

In the Running

Globe and Mail News Coverage of Female and Male Candidates for the Leadership of the New Democratic Party of Canada, 1975-2012

Linda Trimble, Shannon Sampert, Angelia Wagner, Daisy Raphael and Bailey Gerrits

ABSTRACT

Does newspaper coverage of competitive female and male party leadership candidates reflect gendered norms and assumptions? Our paper answers this question by analyzing *Globe and Mail* reporting of the five New Democratic Party of Canada leadership contests held between 1975 and 2012. We compare news visibility and framing of comparable female and male candidates and determine whether or not female candidates have been disadvantaged because of their sex. Longitudinal data allow us to examine changes over time and assess the indirect impact of women's increased presence in electoral politics and party leadership roles on their media portrayals. Our analysis of 315 *Globe and Mail* stories about the NDP leadership contests found fewer differences than was anticipated, especially with respect to public and private framing. However, there were notable differences in news visibility and in the application of gender markers to the first two women who challenged the NDP leadership, Rosemary Brown and Audrey McLaughlin, compared to male competitors or equivalents.

Introduction

Does newspaper coverage of competitive female and male party leadership candidates reflect gendered norms and assumptions? Our paper answers this question by analyzing *Globe and Mail* reporting of the five New Democratic Party of Canada leadership contests held between 1975 and 2012. The New Democratic Party (NDP) was chosen for this study because it has been a path-breaker when it comes to selecting women as candidates and party leaders. Audrey McLaughlin became the first woman national party leader when she won the 1989 NDP leadership convention. When McLaughlin stepped down, Alexa McDonough replaced her, and held the post until 2003. Thus, women led the NDP for nearly 14 years. Moreover, women have featured as competitive candidates in four of the five most recent NDP leadership contests. This level of success for women in elite party politics is unusual, and it offers a unique opportunity to compare media representations of female and male candidates for party leadership positions. Leadership competitions focus media attention on the candidates, offering rich descriptions and evaluations of their personas and performances. As such, news coverage of party leadership contests illuminates the extent to which political leadership is mediated by gender. Examining *Globe and Mail* reporting of five NDP contests spanning 37 years can help determine whether or not media treatment of female political aspirants is indeed among the “daunting obstacles” to women’s elite political engagement, as Bashevkin (2009: 8) suggests. Our paper uses these five NDP case studies to compare news visibility and framing of comparable female and male candidates. Longitudinal data allow us to examine changes over time and assess the indirect impact of women’s increased presence in electoral politics and party leadership roles on their media portrayals.

We begin with an overview of the five NDP leadership contests, situating them within the context of changing levels of electoral success for both women and the NDP. The second section of the paper summarizes the literature on media treatment of women politicians, focusing on gendered patterns in news visibility and framing. Our research methodology, including the choice of texts and the manner in which they are analyzed, is described in the third section, and the fourth part of the paper presents the findings of our content and discourse analysis of the news stories. The final section discusses the findings and draws some conclusions about the relationship between candidate sex and news representation of NDP leadership candidates.

Background to NDP Leadership Selection, 1975 - 2012

Why study national newspaper reporting about leadership selection by the New Democratic Party of Canada? After all, from its inception the NDP was the perpetual third party until the 1993 election, and it was the fourth party in the House of Commons until its recent electoral breakthrough, in 2011, when it gained the status of official opposition (see Table 1). We chose to focus on the NDP because of the unusual success of women in seeking and winning the party leadership role. Only four women have been elected leader of a Canadian national political party and two of them led the NDP. At the sub-national level, 11 of the 30 women selected to serve as party leader in Canada’s provinces and territories have been New Democrats (O’Neill and Stewart 2009, 743; Trimble, 2011). Overall, the party is responsible for nearly 40% of the female party leaders elected to date in Canada. Most importantly, women have been ‘in the running’ for the national NDP leadership since 1975. Indeed,

competitive female candidates¹ have sought the position in four of the five most recent leadership contests (see Table 2).

In the 1974 election, the NDP lost 15 of its 31 seats in the House of Commons, prompting the resignation of party leader David Lewis. Four competitive candidates sought to replace him, and the lone female candidate, Rosemary Brown, placed a strong second to Ed Broadbent in the 1975 leadership contest, with 40.3% of the vote on the fourth and final ballot. The first woman to seek a national party leadership position, Brown was among the very few elected women in Canada at the time, a Member of the Legislative Assembly in British Columbia since 1972. Brown certainly had reservations when she entered political life, feeling she would not win the party nomination because “no Vancouver riding would choose a person who was Black, female and an immigrant to be its elected representative”(Brown, 1989: 4). But win she did, and a few years later Brown contested the national party leadership at a time when women held just over 3% of the seats in the House of Commons (see Table 3) and there were no female party leaders in any Canadian jurisdiction.

The NDP made considerable electoral progress under Broadbent’s stewardship, securing almost 15% of the seats in the 1988 election, a record high for the party. When Broadbent stepped down, seven candidates competed to replace him, though the press complained that the field lacked depth and experience (Conway, 1989: A7). Audrey McLaughlin, a Yukon MP, was among the 13.2% of women in the Commons when she announced her candidacy for the party leadership, and she prevailed over former B.C. premier Dave Barrett, winning on the fourth ballot. McLaughlin became the first female party leader at the national level, but she was not the first in Canada. In 1989, six women were serving as provincial party leader, including Alexa McDonough, who was elected leader of the Nova Scotia NDP in 1980. In this period female party leaders gained a reputation as “incurable losers” (Bashevkin 2009, 26) because many, including Audrey McLaughlin, presided over electoral losses. The 1993 federal election, which sparked the ascendance of the Bloc Quebecois (BQ) and Reform parties, eroded the NDP’s presence in the House, as it was reduced to fourth party status. The New Democrats only returned 9 MPs during this watershed election, down from a high of 43 in 1988. McLaughlin resigned a few years after this electoral setback for her party.

Unsurprisingly, then, the 1995 NDP leadership contest featured only three candidates, BC MP Svend Robinson, Saskatchewan MP Lorne Nystrom, and Nova Scotia NDP leader Alexa McDonough. McDonough sought the NDP leader’s role at time when women were significantly more prominent in electoral politics. In 1995, seven women led federal and provincial political parties, and Canada had its first female premier, PEI’s Catherine Callbeck. McDonough won a seat in the House of Commons during the 1997 election, joining a larger group of female MPs, 20.6% of the total. McDonough’s leadership selection took an unusual trajectory, as her competitors, Robinson and Nystrom, were ahead of her after the primaries.² As a result, McDonough was never pegged as the front-runner.

¹ Competitive candidates are defined as those who mounted nation-wide, well-resourced campaigns and finished above the last place on the first ballot.

² In 1995, the party elected its leader with a hybrid voting system. In advance of delegate voting at the party convention, a series of regional and labour primaries was held. Candidates had to win one primary to advance to the convention ballot. Svend Robinson won the Quebec, Ontario, and BC/Northern primaries, and Lorne Nystrom won the Prairie and Labour primaries. Alexa McDonough won the Atlantic primary.

Convention voting put Robinson in the lead after the first ballot, but McDonough overtook Nystrom and he was dropped from the ballot. Because Nystrom's supporters were expected to go to McDonough, Robinson withdrew from the competition and McDonough was declared the winner.³ As party leader McDonough made electoral gains in her home province of Nova Scotia and, by the time she resigned from the leader's post in 2003, the NDP's representation in the House of Commons had doubled. Still, the party remained in fourth place, far from its record high reached in 1988.

Women's representation in the House of Commons stalled after 1997, and the number of female party leaders dropped precipitously as well (Trimble, 2011). Perhaps this trend explains the absence of a competitive female candidate for the 2003 leadership contest to replace McDonough. The 2003 campaign was essentially an all-male race, won by Jack Layton on the first ballot, as the lone woman in the contest, Bev Meslo, was considered a fringe candidate and finished last on the first ballot with only 1.1% of the vote. As Table 1 reveals, Layton led the party to greater electoral gains in the 2004, 2006 and 2008 elections, doubling the number of MPs, but the party still languished in fourth place, behind the BQ. The 2011 election was momentous for the New Democrats as the "orange wave" swept Quebec and vaulted the party to the status of official opposition, with a third of the seats in the House of Commons (McGrane, 2001: 77).

This unprecedented level of success put the contest to replace the late Jack Layton in the media spotlight, and it was hotly contested, featuring seven candidates, including party president Brian Topp and several MPs. The man credited with helping make the breakthrough in Quebec, Thomas Mulcair, was cited as one of the front-runners from the beginning of the race. While Mulcair emerged victorious in 2012, two women, Peggy Nash and Niki Ashton, were among the seven candidates vying for the top job. Nash placed fourth on the first ballot. That there were two female contenders in 2012 reflects women's increased success in electoral politics. Both women are members of Parliament, re-elected in 2011 to a House of Commons in which women hold a quarter of the seats. Women's success in party leadership roles has rebounded to the "high water mark" achieved in 1993, when 10 women served as party leaders across the country (Trimble and Arscott, 2004: 70).

The 37-year period between 1975, when Brown announced her candidacy for the party leader's role, and 2012, when two women competed for the NDP leadership, evidenced dramatic changes in women's political representation. Women were nearly invisible in electoral politics in 1975. Fourteen years later, when McLaughlin won in 1989, female MPs were still scarce but women were starting to ascend to the party leadership role at the provincial level. McDonough secured the NDP leadership in 1995, during a relative high point for female politicians when women held a fifth of the seats in the House of Commons as well as several party leadership positions, and Canada had its first female premier. Women's representation in the House of Commons stalled between 1997 and 2011, and the number of female party leaders dropped. However, in 2011 the percentage of female MPs finally increased by a few percentage points, to 25%, and by the time of the 2012 NDP leadership contest

³ CPAC. "NDP Leadership Races."

http://www.cpac.ca/forms/index.asp?dsp=template&act=view3&template_id=1475&hl=e. Last accessed 09 May 2012.

there were 10 female party leaders across Canada, three of them premiers.⁴ That women are no longer anomalies in electoral politics should shape news coverage of their leadership aspirations and performances.

Literature Review and Hypotheses

Media coverage provides the primary lens through which political events such as elections and party leadership contests are interpreted and evaluated. Sreberny-Mohammadi and Ross have therefore urged scholars to consider “the manner in which the mediated presentation of politics is gendered” (1996: 103). Mediation refers to the tendency of news coverage to go beyond merely reporting the “facts” by offering colourful descriptions and analysis (Patterson, 1996: 97). Mediation is gendered when news decisions about news selection, emphasis and framing reflect sex-based norms and assumptions. For instance, lexical choices may draw attention to a female candidate’s sex thus constructing her as an outsider to the male-dominated political field. Highlighting a female candidate’s appearance or personal life despite its irrelevance to the political competition serves to trivialize women’s political aspirations (Ross, 2004).

Our analysis of the NDP leadership coverage focuses on two types of gendered mediation, both of which are potentially damaging for a woman’s political career. The first type is marked by differential amounts of media attention to female and male candidates for political office. If female candidates receive less media coverage than do comparably competitive male candidates, this is an indicator that they are taken less seriously because of their sex. The second form of gendered mediation is “a type of framing that results when journalists use language differently depending on the sex of an individual” (Burke and Mazzarella, 2008: 398). Media coverage that draws attention to female candidates’ appearance and family lives while down-playing their ideas and experiences tends to situate women in the private sphere and thus as outsiders to political life. Similarly, greater emphasis on male candidates’ career paths, leadership skills, and policy statements reflects the assumption that men have the qualifications for political leadership roles.

Research on visibility of female politicians has produced mixed results, reflecting changes over time, the competitiveness of the office-seeker, and, perhaps most importantly, the level of the position being sought. Earlier research from Canada and the United States found women candidates for public office to be less visible in press coverage than their male counterparts or competitors (Carroll and Schreiber, 1997; Heldman, Carroll and Olson, 2005; Kahn 1992, 1994, 1996; Kahn and Goldenberg, 1991; Norris, 1997; Sampert and Trimble, 2003). However, more recent studies focusing on elite-level positions such as party or government leader found that female candidates garner as much if not more attention in newspaper articles than equivalent male candidates due to their enduring news value as “novelties” or, in some cases, their likelihood of winning (Bystrom, Robertson and Banwart, 2001; Bystrom et. al., 2004; Lawrence and Rose, 2010; Trimble, 2007; Trimble and Wagner, 2010). For instance, the amount of attention Hillary Clinton received in print and TV news reportage during the 2008 United States Democratic presidential nomination contest equalled or exceeded that of her

⁴ Alberta’s Alison Redford (PC) and Newfoundland’s Kathy Dunderdale (PC) recently brought their parties to victory in a general election, and are among the four Canadian female party leaders to have done so. The others are Pat Duncan (Liberal, Yukon) and Catherine Callbeck (Liberal, PEI).

male rivals (Lawrence and Rose, 2010: 157). Similarly, while “ordinary” female candidates were sidelined in news coverage of the 2005 German national elections, Angela Merkel was as prominent as her male competitor for the Chancellor’s role (Semetko and Boomgaarden, 2005: 167).

Trimble’s (2007) analysis of representations of male and female candidates in *Globe and Mail* coverage of three Conservative Party of Canada leadership races, held in 1976, 1993 and 2004, found that the competitiveness of the female candidates within the contest, measured by their placement on the first ballot, did not adequately predict their visibility within the news coverage. Each of the three female candidates “received more than their fair share” of coverage based on first-ballot results (Trimble, 2007: 986). For instance, in 1976, although Flora MacDonald came in sixth on the first ballot, she garnered more news coverage than did some male candidates who placed above her, including the eventual winner, Joe Clark (Trimble, 2007: 980). Kim Campbell was also highly visible in *Globe and Mail* reporting of the 1993 Progressive Conservative Party of Canada leadership competition, reflecting her front-runner status and the fact that the winner of the contest would become prime minister (Trimble, 2007: 980). Finally, while Belinda Stronach was never predicted to finish better than second place in the 2004 Conservative leadership contest, she received significantly more attention than the winner, Stephen Harper (Trimble, 2007: 981). Trimble argued that the visibility and prominence of competitive female candidates is influenced to some degree by their news value as novelties and their distinctiveness as women in a “man’s game” (Trimble, 2007: 990).

Female candidates, therefore, may be more visible than comparable male candidates because they are described with overt gender markers and framed as unusual or different. Gendered mediation is reflected in coverage that gives more attention to the personal lives and traits of female politicians and de-emphasizes their public personas and issue positions (Kahn, 1994; Bystrom, 2005). Several studies have found that media framing of women politicians draws attention to stereotypical feminine qualities by emphasizing their sex, sexuality, appearance and domestic roles (Carroll and Schreiber, 1997; Falk, 2008; Everitt and Camp, 2009; Heldman, Carroll and Olson, 2005; Jenkins, 1999; Mandziuk, 2008; McGregor, 1996; Murray, 2010; Robinson and Saint-Jean, 1991; Ross, 2002; Van Acker, 1999). There is some evidence that news reporting of Canadian political party leadership contests reflects these tendencies. Belinda Stronach’s bid for the Conservative party’s leadership in 2004 was mediated by blatant gender stereotypes, with undue attention to Stronach’s appearance and sexual allure (Trimble and Everitt, 2010: 65). Indeed, coverage by Canada’s English-language national newspapers featured more attention to Stronach’s hair, wardrobe and sex life than to her public persona and political ideas (Trimble and Everitt, 2010: 59-60). During her quest for the leadership of the governing PC party, Kim Campbell’s looks and family life were discussed in more stories than was the case for her male competitor, Jean Charest (Trimble, 2007: 984). Everitt and Camp’s examination of newspaper reporting about Alison Brewer’s victory in the 2005 New Brunswick NDP leadership contest found discussion of Brewer’s personal identity as a lesbian (Everitt and Camp, 2009).

But these cases may be anomalous. Trimble’s comparison of *Globe and Mail* coverage of male and female candidates for the 1976 Progressive Conservative Party of Canada leadership discovered only modest differences in attention to the appearance and marital status of Flora MacDonald and her male competitors (2007: 987). Studies of election coverage of Canadian prime minister Kim Campbell, New Zealand prime ministers Jenny Shipley and Helen Clark, and U.S. Democratic presidential

candidate Hillary Clinton discerned little attention to their looks, wardrobes and family lives (Trimble, Treiberg and Girard, 2010; Lawrence and Rose, 2010; Trimble and Trieberg, 2010). Alberta newspaper coverage of Danielle Smith and Mark Dyrholm, both of whom contested the leadership of the newly formed Wildrose Alliance Party of Alberta in 2009, made only fleeting mention of either candidate's private attributes or families (Trimble and Wagner, 2010). Perhaps the privatizing tropes of husbands, hairdos and wardrobes are incongruent with the dominant news frame for political competitions, the game frame, which emphasizes the horse race and strategic aspects of the campaign (see Gidengil and Everitt, 1999, 2003; Semetko and Boomgaarden, 2007; Trimble and Sampert, 2004). Therefore women who stand a good chance of winning elections may be discursively positioned "in the game," with their public personas, leadership skills and issue positions as likely to be emphasized as those of comparable male candidates (Trimble and Wagner, 2010).

Our longitudinal, multiple case-study approach allows us to determine whether there are any differences in news reporting of NDP leadership candidates based on their sex and over time. We anticipate finding that the female candidates who sought the NDP leadership at a time when women were largely invisible in electoral politics (namely the 1975 and 1989 leadership contests) were more likely than equivalent male candidates to be marked by their sex and looks, and to be situated in the private sphere via references to their personal lives. The greater prominence of women in elite political roles, particularly party leadership positions, should make the 'gender factor' less remarkable over time, thus less likely to be mentioned in news coverage of the female candidates who contested the NDP leadership in 1995 and, especially, 2012. We also anticipate that the novelty value of the female candidates in 1975 and 1989 affected their visibility vis-à-vis male competitors. Once women's unusualness is no longer a factor, news visibility of competitive female candidates should be equivalent to that of their closest male competitors, so we expect to find relative parity in visibility for female and male candidates in 1995 and 2012.

Methodology

We choose to examine reporting of the five most recent NDP leadership selections by the *Globe and Mail* for two reasons. First, the *Globe and Mail* has been publishing throughout Canada's history and began nation-wide circulation in 1980. In contrast, Canada's other national newspaper, the *National Post*, did not come onto the media scene until 1998. Thus the *Globe and Mail* is the only national newspaper to have reported on all of the leadership contests in our sample and to have nation-wide daily distribution for four of the five NDP leadership contests. Second, even when the *Globe and Mail* was circulated only in Ontario, it was viewed as a paper of record, especially for the political class (Bain, 1994: 68). Since it went national in 1980, the *Globe's* large readership and prominence has made it an authoritative news source across Canada. The newspaper maintains a national audience and is widely recognized for its agenda-setting role within the Canadian news media (Taras, 1999: 18).

To discover the nature and extensiveness of gendered news coverage of NDP party leadership candidates between 1975 and 2012, we analyzed all *Globe and Mail* stories that included a significant discussion of each leadership contest. Stories that mentioned the leadership race in passing were excluded from the study. Since the goal was to analyze the representations of male and female candidates by journalists, we excluded letters to the editor and opinion pieces written by leadership candidates. Data collection started the day after the resignation or death of the party leader and

continued until a week after the leadership convention.⁵ The final sample contains a total of 315 stories, with 51 stories from the 1975 campaign, 115 from 1989, 38 from 1995, 50 from 2003, and 61 from the 2012 contest. Stories for the first four campaigns were retrieved in a PDF format from *The Globe and Mail: Canada's Heritage from 1844* database. Because the database does not include issues of the *Globe* published since 2009, original copies of the newspaper's Alberta edition were collected throughout the fifth campaign. The stories were collected in this manner to preserve their layout, allowing us to measure the presence of candidates in all aspects of the news story, including photos, graphics, text-boxes and pull-quotes.

The 315 news stories in the study were analyzed with both content and discourse analysis techniques. Content analysis is a quantitative method that systematically accounts for the message characteristics in a text (Neuendorft, 2002; Neuman, 2007). The aim of content analysis is to observe and analyze the “overt communication behaviour of selected communicators” (Budd et al, 1967: 2), in this case *Globe* reporters, columnists, and editors. We employed a detailed coding system, which consists of a set of instructions for systematically observing and recording content from a text,⁶ to quantify various aspects of candidate news visibility and framing. Content analysis was supplemented by a feminist discourse analysis of references to selected candidates' personal characteristics, used to explore the ways in which “gender ideology and gendered relations of power” are reproduced in media representations of male and female leadership candidates (Lazar, 2005: 11).

Although several candidates sought the leadership in each campaign, we focused our data collection on the competitive female candidate, her closest male competitor, and the male winner if neither of the other two won the contest. For the all-male campaign, we coded for the winner and his closest competitor. We therefore included the following individuals: 1) female candidate Brown and eventual male winner Broadbent in 1975; 2) female winner McLaughlin and male candidate Barrett in 1989; 3) female winner McDonough and male competitor Robinson in 1995; 4) male winner Layton and male competitor Bill Blaikie in 2003; and 5) female candidate Nash, male competitor Nathan Cullen, and male winner Mulcair in 2012.

⁵ The campaigns lasted anywhere from seven months to a year. The 1975 coverage was collected from July 6, 1974 to July 15, 1975; 1989 coverage from March 4 to December 10, 1989; 1995 coverage from November 17, 1994 to October 21, 1995; 2003 coverage from June 6, 2002 to February 2, 2003; and 2012 coverage from August 23, 2011 to March 31, 2012.

⁶ The coding framework is available from the authors upon request. The authors conducted all coding for this study. A pretest conducted on two stories from each of the first four campaigns resulted in revisions to the coding instrument. Before proceeding with the main study, we coded 20 percent of the stories in all five NDP campaigns for an intercoder reliability test. The Cohen's kappa on the nominal data ranged from 0.673 to 1.000, with strong scores on most variables indicating that different coders using the same framework would generally arrive at the same coding conclusions (Landis and Koch, 1977). The kappa scores on some of the variables were just below the acceptable threshold, so the coders discussed those items until agreement was reached. Each item in the master dataset was recoded to reflect the consensus. The Krippendorff's alpha on the scale variables ranged from 0.740 to 1.000. Additional issues with the coding instrument were discussed among the authors until agreement was reached.

Findings

Visibility

Content analysis was used to measure both visibility and prominence of candidates in the news package, defined as the text of the story as well as all headlines, subheads, captions, photos, text boxes and pull quotes associated with the story. Visibility was measured in several ways. We counted how many stories mentioned the candidate, and noted whether the candidate was included in headlines, photos or mug shots. The positioning of candidates in the story was also taken into account. We determined whether or not they were named first in the story and counted how many times they were named in the news package. For a measure of the extent to which candidates were allowed to speak for themselves, we counted how many words were quoted for each candidate. All of these indicators of visibility are individually significant, but taken together they provide a measure of overall news prominence for each candidate. A six-point prominence index was constructed, with a point allocated for each of the following indicators of visibility in the news package: named in the story, named first in the story, quoted in the story, named in the headline, shown in a photo, and shown in a mug shot.

Table 4 shows clear differences in visibility and prominence between female and male winners on all measures except photos and mug shots. The male winners – Broadbent in 1975, Layton in 2003 and Mulcair in 2012 – were more likely than the female winners – McLaughlin in 1989 and McDonough in 1995 – to be named in the story and main headline and to be quoted in the story. Also, the men were named more often and had significantly more words quoted per story than the female winners. As a result, male winners were more prominent in the news package than were female winners, with prominence index scores ranging from 2.05 to 2.26, compared to 1.76 for McDonough and 1.79 for McLaughlin. Moreover, McLaughlin and McDonough were less likely to be named in the newspaper’s equivalent of “prime real estate”—front-page stories—than were male winners.⁷ McLaughlin was mentioned in 70% of the front-page stories about the 1989 leadership contest and McDonough was named in 50% of the front-page stories about the 1995 race. In contrast, Broadbent (1975 winner) and Mulcair (2012 winner) were discussed in 100% of the front-page stories, and Layton (2003) was mentioned in 86% of these high-profile news stories.

The female losers, Brown in 1975 and Nash in 2012, were positioned quite differently by the *Globe’s* reporting (see Tables 4 and 5). While Brown ran a strong second to Broadbent, her placement on the first and subsequent ballots was not reflected in the news coverage. She was named in only 47% of the stories about the leadership contest, compared to 84% for Broadbent, and was discussed in only four op-eds, compared to 10 for Broadbent.⁸ We did not expect Brown to be as visible as the male winner of the contest, but as Table 4 shows, Brown was less visible on all but two measures (named in the headline and shown in a mug shot) than the most comparable second-place male candidate, Dave Barrett, who finished a close second to McLaughlin in 1989. Nash, who came in fourth on the first ballot in 2012, was more visible and prominent than her closest male competitor, even though he finished ahead of her, in third place. Nash and Cullen were mentioned the same number of times

⁷ Data on location of story are not shown in Tables 4-6, but are available from the authors upon request.

⁸ Data on type of story are not included in Tables 4-6, but are available from the authors upon request.

in the main headline and in front-page stories; otherwise Nash attained higher visibility than did Cullen.

The one area where female candidates tended to achieve parity with their male counterparts was in visual representations. As Table 5 indicates, most of the women were as likely as their closest male competitor to be literally “in the picture.” Brown and Broadbent were featured in the same number of photos and mug shots during the *Globe’s* coverage of the 1975 campaign. However, in 1989, Barrett was more likely than McLaughlin to be visually represented. McDonough and Robinson had the same number of photos in 1995, but McDonough was also depicted in a mug shot. In 2012, while Cullen did not make it into any photos, and had only one mug shot, Nash was shown in four photos and four mugs. The two most recent winners, male winners Layton and Mulcair, were much more likely to be presented in photos than were any other candidate. This reflects the redesign of the *Globe* in reaction to competition from visual news media, resulting in a dramatic increase in photographs accompanying news stories. In 1975, 12% of the news stories featured a photo or photos. By 2003 it was up to 28%, and by 2012, after its most significant redesign, 41% of the stories were accompanied by at least one photograph.⁹

Are these sex differences in visibility and prominence a result of gendered mediation of the candidates? The answer is both yes and no. The sex of the first two women to seek the party leadership position, Brown and McLaughlin, may have deflated the currency of their candidacies in the eyes of *Globe and Mail* reporters and columnists, leading to unfairly low levels of visibility. As indicated above, Brown was less visible on most indicators than were equivalent second-place male candidates and far less prominent than her competitor, Broadbent, to whom she came a strong second. McLaughlin was only marginally more prominent than her closest male competitor, Barrett, despite the fact Barrett declared his candidacy very late in the competition and pundits and polls put McLaughlin clearly in the lead. Given that he was only in the media spotlight for the final two months of an eight-month race, the finding that Barrett was named first in stories and named in headlines almost as often as McLaughlin, and was more visible in photos, indicates a lack of fairness. These results suggest the *Globe* regarded Brown and McLaughlin as less consequential and less viable than comparable male competitors because of their sex.

We do not think the news visibility of the two competitive female candidates who sought the party leadership more recently reflects gendered mediation. McDonough was less prominent than her competitor, Robinson, in everything from headlines to front-page stories to opinion and editorial coverage,¹⁰ but this is likely a result of her placement in the race rather than her sex. McDonough trailed her male competitors after the primaries and came second on the first ballot at the

⁹ The *Globe* has reinvented itself to compete with the upstart *National Post* and with electronic news media. Since 1998, the once grey and rather staid paper has become more colourful, featuring larger photographs and graphics and a tabloid-style approach to news coverage (Kingston, 2009; Maich, 2004). In 2010, it went through a significant redesign, particularly its Saturday paper. The Saturday front page no longer contains any stories and instead consists of graphics, headlines, and photographs.

¹⁰ McDonough was discussed in 64% of the columns and editorials printed about the 1995 leadership contest. In contrast, Robinson was named in all of the op-eds (100%).

convention (Table 2). The most recent competitive woman candidate, Nash, had a slight visibility advantage over her closest male competitor, Cullen. The increased representation of women in electoral politics and party leadership positions across Canada may have resulted in more balanced news visibility of comparably competitive female and male candidates for the 1995 and 2012 NDP leadership.

None of the women candidates was notably more visible or prominent in the news coverage than their placement on the first ballot suggested was appropriate. Thus, the novelty of their sex did not inflate the news value of their candidacies (Trimble, 2007: 974). Were sex differences in framing evident in the coverage, and, if so, did they diminish over time to reflect the increased presence of women in electoral and party politics?

Framing

To measure sex differences in candidate framing, we counted the presence of words or phrases that locate candidates in the public or private realms or that serve as overt gender markers. Media coverage that references candidates' issue positions and public backgrounds (that is, their education, careers, and political experience) situates them in the public realm of paid work, careerism, and political life. In contrast, descriptions of candidates' spouses and children casts them as private actors in the intimate sphere of the home and family. Similarly, media glances (or glares) at an aspiring political leader's appearance can be personalizing or trivializing. Overt references to candidate gender tend to have quite different meanings for male and female candidates, but they often signify women candidates as "other" or deviant from the (male) "norm."

Table 6 presents data, by leadership contest and candidate, on indicators of public and private framing and illustrates little difference in attention the public backgrounds of the candidates based on their sex. References to their issue positions varied greatly by campaign, but, with the exception of McDonough in 1995, women's stances on policy matters were *more* likely to be mentioned than the issues discussed by their direct male competitors. In short, the public aspects of women candidates' backgrounds and campaigns were as visible as those aspects of equivalent male candidates' campaigns. Moreover, with the notable exception of Brown, the female candidates were not privatized or personalized by references to their appearance or familial roles.

Except for Brown in 1975, the appearance, marital status, and children of female candidates were no more likely to be mentioned than the looks and nuclear families of the male candidates, be they winners or losers. Table 6 shows that sometimes these features were mentioned more often for male candidates than for female candidates. For instance, Broadbent's young daughter was discussed in 14% of the stories that mentioned him during the 1975 leadership contest. Yet McLaughlin and McDonough's children were referenced in only 2% and 4% of their stories, respectively. Barrett's appearance was raised in a higher percentage of the news stories naming him than was the case for McLaughlin.

Table 6 also illustrates that the *Globe* gave less attention over time to the bodily personas and private family matters of the female candidates. For instance, in 1995, McDonough's looks were only mentioned in one story and her marital status was never raised. In the 2012 campaign, there was no

discussion at all of Nash's appearance, marital status or children. That such descriptors have not disappeared from press coverage of leadership candidates altogether is evident from the data on Layton and Mulcair. During the 2012 campaign, the *Globe's* reporters commented on Mulcair's beard and mentioned his wife and children. During the 2003 campaign, Layton's looks drew the highest level of attention of all the candidates in our sample, mentioned in 18% of the stories that named him. Called "good looking," "handsome," and "dapper" in several stories, Layton's wardrobe, mustache, and physique were detailed (Lorinc, 2003: F5). Arguably Layton was the most physically objectified of all of the candidates included in this study. Moreover, Layton's marriage to politician Olivia Chow also received more mention than the marriages of any candidate other than Brown.

For Brown, the "Mrs." label provided a key gender marker foregrounding her marital status. She was called "Mrs. Brown" consistently, as was the *Globe and Mail's* practice at the time. As well, Brown's looks were noted in a higher percentage of stories than was the case for any other candidate except Layton. For example, a reporter said she would "win a best-dressed contest in the BC Legislature on an off-day" (Gray 1975: W4). Brown was described as having a "frizzled Afro" illustrating the racialized nature of her coverage, as several articles called her a "black woman" or "black female." We counted the number of stories that overtly described each candidate's race, and Brown was the only candidate to have her ethnicity discussed by the *Globe*, in five of the 24 stories mentioning her (21%). Both her race and her sex were cited as formidable barriers to a successful candidacy. For example, one reporter cited the view among "party sages" that "any candidate who's a black, a woman and a British Columbia MLA rather than a member of the federal caucus has too much against her to be credible as a winning candidate" (Newman, 1975: A1).¹¹

Gendered mediation is evident when overt gender markers are applied to female candidates, thus configuring male as norm, female as anomalous. Gender was noted for in a higher percentage of stories for the female candidates in our sample than it was for most, but not all, of the male candidates. The first two women to seek the party leadership, Brown and McLaughlin, were identified as outliers because of their gendered location. That Brown's was female was mentioned in 25% of the stories that named her, and for McLaughlin it was 24%, far more often than for their male competitors. Broadbent's gender was only mentioned in 9% of his stories, and for Barrett it was only 3% (see Table 6). In contrast, McDonough and Nash were less likely than two of the more recent male candidates, Layton and Cullen, to be tagged with gender markers. While 12% of the stories mentioning McDonough and Nash noted their gendered identities, Layton's was denoted in 13% of the stories, and Cullen's sex was identified in 18% of the stories that named him.

Discourse analysis of these references reveals that they communicate very different meanings. Some are perfunctory and merely identify the fact of the candidate's gender, e.g. "daughter of," "female," "one of two men," and "the guy." These sorts of noncommittal gender identifiers were applied to McDonough and most of the male candidates. For instance, McDonough was termed a daughter, mother, and sister, and Layton was depicted as a man, father, and son. Other gender labels were accompanied by elaborations of the impact of the candidate's gender on their ability to win the race

¹¹ Similarly, Robinson's sexuality was presented as a possible obstacle in 1995. Described as an "open homosexual," "gay," and "openly gay," Robinson's sexuality was discussed in 31% of the stories that mentioned him. One reporter asserted that "his homosexuality may be a liability" (*Globe and Mail*, 1995: A1).

or lead the party. These were applied to Brown and McLaughlin, the first two women to seek the national NDP leadership. For instance, a columnist wrote this about Brown in 1975: “Mrs. Brown suffers, even in a party which prides itself on its open-mindedness, from the dual disadvantages of being both a woman and a black” (Stevens, 1995: 6). Moreover, a “union man” told a reporter the NDP was not ready “for a woman as leader” (Newman, 1975: A1). In contrast, that McLaughlin was female was cited as an important explanation for her front-runner status. For instance, as a *Globe* editorial opined, she was “the only woman in the race when the party had decided it wanted a woman as leader” (*Globe and Mail*, 1989b: A6). But some commentators cautioned that “her sex alone will not be enough” to win the race (Simpson 1989, A6) or to help her last in the party leader’s role (*Globe and Mail*, 1989a: A6). That the “sex factor” is still relevant is shown by reports on the 2012 leadership competition. Nash’s gender was not denoted as frequently as her closest male competitor, Cullen, but while Cullen was simply described as a man (e.g. “one of the men who hopes to lead the federal New Democrats”), Nash’s candidacy was highlighted because she was the “first woman to enter the race.” Indeed, Nash felt compelled to downplay the gender issue in conversation with the reporter: “I’m not in this race because I’m a woman. I’m in it to win” (Galloway, 2011: A5).

In summary, the data show that female candidates for the NDP leadership were as likely as male candidates to be situated in the public sphere, with similar levels of attention to their careers and political experience, as well as to their issue positions. Only one woman was unduly privatized by the coverage, the first woman to seek the position. Brown’s appearance and marriage received more attention than was the case for most of the male candidates. Moreover, Brown’s candidacy was mediated by both her gender and her ethnicity. However, gendered mediation was revealed by discourse analysis of “gender markers,” overt references to the gendered locations of the candidates. McDonough was the only female candidate of the four in our sample whose gender was marked in a perfunctory fashion, similar to the sex descriptors applied to the male candidates. For the other women, Brown, McLaughlin and Nash, the fact that they were female was featured in assessments of their ability to win the race and lead the party.

Conclusions

Are competitive female and male party leadership candidates treated similarly or differently by newspaper coverage? Our analysis of *Globe and Mail* reporting about NDP leadership contests held in 1975, 1989, 1995, 2003, and 2012 found fewer differences than was anticipated, especially with respect to public and private framing. Reporting mentioned issue positions and public backgrounds of female and male candidates in roughly equal quantities. With the exception of Brown in 1975, the looks of female candidates were not discussed to any greater extent than for the male candidates. And, again with Brown as an outlier, reporters did not pay any more attention to the marriages and family lives of the women than for the men.

However, we found differences in news visibility and the application of gender markers to the first two women who challenged the NDP leadership, Brown and McLaughlin, compared to male competitors or equivalents. Both the first female leader of the NDP and the first female challenger for the leadership role were accorded less visibility than their standings suggested was fair. As well, gendered framing was evident in their coverage. Brown’s marital status was consistently referenced and her sex, appearance, and ethnicity were highlighted. McLaughlin’s looks were a source of

commentary, too, and although little was said about her family life, her gender was foregrounded via discussion of her “first woman” status within the party. Neither of the women who sought the leadership more recently, McDonough and Nash, were less visible in the coverage than similarly situated male candidates, nor were they unduly feminized or trivialized by references to their looks or intimate family lives. Indeed, Nash was the only candidate, male or female, for whom nothing was said about appearance, marriage, or children.

From these findings we conclude that the increased presence of women as elected legislators and party leaders across Canada has normalized, to some extent, women’s political aspirations. Women are seen as legitimately “in the running” for party leadership positions, at least within the NDP. A woman party leader is no longer so unthinkable that media commentators feel compelled to spotlight a female candidate’s gendered persona or refer to the prospective winner as the “*man* who will lead the NDP.” However, we end with a note of caution. It has been almost 20 years since a woman was been a clear challenger for the NDP leadership. In the most recent contest, Nash was not close enough to victory to prompt the “woman plus power equals discomfort syndrome” encountered by women who do find themselves in leadership positions (Bashevkin, 2009: 2). Even so, the *Globe’s* coverage of the 2012 leadership race illustrates lingering gendered assumptions about the skills and attributes essential for the political equivalent of the “big leagues.” As a column about Nash declared: “To imagine, however, that a female union activist could some day replace Stephen Harper seems rather far fetched” (Martin, 2011: A19). After all, the columnist continued, two female leaders of the party, McLaughlin and McDonough “fared poorly” because they “weren’t tough enough to stand up against the leaders of the time” (Martin, 2011: A19). *Globe* reporters asserted the party needed a “mean guy” like Mulcair to “act aggressively against Prime Minister Stephen Harper” (Simpson, 2012: F9; also see Wentz, 2012: A3). Mulcair’s pugilistic demeanor was emphasized with words like “trenchant,” “abrasive,” “fire-breathing antagonist,” “pit bull,” and “Juggernaut.” Despite the fact that the *Globe and Mail* avoided feminizing tropes in its depictions of Peggy Nash, the newspaper certainly communicated the message that only tough guys need apply for the top job.

Works Cited

- Bain, George. 1994. *Gotcha! How the Media Distort the News*. Toronto: Key Porter.
- Bashevkin, Sylvia. 2012. "Offer substance, not just style." *Globe and Mail*, 4 January: A13.
- Bashevkin, Sylvia. 2009. *Women, Power, Politics: The Hidden Story of Canada's Unfinished Democracy*. Don Mills: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, Rosemary. 1989. *Being Brown: A Very Public Life*. Toronto: Random House.
- Budd, Richard W., Robert K. Thorp, and Lewis Donohew. 1967. *Content Analysis of Communications*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Burke, Cindy and Sharon R. Mazzarella. 2008. "'A slightly new shade of lipstick': Gendered mediation in Internet news stories." *Women's Studies in Communication* 31(3): 395-418.
- Bystrom, Dianne G., Mary Christine Banwart, Lynda Lee Kaid and Terry A. Robertson. 2004. *Gender and Candidate Communication*. New York: Routledge.
- Bystrom, Dianne, Terry A. Robertson and Mary Christine Banwart. 2001. "Framing the fight: An analysis of media coverage of female and male candidates in primary races for governor and U.S. Senate in 2000." *American Behavioral Scientist* 44(12): 1999-2013.
- Carroll, Susan J. and Ronnee Schreiber. 1997. "Media coverage of women in the 103rd Congress." In *Women, Media and Politics*, ed. Pippa Norris, 131-148. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, Jacob. 1960. "A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 20(1): 37-46.
- Conway, J.F. 1989. "Why the NDP stars don't dare to say yes: So far only the second stringers are in the race." *Globe and Mail*, 27 July: A7.
- Everitt, Joanna and Michael Camp. 2009. "One is not like the others: Allison Brewer's leadership of the New Brunswick NDP." In *Opening Doors Wider: Women's Political Engagement in Canada*, ed. Sylvia Bashevkin, 127-144. Vancouver and Toronto: UBC Press.
- Everitt, Joanna and Elisabeth Gidengil. 2003. "Tough talk: How television news covers male and female leaders of Canadian political parties." In *Women and Electoral Politics in Canada*, ed. Manon Tremblay and Linda Trimble, 194-210. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Falk, Erika. 2008. *Women for President: Media Bias in Eight Campaigns*. Urbana, Ill: University of Illinois Press.

- Galloway, Gloria. 2011. "Nash becomes first woman to enter NDP race." *Globe and Mail*, 29 October: A5.
- Gidengil, Elisabeth and Joanna Everitt. 1999. "Metaphors and misrepresentation: Gendered mediation in news coverage of the 1993 Canadian leaders' debates." *Press/Politics* 4(1): 48-65.
- Gidengil, Elisabeth and Joanna Everitt. 2003. "Talking tough: Gender and reported speech in campaign news coverage." *Political Communication* 20: 209-232.
- Globe and Mail. 1989a. "Who will lead the New Democrats?" *Globe and Mail*, 29 November: A6.
- Globe and Mail. 1989b. "An uneasy start for Ms. McLaughlin." *Globe and Mail*, 4 December: A6.
- Globe and Mail. 1995. "Robinson to seek NDP leadership." *Globe and Mail*, 27 April: A1.
- Gray, Malcolm. 1975. "Has Rosemary Brown's socialist image more style than substance?" *Globe and Mail*, 20 March: W4.
- Heard, Andrew. Women Candidates, Canadian Federal Elections.
<http://www.sfu.ca/~aheard/elections/women-elected.html>. Accessed 06 May 2012.
- Heldman, Caroline, Susan J. Carroll and Stephanie Olson. 2005. "'She brought only a skirt': Print media coverage of Elizabeth Dole's bid for the Republican presidential nomination," *Political Communication* 22: 315-335.
- Jenkins, Cathy. 1999. "Media treatment of women in politics in Australia." In *Journalism Theory and Practice: Proceedings of the 1998 Journalism Education Association Conference*, ed. Jacqui Ewart.
- Kahn, Kim Fridkin. 1992. "Does being male help? An investigation of the effects of candidate gender and campaign coverage on evaluations of U.S. Senate candidates." *The Journal of Politics* 54(2): 497-517.
- Kahn, Kim Fridkin. 1994. "The distorted mirror: Press coverage of women candidates for statewide office." *The Journal of Politics* 56(1): 154-173.
- Kahn, Kim Fridkin. 1996. *The Political Consequences of Being a Woman*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kahn, Kim Fridkin and Edie N. Goldenberg. 1991. "Women candidates in the news: An examination of gender differences in U.S. Senate campaign coverage." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 55: 180-199.

- Kingston, Anne. 2009. "As the Globe Turns." *Macleans*. Vol. 122 (24): 36-40.
<http://www2.macleans.ca/2009/07/09/as-the-globe-turns/> Accessed 6 May 2012.
- Landis, J. Richard and Gary G. Koch. 1977. "The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data." *Biometrics* 33(1): 159-174.
- Lawrence, Regina G. and Melody Rose. 2010. *Hillary Clinton's Race for the White House: Gender Politics and the Media on the Campaign Trail*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner.
- Lazar, Michelle M. 2005. "Politicizing gender in discourse: Feminist critical discourse analysis as political perspective and praxis." In *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Gender, Power and Ideology in Discourse*, ed. Michelle M. Lazar, 1-28. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Lorinc, John. 2003. "You don't know Jack." *Globe and Mail*, 25 January: F5.
- Maich, Steve. 2004. "Troubles at the Globe." *Macleans*, Vol. 117 (44) 38-40.
- Mandziuk, Roseann M. 2008. "Dressing down Hillary." *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 5(3): 312-316.
- Martin, Lawrence. 2011. "Dreaming of a Maggie Thatcher of the Left." *Globe and Mail*, 1 November: A19.
- McGrane, David. 2011. "Political marketing and the NDP's historic breakthrough." In *The Canadian Federal Election of 2011*, ed. Jon H. Pammett and Christopher Dornan, 77-109. Toronto: Dundurn Press.
- McGregor, Judy. 1996. "Gender politics and the news: The search for a beehive bimbo-boadicea." In *Dangerous Democracy? News Media Politics in New Zealand*, ed. Judy McGregor, 181-196. Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.
- Morton, Desmond. 1986. *The New Democrats 1961 – 1986: The Politics of Change*. Toronto: Copp Clark, Pitman.
- Murray, Rainbow. 2010. "Introduction: gender stereotypes and media coverage of women candidates." In *Cracking the Highest Glass Ceiling*, ed. Rainbow Murray, 3 – 27. Santa Barbara: Praeger.
- Neuendorft, Kimberly A. 2002. *The Content Analysis Guidebook*. Thousand Oaks., Calif.: Sage.
- Neuman, W. Lawrence. 2007. *Basics of Social Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Boston: Pearson Education Inc.
- Newman, Christina. 1975. "The listless search for an NDP leader." *Globe and Mail*, 7 June: A1.

- Norris, Pippa. 1997. "Women leaders worldwide: A splash of color in the photo op." In *Women, Media and Politics*, ed. Pippa Norris, 149-165. New York: Oxford University Press.
- O'Neill, Brenda and David K. Stewart. 2009. "Gender and political party leadership in Canada." *Party Politics* 15(6): 737-757.
- Patterson, Thomas E. 1996. "Bad news, bad governance." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 546: 97-108.
- Perreault Jr., William D. and Laurence E. Leigh. 1989. "Reliability of nominal data based on qualitative judgments." *Journal of Marketing Research* 26(2): 135-148.
- Robinson, Gertrude J. and Armande Saint-Jean. 1991. "Women politicians and their media coverage: A generational analysis." In *Women in Canadian Politics: Toward Equity in Representation*, ed. Kathy Megyery, 127-162. Toronto: Dundurn Press.
- Ross, Karen. 2002. *Women, Politics, Media*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Ross, Karen. 2004. "Women framed: The gendered turn in mediated politics." In *Women and Media: International Perspectives*, eds. Karen Ross and Carolyn M. Byerly, 60-80. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Sampert, Shannon and Linda Trimble. 2003. "'Wham, bam, no thank you ma'am': Gender and the game frame in national newspaper coverage of election 2000." In *Women and Electoral Politics in Canada*, eds. Manon Tremblay and Linda Trimble, 211-226. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Semetko, Holli. A. and Hajo G. Boomgaarden. 2007. "Reporting Germany's 2005 Bundestag election campaign: Was gender an issue?" *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics* 12(4): 154-171.
- Simpson, Jeffrey. 1989. "Enter Ms. McLaughlin." *Globe and Mail*, 26 May: A6.
- Simpson, Jeffrey. 2012. "Will Mulcair beat the defenders of the faith?" *Globe and Mail*, 10 March: F9.
- Sreberny-Mohammadi, Annabelle and Karen Ross. 1996. "Women MPs and the media: Representing the body politic." *Parliamentary Affairs* 49: 103-115.
- Stevens, Geoffrey. 1975. "If not Mr. Broadbent..." *Globe and Mail*, 22 January: 6.
- Taras, David. 1999. *Power and Betrayal in the Canadian Media*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
- Trimble, Linda. 2007. "Gender, political leadership and media visibility: *Globe and Mail* coverage of Conservative Party of Canada leadership contests." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 40(4): 1-25.

- Trimble, Linda. 2011. "In the premier league? Women and provincial party leadership in Canada, 1978 – 2011." Paper presented at the University of Manitoba Department of Political Science, 14 June 2011.
- Trimble, Linda and Jane Arscott. 2003. *Still Counting: Women in Politics Across Canada*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
- Trimble, Linda and Joanna Everitt. 2010. "Belinda Stronach and the gender politics of celebrity." In *Mediating Canadian Politics*, ed. Shannon Sampert and Linda Trimble, 50-74. Scarborough: Pearson.
- Trimble, Linda and Shannon Sampert. 2004. "Who's in the game? The framing of the Canadian election 2000 by *The Globe and Mail* and *The National Post*." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 37(1): 51-71.
- Trimble, Linda and Natasja Treiberg. 2010. "'Either way, there's going to be a man in charge': Media representations of New Zealand Prime Minister Helen Clark." In *Cracking the Highest Glass Ceiling: A Global Comparison of Women's Campaigns for Executive Office*, ed. Rainbow Murray, 116-136. Santa Barbara and Oxford: Praeger.
- Trimble, Linda, Natasja Treiberg and Sue Girard. 2010. "'Kim-Speak': l'effet du genre dans la médiatisation de Kim Campbell durant la campagne pour l'élection nationale canadienne de 1993." ('Kim-Speak': Gendered mediation of Kim Campbell during the 1993 Canadian national election'). *Recherches Feministes* 23(1): 29-52.
- Trimble, Linda and Angelia Wagner. 2010. "Wildrose wild card: Alberta newspaper coverage of the 2009 Wildrose Alliance leadership contest." Paper presented at the Prairie Political Science Association Annual Conference, Winnipeg, 2 October 2010.
- Van Acker, Elizabeth. 1999. *Different Voices: Gender and Politics in Australia*. S. Yarra: MacMillan Education.
- Wente, Margaret. 2012. "The New Democrats have no shot, kumbaya." *Globe and Mail*, 22 March: A13.
- Whitehorn, Alan. 1992. *Canadian Socialism: Essays on the CCF-NDP*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, p. 115.

Tables

Table 1: Representation of the New Democratic Party in the House of Commons, 1972 – 2011
(Note: elections held prior to each NDP leadership contest are highlighted)

| Election Year | Seats Held by the NDP | Proportion of Seats Held by the NDP | Placement of the NDP in the House of Commons |
|---------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1972 | 31/264 | 11.7% | Third party |
| 1974 | 16/264 | 6.1% | Third party |
| 1979 | 26/282 | 9.2% | Third party |
| 1980 | 32/282 | 11.3% | Third party |
| 1984 | 30/282 | 10.6% | Third party |
| 1988 | 43/295 | 14.6% | Third party |
| 1993 | 9/295 | 3.1% | Fourth party |
| 1997 | 21/301 | 7.0% | Fourth party |
| 2000 | 13/301 | 4.3% | Fourth party |
| 2004 | 19/308 | 6.2% | Fourth party |
| 2006 | 29/308 | 9.4% | Fourth party |
| 2008 | 37/308 | 12.0% | Fourth party |
| 2011 | 103/308 | 33.4% | Official opposition |

Source: Andrew Heard, Canadian Elections, <http://www.sfu.ca/~aheard/elections/index.htm>

Table 2: NDP Leadership Contests, 1975 – 2012

| Convention date | Candidates | % votes won on the first ballot | % votes won on the final ballot |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--|
| July 7, 1975 ¹² | Ed Broadbent Rosemary Brown Lorne Nystrom John Paul Harney Douglas Campbell | 33.1% 25.5% 21.3% 19.3% 0.7% | 59% 40.3% |
| December 2, 1989 ¹³ | Audrey McLaughlin David Barrett Steven Langdon Simon DeJong Howard McCurdy Ian Waddell Roger Lagasse | 26.9% 23.6% 14.6% 13.1% 10.7% 8.9% 2.2% | 55.1% 44.9% |
| October 14, 1995 ¹⁴ | Svend Robinson Alexa McDonough Lorne Nystrom | 37.8% 32.6% 29.6% | Robinson conceded to McDonough after the first ballot. |
| January 26, 2003 ¹⁵ | Jack Layton Bill Blaikie Lorne Nystrom Joe Comartin Pierre Ducasse Bev Meslo | 53.5% 24.7% 9.3% 7.7% 3.7% 1.1% | Layton won on the first ballot. |
| March 24, 2012 ¹⁶ | Thomas Mulcair Brian Topp Nathan Cullen Peggy Nash Paul Dewar Martin Singh Niki Ashton | 30.3% 21.3% 16.4% 12.8% 7.5% 5.9% 5.7% | 57.2% 42.8% |

¹² Morton, Desmond. 1986. *The New Democrats 1961 – 1986: The Politics of Change*. Toronto: Copp, Clark, Pitman, p. 173

¹³ Whitehorn, Alan. 1992. *Canadian Socialism: Essays on the CCF-NDP*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, p. 115.

¹⁴ CPAC. "NDP Leadership Races."

http://www.cpac.ca/forms/index.asp?dsp=template&act=view3&template_id=1475&hl=e. Last accessed 09 May 2012.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ CPAC. "NDP Leadership 2012."

http://www.cpac.ca/forms/index.asp?dsp=template&act=view3&template_id=1446&hl=e. Last accessed 09 May 2012.

Table 3: Representation of Women in the House of Commons, 1972 – 2011

| Election Year | Number of Seats Held By Women | Percentage of Seats Held by Women |
|---------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1972 | 05/264 | 1.9% |
| 1974 | 09/264 | 3.1% |
| 1979 | 10/282 | 3.5% |
| 1980 | 14/282 | 5.0% |
| 1984 | 27/282 | 9.6% |
| 1988 | 39/295 | 13.2% |
| 1993 | 53/295 | 18% |
| 1997 | 62/301 | 20.6% |
| 2000 | 62/301 | 20.6% |
| 2004 | 65/308 | 21.1% |
| 2006 | 64/308 | 20.8% |
| 2008 | 69/308 | 22.4% |
| 2011 | 76/308 | 24.7% |

Source: Andrew Heard, <http://www.sfu.ca/~aheard/elections/index.htm>

Table 4: Visibility, Prominence and Framing by Sex and Success of the Candidate

Visibility indicators are reported as a percentage or mean of all stories about the contest; Framing measures are reported as a percentage of stories that name the candidate.

| | Female winners | | Male winners | | | Female losers | | Male losers | | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| <i>Visibility</i> | <i>McLaughlin 1989</i> | <i>McDonough 1995</i> | <i>Broadbent 1975</i> | <i>Layton 2003</i> | <i>Mulcair 2012</i> | <i>Brown 1975</i> | <i>Nash 2012</i> | <i>Barrett 1989</i> | <i>Robinson 1995</i> | <i>Blaikie 2003</i> | <i>Cullen 2012</i> |
| Named in story | 71% | 66% | 84% | 78% | 82% | 47% | 43% | 58% | 84% | 64% | 36% |
| Named 1 st in story | 22% | 18% | 37% | 40% | 43% | 6% | 8% | 16% | 34% | 10% | 7% |
| Quoted in story | 17% | 11% | 20% | 34% | 20% | 10% | 12% | 9% | 16% | 16% | 12% |
| Named in headline | 11% | 13% | 22% | 30% | 25% | 6% | 2% | 10% | 21% | 4% | 2% |
| Shown in photo | 3% | 5% | 4% | 16% | 15% | 4% | 7% | 4% | 5% | 8% | 0% |
| Shown in mug | 4% | 3% | 6% | 4% | 2% | 6% | 7% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 2% |
| <i>Prominence (mean)</i> | 1.79 | 1.76 | 2.05 | 2.59 | 2.26 | 1.67 | 1.81 | 1.75 | 1.91 | 1.66 | 1.59 |
| # of times named (mean) | 3.22 | 3.55 | 3.78 | 6.22 | 5.56 | 1.59 | 1.26 | 3.14 | 4.45 | 2.66 | 1.07 |
| # of words quoted (mean) | 4.74 | 5.16 | 12.98 | 16.18 | 12.80 | 5.96 | 7.54 | 3.96 | 9.63 | 6.02 | 5.05 |
| <i>Public framing</i> | <i>McLaughlin</i> | <i>McDonough</i> | <i>Broadbent</i> | <i>Layton</i> | <i>Mulcair</i> | <i>Brown</i> | <i>Nash</i> | <i>Barrett</i> | <i>Robinson</i> | <i>Blaikie</i> | <i>Cullen</i> |
| Public background | 76% | 88% | 86% | 87% | 74% | 83% | 77% | 66% | 72% | 87% | 68% |
| Issue positions | 33% | 20% | 16% | 54% | 8% | 29% | 12% | 25% | 34% | 19% | 9% |
| <i>Private framing</i> | <i>McLaughlin</i> | <i>McDonough</i> | <i>Broadbent</i> | <i>Layton</i> | <i>Mulcair</i> | <i>Brown</i> | <i>Nash</i> | <i>Barrett</i> | <i>Robinson</i> | <i>Blaikie</i> | <i>Cullen</i> |
| Appearance | 6% | 4% | 2% | 18% | 2% | 13% | 0% | 8% | 3% | 13% | 5% |
| Marital status | 4% | 0% | 9% | 15% | 6% | 38% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 3% | 0% |
| Children | 2% | 4% | 14% | 5% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 3% | 0% |
| <i>Gender markers</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sex | 24% | 12% | 9% | 13% | 6% | 25% | 12% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 18% |

Table 5: Measures of Visibility and Prominence by Leadership Contest and Candidate

| Visibility (reported as a % of all stories) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Is the candidate: | 1975 | | 1989 | | 1995 | | 2003 | | 2012 | | |
| | <i>Brown</i> | <i>Broadbent</i> | <i>McLaughlin</i> | <i>Barrett</i> | <i>McDonough</i> | <i>Robinson</i> | <i>Layton</i> | <i>Blaikie</i> | <i>Nash</i> | <i>Cullen</i> | <i>Mulcair</i> |
| Named in story | 24/51 (47%) | 43/51 (84%) | 82/115 (71%) | 67/115 (58%) | 25/38 (66%) | 32/38 (84%) | 39/50 (78%) | 32/50 (64%) | 26/61 (43%) | 22/61 (36%) | 50/61 (82%) |
| Named first in story | 3/51 (6%) | 19/51 (37%) | 25/115 (22%) | 18/115 (16%) | 7/38 (18%) | 13/38 (34%) | 20/50 (40%) | 5/50 (10%) | 5/61 (8%) | 4/61 (7%) | 26/61 (43%) |
| Quoted in story | 5/51 (10%) | 10/51 (20%) | 20/115 (17%) | 10/115 (9%) | 4/38 (11%) | 6/38 (16%) | 17/50 (34%) | 8/50 (16%) | 7/61 (12%) | 7/61 (12%) | 12/61 (20%) |
| Named in main headline | 3/51 (6%) | 11/51 (22%) | 13/115 (11%) | 12/115 (10%) | 5/38 (13%) | 8/38 (21%) | 15/50 (30%) | 2/50 (4%) | 1/61 (2%) | 1/61 (2%) | 15/61 (25%) |
| Visuals (reported as a percentage of all stories featuring either photos or mugs) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Shown in a photo | 2/6 (33%) | 2/6 (33%) | 3/17 (18%) | 5/17 (29%) | 2/5 (40%) | 2/5 (40%) | 8/14 (57%) | 4/14 (29%) | 4/25 (16%) | 0/25 (0%) | 9/25 (36%) |
| Shown in a mug | 3/7 (43%) | 3/7 (43%) | 4/34 (12%) | 5/34 (15%) | 1/1 (100%) | 0/1 (0%) | 2/4 (50%) | 2/4 (50%) | 4/4 (100%) | 1/4 (25%) | 1/4 (25%) |
| Visibility - - Interval level measures (reported as the mean per story) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Brown</i> | <i>Broadbent</i> | <i>McLaughlin</i> | <i>Barrett</i> | <i>McDonough</i> | <i>Robinson</i> | <i>Layton</i> | <i>Blaikie</i> | <i>Nash</i> | <i>Cullen</i> | <i>Mulcair</i> |
| Number of times named | 1.59 | 3.78 | 3.22 | 3.14 | 3.55 | 4.45 | 6.22 | 2.66 | 1.26 | 1.07 | 5.56 |
| Number of words quoted | 5.96 | 12.98 | 4.74 | 3.96 | 5.16 | 9.63 | 16.18 | 6.02 | 7.54 | 5.05 | 12.80 |
| Prominence index scores (mean score per story; possible total of 6) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Brown</i> | <i>Broadbent</i> | <i>McLaughlin</i> | <i>Barrett</i> | <i>McDonough</i> | <i>Robinson</i> | <i>Layton</i> | <i>Blaikie</i> | <i>Nash</i> | <i>Cullen</i> | <i>Mulcair</i> |
| Prominence | 1.67 | 2.05 | 1.79 | 1.75 | 1.76 | 1.91 | 2.59 | 1.66 | 1.81 | 1.59 | 2.26 |

Table 6: Measures of Public and Private Framing by Leadership Contest and Candidate
(Reported as a percentage of stories naming the candidate)

| Public Framing | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Mentioned in story: candidate's: | 1975 | | 1989 | | 1995 | | 2003 | | 2012 | | |
| | <i>Brown</i> | <i>Broadbent</i> | <i>McLaughlin</i> | <i>Barrett</i> | <i>McDonough</i> | <i>Robinson</i> | <i>Layton</i> | <i>Blaikie</i> | <i>Nash</i> | <i>Cullen</i> | <i>Mulcair</i> |
| Public background | 20/24 (83%) | 37/43 (86%) | 62/82 (76%) | 44/67 (66%) | 22/25 (88%) | 23/32 (72%) | 34/39 (87%) | 27/31 (87%) | 20/26 (77%) | 15/22 (68%) | 37/50 (74%) |
| Issue position(s) | 7/24 (29%) | 7/43 (16%) | 27/82 (33%) | 17/67 (25%) | 5/25 (20%) | 11/32 (34%) | 21/39 (54%) | 6/31 (19%) | 3/26 (12%) | 2/22 (9%) | 4/50 (8%) |
| Private Framing | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <i>Brown*</i> | <i>Broadbent</i> | <i>McLaughlin</i> | <i>Barrett</i> | <i>McDonough</i> | <i>Robinson</i> | <i>Layton</i> | <i>Blaikie</i> | <i>Nash</i> | <i>Cullen</i> | <i>Mulcair</i> |
| Appearance | 3/24 (13%) | 1/43 (2%) | 5/82 (6%) | 5/67 (8%) | 1/25 (4%) | 1/32 (3%) | 7/39 (18%) | 4/31 (13%) | 0/26 (0%) | 1/22 (5%) | 1/50 (2%) |
| Marital status | 9/24 (38%) | 4/43 (9%) | 3/82 (4%) | 0/67 (0%) | 0/25 (0%) | 0/32 (0%) | 6/39 (15%) | 1/31 (3%) | 0/26 (0%) | 0/22 (0%) | 3/50 (6%) |
| Children | 1/24 (4%) | 6/43 (14%) | 2/82 (2%) | 0/67 (0%) | 1/25 (4%) | 0/32 (0%) | 2/39 (5%) | 1/31 (3%) | 0/26 (0%) | 0/22 (0%) | 2/50 (4%) |
| Gender markers | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sex | 6/24 (25%) | 4/43 (9%) | 20/82 (24%) | 2/67 (3%) | 3/25 (12%) | 1/32 (3%) | 5/39 (13%) | 1/31 (3%) | 3/26 (12%) | 4/22 (18%) | 3/50 (6%) |