first Bush White House, we screwed up everything in September, October, November in terms of presentation.

Remember, Jim Baker said, 'This is a war about jobs.' We said it included mixed signals (*Meet the Press*, September 2013).

This statement includes both personal narrative, a feminine characteristic and expertise, a masculine characteristic. In this statement Kristol uses personal narrative by discussing his time in the White House and then also later uses outside expertise by citing Jim Baker.

Will stated,

I think people will look back on this deal as where liberalism passed an apogee and went into decline for the following reason. In the Bush tax rates were passed in two tranches, 2001 and 2003. In 2001, only 28 Democratic members of the House voted for them. In 2003, only 7 did. And they did it to make for only 10 years, they were to expire.

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

Under this deal, 172 House Democrats voted to make the Bush rates permanent for all but 0.5 percent of American taxpayers (*This Week*, January 2013).

In this example, Will uses relation to start off his statement by saying “I think,” and then switched to fact, by portraying fact through numbers and data. As states, many statements made by the pundits featured a variety of both masculine and feminine style characteristics.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Summary of Results

Overall, there were 352 instances of gendered rhetorical style found. The feminine characteristic, relation (F2), was found 123 times throughout, the most out of any characteristic. In addition, more feminine rhetorical styles were implemented than masculine rhetorical analysis, which went against Hypothesis 1. Hypothesis 1 was developed from Hofstede's Theory of Cultural Dimensions, which states that the United States is a masculine driven country; therefore, Hypothesis 1 predicted that masculine style would be the overall dominant style used by both male and female pundits, assuming that style would be tailored to fit the masculine setting.

There are many advantages to using feminine styles of rhetoric as a pundit. By engaging the audience through phrases such as "I think," the pundit is able to express his own opinions, while also seeming open to the ideas of other pundits. Similarly, asking questions is another good way for pundits to expand the floor of discussion and invite participation from other speakers. Using narratives and personal experiences throughout dialogue is a way for a pundit to cite their credibility, while also keeping a conversational tone and pace.

There are also many advantages for a pundit to use masculine rhetorical styles. In the fast-paced nature of roundtable discussions on the Big Five, pundits often have to use assertive tones and interruptions in order to get talking time to get their point across. Using credibility tactics such as citing their own expertise or the expertise of someone else helps the pundit in backing up the claims that they are making. Verbal attacks allow the pundit to confront others in the conversation, which questions the other person's credibility. Using numbers and data as facts allows the pundit to use accepted evidence to back up their claims and arguments.

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

Hypothesis 2 stated that the issue being discussed will be the driving factor of the pundit's choice of rhetorical style; therefore, it was hypothesized that certain issues will call for certain styles. Essentially, masculine issues will take masculine forms of rhetorical style and feminine issues will take feminine rhetorical styles. This hypothesis derived from the notion that the context of the situation will determine the style used. Hypothesis 2 held true in some aspects and false in other aspects. Of the issues analyzed (economy, gun control, politics, immigration, foreign relations/military, education, and healthcare) masculine issues (Petrocik, 1996) were discussed much more frequently, with politics and the government the most discussed issue. Because characteristic F2, relation was the most frequent rhetorical style characteristic used overall, it was also the most frequently used characteristic for a number of individual issues including economy, politics, immigration, foreign relations/military, and health care. Therefore, five out of seven issues were addressed most frequently with feminine rhetorical style. It is important to note however, that in all issues, the second most frequently used characteristics fell within masculine rhetorical styles, specifically confrontation.

From this analysis, there are many possible explanations as to why feminine style was found the most throughout the transcripts. It is important to note the prominence of feminine characteristic 2, relation. Found within this characteristic is the use of "I think." Many pundits used this phrase before beginning their statements, and also used it multiple times throughout sentences and responses as well before giving their opinion. The use of the phrase had a large effect on the prominence of feminine style found throughout analysis. It is also possible that "I think" is not as clear a marker of relation, but that both the context of the entire statement and vocal tone might have an impact.

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

Although the theme of relation was found so often throughout analysis, it is still important to explore why feminine style was used so often, regardless of the use of the phrase “I think.” First, it appears that women are mitigating the masculine style. Because more women are appearing on the panels as pundits, it is possible that males are changing their styles of language to help accommodate and encourage female participation in discussion. This shows the importance of females in the field. It is also possible to consider that only males on the panel could lead to more masculine rhetorical styles used. Another reason for the prominence of the feminine style goes back to Jamieson’s (1988) arguments. She argued that in television, showing characteristics regarded as using an effeminate style is the norm because television invites a personal, self disclosing style that draws public discourse out of a private self which means that political speakers must assume a more feminine style of communication. Therefore, the findings of this thesis supported prior literature stating that television calls for a feminine style of rhetoric.

Limitations

There were a number of limitations within this study. The first limitation is that only texts were analyzed to determine the pundit’s rhetorical style. Because of this, no instances of physical style, such as facial expression, or vocal expression, such as sarcasm, could be analyzed. Analysis was strictly based on inferences and breakdowns made from the text included in the transcripts. Another limitation within the study is that certain comments for which coding could not be done. For example, certain quick snippets, like a pundit saying, “Yeah” were not eligible for analysis.

In addition, representation was not equal for pundits in terms of gender and individual pundit. Males were featured in 15 episodes, where females were only featured in nine. Bill Kristol and George Will were featured more than any pundit with six episodes each, where

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

Peggy Noonan was only featured four, Amy Walter and Karl Rove three, and Neera Tanden only two. Because the male pundits chosen for analysis were featured more frequently, there were more instances of male rhetoric to be analyzed. While this was only a sample of pundits featured on the Big Five, it still further demonstrates the inequality in the media's presentation. As Melber (2011) stated, political pundits are overwhelmingly white males.

As gender was the primary consideration within analysis, factors such as ideology and race were not considered when selecting the pundits. Therefore, there was little diversity in the demographics of the pundits selected. The three male pundits are all white conservative political pundits. Of the females, two are white, and one is Indian. There is variance between the female pundits in political leaning with Noonan conservative, Tanden liberal, and Walter independent.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

Gendered rhetorical style can be explored in a multitude of settings. Scholars have shown that males and females have different speaking styles, and that these styles vary across settings, as well as by individual. These theories were chosen as a backbone for analysis in this study to establish whether there were rhetorical style differences found between male and female pundits in the masculine scene of political punditry.

Hofstede's Theory of Cultural Dimensions can be applied worldwide to understand cultural characteristics of different countries. This looks at workplace culture an individual culture which is helpful in identifying the cultural tendencies that make up the population and helps to explain why the culture in places is as it is. The theory of cultural dimensions identifies the United States as a masculine driven country because there is a "preference in society for achievement, heroism, assertiveness, and material rewards for success" ("The Hofstede Centre," 1983, para. 5). The Masculinity Index (MAS) applies to countries as social systems, not

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

specifically to the individuals within the countries; however, the division of people into two sexes and what represents the appropriate role for men is that this tends to become the concept of their own role a model for society as a whole. However, the results of the content analysis disproved the presence of the theory of cultural dimensions within the realm of political punditry.

This thesis also served to provide practical implications for the field of punditry. It was hypothesized that masculine rhetorical style would be used by the pundits who appear frequently across multiple networks; however, it was found that relation, a feminine characteristic, was the most frequently used characteristic. By studying the results of the content analysis, one can see the themes that pundits are: (1) more likely to comment on and (2) what styles they used based on the type of issues, masculine or feminine.

Suggestions for Future Research

This thesis attempted to contribute towards the existing gap in the literature regarding a lack of research on what forms of gendered rhetorical style pundits who have been asked to appear on multiple networks employ to further understand the role of gendered rhetoric in political punditry and possibly serve future pundits in developing their rhetorical strategies. The findings of this thesis, filling the gap, indicate that pundits are more likely to use a feminine style of communication during roundtable discussion, due prominently to the use of the characteristics “I think” or “I believe,” which are meant to allow the pundit to state his or her opinion without it being stated as pure fact. Future studies could be taken in many directions. A larger or different time frame could be considered for analysis. The time frame for this analysis was chosen with the intention of selecting a non-election year, where political strategy would not dominate

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

discussion. However, future research could explore whether or not different time frames call for different pundits who use different rhetorical styles.

Future studies could also explore different methods for selecting pundits (i.e., pundits who appeared the most regardless of network). For this study, pundits were selected on the basis of appearing on multiple networks multiple times during the year. Other time frames could consider ratings seasons, select a different year, or construct a time frame in another way.

Another possible study could look at whether or not gendered rhetorical styles differ if there is only one gender on the panel. It is possible that females would use more feminine styles if only females were on the panel and males could use more masculine styles if only males were on the panel. It is also possible that other topics could be discussed if there is only one gender present on the panel.

In addition, future studies could build off of the current study to find common themes considering demographics such as race and ideology. It is conceivable that rhetorical styles could differ based on groups of race or ideology. For example, it is possible that conservatives take on a more masculine style than liberals, or vice versa.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

The goals of this thesis were to provide greater insight and understanding into the gendered rhetorical style of political pundits. This study was conducted in order to analyze the gendered rhetorical styles that commonly featured political pundits use. Six pundits were chosen for analysis based on the criteria that they appeared on multiple networks of the Big Five during the year of 2013. This criterion was used as the selection for analysis as it represented the pundits' versatility of appearing on multiple networks and frequency of appearing multiple times throughout the year. It was hypothesized that masculine style will be the overall dominant style used by both male and female pundits, and that the issue being discussed will be the driving factor of the pundit's choice of rhetorical style; therefore, certain issues will call for certain styles. Neither Hypothesis 1 nor Hypothesis 2 was supported, as themes of feminine rhetorical style were used almost equally, though twice more, than masculine rhetorical styles. This was found to be both true and false. Because characteristic F2, relation was the most frequent rhetorical style characteristic used overall, it was also the most frequently used characteristic for a number of individual issues. It is important to note however, that in all issues, the second most frequently used characteristics fell within masculine rhetorical styles.

Since a gap in literature exists regarding political pundits and gendered rhetorical style, this thesis served to investigate what form of gendered rhetorical style pundits who have been asked to appear on multiple networks employ. This study acts to further understand the role of gendered rhetoric in political punditry and possibly serve future pundits in developing their rhetorical strategies by investigating what form of gendered rhetorical style pundits who appear on multiple networks use.

REFERENCES

- Ahagen, M. & Nilsson, J. (2013). Gendered Rhetoric in the UN General Assembly? The Rhetorical Styles of Male and Female Representatives of Sweden and the United States. *University West*. Retrieved from <http://www.diva-portal.se/smash/get/diva2:627080/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Anderson, K. (2002) From Spouses to Candidates: Hillary Rodham Clinton, Elizabeth Dole, and the Gendered Office of the U.S. President. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, (5.1) 105-132.
- Anderson, K. and Sheeler, K. (2005). *Governing Codes: Gender, Metaphor, and Political Identity*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Anderson, K. V. (1999). "Rhymes with Rich": "Bitch" as a tool of containment in contemporary American politics. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 2(4), 599-623.
- Baitinger, G. (2015). Why are there so few women on the Sunday morning talk shows? *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/monkey-cage/wp/2015/01/08/why-are-there-so-few-women-on-the-sunday-morning-talk-shows/>
- Balkin, J. M. (1999). How Mass Media Simulate Political Transparency. *Cultural Values*, 3(4), 293.
- Bernstein, J. (2014). Stop Watching the Sunday Talk Shows. *Bloomberg View*, Retrieved from <http://www.bloombergview.com/articles/2014-03-21/stop-watching-the-sunday-talk-shows>
- Blankenship, J., & Robson, D. C. (1995). A "feminine style" in women's political discourse: An

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

- exploratory essay. *Communication Quarterly*, 43 (3), 353–366.
- Bone, J. E., Griffin, C. L., & Scholz, T. L. (2008). Beyond Traditional Conceptualizations of Rhetoric: Invitational Rhetoric and a Move Toward Civility. *Western Journal of Communication*, 72(4), 434-462.
- Bro, P. (2012). License to Comment: The popularization of a political commentator. *Journalism Studies*, 13(3), 433-446.
- Bruce, F. (2010). *Hedging in political discourse: The Bush 2007 press conferences*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Brummett, B. (2000). *The Politics of Style and the Style of Politics*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Bystrom, D. (2004). *Gender and candidate communication: Videostyle, webstyle, newstyle*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Campbell, K. K. (1983). Femininity and Feminism: To be or not to be a woman. *Communication Quarterly*, 31(2), 101-108.
- Campbell, K. K. (1989). *Man cannot speak for her: A critical study of early feminist rhetoric*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Campbell, K. K. (1989). The Sound of Women's Voices. *Quarterly Journal Of Speech*, 75(2), 212.
- Campbell, K. K. (2001). Rhetorical Feminism. *Rhetoric Review*, 20(1/2), 9.
- Center for American Progress. (2016). *Neera Tanden: President and CEO of the Center for*

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

- American Progress and the Center for American Progress Action Fund*. Retrieved from <https://www.americanprogress.org/about/staff/tanden-neera/bio/>
- Edwards, J. (2009). *Gender and Political Communication in America: Rhetoric, Representation, and Display*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books
- Edwards, B. White, Conservative Men Dominate Sunday Morning Political Talk Shows. *The Root*. Retrieved from http://www.theroot.com/articles/culture/2014/02/white_conservative_men_dominate_sunday_morning_political_talk_shows.html
- Face the Nation* [Transcript]. (2013, July 7). CBS. Retrieved from <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/face-the-nation-transcripts-2013/>
- Face the Nation* [Transcript]. (2013, August 4). CBS. Retrieved from <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/face-the-nation-transcripts-2013/>
- Face the Nation* [Transcript]. (2013, December 1). CBS. Retrieved from <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/face-the-nation-transcripts-2013/>
- Foss, S. K., & Griffin, C. L. (1995). Beyond persuasion: A proposal for an invitational rhetoric. *Communication Monographs*, 62(1), 2.
- Fox News. (2016). Karl Rove. *Fox News*. Retrieved from <http://www.foxnews.com/person/r/karl-rove.html>
- Fox News Sunday* [Transcript]. (2013, January 6). FOX. Retrieved from <http://www.foxnews.com/on-air/fox-news-sunday-chris-wallace/transcripts>

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

Fox News Sunday [Transcript]. (2013, March 3). FOX. Retrieved from

<http://www.foxnews.com/on-air/fox-news-sunday-chris-wallace/transcripts>

Fox News Sunday [Transcript]. (2013, June 2). FOX. Retrieved from

<http://www.foxnews.com/on-air/fox-news-sunday-chris-wallace/transcripts>

Fox News Sunday [Transcript]. (2013, August 4). FOX. Retrieved from

<http://www.foxnews.com/on-air/fox-news-sunday-chris-wallace/transcripts>

Fox News Sunday [Transcript]. (2013, October 6). FOX. Retrieved from

<http://www.foxnews.com/on-air/fox-news-sunday-chris-wallace/transcripts>

Fox News Sunday [Transcript]. (2013, November 3). FOX. Retrieved from

<http://www.foxnews.com/on-air/fox-news-sunday-chris-wallace/transcripts>

Fox News Sunday [Transcript]. (2013, December 1). FOX. Retrieved from

<http://www.foxnews.com/on-air/fox-news-sunday-chris-wallace/transcripts>

Gertz, M. (2013). Stagnant American Newsroom Diversity in Charts. *Media Matters*, Retrieved

from <http://mediamatters.org/blog/2013/06/25/stagnant-american-newsroom-diversity-in-charts/194597>

Hass, A. (1979). Male and female spoken language differences: Stereotypes and evidence.

Psychological Bulletin, 86(3), 616-626.

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online*

Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>

Hofstede, G. (1983). National Cultures in Four Dimensions: A Research-Based Theory of

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

- Cultural Differences among Nations. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 13(1/2), 46–74. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40396953>
- Holsti, O.R. (1969). *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Jamieson, K. (1995). *Beyond the Double Bind: Women and Leadership*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Jesperesen, O. (1964). *Mankind, nation and individual from a linguistic point of view*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Johnson-Cartee, K. (2005). *News Narratives and News Framing: Constructing Political Reality*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kahn, K. & Gordon, A. (1997). *How Women Campaign for the US. Senate: Substance and Strategy. Women, Media, and Politics*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kessler, E. (2013). Genderlect and Linguistic Styles. *SAGE Reference*. Retrieved from <http://sk.sagepub.com/reference/encyclopedia-of-management-theory/n93.xml>
- Lakoff, R. (1973). *Language and Woman's Place*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from http://web.stanford.edu/class/linguist156/Lakoff_1973.pdf
- Lippman, W. (1922) *Public Opinion*. New York, NY: New York, Harcourt, Brace and Co.
- Melber, A. (2011). White Male Pundit Power. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/ari-melber/white-male-pundit-power_b_105969.html

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

Meet the Press [Transcript] (2013, September 2). NBC. Retrieved from

<http://www.nbcnews.com/meet-the-press/meet-press-transcripts-n51976>

Meet the Press [Transcript] (2013, November 3). NBC. Retrieved from

<http://www.nbcnews.com/meet-the-press/meet-press-transcripts-n51976>

Mitchell, A., Gottfried, J., & Masta, K.E. (2015). *Millennials and Political News: Social Media-the Local TV for the Next Generation*. Pew Research Center

Nimmo, D., & Combs, J. E. (1982). Fantasies and Melodramas in Television Network News:

The Case of Three Mile Island. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*:

WJSC, 46(1), 45-55.

Nimmo, D. & Combs, J. (1992) *The political pundits*. New York, NY: Prager

Nordquist, R. (2015). Verbal hedge (communication). *About Education*. Retrieved from

<http://grammar.about.com/od/tz/g/verbhedterm.htm>

Page, J., & Duffy, M. (2008). U.S. Presidential Campaign 2008: A Fantasy Theme Analysis of

Visual Stories Spun on the Web. *Conference Papers- International Communication Association*, 1-27.

Parry-Giles, S. J., & Parry-Giles, T. (1996). Gendered politics and presidential image

construction: A reassessment of the 'feminine style'. *Communication Monographs*, 63(4), 337.

Perry, S. (2005). Gender difference in French political communication: From handicap to

asset? *Modern & Contemporary France*, 13(3), 337-352.

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

Petrocik, J. R. (1996). Issue Ownership in Presidential Elections, with a 1980 Case

Study. *American Journal of Political Science*, 40(3), 825–850.

Pew Research Center. (2014). Network TV: Sunday Morning Political Show Viewership. Pew

Research Center's Journalism Project. Retrieved 7 May 2016, from

<http://www.journalism.org/media-indicators/sunday-morning-political-show-viewership/>

Pew Research Center. (2012). Section 4: Demographics and Political Views of News Audiences.

Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. Retrieved 7 May 2016, from

<http://www.people-press.org/2012/09/27/section-4-demographics-and-political-views-of-news-audiences/>

Pew Research Center. (2005). The Gender Gap. *Pew Research*. Retrieved from

<http://www.journalism.org/2005/05/23/the-gender-gap/>

Pfafman, T. M., & McEwan, B. (2014). Polite Women at Work: Negotiating

Professional Identity Through Strategic Assertiveness. *Women's Studies in*

Communication, 37(2), 202-219.

Powell, L., & Shelby, A. N. (1985). Para-Political Opinion Leaders as Audience:

Communicative Goals and Media Usage. *Communication Research Reports*, 2(1), 135-140.

Pundit [Def. 1]. (n.d.). *Merriam-Webster Online*. In Merriam-Webster. Retrieved December 11,

2015, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/pundit>.

Savillo, R. (2015). Report: State of the Sunday Morning Political Talk Shows in 2014.

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

Media Matters, Retrieved from <http://mediamatters.org/research/2015/02/11/report-state-of-the-sunday-morning-political-ta/202437>

State of the Union [Transcript]. (2013, January 6). CNN. Retrieved from <http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/sotu.html>

State of the Union [Transcript]. (2013, December 1). CNN. Retrieved from <http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/sotu.html>

Tannen, D. (1990). *That's not What I Meant!: How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Relationships*. Ballantine: New York

Tannen, D. (1986). *You Just Don't Understand*. Ballantine: New York

The Cook Political Report. (2015). Amy Walter. Retrieved from <http://cookpolitical.com/about/staff/amy-walter>

The Hofstede Centre. (1983). Retrieved from <https://geert-hofstede.com/cultural-dimensions.html>

The Washington Post Company. (1998). George F. Will. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/opinions/will.htm>

The Weekly Standard. (2016). William Kristol. Retrieved from <http://www.weeklystandard.com/author/william-kristol>

This Week [Transcript]. (2013, January 6). ABC. Retrieved from <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/week-transcript-archive/story?id=16614108>

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

This Week [Transcript]. (2013, April 7). ABC. Retrieved from

<http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/week-transcript-archive/story?id=16614108>

This Week [Transcript]. (2013, June 2). ABC. Retrieved from

<http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/week-transcript-archive/story?id=16614108>

This Week [Transcript]. (2013, July 7). ABC. Retrieved from

<http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/week-transcript-archive/story?id=16614108>

This Week [Transcript]. (2013, August 4). ABC. Retrieved from

<http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/week-transcript-archive/story?id=16614108>

This Week [Transcript]. (2013, September 1). ABC. Retrieved from

<http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/week-transcript-archive/story?id=16614108>

This Week [Transcript]. (2013, November 3). ABC. Retrieved from

<http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/week-transcript-archive/story?id=16614108>

This Week [Transcript]. (2013, December 1). ABC. Retrieved from

<http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/week-transcript-archive/story?id=16614108>

Wadsworth, A. J., Patterson, P., Kaid, L. L., Cullers, G., Malcomb, D., & Lamirand, L. (1987).

"Masculine" VS. "Feminine" Strategies in Political Ads: Implications for Female Candidates. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 15(1/2), 77.

Waldman, P. (2014). Can the Sunday shows get better? *The Washington Post*, Retrieved from

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2014/03/21/can-the-sunday-shows-get-better/>

STYLE OVER SUBSTANCE?

Wall Street Journal. (2015) Peggy Noonan's Blog. Retrieved from

<http://blogs.wsj.com/peggynoonan/>

Weinstein, B. (2016). Political Punditry Isn't Dead, Yet. *Fortune*. Retrieved from

<http://fortune.com/2016/05/06/political-punditry-isnt-dead-yet/>

Winter, N. (2010). Masculine Republicans and Feminine Democrats: Gender and

Americans' Explicit and Implicit Images of the Political Parties. *Political Behavior*, 32(4), 587–618. Retrieved from

<http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.lib.vt.edu/stable/40960956>

Wood, J. (2009). *Gendered Lives: Communication, Gender, and Culture*. Stamford, CT:

Cengage Learning

Wood, J. T., & Inman, C. C. (1993). In A Different Mode: Masculine Styles of Communicating

Closeness. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 21(3), 279.