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Abstract

Equality in different facets of life is becoming second nature in the United States. Unfortunately, there is still work to do to create a united America. One of the places where our country lacks in equality is politics. While more women are becoming involved in politics, our country has still never had a female president, or vice president.

In looking at the rhetorical constructs of The Cult of Domesticity, with ethos, pathos, and logos; a study was conducted following the debate strategies of Hillary Rodham Clinton in her quest for the presidency in both 2008 and 2016. Four debates were watched and critically analyzed to determine Clinton’s political qualifications, and if they should have been enough to win her the presidency. The four core characteristics of a politician were analyzed with Clinton and male politicians in mind to see any major differences.
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Chapter 1:

The Life and Career of Hillary Clinton

“Madame President” is a phrase the American people have not heard unless they were watching a television show or movie. In American society, the idea of women holding power positions in the workplace has been highly debated for decades. Long before Barbara Welter in 1966 and Kathleen Jamieson in the 1990s, conventional wisdom has said that women are meant to stay at home to take care of their families while being submissive to men. Leaving the domestic sphere was and still to this day is a monumental task for many women. Traditionally, women have been looked at as housewives, teachers, or nurturers while the man of the household is considered the breadwinner, or the primary source of financial support, following the ideals instilled in The Cult of Domesticity (also referred to as the Cult of True Womanhood). Those models led to the idea of a double bind where women were thought of being able to work or stay at home, but not do both successfully. Few women have broken the mold as successfully as Hillary Rodham Clinton. She has challenged the conventional wisdom of being both a domestic and working woman, as she is a mother, First Lady, Senator, Secretary of State, and Presidential Candidate. However, despite her success of shedding the traditional confines, she and all other women have not as of yet reached the pinnacle of political leadership in the United States—President.

The following paper analyzes Clinton’s debate strategies and qualifications in her two presidential campaigns, focusing primarily on her debate performances, looking to see if those rhetorical choices compare to that of other presidential candidates, and analyzing her electoral ethos. The framework for this analysis lies within The Cult of Domesticity, the 19th Century standard that women were to follow, and in part, continues to be abided by. The Cult of
Domesticity led to double binds existing for women. The following introductory chapter gives a brief history of The Cult of Domesticity and the concept of a double bind. The chapter then presents a brief history of Clinton’s life and political career with a focus on her balance between home and work life. The concept of a double bind leads to the debate concerning whether or not a woman, particularly Clinton, must challenge or completely subvert the double bind to be President of the United States.

Many issues of women’s advancement in the working field come with the values displayed within The Cult of Domesticity. Barbara Welter (1966) is one of the leading voices in the discussion of The Cult of Domesticity. In “The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860” she examined the four traditional virtues that society defined as to what the proper role of a woman should be. These attributes include piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity. For this analysis, domesticity is the trait of importance. Welter’s mid-19th-century study of American society states a woman’s place was in the home where her duties included being a daughter, mother, sister, wife, cook, housekeeper, and nurse. In nursing her family back to health, the woman felt accomplished and needed (p. 5). In many cases, women today are still expected to uphold the standards set in The Cult of Domesticity.

Although the overt nature of The Cult of Domesticity is not as prevalent today as it was in the 19th century, it still exists. In “The Good Wife: How the Cult of Domesticity still Reigns in the 21st Century” (2015), Laura Turner delves into the idea of women today being satisfied with their role in the home. For example, an overwhelming 80% of the users of the website Pinterest, a site known for “pinning” interests such as home decorations and cooking onto an online board, are women (Turner, 2015, para 17). Such a high percentage correlates to women presumably being satisfied with their domestic duties. But even with those interests still being
primarily female, women who choose to follow the domestic sphere and stay at home with the kids get questioned because some believe parenting is not actual work (para 18). The Cult of Domesticity has created an ideal standard of the domestic goddess that is nearly impossible for women to uphold; furthermore, the morals introduced by The Cult of Domesticity still continue to confine women to specific roles in life making it difficult to become successful in any realm. The details of these ethical responsibilities are in Chapter 2.

To continue with the framework for this thesis, the concept of a double bind must be defined. In her book *Beyond the Double Bind: Women and Leadership* (1995), Kathleen H. Jamieson gives the definition of a double bind as “a rhetorical construct that posits two and only two alternatives, one or both penalizing the person being offered them . . . The strategy defines something ‘fundamental’ to women as incompatible with something the woman seeks—be it education, the ballot, or access to the workplace” (1995, p. 13-14). Continuing with the confines The Cult of Domesticity creates, double binds put those restrictions into action. Through her definition, Jamieson implies that women can be housewives supportive of their husbands and properly take care of family, or they can work, but women cannot work and take care of their homes and families—thus, the double bind.

Many women, including Clinton, have fought against the double bind. The Pew Research Center published “Breadwinner Moms” in 2013, a study by Wendy Wang, Kim Parker, and Paul Taylor which examined how many working mothers there are and how much these women contribute to their household. The number of working mothers has drastically increased from 1960 to 2011. In 1960, in homes with children under 18, only 10.8% of women provided the sole or primary source of income to the household (Wang, Parker, and Taylor, 2013, p. 1), suggesting the impact The Cult of Domesticity had on society. In 2011, the men are still the majority
breadwinner, but the 10.8% is now 40.4%, with 25% of women being single mothers, and 15% of women married and the primary breadwinner (p.1, table 1). “Breadwinner Moms” successfully proves that change is possible in society, and what is considered the norm, does not always have to be the standard because almost half of the financial supporters in families are women. Therefore, the idea of Clinton fighting the double bind to campaign and possibly become President of the United States can be another societal change that can one day become the norm.

A woman such as Hillary Rodham Clinton entering the political arena is someone seemingly aware of the extremes of the double bind. Not only does such a move suggest that she must separate herself from the elements of The Cult of Domesticity, such as domesticity and submissiveness, but she must also navigate a male-dominated workplace, such as a political office. There have been women in politics before, but in the history of the United States, there has never been a female president. Because of the male dominated field, the navigation of the double bind of being feminine and “unfeminine,” or a working woman, is crucial for Clinton to win the race. With the framework of The Cult of Domesticity and double binds in mind, it is important to look at the political and domestic life of Hillary Clinton, as the latter study determines if her qualifications and debate strategies compare to her male counterparts. Additionally, taking into consideration if her fight against the societal norms and through breaking out of the confines of the Cult of Domesticity and the double bind is enough was important in my analysis. I split her life into four sections including her legal career, her time as First Lady, her time as Senator of New York, and her time as Secretary of State. Her 2008 and 2016 presidential election campaigns are studied at length in the Literature Review and the study itself.
Legal Career

Clinton enrolled in Yale Law School in 1969. Clinton was active in law school as she served on the Board of Editors of Yale Law Review and Social Action and interned with Marian Wright Edelman, a children’s advocate (Black, 2009, p.91). Law school is also where she met her husband, William (Bill) Clinton. She then advised the Children’s Defense Fund and “joined the impeachment inquiry staff advising the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives” after graduation (p. 91).

Bill Clinton had started a political career in Arkansas, and after finishing her jobs with the Children’s Defense Fund and the impeachment inquiry staff, Hillary Clinton moved to support Bill’s career (Black, 2009, p. 91). The two married in 1975 and the same year she joined the faculty at the University of Arkansas Law School, and the Rose Law Firm the following year. She was appointed to the board of the Legal Services Corporation by President Jimmy Carter in 1978 while Mr. Clinton became Arkansas’ governor (p. 91). With law school and her early legal career, Clinton validated a prime example of the double bind that women could not work and have a family life. She finished her jobs before joining her soon-to-be husband. Clinton made sure that her work came before her family until her family grew.

In 1980, when her daughter, Chelsea, was born, Clinton had to begin balancing her family life with her legal career (Black, 2009, p. 91). She served on numerous public service committees and even co-founded the Arkansas Advocates for Children and Families (p. 91). However, her non-domestic duties were not nearly as numerous as they were when Clinton became First Lady in 1993, which shows her pulling back on politics to have more time to provide better domestically for her family. Even though she pulled back, Clinton navigated the double bind by still having a presence in the legal field while raising her daughter. This
navigation, whether she was aware of it or not, was a major piece of Clinton’s journey of fighting against the societal norm.

**First Lady**

As a First Lady, Clinton was more than the President’s wife; she was his partner in his leadership. In her autobiography, *Living History*, Clinton states “Bill couldn’t appoint me to an official position even if he had wanted to . . . But there were no laws to prevent me from continuing my role as Bill Clinton’s unpaid adviser and, in some cases, representative. We had worked together for so long, and Bill knew he could trust me” (2003, p. 120). First Ladies to this point have been primarily thought of as the supporter and Clinton was changing the game. She was similar to only a few others, such as Eleanor Roosevelt and Nancy Reagan. She had the legal expertise to help her husband with his political plans. She was given the opportunity when President Clinton asked her to oversee his health care initiative (p. 120). The reaction to the First Lady being politically involved was mixed. Clinton recalls:

> Bill and I had worried about the problems we would face when we moved into the White House, but I never expected that the way I defined my role as First Lady would generate so much controversy and confusion. In my own mind, I was traditional in some ways and not in others. I cared about the food I served our guests, and I also wanted to improve the delivery of health care for all Americans. To me, there was nothing incongruous about my interests and activities (Clinton, 2003, p. 141).

Instead of being applauded for trying to support her husband and his work by overseeing his health care initiative, Clinton received mixed reactions from the American people. A wife to serve her husband as well as the public was virtually unheard of and Clinton was bringing new
ideas at the thought of what a First Lady or wife can be, breaking the mold set by The Cult of Domesticity.

Even with the wavering support of the American people, Clinton wanted to make a difference with health care reform. She did not hesitate when President Clinton asked her to chair the task force. However, the position did not last, as Rodham Clinton was not a government employee. Non-government employees are not allowed to head task forces or even attend the meetings (Clinton, 2003, p. 153). The law did not stop Clinton from working to provide health care to the masses. After the health care reform had failed, Clinton created the Children’s Health Insurance Program (Hillary for America). Even with breaking the mold of The Cult of Domesticity, it is interesting to see that many of Clinton’s interests remain in tasks or ideas provided within the domesticity sphere, such as health care. In working to create better access to health care, Clinton was able to take the nurturing aspect of The Cult of Domesticity and introduce it in a new way to her political workplace, successfully beating the double bind stereotype. Taking the lessons learned as First Lady, Clinton ran for Senator of New York.

**Senator**

In 2000, Clinton continued to be a working woman in politics when she was elected to the United States Senate representing New York (Gerth and Van Natta, 2007, p. 4060). In her first term as Senator, Clinton helped secure $21 billion in funding for the World Trade Center’s redevelopment after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 (Marshall, 2014, para. 4). In addition to finding funding, Clinton openly supported the war in Iraq and Afghanistan during her time as Senator (O’Shea, 2008, para. 2-3). Because of her support of the war, she was a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee in 2003 (para 5). Her stance changed in 2007, during her second term, when she favored the beginning of troop withdrawal from Iraq (para 4). Having
her position change could potentially lessen her ethos with voters, both in 2007 and today, because a change in stance could portray weakness, or indecisiveness, which are considered highly feminine traits within the confines of the double bind. An example of her weakened ethos with a voter is shown in the Clinton’s Ethos in 2016 Election section of the thesis. Due to her genuine foreign and military interests, Clinton served as the only senator on the Transformation Advisory Group. The Transformation Advisory Group advises the U.S. Joint Forces Command on “issues pertaining to the different branches of the military” (para. 8).

As Senator, Clinton also worked as a member of the “Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, and the Special Committee on Aging” (O’Shea, 2008, para. 6) showing a wide variety of political interests. The variety of political interests shows Clinton successfully breaking out of the idea of a double bind by working in both the traditionally feminine fields (health and education) as well as in stereotypically masculine fields (labor, pensions, and military). Additionally, she focused on improving healthcare and financial support for veterans (para 9). In focusing on healthcare, Clinton brought her passions from her time as First Lady to her time as Senator. Clinton remained in the Senate until President-elect Barack Obama announced that she would be his nominee for U.S. Secretary of State in December 2008.

Secretary of State

On December 1, 2008, Barack Obama announced Hillary Rodham Clinton as his nominee to serve as the sixty-seventh Secretary of State (Clinton, 2014, p. 19). Walter Russell Mead, the James Clarke Chace professor of foreign affairs at Bard College weighed in on her success as a Secretary of State in his Washington Post article “Was Hillary Clinton a good secretary of state?”, Mead believes Clinton was better than the average Secretary of State but still
had her flaws. As Secretary of State, her job was to implement President Obama’s ideas on foreign policy (Mead, 2014, para. 3). Along the same lines, she had her opinions on foreign policy and politics and was not afraid to voice her beliefs, which shows her defying The Cult of Domesticity and the traditional feminine trait of being submissive. Clinton and President Obama had differing opinions on significant world events such as the counsel in Syria, but she was still able to earn his trust and stay on his team well into his second term as President (para. 9).

Clinton also brought additional ideas not directly related to foreign affairs to the table during her time as Secretary of State, including the empowerment of women and civil society engagement. Clinton is known to care about women’s rights and the equality of women and has since before she was First Lady. She finds women capable of asserting themselves to overcome limits on their freedom to create an ideal America (Mead, 2014, para. 13). As for civil society engagement, Clinton helped develop “technological work-arounds to curtail the ability of national governments to close down the Internet during times of civil unrest” (para. 14). By being forceful in both foreign affairs and social life, Clinton proved to be a capable Secretary of State.

Although she had many notable accomplishments as Secretary of State, Clinton’s success as Secretary and her ethos in the 2016 presidential campaign are in question due to the email scandal in which she and her team were involved. Just days before Clinton was sworn in as Secretary of State in 2009, her staff created an email domain on a server Clinton was using as Senator: HDR22@clintonemail.com. Clinton claims the address was used “exclusively for all her government and personal emails while serving as Secretary” (Calabresi, 2015, p. 40). In August 2014, House Republicans began investigating the Benghazi, Libya terrorist attacks from 2012 and brought up Clinton’s private email usage (p. 40). She was then asked to give the department
any private emails that contained government business. On December 5, 2014, Clinton gave the State over 30,490 work emails and erased the rest, claiming they were personal. There were 62,320 emails in total, including those given to the State and those erased (p. 41). There is nothing illegal about having a private server and having her government email on it, although it is uncommon. The issues come with the erasing of government emails. If any government records were erased, either purposefully or accidentally, Clinton will have broken the law (p. 41). The State Department has already found over 300 potentially classified emails from the ones she had turned over, 15 of which have been given to the Benghazi committee (p. 41). It is unclear as to whether or not Clinton has broken any laws as the investigation is ongoing, but the scandal itself may have been enough to lose her the 2016 election since her credibility and authority was called into question. This event is an important one to note because of its “wildcard factor.” Since no other candidates endure the same controversy, the email scandal may have taken away from her success in the campaign, and it has nothing to do with her being a woman confining to, or breaking free from the standards set in The Cult of Domesticity or double binds.

With a background on The Cult of Domesticity, double binds, and Clinton’s political career and accomplishments, we are now able to fully explore the existing literature included in the feminist-political rhetorical sphere. The Literature Review will consist of existing research on The Cult of Domesticity, double binds, ethos in politics and how men and women have a different political ethos, and Presidential debates and their strategies. Included with the literature will be examples of how Clinton and other women have either confined to or broken out of, traditional feminine roles.
Chapter 2:  

Literature Review

In the following sections of this chapter, the existing literature pertaining to topics relevant to Hillary Clinton's ethos during political debates are discussed. Using The Cult of Domesticity and the double bind as the framework, ethos in politics, women’s ethos in politics, and debates in presidential elections will be explored in depth looking at the issues from a historical and current point of view. Additionally, the gap in the literature on debate ethos will be made apparent.

Cult of Domesticity

Overview. In the 19th century, women were expected to follow the cardinal virtues of The Cult of Domesticity. According to historian Barbara Welter (1966), a foundational voice of her time, in “The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860”, the four virtues which defined a woman’s proper role in life were piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity (p. 1).

The source of a woman's strength was her piety, meaning her religion. Religion was valued most since it was a divine right (p. 1). Religion was also highly regarded since being involved in religion would not take the woman away from her domestic sphere (p. 2). Just as piety was valued, purity was essential to womanhood. If a lady were not virginal, she was considered unnatural and unfeminine (p. 2). Women were tested by seductive men to break their virginity, and if a woman broke her purity, "madness or death" was the punishment because the female was to be pure until marriage (p. 2-3). In addition to being virginal, women were to be submissive to their husbands. "Women were the passive, submissive responders" while the men worked and kept a social presence outside of the home (p. 4). The permanent order of superiority was God first, man second, and woman third. “Man was ‘woman’s superior by God’s
appointment, if not in intellectual dowry, at least by official decree” (p. 4). Because of their inferiority to men by God's appointment, women were expected to stand by and stay faithful to their husbands regardless of how the man treated them. Lastly, domesticity was key for women to be considered a true woman. A woman's place was in the home. Her roles included: daughter, sister, mother, wife, cook, housekeeper, and nurse. Through nursing her family back to health, the woman was supposed to feel accomplished, useful, and needed (p. 5).

An example of women succumbing to the pressures of The Cult of Domesticity and how women suffer comes from Elizabeth Stuart Phelps' short story "The Angel Over the Right Shoulder" (1852). Phelps' story focuses on a married woman whose domestic duties took precedence over her own writing. She loved to write but instead of following her passion, Phelps focused on her family and their needs instead of her own. Her husband wanted her to spend two hours of every day to herself, causing him to break the mold in an era in which women were often discouraged from intellectual pursuits. She was to lock herself in her room and write. She tried, but her family needed her. She was continually interrupted to help her husband or children. In the end, she realized her family came before her personal interests. Phelps' short story shows the struggles women went through in the 19th century. Should women do what is expected of them by according to the ideals of The Cult of Domesticity? Or, should women have their lives and their own interests? These questions still haunt women more than a century later.

Additionally, in Nancy Cott’s, *The Bonds of Womanhood: ‘Women’s Sphere’ in New England 1780-1835*, Cott mentions an interesting comparison to the domesticity aspect of the Cult of Domesticity to working men:

Defining it as her province, the canon of domesticity made woman's household occupation her vocation. The very attempt to immobilize woman's role in the home
transformed her household duties into a discrete, specialized, and objective work-role. Domesticity as a vocation meant, furthermore, that woman's work-role imitated man's while lacking his means of escape. If man could recover from his work "at home," woman's work was "at home." She provided for his relief. Since her sex-role contained her work-role, for her there was no escape (Cott, 1997, p. 74).

In being unable to escape, work and home collided for women, making their lives even harder than their husbands’, even if that was not societally seen. Cott’s input relates directly to Phelps’ “The Angel over the Right Shoulder” because since the woman in the story could not leave her home, she was constantly worried about what was going on in the home, as her work never truly went away. For men, home was a respite; for women, a job in and of itself.

To this day, women still conform to implicit gender roles. In the United States, even if a woman is not a stay-at-home mother, she is more likely to be a teacher or a nurse, and perform in the caretaker role. These domestic duties still impact the gender stereotypes in the culture of the United States today. For example, according to the U.S. Department of Labor, in 2014, a strong majority of working women are secretaries and administrative assistants, elementary and middle school teachers, and registered nurses (Most Common Occupations, 2014). Motoko Rich, of The New York Times, acknowledges that since women began to enter the workforce in 1960, teaching and nursing were two of the only occupations open to them. However, "despite inroads that women have made entering previously male-dominated fields, there has not been a corresponding flow of men into teaching and nursing" (2014). Although The Cult of Domesticity still has its place in today's society, the ideas do not garner universal support.

In her 2002 article “True Womanhood Revisited,” Mary Louise Roberts reviewed Welter’s examination of The Cult of Domesticity. Roberts acknowledged Welters’ importance in
laying a preliminary groundwork on the structure of women’s public and private lives (p. 151) before she detailed the lack of specificity in Welter’s analysis of The Cult of Domesticity. Other than just having a domestic presence, according to Roberts, The Cult of Domesticity had aspects unexplored by Welter, such as women’s involvement in theater and journalism. Women were able to have a voice through their participation by being able to express themselves outside of the boundaries they were held to inside the home (p. 152-153). Through theater and journalism, women were able to get out of the house, according to Roberts. Despite Welter’s article lacking an exploration of aspects of womanhood outside of the home, Roberts credits Barbara Welter for raising necessary questions about womanhood in a time of much debate on gender roles, the 1960s. (p. 153).

Furthermore, Cheryl Glenn attempts to rewrite the history of classical rhetorical women, to give them a voice in a male-dominated society with her book *Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition from Antiquity through the Renaissance* (1997). To introduce the idea of the ideal woman, Glenn states:

For the past twenty-five hundred years in Western culture, the ideal woman has been disciplined by cultural codes that require a closed mouth (silence), a closed body (chastity), and an enclosed life (domestic confinement) (Stally-brass, 1987, p. 127). Little wonder, then, that women have been closed out of the rhetorical tradition, a tradition of vocal, virile, public—and therefore privileged men (Glenn, 1997, p. 1).

Silence demonstrated by a closed mouth, a closed body, and an enclosed life were the only expectations of a woman for the past twenty-five hundred years in Western culture. Women were told not to talk in a public sphere, to be faithful to their husbands and to always agree with them, and to be the homemaker. Classical women were not expected or encouraged to be anything
more. In the classical era, if a woman attempted to break the mold, a man would either take the credit for her idea or discredit her completely since women were not encouraged to have meaningful thought. Due to the lack of social opportunities for women and the silence they were expected to hold, women had to be careful of the ramifications of men, making a life outside of the confines of The Cult of Domesticity difficult for women to achieve. Particular women such as Queen Elizabeth I and Maria Stewart are discussed in-depth in *A Historical Look at Women’s Ethos in Politics* and compared to Clinton. Queen Elizabeth I and Maria Stewart are chosen due to their rhetorical roots and leadership abilities.

**The cult of domesticity’s impact on American society.** Taking Welter’s updated definition of The Cult of Domesticity into account, the results of the expectations of women in American society were and still are evident today within gender stereotypes and the types of "traditional" jobs each gender is expected to do, referencing back to the women as caretakers and the men as business professionals. Implicit gender stereotypes associate men and women with specific stereotypic traits, abilities, and roles (Rudman and Phelan, 2010, p. 193; Banaji & Hardin, 1996; Nosek, Banaji, & Greenwald, 2002; Rudman & Goodwin, 2004; Rudman, Greenwald, & McGhee, 2001). Men are considered the workers and leaders, as The Cult of Domesticity states, while women are the wives, mothers, supporters, and caretakers. These roles help feed into the idea of “proper” employment in the United States. Although much has changed, as noted in the Pew Research Center study in Chapter 1, there is still a long way to go in this country before employment is truly equal between men and women.

Working women, for the most part, still follow the implicit gender roles in their jobs, as shown previously in the **Overview** section. Women are considered compassionate and considerate, perfect for teachers. Jennifer L. Lawless and Richard L. Fox portray “women’s
presence in the pipeline professions [business, politics, etc.]” from 1972-2009 in their book *It Still Takes a Candidate*. From 1972-2009, the percentage of teachers that were women was consistently at 50% or higher, while the number of women who were Fortune 500 CEOs stayed consistently at less than 5% (Lawless and Fox, 2010, p. 896). As of February 2016, the number is still low. Catalyst created a list of all of the women who currently hold CEO positions at S&P 500 companies. According to their list, there are only 20 women holding CEO positions, which accounts for 4% (Catalyst, 2016). According to conventional wisdom, teachers are nurturers and stay-at-home wives and mothers share the same values. Going into education to help raise the future generations is not a giant leap for working women. Thus,

> Not only do women continue to bear the responsibility for a majority of household tasks and child care, but they also face a more complicated balancing of these responsibilities with their professions than do men. As a result, an increasing number of highly successful professional women are “opting out” of their careers to fulfill traditional gender roles (p. 392).

Having women opt out of careers for which they are qualified and want to do due to the pressure of conforming to the ideals of The Cult of Domesticity adds to the already widespread model of what a woman should do and who a woman should be in society. Careers in politics, business, or other “power positions” are often considered too masculine for women to succeed. Similarly, Lawless and Fox also discuss the willingness of qualified women to run for political office due to the stereotypes putting women in the housework and child care field. Adding another career into the mix would be difficult for any woman since the household work is typically left to them. One reason as to why juggling a home life with a career is difficult is due to the double bind women face, stating they can either be a caretaker or a career woman, but not both.
Women are able to juggle a job and motherhood, but they sometimes feel as if they not only should not, but cannot, juggle both. In *The New York Times* 2014 article “Why U.S. Women are Leaving Jobs Behind” by Claire Cain Miller and Liz Alderman, the maternity leave timeframe given to U.S. women is discussed as a reason why women quit their jobs when they have children to care for. In the United States, 12 weeks, or three months is a common amount of time to give the new mother off work (Miller & Alderman, 2014). At three months, the mother is expected to find alternate care for her child and return to work if she is working a full-time job. Many women find that situation less than ideal, and quit their jobs if they are financially able. Paulette Light, of *The Atlantic*, referred to a 2013 statistic that claimed “43% of highly qualified women with children are leaving careers or off-ramping for a period of time” (Light, 2013). Women, such as Clinton were able to juggle both employment and motherhood; however, she was criticized for having a political job and being domestic by some of the American public.

**Double Bind**

**Overview.** Kathleen H. Jamieson describes the double bind as “a rhetorical construct that posits two and only two alternatives, one or both penalizing the person being offered them . . . The strategy defines something ‘fundamental’ to women as incompatible with something the woman seeks—be it education, the ballot, or access to the workplace” (1995, p. 13-14). The double bind dictates that women can either be supportive housewives or they can work, but they cannot do both. The lack of research starts when women begin to work while they are housewives, meaning a married, working woman with a family. Since the working housewife goes unexplored by many researchers, extreme conclusions about working women are made. Double binds are about power and place in society. An example of a double bind used in politics is “women who are considered feminine will be judged incompetent, and women who are
competent, unfeminine” (p. 16). The feminine/unfeminine double bind is a determining factor in a female politician’s ethos, as her ideas, appearance, and leadership can be brought into question. Deborah Brooks claims “to succeed on one front is necessarily to fail on the other” when discussing the political double bind (2013, p. 110). Consequently, societal beliefs lean to a woman being feminine and dependent on their spouse, as The Cult of Domesticity states. However, women in politics are attempting to be seen as both feminine and strong. If they succeed, the public can see the ability for a feminine woman to be a strong leader. In addition to the feminine/unfeminine double bind, four other types exist: women are complimented more for their bodies than brains; women can speak out or choose to be silent and invisible; aging women are considered less relevant and valuable, while aging men are considered distinguished; and women are subordinate whether they claim to be similar or different than men (Jamieson, 1995, p. 16).

Specifics pertinent to Clinton’s campaigns. The context of the Cult of Domesticity and the feminine/unfeminine double bind helps define Clinton’s rhetorical strategies in the 2008 and 2016 elections. Jamieson and Tasha N. Dubriwny describe the double bind female candidates, and working women in general, tend to find themselves in by stating, “Women running for office have had to develop numerous strategies for dealing with what is a classic double bind: women must prove that they are ‘man enough’ for the job, while at the same time demonstrating that they are not too aggressive, angry, or tough” (Jamieson, 1995). At the same time, “women cannot be overly feminine as femininity is represented as the antithesis of political competence” (Dubriwny, 2013, p. 38). Jamieson and Dubriwny agree that stereotypes exist in both politics and gender. In addressing the stereotypes and playing the double bind to their advantage, women can
have a chance of winning the election. If they do not develop the strategies needed for dealing with the double bind, the public will not respond well to their campaigns.

When Clinton ran for president in 2008, she had to walk a fine line of being too masculine and too feminine while presumably keeping the double bind strategies in the back of her mind. As a possible example of this point, during her 2008 election campaign, Clinton publicly cried after the New Hampshire primary. The tears may or may not have been part of her double bind strategy; only Clinton will know the real cause. Nevertheless, instead of voters and the media seeing her tears as genuine, a double bind was immediately applied by the press to her showing of emotion. By crying, Clinton was either showing that she was too weak and emotional to be a successful president or she was strategically planning emotion into her campaign since she was seen as a tough female and therefore not feminine (Dubriwny, 2013, p. 40; Curnalia and Mermer, 2014, p. 28-29; Bligh et al, 2010, p. 824). When the double bind scenario was applied to Clinton’s speech and emotion, the question of whether or not she was genuine came to fruition, with the media playing a significant role in perpetuating the double bind interpretation.

Furthermore, Clinton presumably attempted to use the double bind to her favor in 2008 by showing the country her transformation from wife to politician. Similar to the crying in New Hampshire, the use of the double bind may or may not have been a conscious choice. With the transformation, she was able to show how she possessed both sides of the double bind. She was powerful and feminine as well as social and political (Dubriwny, 2013, p. 36). According to the double bind, to be successful in politics, women must negotiate the double bind and use it to their advantage. In not hiding her motherhood and ability to be a good wife and First Lady to the President, she showed her femininity. In being a successful attorney and senator, Clinton was
able to show her powerful and political side to the public. Having a balance helped her popularity in the candidacy. However, having the credentials was not enough for Clinton to win the 2008 election. She needed to take the double bind one step further and emphasize the “masculine” traits she possessed, specifically leadership ability (see *Ethos in Politics* for more information). In focusing on feminist issues and allowing her femininity to be on display, there was a lack of leadership potential in the eyes of some voters. In politics, men are generally considered to have the upper-hand in leadership skills since leadership is considered a masculine trait. Clinton had to be careful in her debate with the feminine/unfeminine double bind because that was what ultimately determined her ethos in the eyes of some voters. If Clinton successfully negotiates the double bind that surrounds femininity and leadership, she can “foster rhetorical ingenuity that allows political women to expand [the] cultural understanding of what it means to be a good leader” (Sheeler & Anderson, 2013, p. 12). Ultimately, in 2008, Clinton was not elected. 2016 could be her year to show the country that a woman can be a good leader in her own right.

The idea of the double bind was reflected in Clinton’s 2016 presidential campaign by the media. Clinton was being interviewed by Anderson Cooper when he asked a loaded question about sexism in the debate. He prefaced his question of “Do you think that’s sexist” by telling Clinton about media personnel and other public figures believing she should smile more and stop yelling. Clinton smiled, and responded by saying “Well let me say I don’t hear anybody say that about men and I’ve seen a lot of male candidates who don’t smile very much and talk pretty loud, so I guess I’ll just leave it at that” (Clinton, 2016, Twitter video clip). Clinton was overtly compared to men in a negative light because she was acting similarly, while little was said about the men's behavior since the traits she was criticized for were masculine. Even if the double bind
is not being portrayed on a conscious level, in politics the double bind is inherent. Jennifer L. Lawless and Richard L. Fox reference Georgia Duerst-Lahti when they assert "electoral positions, especially at the highest levels, are ‘imbued with masculinity’ and the conscious and subconscious perceptions that ‘masculine persons' should occupy these positions" (Lawless and Fox, 2005, p. 430). In media and news outlets criticizing Clinton and not her male counterparts, the masculine nature of the political arena is evident.

**Ethos in Politics**

**Overview.** Unsurprisingly, in the current United States political landscape, the traits considered in establishing a candidate’s ethos lean heavily toward men. Donald R. Kinder (1986) is a seminal figure in scholarship on political ethos, and in his study, he found that the four most powerful traits are leadership, competence, integrity, and empathy. Holian and Prysby use Kinder’s work as a guidepost when describing the four characteristics. A candidate displays leadership when they are decisive, can take action, and accomplish tasks. Competence indicates experience, knowledge, and intelligence. Integrity shows honesty and morality. Empathy shows the candidate’s ability to understand the problems of other people (Holian and Prysby, 2014, p. 486). Leadership, competence, integrity, and empathy as the core characteristics of political candidates have been widely accepted by numerous researchers (Goren 2002; McCann 1990; Miller and Shanks 1996; Pierce 2003) (Holian and Prysby, 2014, p. 486). Of the four character traits, men are typically considered stronger than women in leadership, competence, and integrity due to gender stereotypes. Leadership, competence, and integrity also rank higher for the voters than empathy, which is presumably a more feminine trait, giving men the dominant upper-hand in elections (Huddy and Terkildsen, 1993, p. 504). Also, since politics is male dominated, an already masculinized ethos exists. Lawless and Fox (2010) argue that since most political
institutions are run and controlled by men, there is an ingrained ethos of masculinity (p. 410). As of 2015, Congress is still primarily made up of men. According to Philip Bump of *The Washington Post*, Congress consists of 80% men, with only 20% women (Bump, 2015), showing that an ingrained ethos of masculinity still exists among politicians today. The masculine ethos is on both a conscious and subconscious level (Lawless and Fox, 2010, p. 436) since women are typically not in high positions of political power. Women tend to be the supportive wife, or First Lady, instead of having the leadership role herself.

**Women’s Ethos in Politics**

*A historical look at women’s ethos in politics.* Georgia Duerst-Lahti defines gender ethos as "the characteristic spirit or essential and ideal attributes that correspond to gender expectations" (2014, p. 18). Gender expectations have had a significant impact on the development and progress of women in the social and political spheres. Historically, there have been numerous women who have found ways to navigate the gendered expectations before Clinton's legal and political careers. One woman who successfully gained the respect of a nation was Queen Elizabeth I. Queen Elizabeth I (1533-1603) was able to successfully use rhetoric in a nontraditional way in the male-dominated England through being an antinarcissistic rhetoric. Katherine Fredlund argues social inequities caused the silence of women in classical rhetoric in her article “Antinarcissistic Rhetoric: Reinforcing Social Inequities through Gender Performance” (2014). Fredlund defines antinarcissistic rhetoric as praising “women for being less than men, for being submissive, and for having corporeal fragility… and recognizes a woman rhetor’s success in traditionally masculine areas as an exception to her otherwise unexceptional sex” (Fredlund, 2014, p. 22). Antinarcissistic rhetoric’s definition encapsulates the
idea of women being less than men, but still able to contribute to rhetoric, and in Elizabeth and Clinton’s cases, politics.

As Queen of England, Elizabeth I had the right and duty to speak publicly. Even with a responsibility to her people to speak to them and for them, as an unmarried, female monarch, Queen Elizabeth I had to use antinarcissistic rhetoric to develop ethos among her country. She used antinarcissistic rhetoric through acknowledging her femininity from the inception of her speeches and then performing in a masculine sense. "Queen Elizabeth I performed the feminine by apologizing for her speech—something a King would never do" because "without a performance of the feminine, the female rhetor risked a failed ethos; yet without the masculine performance, the female rhetor had no way to speak at all" (Fredlund, 2014, p. 29). Fredlund argues Queen Elizabeth would have no ground to stand on if she were unable to acknowledge her femininity because she would have no ethos. At the same time, if she were not masculine enough in her speeches, she would not have an audience willing to listen.

As a female ruler, Queen Elizabeth I was already a cultural outlier. Glenn asserts in Rhetoric Retold that Elizabeth used her unique position to her rhetorical advantage. Glenn writes, “By regendering the throne, however, Elizabeth could keep silent as a queen, yet pronounce, decide, and rule as the mightiest of kings, always playing gender to her own advantage” (Glenn, 1997, p. 161-162). Through keeping silent as a queen, but ruling with the mighty fist of a king, Glenn believes Elizabeth employed an androgyne trope in which she differentiated her body natural from her body politic. Elizabeth’s body natural, by being a woman, is feminine. Elizabeth introduces her femininity in her speeches, as introduced by Fredlund, but then moves into the body politic, which is masculine. The traditional, masculine body politic has the monarch as the head and the subjects as the body (p. 163). This idea is comparable to Clinton's decision to wear
pantsuits as opposed to a more feminine clothing option. Through her reign as Queen, Elizabeth had the ability to separate her gender from her speeches, after acknowledging her gender, which resonated with the people of England.

In addition to Queen Elizabeth I, other women in rhetoric’s vast history have challenged gender norms in the public sphere. Maria Stewart, for example, was a free African American woman when she was born in 1803, and supported herself as a “domestic servant,” as she was widowed and lost her husband. Though she may not have been a slave technically, she still felt the pain of enslavement. Stewart was lucky enough to receive an education at Sabbath school through the age of 20. She would read bibles and keep journals, which was rare for someone of her race (Bizzell & Herzberg, 2001, p. 1031). Education and religion are the guideposts of her rhetoric.

Through experiencing the pain of other African Americans, Stewart knew she had to be an advocate for them. She made her thoughts and concerns about abolition and feminism known in print by publishing in *The Liberator*, and while she used written rhetoric to begin imparting change, her speeches are where she was the most powerful (p. 1032).

Whether deliberate or not, Stewart took the idea of the Cult of Domesticity and only followed the parts of it that she wanted. As formerly mentioned, the four cardinal virtues of the Cult of Domesticity include religion, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity. While being religious, and domestic (in some ways), Stewart was the opposite of submissive. She did not believe in submitting to man, or anyone. She was married and widowed early, but her moral and ethical beliefs caused her to speak about the rights of the oppressed (women and slaves).

During the "Lecture Delivered at Franklin Hall," 1832, Stewart took the usual social conventions and challenged them. Not only was she disrupting the idea of the Cult of
Domesticity by speaking publicly, but she also was (or may have been) the first woman of any race to speak in front of a gender-mixed audience (p. 1033). During the speech, Stewart relied on pathos and logos to change the minds of her audience members. She used piety and morality as a central part of her speech, telling her audience that the only teacher she has ever had was the Holy Spirit (p. 1037) and then she repeatedly brings the speech back to God. Using God as a central point in her speech was good logos and ethos because faith was one of the only connecting themes of the different races and different genders. Stewart's appeal to emotion may be the strongest and most compelling aspect to her lecture. She describes the physical and emotional pain a slave has to go through with such detail that anyone, whether they have had a similar experience or not, can at least imagine what slaves had to go through on a daily basis.

I have learnt, by bitter experience, that continual hard labor deadens the energies of the soul, and benumbs the faculties of the mind; the ideas become confined, the mind barren, and like the scorching sands of Arabia, produces nothing; or like the uncultivated soil, brings forth thorns and thistles.

Again, continual hard labor irritates our tempers and sours our dispositions; the whole system becomes worn out with toil and fatigue nature herself becomes almost exhausted, and we care but little whether we live or die (p. 1038).

Knowing her audience was mixed, the quoted passage painted an undeniable picture of the pain and suffering a slave had to go through. She used her rhetoric in a social event to show the hard truth to those who probably did not want to listen, which often happens in political advocacy and movements. Protests, rallies, and even debates feature similar rhetoric. If Stewart could use words to emote such feeling, one can only imagine how the use of speech itself impacted the mixed audience. Stewart used every form of rhetoric she knew: preparing an influential speech,
delivering the speech with great power, using Christ and her piety as a foundation, and being aware of her mixed audience. Even today, politicians use many of these same tactics to persuade and influence their audience. Her ethos seemed to shine through due to her appeal to raw emotions.

Both Queen Elizabeth I and Maria Stewart serve as essential parts of the underpinnings of feminist ethos in rhetoric and leadership, with Clinton serving as a prime example of the importance of ethos in feminist rhetoric today. Elizabeth, Stewart, and Clinton each utilize rhetorical strategies to better inform and persuade their audience to take action. For Elizabeth, she was already Queen, so her rhetoric consisted of getting her country to rally behind her and support her. Clinton is similar in the fact that she aspires to lead the country and the voters support needs to be evident to become President. She needs to use similar rhetorical strategies as Queen Elizabeth I to resonate with the people of the United States as Elizabeth did with her country. Stewart was not trying to lead a country, but a movement. Clinton can take from her passion. Stewart successfully used pathos in order for her audience to take her seriously. Clinton's long tenure as a politician shows her qualifications and ability to do the job; however, it does not necessarily show passion.

Additionally, both Elizabeth and Stewart were aware of their audiences and crafted their rhetoric to their specific audiences. Clinton can use audience awareness in multiple ways. First, the primary audience of concern consists of the American public, the voters. She needs to persuade the voters that she is a better choice than any of her opponents. Next, the media is another type of audience she needs to consider. The media tends to feed into the double bind of a woman being in politics more than the public. Because the media can take anything Clinton, or any other candidate says out of proportion, she needs to be careful of what she says at all times.
Similar to the media, the other candidates are an audience all of their own and will twist what she says to work for them. Just as Elizabeth and Stewart had audience awareness, Clinton’s campaign depends on her audience awareness.

**Recent discussion of women’s ethos in politics.** Due to the stereotypes surrounding women, gaining higher levels of political office can be a monumental task. According to Michelle Bligh, Jennifer Merolla, Jean Reith Schroedel, and Randall Gonzalez’s 2010 article “Finding Her Voice: Hillary Clinton’s Rhetoric in the 2008 Presidential Campaign”, women are seen as more liberal with a better ability to handle issues related to women, education, civil rights, and poverty. However, women are generally seen as less able to handle issues related to crime, foreign policy, and military as they are typically associated with strength and men (2010, p. 826). Being considered unable to lead the country in foreign and military affairs weakens the confidence voters have in women and therefore hurts the candidate’s credibility.

In addition to being doubted as leaders in major political realms, women traditionally have a harder time than men gaining ethos in politics because of their assumed nature of compassion, trust, compromise, and empathy as opposed to men being considered leaders who are assertive, self-confident, and active (Bligh et. al, 2010, p. 826). The latter traits are considered the ideal traits of a presidential candidate. Assertiveness and confidence portray an ability to inspire and lead, while compassion and trust represent supportive qualities. While supportive qualities have their place, they do not embody the President of the United States. Caring and reassuring qualities go hand-in-hand with The Cult of Domesticity; where a woman is meant to support her man, her man is supposed to provide for her. Through having an assumed nature of compassion and compromise, a stereotypical woman is not considered an ideal leader for our country.
Another issue with female ethos and stereotypes is that female stereotypes and female politician themselves differ, creating confusion for the voter. Should the voter endorse a woman who is a businesswoman or politician, even though those careers are considered masculine? In addition to the traits mentioned earlier, other typical feminine traits include affection, morality, sensitivity, and warmth (Schneider and Bos, 2014, p. 247). However, Schneider and Bos’s study concludes that female politicians’ top traits differ from the typical woman. The top traits for female politicians include well-educated, confident, assertive, well-spoken, and hardworking (p. 255). With traits such as assertive, confident, and hardworking, female politicians are similar to the masculine ethos traits male politicians are considered to have. Therefore, women politicians have similar characteristics as males and should be considered on the same playing field as their male counterparts.

The final factor that plays a role in the ethos of women in politics remains the women themselves and their lack of confidence or willingness to run for office. If no women are running, gaining credibility in the races themselves is difficult. To date, according to the Center for American Women and Politics, only fourteen women (Lockwood in 1884 and 1888; McCormack in 1976 and 1980; Fulani in 1988 and 1992; Clinton in 2008 and 2016) have run for President of the United States. Beginning in 1872 with Victoria Woodhull to the 2016 election with Clinton and Carly Fiorina, only a handful of women have had the courage to break out of the traditional feminine mold to run for Presidential office in the United States¹. Most of the early female candidates did not gain much ground as they ran on an independent ticket. Many of the later candidates dropped out of the race quickly due to insufficient support or lack of funding.

making their run for President unknown to many of the American public (CAWP). Until Clinton’s 2008 run, the idea of a female president was not seriously considered in American society. According to Kelly Dittmar and Susan J. Carroll in “Cracking the Highest, Hardest Glass Ceiling” (2014), "Clinton took a major step forward in normalizing the idea of a female American president. Her candidacy, popularity, and challenge to gender norms had a near-immediate impact on American politics" (p. 55). The effect was noted when Sarah Palin was chosen as Republican John McCain's Vice Presidential candidate in the same year. Despite the lack of success by women presidential candidates, it is important to note that women have and continue to break out of the mold in other facets of life.

**Hillary Clinton’s ethos in the 2008 election.** Clinton began her campaign in 2008 with an announcement that was recorded in her living room while she was sitting on her couch, and she wanted to invite America into her home and have America invite her into theirs. This tactic was similar to the Fireside Chats done by Franklin D. and Eleanor Roosevelt where they invited America into their home. The background of Clinton’s campaign announcement included flowers and well-placed photographs of her family. In her announcement, Clinton kindly asserted “And while I can’t visit everyone’s living room, I can try. And with a little help from modern technology, I’ll be holding live online video chats this week” (Solonyc, 2007, video announcement). Through using the living room as her office, Clinton showed that her home life was as important to her as her politics. Throughout the announcement, Clinton made sure to keep open body language. For example, she sat comfortably on her couch with her arm on the back, in a relaxed position, reinforcing her familiarity with the home. By beginning her advertising campaign with a “housewife-esque” commercial, she was showing the country her feminine side (Solonyc, 2007, video announcement). This careful staging on the part of her campaign
managers may have been out of awareness of the double bind. Since she was known as a career politician, having the country see her as a woman and a mother was an attempt at credibility with other wives and mothers. According to Kristina Horn Sheeler and Karrin Vasby Anderson, Clinton made sure to only have one sign of power, her red jacket, which was softened by the tailoring and the living room atmosphere (2013, p. 94). In implementing a feminine and conversational tone, Clinton’s announcement let voters into a side of politicians rarely seen.

Once the 2008 campaign began, Clinton attempted to gain support from women by using feminism as an “inventional resource” (Dubriwny, 2013, p. 37) by using the public’s memory of feminist social movements in order to point to America’s promise as a democracy. She used the movements to portray her role in America’s promise and to gain ethos with other women. Clinton referenced women’s rights as a part of a larger march toward equality with current feminist issues such as suffrage and equal opportunity (p. 45-49). Social justice was a major issue in her campaign, in what may have been an attempt to make her more attractive to the female voter population.

Clinton’s ethos in the 2016 election. In 2016, Clinton, similar to every other politician, has had her good and bad publicity, resulting in newspaper articles about her credibility as a candidate. Some news writers focus on her mistakes, while others look at her perseverance as a candidate. For example, in The New York Times article “Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump are Winning Votes, but Not Hearts” by Michael Barbaro (2016), Barbaro noted that after overwhelming victories over competitor Bernie Sanders in swing states such as Ohio, North Carolina, and Florida, over 53 percent of Americans have an unfavorable opinion of her according to the Gallup poll (para. 6-9). The article explains that although many Democrats see Clinton as honest, they believe Sanders is more honest (para 13). Considering Sanders to be
more honest than Clinton can definitely impact the ethos she has amongst voters. As previously mentioned, one of the four main traits looked at to calculate a candidate's ethos is integrity. Having integrity tends to include being an honest person in the eyes of the voters. Integrity is also one of the "masculine" traits, so it is important that Clinton overcomes the Democratic voters' beliefs that she is not as honest as Sanders to have a better chance at winning the election.

Moreover, some voters see morality as an issue with Clinton. Since she has been in the public eye and the political spectrum for most of her adult life, her actions, past and present are looked at under a microscope. Barbaro's article interviewed a Democratic voter who believes Clinton has "no moral center" because of her past actions including favoring free trade agreements which “killed” American jobs and the 2003 war in Iraq (para. 19-20). In addition to honesty, morality is also an integral part of having integrity, harming Clinton's ethos with Democratic voters.

On the other hand, Frank Bruni, also of *The New York Times* focused on the positive aspects of the campaign in the 2016 article "Hillary Clinton's Moment." Bruni begins his article by noting the negatives, calling Clinton a "deeply flawed politician" (para. 2). He then notes her tenacity through explaining that she is "a preternaturally determined, resourceful and patient one" (para. 3). Through fighting the cynics and getting up every time she was knocked down, Clinton showed the world her grit (para. 8). He ends his article in discussing a possible match-up with Republican front-runner, Donald Trump: “Clinton has the toughness to engage in—and survive—a brutally ugly contest. She also has the smarts to know the cost of it” (para. 26). Bruni was able to see past the negatives to see the politician as a whole. Although Clinton does not

---

1 Donald Trump, businessman and reality television star became President-elect in 2016 after defeating former Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton.
have universal support, she is getting the votes, so her ethos in 2016 against Senator Sanders seems to be more so than it was in 2008 against President Obama.

**Debates in Presidential Elections**

**Reasoning.** For the following study, I focus on presidential debates for several reasons. First, debates are where the American public sees the candidates running together. In seeing candidates together talking, arguing, and debating, the voters get a better idea of what each candidate believes in and they get a stronger sense of who the candidate is as a person. Voters can do all the research they want, but debates are live with other candidates in the running, which makes them unique and perhaps less staged than a commercial advertisement or planned political rally or speech.

Secondly, there is little existing research on a candidate’s ethos within the debates themselves. The core researchers for political debates include R.V. Friedenberg and Kathleen Jamieson. The biggest flaw in their research is that it is from the late 1980s through the 1990s. However, their research is still crucial to understanding the rhetoric behind political debates and will be reviewed in detail later on, but the research is dated and debate-specific for previous presidential debates. There is far less data on the last few presidential campaigns. Even with Friedenberg and Jamieson's research, the focus of the research surrounding presidential campaigns tends to be ethos in politics, in general, the media's impact on a candidate's ethos, and other aspects of the presidential campaigns. However, using the debates to explore and characterize a specific candidate's ethos is not generally a topic of interest, creating an opportunity for my work to help fill a gap in the literature.

Finally, there are multiple existing debates within similar time frames from both elections. Since my work is analyzing Hillary Clinton’s ethos from debates in both the 2008 and
2016 elections, I needed an aspect of the elections with relatively few differences, keeping the data as consistent as possible. The candidates Clinton ran against changed from the 2008 to 2016 election, but the structure of the debates stayed the same. Therefore, I was able to choose the first debate from each campaign and the first one-on-one Democratic debate from each election to compare and contrast. This way, the debates could stay as similar as possible.

Structure of political debates. According to Kathleen Jamieson, televised debates are crucial to a candidate's campaign because of their length and validity since "messages running an hour or longer, debates offer a level of contact with candidates clearly unmatched in spot ads and news segments… the debates offer the most extensive and serious view of the candidates available to the electorate (Jamieson 1987, p. 28). In having more than a 30-60 second commercial or an interview on a news network for a few minutes, the public can tune in for 2-3 hours and watch the presidential hopefuls answer questions about policy and their leadership abilities. The debates also give the candidates an opportunity to interact with one another and lets the public see how they communicate with their fellow candidates. With the time frame being a few hours instead of a few minutes, the candidate is presumably more likely to have spontaneous moments where the public can see their true colors and how they respond to unprompted questions.

Robert V. Friedenberg’s landmark anthology on political debates, Rhetorical Studies of National Political Debates 1960-1992 (1996), details presidential debates from 1960-1992 and ends with Friedenberg’s analysis of the patterns and trends existing in political debates. He focused on answering the following questions:

1. What factors motivated the candidates to debate?³

³The 1976 election was important to candidate motivation because it was the first election where an incumbent president engaged in the debates in an attempt at reelection (Friedenberg, 1992, p. 236). Additionally, the 1976 election was the year Vice
2. What were the goals of each candidate in debating?

3. What were the rhetorical strategies utilized by each candidate?

4. What were the effects of the debates (p. 235)?

Friedenberg’s analysis determined that “candidates will target audience segments that are vital for their success, and treat specific issues that are designed to appeal to these targeted audiences” (Friedenberg, 1996, p. 240). Friedenberg is asserting that even if an issue does not hold as much importance as a different issue the candidate is fighting for, the candidate will emphasize whichever issue is likely to resonate with the audience. Similarly, the topics and issues commonly discussed in national debates tend "to develop a broad, inclusive, overall theme with which most voters can identify" (p. 241). Candidates cater to the audience because if the topic is too complicated for voters to comprehend fully, the message may become lost and their audience casts the votes.

In addition to issue goals, the candidate also attempts to portray a particular image to the public. Friedenberg's research concludes that image goals typically consist of: "(1) creating a more positive image of themselves; (2) creating a more negative image of their opponent; (3) positively modifying existing images of themselves; and (4) negatively modifying existing images of their opponents" (1996, p. 242). The goal of debates is to win votes. To gain votes for a specific candidate, votes need to be taken away from their opponent. Negative campaigning's goal is for the voters to see the bad in their presumed choice of candidate while seeing the good in their opponent. With debates being live for multiple-hour blocks, the audience gets a real taste of the candidates.

---

Presidential debates were introduced (p. 237). Arguably, 1984 is the year debates became second nature in elections and candidates were expected to debate (p. 239). For the purposes of this thesis, the question of candidate motivation to debate is not discussed since the motivation is expected.
For the candidates to successfully show the viewers who they are, or at the least, who they want the audience to see, they implement specific strategies in relation to the issue and image goals already discussed. Friedenberg states that the opening and closing statements are a crucial time for candidates to get their issues across to their target audience(s) because it is the only time where they are in complete control of their time (p. 247). At any other time during the debate, the candidate could be cut off by either the other candidates or the moderator and their issues may not be portrayed in the light they originally planned. Another strategy used to get the issues to sit with the audience is to have an overall theme to the debate. The theme is introduced in the opening statement with the answers to the questions reinforcing the idea. The closing statements would then round out the theme to the audience (p. 248). Themed speeches can be seen as easier for the public to grasp and remember. Additionally, one last issue-based strategy often used in debates, according to Friedenberg, is to avoid specifics. By speaking in generalities and not putting a specific event or place in the answers, the politicians are less likely to offend the voters or create unnecessary controversy (p. 250).

Furthermore, the image-oriented debate strategies need to be taken into account. The first strategy Friedenberg discusses relates to candidate ethos in what voters look for. As mentioned in *Ethos in Politics*, politicians want the voting public to see them as "experienced, activist leaders, who take charge of events, rather than as passive leaders who respond to events" (Friedenberg, 1996, p. 253). In looking at past debates, Friedenberg determines that the ability to show leadership ability may be the most important strategy in a presidential debate (p. 253). Similarly, candidates will suggest "that they personify characteristics or roles that the public seeks in the president" (p. 255). Through showing in the debates that they can be competent, honest, and a hard worker can possibly portray the audience to give them their votes. On the
other hand, attacking the opponent is also a commonly used debate strategy to damage the opponent's ethos whilst adding to ones' ethos (p. 255). This approach can be used to sway a voter to the side of the debater doing the attacking; however, it should be employed with caution, as it could also backfire on the candidate attempting to attack.

In addition to what candidates say and the image they want to portray about themselves, debates give viewers a chance to see how they act, what they wear, and how they present themselves nonverbally, which can also play a role in a candidate’s ethos. One of the most well-known examples of physical appearance making a difference in the outcome of the election was the first debate of the 1960 election between John F. Kennedy and Richard Nixon.

Kennedy was young, vigorous, and sharp, wearing a dark suit against a light background. Nixon was pale, shifty-eyed, slouching due to reinjuring his knee upon arrival to the debate, perspiring with his perpetual five o'clock shadow seeping through his Lazy Shave, and indistinct wearing a light-colored suit against a light background . . . That the visual image had an impact is unquestionable. That it was a lasting impact is questionable. (Friedenberg, 1996, p. 21).

Nixon's qualities as a candidate were questioned due to his appearance. He appeared sickly and unprofessional compared to his counterpart, Kennedy. Since the debates were televised, the nation could see a vast contrast between the two and began to question Nixon. While the Kennedy-Nixon debate is a dramatic example of how physical appearance can help or hurt a candidate in debates, it is important to note that any nonverbal cue, no matter how small, can have an effect on the candidate's success.

Having a framework of what has been successful and unsuccessful in Presidential debates considering both policy and appearance is crucial to analyzing the current debates. Although
women have not played a major role in the Presidential debates historically, having Clinton as a major party front-runner creates a need for a current analysis. With Friedenberg’s analysis of rhetorical strategies and the effects of the debates in mind, I watch and analyze the first Democratic debate from 2008 and 2016. Additionally, I watch the first debate between only Clinton and Obama in January 2008 and Clinton and Sanders in February 2016 to determine the ethos of Hillary Rodham Clinton’s performances in regards to her campaign run. In said debates, I analyze Clinton based on her ethos as a candidate, keeping in mind the ideas of The Cult of Domesticity, double binds, and debate techniques as she is the first woman on a major-party ticket to win a major party ticket.
Chapter 3:
Methodology

In this thesis, the notion of gender bias in politics was examined to attempt to answer the question "to what extent are women in politics treated unfairly due to their gender"? In the Introduction and Literature Review sections, the rhetorical framework for this study was laid out. The rhetorical framework was constructed using elements from many theories. The Cult of Domesticity, double binds, the core characteristics of a politician, the ideas of ethos, pathos, and logos in politics, and certain debate strategies from Robert V. Friedenberg's landmark anthology *Rhetorical Studies of National Political Debates 1960-1992* (1996) are the foundations of this study. A look at each of these elements both individually and as a group helped in answering the question of gender equity in politics. In examining the different aspects of the framework, it was important to study Clinton's life through law and politics to truly compare her to her counterparts. While the framework will be returned to here in the Methodology, the Literature Review provides a more in-depth analysis.

As previously noted, the four main traits in the Cult of Domesticity as per Barbara Welter’s “The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860” include piety, purity, submissiveness and domesticity. These behaviors provided guidelines for specific attributes of Clinton’s to be aware of in the study. Furthermore, Kathleen Jamieson defined a double bind as “a rhetorical construct that posits two and only two alternatives, one or both penalizing the person being offered them . . . The strategy defines something ‘fundamental’ to women as incompatible with something the woman seeks—be it education, the ballot, or access to the workplace” (1995, p. 13-14). In this proposed double bind, Clinton can either be President of the United States or in a supportive position, as she has been her entire career, which begs the question of women in politics. She
clearly in her long political career has already surpassed the typical double bind where women either stay home or work. Although Clinton defied the traditional double bind, the idea of a double bind was used to see if assumptions were made by other politicians in the study. In addition to the double bind, I examine the core characteristics of a politician. The core components according to Donald R. Kinder (1986) are leadership, competence, integrity, and empathy; which go hand-in-hand with the rhetorical ideals of ethos (ethics), logos (logic), and pathos (emotional appeal). The core characteristics were imperative to the study, as they demonstrated whether Clinton was as qualified for the position of president as her male counterparts in the sense that the qualities are generally considered to determine ones qualifications for office.

Lastly, it was imperative to find information from past debates, which is where *Rhetorical Studies of National Political Debates 1960-1992* came into the conversation. Without keeping past studies in mind, it would have been much harder to find the information necessary for a rhetorical background. To answer the question "to what extent are women in presidential debates treated differently?" there is a need to know how debates typically are conducted. However, many of the rhetorical approaches used in the debates matched one of the aforementioned pieces within the framework in connecting with ethos, pathos, or logos; however, looking specifically at Clinton's rhetorical strategies and the tactics used against her in the debates needed to be accounted for in the methodology.

The choice to examine and analyze debate strategies came from the limited in-depth research done on debates recently. Many journal articles focus on the media’s impact on the elections, such as “Gendered Campaign Tweets: The Cases of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump” (2016) by Jayeon Lee and Young-shin Lim and "A Tale of Two Clintons: Media Bias in
the Coverage of Hillary Clinton's 2008 Presidential Campaign" (2009) by Raluca Moldovan, but there was far less on debate rhetoric. In choosing which debates to use in the research, I wanted to keep them as similar as possible. I chose four debates, two from the 2008 campaign and two from the 2016 campaign. Having more than one debate from each election made the study more reputable; yet, it was still manageable under time constraints. The two debates from each campaign I focused on were the first Democratic debate and the first one-on-one Democratic debate from each year. The candidates are different, but Clinton had to make her case in each. There are no Republican vs. Democrat debates since Barack Obama won the Democratic ticket in 2008. While Clinton won the ticket in 2016, to keep the debates comparable, I chose to exclude them from this research.

To begin my research, I watched each debate once in its entirety. The specifics of each debate are displayed in Table 1. This table also helps underscore the similarities between the debates, for example, the length for the debates ranged from 90 minutes to 120 minutes, and they were broadcasted on either CNN or MSNBC. Additionally, the table shows that each debate was the first of its kind both years, the first Democratic debate and the first Democratic debate with only two candidates. However, the campaign began about six months earlier in the 2008 election than the election in 2016.
During the debates, I watched and listened to see if there was anything that stood out to me. I looked for Clinton referencing herself as a woman, or her opponents referencing her womanhood in regards to the double bind and the Cult of Domesticity. Additionally, Clinton's viewpoints on the gender gap in America was of importance. I would then write down a quick summary and the time stamp of the moment something of importance was said or done. After the initial viewing of the debate, it was watched again with a printed transcript which I highlighted and annotated.

While watching the debates for the second time around, I used the framework as described above and created a list of questions/points to analyze. The questions are listed below by category:

1. Cult of Domesticity
   a. Did Clinton refer to her womanhood and any of the four traits? If so, how?
   b. Did Clinton refer to gender roles between men and women?

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time of Year</th>
<th>Length of Debate</th>
<th>Broadcasting</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| South Carolina State University, Greerburg, South Carolina | April 26, 2007 | 90 minutes | MSNBC | Senator Joe Biden
Senator Hillary Clinton
Senator Chris Dodd
Senator John Edwards
Senator Mike Gravel
Congressman Dennis Kucinich
Senator Barack Obama
Governor Bill Richardson |
| The Kodak Theatre, Los Angeles, California | January 31, 2008 | 90 minutes | CNN
Los Angeles Times
Politico | Senator Hillary Clinton
Senator Barack Obama |
| Wynn Resort, Las Vegas, Nevada | October 13, 2015 | 120 minutes | CNN | Governor Lincoln Chafee
Secretary of State Hillary Clinton
Governor Martin O'Malley
Senator Bernie Sanders
Senator Tim Webb |
| University of New Hampshire, Durham, New Hampshire | February 4, 2016 | 105 minutes | MSNBC | Secretary of State Hillary Clinton
Senator Bernie Sanders |
2. Double Bind
   a. Was the idea of a double bind present in the debate? How, how often, and by whom?

3. Core Characteristics of a Politician
   a. Did Clinton do anything to assert her
      i. Leadership abilities
      ii. Competence
      iii. Integrity
      iv. Empathy

4. Ethos, Pathos, and Logos
   a. Which did Clinton use more? How?

5. Robert V. Friedenberg’s *Rhetorical Studies of National Political Debates*
   a. What rhetorical strategies were used by Clinton?
   b. What rhetorical strategies were used against Clinton?

Each question refers to the main idea of a woman's ethos in the political realm. Specifically, when focusing on the Cult of Domesticity, I was looking for words such as "woman," "mother," "housewife," "health care," "religion," and "children" as those words correlate with the four traits. Additionally, when focusing on double binds, I was listening for words or phrases similar to "gender gap" or "change" and "first woman President" because they indicate a double bind. Similarly, when looking at the core characteristics of a politician, I watched for the phrases "leadership abilities," "my record," and her stances on important issues. Furthermore, I was interested in seeing which characteristic she relied on most, which falls into the ethos, pathos,
and logos. Lastly, I looked at different rhetorical strategies used by Clinton and against her. Beyond these, I did not have any specifics going into the debates; instead, I was curious as to what I would find.

Following the completion of my analysis, I decided to group her answers into categories based on my rhetorical framework, as discussed above and in the previous chapters. In watching the debates, I realized I needed another category: “other unexpected findings" because I noticed other patterns that did not fit with the questions I was asking but were still important to answer the question "to what degree are females treated unfairly in politics?"

Through the in-depth research of the four debates, the following themes emerged through all four debates:

1. “Feminine issues” represented by Clinton
2. Characteristics of a politician
3. Unexpected moderator bias
4. Other findings which warrant discussion.

These themes are discussed in Chapter 4, when the study is conducted.
Chapter 4: The Study

After analyzing the four debates using the rhetorical framework described in the previous chapters, themes began to develop from the different categories I initially researched. The Cult of Domesticity played a significant role in the issues Clinton supported in the debates. Additionally, in each debate, Clinton attempted to show her leadership abilities, competence, integrity, and empathy; therefore, she demonstrated the four core characteristics of politicians as well as ethos, pathos, and logos. From there, I began to notice the moderator bias against Clinton. It was unexpected but worth noting the findings and the analysis. Lastly, there were other results, or lack thereof, worth noting.

Feminine Issues

The cult of domesticity. When examining the Cult of Domesticity, four traits are taken into consideration. As previously detailed in the Literature Review, the four traits making up a "true" woman are piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity. While Clinton did not directly refer to these attributes and their given names, through the issues she supported, traits became evident. For example, through all four debates, the idea of equality was apparent through Clinton's support of health care and women's and family rights.

For instance, in the first Democratic debate of the 2008 election, Clinton was asked if Walmart stores were good or bad for the United States. Clinton responded with “… when Walmart started, it brought goods into rural areas, like rural Arkansas, where I was happy to live for 18 years, and it gave people a chance to stretch their dollar further” (Clinton, 2007 Apr.). From there, she veered from the question and began to talk about what she saw as the bigger picture: "… this is all part, though, of how this administration and corporate America today don't
see the middle class and working Americans. They are invisible. They don't understand that if you're a family that can't get health care, you are really hurting…” (Clinton, 2007 Apr.). In taking a seemingly economic question about the Walmart Corporation and creating a dialogue about middle-class families and working Americans without health care, Clinton was able to assure the American public of her most critical issues and what she would, presumably, as President, work hardest to fix.

To continue, Clinton declared in the first Clinton v. Obama debate of 2008 that health care "is the passionate cause of her public service" (Clinton, 2008 Jan.). She then detailed her experience in attempting to expand health care. "I started trying to expand health care many years ago, first to children, then to rural areas in Arkansas, and obviously tackled it during my husband’s administration” (Clinton, 2008 Jan.). In detailing her efforts, Clinton made it clear that she is and has been passionate about health care for her the span of her political tenure. Clinton not only showed her view on healthcare but other domestic issues in the one-on-one debate of 2008. She touched on her work with foster care and the Adoption and Safe Families Act in California to provide children with stable homes and college tuition costs for middle-class families. In commenting on more than health care, voters could see a variety of domestic issues Clinton supported.

Furthermore, in the 2016 campaign, Clinton added more of the same to the conversation in the first Democratic debate of 2016. Beginning in her opening statement, she highlighted equality issues and concerns that both went with and against the Cult of Domesticity, such as equal pay for equal work, and paid family leave. Equal pay for equal work defies the Cult of Domesticity by suggesting that is okay for women to be the breadwinners of the family. However, today, 57 percent of women eligible for work are in the labor force, making her point
to challenge the Cult of Domesticity plausible (Data & Statistics). On the same note, paid family leave also insinuates women are working. However, paid family leave would allow women, and men, to spend more time with their children, raising them to be “good people."

Her opening statement was not the only time domestic issues were raised. Throughout the debate, Clinton referenced health care and reforming foster care, as in previous debates. However, new to this debate was the idea of widowed and single women needing more help from Social Security, which only Clinton brought up, because they did not make enough during their careers to be stable. Referencing widowed and single women may be about her stances on equal work for equal pay, or it may be due to women working jobs that typically pay less than men, such as a waitress or a teacher, jobs that reflect the values of the Cult of Domesticity, or they may be the only jobs available to them.

Lastly, in her first of many debates against Senator Bernie Sanders, Clinton continued to assert her stance on domestic issues. As in the first debate of 2016, Clinton's opening statement consisted of buzzwords such as "sexism," "discrimination," "health care" and "I want to imagine a country… where every child gets to live up to his or her potential." The opening statements in the two debates in 2016 were a drastic change from the 2008 debates. For the first debate in 2008, since the number of candidates were so high, they agreed to skip opening statements and start with the questions. As for the Clinton v. Obama debate, Clinton focused on issues mainly unrelated to the Cult of Domesticity. The issues she immediately addressed were: the Iraqi war, the Afghanistan war, a bad economy, healthcare, the energy crisis, global warming, and Americans living below the poverty line. Out of the seven issues Clinton touched on, only two were somewhat related to domesticity, health care, and the poverty line. One possibility as to the reasoning Clinton spoke more openly on domestic and feminine issues because of criticism she
received in 2008; additionally, the United States was still in a recession so this could be another reason as to why her focus was different in 2008.

Continuing in the Clinton v. Sanders debate, Clinton does address issues within the Cult of Domesticity on a frequent basis. Clinton stayed true to her previous issues in the final debate analyzed. Her primary domestic goals included universal health care, especially for children and paid family leave. In keeping consistent with the issues, Clinton may have been attempting to show the voters that her opinions on the important topics do not falter, or, she may have been responding to Sanders’ positions on the issues, trying to persuade his voters to support her.

Although Clinton's main tie to the Cult of Domesticity is her support of domestic traits, she does occasionally mention the other traits indirectly. For example, in both 2008 debates analyzed, Clinton brought up being First Lady during her husband's presidency. While more than likely unintentional, in the first Democratic debate of 2008, Clinton recalled a time where she "accompanied" Mr. Clinton to Columbine after the massacre occurred. As First Lady in an accompanying role, she could be seen as submissive. However, her legal and political careers say otherwise. Surprisingly, the idea of religion or any reference to God was only brought up one time by Clinton, and rarely by any other candidate as well. In 2016's first Democratic debate, Clinton used her opening statement to express her desire to help others. "I have spent a very long time—my entire adult life—looking for ways to even the odds to help people have a chance to get ahead, and in particular, to find the ways for each child to live up to his or her God-given potential." (Clinton, 2015 Oct) While seemingly harmless, by referring to God, Clinton gave voters a glimpse into her life and her belief system. Just as she did here, Clinton has used other opportunities to reference her Methodist upbringing briefly. Whether or not her issues of importance are due to her being a woman is something only Clinton herself can answer.
However, through her stances, Clinton clearly represents women and women's issues and has for the extent of her legal and political career. In addition to the Cult of Domesticity, Clinton referencing her womanhood was another area of interest.

**Womanhood references.** Similar to the Cult of Domesticity, it was interesting to see if Clinton would actually refer to herself as a woman, and if so, in what context? In 2008, there were very few references by Clinton or other candidates about her being a woman. As previously mentioned in the Cult of Domesticity section of the study, Clinton referred to her time as a First Lady in the 2008 debates. Other than mentions of her being Mr. Clinton's wife, she only hinted at her gender one additional time in the two 2008 debates analyzed. In the debate with Senator Barack Obama, Clinton was asked about the differences between her policy and Senator Obama's. She then gave her answer, and then instead of criticizing Obama, she criticized the Republican Party by saying "they are more of the same." Clinton concluded her segment by asserting "Neither of us, just by looking at us, you can tell, we are not more of the same. We will change our country." By including the phrase "just by looking at us," Clinton hinted at her gender and Obama's race. (Clinton, 2008 Jan)

Equally important to 2008 are the 2016 debates and how Clinton overtly referred to her womanhood. The Secretary of State did not shy away from her gender in both 2016 debates. She used her womanhood to her advantage by referencing the change the country would experience with the first female president. Furthermore, in the first Democratic debate of the 2016 election, Clinton used her opening statement to frame her womanhood. To demonstrate, she began by referencing the idea of the glass ceiling when introducing herself and her life:

I'm Hillary Clinton. I have been proud and privileged to serve as First Lady, as a senator from New York, and as Secretary of State. I'm the granddaughter of a factory worker and
the grandmother of a wonderful one-year-old child. And every day, I think about what we need to do to make sure that opportunity is available not just for her, but for all of our children. (Clinton, 2015 Oct)

In introducing her background as both a politician and a family woman, Clinton attempted to make it clear from the start that she was serious about both politics and her domestic duties. She then went on to discuss her plans if she were to win the presidency and brought her opening statement full circle by proclaiming "we can work together and, yes, finally, fathers will be able to say to their daughters, you, too can grow up to be President" (Clinton, 2015 Oct). By embracing who she is as a woman, she was able to make voters and her fellow competitors alike possibly realize that being a woman should not impact her ability to be president, and that she should not be judged based on her gender, but her abilities. However, she seems to be using intentional rhetoric in appealing to voters specifically because she is a woman.

Continuing through the first Democratic debate of 2016’s campaign, Clinton appeared unafraid of bringing up her gender. For example, when asked by moderator Anderson Cooper “how would you not be a third term President Obama?” Clinton responded, “Well, I think that's pretty obvious. I think being the first woman president would be quite a change from the presidents we've had up until this point, including President Obama.” Later on, in the debate, she referenced the idea of being the first female president again when claiming “Well, I can't think of anything more of an outsider than electing the first woman president, but I'm not just running because I would be the first woman president” (Clinton, 2015 Oct). She then went on to speak about her experience and results, but the mere fact that she embraced herself for who and what she is should not be overlooked, as she seemed to be more hesitant to do so in the 2008 campaign.
Moving onto the first Clinton v. Sanders debate of 2016, Clinton only used the idea of being the first female president once, but when she did, it appeared to have made an impact. Sanders claimed that Clinton represented the establishment and that is when the Secretary of State needed to speak up. Clinton proclaimed:

    Well, look, I’ve got to just jump in here because, honestly, Senator Sanders is the only person who I think would characterize me, a woman running to be the first woman president, as exemplifying the establishment. And I’ve got to tell you that it is... It is really quite amusing to me. (Clinton, 2016 Feb)

Her response garnered applause from the audience. In using the biggest difference from the typical establishment as Clinton had, her gender, she was able to turn something seemingly negative around to benefit her in the debate. It is interesting to see how she went from advertently or inadvertently masking her womanhood in 2008 to embracing her womanhood in 2016, which is discussed in Chapter 5.

**Core Characteristics of a Politician**

In exploring the four core characteristics of a politician, I quickly realized via my analysis that I was able to combine those with the ideas of ethos, pathos, and logos. The four core characteristics of a politician, according to Kinder (1986), are leadership abilities, competence, integrity, and empathy. Competence and logos, integrity and ethos, and empathy and pathos parallel each other in portraying the core traits of a politician. It should be noted that in each of the four debates, Clinton attempted to show each of the four core qualities of a politician, which I explore in the following paragraphs.

**Leadership abilities.** As mentioned in the literature review, leadership is demonstrated in a politician when they are decisive, can take action, and accomplish tasks. In the first
Democratic debate of the 2008 campaign, Clinton displayed her leadership by talking about different priorities she has fought for throughout her career. The issue that was the most frequent in the first debate was health care. She mentioned health care on multiple occasions, whether the question warranted an answer about health care or not. To elaborate, when asked why the Republicans are looking forward to running against her as opposed to her fellow candidates, Clinton responded: “from my perspective, it may have something to do with the fact that I have stood up for what I believed in. I tried to achieve universal health care back in '93 and '94, and I still have the scars from that experience” (Clinton, 2007 Apr.). In still having scars, or the negative backlash from the public and her fellow politicians, from her universal health care ambitions, Clinton shows both decisiveness and the ability to take action concerning an issue of importance. She did not accomplish the task she had set out to, but she made progress, and in turn, showed leadership qualities.

Similarly, when asked about how she would pay for her proposed plan, Clinton brought up the fact that she has experience in putting together health care plans by saying:

I do have the experience of having put forth a plan which met with many of the features that John [Edwards] and Barack [Obama] just mentioned. And people were enthusiastic about it initially, but then after the insurance companies and the pharmaceutical companies got finished working on it, everybody got nervous, and so politically, we were not successful. (Clinton, 2007 Apr)

Although she was not successful in her plans for universal health care in the 1990s, she still considers the fact that she has had experience in creating a solid health care plan an asset. With both examples of health care reform, Clinton was able to portray the traits of a leader.
Another way she demonstrates decisiveness occurs in the one-on-one debate with Senator Obama. Clinton references her leadership abilities and the events to prove them more often. She begins with health care reform, as it “is the passionate cause” of her public service. By asserting the passionate cause of her public service, Clinton was able to show her decisiveness. She was well-aware of her advocacy for women’s and children’s health care issues. She then goes into detail about her time working for expanding health care:

I started trying to expand health care many years ago, first to children, then to rural areas in Arkansas, and obviously tackled it during my husband's administration. And the reason why I have designed a plan that, number one, tells people, if you have health insurance and you are happy with it, nothing changes, is because we want to maximize choice for people. (Clinton, 2008 Jan)

Although she did not get the results she wanted, she noted that she began the conversation and that the efforts resulted in the Children's Health Program in California. "We now have a million children in California who every month get health insurance because of that bipartisan effort" (Clinton, 2008 Jan). Clinton showed leadership skills by taking the time to explain her platform while showing her decisiveness to take action and accomplish tasks, even if the task was different than her original plan.

Later on in the debate, Clinton went into great detail about how she is a leader. She wanted to give a voice to those without. She began by talking about her leadership within the Legal Services Corporation. She explained:

I was honored to be appointed by President Carter to the Legal Services Corporation, which I chaired, and we grew that corporation from 100 million to 300 million. It is the
primary vehicle by which people are given access to our courts when they have civil
problems that need to be taken care of. (Clinton, 2008 Jan)

She is showing her leadership abilities by being appointed by President Carter and chairing a
committee that completed the tasks at hand. She continued with talking about her projects that
provided aid for prisoners, as well as reforming the Arkansas education system, and expanding
health care. These accomplishments were lumped together, showing the wide variety of projects
and policies she was able to accomplish as a leader.

In the first Democratic debate of 2016, Clinton, as expected, continued to highlight her
leadership abilities. From the first question asked, Clinton found ways to show her ability to take
action and complete tasks. She was asked about her changing views. Moderator, Anderson
Cooper, asked, "Will you say anything to get elected?" Clinton was able to answer the question
by saying that she changes her views when new information becomes available to her, but then
quickly turned the answer into an opportunity to highlight her leadership skills and tenure in
politics.

I think that, like most people that I know, I have a range of views, but they are rooted in
my values and my experience. And I don't take a back seat to anyone when it comes to
progressive experience and progressive commitment. You know, when I left law school,
my first job was with the Children's Defense Fund, and for all the years since, I have been
focused on how we're going to un-stack the deck, and how we're going to make it
possible for more people to have the experience I had. (Clinton, 2015 Oct)

In taking a seemingly cut and dry question and flipping it to create an opportunity to speak of her
experience, Clinton portrayed her ability to take action and be a leader, in addition to avoiding to
answer a difficult question. Her Children's Defense Fund experience shaped her beliefs and had
helped in her decisiveness when it comes to issues. In continually using her Children’s Defense Fund as an asset, she underscored that this was one of her first major steps in building a legacy as a leader.

To continue on a similar note, when asked, “You spearheaded the reset with Russia. Did you underestimate the Russians, and as president, what would your response to Vladimir Putin be right now in Syria?” Clinton began her answer with what the United States government accomplished in Russia while she was Secretary of State.

Well, first of all, we got a lot of business done with the Russians when Medvedev was the president and not Putin. We got a nuclear arms deal, we got the Iranian sanctions, we got an ability to bring important material and equipment to our soldiers in Afghanistan.

(Clinton, 2015 Oct)

Through highlighting her accomplishments with the Russian government, Clinton showed her decisiveness in getting important issues taken care of. In getting a nuclear arms deal, the Iranian sanctions, and materials to the soldiers in Afghanistan, Clinton reminded the viewers of her leadership abilities and her willingness to take action on world issues. These world issues hold a seriousness that her work with the Children's Defense Fund lacked. Her leadership abilities continued to grow throughout her career, which Clinton portrayed with her work within international affairs.

Additionally, in the first Democratic debate of 2016, Clinton’s last name came up as a reason as to why she should not be elected. Anderson Cooper mentioned Governor O’Malley saying “the presidency is not a crown to be passed back and forth between two royal families.” He then asked, "Why should Democrats embrace an insider like yourself?" Clinton responded thoughtfully by saying:
I'm running because I have a lifetime of experience in getting results and fighting for people, fighting for kids, for women, for families, fighting to even the odds. And I know what it takes to get things done. I know how to find common ground and I know how to stand my ground. And I think we're going to need both of those in Washington to get anything that we're talking about up here accomplished. So I'm very happy that I have both the commitment of a lifetime and the experience of a lifetime to bring together to offer the American people. Well, I would not ask anyone to vote for me based on my last name. I would ask them to listen to what I'm proposing, look at what I've accomplished in the Senate, as Secretary of State, and then draw your own conclusion. (Clinton, 2015 Oct)

Instead of focusing on her last name or her husband’s time in office, as the moderator questioned, Clinton chose to focus on her potential as president. She focused on her ability to "get things done" and "stand her ground." In doing so, Clinton was able to divert the focus of having another Clinton in the White House to what she has done and will continue to do for this country if she is elected president. She wanted her accomplishments and experience as a leader in politics to take precedence over her last name in the election.

Moving on to the debate against Senator Bernie Sanders, Clinton continued focusing on the tasks she has accomplished during her career. She even brought up the first debate of the 2016 campaign.

If I could, you know, in the very first debate I was asked am I a moderate or a progressive and I said I'm a progressive who likes to get things done. Cherry picking a quote here or there doesn’t change my record of having fought for racial justice, having fought for kids’ rights, having fought the kind of inequities that fueled my interest in service in the
first place going back to my days in the Children’s Defense Fund. It certainly didn’t stop me from taking on the drug companies and the insurance companies. Before it was called Hillarycare — I mean, before it was called ObamaCare it was called Hillarycare because we took them on, and we weren’t successful, but we kept fighting and we got the children’s health insurance program. Every step along the way I have stood up, and fought, and have the scars to prove it. (Clinton, 2016 Feb)

Just as in the past, Clinton went back to her tried and true work with the Children’s Defense Fund and her health care reform efforts. In doing so, she reinforces the idea that she is a leader who works hard to accomplish tasks and tackle issues of importance to her. Her ideals remained similar throughout her career, and she has not stopped working to fix the problems in the system in regards to children's care and health care. Additionally, she established a clear line from her work to reform national health care by slipping in the term “Hillarycare,” as the reform efforts were termed "Hillarycare" before they were "Obamacare." Her efforts made progress but ultimately did not pan out. She mentioned that she stills has the “scars to prove it,” which showed that she had no plans backing down, and does not regret even a failed effort. Her continued efforts are showing that she can be a decisive leader in government.

Lastly, Clinton attempted to portray leadership abilities in her commitment to change multiple issues in our country. Clinton was asked, “So there are three big lifts that you’ve talked about: immigration, gun reform, climate change. What do you do first? Because you know the first one is the one you have the best shot at getting done.” (Todd, 2016 Feb) Clinton did not want to accept the premise of only getting one big task accomplished during her presidency if elected. “I don’t want to just stop bad things from happening, I want to start good things
happening.” She then went into great detail of all of the good she wants to help create, which includes, but is not limited to:

1. Half a billion more solar panels deployed in the first four years
2. Enough clean energy to power every home in the next four years
3. 100% health coverage and bringing down the cost of prescription drugs
4. Paid family leave
5. Early childhood education
6. Do more for small business
7. Immigration reform
8. Economic revitalization with manufacturing (Clinton, 2016 Feb)

While the above list consists of typical traits and issues of concern for politicians, they are consistent with the rhetoric of Clinton's campaigns. On multiple occasions, Clinton has claimed to be a "progressive who gets things done." In being a person that gets things done, Clinton prepared a plan and a list of important issues that she would immediately begin working on when taking office if elected. In addition to being a proper leader, a politician must also have competence.

**Competence and logos.** To begin, one consistent thread in all four debates was the intentional inclusion of Clinton’s political tenure multiple times in each debate, which highlighted her competence as a politician. As stated previously in the Literature Review, competence indicates experience, knowledge, and intelligence, which aligns nicely with the rhetorical idea of logos. Logos focuses on the message, as it is an appeal to reason. Through using her intelligence and experience, Clinton used logos in giving her message. In the first debate of 2008, Clinton touched on being a senator in New York since September 11, 2001, as
well as working for universal health care since 1993. Having such tenure in politics can show competence in a difficult career. While discussing the events of 9/11, Clinton expressed her desire to make America safe, and how she has tried to convince the administration to take action to make America safer.

You know, we haven’t secured our borders, our ports, our mass transit systems. You can go across this country and see so much that has not been done . . . I think that this administration has consistently tried to hype the fear without delivering on the promise of making America safer. (Clinton, 2007 Apr.)

Clinton is displaying competence by implying that if she or any other Democrat were in office in 2001, America would be safer now than it is. She is suggesting that the Republican party listened to, and ignored her ideas. By giving dates such as 1993 and 2001, Clinton is reminding viewers and possibly other candidates of her tenure in public service, and showing that she has been a leader for over twenty years. Part of the rhetoric of logos is using data to support claims, and by speaking to her tenure, Clinton used her political career as an illustration of her competence and longevity as a politician.

Her tenure was an important aspect of her competence, but the ideas and plans on display during the debate were equally, if not more, important. Still, in the first debate of 2008, Clinton used every opportunity to discuss her plans for the future, whether that was what the specific question warranted or not. Specifically, when responding to her vote for the Iraq war, Clinton took responsibility for her vote, claiming, she "did as good of a job as I could at the time." She then turned the topic of her ‘bad’ vote into what happens next:

But I think the real question before us is, what do we do now? How do we try to persuade or require this president to change course? He is stubbornly refusing to listen to the will
of the American people. He threatens to veto the legislation we passed, which has been something that all of us have been advocating for a number of years now. And I can only hope that he will not veto it. And I can only end by saying that, you know, if the president does not get us out of Iraq, when I’m president, I will. (Clinton, 2007 Apr.)

Although she indeed voted in favor of the Iraq war, Clinton did not focus on her vote. As was mentioned earlier, she took the stance that she had changed her mind based on new information and used the new information to advocate for her presidency and the Democratic party. Taking responsibility, even though she quickly diverted from the comments about her vote, potentially shows integrity. She was willing to admit when she made a mistake, and she was able to see that her vote was a mistake. Looking to the future demonstrates competence for a couple of reasons. First, it simply indicates that she has plans for her presidency that are different than what the current administration is doing. Secondly, diverting the question with a plan for her prospective presidency displays logic because focusing on the greater good appears smarter than focusing on her history which is perceived in a negative light.

To add to the competence conversation, tenure and her plans were Clinton’s main gateways to showing her competence in the debate with Senator Barack Obama. Her tenure was subtly brought up when she explained that health care "is the passionate cause of my public service." She explained how she started trying to expand health care before Bill Clinton's administration, during his presidency, and after. Furthermore, when asked about comprehensive immigration reform and her lack of action in regards to it, Clinton brought her tenure in politics into the conversation yet again by stating "Well, actually, I co-sponsored comprehensive immigration reform in 2004 before Barack came to the Senate. So I’ve been on record for some time" (Clinton, 2008 Jan). Clinton assertively stated that she has been in the political realm
before Obama. Her comment could have been to show that she believes that more experience makes for a better leader.

Something new in the Clinton/Obama debate was Clinton's referencing to leaders who have shown support for her in the election. For example, while talking about the Iraqi war, Clinton said: "I am so proud to have the support of leaders like Congresswoman Maxine Waters, who is here with us tonight, who was one of the -- who was one of the original conveners of the Out of Iraq Caucus" (Clinton, 2008 Jan). By saying who Waters is and why she is important to the topic, Clinton established Waters as a leader. By having Waters’ support, Clinton was able to portray that she, too, is competent in her political work because other important leaders have seen what she can do.

In addition to her tenure and support, her ideas for her time in office showed competence in the second debate. For example, her plan for health care expansion was split into three steps:

1. Tell the health insurance industry that they can “no longer deny coverage to anyone and they have to cover everyone, including every pre-existing condition.”
   Additionally, “they have to compete on cost and quality” so that everyone, regardless of conditions are covered.

2. “We've got to make it clear to the drug companies that they do deserve to be part of the solution, because we all benefit from the life-saving remedies they come up with, but we pay for it many times over.”

3. “As Democrats, we carry the banner of universal health care. The health insurance industry is very clever and extremely well-funded.” (Clinton, 2008 Jan)

In splitting her plan into three clear and logical phases, Clinton was able to communicate her message while showing her knowledge and intelligence clearly.
The 2016 campaign trail seemed to provide more of the same when it came to competence abilities. Clinton’s tenure in politics and her plans for change continued as her platform for showing competence. Beginning in her opening statement, Clinton states “I have been proud and privileged to serve as First Lady, a senator from New York, and as Secretary of State.” As opposed to 2008, Clinton began 2016 with a summary of her accomplishments that portray her lengthy political career.

When questioning began in the first Democratic debate of the 2016 election, Clinton was asked if she were a progressive or a moderate, because she had been caught on different occasions saying both. Clinton then asserts “I’m a progressive. But I’m a progressive who likes to get things done. And I know… how to find common ground, and I know how to stand my ground, and I have proved that in every position that I’ve had . . .” In this scenario, Clinton directly answered the question and then elaborated different times she has proven her abilities to stand her ground. For example, “… reforming foster care and adoption to the Children’s Health Insurance Program, which insures… 8 million kids. So I have a long history of getting things done, rooted in the same values… I’ve always had” (Clinton, 2015 Oct). Keeping the same values falls under integrity, but can also be seen as competence since Clinton had the knowledge and intelligence to refer to her political experience and the good that resulted.

In addition to her tenure, Clinton was able to show competence in her comprehensive plans. For example, when asked about her plans for college affordability, Social Security expansion, and Medicare, Clinton had a very logical answer in that she believed free tuition should be implemented at public colleges, but working through college is important.

But I do believe - and maybe it's because I worked when I went through college; I worked when I went through law school - I think it's important for everybody to have
some part of getting this accomplished. That's why I call it a compact. But, yes, I would like students to work 10 hours a week in order to make it possible for them to afford their education. And I want colleges to get their costs down. They are outrageously high in what they're charging. (Clinton, 2015 Oct)

Here, she is using her personal experience, as well as what the Democratic party would assume as common sense in getting costs for colleges down to help young Americans get the education they deserve. However, she still wants students to work part-time during school, so they have a part in paying for their school, which she believes helps build character, as it did with her. Clinton was competent in using her knowledge and past experiences to create a plan that she believes is the best and most logical case scenario with public colleges and universities.

Continuing with her plans, Clinton was asked if she would support expanding Social Security and making Medicare available to all Americans. Clinton has a plan where she does not want to expand Social Security without working with what is already available first. She wants to help those who need it most, which is something she has attempted to do her entire career.

I want to enhance the benefits for the poorest recipients of Social Security. We have a lot of women on Social Security, particularly widowed and single women who didn't make a lot of money during their careers, and they are impoverished, and they need more help from the Social Security system. And I will focus - I will focus on helping those people who need it the most. And of course I'm going to defend Social Security. I'm going to look for ways to try to make sure it's solvent into the future. And we also need to talk about health care at some time, because we agree on the goals, we just disagree on the means. (Clinton, 2015 Oct)
Clinton was able to show her competence in a couple different ways when discussing Social Security and Medicaid. First, she realizes that government plans such as Social Security are not a “one size fits all” type of situation. Clinton sees that there are some people that need more help than others, and that could be a result of her experience in politics and her work with trying to get universal health care in the 1990’s. Moreover, Clinton took the opportunity to transition into a topic that has been of interest to her for the span of her political career, health care. She is knowledgeable of health care reform, as she spent the entirety of her career fighting for it. Clinton is well-aware of her experience and what makes her intelligent and competent, so she mentions it whenever possible. Her rhetoric in these situations can translate in a couple of different ways with the voters. The first is that the public could potentially view Clinton as someone experienced and poised to take office. On the other hand, voters could see her consistent mentioning of her accomplishments as pretentious, dependent on the beliefs of the voters.

To continue with the 2016 campaign, in the first debate against Senator Bernie Sanders, Clinton’s tenure remained to be in the spotlight, along with the pressing issues the United States had to deal with and change. Early in the debate, Clinton took the opportunity to remind viewers of what she said in the first debate of 2016. As stated in the leadership section, as the characteristics of a politician have some overlap:

Cherry picking a quote here or there doesn’t change my record of having fought for racial justice, having fought for kid’s rights, having fought the kind of inequities that fueled my interest in service in the first place going back to my days in the Children’s Defense Fund. (Clinton, 2016 Feb)
By going back to her time at the Children’s Defense Fund, Clinton gives voters an idea of how long she has been in public service, and that even before her political tenure, she was still working hard to fix inequities. Later on in the debate, Clinton defends the notion that people support her because they know of the work she has done and know that she will continue to get things done by saying “People support me because they know me. They know my life’s work” (Clinton, 2016 Feb). Throughout the debate, Clinton urged voters to look at her record when undesirable information came up to diverge from the question or comment to look at what she has done as a leader in politics for years. When asked about releasing her speeches to Goldman Sachs, Clinton said she would look into it, but to look at her record. She quickly took the question and turned it to what she has, and wants to continue to do if she is elected president. Clinton seemingly believes that her tenure in politics is the greatest way to indicate her competence and capabilities.

Additionally, as a strategy to show her competence, Clinton referenced governors and other Vermont leaders in the audience who support her over Sanders, as she did in 2008 with Maxine Waters. “And I think it’s because they’ve worked with me, they’ve seen what I do.” By using governors and senators from Sanders’ home state of Vermont, it can be assumed that Clinton was referring to her competence while questioning Sanders’ ability to be a successful president. While having support of other leaders shows ability in herself, it is also a logical move on Clinton’s part to bring up on the debate stage.

In the final debate, Clinton was persistent in her attempts at showing competence. Just as in the past debates, Clinton mentioned universal health care and her progress in achieving health care for all. However, in this debate, she showed competence through her plans to build upon the progress that has been made through Obamacare instead of starting over.
I think that would be a great mistake, to once again plunge our country into a contentious debate about whether we should have and what kind of system we should have for healthcare. I want to build on the progress we’ve made; go from 90 percent coverage to 100 percent coverage. And I don’t want to rip away the security that people finally have; 18 million people now have healthcare; preexisting conditions are no longer a bar. So we have a difference. (Clinton, 2016 Feb)

In the above excerpt, Clinton recognizes progress has been made and starting over would hurt more people than it would help. She argues that there have been seemingly positive changes with health care with the Obama administration and Clinton wants to add to it and continue the growth instead of starting over which shows logical thinking because she used her experiences in fighting for health care reform to make a valid argument.

On a similar note, Clinton quickly demonstrated competence by touching upon her views on affordable college, the minimum wage, and equal pay for equal work in a way that appears to show not only what she wants, but what can actually happen.

I also believe in affordable college, but I don’t believe in free college, because every expert that I have talked to says, look, how will you ever control the costs. What I want to do is make sure middle class kids, not Donald Trump’s kids, get to be able to afford college . . . And of course, I believe in raising the minimum wage and equal pay for work. But the numbers just don’t add up, from what Senator Sanders has been proposing. That’s why all of the independent experts, all of the editorial boards that have vetted both of us have concluded that it is just not achievable. (Clinton, 2016 Feb)

Although some may see singling out his family as an attack on Republican candidate Donald Trump, Clinton makes a few valid points that underscore her competence. First, she believes the
people who need help affording college should get the help. People with money would not need to benefit from a discounted education. Additionally, she brings in expert opinions to say having free college is not plausible, just like raising the minimum wage as high as her opponent, Senator Sanders, wants to is not possible. In the debate against Sanders, Clinton showed competence by explaining her plans to the public, while also being reasonable to what can be accomplished.

Lastly, Clinton made sure to note her experience in politics, specifically her tenure as Secretary of State as a selling point of her competence. “I’ve said this before and I’m very proud of it, that when it comes to judgment, having run a hard race against Senator Obama at the time, he turned to me to be Secretary of State.” Although Clinton lost the presidential campaign against Obama, she was still able to turn that time into a positive because Obama saw her as a valuable member of his team through being Secretary of State. She then went into detail about her time as Secretary of State in saying:

And when it comes to the biggest counterterrorism issues that we faced in this administration, namely whether or not to go after bin Laden, I was at that table, I was exercising my judgment to advise the president on what to do, on that, on Iran, on Russia on China, on a whole raft of issues. (Clinton, 2016 Feb)

Clinton’s experience in major international events, such as finding and killing terrorist Osama bin Laden, insinuated that she was competent in her Secretary of State position and she implied that the same level of experience and intelligence would continue in her presidency if elected. To continue with the core characteristics of a politician, integrity is examined in the following section.

**Integrity and ethos.** As referenced in the Literature Review, integrity in a candidate shows their honesty and morality, which fits well with ethos, as ethos brings the rhetorical focus
to a person’s character. Clinton's integrity did not appear to be her main focus in the first debate of 2008's election. There was only one instance where she attempted to bring her integrity into the bigger picture because she was called out by John Edwards about voting for the Iraq war. Moderator Brian Williams allowed Clinton to respond to Edwards' accusations. Clinton took responsibility for her vote, showing a hallmark of integrity. “Well, Brian, I take responsibility for my vote. Obviously I did as good a job I could at the time. It was a sincere vote based on the information available to me." Clinton quickly stated, "And I've said many times that if I knew then what I now know, I would not have voted that way” (Clinton, 2007 Apr.). Although she was honest about her vote and did not lie, she also spent very little time on the topic of her past vote. Clinton wanted the first debate to be about her plans and her leadership more than her integrity as a candidate.

In the Clinton/Obama debate, Clinton references her integrity more than she does in the first debate, although it was yet again used less than leadership and competence. In this sense, integrity is defined a person having moral and honest intentions in all they do. First, when the topic of comprehensive immigration reform is mentioned, Clinton has integrity in her response to allowing immigrants into the country. “We want to -- we want to be fair to people. We want to respect the dignity of every human being, every person who is here” (Clinton, 2008 Jan). Respect, fairness, and dignity all show a moral compass and integrity in a difficult situation.

Referencing to another use of integrity in the debate versus Senator Obama, Clinton was asked about her husband and why another Clinton should be in the White House. She showed her integrity in wanting to be judged on her own merits, and not her husband’s.

But I think that what's great about our political system is that we are all judged on our own merits. We come forward to the American public and it's the most grueling political
process one can imagine. We start from the same place. Nobody has an advantage no
matter who you are or where you came from. You have to raise the money. You have to
make the case for yourself. (Clinton, 2008 Jan)

Here, Clinton asserts the fact that she wants to be judged based on what she has done in the past
and that she started from the same place as Senator Obama and any other candidate in the
presidential race. She realizes that she needs to make the case for herself and that she cannot rely
on her husband. She wants the American people to vote for her because they see her as the
candidate with the most integrity, and she shows her integrity by being honest about the
campaign trail. She is not her husband or anyone else; she is Senator Hillary Clinton, presidential
candidate.

Moving on to 2016, Clinton had her integrity questioned from the get-go due to her email
scandal, which has been mentioned in more detail in the Literature Review section of this paper.
Moderator Anderson Cooper asked

Secretary Clinton, you are going to be testifying before Congress next week about your e-
mails. For the last eight months, you haven't been able to put this issue behind you. You
dismissed it; you joked about it; you called it a mistake. What does that say about your
ability to handle far more challenging crises as president? (Cooper, 2015 Oct)

Clinton began by simply addressing the fact that she had taken responsibility for the emails, as
Anderson's comments before the question made it seem otherwise. She went on to say, "I did say
it was a mistake. What I did was allowed by the State Department, but it wasn't the best choice."
Although she took responsibility, she also dismissed the responsibility to a degree by saying that
her actions were permitted. However, Clinton did talk about everything she has done in an effort
to right her wrong.
And I have been as transparent as I know to be, turning over 55,000 pages of my e-mails, asking that they be made public. And you're right. I am going to be testifying. I've been asking to testify for some time and to do it in public, which was not originally agreed to.

(Clinton, 2015 Oct.)

By testifying in public, Clinton attempted to make the situation better. Although the initial situation did not show much integrity in the eyes of many voters and politicians, it can be said by some that her response to the situation has been honest since her response was public. She continued to say that she believes the issue is legitimate, and she has answered and will continue to answer questions given to her about the situation in an attempt to show integrity.

Once the topic of emails ended for the night, Clinton was asked if she regrets her vote on the Patriot Act, as she supported it. Clinton kept her answer short and honest when saying that she does not regret her vote. She then discussed how the Bush administration took the Patriot Act the wrong way, but she did not regret her vote.

No, I don't. I think that it was necessary to make sure that we were able after 9/11 to put in place the security that we needed. And it is true that it did require that there be a process. What happened, however, is that the Bush administration began to chip away at that process. And I began to speak out about their use of warrantless surveillance and the other behavior that they engaged in. We always have to keep the balance of civil liberties, privacy and security. It's not easy in a democracy, but we have to keep it in mind.

(Clinton, 2015 Oct)

Clinton was able to show integrity by standing up for her decision to vote for the Patriot Act, even if it did not go the way she had thought when she voted. She honestly thought that there
needed to be a plan in action after the September 11th attacks on our country, and at the time, she believed the Patriot Act was the solution.

In the final debate analyzed against Bernie Sanders, Clinton was asked about her morality on multiple occasions, with the first being her speaking circuit after she left the Secretary of State position. Moderator, Rachel Maddow, asked, “When you were asked about speaking fees and the amount of speaking fees you got from Goldman Sachs speeches, you said that’s what they offered. Have you been too dismissive of voters’ concerns about this issue in your own campaign and your own career?” (Maddow, 2016 Feb) Clinton responded with more detail about her time on the speaking circuit in saying “. . . I did go on the speaking circuit. I spoke to heart doctors, I spoke to the American Camping Association, I spoke to auto dealers, and yes, I spoke to firms on Wall Street. They wanted me to talk about the world, what my experience had been as Secretary of State” (Clinton, 2016 Feb). Clinton used other speaking engagements to counteract the idea of her speaking to leaders of Wall Street. In using doctors, the American Camping Association, and auto dealers, it appears that Clinton is attempting offset the negative appearance of Wall Street with American blue collar workers and respected doctors to show integrity. She is saying that even though she spoke to firms on Wall Street, she also spoke with anyone wanting to hear her speeches; Wall Street just happens to be the focus. She also attempted morality and integrity by agreeing to an audit of her speeches if the party decided that is what they wanted to do by answering “Whatever they decide to do, that’s fine.” In agreeing to an audit, Clinton made an effort at integrity by allowing the public to see her speeches to Wall Street. To allow the transcripts of her speeches to be leaked, Clinton showed that she had nothing to hide.
Similar to the questionable morals in giving the speeches, the 2016 email scandal, which is detailed more in the Literature Review section of this paper, was one of Clinton’s biggest obstacles to overcome as it injured the public’s perception of her integrity. Moderator Chuck Todd asked about the open FBI investigation. “Are you 100 percent confident that nothing is going to come out of this FBI investigation?” Clinton’s response seemed very serious when she replied

I am 100 percent confident. This is a security review that was requested. It is being carried out. It will be resolved. But I have to add if there’s going to be a security review about me, there’s going to have to be security reviews about a lot of other people, including Republican office holders, because we’ve got this absurd situation of retroactive classifications. (Clinton, 2016 Feb)

She is not saying what she did with the emails was the correct decision; she claimed in the previous debate that she wishes she could have acted differently, which portrays an honesty which is not seen much in politics, as well as the reality that she had been caught. However, she then quickly chooses to mention the other security issues with Republicans and other office holders because she is not the only person who should have a security review. Clinton ends by saying “So I have absolutely no concerns about it, but we’ve got to get to the bottom of what’s really going on here, and I hope that will happen” (Clinton, 2016 Feb). Clinton appears confident that at the end of the investigation, her integrity will be intact because she arguably did not do anything illegal. With her integrity in question during the 2016 election, it was important for Clinton to appeal to her audience through empathy and pathos.

**Empathy and pathos.** The final trait to consider in a candidate’s qualifications is empathy, which shows the ability to understand the problems of other people. Empathy and
pathos fit nicely together, as pathos focuses on the beliefs of the audience. Clinton has been described as being weak in the area of empathy, even though empathy is the only trait considered feminine in the four core characteristics, meaning society expects women to be more empathetic than men. Clinton attempted to show empathy during the first Democratic debate I watched in a few different ways. First, when she was asked if the government played a role in the Virginia Tech massacre, Clinton said yes and then went on to talk about her time as First Lady and Columbine. She reminisced saying:

Yes. You know, I remember very well when I accompanied Bill to Columbine after that massacre and met with the family members of those who had been killed and talked with the students, and feeling that we had to do more to try to keep guns out of the hands of the criminal and of the mentally unstable. (Clinton, 2007 Apr.)

In discussing her visiting with family members of the deceased and the students of Virginia Tech, Clinton attempts empathy by showing that she understands the feelings of those affected and that she was there to comfort the distraught community at Virginia Tech. While she did not talk about her own tragedy or feelings, she attempted to connect with those who hurt.

In addition to the Virginia Tech massacre, Clinton shows empathy when talking about the attacks of September 11, 2001, and her time as a senator. She said, "having been a senator during 9/11, I understand very well the extraordinary horror of that kind of an attack and the impact that it has far beyond those who are directly affected" (Clinton. 2007 Apr.). Her statement seemed to be Clinton's way of relating to the country because of 9/11. She understands that the entire country was affected in some way, even if voters did not know any victims as that day changed the course of United States forever.
Her final attempt at empathy came during her last question of the first debate. Clinton was asked whether or not Walmart is a blessing or a curse to this country. Clinton responded that Walmart is a mixed blessing due to the accessibility of goods in rural areas. “... when Walmart started, it brought goods into rural areas, like rural Arkansas, where I was happy to live for 18 years, and gave people a chance to stretch their dollar further” (Clinton, 2007 Apr.). In adding that she was happy to live in rural Arkansas for 18 years, Clinton is attempting to relate to those who live in the same types of rural areas, whether it is Arkansas or not. As previously stated, the rhetorical ideas of pathos relate to and persuade the targeted audience. In living in rural Arkansas, Clinton used pathos to answer a question about Walmart.

Moving on to the first debate against Senator Barack Obama in 2008, Clinton used the stories of the citizens she has spoken with to portray her understanding of the problems of other people. An example of this came when comprehensive immigration reform was mentioned. Clinton began by stating facts that resonated with the American public:

I believe that in many parts of our country, because of employers who exploit undocumented workers and drive down wages, there are job losses. And I think we should be honest about that. There are people who have been pushed out of jobs and factories and meat processing plants, and all kinds of settings. And I meet them. (Clinton, 2008 Jan.)

In discussing the jobs and wages lost by American workers to undocumented workers, Clinton brings to light that there are many citizens that are struggling to make ends meet due to undocumented workers working for less money under the table. She then goes into a specific detail from a man she met in Atlanta.
You know, I was in Atlanta last night, and an African-American man said to me, "I used to have a lot of construction jobs, and now it just seems like the only people who get them anymore are people who are here without documentation." So, I know that what we have to do is to bring our country together to have a comprehensive immigration reform solution. (Clinton, 2008 Jan.)

The construction worker in Atlanta is an example of Clinton's attempts at emotional appeal. She has not been in that kind of situation herself, as she is a politician; but her constituents have been. Because of this, she is portraying the problems of the people on the bigger debate stage to show that she does understand and that she will work to have a solution to comprehensive immigration reform. She uses the man in Atlanta to demonstrate that she listens to the problems of the people, understands where they are coming from and will work to fix them.

Likewise, in the first Democratic debate of 2016, Clinton attempted to understand the problems of other people with her emotional appeals. What appears to be her best use of pathos comes when she talks about the challenges of the working mother in the debate on paid maternity leave.

I remember as a young mother, you know, having a baby wake up who was sick and I'm supposed to be in court, because I was practicing law. I know what it's like. And I think we need to recognize the incredible challenges that so many parents face, particularly working moms. I see my good friend, Senator Gillibrand, in the front row. She's been a champion of this. We need to get a consensus through this campaign, which is why I'm talking about it everywhere I go, and we need to join the rest of the advanced world in having it. (Clinton, 2015 Oct.)
Clinton’s life experiences as a working mother can help her in relating to other working mothers who want to spend time with their babies. She had to juggle a job and being a mother, and so she wants others to know that she understands their struggles because she has been through them herself. From a rhetorical standpoint, Clinton uses an appeal to the emotions of other working moms in hopes that they see that because she has been through it herself, she will make the changes needed to get paid maternity leave in our country.

Clinton continued to show empathy in the first Democratic debate of 2016 when she was asked, “In all candor, you and your husband are part of the one percent. How can you credibly represent the views of the middle class?” Clinton made it known that she was not born in the one percent through her response. She stated:

Well, you know, both Bill and I have been very blessed. Neither of us came from wealthy families and we've worked really hard our entire lives. And I want to make sure every single person in this country has the same opportunities that he and I have had, to make the most of their God-given potential and to have the chances that they should have in America for a good education, good job training, and then good jobs. (Clinton, 2015 Oct.)

In her response, Clinton once again used her personal experiences to relate to the issues the middle class face. She used her and her husband’s work ethic in her favor to portray empathy so that the audience can relate and emote. She then used her experiences to attempt to give the rest of the country the same opportunity on her election platform.

Moving onto the debate versus Senator Bernie Sanders, there were a few instances in which Clinton used rhetoric in an attempt to appeal to understanding the problems of other everyday people. She began to show empathy while talking about the Wall Street crash victims.
“I mean, look, I care deeply about this because just like you I have met so many people who had their life savings wiped out, who lost their homes, who are barely back with their heads above water” (Clinton, 2016 Feb). Through speaking briefly about meeting those who struggled due to the Wall Street crash, Clinton is attempting to tell voters that she understands what they went through and will do anything she can to prevent the same type of situation from happening again. Although she did not go through the issues herself, she connects to the emotions of everyday Americans to use pathos as a rhetorical strategy in the debate.

In addition to Wall Street, Clinton's greatest showing of empathy came when the Flint, Michigan water crisis was mentioned in the debate. Clinton asserted that she would go above the wishes of the state to help resolve the situation in Flint. She then made an effort of empathy in bringing up the needs of the children of Flint, Michigan.

This is an emergency. Every day that goes by that these people, particularly the children, are not tested so we can know what steps must be taken to try to remediate the effects of the poisoning that they have been living with is a day lost in a child’s life. I know from the work that I’ve done over so many years, lead, the toxic nature of lead can affect you brain development, your body development, your behavior. (Clinton, 2016 Feb.) Here, Clinton uses the livelihood of children to connect with the voters, as children are the future. In bringing up the urgency of the situation, Clinton is showing that she understands how much of a problem the water in Flint is to the people of Flint, Michigan. While she is not in Flint, and cannot first-hand understand the struggle, she is acknowledging that there is a problem that she feels needs to be fixed.

Empathy, along with leadership, competence, and integrity is integral characteristics of a successful politician. Clinton made an attempt in each of the four debates to display the traits of a
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politician. After exploring the qualities of the candidate at hand, it is important to explore the specific findings of the study.

Other Findings

Unexpected moderator bias. When watching a debate, it is expected that the moderators keep an unbiased front with the candidates in order to keep the debate fair. However, this did not occur in the majority of the debates. Bias is defined in this sense as prejudice against a particular person. In this case, there seemed to be bias against Clinton in three of the debates from the moderators and not the other candidates. Beginning with the first Democratic debate of the 2008 campaign, Brian Williams was the moderator. For the most part, he stayed neutral. However, he did attempt to get the other candidates to go against Clinton. For example, when speaking with Senator John Edwards, Williams asked a question directly about Clinton:

Senator Edwards, you made a high profile apology for your vote in favor of the Iraq war resolution. You have said, quote, "We need a leader who will be open and honest, who will tell the truth when they made a mistake." Was that not a direct shot at your opponent, Senator Clinton? (Williams, 2007 Apr.)

Edwards kept his answer professional, saying, “No, I think that's a question for the conscience of anybody who voted for this war. I mean, Senator Clinton and anyone else who voted for this war has to search themselves and decide whether they believe they've voted the right way; if so, they can support their vote” (Edwards, 2007 Apr.). When singling out Clinton in Edwards’ question, it put both Edwards and Clinton in an uncomfortable place. After Edwards finished speaking Williams allowed Clinton to respond by saying “Senator Clinton, I owe you a response, probably, in terms of your vote” (Williams, 2007 Apr.). The use of probably insinuates that Williams believed that even though he directly brought Clinton’s name up in a negative way, her
response was not necessary. However, she responded about her decision in a businesslike manner.

Additionally, Williams brought up the negative public opinion of Clinton, while not mentioning the public opinion of any other contender. “Senator Clinton, recent national polls indicate the majority of the general public has an unfavorable view of you right now at this point in time. Why do you think Republicans are looking forward to running against you with so much zeal” (Williams, 2007 Apr.)? Clinton answered his question in a skilled manner when saying:

Well, Brian, you'd have to ask them. I'm sure that they would give you all the reasons.

But from my perspective, it may have something to do with the fact that I have stood up for what I believed in. . . . You know, I take it as a perverse form of flattery, actually, that if they weren't worried, they would not be so vitriolic in their criticism of me, because I believe that the country is ready for change. (Clinton, 2007 Apr.)

The question about public opinion seemed extremely one-sided, especially since there were not similar questions directed at the other candidates. Additionally, in asking why Republicans are looking forward to running against her, Williams alludes to the idea that she would lose to the Republican Party if she made it that far in the election. This type of language and forced questioning was not present in the debate with Clinton's competitors, which shows moderator bias by Williams.

It is important to note that Williams asked uncomfortable questions to each candidate in a segment which he entitled "the elephant in the room", where he focused on something the candidate had said or done that turned into something controversial. Clinton's question was about burgeoning hedge funds in New York. However, Williams never referenced other candidates in questions to other contenders, as he did with Clinton to Senator Edwards.
Going forth to the debate versus Senator Barack Obama in 2008, the moderator bias was evident. Wolf Blitzer was the main moderator in the Clinton/Obama debate with Doyle McManus and Jeanne Cummings asking occasional questions. Starting early, Blitzer was similar to Williams in the previous debate when making Obama’s answers or actions “swipes” against Clinton. In particular, Obama was answering a question about healthcare when he said “...And the antidote to that is making sure that anybody in America who needs health care is going to get it” (Obama, 2008 Jan). The end of Obama’s health care segment had no intentional attacks on Clinton, yet Blitzer still said “I just want to be precise, and I'll let Senator Clinton respond. But you say broadcast on C-SPAN these deliberations. Is that a swipe at Senator Clinton because...” before Obama quickly interrupted and said “No, it’s not a swipe. . .” to abruptly stop any further assumptions from taking place. In announcing assumed swipes at Clinton by Obama, Blitzer appears to make both candidates uncomfortable by stirring the metaphorical pot and attempts to create issues out of statements that did not warrant problems.

Almost immediately after the presumed "swipes," Blitzer made another seemingly negative remark to Clinton's political ethos in stating "Senator Clinton, we remember in '93, when you were formulating your health care plan, it was done in secret” (Blitzer, 2008 Jan.). Being secretive is typically not a positive asset for politicians to be known for, so by Blitzer insinuating Clinton is secretive, he may have been showing moderator bias. Clinton simply responded by stating “Well, it was an effort to try to begin this conversation, which we're now continuing. It has been a difficult conversation. There have been a lot of efforts” (Clinton, 2008 Jan.). She did not buy into Blitzer’s unfavorable comments. Instead of focusing on the bias of Blitzer, Clinton explained why she kept quiet at first.
Again in the debate against Obama, Blitzer yet again attempted to put negative words about Senator Clinton into Obama’s discussion. The conversation went as followed:

BLITZER: Are you suggesting that Senator Clinton's policy was not, in your words, "humane"?

OBAMA: That is -- what I said was that we have to stand up for these issues when it's tough, and that's what I've done. I did it when I was in the state legislature, sponsoring the Illinois version of the DREAM Act, so that children who were brought here through no fault of their own are able to go to college, because we actually want well-educated kids in our country who are able to -- who are able to succeed and become part of this economy and part of the American dream.

BLITZER: Was she lacking on that front? (my italics)

OBAMA: Wolf, you keep on trying to push on this issue.

BLITZER: I'm just trying to find out what you mean.

OBAMA: There are those who were opposed to this issue, and there have been those who have flipped on the issue and have run away from the issue. This wasn't directed particularly at Senator Clinton. But the fact of the matter is I have stood up consistently on this issue. …

Obama finished his answer and then Blitzer allowed Clinton to respond but did so with a loaded question. He asked "I want to let Senator Clinton respond. But were you missing in action when Senator Obama and Senator McCain and Senator Kennedy started formulating comprehensive immigration reform" (Blitzer, 2008 Jan.)? Instead of simply allowing a response, Blitzer attempted to put Clinton in an uncomfortable position yet again, making his bias clear.
The aforementioned discussion shows Blitzer’s obvious favoritism in multiple areas of the election. First, he had a clear winner chosen before the debate began, as seen through his biased questions toward both Clinton and Obama. He showed clear support of Obama by knocking Clinton down at every opportunity. It begs the question that if Clinton were a man, would the same treatment occur? Secondly, Clinton and her views are assumed to be inhumane by Blitzer, which as a moderator, seems to cross a line. He never questioned Senator Obama's policies the way he questioned Clinton's. To continue on a similar note, Blitzer asked Obama his opinions on Clinton and her policies with implicit bias instead of questioning Clinton herself. If she were a man, would the type of questioning Blitzer used still be appropriate? Lastly, when he finally did allow Clinton to speak, Blitzer framed the question in such a way that she was not a part of the conversation. Instead of simply letting her respond, he asked her if she was "missing in action," which shows apparent prejudice against Senator Clinton, as he never asked Obama questions with the same type of tone.

Later on, in the same debate, Blitzer yet again used the term “clear swipe” at Obama’s plans in regards to Secretary Clinton. Obama ended one of his statements by saying

. . . because I will offer a clear contrast as somebody who never supported this war, thought it was a bad idea. I don't want to just end the war, but I want to end the mindset that got us into war in the first place. That’s the kind of leadership I'm going to provide as president of the United States. (Obama, 2008 Jan.)

Blitzer took the opportunity to once again bring up the fact that Clinton originally voted for the war in Iraq.

BLITZER: Senator Clinton, that's a clear swipe at you. (My italics)

CLINTON: Really?
CLINTON: We're having -- we're having such a good time.

OBAMA: I wouldn't call it a swipe.

CLINTON: We're having such a good time. We are. We are. We're having a wonderful time.

OBAMA: Yes, absolutely.

Clinton laughed off Blitzer’s comment, but that still does not change the fact that Blitzer was clearly against Senator Clinton and favored Obama.

Lastly, Blitzer suggested that Clinton was naïve in trusting President Bush. Blitzer began the question by asking “... if you knew then what you know now, you wouldn't have voted like that. But why can't you just say right now that that vote was a mistake?” Clinton then had a lengthy response, which said

... The idea of putting inspectors back in—that was a credible idea. I believe in coercive diplomacy. ... I think what no one could have fully appreciated is how obsessed this president was with this particular mission. And unfortunately, I and others who warned at the time, who said, let the inspectors finish their work, you know, do not wage a preemptive war, use diplomacy, were just talking to a brick wall. (Clinton, 2008 Jan.)

To which Blitzer responded, “So, what I hear you saying -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- is that you were naïve (my italics) in trusting President Bush” (2008, Jan.)? The audience clearly booed when Blitzer made the specific accusation. Clinton responded, and then Blitzer then questioned Obama about the same issue.

CLINTON: No, that's not what you heard me say. Good try, Wolf. Good try. You know...

BLITZER: Was she naive, Senator Obama?
CLINTON: Well the question was asked to me, I deserve to answer.

BLITZER: I thought you weren't going to answer.

CLINTON: You know, I think that, you know, that is a good try, Wolf.

After asking a biased question that even upset the audience, Clinton was interrupted before she was given a chance to answer. The amount of preference that Blitzer demonstrated towards Senator Barack Obama was obvious due to the amount of times he attempted to discredit Secretary Clinton. There are other instances in which Blitzer shows his moderator bias toward Clinton, but just the most egregious have been highlighted in this analysis.

The 2016 debates were much tamer in comparison to 2008 when it came to moderator bias, specifically against Secretary Clinton, as there was very little to note. Both instances were with Anderson Cooper, the moderator of the first Democratic debate of the 2016 campaign. As other moderators in the past had done, Cooper also insinuated that Clinton changed her political stances to get votes. This was the first question after the opening statement, seemingly starting Clinton off at a disadvantage. Cooper asked a loaded question by saying:

Secretary Clinton, I want to start with you. Plenty of politicians evolve on issues, but even some Democrats believe you change your positions based on political expediency. You were against same-sex marriage. Now you're for it. You defended President Obama's immigration policies. Now you say they're too harsh. You supported his trade deal dozens of times. You even called it the "gold standard." Now, suddenly, last week, you're against it. Will you say anything to get elected? (Cooper, 2015 Oct.)

Clinton attempted to twist the question by talking about the points in which she has been consistent during her political career.
Well, actually, I have been very consistent. Over the course of my entire life, I have always fought for the same values and principles, but, like most human beings - including those of us who run for office - I do absorb new information. I do look at what's happening in the world. You know, take the trade deal. I did say, when I was Secretary of State, three years ago, that I hoped it would be the gold standard. It was just finally negotiated last week, and in looking at it, it didn't meet my standards. My standards for more new, good jobs for Americans, for raising wages for Americans. And I want to make sure that I can look into the eyes of any middle-class American and say, "this will help raise your wages." And I concluded I could not. (Clinton, 2015 Oct.)

Instead of answering a loaded yes or no question, Clinton attempted to show the country her consistency and her high standards in taking the question and flipping it to the positives of her political experience. However, Cooper did not accept the answer, as she did not answer the direct question. His follow-up went as follows:

Secretary Clinton, though, with all due respect, the question is really about political expediency. Just in July, New Hampshire, you told the crowd you'd, quote, “take a back seat to no one when it comes to progressive values.” Last month in Ohio, you said you plead guilty to, quote, “being kind of moderate and center.” Do you change your political identity based on who you're talking to? (Cooper, 2015 Oct.)

To this, Clinton said “No.” before continuing with her answer that yet again went into detail about her political experience and values, which ended with her claiming that she is a “progressive who likes to get things done.”

The biggest difference between this specific example and the similar examples in the 2008 debates is that Cooper began the debate by asking each candidate a question in which the
voters had expressed concern. He began with Clinton but then continued with the hard questions for every candidate. In this sense, he was not biased since he was giving each candidate a difficult question, as opposed to solely Secretary Clinton, as Brian Williams and Wolf Blitzer did in the 2008 debates.

The only other instance of “bias” by Cooper was clearly a joke. Returning from a break, it took Clinton longer to use the restroom than her male counterparts. Cooper made a joke about it which singled her out, but it was an obvious joke in which everyone laughed, including Clinton.

COOPER: And welcome back to this CNN Democratic presidential debate. It has been quite a night so far. We are in the final block of this debate. All the candidates are back, which I'm very happy to see.

(LAUGHTER)

COOPER: It's a long story. Let's continue, shall we? Secretary Clinton, welcome back.

CLINTON: Well, thank you.

(LAUGHTER)

CLINTON: You know, it does take me a little longer. That's all I can say.

The joke by Cooper seemed to be taken in good spirits by Clinton. However, while this is not a specific example of assumed bias, Clinton was inadvertently called out by Cooper for being a woman, as it took her longer to return.

The Clinton v. Sanders debate was the most heated amongst the candidates of the four debates analyzed, but the moderators were seemingly fair. Moderators Chuck Todd and Rachel Maddow kept their parts in the debate specifically on the topics themselves. Any deviation from the topics seemed even for both parties. They both had the other opponent discuss their opinions
on opposing viewpoints, but they did it fairer than any other moderator or group of moderators had done.

The first Clinton v. Sanders debate was the only one of the four that had a female moderator in a main role, which in and of itself, is a point relevant to the argument of a woman’s place in politics. The Obama v. Clinton debate had a woman as a guest moderator where she asked a few questions, but Rachel Maddow was the first female moderator in a main role. Does a female moderator help stop prejudice against other female candidates? The Clinton and Sanders debate at least begs the question. While moderator bias was unexpected, a double bind scenario with Clinton was expected but did not appear.

**Lack of a double bind.** As a reminder, Kathleen Jamieson defines a double bind as “a rhetorical construct that posits two and only two alternatives, one or both penalizing the person being offered them . . . The strategy defines something “fundamental” to women as incompatible with something the woman seeks—be it education, the ballot, or access to the workplace” (1995, p. 13-14). During my research, I was expecting to see Clinton treated differently due to the fact she was a woman running for President of the United States. However, the double bind did not seem to exist in either election, at least in the debates.

Her fellow competitors seemed to respect her and think highly of her and her work in public service, as opposed to shaming her for being a politician and not just a housewife and mother. Even if they did not think highly of her, they more than likely would not publicly express it, as they would risk losing female voters. For example, in the first debate with only Clinton and Obama in 2008, the two were respectful of each other and their policies. Obama stated multiple times throughout the debate that he respected Clinton and her political record. One instance of this came when he said "... I respect Senator Clinton. I think her service to this
country has been extraordinary. And I'm glad that we've been walking on this road together and that we are still on that road . . .” (Obama, 2008 Jan.). His respect for Clinton was the complete opposite of what was expected. Many still believe that the woman is meant to stay home and take care of her children and husband while the man works, or, the double bind. However, Clinton’s male opponent praised her for the service she has given to the public.

The unanticipated respect continued in the 2016 campaign with Senator Sanders. Although their one-on-one debate became heated, Clinton and Sanders still shared a mutual respect for one another. For example, at the start of the debate, Sanders wanted to start with a clean slate. “Let’s deal with some of the comments that Secretary Clinton made. And by the way, you know, sometimes there’s a lot of drama here. I have known Secretary Clinton for 25 years and respect her very much” (Sanders, 2016 Feb). Although they were fighting for the nomination, Sanders made sure the country knew he respected her. He later said, “I happen to respect the Secretary very much; I hope it’s mutual. . .”, and Clinton agreed that the respect is, in fact, mutual.

Coming into the research, a double bind seemed to be a given because there has not been a female president and politics are still male-dominated to this day. However, the opponents respected each other and chose to attack the issues and not the person behind the issues. While her opponents did not always agree with her views, they never attacked her for being a woman running for office. Although the findings were not anticipated, they are still important to explore the full picture of rhetoric in the realm of women in politics.
Chapter 5:

Summation and Discussion of my Research

Reminiscing on this year-long research project, it is important to take a moment to see what truly occurred as a result of my work. It is equally important to see where I could have improved my research and methodology, as well as ideas for new and innovative research on feminist-political rhetoric. It is also vital to reiterate that I began my research for this project in October of 2015; therefore, the final presidential election of 2016 had not yet occurred and the writing may be reflective of that fact.

When first beginning this thesis, I had big ideas. I wanted to focus on both women in the 2016 campaign, Clinton and Republican Carly Fiorina. The debates were only one of many aspects of rhetoric in campaigns I wanted to give my attention. I wanted debates, advertisements, campaign announcements and the media's impact all in one thesis. I am thankful to the committee members who were well-aware of how much work analyzing the debates alone would be.

In reviewing my findings, I found many surprising and unexpected revelations, as well as some expected findings. First, it was interesting to see the references to womanhood evolve over the years. In 2008, it almost appeared as if she was avoiding the gender issue altogether, possibly making it appear as a negative aspect to her campaign. She focused on the points and only the points of her plan if she were to win the presidency. However, in 2016, she referenced her womanhood from her opening statements in her debates, possibly due to the media’s constant criticism of her 2008 campaign. One example of her womanhood references comes from the first debate of the 2016 election when Clinton’s opening statement began with stating: “I'm Hillary Clinton. I have been proud and privileged to serve as first lady, as a senator from New York, and
as Secretary of State. I'm the granddaughter of a factory worker and the grandmother of a wonderful one-year-old child.” (Clinton, 2015 Oct.) Here, she embraced her womanhood from the first minute of the debate, showing a stark contrast. The conscious effort to acknowledge her womanhood could have helped with the popular vote victory in the 2016 campaign as the female population may have been looking for someone to relate to on a more personal level. In that sense, Clinton had an advantage by being a woman.

However, even her attempts at pathos and relatability in 2008 and 2016 did not seem to be enough, and in my opinion were not strong enough. During the debates themselves, Clinton rarely mentioned events that she was directly affected by for emotional appeal. Instead, she would focus on what happened to civilians she’s spoken to. For example, there was a construction worker in Atlanta who kept losing jobs due to undocumented workers (Clinton, 2008 Jan). She felt for him, but at the same time, it did not affect her in any way. She used the story as an example of what needs to change in this country. She’s also attended different events that left an impact, but the emotional appeal seemed to be lacking throughout all of the debates, as none of the events were personal to her.

Even with the lack of pathos in both 2008 and 2016, much of the lack of ethos in 2016 may be tied to her email scandal and the amount of trust the public and other politicians have in her abilities. In rhetoric, having a questionable ethos can destroy a person’s pathos and logos, as all three components are needed in order to be a successful rhetorician. From the beginning of her 2016 campaign, the public had specific questions for Clinton about her emails and whether she could be trusted that the other candidates did not, all because of her email scandal, which may have caused issues from day one.
While it is possible that the emails may be the reason Clinton lost the 2016 election, I still believe there is prejudice against women in politics due to the numbers. While we are increasing the amount of women in the House of Representatives and the Senate each year, we have still not had a majority. The majority of politicians are still Caucasian men, even though there are so many other people in this country who need representing.

The United States is forever progressing, but with no female President or even Vice President, the United States still has more progress to make. With only analyzing debates and not every aspect of the election process, it is hard to pinpoint a reason as to why there has not been a woman as President. Even though the double bind was not present amongst the candidates in the debates, I still believe the double bind should be taken into political and rhetorical consideration. The media is known for being biased, leaning towards one party or another. However, the media bias of gender in presidential campaigns has not been thoroughly examined, as we are just beginning to have women run as major-party contenders for President of the United States. More research needs to be done to confirm my suspicion, but it is worth looking into.

On a different note, I assumed that ethos, pathos, and logos would go hand-in-hand with politician characteristics. If I were to redo the thesis, I would not have made the assumption as there are essential rhetorical differences that I continuously overlooked. Connecting pathos with empathy, logos with competence, and ethos with integrity were gross generalizations. Just because Clinton has stories portraying empathy, it does not mean it will automatically connect with voters. Similarly, logos can indicate ideas through experience, but it does not have to. In putting logos in the same line as competence, I did logos an injustice. The same theory goes with ethos; however, ethos and integrity relate more to each other than the examples with pathos and logos.
Additionally, research was limited, mainly because of time constraints. With only having a year to complete a project of this multitude, I was only able to watch and analyze two debates from each election, making the results less than desirable. However, I did do my best in keeping the debates as similar as possible (first Democratic debate and first one-on-one debate). Given more time, I would analyze each debate in the election to have a complete study. Adding the debates with Donald Trump would call for an interesting analysis of comparing their rhetorical strategies. Trump’s rhetoric in the 2016 election would be an interesting follow-up to this project.

On a similar note, in society today, an idea for further exploration with political rhetoric would be the use of social media, i.e. Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram by the candidates to secure votes of the younger generation or to relay facts about their opponents. This is especially interesting because as I found in my analysis, the candidates were seemingly cordial with one another. How would that correlate to social media use? There are never-ending ideas about rhetorical research in the world of politics, and this thesis was just scratching the surface of potential venues.

The importance of this topic will never end. When examining presidential debates and campaigns, voters are looking for the next leader of our country. Presidential debates should never be taken lightly. Adding gender equality into the mix makes it even more crucial than ever to find a solution as to why the United States has yet to have a female president. Women seem to be in an impossible situation. If women are considered “feminine”, they typically are not cut out to be politicians in American society. However, if they are politicians, there seems to be a certain femininity missing. Until this vicious double bind ends, the United States will continue to be under the leadership of men.
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