

Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy

John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University

Women and News: Expanding the News Audience, Increasing Political Participation, and Informing Citizens

Joan Shorenstein Center
PRESS • POLITICS



• PUBLIC POLICY •

Harvard University
John F. Kennedy School of Government

Table of Contents

Women and News: Expanding the News Audience, Increasing Political Participation, and Informing Citizens

*A Conference sponsored by the
Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy
on November 29 & 30, 2007*

Keynote Speech: Ellen Goodman, Syndicated Columnist Introduction by Alex Jones, Director of the Shorenstein Center	p. 2
Luncheon Speech: Arianna Huffington, Founder of the Huffington Post Introduction by Thomas Patterson, Bradlee Professor of Government and the Press	p. 14
A Narrative Overview of the Research on Women and News By Shauna Shames, Harvard University; Marion Just, Professor of Political Science at Wellesley College	p. 29
Appendix: Conference agenda and bios	p. 52

Keynote Speech: Ellen Goodman November 29, 2007

MR. JONES: I'm Alex Jones. I'm Director of the Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy and, on behalf of the Shorenstein Center, and of the Kennedy School of Government and of Harvard University, it is my great pleasure to welcome you all here. This is a great pleasure indeed, it's been an effort of great passion, really, for the Shorenstein Center to put this program together. As you know, it's called "Women and News: Expanding the News Audience, Increasing Political Participation, and Informing Citizens"—a rather cumbersome title.

But I think "Women in News" really gets to the heart of it. This began with a conversation that I had last spring when Ellen Goodman and Linda Douglass—both fellows at the Shorenstein Center at that time—came into my office with a kind of horrified look on their faces and proposed this in the wake of research that they had done which was appalling to them, and was appalling, in fact, and I think reasonably so, to all of us who are interested in news, interested in politics and interested in participation. Because it was focused on a couple of facts—facts such as that women were less likely to be involved in politics—women were less likely to be knowledgeable about some areas of important public policy. Women were less likely to be willing to inform themselves and pay attention to news in certain areas that are very important, as we go forward with trying to sort out the future of this country.

And they proposed this conference. It was a very easy sell. I immediately believed and was convinced that it was something that we should do, and I welcome you all here to this conference that began with that moment.

I want to say just a few things before I introduce our keynote speaker. First, I want to commend to you the document that you have on your table, if you have not looked at it. It is the fruit of research that was done by two people, Shauna Shames and Marion Just. (Applause)

Shauna is a graduate student in Harvard's Government Department. Marion is the much esteemed Professor of Political Science at Wellesley College and a research associate at the Shorenstein Center. I really do commend it to you, if you have not read it.

As you know, we have a very distinguished group of panelists that will be gathering tomorrow, we are very grateful to all of them for taking the time to come and think about these profoundly timely topics.

I also want especially to thank Tom Patterson, Nancy Palmer and Edie Holway and the staff of the Shorenstein Center for the exemplary work in putting this all together. (Applause)

Tonight our keynote speaker is Ellen Goodman, who many of you know. Her weekly column is syndicated through the *Washington Post* Writer's Group from here, her base in Boston. It appears in more than 400 newspapers. She began her journalistic career at the *Detroit Free Press* after graduating from Radcliffe and she had the very good fortune, in my opinion and I think in hers as well, to come to the attention of Tom Winship, who was the editor of the *Boston Globe*, when she was coming back to Boston. She was just telling me that the *Herald* offered her more money but Tom persuaded her nonetheless.

(Laughter)

Tom, if any of you know Tom, was a remarkable man and a joyful, serious journalist. He loved women, but even more he loved tough reporting and reporting that had that additional element of heart and empathy and—this is a big thing—humor. Ellen has all of those. For instance, when she left the *Globe*, she decided to base her own office here in Cambridge at the epicen-

ter of Harvard Square, and some of you may be aware that she is in the building that is also occupied by that esteemed law firm—

(Laughter)

Dewey, Cheatem and Howe.

(Laughter)

Click and Clack are her neighbors. But a good sense of humor is one of her weapons, in a sense—she uses it to help get people to pay attention; she also tells stories and does deep reporting. She often seems to speak from the heart, but combines that with speaking with a voice that springs from what she also has, which is a tough and combative nature. One of the things that has concerned her all along is women in all their dimensions. This gathering focus on women in news is a theme that really does spring very much from the work that Ellen has done for all the years that she has been writing—her journalism and especially her column.

Let me read you just a very few things from her work. On what is normal for today's working woman: "Normal is getting dressed in clothes that you buy for work and driving through traffic in a car that you are still paying for, in order to get to the job you need to pay for the clothes and the car and the house you leave vacant all day so you can afford to live in it."

(Laughter)

These are the women that we are trying to interest in a dimension of news that they don't necessarily pay a lot of attention to. On being a woman who is out there in a very brutal media environment: "I do not think that women should train in the Ann Coulter School of Opinion-Hurling. I avoid leaving teeth marks on innocent ankles. We don't need more women or men in the Strunk and Food Fight Stylebook. There are many ways to be heard. But writing out loud, saying what you think on the op-ed page or in the blogosphere, on talk radio or in politics, requires a little hide-toughening."

And on how to keep your courage when you dare to speak your mind: "As for keeping the attack dogs from nibbling away your courage? My theory, after decades in this business, is that you only give a few people the right to make you feel rotten. You have a handful of chits to give out, penuriously, to those you trust and respect. You don't give them to just anyone with an e-mail address and an epithet."

Ellen will be speaking her mind tonight, I have no doubt. It is my pleasure to introduce Ellen Goodman.

(Applause)

MS. GOODMAN: Thank you. And do feel free to keep eating your dessert. I'm still in post-Thanksgiving mode so I will feel right at home here.

I must say that whenever I'm introduced, particularly at Harvard, I think of my favorite credential story, and this happened to me the morning after I won the Pulitzer. I opened up the *New York Times*, and in the *Times* they had pictures of all of us and under my picture it said that I had graduated from college summa cum laude, and I thought it was very nice of the *New York Times* to give me a summa, since Radcliffe had neglected to.

(Laughter)

So I wrote a letter to the managing editor of the *Times* thanking him very much for my summa and he sent me back a note saying, "Oh, it is our pleasure, you are now the first person in American history to have won a Pulitzer and a summa on the same day."

(Laughter)

So, my own highest academic award was a newspaper error which I suppose is proper payment for a lifetime in journalism.

(Laughter)

I am glad to be here, very glad that the Shorenstein Center is holding a conference

on women and news. A lot of us here are veterans of conferences on women and politics and veterans, as well, on conferences of women and journalism. But the Shorenstein Center is a perfect venue for bringing these subjects together, so I'm looking forward tomorrow to seeing the connections—the connections that we can draw between the way news is framed, reported, delivered and what's going on in civic life for women and men. I think this is an important part of the discussion on pathways to the full integration of women in our society.

I hope in my few minutes tonight to set up some of the background for the conversation and ask some of the questions that we can think about tomorrow. I think it's important we go beyond talking about basic discrimination and glass ceilings—we've all been there, done that—to the next generation of issues and to a really deeper understanding of how political news is covered and received, or not covered and not received. It's a moment to see where progress for women has stalled and how we might jump start another period of change.

I come here with a memory of the bad old days, I guess. I am a certified member of the beachhead generation, the wave of women who got a toehold on the sands of equality, and I would like to tell you, particularly the students here, just a little bit about my own history in that regard. When I graduated with my non-summa degree I went to New York and I got one of those jobs in the news magazines that they reserve for over-educated young women. And in those days, women could literally not write for the news magazines. Men were the writers and women were the researchers.

And I tell you this not to let you know that I walked four miles in the snow to school, but—at least for the students in the room—I have found out that young women know that we were discriminated against, but they've forgotten that it was legal.

(Laughter)

And I began work in 1963, which was before the Civil Rights Act of 1964 made discrimination against women illegal. I then went from *Newsweek* to the *Detroit Free Press* where I was among the first women in the city room. And then in 1967, I did indeed come back to Boston and to the *Boston Globe* for \$10 less, as Alex said, and I took a job in the women's pages, which was the job that was offered to me. I was pregnant at the time and figured I'd better get a job, and we used to refer to the women's pages then as "back there."

So, I had my daughter about eight months later and I decided to stay at home in order to get her off to a good start in life—so I didn't go back to work until she was six weeks old.

(Laughter)

Well, at that time I was literally the only mother of a preschool child in the city room and I remember very clearly the attitude of some of my colleagues when I first came back to work. I would meet them in the hallway and they would say, "And who takes care of your child?" And about the twentieth time this happened to me in my first week back at work I turned around and said, "Oh, I just leave her at home with the refrigerator open and it all works out."

(Laughter)

Well, things have changed a great deal since then.

I am also here tonight as something of a Harvard recidivist, I guess. I recycled through Harvard the first time in the early 1970s when I was a Nieman Fellow, in studying the dynamics of social change in America at a moment when social change was indeed dynamic. It was a period of enormous progress, particularly in the roles of men and women. My Nieman class was the first to have four women, which was the sum total of all the women who had previously gone through the program.

Many of us had the belief back then that we would integrate the news and the masthead the way we had integrated the help-wanted ads. Women would not only become full participants in political life but women's issues, family, children, values, would become equal news. The

slogan of that era was “the personal is political.” We believed that the division between women in the private sphere and men in the public sphere would melt away, and some of it did. Women’s issues such as abortion and marriage and family values did indeed become political and front-page issues. Be careful what you wish for.

(Laughter)

Newspapers no longer named those sections “the women’s pages.” They renamed them “living,” “style,” “lifestyle.” More women entered politics and political journalism and we have indeed made enormous progress. But by the time I came back to Harvard for my next recycle as a visiting fellow at the Shorenstein Center, I was thinking more about how this social change had stalled. In some ways it was and is an odd time to worry about the sluggishness of the movement in the Women’s Movement in journalism or in politics.

For the first time, after all, we have a female Speaker of the House, Nancy Pelosi. We have the first female front-runner for the presidential nomination, Hillary Clinton, if she is still the front-runner this week. We have the first woman anchoring a network evening news, Katie Couric—although she is not a front runner—and, even more remarkably for those of us who are undergraduates we have the first woman president of Harvard. When Drew Faust was inaugurated last month, she opened a sealed letter from President Eliot dedicated to his 21st century successor and it began: “My Dear Sir.”

(Laughter)

She also got a note from Bill Clinton and that read, “I think women should be presidents of everything.”

(Laughter)

But returning here I was also aware of what seemed stuck. Yes, women now hold a record-high percentage of the seats in Congress, but that record is 16.4 percent; hold your applause. Yes, women are joining state legislatures, but that number is 24 percent and it hasn’t changed more than a few percentage points in a decade. Only 13 percent of big city mayors are women. There are fewer women going into politics than into any other profession, than into medicine or law or journalism. Meanwhile, in journalism, I think progress has also stalled.

There are indeed more women fighting in the war in Iraq and more women covering that war. Women today constitute about a third of full-time journalists at daily newspapers and about the same percentage at all the other news media, but that’s roughly the same percentage that it was 25 years ago. What happened to the idea that we would sort of naturally bubble up? I’m afraid that the fizz went a little flat.

Overall, we hold 29 percent of top newspaper jobs and 18 percent of publisher seats. The cup is one-third full. We are not just stuck but in some ways spinning our wheels. I had an experience last spring when I went down to the *Globe* for a breakfast in honor of Elizabeth Newfer, the *Boston Globe* reporter who had died in Iraq, and I sat next to a young metro reporter who told me that the young women on the metro desk couldn’t imagine doing their job if they had small children. And I said, “But, but, but—we all did it.”

(Laughter)

And she looked at me like I was talking about the dark ages, before the era of what we all know as “extreme jobs.”

So, stalled in politics, stalled in journalism. But there is another place where women are stalled. I came here last year with a statistic stuck in my craw: two weeks before the 2004 election, 40 percent of Americans still—*still*—believed that Saddam Hussein was directly responsible for 9/11. While that was depressing enough for those of us who are in the news business, it was a product of both inattention and disinformation. But the gender gap was even more appalling. Only a third of men believed this, but nearly half of women believed this.

Why had women flunked the biggest news pop quiz of the war? Was this misinformation the reason for the so-called “security mom” vote? Was it because many women were not engaged in the news because the way we frame the news tells women in a thousand different ways that politics is not for them? So, as the title of this conference suggests, I believe there is an interrelationship between civic engagement, public information, public attention, the media and politics, and let me lay out a few more things that I hope we will wrestle with tomorrow.

First, we have to look directly at the gender gap in public affairs information. I spent some time pouring over the polls from Pew—bless you all, Andy. And for as long as Pew has been tracking it there has been a public affairs information gender gap. Men have more basic knowledge about politics than women. In 2006 52 percent of the men knew the name of the Secretary of State, only 34 percent of the women knew Condoleezza Rice; 42 percent of men knew that Putin was President of Russia, compared to 23 percent of women; and 74 percent of men compared to 56 percent of women knew that the GOP then controlled Congress.

Now, my favorite explanation for this, I confess, came from an academic who told me that half the gap comes from the fact that men simply won’t say, “I don’t know.”
(Laughter)

They don’t ask directions, they don’t say “I don’t know,” they guess. But there is still what I would call a division of knowledge labor. It’s not that women are news airheads, it’s that they carry different information. Bob Blendon was the one who reminded me that women know a good deal more than men, for example, about healthcare—but when you look into that figure as well, what you find is that women know a lot more about diseases, the kinds of things that they want to know for their families, and men know a lot more about healthcare policy.

At the same time, women are more likely than men to know the name of their school superintendent and I am willing to bet big money that they are much more likely to know the name and telephone number of the pediatrician, the teacher, the birthdays of everyone in the family, and what they are going to get for Christmas. They are the experts in what we might call private affairs information, they are the keepers of the knowledge about relationships and about care.

Meanwhile, an equally large gap remains in what we call news interest, particularly around foreign affairs. In 2002, there was a 20 point gender gap in the interest in foreign affairs, then in 2004, as the Iraq War came about, the gender gap closed and everybody was more interested, and then in 2006 the gender gap was wide open again. This is intriguing because at the same time we know that women turned against this war first and hardest before the 2006 election. So what did this mean? Had women learned all they need to know and stopped paying attention or, again, is foreign affairs, like politics, being narrated for and by men?

It’s not a surprise that what people learn depends on where they go for news. The Pew folks also did a study they labeled “his” and “hers” news—with all due respect and apologies, I have relabeled it “pink” and “blue” news. To give you an idea of the division, the website for the “Today Show” is not actually pink but it is actually peach.
(Laughter)

The “Evening News” website is actually blue, I kid you not. On November 1st the peach-colored page led with this news: “Why sex and lies make bad bedfellows.” The blue-colored page led with “Housing market feeling economic ripples.” Even though the “Evening News” is clearly trying to attract women viewers with stories about health—often scare stories—we have something of a color war going on. Meanwhile, we know men are much more likely to listen to talk radio and women to talk television. That’s not exactly a news bulletin.

On talk radio the hosts, from the recovering Rush Limbaugh to the comeback slur-meister Don Imus, are overwhelmingly men. So are the callers and so are the listeners. So, for that matter, are the vast majority of the TV, cable TV hosts and commentaries, from Chris Mathews

to Bill O'Reilly, with the possible exception of Ann Coulter—although I am willing to do a steroid test on Ms. Coulter.

(Laughter)

Meanwhile, on what I call “talk television,” the hosts are often women, from Oprah, to “The View,” and the audience is overwhelmingly female. Well, in the mostly male talk radio world the subject, when it isn't sports, is politics. In the mostly female talk television world the subject is relationships; there is little political content, direction or solutions. What, after all, can a politician do about sisters who steal your boyfriends or daughters who striptease for a living, two recent subjects?

(Laughter)

Even when the pink shows talk politics, they are more likely to turn politics into relationships, and even when Oprah decides to go into politics, she does it for the man she calls “my favorite guy.” As for issues, she says, “I know him well enough to believe in his moral authority.” So why is the landscape pink and blue? Is it because of the choices men and women make, what male and female consumers want, or because of the assumption of marketers and producers? Is it, for example, true that women don't want to turn their radios to politics or only that they don't want to hear any more angry male voices?

By the way, even as we meet, this pink and blue landscape is in flux. For a time, the format of the morning news was becoming softer and softer and softer until it was virtually liquid.

(Laughter)

And it was doing that in pursuit of escaping women viewers. Yet, at the same time, the same shows lost 450,000 women viewers last season, so the assumptions may actually be wrong, as well as counterproductive. And the best exception to pink and blue news—purple news, if you will—may still be NPR, which for many years had both a growing audience and a shrinking gender gap. There is some evidence, we'll hear tomorrow, that women pay more attention to politics when women are running for office. Maybe women also pay more attention to news when there are more women reporting it.

So these are some of the questions about the frayed connections between our role as citizens, journalists, politicians. But if we are looking at how things are stalled, we have to also look at the role of news consumers. There is no one in this room unaware of the changing media landscape. We live in an era when the mass media may be the minority, when marketers are slicing and dicing, fragmenting the audience and considering citizens as nothing but an audience.

I saw a recent ad for hyper-targeting on MySpace. This is not a phrase that trips easily off my lips. But what it was doing was telling advertisers to, and I quote: “target self-expressed user interests and passions—’I love video games,’ ‘I love hip-hop,’ ‘I love shoes,’ ‘I love skating.’” It made me wonder if “I love politics” will soon be a targeted interest on a scale of, say, skateboarding.

It also made me aware that much of the news content is being deliberately driven by marketing into sex-segregated cul-de-sacs. Gannett is one of many companies that are having great success with mommy blogs on their websites. There is the hope, I am sure, that when women enter a site to read soft news about, say, Angelina Jolie's adoption of an African baby, they will stay to get engaged in the story of Africa. But is anyone actually engaging them that way? It seems at least as likely that they will only get involved in the story of Angelina Jolie's adoption of an Asian baby.

The Internet is a perfect example of the ways that the new media are both connecting and fragmenting people. I think there are enormous possibilities for women in Internet journalism because the entry level, the entry price is so low and anybody can do it. Half of the 96

million blogs are being written by women, but what about politics? The netroots are a virtual “new boys” network. Tomorrow one panel will talk about the op-ed page that still looks like an X-Y-rated zone, but when a graduate student did a spreadsheet of the top 90 political blogs for me last spring, a full 42 percent were edited and written by men only, while seven percent were written by women only.

There are women writing the top political blogs from Jane Hampshire on the left to Michelle Malkin on the right. Arianna Huffington is one woman who runs one of the most popular blogs, but I am sure that tomorrow she will be among the first to tell us how many more men than women blog for Huffington Post. I looked today and the ratio was nine to one. Is that because men still raise their hands first in class, a fact that I can attest to after having attended several evenings at the Kennedy School forum?

Last summer the “Yearly Kos” convention actually had a panel called “Blogging While Female.” The question for many of us in the opinion writing is why relatively few women still express their opinions. On the Blogging While Female panel one of the recurrent concerns that came up was harassment. Now, I can attest to the fact that when you tell people what you think for a living, they tell you what they think of what you think, and I am hardly a wilting flower, but sometimes it’s pretty startling.

A couple of months ago after a Maureen Dowd column I pulled these responses off of the Huffington Post website and I suspect these were the cleaned-up ones. Let me quote them. One: “Her alleged op-eds are nothing but the ranting of a desperate, man starved old maid.” Two: “She should be sequestered in the same room with Larry Craig.” I’m not sure what that meant.

(Laughter)

Three: “How old is Dowd anyway? And maybe she is a virgin.” Can you imagine anyone saying that Tom Friedman would have been against the Iraq War if only he had gotten laid more often?

(Laughter)

Well, Gina Cooper, the organizer of the “Yearly Kos,” told me that she gets hate e-mail with sexual threats and comments like, “I’m going to hunt you down.” So, in this stalled revolution, there may be many women who are scared silent, who write under pseudonyms or who retreat to the comfort zone of the mommy blogs.

One other related point, political journalism is increasingly a food fight. Forgive me a small personal story that I have told at least one of you before. I agreed only once to go on the “O’Reilly Factor”—don’t ask.

Well, that afternoon, kind of skating ahead of the cracking ice of my deadline life, I ran out to the car that was waiting for me and I ran smack into the glass door at the *Globe*. This is a door that had been there for the entire 30 years that I had worked at the paper.

(Laughter)

I ended up with a black eye and I figured that that was God’s way of telling me to give Bill Reilly a good leaving alone, but generally I have found a somewhat less destructive, self-destructive way to avoid the opinion hurling circuit. When a booker calls and asks me for a quick view for a pre-interview on assisted suicide, or the death penalty or abstinence education, all I have to say is, “Well, that’s complicated,” or “I have mixed feelings about that,” and I can hear the phone going back on the hook.

(Laughter)

In food-fight journalism they are looking for folks who will duke it out. They are still mostly men and the folks willing to duke it out are still mostly men.

This leads me to the final connective tissue between gender, news and politics: the

framing of the news. How many times have we all thought that conflict is the ultimate media bias, and isn't it a male bias? We know that politics is most easily, most lazily framed as a fight. Consider the CNN ad in the *New York Times* a couple of weeks ago on the day of the democratic debate in Nevada. It said, "Live from Las Vegas, they've warmed up, tonight the gloves come off."

Well, never mind that they didn't come off. A couple of disagreements were analyzed as a knockout, a verbal exchange was described as a jab above the belt, below the belt, et cetera. Although women do not have exactly the same anxiety about being hit below the belt, many are in fact turned off by this language.

Marion Just will talk tomorrow about the study for the Project in Excellence in Journalism that shows that only 12 percent of the stories about this election were presented in a way that explained how citizens might be affected by the election, while nearly 86 percent focused on matters that affected the parties and the candidates. But I would suggest that this bias disproportionately affects women as reporters and consumers of the news, as candidates and as voters, it frames politics in boy talk.

I would like to offer a final thought. We need to look at that women's motive and slogan again—"the personal is political"—in a fresh way. We do live in an era when the political has become stunningly personal. We know more about Elizabeth Edwards' cancer than about her husband's healthcare policy, we know more about Hillary Clinton's marriage than about her family and medical leave policy, but what we still don't do well is frame the personal as political, explain why and when and where politics matters in our lives and why it isn't just another form of infotainment.

I do have a cockeyed optimistic view. I think the best way to connect women and men with politics and civic life is by writing the kinds of stories that journalists, maybe especially women journalists, have always favored, always taken as the best. These are the stories that contain a compelling narrative, the stories that do indeed draw a line between what matters in our lives and in politics. The best kind of journalism is also the most effective.

I'll close it by saying that during the conference I do hope we keep in mind a woman who will not be here. She is Anita Esterday, a waitress in Iowa. Last month there was one of these "gotcha" feeding frenzies and half the political reporters were trying to track down the story that Hillary Clinton hadn't left a tip for a waitress. "Tipgate" was the story of the hour.

(Laughter)

When the waitress was finally found she had the last word. Esterday told a reporter for the *New York Times*, and I quote: "You people are really nuts."

(Laughter)

"There's kids dying in the war, the price of oil right now—there's better things in this world to be thinking about than who served Hillary Clinton at Maid Rite and who got a tip and who didn't get a tip." I think we can all raise a glass to Ms. Esterday.

Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Ellen has agreed to take a few questions and—

MS. GOODMAN: As long as I've got my wine.

MR. JONES: And I want you to know she was totally abstentious during dinner, but I was charged with bringing a glass of wine immediately, as soon as she had finished her remarks. So, we don't have another microphone but if you will speak in loud, authoritative tones, we will be glad to entertain questions. Just hold up your hand if you have a question for Ellen.

MS. STAN: I don't have anything particularly original to ask. I'm Adele Stan with the National Women's Editorial Forum.

And since we do have a woman running in a front runner capacity this time around, I'm wondering what your observations are in terms of how do you think that the media are

dealing with this situation? I think a number of us have written about how there seems to be sort of confusion and discomfort about how to talk about a woman, given the sports analogy and the language that we are used to hearing.

MS. GOODMAN: Well, starting with the coverage of her cleavage—do you all remember that story? The Robin Givhan piece in the *Washington Post* that seemed to make a mountain out of an inch of T-shirt, and her cackle. I mean there have been a tremendous, really outrageous number of pieces on that sort of detail. But I think in some way what we are seeing is Hillary Clinton being compared to other women. I mean it's almost as if she is running both against the other candidates and against a whole range of images of femaleness.

The whole question about being certain and aggressive—I mean, I think she has done an amazing job. For the whole first part of the campaign I thought she had completely de-gendered it. For the first time the female candidate had become, for better and for worse, politically, the establishment candidate. Imagine that. For the first time the female candidate had become the one running on experience and that was always a knock against women. So for the first part of the campaign I thought it had been remarkably de-gendered.

Then I was struck by how the minute she mentioned what everybody knew, which is that she was the only female candidate in a sea of men, she was accused of playing the gender card. Now, I'm not sure what a gender card is, and where you buy one and whether there is a pack of them.

(Laughter)

I've never quite figured out what that is, but it does seem to me that she was called on showing what everybody already knew, that she was the one woman in that group of candidates. It's such an interesting story because there are a zillion ways to look at it, and I think women who are judging her or potentially voting for her, thinking about her as a candidate, are also judging her by standards of womanness—as well as by standards of general political experience, and it has become a really fascinating story.

I have been particularly struck, I think, that she is so much more popular among working-class women than among the women you would assume would be just like her, you know, in a profile. But the working-class women have been much more accepting. I've also been really interested in watching the African American vote between her and Obama and that African American women have so identified with her, and I'm sure with Bill, but they have so identified with her.

And one of the things that you see in the African American community is that the older middle-aged women stake out political positions first and the community drifts towards them—I mean that's the way it's been described to me by far savvier political watchers than I—and I have been very interested in watching how the African American women have staked her out as their candidate, despite the obvious appeal of a very appealing African American candidate. So we are seeing a fascinating campaign on the Democratic side.

And on the Republican side, if I were a Republican, I would just be in full-throated depression.

(Laughter)

MR. JONES: Questions? There is a question I would like to ask you. You wrote in a blog, I guess it was a blog, after the November election last time about how women had been the swing in a number of states that made the difference between there being a Republican and a Democratic Congress. Do you expect women, as a block, to be the deciders of the presidential election and how do you see that shaping up in terms of how they are going to go?

MS. GOODMAN: I think it is such a long way between now and next November that I don't want to put my money—I don't want to put that down now. But I do think that women are very engaged and certainly Hillary Clinton has engaged them. The fact that there is

somebody there who looks like them, who is going through this, the fact that there is all this conversation about gender as well as politics has, really, I think engaged a lot of their attention. Women have also been more traditionally anti-war and this is no exception.

Depending on who is running, I would guess that what we have seen that women who had also staked out their positions in terms of being of the anti-war, democratic candidate earlier and men would drift to them. That's been one of the changes, as I understand it, in the past several elections. It used to be that men staked out their position and women drifted to them, and in 2006 there is no question women staked out their position earlier and then men drifted towards them.

I don't know if this is happening in households or just in the general population, but I think that you will see—particularly if Hillary Clinton is running, you will see a very strong turnout. It's one of the other little subpieces of the demographics that's so interesting, the way older women have identified with her candidacy too.

MR. JONES: Yes? Over here, do you have a question?

FROM THE FLOOR: You talked about the importance of good narratives as a way to kind of address this problem of engaging women in the news, and so I have kind of two quick questions under that category. First is how do you think the idea—because I think conflict is often like cited as a central portion of a good narrative—so how do you think that conflict should be reframed so that the conflict is not necessarily violent conflict and so it incorporates the narratives that are relevant to women more?

And then, second, to what extent do you think women need to be the protagonists in these narratives that are portrayed in the media more at least just, you know, more a part of them?

MS. GOODMAN: Well, you know, there is a difference between conflict and fight, there is a difference between difference and conflict, and certainly there is every reason to show differences between candidates. And I do think that when women hear the sports metaphors, particularly boxing but also slam dunking—it took me, I don't know, three campaign cycles before I actually figured out what a slam dunk was. When they hear that, when they hear the language, it feels exclusionary, it feels like they are left out of the conversation about it.

And I think that when they do hear that people are fighting, they just say, “Oh, oh you little boys.” It's like dealing with their children, they say, “I don't care who is right and who is wrong, just stop fighting.” Not that that's—we do care who is right and who is wrong, but I think that's not a narrative that engages people. Even if you see a fight, even if you watch it, it keeps you outside the ring and what we want to do is engage people into the decision-making process.

In terms of creating a narrative where the woman is a protagonist, I think the little, short ads often try to do that. They have some woman sitting there thinking about her healthcare, and that's useful for a political ad but it's also very useful for storytelling in news. What does this actually mean? What does this healthcare plan versus this one mean? What does it mean in terms of our war policy? There are narratives for both sides to tell and I think you can engage them.

I had an experience just the other night when I raised the question about women not wanting to think about the Iraq issue or not being engaged in it but just turning off. A woman came up to me, an older woman who had a daughter in Iraq, and she said I think that it isn't so much that we have fatigue and said it's too painful—and I know I stopped watching the news because it was too painful. So we have to tell stories that get people to listen and not just body bag stories.

MS. MCKIM: Hi. My name is Jennifer McKim. I'm a Nieman Fellow and a mother of two young children.

And I was interested to hear you talk about how you sat with a *Boston Globe* reporter who was thinking it was easier back when you started and I'm wondering what you think

about that, is there is any validity to that and, if so, what is happening in our newsrooms now?

MS. GOODMAN: One thing that was easy—well, I don't think it was easier, I mean you have my war stories—we didn't even have maternity leave. I had no job guarantee. I was supposed to leave when I showed and wasn't supposed to come back, and just because I was welcomed back—it was all those things. I'm not at all suggesting that it was easier in the bad old days.

I think what we did have was the sense of, for women and many of the men in my office, was the sense of being in it together, that there was a movement there. So, for example, the group of women at the *Globe* in the '70s, we met many nights, we put together a truly amateurish protest document that said, "*Boston Globe* sexism, morning, evening and Sunday."

(Laughter)

It was really tacky but it was before we had PowerPoint, before we had computers. But we felt that we were acting collectively, and we could talk together and we were in it together, and I think that sense of collective action has dissipated. Among the younger generation, everybody is once again feeling that they have to figure it all out on their own and that's disappointing, as well as the extreme job thing, you know, which is 24/7 and you are blogging when you are not reporting, when you are not videotaping, when you're not on the dot com, so I think that that is happening simultaneously.

But I think that there has to be, we need to get that sense of togetherness back to change some of what's going on inside our own institutions.

MR. JONES: Just a couple more. One over here?

MS. GRAFF: You asked a number of great questions. And I wondered what you thought about the idea of why is there a pink and blue news. Is it that women are less interested in news or is it that it's driven by marketing assumptions, and the framing of the news and the idea that does marketing drive news into sex segregated spots and then sort of drop you into the ads? You know: "Here's the diapers." What do you think? You just made some suggestions.

MS. GOODMAN: Well, I do think that marketing is fragmenting everything, that there used to be there networks, now there are 370 networks and their marketers are saying to the advertisers, "we can deliver to you only the people who play soccer on Tuesday afternoons." And you want those people because you can sell them Tuesday afternoon soccer T-shirts, and there is something very specific and directed at that.

Now, the problem with that is that politics is part of citizenship, politics is not fragmented, politics is what we are in together. This feeds back into what I was saying before, that sense of being in anything together has been remarkably diminished over the last 10, 15 years, and some of it is the technology too, you know—so that you are in your own iPod world. You can make exactly what you want, you don't have to watch television with anybody else, you don't have to share their music. I was sitting—this is just parenthetical but I was with my grandson this weekend and he no longer thinks that you should have to listen to the whole record the way we did, or the CD. Excuse me, record?

(Laughter)

That you should be able to push through and only hear what it is that you want. And if you watch something on television you should be able to fast forward past the parts that you don't like. So that the whole world has been sliced and diced to the point where each person forms their own little constituency. Except guess what, it doesn't work like that when you are trying to make national policy, when you are trying to get people together to come with a healthcare plan, come up with a foreign policy.

So, frankly, good news is at odds with current marketing, so I do think that the marketing is a real part of this problem.

FROM THE FLOOR: I just wonder what you would suggest, I mean women

aren't well represented on the editorial pages, so what can be done to change that?

MS. GOODMAN: It's a sort of double helix—like the DNA— it's a double helix because you need to make the newspaper more friendly to work in families so that women will stay in it longer, they won't leave faster, and then you need to encourage them and give them more responsibility and wages so that they'll be motivated to stay. I mean it's a complicated story. In the '70s, we thought, well, we would get our little ten point program and it would be all over. Or you would pull one string and the whole thing would come out, and it's really a much more complex story right now.

I was struck when I was here last spring that the best and the brightest of young graduate students—there was still a real difference between the number of men, male students who would raise their hands and the number of women. I remember, one young woman told me that there was an interesting group who had gotten together and had made a plan that each one of them was going to ask questions and they would support each other.

Then there was also somebody who told me about a conference, not a conference, but a workshop, in which they were trying to get women to deal with conflict when they did speak up, and one of the things that they did was they sent one of their members out of the room and then they all said when she comes in—and she has been assigned to talk—and when she comes in, nobody look her in the eye. And so she came in, and she was talking and none of them looked her in the eye, and what they were trying to do was to—this is the hardest thing, you want to relate, you want reaction, they were trying to literally train people to do this.

And I do think, you know, Alex read my little, “You only give out so many chits to people who make you feel bad about yourself,” and I do think that that is really crucial to teach women that it doesn't matter if some jerk sends you an e-mail. We had a group last spring who were a group of Republican campaign managers. One woman raised her hand at the forum and asked a question about whether, about nursing care, I believe it was, and she was shot down by one of the managers, who shall remain nameless, and no other woman got up to a microphone after that.

Well, two things have to happen, one, you bite the guy in the ankle. Secondly, you've got to just learn. It's learned behavior—it's not like you wake up one morning, and you write and people hate you or they write you horrible things and it doesn't bother you. You learn not to be bothered and we have to teach people how. The first ten times this happens—I'm sure everybody here has had that ghastly either e-mail or confrontation with somebody that we wrote about, and the first ten times this happens it's hard, and then it's not so hard, so it's learned and taught behavior.

And I think you also have to go out and encourage and bring people in either to write op-eds on your page, or to write blogs or to speak up at a meeting or to speak up on a television panel.

MR. JONES: Ellen, thank you very much.

(Applause)

Luncheon Speech: Arianna Huffington November 30, 2007

MR. PATTERSON: Welcome again, thank you all for being here. I'm Tom Patterson, Bradlee Professor of Government and the Press here at the Kennedy School, Acting Director of the Shorenstein Center. I would like to recognize the real Director of the Shorenstein Center who is on leave this year, Alex Jones.

(Applause)

And I do want to recognize some people who have worked hard to make this event a success. No one has done more, hour-wise, thought-wise, just pure energy-wise than Camille Stevens of our staff.

(Applause)

We can never do these things without Edie Holway and Nancy Palmer.

(Applause)

And it's my pleasure to introduce today's luncheon speaker, Arianna Huffington. She has been a commentator, columnist, blogger, editor, author, kind of a regular Jill-of-all-trades, if you will. I'm a real fan of the Huffington Post which she cofounded and edits and I absolutely love her book titles. If my count is correct, she has written eleven books including *Fanatics and Fools*; *Pigs at the Trough*. You'll notice you don't need the subtitles to know who she is talking about.

(Laughter)

Here are a few more titles: *How to Overthrow the Government*, *Greetings from the Lincoln Bedroom* and the 1980s international bestseller that later became a feature film, *Picasso: Creator and Destroyer*. The Picasso book appeared shortly after a roughly similar entitled film *Conan the Destroyer*, featuring the then-unheralded Arnold Schwarzenegger, perhaps the only man to beat her in a head-to-head competition. Holding your own with Arianna Huffington is tough, as Bill O'Reilly, Chris Matthews, Bill Maher and others can attest, she is practiced at give and take.

As an undergraduate at Cambridge University she was President of the famed debating society, the Cambridge Union. Her journey from England to America was later matched by a journey from the Republican Party to a fierce political independence that insists on holding the powerful to account whatever their party or position. Yesterday over her byline in the Huffington Post was a typical Arianna headline, "Karl Rove's Shameless, Remorseless, Soulless Attempt to Rewrite History." Her article was a sharp rebuttal of Rove's claim that congressional republicans and not the White House quickened the pace of the U.S. invasion of Iraq.

Arianna Huffington is fearless, to borrow a word from the title of her latest book. The book is a straightforward, to the point, treatise on how you too can be bold, maybe. But there is only one Arianna Huffington, bold of opinion, bold of speech, bold of wit and marvelously accomplished. In 2006, she was named to the Time 100, *Time* magazine's list of the world's 100 most influential people, and we are honored to have her with us today.

Arianna Huffington.

(Applause)

MS. HUFFINGTON: Thank you so much for this wonderful introduction. I loved all the connections, including *Conan the Destroyer*.

Thank you all for being here. I enjoyed the second half of the previous session that I heard. So, for those of you who haven't heard me before, this accent is for real.

(Laughter)

Although I joked once that I was really born in Fresno, California and had culti-

vated it to give myself an air of being an ethnic minority.
(Laughter)

And believe it or not I got 37 letters from people asking me how exactly did I go about changing my accent, which perhaps explains a certain gullibility in the American electorate, which perhaps explains the current occupant in the White House and why Karl Rove thinks that he can get away with rewriting history.

But we are here to talk about women and the media and I've been asked to use my experience with the Huffington Post as a case study of one woman's journey into the new media.

And I must say that, for me, the moment when I wanted to get involved with the new media was when Josh Marshall took down Trent Lott. I don't know if you remember that—Trent Lott made some racist remarks at a Strom Thurmond birthday lunch; the traditional media largely ignored them and moved on. Josh Marshall covered them exhaustively, other bloggers followed, including bloggers from the right. They followed them not just by repeating the same story but the way bloggers do it best, which is by developing the story, by going back into the past and finding other things Trent Lott had said, therefore making the connection that this was not an isolated moment part of a larger narrative which is, again, what particularly works online, the way it worked with “macaca” and George Allen.

So, I thought, this is amazing—this is one man being able to bring down the majority leader of the Republican Party, this is real power to the people and I wanted to be part of it, and so I started something that I called “Arianna Online” which was my first incarnation of the Huffington Post where I basically put all my columns, had a forum interaction with the readers.

And then after the '04 election I—together with Kenneth Lehrer, who came from the AOL-Time Warner stable—decided to launch a combination of a collective blog, news and opinion. This is really what the Huffington Post is and I think that's what News 2.0 is going to be, and news aggregated, in our case, from all around the world. But what we do is we pick what we think the important news is because, as I.F. Stone once said, the question every day is what page the front page news is going to be, because the front page news is not always on the front page. So we create our own front page.

Let me give you an example, from Monday's *New York Times* where the headline was about how the White House is lowering the bar on political progress in Iraq. We thought that the story completely buried the lead that in fact there had been no political progress in Iraq at all, that in fact they were playing games with words, moving from reconciliation to accommodation. And now the highest goal was to help Iraq spend its budget—that is reducing expectations to a laughable extent.

So, we splashed it with a headline that was about the fact that the surge had not really worked—because the surge was about allowing political progress to work, remember? If you go back to the surge, it was not about whether the surge would work militarily—I mean nobody doubts that if you put more army in a particular part of the universe it's going to control violence, right? There is less violence within the White House than outside the White House in Washington, D.C.

(Laughter)

It's almost tautological to say that the surge has worked militarily, especially when you add the fact that two million people have left Iraq, two million people are misplaced and there has been an ethnic cleansing to such an extent that there are fewer people to kill in your neighborhood.

(Laughter)

That is really the way the Huffington Post presented the news because we believe that's where the truth is. So, part of what our philosophy of news is not to be agnostic about the

truth. So much of traditional media basically is like—it's like Pontius Pilot. It's as though they don't want to take a stand on where the truth lies, and we've seen that with global warming—we've had endless reporting that basically presented the facts in those ways. On the one hand, we have Al Gore pointing out the dangers of global warming. On the other hand, we have Senator Inhofe telling us that global warming is a fraud; well, it's for us to decide.

Well, it's not like that—in fact the truth is not always in the middle, not every story has only one hand and then the other. I have an 18-year-old daughter who is the editor-in-chief of her school paper and she had to produce a mission statement, and I read it after she had finished it—because I'm not allowed to read anything before, because I don't know anything.

(Laughter)

And in that paper she said, “I consider our mission to ferret out the truth,” and I thought, wow, you know, that's what journalists supposedly consider their mission when they are at journalism school, and then what happens? Then our mission becomes to present both sides of an argument. So, at the Huffington Post we present both sides of an argument when the truth has not yet been determined.

And then when it comes to opinion we have 1,800 bloggers who blog whenever their spirit moves them. I know that we are being caricatured in the *Boston Globe* for not paying our bloggers, but the truth is that our bloggers are not journalists in the sense of somebody who has a job with expectations, with deadlines. They basically are op-ed writers who can express their views whenever they want. And I'm sure nobody writes an op-ed, unless you are Ellen Goodman or somebody who is doing it for a living, for the money—nobody writes it to get \$100 from the *New York Times* or from the *Boston Globe*. They write it because they want their views out there.

So what we do is basically provide a platform, an audience, moderated comments. Our comments are moderated 24/7 because we believe that's the only way to actually have a civil discourse without allowing the discourse to be overrun by trolls and ad hominem attacks. And I think one of the problems that we are all dealing with online is anonymity and people hiding behind anonymity, and we have chosen from the beginning to basically not allow that on our blogs.

Let me just give you an example of the original inception of the Huffington Post for me, when it came to the blog, which was to bring people who are incredible voices in our culture whom we are not hearing from enough. The first person I invited to blog was Arthur Schlesinger, and I remember I called him up and he said to me, “So, what's a blog?” And I tried to explain and he said, “Let me take you to lunch and you can tell me about it.” So we went to lunch at the Century Club and Arthur and I were the youngest people there.

(Laughter)

And he said to me, “Arianna, I barely have a computer. I don't do e-mail.” I said, “Don't worry, how do you communicate?” He said, “I have a fax machine.” I said, “Okay, you can write your blog and fax it to me.” So I would get these faxes from Arthur and it was like one of the great joys. I remember the president giving a speech on Yalta, the Yalta Agreement, and Arthur—who had been there—immediately wrote a blog. It was just two paragraphs, exposing the lack of any kind of historical truth in what the president was saying, and we put it up immediately.

And that, for me, was kind of my dream: to have people with real knowledge, real understanding, real insights interrupt their real work because his real work was not blogging—to do something which became like a means to enter the cultural bloodstream and then move on into the real work. And I had a similar experience with Norman Mailer. I don't know why I'm picking only dead bloggers but—

(Laughter)

Dead white bloggers.

(Laughter)

Dead white male bloggers—what's going on here?

(Laughter)

At a conference about women and the media.

(Laughter)

And Norman Mailer, when I invited him to blog, he said, “I'm finishing a book, I won't be able to do it until I finish my book.” And then *Newsweek* came out with that story about the Koran controversy, do you remember, flushing the Koran down the toilet? So he e-mailed immediately. He said, “I want to be part of this. He said, “Here is what I want my blog to be,” and he sent me his blog.

So, this is just to give you an idea of how I see blogging from people including Graham Allison and Alex Jones who have blogged on the Huffington Post, with something to say and they send it to us or they can post themselves, they have their own password, but if they are too busy to even be bothered with the technicalities, we do it for them.

We even take dictation. Ari Emmanuel, who is my agent in L.A., calls me regularly and rants, and I interrupt him and I say, “Okay, that's a blog, let me take my pen out.” And as he is ranting to me as you would rant to a friend, I take notes. And that happened, for example, when Mel Gibson was arrested—do you remember? And then he exploded with anti-Semitic remarks and Hollywood was about to give him a pass. Well, Ari called me and dictated this blog calling on Hollywood to stand up and not let Mel Gibson get away with it, and it really changed the debate because he did it. We posted it immediately on a Sunday. By Monday, other Hollywood figures had joined the demand for Mel Gibson to be held accountable.

And at the same time, we have a lot of young people who use the Huffington Post as an audition platform, people who are not known, but who are interesting, good writers with good insights, and I love it when people write to me and say, “I got a book deal,” or, “I got a record deal,” or, “I got a job as a journalist,” or, “I found my wife on the Huffington Post.”

(Laughter)

Which brings me to the third element, which is community. Community is a key and growing part of the Huffington Post. On the blog alone we had last month 250,000 comments and these were comments that we approved, and increasingly, the comments we don't approve are getting fewer and fewer because people realize there is no point wasting their time coming on the site because they are not going to be approved if they are just ranting. We are including our community in just about everything we do and I'll come back to that in a minute.

So, let me just now go back to the beginning and tell you my experience as a woman starting basically a new business in online media. At the beginning there were so many naysayers who ranged from my friends, who loved me and who didn't want me to fail again—having just failed, as you just reminded us, Tom, in defeating Arnold Schwarzenegger for Governor. So they said, you just came out of that, and you now want to start an Internet project? And you are not exactly 25, and I'm actually 57 now. The Huffington Post was launched in '05, so I was 55 and I wanted to start an Internet business.

So my friends who loved me were saying to me, “You know, you have your books, you have your column, you have your radio shows, your speaking, why do you want that?” And the people who didn't love and didn't know me or knew me and didn't love, whatever combination of things—

(Laughter)

—were kind of summed up in what Nicky Fink wrote in the *L.A. Weekly* the day the Huffington Post launched which, incidentally, I have memorized. I have included it in my book on becoming fearless as an example of how we women should not be stopped by bad reviews. And I'm going to give you just three lines. It said, “The Huffington Post is the movie equivalent of *Gigli*,

Ishtar and *Heavens Gate* all rolled into one.”

(Laughter)

“The Madonna of political reinvention”—that was me—“has reinvented herself one time too many and this failure is simply unsurvivable.” That's not a good review—

(Laughter)

—to get on your first day as a new media enterprise. And interestingly enough, a year later she sent me an e-mail saying, “I was wrong, the Huffington Post has become an indispensable part of the Internet and I would like to blog for you.”

(Laughter)

And I said, “Great,” because I think, as I've grown older, the one thing I have learned is that the worst thing we can do is hold grudges. That's the most draining thing we can do. And I have found that holding grudges is absolutely poisonous and I'm working very hard to hold no grudges against anyone, let alone Nicky Fink. So, that brings me actually to the more personal part of this, which I think we as women are dealing with more than men—that's certainly my experience from my own life and from talking to a lot of other women—which is that we are much more afraid of failing, we are much more needing of approval, and of being liked.

And as a result, we have a harder time taking the kind of risk that is involved in any new project, even if it's not on the Internet but particularly on the Internet which has such a high failure rate.

And Carlisle Little and I were at a blogger conference recently and a lot of the women there talked about the same feeling, that fear of failure, that fear of rejection, and I see that again with my daughters all over again. My daughter who is about to apply for college is saying to me, “Mom, I'm not going to apply to Yale because I'll never get in.”

And I said, “Well, you know, if you don't apply you have 100 percent chance of not getting in,” and nevertheless, the fear of being rejected is sort of greater for her than the desire to do something or to take the risk that is involved in that. So that's something which made me actually write the book on becoming fearless, which I wrote after I launched the Huffington Post and after my daughter started expressing some of the same fears that I thought our generation of women would have helped them conquer or at least make their journey easier. And I saw that in fact it hadn't—that they had to go through their own understanding about that.

And I also realized that while we are focusing a lot on the obstacles set by society and by our culture, and there are plenty of those, our culture still has a very uneasy relationship with women in power—which was kind of expressed in what Marlo Thomas said, that for a man to be called ruthless you have to be Joe McCarthy, for a woman to be called ruthless you have to put somebody on hold.

(Laughter)

But beyond the cultural obstacles we are facing, I think, are the internal obstacles, which are in a sense even more subtle and even more dangerous because we can't stop those voices in our head, we take them to bed with us. And I call those voices of the inner critic, the inner judge, the obnoxious roommate living in my head, who from morning until night puts me down because that's her job, and she does it very well. And I don't know about your obnoxious roommate—I think you guys have it, too, don't get me wrong, it's just that you know how to shut it up.

It's like you go and watch a football game and ignore it, and we have a much harder time ignoring that voice; we have to sort of wrestle it into the ground. And I've been working to moderate the volume of my obnoxious roommate through the years and I'm doing a pretty good job, so now she only makes guest appearances.

(Laughter)

And recently I was on the Colbert Show and I told Steven, “My obnoxious

roommate sounds exactly like you.”

(Laughter)

And he said I had to find a place to crash.

(Laughter)

So, dealing with all the personal demons that we all carry I think is an essential part of our journey into the media because our journey into the media involves being in public and allowing ourselves to be judged in whatever sphere we choose to be part of. And for me, that journey started when I was at Cambridge, and I stood up to speak at the Cambridge Union and I was ridiculed for my accent because in England, of course, people are so much snobbier about accents than we are here. I mean Henry Kissinger could never have been Secretary of State or Foreign Secretary in England, which might not have been a bad thing, but that's another story.

In fact, when I first met him, when I moved from London to New York, I thanked him profusely for making incomprehensibility acceptable in American public life.

(Laughter)

So that was my first real struggle with being laughed at and keeping going. That's why, for me, fearlessness is not the absence of fear, it's continuing on the journey you want to be on even while you are afraid, doing what you want to do even while you are afraid.

And one more little thing about my past. When I decided I wanted to be a writer and after my first book, which was commissioned, came out, I sat down and wrote a book which had not been commissioned about the crisis in political leadership. And you may not have heard of it because it hardly sold any copies, but it was a really interesting exercise for me. I really, really felt that it was an important book. When you are 25 and you think, “This book is going to change the world, and I don't care if I'm not commissioned for it.” I got an overdraft from Barclays Bank and wrote this book which was called *Ask the Reason* when it was finally published in America. But the journey of being published was being rejected by 36 publishers, and that was a really interesting journey—because I think that about rejection at 25, I did wonder whether I really was a writer, since so many people who knew about writing were rejecting it.

But I kept going and I think for me that ability not to be discouraged is key, especially for us women because, as I talk to men and women, I find that women are more easily discouraged if what they want—what *we* want—to do is not immediately successful or immediately accepted. So, that's just a little about what goes into launching any kind of project or getting involved in anything that involves public approval or disapproval for us as women—certainly for me in my own journey.

I want to make one more point and then I want to open it up so we can have questions and a discussion.

So, the last point I want to make is that given the Pew research findings about women's interests in politics, which are really a lot more complicated because—as was made clear in the panel beforehand—it doesn't mean that women are really not interested in politics but they are interested in different aspects of politics, which I think is incredibly interesting. You know, less in the horse race, less in the polling and more in the narrative, in the way politics affects our lives, which is kind of very healthy to me.

In order to reach people where they are, women and men, and not just in their political lives, we've launched six new verticals, including “media,” “business,” “entertainment,” and “living” on the Huffington Post. And I find that I'm using the “living” vertical to really introduce all the things that I care about outside politics and that have become kind of my philosophy of life.

And I remember again when Caroline Little and I were at this blogger conference, we were both stunned by how few political bloggers were among them. There were over 900 women and the vast majority were not political bloggers. There were some great women, who I

have become very close to, who have launched something called, “Ladies who Launch.” And instead of lunching, they get together and do the launch projects, and one of them has launched a new jewelry business, and another one a babysitting business and another gave up being a lawyer because she hated it and has started writing, and they support each other. It's just an absolutely great group, and I met them there and there were endless, endless amounts of mommy bloggers, talking about sleep deprivation and blogging, you know, what it's like to be an exhausted mother in the middle of the night, which I'm sure is adding to their exhaustion.

(Laughter)

So when I saw this explosion of creativity around nonpolitical issues, again, I wanted to capture it on the Huffington Post and that was one of the motivations for creating the Living section, which now has three boxes at the top which I consider the three dimensions of a full life: “The Balanced Life,” “The Giving Life,” and “The Inner Life.”

The first one is basically how to bring less stress and more productivity into our lives, which is what we all want. We want to do what we want to do with less stress and greater effectiveness and better health. And we have people who write every day of the week, like David Allen who is a fabulous writer who writes exactly on this theme, his latest book is called *Getting Things Done*.

The middle box is really about how we make a difference in our own lives by making a difference in others lives. It's basically charities, philanthropy, giving. It's from the point of view of the giver, how it's changing our life, rather than from the point of view of the group or the person who is being helped.

And the final box, “The Inner Life,” asks, “How do we connect with ourselves? How do we bring balance into our lives?” And I find that women are more and more fascinated by the subject. I was recently moderating a panel at the Fortune Women's Conference and they had asked me to talk to these successful women who were running businesses about what made their business work. And I turned the subject around because I thought that what everybody wanted to hear is how did they make their lives work? How did they integrate everything into their lives, their children, their career, their own personal needs—because I am finding wherever I go that there are more and more overwhelmed, overloaded, sleep-deprived, exhausted, creative people around and we have to do something about that. I think sleep deprivation is an absolute disease, I think it's a plague, it's the modern plague.

And, I don't know, how many people here are sleep-deprived? Right now, I mean.

(Laughter)

Do you want me to stop so you can take a nap?

(Laughter)

I think napping, incidentally, is incredible—you know, it's just something that we all need to bring more of into our lives. And of course men, you know, you guys are really responsible for this disease of sleep deprivation because you kind of treat it as a virility symbol. And I have had dinner with so many men who would say to me things like, “I only need four hours sleep,” and I always stop myself from saying, “You would have been so much more interesting if you had had five.”

(Laughter)

And for me it came in a very dramatic way, my life did, this year, when I—I was with my daughter on a college tour, you know those tours, and we had made the agreement that I would not look at my Blackberry during the day, that I would be totally present with her. So what would happen is that I would get back to my hotel, she would go to sleep and I would work. I basically returned to Los Angeles after a week, absolutely exhausted, got up in the morning to do Reliable Sources, came back to my desk, sat down, got up to go bring a cup of tea and I fainted, hit my

head on my desk and broke my cheekbone, got five stitches on my right eye and went then through the whole gamut of tests because they don't know—do you have a brain tumor? Is your heart failing?

It turned out to be what they call Vasovagal syndrome, which is a combination of exhaustion, low blood pressure and not having had breakfast.
(Laughter)

It was a real rude awakening about my own life but also about what was going on in our culture, about how many of us who are driving ourselves into the ground or against a wall, whatever metaphor you want to use. And so I got my lesson in a relatively tough way, but I took it to heart, and I looked at my life and I started making some changes that included more sleep, and saying, “no more,” and included the beginning of a journey towards more balance. I can't say that I'm there by any means at all but I have gone down from three Blackberries to two.

I remember my mother who, the night before she died—the last time she got really angry with me—she saw me opening my mail and talking to my children at the same time, and she looked at me and said, with her very much heavier Greek accent, “I abhor multitasking.”
(Laughter)

And then so I just want to end by saying that if we are looking for one new trend on the Internet that we women can lead, it's the trend towards disconnecting. I think we are all over-connected and I think the next big thing on the Internet is going to be connecting in order to disconnect and connect with ourselves, which is ultimately the best and most important connection.

Thank you.

(Applause)

MS. HALE: Thank you. My name is Connie Hale, I'm with the Nieman Foundation for Journalism, the Narrative Director there.

And I have a question that will eventually be about your blog and bloggers in general, it comes actually from the magazine world, where I'm a journalist. And when I posed the question to a number of editors of major national magazines in the country why there were so many more bylines by men than women, Gerald Marzorati of the *New York Times Magazine* answered at least part of the answer had to be that the bloviator class is men.

And in the previous discussion we were talking about how few political talk shows, Sunday political talk shows, are led by women. So my question is, first of all, do you think bloggers are bloviators? How are you addressing that particular element on the Huffington Post? And do you have any thoughts besides your thoughts about fear of rejection that explain why political discourse has so many male voices?

MS. HUFFINGTON: I think there is definitely an issue here. I think it's a very important issue and my experience with it has been when I invite men and women to blog, the response is very different, and that includes my own girlfriends. The men always say, “Oh, yes, great, of course,” assuming that everybody is interested in their opinions. The women will say, “Oh, you know, I mean I can't write,” or “Are you sure? Do you think anybody would want to read it?”

In fact, we are now in the process of addressing that by creating what I'm calling the purgatory where women's blogs will live and be commented on by other women until they are confident enough to let them see the light of day, so that they can actually see there is going to be an interim stage. And I do that with my own friends who I think have interesting things to say and they are very nervous about saying them in public. I say, “Send it to me first, I'll give you my honest feedback.”

Then when they get your feedback and when they get some kind of sense that they are okay, that it's going to be safe, you can let that out. I would love to know, and I'm looking at Ellen, whether any of the women writers here have—whether you ever felt that way when you

started, because I know I did. When I first started, I was very afraid of how what I was writing would be perceived. I didn't know whether I was communicating what I intended to. Then you get more and more confidence as you go along, but it's clearly the job of an editor. But you can have that job being done by your community.

So there is no question, I find there is a real difference here in the way men and women are willing to take the risk of speaking up, because there is a risk there. Any time you open your mouth you are going to upset some people, if you say anything interesting, and you are not going to be liked by everybody. And there are many women for whom the highest objective remains to be liked by everyone and then writing the wrong thing is the wrong thing to do, if that's your highest objective.

But the rewards of expressing yourself so overwhelm the disadvantages of being criticized, and it gets so much easier to take criticism that it's a journey. And so I'm very committed to helping women on the Huffington Post through that journey. And in fact anybody here who wants to write for us, I would love it, you just have to send it to me: arianna@huffingtonpost.com, and I'll take it on from there. And if you are a woman and you are nervous about that, we'll put you in that interim space so that you get feedback from the community until you are safe to let it see the light of day.

But that's why I was particularly adamant from the beginning—we now have 49 people working at the Huffington Post, from when we had three, I invested those first meager resources in hiring 24/7 comment moderators because I knew that—I knew it both from the celebrities, like Steve Martin, when he first blogged and somebody said something nasty about one of his movies, and he called me up and I said, “Steve, come on, you know, it's one comment out,” so I said, “Well, remember, it's only one percent of one percent of the people who read your blog who comment, and out of all those comments, all the great comments you have, somebody hated one of your movies, get over it.”

(Laughter)

But a lot of women, especially, find that there are women who start and then I would not hear from them for a long time, and I might e-mail or call them and they would say, “Oh, but, you know, I got such a nasty comment.” And so that's why we became much more sensitive to have people perceive that and there is a definite difference.

MS. BERKOWITZ: Hi. Thank you so much for coming. My name is Elana, I'm a student here and at the Business School. I had a question, you know, I very much appreciate when I visit the Huffington Post that compared to some of the other most read blogs, you do hear more women's voices and just a more diverse range of voices. But I guess one thing I think about is there is a normative value to having diversity in voices on the Internet but there is also probably an instrumental value in that by having, say, more women's voices. Does that mean that issues that perhaps get more neglected by male bloggers, whether it's right to choose or balancing work life and home life, get more attention?

So I'm just trying to figure out—I think we all probably here agree on the normative value, but is that instrumental value really there in terms of having these voices? And then sort of to follow up on that in terms of how do we actually get more of those voices included, I had the awkward situation of—when I ran an online magazine for my old think tank—of finding my only female intern sobbing in my office because someone had written something rude about her in response to a blog post and it was the first blog post, of course, she had ever written.

And it made me think that sometimes there is a certain amount of hubris that's good hubris and that men seem to have sometimes in greater quantity—of saying, “Well, obviously everyone wants to know what I thought about the Colts game,” even though no one might want to know what they think about the Colts game—but that that hubris in fact was useful, and it took

months to have her blogging again. And I was wondering how we can do more to have women have this constructive hubris so they can be more participatory?

MS. HUFFINGTON: Well, constructive hubris, I think that's a great way of putting it. To answer your first question first about whether there is some instrumental value, of course there is and we find that especially in our living section, where we get a lot more women bloggers, as you would expect, and where—they don't just write about fashion, and food and all the more obvious things—they also write about issues like abortion or, we have Joan Blades who writes about Moms Rising, which is a group that's come together to work on policy issues that affect women, like childcare.

I'm finding that there is something very interesting happening at the moment on the political blog and women are particularly attuned to it, though not exclusively—and this is that I'm finding among our bloggers—and women are rejecting at the moment the kind of easy, right/left way of looking at everything. This is one of my own passions in terms of the mainstream media's obsession with looking at everything in right/left terms, which is so obsolete.

If I read one more reporter who says that Hillary Clinton is succumbing to pressure from the left to change her views on the war, and you look at the polls where you have over 60 percent of people who want to bring the troops home, either the left has dramatically expanded without anybody taking notice or this is not the left anymore. And a lot of major issues, especially issues that are huge in the '08 election like the war, like universal healthcare, are no longer in any way, shape or form left-wing issues. I mean, Detroit is passionate now about universal healthcare, otherwise they are all going to be bankrupt.

Women, I'm finding, are just really eager to reinvent the way we look at things politically, the women who are engaging in political blogging, to stop just following the traditional path and looking at everything through these conventional wisdom eyes. And about ways to encourage that, I think part of what I said before applies and, as I said, I'm really committed to that.

MS. HUNT: May I? I'm Swanee Hunt and—

MS. HUFFINGTON: How are you, Swanee?

MS. HUNT: It's good to see you. I direct the Women in Public Policy Program here at the Kennedy School and of course I have something to say.

I want to corroborate some of what you are saying because now with brain research, looking at MRIs and the radical difference between men's and women's brains, looking at testosterone tests that are showing that testosterone may not make you more aggressive, it may give you what's called “positive illusion,” which is—

(Laughter)

—if you think you can prevail, you are much more likely to go into battle, hence the relationship between guys becoming aggressive because they can, because they think that they will prevail. So we are getting a lot of corroboration of what we see in action. And also, of course, there may be the high value on relationship, which may also have to do with brain function, too, with the frontal cortex. So I would love to talk to you more about that and I'll send you more about that.

MS. HUFFINGTON: That's great. Maybe you can blog about it.

MS. HUNT: I would love to do that.

What we are seeing then, here at the school, is when we have a speaker and I'm moderating, even though the topic may be reproductive rights, the first—we have four mics set up—and the first eight people standing at the mics are men. And so sometimes I've said, “We have time for one more question, I'm going to skip you—even though you are next—I'm going to take the woman behind you. I cannot tolerate having no women address this topic.”

And so I talk to the women ahead of time and I say, “What's going on here?” And

they say, “Well, I actually had a question but I wasn't sure if it was really worthwhile for everyone's time, I didn't want to take up the airtime,” and blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. So I meet with most of the women here at the Kennedy School before, and I say, “Look, before you go into the forum you write your question. You know why you are going to hear this speaker, so write a question, you can always change it during the speech, sit next to the microphone, even though people have to crawl over you, and you force yourself to come right up to the mic.” But it takes that kind of strategy and training.

And in class I'll ask a question, and the women are thinking, and the guys shoot up their hands and they have no idea what they are going to say but they know it will be brilliant.
(Laughter)

Anyway, so that's to corroborate.

Now, may I take any of that, or maybe not—it's a different topic, I think. You were talking about your space about philanthropy and that it's not going to be focused on the causes but rather on the experience of giving. I have never heard anyone address this topic from that angle, and I wonder if you would give us a paragraph or two to develop that idea?

MS. HUFFINGTON: Absolutely, and thank you for being here. I'm a huge admirer for what you are doing and your work, and my daughters and I have actually read big parts of your book together and you are an inspiration to them because, of course, you know daughters—at least my daughters—never find inspiration in their mother, so I'm always looking for—
(Laughter)

—I'm always looking for other female role models, so thank you.

MS. HUNT: Thank you.

MS. HUFFINGTON: And actually I wrote a book in the middle '90s called *The Fourth Instinct*, in which I looked at exactly that—the fact that most biology and psychology talks about the first three instincts, survival, sex and power, and then give them different names. But it comes down to those three. And yet if you look at human history and if you look at our own experience, there is another instinct that drives human behavior and I called it the Fourth Instinct, because I didn't want to give it any particular name that would immediately frame it in one way or another.

And I think that Fourth Instinct is what drives us to seek meaning in our lives. It's what drives us to altruistic behavior. It's what drove so many gentiles with their lives at risk, for example, to save Jews in the Second World War. I mean, if you read those stories, it doesn't make any sense, in terms of the first three instincts, and it's also what drives a lot of people into giving and philanthropy. Sure, there are also the other instincts at play, like being accepted within your community, having a building named after you.

But there that instinct to give is very, very ingrained in us and that's why we get so much back. Because if we don't follow that instinct, if we don't propitiate that god, as the Greeks would put it in their mythology, we are paying a price. And so by focusing on that aspect we are also encouraging it because we are reinforcing the positive effect it has, and I feel particularly strongly about that with young people. Community service, which is now seen as a chore in so many schools, is in fact extraordinary at that moment of connection, which sometimes happens and sometimes it doesn't.

But I know when I was dealing with my youngest daughter's eating disorder, and mercifully she is fine now, but I included community service in her process of healing and recovery and it actually was one of the most powerful things. She was volunteering with an organization called A Place Called Home in South Central Los Angeles, tutoring at-risk children. It put her own problems and her own perfectionism in context and it helped tremendously. So that's actually one of the things that we are working on at the Huffington Post, that you and I have talked about, that I

would love you to be part of.

But I would like to encourage anybody who has had an experience giving that they want to share. It encourages others and it is very, very powerful.

And just one more thing about that, I was recently at the Google Zeitgeist Conference and there was a woman who was working with at risk young people, mostly African American, in the South Bronx. Her name is Majora, and she is now one of our bloggers. And in the course of speaking about that experience she started weeping and she could not stop, and she had been so affected by the destroyed lives she was seeing around her every day that this was no longer for her just community service or just something that she was doing. She had completely internalized the urgency of that.

And it was the most powerful moment for everybody there of the whole conference and it brought everybody together in a way that nothing else that had only appealed to our heads had done.

MS. GRAFF: It's wonderful to hear you, thank you. I'm E.J. Graff, I work at the Schuster Institute for Investigative Journalism at Brandeis.

And I wanted to comment on the sense of women's caution expressing our opinions. I think it's very easy for us all to talk about the internal caution—whether it's nature, nurture or culture, it doesn't really matter—but there is also, women do get much more sexualized violent response when women express their opinion, and that's been documented and it's less often discussed. It actually is more dangerous for women to express opinions.

I think of three things, and I'm going to get some of this wrong, and there are people who know better than I do and I hope they will chime in if I get it wrong. But the University of Maryland did a study in which they put posts on bulletin boards—chat boards, I can't remember, it wasn't blogs—alternately with women's names and men's names, and the women's names got 25 times more negative comments, 25 times. That's not twice as much, that's a lot more, so the nastiness is much more.

When Salon started putting their—instead of getting letters or e-mails that went directly to the writers' e-mail boxes but they went automatically public, everyone there was suddenly shocked by how much higher the level of sexualized violence was at the women writers than at the men. So a man would get called a dickhead for having a stupid opinion and a woman would get a, I can't even say some of the things but, you know, a rape threat, essentially. And it can be a real, not to everybody, but it can be a really different level of violent attack and I think that needs to be taken into account.

And the third thing I think in connection with all of this, is most of the opining women that I know—and this is just informal I haven't done this as an actual survey but I ask women about this—have had some kind of stalking or actual threat experience based on their public appearances, and I don't know as many men who have had that kind of real threat. So, just to say that some of the caution is experientially accurate, that's all.

MS. HUFFINGTON: Well, I mean there is no question that there have been women bloggers who have spoken about their getting a lot more comments that had this sexualized violence that you talk about. One of them suspended her blog and that became one of the issues that occupied the blogosphere for a while.

And in terms of opining women having more stalkers, I mean I'm not at all familiar with that. I don't know. I think we have quite a few opining women in this room—have you ever had this stalking? I haven't and I feel really bad now.

(Laughter)

I mean, trust me, I'm not taking that lightly. I think that is extremely serious. And again, we have to remember that it takes a very, very tiny number of people to create that threaten-

ing environment, whether it's in life or online. It could be five crazy people, and I'm not using that in the technical sense, but, you know, people with real problems who use that language, and it can change immediately the culture. That's why I think one of the things that I feel really strongly about—and again, Carla and I and those of us who are working online are dealing with how do we deal with comments.

And I think, increasingly, I don't think it is a free-for-all and I think there are responsibilities and we are absolute. We ban people, too. It's like if somebody would comment and use that kind of language—because you have to register to comment on the Huffington Post—not only do we not approve the comment but if it's a consistent pattern, we just ban the commenter.

So I think if we bring more of the zero tolerance online that exists in our civilized society, then we will just recognize this is not free speech. It's no more acceptable than crying “fire” in a crowded theater, so that's I think one of the ways to deal with that.

I see Rick Kaplan standing over there—I don't know if you are dealing with those problems with Katie Couric. Incidentally, I now have two women on the Huffington Post who are part of my life who talk about Rick Kaplan on a daily basis. Our CEO, who came from CBS.com, Betsy Morgan, and our editor in charge of all the nonpolitical verticals worships Rick and that's Wil- low Bay who actually was—Marty was one of her mentors. Sorry, Rick, I'm sorry.

(Laughter)

MS. HUFFINGTON: Marty Cutler is one of our famous bloggers of course, the one who writes every Monday, that's why he is on my mind. So, as I look at Rick I think of those two key women on the Huffington Post.

But, have you had that problem with stalking?

MR. KAPLAN: Not personally.

MS. HUFFINGTON: No, not personally because you are a tall man but—

(Laughter)

MS. HUFFINGTON: But with Katie?

MR. KAPLAN: Yes, I think most, too many anchor women, too many women on television have that problem. It's a common problem.

MS. HUFFINGTON: So that's obviously another thing that we are probably going to be addressing on the next time then.

MS. CROSSLEY: I wanted to put this in a generational context and ask a question. There has been a lot of talk about rejection and all of the points that you made, and those are quite valid—but I wonder also how many women are impacted by being few in number and feeling a burden of responsibility so that your words—you are not so much concerned about if you are going to like me or not like me, but I'm carrying and representing other people and I know that each one of my words now is going to be parsed in that way about who I represent. That's particularly true for—

By the way, my name is Callie Crossley.

It's particularly true for women of color, and I came from a generation of parents who said, you know, “Be a credit to your race.” So I'm quite conscious about, “I'm saying something, I'm representing more than myself,” and I don't know if that has any impact on how people decide whether they will opine and speak. And I wonder if younger women, be they of color or not, just from your experience, feel none of that or don't feel that that's—that every word they say is representative of a group larger than themselves.

MS. HUFFINGTON: Well, actually, it can work this way but I'm also hearing that it works the other way, like women of color, say, who feel I have the opportunity, I have a platform, or I have the privilege of a good education or whatever it is—so if I give voice to concerns that others share who don't have that voice, then I have that responsibility, too. So I find it can

work both ways. It can work both as something that holds women back but also as something that gives them a greater sense of urgency and responsibility about giving a voice to certain issues that others who are paying a price are not having the same platform to express.

MS. CROSSLEY: Any generational difference?

ARIANNA HUFFINGTON: Well, I know, for example, that—again, this is a purely anecdotal conclusion—I would say that younger women have more of a sense of responsibility and a sense of they have something to say, they have a platform. Or they have a voice or if they have the ability to express themselves, they have a responsibility to do it. For my book, for example, I talked to Rory Kennedy, who is Bobby Kennedy's youngest child, and she is paralyzed by public speaking.

And then she had this huge passion to do something for AIDS in Africa and she said to me that the thing that in the end overcame her fear—in the sense of doing it even though she is afraid, not in the sense of not being afraid while speaking—was the fact that she went to Africa, and saw what was happening and said, “I have a voice, I have a platform, I can give voice to what's happening, I have a responsibility to do it no matter how hard it is, no matter how terrifying it is for me.”

MS. KING: I'm Susan King from the Carnegie Corporation.

And Linda Wertheimer in the last panel said that National Public Radio, being a new medium, offered women a real opportunity at a particular time to sort of start new and move right to the top, and this is the new platform. You are an entrepreneur so you've even got your name on it, but do the blogs and this new platform offer more of an opportunity, particularly for women, to make in-roads in important ways?

And then the second question which everybody is talking about when we talk about the new platforms, et cetera—what is the financial backing of it? What is the money part of it? What's the reality of it? Is the Huffington Post up and going, and offering opportunity for young women to be as entrepreneurial so that they can also see themselves in a financial stream going forward?

MS. HUFFINGTON: Let me take your second question first. Absolutely, new media are entirely viable. I mean, we are at the moment entirely supported by advertising and by venture capital. We have two venture capital financing rounds, and also if you come to the Huffington Post office, and you are welcome to—it's on top of Dean and DeLuca, in Soho, in New York, and you come to the fourth floor, which is where our newsroom is—you will see it is dominated by young women, they are largely in their 20s, they are absolutely amazing. They bring a passion and a commitment to it and a new way of doing things, and they are constantly reinventing things. I learn from them every day.

I mean, I didn't know how you drive traffic by tagging things and by connecting things, or what SEO was. They created this Rove tagline today, where they are tagging everything about Rove, and it's just like a new world. And I'm by far the oldest person at the Huffington Post. And we are increasingly promoting from within and that's part of why I think a lot of, a lot of new possibilities for women, yes, and totally sustainable financially.

And your first question though? Oh, yeah.

I think definitely they will move, yeah, I think they would definitely move faster, but I also want to say here that I don't see the new media as a replacement of the old media. I want to say that very quickly because, again, I think this either/or debate is also obsolete. I think in the foreseeable future, while any of us here in this room and our children are alive, there is going to be old media and new media living together. It's going to be a hybrid future. It's a little bit again like the old debate; is it going to be Ginger or is it going to be Maryanne? It's going to be both.

(Laughter)

It's 2007, let's have a three-way. And, again—

(Laughter)

—look at what the *Washington Post* has done. The *Washington Post*—and I'm not just saying that because Caroline Little is here—has done amazing things online and, again, that part of a commitment by Don Graham and by the leadership at the *Post* to own that space in there sphere. And so I think that the traditional media that are going to thrive in the brave new world are the ones that incorporate new media in what they are doing. And in the same way, the new media are going to be more and more important players are the ones that incorporate what is best about traditional journalism.

We are sticklers about fact-checking and accuracy on the Huffington Post. We have a rule—if you go backstage as a blogger you will see our rules—which is that if you make a mistake, you have to withdraw it within 24 hours and explain what happened or your password is withdrawn. Now, that is a pretty stringent rule, I would say it's more stringent than the *New York Times*—that would have actually disallowed a lot of people's passwords in the lead-up to the war.

(Laughter)

And at the same time, we have other rules, like if you have a conspiracy theory that 9/11 was created by the government, we are not going to allow it. So, we are basically discouraging online crazies and we are honoring and accepting the best of traditional journalism. And in the same way, we are increasingly moving into reporting because, again, one of the things about the blogosphere is that we are leaving off traditional reporting, and to a very, very large extent we are.

But increasingly, we are moving into that arena, Josh Marshall has done some amazing reporting. This is the last question, I hear, I'll be very quick. So we hired Tom Edsall who used to be at the *Washington Post* to oversee our reporting team and we have some wonderful young reporters who are breaking stories and doing it both in a traditional way but also by using distributive journalism, wisdom of the crowd. We launched this Off the Bus Project of citizen journalism that is working directly with the political reporting team.

MR. PATTERSON: Well, my apology to those of you with questions, but we are literally out of time, and on behalf of the Shorenstein Center and the conference, I would like to thank Arianna Huffington.

MS. HUFFINGTON: Thank you very much.

(Applause)

A Narrative Overview of The Research

This document was prepared by Shauna Shames and Marion Just to inform the discussion at the Women and News Conference

Are Men Just More Interested in Politics?

Decades of data make it look as if women care less about politics than men. While women vote at rates equal to or even exceeding men's rates (*Inglehart and Norris 2003; Jamieson 2000; Rosenstone and Hansen 1993*), political scientists find that voting is an anomalous form of participation (*Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995, 23-4; Skocpol and Fiorina 1999*). It is relatively low-cost, carries few tangible benefits, and is not a good predictor of other forms of participating. In most of these other forms, men predominate. Men give money to campaigns more often, and they give higher amounts (*Burns, Schlozman, and Verba 2001; Inglehart and Norris 2003; Brown Jr., Powell, & Wilcox 1995; Francia et al. 2003*). Despite logging more paid hours in the labor force, men are more likely than women to serve on a local governing board (*Burns, Schlozman, and Verba 2001*). Men are significantly more likely to contact their elected representative to express a policy opinion or ask for constituent service, and are more likely to join organizations that take stands in politics (*Ibid*). And men are much more likely to run for office themselves. Men continue to dominate electoral politics as candidates and incumbents (*Lawless and Fox 2005; Moncrief, Jewell & Squire 2000*). Although women constitute 51% of the U.S. population, they make up only 16% of Congress, 24% of state legislatures, 13% of big city mayors, 18% of state governors, and 11% of the Supreme Court (*CAWP 2007*). Men still hold, on average, over three-quarters of all legislative seats nationally, and have been 100% of our presidents. Although the gender differences in political participation for ordinary citizens are not huge, they are meaningful and persistent.

The same gender trends appear to hold true for news. Men follow political news more closely than do women – and in the case of some news areas, including economic and international relations stories, much more closely (*Pew 2006, 42-43; Pew 2007a; Pew 2007b*). Differences in news attention begin in childhood and show up in research as early as the fourth grade (*Garramone & Atkin 1986; Atkin 1981; Greenstein 1961*). In self-reported studies of news interest, men show more interest than women in stories about political figures and events in Washington, sports, business and finance, military/war news, and international affairs; women express more interest than men in news about health, crime, weather, culture and arts, religion, entertainment, celebrities, and local and community people and events (*Pew 2007a*). For the past twenty years, Pew has tracked gender gaps in interest in individual news stories. Their largest recorded gaps exceed fifteen percentage points, on both sides. Stories where the gap favored men (with more men than women closely following the news) are in the arenas of sports, war and military matters, business and financial news, and international relations. By contrast, stories where the gap favored women tended to cover health news, school shootings, celebrity deaths, and endangered children. However, women are just as attentive as men to certain kinds of political news, especially court decisions (which often concerned

abortion rights, *Pew 2006*) and natural and human-made disasters, including stories about crime, dangerous weather, and diseases (*Pew 2007*).

Because men are more interested in some political topics, it is not surprising that they have more political information than women do. National polls show men knowing more than women about politics and political figures (*Delli-Carpini & Keeter 2000; Pew 2006, 2007; Jamieson 2000; Mondak & Anderson 2004*). Communications and political science scholars, however, have pointed out that up to half of the observed gender gap may be a factor of survey measurement error (particularly since women are more likely to admit that they don't know an answer, while men are more likely to guess, apparently particularly if the interviewers are mostly women; see *Mondak and Anderson 2004; Jamieson 2000, Chapter 9*). Scholars have suggested that the gender information gaps may arise from underlying discrepancies in basic political knowledge; those with more initial knowledge about politics and how the political system works are more likely to be receptive to and be able to process new information (*Palfrey and Poole 1987; Tichenor, Donoghue and Olien 1970; Jamieson 2000; Neuman, Just, & Crigler 1992; Zaller 1992; Graber 1988, Junn 1991*). Differences between men's and women's starting points of political knowledge may thus lead to further gaps where men are more interested in and able to process new political information.

Such differences in political knowledge and subsequent information uptake can have important policy implications. For instance, in the critical policymaking period of the 2002-3 buildup to war with Iraq, more women than men thought Saddam Hussein was concealing weapons of mass destruction (*USA Today/CNN/Gallup 2002; University of Wisconsin Survey Research Center 2003*). Clearly, such a belief did not arise only from gender differences in political attentiveness; men who watched FOX News were also disproportionately likely to believe this (*PIPA 2003*). Yet the gender differences in knowledge are worrisome as they diminish the quality of public deliberation as well as decreasing overall participation and engagement. Political scientists Michael X. Delli-Carpini and Scott Keeter write, "Political knowledge facilitates more effective citizenship... and engagement in politics. It enables citizens to comprehend the political world and to develop attitudes about politics... And it is critical to an effective linkage between attitudes and political behavior" (*Delli Carpini and Keeter 2000, 23*). Lack of knowledge and information about politics correlate with lack of participation, and vice versa. Put simply, interested and knowledgeable people participate more politically, and those who are more active more gain more interest in and knowledge of politics as they participate.

Does all this mean that men are simply hard-wired to like politics more? A cursory review of the evidence suggests so. Such a glib conclusion, however, unravels when we take a closer look.

Going Beyond the Surface: Where the Gender Gap Disappears

As noted above, women pay as much or more attention than men to stories that they see as affecting their rights and the health and safety of themselves and their families. Indeed, the gender gap in political information mostly disappears for local-level politics (*Delli Carpini and Keeter 2000*). Women are less likely than men to be able to name the Secre-

tary of State, but more likely than men to be able to name their county's School Superintendent (*Ibid*, 37). Generally, women know more than men about health issues and diseases, but men are more likely to follow health policy (*Brodie et al. 2003*). Thus women know more about facts of health but less about health policies. There appears to be a disconnect between the information that women look for and gain from the news and the arena of politics or public policy. The same trend holds for participation. Women participate enthusiastically in all sorts of community-based, nonprofit, and religious groups and activities. Women are as likely as men to attend city council and school board meetings (*Conway 2001, 231*), but men are more likely to hold leadership positions (*Burns, Schlozman, and Verba 2001*). Women have led major social movements for political changes to improve health, safety, and equality, including those for temperance, woman suffrage, settlement houses/poverty reform, children's welfare, and the equal rights amendment (ERA) (*see, for example, Cott 1987; Scott and Scott 1982; Kradtator 1971; Mansbridge 1986; Skocpol 1992; Buble and Buble 1978; Marilley 1996. Burns, Schlozman, and Verba 2001, Chapter 3, gives an excellent overview of gender and civic activity*).

Surveys of church attendance find that women are more likely than men to affiliate with a church, to attend services, and to be active in a congregation (*Burns, Schlozman, and Verba 2001, 363*). Men, however, are more likely to exercise congregation leadership (*Ibid*). There are virtually no differences between men's and women's levels of nonpolitical, non-religious civic activity; however, men are more likely to volunteer for groups that take a stand in politics (*Ibid, 81-2*). Slightly more women than men give time to charity, and the sexes are equally likely to make charitable contributions, though those from men tend to be larger on balance (*Ibid*). Just as with news, women seem to be more selective than men about the political activities in which they engage. Clearly, however, women are not apolitical; women have steadily increased their presence in state legislatures over time (*CAWP 2007*). In addition, the number of women governors serving at the same time has increased from 5 or 6 in the 1980's to 10 today. Steady gains in state legislatures have slowed recently, however; various theories attribute this slowdown to work-family balancing difficulties for women public officials, negative effects of term limits for women as legislators (term effects, once thought to be good for women, actually seem to have the effect of removing incumbent women without replacing them with new women), differential treatment of women as candidates by news media, women's perception of the political realm as unfriendly to them or their policy issues, or the greater willingness of men to run for office (*Palmer & Simon 2006; Lawless & Fox 2005; Moncrief, Squire, & Jewell 2001; Williams 2000; White House Project 1998, 2000; Kahn 1996*).

Powerlessness & Representation

Differences in political interest and activity are, of course, complicated by other axes of identity. Many studies have investigated the impact of income and race/ethnicity on political participation (see, e.g., Verba, Schlozman, & Brady 1995; Lien 1994; Bobo & Gilliam Jr. 1990; Ublaner, Cain, & Kiewiet 1989; see also Leighley & Vedlitz 1999 and Leighley 1995 for more information). These works have often found effects similar to those described above for gender, suggesting that the underlying factor is not demographics, but relative powerlessness. Until recently, women have also tended to receive less education – an inequality that has actually reversed in the past few decades, with more women than men now graduating from college (U.S. Census Bureau 2007). Despite women’s educational gains, however, the gender difference in political activity persists, leading some to speculate on the psychological factors involved. In contrast to men, women are socialized from infancy to believe they should prefer the private to the public sphere (Williams 2000; Valian 1999; Phillips 1991; Bem 1988; Sapiro 1983; Duverger 1955). Women see few women in office and therefore may believe, consciously or not, that politics is not for them (Atkeson & Carrillo 2007; Burns, Schlozman, & Verba 2001; Kahn 1996; Phillips 1991; Sapiro 1983). At the same time, women tend to have lower incomes than men due to a persistent wage gap and greater family care responsibilities, and therefore have fewer of the resources that stimulate political interest and participation (Williams 2000; Burns, Schlozman, & Verba 2001; Waldfoegel 1994; Blau & Kahn 2000).

Interestingly, the participation and political knowledge gaps appear to shrink or even disappear where women see other women participating in politics (Burns, Schlozman, and Verba 2001, Chapter 13). In states with no female Senator (or Senate candidate), for instance, 65% of men and only 51% of women can name one Senator. However, in states with a female Senator or female candidate for Senator, 75% of men and **79% of women** can name a Senator (*Ibid*, 343). Having a female Governor and/or having more women state legislators also increases women’s sense of political *efficacy*, their perception of their ability to make a difference in politics and their confidence in government (Atkeson and Carrillo 2007). And having a female candidate for high political office makes women (but not men) significantly more likely to: express political interest and interest in the campaign, follow the campaign in the media, express likes and dislikes about the major-party candidates for the House (whether or not these are women), and say they are “very interested” in a campaign (Burns, Schlozman, and Verba 2001, 347-8). Women also seem to gain more politically-relevant skills in all-female organizations, whether political, social, or religious (*Ibid*, Chapter 9).

In conclusion, recent data suggests that politics looks like a “man’s game” because it previously has been a man’s game: a vicious cycle. Media representations of women in positions of power, such as female Senators or Senate candidates, seem to have the power to disrupt the cycle and increase women’s interest in and engagement with politics. Representations of politics as problem-solving – more common in local politics, where both sexes pay equal attention (Conway 2001; Burns, Schlozman, and Verba 2001) – rather than partisan point-scoring may decrease the gender differences in political attentiveness (Rosenstiel et al 2007). And the recent data suggest that as more women enter politics as candidates and elected office-holders, they may raise the level of women’s

political participation as citizens. However, these are still controversial questions, and not at all resolved, especially since both race and gender are often not explored in studies of political interest (see, e.g., Mutz 2005; Patterson 2000; Prior 2005).

Gender, Segregation, and News Sources

A 2006 Pew report says men and women live in a world of “His and Hers” when it comes to news sources. Women are more likely than men to watch local TV news and nightly network news, and are much more likely to watch network news magazines and network morning shows. Men are more likely to read the newspaper, listen to radio news, get news online, listen to talk radio, and watch cable news ((Pew 2006; see *Fact Sheet 2*). Looking at specific sources, more men than women watch, read, or listen to: business/political/news magazines, the Daily Show, Rush Limbaugh, CNBC, C-SPAN, news online, talk radio, late night TV, Sunday talk shows, the News Hour and O’Reilly Factor, CNN, and daily newspapers (Pew 2006). The largest gaps are for business magazines (where the readers are 71% men), the Daily Show (66% men), political magazines (65% men), and Rush Limbaugh (62% men, *Ibid*). More women than men watch, read, or listen to: FOX News, local TV news, network nightly news, community newspapers, Larry King Live, TV news magazines, MSNBC, and especially morning news shows (where the audience is 64% women) and religious radio (where the audience is 66% women, *Ibid*).

In an effort to attract more women viewers, “his” media sources have begun to develop separate pathways for women, like “mommy blogs.” Coverage of politics in these “hers” sources is uneven; some sources work politics into “soft news,” while other outlets avoid politics altogether. For instance, Greenstone Media, founded by Gloria Steinem and Jane Fonda as an attempt at a different kind of talk radio aimed at women, purposely excludes politics, since their research found that women rated politics as their least favorite subject (*Greenstone 2006; Boston Herald 2006*).

Of all news outlets, only NPR’s audience is at least ½ women (Pew 2006), a sharp increase from 1996. A decade ago there was a 25% gender gap in NPR listeners: 16% of men and 11% of women surveyed said they listened to NPR in 1996 (Pew 2006). The lack of a gender gap in the recent survey may be due to NPR’s news framing and presentation style, their relatively even gender balance of reporters and editors, or other factors. For example, the lack of a gender gap arises from NPR’s particular listener demographic profile (perhaps highly educated men and women are more alike than they are different in their news source and style preferences?). Nevertheless, NPR’s success in eliminating gender differences among listeners (clearly present a decade ago) can be instructive, and further research is needed to determine the factors involved in this closing of the gap.

Regarding soft news and its ability to engage women in politics, the research is mixed. Some studies find that soft news, which is more heavily viewed by women than hard news, can be informative and educational about politics. For instance, *Baum 2003* finds that soft news programs (or even non-news sources that discuss current events, such as “Oprah” or “The View”) have caused Americans to pay more attention to recent foreign policy crises than they did to major U.S. interventions in Korea and Vietnam in the 1950s-70s. In a recent study, *Baum 2005* found that soft news

programs have important effects on the political behavior of the less involved citizens: “politically unengaged voters who watch entertainment-oriented TV talk shows are more likely to find the opposition party candidate likeable, as well as to cross party lines and vote for him, relative to their counterparts who do not watch such shows and those who are more politically aware (*Baum 2005, p. 213*).

Other researchers have found that informal conversations about politics play an important role in generating news interest and in helping people understand political news and politics more generally: “Conversation about the news is a major and often overlooked correlate of comprehension, and ... interpersonal channels may play at least as important a role in the public's awareness and understanding of the news as exposure to the news media” (*Robinson & Levy 1986, p. 160*). That is, women might be more likely to show more interest in news and politics if they were more engaged in informal conversations about politics. However, critics allege that increasing soft news coverage in hard news programs and overly-critical journalism are shrinking news audiences (*Patterson 2000*). Whether or not soft news programs can be educative and politically engaging, the clear fact is that they do not cover politics in as deep and substantive a manner as hard news. Women's greater willingness to watch soft news programs may contribute to the gender gaps in political knowledge.

It is not only the news audience that is gendered, however; media organizations also have gender imbalances. Men continue to dominate the news business as directors, editors, and publishers (*see Fact Sheet 2*), and a new study found that 2/3 of deans, directors and department heads of journalism and mass communication schools and programs are male (*ASJMC 2007*), even though women presently constitute 65% of all undergraduate and graduate journalism and mass communication students (*Creedon & Cramer 2007, 6*). In terms of the voices the public hears through op-ed pages, far fewer opinion pieces by women than men are published. This is probably due to a combination of factors, including male editors more often soliciting pieces from male writers, fewer women submitting unsolicited work, and unconscious discrimination in choosing pieces (*Estrich 2005; Pollitt 2005*).

The lack of women in positions of news leadership may have detrimental effects for both the news sources and women as audience members. Women in the newsroom appear to make a difference in both the content of news and in the bottom line (*Media Management Center 2006; Creedon & Cramer 2007; Craft & Wanta 2004; see also Catalyst 2004 and Nicholson, forthcoming*). In particular, female managers more than male managers, appear to: “have attributes that motivate their followers to feel respect and pride because of their association with them; attempt to develop and mentor followers and give them rewards for good performance; [and] show optimism and excitement about future goals and new perspectives on problem-solving” (*Media Management Center 2006, 13; see also: Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt 2001*). Women in newsrooms, like women in other nontraditional fields such as science and politics, often think about things differently, do things differently, draw different conclusions, and in short bring important values to the table (*Rhode 2002; Swers 2002; see also Zimmer 2007 and Nicholson, forthcoming*). In a study of whether gender matters in the newsroom, two journalism professors found that “when a newspaper had a large percentage of women in managerial positions, male and female reporters covered a similar agenda of issues. However, in newspapers with a

low percentage of women managers, male reporters covered politics more often than female reporters, and female reporters were more likely to cover education stories” (*Craft & Wanta 2004, 134*).

In terms of the impact of such differences on the bottom line, Catalyst’s 2004 study *The Bottom Line: Connecting Corporate Performance and Gender Diversity* demonstrated that Fortune 500 companies with high percentages of women officers experienced, on average, 35.1% higher return on equity and 34% higher total return to shareholders than did those with low percentages of women corporate officers (*Catalyst 2004*). While this study did not prove causation, it showed a strong correlation between companies that have diversified their senior management and strong financial benefits.

What is the source of gender imbalance in the news business? Research suggests several factors that in all likelihood work together in combination to produce the gaps we observe. Work/family conflict continues to be a problem for all news personnel, but especially women, as women still do the bulk of child care and housework (*API & Pew 2002; Hochschild 2003; Williams 2000*). In addition, conscious and unconscious discrimination on the job front (including sexual harassment, gender schemas, discrimination in hiring and promotions) continue to limit women’s opportunities for advancement and make women less happy in their news-business jobs than similarly-situated men (*Creedon & Cramer 2007; Pollitt 2005; API & Pew 2002; Valian 1999; NewsInc 1991*). These sex-based differences in workplace environment, culture, and opportunities may further exacerbate work/life conflict and intensify the competing demands of family, making for a vicious cycle (*Hewlett 2007; Crittenden 2002; Williams 2000; Eagly & Carli 2007*). Scholars who study gender stress more generally the deeply-rooted cultural expectations that continue to block women’s advancement, particularly limiting schemas and stereotypes about motherhood, emotionality, competency, compassion, nurturing, and ambition (*Eagly and Carli 2007; Valian 1999; Fletcher 1999; see also Wilson 2004*).

Women also have somewhat different ways of working and interacting (particularly a preference for less hierarchy, more teamwork, and a more blended personal and professional set of relationships) that are not recognized or rewarded by men in positions of power (*Fletcher 1999*). Employers tend to hire and promote those who look and think like them, leading to yet another cycle that seems to empower men (and particularly white men) and, unconsciously, lead to discrimination against women and people of color (*Pollitt 2005; Fletcher 1999; Valian 1999*). As Virginia Valian writes after evaluating an impressive collection of data on women in various professions, how children are reared, and how women are perceived, “The statistical data... suggest that women will not advance faster without a better understanding of gender schemas and how they hinder women’s accumulation of advantage” (*Valian 1999, 216*). Sociologists Alice Eagly and Linda Carli write that it is none of these factors singly, but the synergy of all together, that holds women back: “It’s not the glass ceiling, but the sum of many obstacles along the way” (*Eagly & Carli 2007*).

Gender & Media Effects

Collectively, news media help shape American's political knowledge, public opinion, and the political agenda (*Baum 2003; Zaller 1992; Graber 1988; Kingdon 1984; McCombs & Shaw 1972*) in a process known as "media effects" studied and explained by political communications scholar Doris Graber (*Graber 2006; Graber 1988*). Media have both an "authority-setting" and "agenda-setting" effect (*McCombs & Shaw 1972, Kingdon 1984; White House Project 2001*). The authority-setting effect is particularly relevant for this project, as some literature speculates that seeing members of your identity group in positions of authority heightens engagement (*Atkeson & Carrillo 2007; Gandy 2001, 1998; Burns, Schlozman, & Verba 200; Bobo & Gilliam Jr. 1990; see above on women's participation*). If this is indeed the case (further research is needed in this area), women's lack of engagement relative to men is not hard to understand. Research finds that Sunday morning talk shows present authority as decidedly male; of the guests on these shows, who are presented as experts in politics, policy, or international relations), only 11% of all guests and only 7% of repeat guests were women (*White House Project 2001; see also Media Matters 2007; FAIR 2005; White House Project 2005*). Another study found that a little over 2/3 of all local news sound bites were by men, with less than 1/3 by women (*MMC 2007*).

Male dominance of news inevitably reflects men's greater likelihood of holding positions of authority, yet women seem absent from political news in disproportionate share to their presence in positions of power. In a study of 16,800 randomly-selected news stories across time and 45 different news outlets, more than 75% of stories contained male sources, while only 25% contained female sources (*Project for Excellence in Journalism 2005*). Women were most likely to be cited in lifestyle stories, and least likely to be cited in foreign affairs stories (*Ibid*). Newspapers were the most likely to cite female sources (41% of stories) while cable news was least likely (only 19%; *Ibid*). Across all media, there was a greater likelihood of quoting two men than two women in a story (*Ibid*). The research in Fact Sheet 1 suggests that the visual and aural impact of men's dominance of positions of power in news presentations may perpetuate a cycle. Conscious or not, depictions of politics as a "man's game" seem to lead women to disengage, resulting in men's continued dominance of politics.

Women's lack of engagement with political news may also be due to features of news presentation. Fact Sheet 2 shows that men and women seek news from different sources. The exact mechanisms leading women away from hard news and toward soft news are as yet unknown, but may have something to do with women's preference for greater emotional attachment with those who deliver the news. A 2007 report finds that women are more likely to develop relationships with TV anchors and feel connected to them, and that informal chitchat helps them feel that they know these newscasters as people (*MMC 2007, p. 35*). Women's news preferences may be prompted by what psychologists have called women's relational thinking, referring to a female preference for understanding the world as a "network of relationships" (*Gilligan 1982*). More research is needed in this area, and particularly to determine whether such relational thinking relates to women's distaste for negative political ads and negative or mean-spirited political discussion (*Kern and Just 1997; Trent and Sabourin 1993; Garramone 1984*). In evaluating middle-class men's and women's responses to

candidate advertising, political scientists Montague Kern and Marion Just found that men admire candidates' narratives about their ability to "make it on their own." Women tend to dislike negative advertising and blame the authors of the attack (*Kern and Just 1997*).

Looking Ahead: Promising and Problematic Trends

The above research and statistics paint a picture of an entrenched gender system that gives rise to self-reinforcing cycles of women's political and news disengagement. Can these cycles be disrupted? If the causes of the differences between men's and women's political knowledge are so deeply-rooted, can we hold out the hope increasing women's news attention? Certain new trends suggest that we can answer yes to both questions, even in the face of new inequalities.

The first promising trend is a dramatic rise in women holding elective office and other positions of political power. In the past fifteen years, women have gone from 2% and 5% of the U.S. Senate and House, respectively, to 16% of both bodies, an increase of 700% for the Senate and over 200% for the House (*CAWP 2007*). In that same time period, the number of female state governors has increased from 3 to 9, another 200% increase (*CAWP 2007*). Women have won the presidencies or prime ministerships of several countries in the past two years, including Chile, Liberia, and Germany. Here in the U.S. we have had two major firsts this year: the first female Speaker of the House (Nancy Pelosi) and the first female front-runner for a major party presidential nomination (Hillary Clinton). In the past decade, we have had both our first woman as Secretary of State (Madeleine Albright), our first woman as Attorney General (Janet Reno), and our first woman of color as Secretary of State (Condoleezza Rice). Since scholars have found that the lack of female role models seems to help perpetuate a cycle of male political leadership, the rising number of prominent women in politics may encourage more young women to view politics as a possible vocation.

At the same time, education is no longer a barrier preventing women from attaining leadership in politics or its feeder professions (law, business, education, and activism). In 2006, women were 57% of college graduates, half of law school entrants, 52% of M.A. recipients. Without other changes, however, it is not clear that education alone will enable close the leadership gaps (*Wilson 2004; Valian 1999; Williams 2000*). Men are still disproportionately represented in higher-paying positions in law and business (*WHP forthcoming*), and women are disproportionately represented in lower-paying and lower-status positions, perhaps in large part due to work/family conflict and women seeking less demanding positions, to have and care for children (*Williams 2000; Hewlett 2007*). A growing number of companies are realizing the value of retaining skilled women, and are trying to institute workplace changes like flextime, telecommuting, and "mommy-tracks" (*Wilson 2005; Mason & Ekman 2007; Hewlett 2007*). As long as such programs are reserved only or mainly for women, however, and as long as those who use them are stigmatized or thought to be not as dedicated to their jobs, women are unlikely to achieve full equality (*Williams 2000; Hewlett 2007; Crittenden 2002*).

Turning to new forms of political media, we see both the potential for greater equality and new inequalities. The blogosphere holds hope for overcoming some of the gender imbalance in traditional media by decreasing the costs of entry. Yet there are substantial gender disparities in elec-

tronic media. Of the top 90 political blogs, columnist Ellen Goodman found that 42% are edited and written by men only, while only 7% are by women only (*Goodman 2007*). The remaining blogs are edited or authored by both men and women together, although Goodman notes, “the ‘coed’ mix was overwhelmingly male” in terms of having more male than female writers/editors (*Ibid*). Fact Sheet 3, giving ratings and a gender breakdown of the editors of some top political blogs, shows that the political blogosphere is mostly shaped by men. Perhaps because of men’s dominance of political blogs, men are more interested than women in reading blogs. In a 2007 survey, half of men but only a third of women report visiting political blogs (*NYT/CBS 2007*). Women may stay away from blogging because they get more negative comments and personal threats when they post opinions or appear angry, prompting Ellen Goodman to wonder if women are “scared silent” (*Goodman 2007*).

Fully half of all internet users, however, are women, and women seem to be attracted to other blogs (as evidenced by the popularity of “mommy blogs”) – just not specifically political ones. Perhaps more female bloggers would draw in more women readers; or it may be necessary for women to have greater engagement with politics before they become more involved with political blogs.

Looking at more traditional forms of media, we see some promising trends. Women have immense purchasing power (studies find that women make 80 to 85 percent of family purchases, *Gannon 2007*) so that women are a prime and highly-sought audience for all types of news businesses (*Arbitron/Joint Communications 2001*). Many of the changes that media sources could make to appeal to women are also recognized as practices that make for better journalism, including transparency, more diversity among managers and reporters, and less hierarchy in newsrooms (*see Nicholson, forthcoming*). Appealing to women consumers and having more women in positions of news leadership could enhance journalism, help the bottom line for news businesses, and encourage more women to engage with politics. The result will be a larger audience for news and more, and more diverse, citizens engaged in politics.

Fact Sheets

These Fact Sheets were prepared by Shauna Shames and Marion Just to inform the discussion at the Women and News Conference

Fact Sheet #1: “Why Does Politics Look Like a Man’s Game?”

Gender, Knowledge, the News, and Political Participation

Some facts about political knowledge and news interest by gender:

- ◆ Men follow political news more closely than do women – and in the case of economic and international relations stories, much more closely (*Pew 2006, 2007*)¹. Differences in news attention begin in childhood, as early as 4th grade (*Garramone & Atkin 1986; Atkin 1981; Greenstein 1961*).
- ◆ Interest in political news links to political knowledge, and both link to participation, such as voting, following/supporting campaigns, volunteering, contacting officials, etc. (*MMC 2007; Burns, Schlozman, and Verba 2001; Graber 1988; Zaller 1992*).
- ◆ Men express more interest in news about political figures and events in Washington, sports, business and finance, military/war news, and international affairs; women express more interest in health, crime, weather, culture and arts, religion, entertainment, celebrities, and local and community people and events (*Pew 2007*). However, women are just as attentive as men to certain kinds of political news, especially court decisions (*Pew 2006*) and natural and human-made disasters, including stories about crime, dangerous weather, and diseases (*Pew 2007*).

ATTENTION TO TYPE OF NEWS, BY GENDER

	Men	Women	Diff.
<i>Average percent following this type of news "very closely":</i>			
Sports	24	18	- 6
Financial/Business	36	31	- 5
International Policy/Politics	21	16	- 5
Political Scandal	21	18	- 3
Domestic Politics	23	20	- 3
Campaign Related	22	20	- 2
Domestic Policy	26	24	- 2
Legal, inc. Court Decisions	23	24	+ 1
Physical/Science/Health	22	24	+ 2
Personality/Entertainment	14	16	+ 4
Human-made Disaster/Accident	36	40	+ 4
Natural Disaster	35	39	+ 4
Crime	27	33	+ 6
<i>Source: Pew 2007.</i>			

◆ National polls show men know more than women about politics and political figures (*Delli-Carpini & Keeter 2000; Pew 2006, 2007; Jamieson 2000; Mondak & Anderson 2004; see Table on following page*).

◆ In the critical 2002-3 period of decision-making about war with Iraq, more women than men

¹ See “Narrative” document for full bibliographic citations for all references.

thought Saddam Hussein was concealing weapons of mass destruction (*Gallup 2002; Univ. of Wisc. 2003*). Male FOX News watchers were also disproportionately likely to believe this (*PIPA 2003*).

- ◆ Men and women are equally knowledgeable about local politics, with more women able to name the School Superintendent (*Delli-Carpini & Keeter 2000*). Women know more about health issues and diseases, but men are more likely to follow health policy (*Brodie et al. 2003*).

Some differences in the political behavior of men and women:

- ◆ Women vote at rates equal to or exceeding men’s (*Inglehart & Norris 2003; Jamieson 2000*), and are as likely to attend city council and school board meetings (*Comway 2001*); but men are more likely to serve on a local governing board (*Burns, Schlozman, & Verba 2001*).
- ◆ Men are more likely to join groups taking a stand in politics, and are much more likely to contact their representatives. Men give more money to campaigns, and give more often (*Burns, Schlozman, & Verba 2001; Brown, Jr, Powell, & Wilcox 1995; Francia et al. 2003*).
- ◆ Women constitute 51% of the U.S. population, 16% of Congress, 24% of state legislatures, 13% of big city mayors, 18% of governors of states, and 11% of the Supreme Court (*CAWP 2007*).

Some explanations for differences in knowledge, news interest and political behavior:

- ◆ In contrast to men, women are socialized from infancy to believe that they should prefer the private to the public sphere (*Williams 2000; Valian 1999; Bem 1988; Sapiro 1983; Duwenger 1955*).

MEN’S AND WOMEN’S POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE: A SAMPLE

	Men	Women	Difference
Which countries have nuclear capacity?*	43	20	-23
Did stock market recently go up or down?*	70	48	-22
Who is Vladimir Putin?*	42	23	-19
Does the House have GOP majority?*	74	56	-18
Did a gun control bill pass the House?*	35	30	-5
Year Clinton’s impeachment trial ended?*	41	45	+ 4
Who is Ellen DeGeneres? (post-coming out)	56	67	+ 11
Classified as “High Political Knowledge”***	45	25	-20

*Sources: * = Pew 2006, ** = Pew 2000, *** = Pew 2007*

- ◆ Women see few women in political office and therefore believe that politics is not for them (*Atkeson & Carrillo 2007; Burns, Schlozman, & Verba 2001; Kahn 1996; Sapiro 1983*). Like low-wage men, women feel less able to influence politics and pay less attention than do high-wage men (*Verba, Schlozman, & Brady 1995*).

- ◆ Female candidates for high political office make women (but not men) significantly more likely to: express interest in politics and the campaign, follow the campaign, and express likes and dislikes about other political candidates (*Burns, Schlozman, & Verba 2001, 347-8*). In states with no female Senator or candidate, only 51% of women can name a Senator, compared to **79% of women** in states with a female Senator or candidate (*Burns, Schlozman, & Verba 2001, 343*).

- ◆ Women, like others less knowledgeable about how political systems work, are less likely to be receptive to and able to process new political information (*MMC 2007; Bennett & Bennett 1993; Neuman, Just and Crigler, 1992; Zaller 1992; Graber 1988*). Research shows that TV news can be effective in increasing levels of political knowledge (*Neuman, Just, and Crigler 1992*).
- ◆ Women tend to have lower incomes than men due to both a persistent wage gap and to greater family caretaking responsibilities, therefore, have fewer of the resources that stimulate political interest and participation (*Williams 2000; Burns, Schlozman, & Verba 2001; Waldfogel 1994*).
- ◆ Women may be less likely than men to pursue political office because they are concerned about balancing work and family, they are less likely than men to be asked, they fear harsher treatment in the news media, or they perceive the political realm as unfriendly to them or their policy issues (*Williams 2000; White House Project 1998, 2000; Kahn 1996*). Alternatively, the difference may arise because of the greater willingness of men to run for public office, the tendency of incumbents to nearly always win, and the fact that the vast majority of incumbents are male (*Palmer & Simon 2006; Lawless & Fox 2005; Moncrief, Squire, & Jewell 2001*).

Fact Sheet #2: “Gendered Genres”

Women in the News Business and in the News Audience

Some facts about women in the news audience:

- ◆ Women are a highly-sought audience for all forms of media. Women make 80% of all purchasing decisions, and are therefore a prime target for advertisers (*Gannon 2007*). Arbitron Research explained, “Women are an increasingly desirable target for advertisers and programmers alike... [They are] contributing more to household incomes and making more household spending decisions than ever” (*Arbitron/Joint Communications 2001, 2*).
- ◆ Pew reports that media consumers live in a world of “his and hers,” meaning men and women get news from different places (*Pew 2006*).
- ◆ In 2006, NPR was the only outlet where women made up half the news audience (*Pew 2006*). In 1996, there was a 25% gender gap in NPR listeners: 16% of men and 11% of women surveyed said they listened to NPR (*Pew 2006*). The gender parity in the NPR audience may be due to NPR’s news framing and presentation style, their relatively-even gender balance of reporters and editors, or other factors.
- ◆ Media sources have begun to develop separate pathways for women, such as “mommy blogs.” Political coverage in “hers” sources is uneven; some sources work politics into “soft news,” while other outlets avoid politics altogether. For example, Greenstone Media an attempt to develop a talk radio format for a female audience does not include politics (*Greenstone 2006; Heslam 2006*).
- ◆ Some research finds that soft news programs, which are more heavily-viewed by women than hard news, can arouse interest in and inform the audience about political issues. For instance, Baum (*2003*) finds that soft news programs caused Americans to pay more attention to recent foreign policy crises than they did to major U.S. interventions in Korea and Vietnam in the 1950s-70s). However, others caution that the softening of hard news programs and overly-critical journalism are shrinking news audiences (*Patterson 2000*).
- ◆ Some literature speculates that seeing members of your identity group heightens engagement in news (*Gandy 2001; Burns, Schlozman, and Verba 2001*). Whether conscious or not, media depictions of politics as a “man’s game” seems to lead women to disengage with political news (*see Fact Sheet 1*).
- ◆ Media have both an “authority-setting” and “agenda-setting” effect (*McCombs & Shaw 1972, Kingdon 1984; White House Project 2001*). Research finds that Sunday morning talk shows present authority as decidedly male; only 11% of all guests (considered to be experts in politics, policy, or international relations) and only 7% of repeat guests were women (*White House Project 2001; see also Media Matters 2007; FAIR 2005; White House Project 2005*). Another study found that 2/3 of all local news sound bites were by men, with less than 1/3 by women (MMC 2007), probably because men are still more likely than women to be found in positions of authority.

Some facts about women in the news business:

- ◆ Men continue to dominate the news business as directors, editors, and publishers (*see table*), even though women constitute 65% of all undergraduate and graduate journalism and mass communication students (*Creedon & Cramer 2007, 6*). A new study found that 2/3 of deans, directors and department heads of journalism and mass communication schools and programs are male (*ASJMC 2007*).

- ◆ Far fewer opinion pieces by women than men are published in newspapers, probably due to a combination of factors, including male editors more often soliciting pieces from male writers, fewer submissions from women writers coming in, and unconscious discrimination in choosing pieces (*Estrich 2005, Pollitt 2005*).

- ◆ Women in the newsroom appear to make a difference in both the content of news and in the bottom line (*Media Management Center 2006; Catalyst 2004; Nicholson, forthcoming; Craft & Wanta 2004*).

Women in newsrooms, like women in other nontraditional fields such as science and politics, often think about things differently, do things somewhat differently, draw different conclusions, and in short bring an important “value-added” to the news (*Rhode 2002; Swers 2002; see also Zimmer 2007 and Nicholson, forthcoming*).

WOMEN IN THE NEWS BUSINESS, BY MEDIA TYPE AND POSITION

	Women	Men
Television:		
Commercial news directors	24%	76%
Personnel in commercial news operations	39	61
Radio:		
News general managers	13	87
News directors	26	74
Personnel working in radio news	22	78
Newspapers:		
President/Publisher/CEO at large newspaper	18	82
Editor/Exec. Editor/Senior VP/VP News	26	74
Newspaper personnel	48	52
Salaries:		
Median salary for journalists in all news media	\$37,731	\$46,758
<i>Sources: Dates 2007, Cramer 2007, Nicholson 2007, Media Management Center 2006, 2001.</i>		

Some explanations for women’s lack of advancement in the news business:

- ◆ Work/family conflict continues to be a problem for all news personnel, but especially women, as women still do the bulk of child care and housework (*API & Pew 2002; Williams 2000; Hochschild 2003*).

- ◆ An alternative explanation is that sexual harassment, gender schemas, gender gaps in pay, and other unconscious discrimination continue to limit women’s opportunities for advancement and make women less happy in their news-business jobs than similarly-situated men (*Creedon & Cramer 2007; Pollitt 2005; API & Pew 2002; Valian 1999; NewsInc 1991; see also Craft & Wanta 2004 on differential treatment of women reporters by male and female managers*). The explanations could also be combined: such sex-based differences in workplace environment, culture, and opportunities may further exacerbate work/life conflict and intensify the competing demands of family (*Hewlett 2007; Crittenden 2002; Williams 2000*)

Fact Sheet #3: “Good for Democracy, Journalism, and the Bottom Line?”

New Media, Old Media, & Opportunities for Change

Some facts about women in conventional political media:

- ◆ Male dominance of news reflects men’s greater likelihood of holding positions of authority, yet differences among outlets suggest that the imbalance can be moderated without compromising substance. In a study of 16,800 randomly-selected news stories across time and 45 different news outlets, more than 75% of stories contained male sources, while only 25% contained female sources (*Project for Excellence in Journalism 2005*). Women were most likely to be cited in life-style stories, and least likely to be cited in foreign affairs stories (*Ibid*). Newspapers were the most likely to cite female sources (41% of stories cited women) while cable news was least likely (only 19%; *Ibid*). Across all media, there was a much greater likelihood of quoting two or more men than two or more women in a single story (*Ibid*). Another study found that 2/3 of all local news sound bites were by men, with less than 1/3 by women (*MMC 2007*).

Some facts about women in new political media:

- ◆ According to Pew Internet, 67% of Americans go online, with users evenly divided between the sexes. However, men and women differ dramatically in their online usage. Men are more avid consumers of online information (e.g. news, weather, sports, politics, finance, software, etc). Women like the Internet for the human connections it promotes: “More women than men send and receive e-mail, and they use it in a richer and more engaging way” (*Pew Internet 2005, iii*).
- ◆ The blogosphere holds hope for overcoming some of the gender imbalance in traditional media by decreasing the cost of entry – yet there substantial gender disparities in the new media world as well. Of the top 90 political blogs, one observer found that 42% are edited and written by men only, while only 7% are by women only (*Goodman 2007*). “Another 45 percent were edited or authored by both men and women, though the ‘coed’ mix was overwhelmingly male” (*Ibid*).
- ◆ In terms of readers, men appear to be more interested than women in blogs: half of men and a third of women report visiting political blogs. (*NYT/CBS 2007*).
- ◆ Blogs link back and forth to each other throughout the day. Some ratings services use these links to establish the popularity of particular blogs (*TTLB 2007*). The table below gives statistics and a gender breakdown of the editors/lead writers for some top political blogs (*see table below*).

Top Political Blogs: Ratings Statistics and Gender Breakdown

Blog Name (alpha.)	Lead Person(s) (M or F)	TTLB Rating/Links [^]	Nielsen BuzzMetrics Rating/Cites*
Captain's Quarters	Ed Morrissey (M)	9	21
CrooksandLiars	John Amato (M)	17	13
DailyKos	Markos Moulitsas Zúniga (M)	2	7
Drudge Report	Matt Drudge (M)	(not ranked)	(not ranked)
Fire Dog Lake	Jane Hamsher (F)	49	(not ranked)
Eschaton	Duncan Black (M)	20	(not ranked)
Huffington Post	Arianna Huffington (F)	4	(not ranked)
InstaPundit	Glenn Reynolds (M)	6	22
Little Green Footballs	Charles Johnson (M)	5	25
Michelle Malkin	Michelle Malkin (F)	3	16
Power Line	John Hinderaker (M), Scott Johnson (M)	7	47
Real Clear Politics	John McIntyre (M), Tom Bevan (M)	19	(not ranked)
Talking Points Memo	Joshua Micah Marshall (M)	12	12
Volokh Conspiracy	Eugene Volokh (M) , Alexander Volokh (M)	18	67
Political Animal/ Washington Monthly	Kevin Drum (M)	32	28
Wonkette	Alex Pareene (M), Ken Layne (M)	44	43

[^] TTLB ratings as of 8/3/07, based on links to that blog; * Nielsen BuzzMetrics ratings as of 9/7/07, based on citations of that blog. Sources: TTLB 2007; Nielsen BuzzMetrics 2007; individual blogs' sites.

Some facts about opportunities for change:

- ◆ Certain demographic and political trends lend hope for increasing equality, including rising rates of college and post-college education for women, slowly increasing numbers of women in politics as elected and appointed officials, and recent high-profile advances by women (Hillary Clinton as the first female party frontrunner for president; Nancy Pelosi as first female Speaker; and increased discussion of women as leaders due to election of women presidents/PMs in several other countries in past few years) (*WHP forthcoming; U.S. Census 2007; CAWP 2007*).
- ◆ *Survey research shows that people are less interested in news about politics than they are in news about how to deal with policy issues such as education or health care costs (Rosenstiel et al. 2007).* If more of politics looked like community problem-solving rather than partisan argument, it is possible that women might be more engaged. After all, as many women as men attend local political meetings like city council and school board (*Conway 2001; Burns, Schlozman, and Verba 2001*).
- ◆ Many of the changes that media sources could make to appeal to women are also recognized as practices that make for better journalism, including transparency, more diversity among managers and reporters, and less hierarchy in newsrooms (*see Nicholson, forthcoming*).
- ◆ Appealing to women consumers and having more women in positions of leadership can help the bottom line for news businesses (*Catalyst 2004*).

References for Narrative & Fact Sheets

- American Bar Association (ABA) Commission on the Status of Women in the Profession: 2006. “Charting Our Progress: Women in Legal Status,” ABA report by the Commission on the Status of Women in the Profession. Chicago: ABA.
- American Press Institute (API) and Pew Center for Civic Journalism: 2002. “The Great Divide: Female Leadership in U.S. Newsrooms,” Report and survey conducted by Selzer & Co., Des Moines, IA. Available at: http://www.pewcenter.org/doingcj/research/r_apipewstudy.pdf (accessed June 21, 2007).
- Arbitron/Joint Communications: 2001. “What Women Want: Five Secrets to Better Ratings,” *Arbitron/Joint Communications research report*. Columbia, MD: Arbitron Inc. and Darien, CT: Joint Communications. Available at: <http://www.arbitron.com/downloads/whatwomenwantcontests.pdf> (accessed September 7, 2007).
- ASJMC: 2007. “J-school administrators overwhelmingly white and male, survey finds,” News release on new study by the Association of Schools of Journalism and Mass Communication (ASJMC), Philip Merrill College of Journalism at the Univ. of Maryland. Available at: <http://www.journalism.umd.edu/newrel/07newsrel/jmcsurvey07.html> (accessed September 11, 2007).
- Atikin, Charles K.: 1981. “Communication and Political Socialization,” in *Political Communication Handbook*, eds. Dan Nimmo and Keith Sanders. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage; pp. 299-328.
- Atkeson, Lonna Rae & Carrillo, Nancy: 2007. “More is Better: The Influence of Collective Female Descriptive Representation on External Efficacy,” *Politics & Gender* 3: pp. 79-101.
- Baum, Matthew: 2003. *Soft News Goes to War*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.
- _____: 2005. “Talking the Vote: Why Presidential Candidates Hit the Talk Show Circuit,” *American Journal of Political Science* 49, pp. 213-34.
- Bem, Sandra L.: 1988. *Psychology of Sex Roles*, 2nd ed. Littleton, MA: Copley Publishing Group.
- Blau, F.D. and Kahn, L.M.: 2000. “Gender Differences in Pay,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 14(4), Autumn; pp. 75-99.
- Bobo, Lawrence and Gilliam, Franklin D., Jr.: 1990. “Race, Sociopolitical Participation, and Black Empowerment,” *American Political Science Review* 84, pp. 377-393.
- Brodie, Mollyann; Hamel, Elizabeth C.; Altman, Drew E.; Blendon, Robert J.; and Benson, John M.: 2003. “Health News and the American Public,” *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* 28(5), October.
- Brown, Clifford W., Jr; Powell, Lynda W.; and Wilcox, Clyde: 1995. *Serious Money: Fundraising and Contributing in Presidential Nomination Campaigns*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Buhle, Mari Jo and Buhle, Paul, eds.: 1978. *The Concise History of Woman Suffrage*. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press.
- Burns, Nancy; Schlozman, Kay; and Verba, Sidney: 2001. *The Private Roots of Public Action*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Catalyst: 2004. *The Bottom Line: Connecting Corporate Performance and Gender Diversity*. New York: Catalyst. Available online at: <http://www.catalyst.org/files/full/financialperformancereport.pdf> (accessed September 4, 2007).
- CAWP: 2007. “Facts and Findings,” Fact Sheets from the Center for American Women and Politics. New Brunswick, NJ: CAWP. Available at: <http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/> (accessed July 3, 2007 and September 6, 2007).
- Census Bureau, U.S.: 2007. “Table 1. Educational Attainment of the Population 15 Years and Over, by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 2006.” U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, 2006 Annual Social and Economic Supplements. Available online at:

<http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/education/cps2006.html>.

- Conway, M. Margaret: 2001. "Women and Political Participation," *PS: Political Science and Politics* 34(2), June: pp. 231-233.
- Craft, Stephanie and Wanta, Wayne: 2004. "Women in the Newsroom: Influences of Female Editors and Reporters on the News Agenda," *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 81(1), Spring; pp. 124-138.
- Cramer, Judith: 2007. "Radio: The More Things Change... The More They Stay the Same," in *Women in Mass Communication*, 3rd ed., Pamela J. Creedon and Judith Cramer, eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 59-72.
- Creedon, Pamela J. and Cramer, Judith, eds.: 2007. *Women in Mass Communication*, 3rd Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Crittenden, Ann: 2002. *The Price of Motherhood*. New York: H.Holt & Co.
- Cott, Nancy: 1987. *The Grounding of Modern Feminism*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press.
- Dates, Jannette L.: 2007. "Women and Minorities in Commercial and Public Television News," in *Women in Mass Communication*, 3rd ed., Pamela J. Creedon and Judith Cramer, eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 73-84.
- Delli-Carpini, Michael X. and Keeter, Scott: 2000. "Gender and Political Knowledge," in *Gender and American Politics: Women, Men, and the Political Process*, eds. Sue Tolleson-Rinehart and Jyl J. Josephson. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Duverger, Maurice: 1955. *The Political Role of Women*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Eagley, A. H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, M. (2001). The leadership styles of women and men. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 781-797.
- Eagly, Alice H. and Carli, Linda L.: 2007. "Women and the Labyrinth of Leadership," *Harvard Business Review*, September; pp. 62-71.
- Estrich, Susan: 2005. "Michael Kinsley and Me," blog post at "Stop the Bias: Women and Men for Diversity in Media," March 18, available at: <http://www.latimesbias.org/> (accessed July 14, 2007).
- FAIR: 2005. "Women's Opinions Also Missing on Television," Media Advisory (results of study also printed in FAIR's magazine *Extra!* (May/June 2005). New York: FAIR (Fairness & Accuracy in Reporting). Available online at: <http://www.fair.org/index.php?page=105> (accessed September 3, 2007).
- Fletcher, Joyce K.: 1999. *Disappearing Acts: Gender, Power, and Relational Practice at Work*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Francia, Peter L., et al.: 2003. *The Financiers of Congressional Elections: Investors, Ideologues, and Intimates*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- Gandy, Oscar H., Jr.: 2001. "Racial Identity, Media Use, and the Social Construction of Risk among African Americans," *Journal of Black Studies* 31(5), May; pp. 600-618.
- _____: 1998. *Communication and Race*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Gannon, Joyce: 2007. "When it comes to spending, dad gets the hook; Studies show moms still control bulk of purchase decisions in the home," *Pittsburgh Post Gazette*, June 17; p. C-1.
- Garramone, Gina and Atkin, Charles: 1986. "Mass Communication and Political Socialization: Specifying the Effects," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 50(1), Spring; pp. 76-86.
- Garramone, Gina: 1984. "Voter Response to Negative Political Ads," *Journalism Quarterly* 61: 250-59.
- Goodman, Ellen: 2007. "E-Male," *Boston Globe*, August 10, 2007: A-15.
- Graber, Doris: 2006. *Mass Media and American Politics*, 7th ed. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- _____: 1988. *Processing the News: How People Tame the Information Tide*, 2nd ed. New York: Longman.
- Greenstein, Fred I.: 1961. "Sex-Related Political Differences in Childhood," *Journal of Politics* 23(2), May; pp. 353-371.
- Greenstone Media: 2006. "We've Done the Research," Research Report. New York: Greenstone Media. Available online at: <http://www.greenstone.momentummediamarketing.com/GreenStone%20Research%209-06.pdf>

(accessed May 23, 2007).

- Heslam, Jessica: 2006. "Radio Gals Have 'Broad' Appeal," *Boston Herald*, October 20, p. 3.
- Hewlett, Sylvia Ann: 2007. *Off-Ramps and On-Ramps: Keeping Talented Women on the Road to Success*. Boston: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Hochschild, Arlie: 2003. *The Second Shift*, updated introduction. New York: Penguin Books.
- Inglehart, Ronald and Norris, Pippa: 2003. *Rising Tide: Gender Equality and Cultural Change Around the World*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Jamieson, Kathleen Hall: 2000. *Everything You Think You Know About Politics... And Why You're Wrong*. New York: Basic Books.
- Junn, Jane: 1991. "Participation and Political Knowledge," in *Political Participation and American Democracy*, ed. William Crotty. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Kahn, Kim Fridkin: 1996. *The Political Consequences of Being a Woman: How Stereotypes Influence the Conduct and Consequences of Political Campaigns*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- Kern, Montague and Just, Marion: 1997. "A Gender Gap Among Viewers?" in *Women, Media, and Politics*, ed. Pippa Norris. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Kingdon, John W.: 1984. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Kraditor, Aileen: 1971. *The Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Lawless, Jennifer L. and Fox, Richard L.: 2005. *It Takes a Candidate: Why Women Don't Run for Office*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Leighley, Jan E. and Vedlitz, A.: 1999. "Race, Ethnicity, and Political Participation: Competing Models and Contrasting Explanations," *Journal of Politics* 61(4), November; pp. 1092-1114.
- Leighley, Jan E.: 1995. "Attitudes, Opportunities and Incentives: A Field Essay on Political Participation," *Political Research Quarterly* 48(1), March; pp. 181-209.
- Lien, Pei-te (1994). "Ethnicity and Political Participation: a comparison between Asians and Mexican Americans," *Political Behavior* 19: 237-264.
- Mansbridge, Jane: 1986. *Why We Lost the ERA*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Marilley, Suzanne M.: 1996. *Woman Suffrage and the Origins of Liberal Feminism in the United States, 1820-1920*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Mason, Mary Ann and Ekman, Eve Mason: 2007. *Mothers on the Fast Track*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- McCombs, M.E. and Shaw, D.L.: 1972. "The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass Media," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, v. 36, no. 2, pp. 176-187.
- Media Management Center and McCormick Tribune Foundation: 2006. "Women in Media," Report by Media Management Center (MMC). Chicago: MMC, Northwestern Univ. Available at: <http://www.mediamanagementcenter.org/publications/wim2006.asp> (accessed May 5, 2007).
- Media Matters: 2007. "Sunday Shutout: The Lack of Gender & Ethnic Diversity on the Sunday Morning Talk Shows," Media Matters for America, available at: <http://mediamatters.org/items/200705140001> (accessed September 2, 2007).
- Media Management Center, Medhill School of Journalism, and Knight Foundation: 2007. "The Local TV News Experience: How to win viewers by focusing on engagement," research study. Chicago: Media Management Center, Northwestern Univ. Available at: <http://www.mediamanagementcenter.org/localTV/localTV.pdf> (accessed September 6, 2007).
- Moncrief, Gary; Squire, Peverill; and Jewell, Malcolm E.: 2001. *Who Runs for the Legislature?* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Mondak, Jeffrey J. & Anderson, Mary R.: 2004. "The Knowledge Gap: A Reexamination of Gender-Based Differences in Political Knowledge," *Journal of Politics* 66(2), May; pp. 494-512.
- Mutz, Diana C. and Reeves, Byron: 2005. "The New Videomalaise: Effects of Televised Incivility on Political Trust," *American Political Science Review* 99(1), February; pp. 1-15.
- Neuman, W. Russell; Just, Marion R.; and Crigler, Ann N.: 1992. *Common Knowledge: News and the Construction of Political Meaning*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- NewsInc: 1991. "It Does Happen Here: Sexual Harassment" *NewsInc.*, December, pp. 27, 30-31.

- Nicholson, June O.: *forthcoming*. "Introduction," *The Edge of Change: Women in the 21st Century Press*. Champaign: Univ. of Illinois Press.
- _____: 2007. "Women in Newspaper Journalism (Since the 1990s)," in *Women in Mass Communication*, 3rd ed., Pamela J. Creedon and Judith Cramer, eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 35-46.
- Nielsen BuzzMetrics: 2007. "BlogPulse Profiles," a service of Nielsen BuzzMetrics. Profiles available at: <http://blogpulse.com/profile> (profiles accessed September 7, 2007).
- NYT/CBS: 2007. "Blog Poll: Who Visits Political Blogs," *The New York Times* and CBS News telephone poll results, conducted March 7-11. Available at <http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2007/03/12/> (accessed September 7, 2007).
- Palfrey, Thomas R. and Poole, Keith T.: 1987. "The Relationship between Information, Ideology, and Voting Behavior," *American Journal of Political Science* 31(3), August; pp. 511-30.
- Palmer, Barbara and Simon, Dennis: 2006. *Breaking the Glass Ceiling: Women and Congressional Elections*. New York: Routledge.
- Patterson, Thomas E.: 2000. "Doing Well and Doing Good: How Soft News and Critical Journalism are Shrinking the News Audience and Weakening Democracy and What News Outlets Can Do About It," Faculty Research Working Paper, Shorenstein Center, Kennedy School of Government; available at: [http://ksgnotes1.harvard.edu/Research/wpaper.nsf/rwp/RWP01-001/\\$File/rwp01_001_patterson.pdf](http://ksgnotes1.harvard.edu/Research/wpaper.nsf/rwp/RWP01-001/$File/rwp01_001_patterson.pdf) (accessed July 12, 2007).
- Pew Research Center for the People & the Press: 2007. *Public Knowledge of Current Affairs Little Changed by News and Information Revolutions*. Washington, DC: Pew. Available from <http://www.people-press.org>.
- Pew Research Center for the People & the Press: 2006. *Pew Research Center Biennial News Consumption Survey*. Washington, DC: Pew. Available from <http://www.people-press.org>.
- Pew Internet & American Life Project: 2005. "How Women & Men Use the Internet," report by Pew Internet and American Life Project. Washington, DC: Pew Internet. See <http://www.pewinternet.org/>
- Phillips, Anne: 1991. *Engendering Democracy*. Univ. Park: Pennsylvania State Univ. Press.
- PIPA: 2003. "Misperceptions, the Media and the Iraq War," the PIPA/Knowledge Networks Poll, the American Public on International Issues series. Univ. of Maryland: PIPA (Program on International Policy Attitudes) and Menlo Park, CA: Knowledge Networks.
- Pollitt, Katha: 2005. "Invisible Women," *The Nation*, April 4. Available at: <http://www.thenation.com/doc/20050404/pollitt> (accessed July 20, 2007).
- Prior, Markus: 2005. "News v. Entertainment: How Increasing Media Choice Widens Gaps in Political Knowledge and Turnout," *American Journal of Political Science* 49(2), July; pp. 577-592.
- Project for Excellence in Journalism: 2005. "The Gender Gap: Women are Still Missing as Sources for Journalists," report by the Project for Excellence in Journalism (PEJ). Washington, DC: PEJ. Available at: <http://www.journalism.org/files/gender.pdf> (accessed September 7, 2007).
- Rhode, Deborah: 2002. *The Difference 'Difference' Makes: Women and Leadership*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Law & Politics Series.
- Rosenstone, Steven J. and Hansen, John Mark: 1993. *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America*. New York: Macmillan Pub. Co.
- Tom Rosenstiel et al.: 2007. *We Interrupt This Newscast: How to Improve Local News and Win Ratings, Too!* New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 134-135.
- Sapiro, Virginia: 1983. *The Political Integration of Women*. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press.
- Scott, Anne Firor and Scott, Andrew: 1982. *One Half the People: The Fight for Woman Suffrage*. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press.
- Shaw, D.L. and McCombs, M.E.: 1977. *The Emergence of American Political Issues: The agenda-setting function of the press*. St. Paul: West Publishers.
- Skocpol, Theda and Fiorina, Morris: 1999. *Civic Engagement in American Democracy*. DC: Brookings Institution.

- Skocpol, Theda: 1992. *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press.
- Swers, Michele: 2002. *The Difference Women Make*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- The Truth Laid Bear (TTLB): 2007. "The TTLB Blogosphere Ecosystem," a blog-rating system and list of rankings, available at: <http://truthlaidbear.com/ecosystem.php> (accessed August 3, 2007). More information about the "ecosystem" ratings at: <http://truthlaidbear.com/AboutTTLB.php> (accessed September 7, 2007).
- Tichenor, P.J.; Donohue, G.A.; and Olien, C.N.: 1970. "Mass Media Flow and Differential Growth in Knowledge," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 34(2), Summer; pp. 159-70.
- Trent, Judith S. and Sabourin, Teresa Chandler: 1993. "When the Candidate Is a Woman: The Content and Form of Televised Negative Advertising," in *Communication and Sex Role Socialization*, eds. Cynthia Berryman-Fink, Deborah Ballard-Reisch, and Lisa H. Newman. New York: Garland Publishing.
- U.S. Census Bureau: 2007. "Educational Attainment, 2006," Current Population Survey Tables, available at: <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/education/cps2006.html> (accessed August 30, 2007).
- Uhlaner, Carole J.; Cain, B.E.; and Kiewiet, D.R.: 1989. "Political Participation of Ethnic Minorities in the 1980s," *Political Behavior* 11(3); September; pp. 195-231.
- Univ. of Wisconsin Survey Research Center: 2003. "Badger Poll 12, Release 2," Survey Center. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin. Available at: <http://www.uwsc.wisc.edu/badg122.pdf> (accessed July 12, 2007).
- USA Today/CNN/Gallup: 2002. "USA Today/CNN/Gallup Poll," *USA Today*, September 19.
- Valian, Virginia: 1999. *Why So Slow?* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Verba, Sidney; Schlozman, Kay; and Brady, Henry: 1995. *Voice & Equality*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Waldfogel, Jane: 1994. *The Family Gap for Young Women in the U.S. and U.K.: Can Maternity Leave Make a Difference?* Cambridge, MA: Wiener Center, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard Univ.
- White House Project, The (TWHP): 1998. *Framing Gender on the Campaign Trail*. TWHP Report. New York: TWHP. Available online at: <http://thewhitehouseproject.org/culture/researchandpolls/index.php#research> (accessed September 7, 2007).
- White House Project, The: 2000. *Style Over Substance: Spotlight on Elizabeth Dole*. TWHP Report. New York: TWHP. Available online at: <http://thewhitehouseproject.org/culture/researchandpolls/index.php#research> (accessed September 7, 2007).
- White House Project, The: 2001. *Who's Talking?: Gender and Sunday Morning Talk Shows*. TWHP Report. New York: TWHP. Available online at: <http://thewhitehouseproject.org/culture/researchandpolls/index.php#research> (accessed September 7, 2007).
- White House Project, The: 2005. *Who's Talking Now?: A Follow-Up Analysis of Gender and Sunday Morning Talk Shows*. TWHP Report. New York: TWHP. Available online at: <http://thewhitehouseproject.org/culture/researchandpolls/index.php#research> (accessed September 7, 2007).
- White House Project, The: (forthcoming). *Benchmarking Women's Leadership: Comparing Across Sectors*. TWHP Report. New York: TWHP. Once published, will be online at <http://thewhitehouseproject.org/culture/researchandpolls/index.php#research>.
- Williams, Joan: 2000. *Unbending Gender: Why Work and Family Conflict and What to Do About it*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Wilson, Marie C.: 2004. *Closing the Leadership Gap*. New York: Viking. Zaller, John R.: 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.

- Zimmer, Carl: 2007. "In Ducks, War of Sexes Plays Out in Evolution of Genitalia," NY Times, May 1; P. F-3.

Women and News:
Expanding the News Audience, Increasing Political
Participation, and Informing Citizens

A Conference sponsored by the
Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy

John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University

PROGRAM

Thursday, November 29, 2007 (*Charles Hotel Pavilion, Kennedy Room, 1st Floor*)

6PM Welcome by Alex Jones. Cocktails and dinner.

Keynote speech by Ellen Goodman

Friday, November 30, 2007 (*Kennedy School, Taubman Building, Nye Conference Center, 5th Floor*)

9–10:30AM **Gender, Knowledge, the News, and Political Participation**

Moderator: Thomas E. Patterson. *Panelists:* Susan Carroll, Pippa Norris, Kay Schlozman, Sidney Verba

10:45AM–12PM **Women in the News Business and in the News Audience**

Moderator: Linda Douglass. *Panelists:* Rick Kaplan, Andrew Kohut, Sandy Rowe, Shelley Ross, Linda Wertheimer

12:15–1:30PM **Luncheon keynote speech by Arianna Huffington**

1:45PM–3PM **New Media, Old Media and Opportunities for Change**

Moderator: Marion Just. *Panelists:* Garance Franke-Ruta, Caroline H. Little, Robin Sproul

Joan Shorenstein Center
PRESS • POLITICS



• PUBLIC POLICY •

Harvard University
John F. Kennedy School of Government

PARTICIPANTS

Susan J. Carroll is Professor of Political Science and Women's and Gender Studies at Rutgers University as well as Senior Scholar at the Center for American Women and Politics (CAWP) of the Eagleton Institute of Politics. As senior scholar at CAWP, Carroll has coauthored several publications focusing on the recruitment and impact of women state legislators and members of Congress, including *Reshaping the Agenda: Women in State Legislatures*; *Women's Routes to Elective Office: A Comparison with Men's*; and *Voices, Views, Votes: The Impact of Women in the 103rd Congress*. Carroll has published many journal articles and book chapters focusing on women candidates, voters, elected officials, and political appointees. She is the author of *Women as Candidates in American Politics*; editor of *The Impact of Women in Public Office* and *Women and American Politics: New Questions, New Directions*; and coeditor of *Gender and Elections: Shaping the Future of American Politics*. A founder and former president of the Organized Section for Women and Politics Research of the American Political Science Association, Carroll's recent research examines gender and political representation and the role of gender in elections.

Linda Douglass is a contributing editor for *National Journal*. In December 2005 she retired from ABC News, where she worked for nine years as a correspondent in the Washington, DC, bureau. She became the network's congressional correspondent in 1998 and was named Chief Capitol Hill Correspondent in December 2000. During her 8 years on Capitol Hill, Douglass covered all of the major policy debates in Congress. Before joining ABC News, she covered politics and general assignment stories for CBS News. There Douglass reported for the political unit, where she established a feature focusing on campaign finance entitled "Follow the Dollar." Prior to joining CBS News in 1993, Douglass was an award-winning political reporter for KNBC-TV in Los Angeles. She provided in-studio analysis on election nights and anchored the award-winning weekly interview program, "News Conference." Douglass is the recipient of numerous awards, including the 2000 National Press Foundation's Everett Dirksen Award, for her coverage of Congress. In Spring 2007 Douglass was the first Kalb Fellow at the Shorenstein Center.

Garance Franke-Ruta is a senior editor at *The American Prospect*, where she covers electoral politics and writes for the magazine's group blog, Tapped. She was previously a senior writer at *City Paper*, Washington D.C.'s alternative weekly newspaper. From 2004 to 2005, Franke-Ruta was a Security and Liberty Post-9/11 Fellow with the University of Southern California's Institute for Justice and Journalism. Her work has also appeared in *The Washington Monthly*, *The New Republic*, *Salon*, *Legal Affairs*, *Washington Business Forward*, *Utne Reader*, and *National Journal*. She graduated magna cum laude from Harvard College in 1997 and has lived in Mexico, New Mexico, and New York City. In the fall of 2006 she examined the representation of women in opinion journalism as a Fellow at the Shorenstein Center.

Ellen Goodman is a syndicated columnist at *The Boston Globe*, for the Washington Post Writers Group. Goodman began her career as a researcher for *Newsweek* magazine, before becoming a reporter for the *Detroit Free Press* in 1965. She joined *The Boston Globe* as a reporter in 1967 and became a full-time columnist in 1974. A 1963 graduate of Radcliffe College, Goodman returned to Harvard in 1973 as a Nieman Fellow. She has published many books, including six collections of her columns and *I Know Just What You Mean: The Power of Friendship in Women's Lives*, which she coauthored with

Patricia O'Brien. She was awarded the Pulitzer Prize for Distinguished Commentary in 1980. In Spring 2007 Goodman was a Visiting Goldsmith Fellow at the Shorenstein Center.

Arianna Huffington is a nationally syndicated columnist and author of ten books, including *Picasso: Creator and Destroyer*; *Pigs at the Trough: How Corporate Greed and Political Corruption Are Undermining America*; and most recently, *On Becoming Fearless...in Love, Work, and Life*. She is the cofounder and editor-in-chief of the Huffington Post and co-host of the radio program "Left, Right & Center." Born in Greece, she joined the American political scene with her former husband, Congressman Michael Huffington. She graduated from Cambridge University with an M.A. in economics. In 2006 she was named to the *Time* 100, *Time* magazine's list of the world's most influential people.

Alex S. Jones is Director of the Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy and Laurence M. Lombard Lecturer in the Press and Public Policy at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government. He covered the press for *The New York Times* from 1983 to 1992 and was awarded the Pulitzer Prize in 1987. In 1991 he coauthored (with Susan E. Tiff) *The Patriarch: The Rise and Fall of the Bingham Dynasty*. In 1992, he left the *Times* to work on *The Trust: The Private and Powerful Family behind the New York Times* (also coauthored with Tiff). He has been a Nieman Fellow at Harvard, a host of National Public Radio's "On the Media," and host and Executive Editor of PBS's "Media Matters." Jones is on leave for the 2007–2008 academic year.

Marion Just is a Professor of Political Science at Wellesley College and a research associate at the Shorenstein Center. She is also a consultant to the Project for Excellence in Journalism and a member of the advisory board of the Reform Institute. A past president of the New England Political Science Association and the Northeastern Political Science Association, Professor Just received the American Political Science Association's Distinguished Career Award in Political Communication in 2007. Recently, Professor Just coauthored *We Interrupt This Newscast: How to Improve Local News and Win Ratings, Too*. She is coauthor of *Crosstalk: Citizens, Candidates, and the Media in a Presidential Campaign* and *Common Knowledge: News and the Construction of Political Meaning*. She has a B.A. from Barnard College, an M.A. from the Johns Hopkins University, and a Ph.D. from Columbia University.

Richard Kaplan is Executive Producer of the CBS Evening News. A journalist for over thirty years, Kaplan is the former President and General Manager of MSNBC. Previously, Kaplan served as Senior Vice President of ABC News, a position to which he was appointed after coordinating the network's news coverage of the war in Iraq. From 1997 to 2000, Kaplan was president of CNN-US. From 1979 to 1997, Kaplan held a variety of high level positions at ABC News. He served as Executive Producer for "World News Tonight" with Peter Jennings, "Primetime Live," "Nightline," "World News This Morning" and "Good Morning America." Kaplan joined ABC News in 1979 as a senior producer for "World News Tonight." He worked on "The CBS Evening News" with Walter Cronkite from 1974 to 1979. He was the Visiting Lombard Lecturer and a Fellow at the Shorenstein Center from 2001 to 2002.

Andrew Kohut is the President of the Pew Research Center, Director of the Pew Research Center for the People & the Press, and Director of the Pew Global Attitudes Project. Prior to joining the Pew Research Center, Kohut was President of the Gallup Organization for ten years. He founded Princeton Survey Research Associates and served as Founding Director of Surveys for the Times Mirror Center before becoming its Director in 1993. A press commentator on the meaning and in-

terpretation of opinion poll results, Kohut has served as a public opinion consultant and analyst for National Public Radio in recent elections. He has also written widely about public opinion for leading newspapers and magazines, as well as for scholarly journals including *The New York Times*, *Columbia Journalism Review*, and AOL News. In addition, Kohut has coauthored four books, among them *The Diminishing Divide: Religion's Changing Role in American Politics* and 2006's *America against the World*.

Caroline H. Little has been the Chief Executive Officer & Publisher of Washingtonpost. Newsweek Interactive since January 2004. Little joined WPNI in 1997 as General Counsel. She was promoted to Vice President of Administration and General Counsel in 1998, became Senior Vice President of Business Affairs and General Counsel in 1999, assumed the role of Chief Operating Officer in April 2000, and was named President in April 2003. Prior to joining Washingtonpost. Newsweek Interactive, Little was Deputy General Counsel at *U.S. News & World Report*, *The Atlantic Monthly*, and *Fast Company*. As General Counsel, she was active in negotiating agreements with online-service providers, licensing, multimedia syndication agreements, and other areas involving circulation and marketing of the magazines. An active member of both professional organizations and the charitable community in Washington, Little is a member of the Board of Governors for the D.C. Bar, an advisory board member for the Posse Foundation, and a board member for the Woolly Mammoth Theatre Company and the charitable group WEAVE (Women Empowered Against Violence).

Pippa Norris is the Paul F. McGuire Lecturer in Comparative Politics at the John F. Kennedy School of Government. Norris is a political scientist who focuses on democracy and development, public opinion and elections, political communications, and gender politics. She has recently returned from serving as the Director of Democratic Governance at the United Nations Development Program in New York. Norris has published many journal articles and three dozen books (many in translation), including *Framing Terrorism*, *Comparing Democracies 2*, *Electoral Change Since 1945*, *Women, Media, and Politics*, *Comparing Democracies*, *Women in Politics*, *British By-Elections*, and *Politics and Sexual Equality*. She has served on the executive committee of the American Political Science Association and the International Political Science Association, as a consultant to the UN, IDEA, UNESCO, the Council of Europe, NED, and UNDP, and held visiting appointments at many universities. She holds a B.A. in politics and philosophy from Warwick University and master's and doctoral degrees in politics from the London School of Economics.

Thomas E. Patterson is Acting Director of the Shorenstein Center and Bradlee Professor of Government and the Press at the Kennedy School of Government. His most recent book, *The Vanishing Voter*, looks at the causes and consequences of declining electoral participation. His book on the media's political role, *Out of Order*, received the American Political Science Association's Graber Award as the best book of the decade in political communication. An earlier book, *The Unseeing Eye*, was named by the American Association for Public Opinion Research as one of the fifty most influential books on public opinion of the past half century. He also is author of *Mass Media Election* and two general American government texts: *The American Democracy* and *We the People*. His articles have appeared in *Political Communication*, *Journal of Communication*, and other academic journals, as well as in the popular press.

Shelley Ross was named Senior Executive Producer of CBS' "The Early Show" in September 2007. Ross' first job in television was NBC's "Tomorrow Show" with Tom Snyder, where she booked the first-ever interview with Charles Manson. Ross became a producer at NBC News in 1989, where she

worked on the news magazine “Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow” with Maria Shriver. From 1989 until 1998 she held several key positions at ABC’s “PrimeTime Live,” during which time she produced a series of groundbreaking Pentagon reports with Sam Donaldson and became a senior producer and then Executive Producer of Special Projects, West Coast. In May 2004 Ross became executive producer of ABC’s “PrimeTime Live.” Ross has received numerous awards throughout her career including three Emmy Awards, a Peabody Award and four New York Film Festival Golden Eagle Awards, among others. She is the author of a history book, *Fall From Grace: The History of Sex Scandal and Corruption from 1702 to the Present* and is the coauthor, with now-retired UCLA professor of clinical neurology Dr. Louis Rosner, of *MS: New Hope and Practical Advice for People with MS and Their Families*.

Sandy Rowe has been the Editor of *The Oregonian* for the last thirteen years. Under her leadership *The Oregonian* has won four Pulitzer Prizes, including the gold medal for public service. *The Oregonian* has been recognized as one of the best daily newspapers in the U.S., and Ms. Rowe was named Benjamin Bradlee Editor of the Year in 2003 by the National Press Foundation. From 1984 until April 1993 Ms. Rowe was Executive Editor and Vice President of *The Virginian-Pilot* and *The Ledger-Star*. She remained with the *Pilot* and *Ledger-Star* for twenty-two years. Ms. Rowe chairs the Knight Foundation Journalism Advisory Board and is a member of the Medill School of Journalism Board of Visitors at Northwestern University. She chairs the Board of Visitors of the Knight Fellowships at Stanford University and is a board member of the Committee to Protect Journalists. Ms. Rowe is a graduate of East Carolina University in Greenville, N.C.

Kay Lehman Schlozman has been a member of Boston College’s Department of Political Science since 1974 and currently serves as J. Joseph Moakley Endowed Professor of Political Science. The winner of the American Political Science Association’s 2004 Rowman and Littlefield Award for Innovative Teaching in Political Science, Schlozman teaches undergraduate and graduate courses in American politics. She has written numerous articles in professional journals and is Editor of *Elections in America* and coauthor of *Injury to Insult: Unemployment, Class, and Political Response* (with Sidney Verba); *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics* (with Sidney Verba and Henry E. Brady); and, most recently, *The Private Roots of Public Action: Gender, Equality, and Political Participation* (with Nancy Burns and Sidney Verba). Among her professional activities, she has served as Secretary of the American Political Science Association and as Chair of the Association’s organized section on Elections, Public Opinion, and Voting Behavior. She is the recipient of the American Political Science Association’s 2006 Frank Goodnow Award for Distinguished Service to the Profession of Political Science. Schlozman has a B.A. from Wellesley College and an M.A. and Ph.D. from the University of Chicago.

Robin Sproul, Vice President and Washington Bureau Chief of ABC News, is a Kalb Fellow at the Shorenstein Center. Responsible for the editorial supervision and management of the network’s bureau, Sproul oversees news coverage of all Washington beats and serves as the network’s liaison to the federal government on news policy matters. Sproul has earned broadcasting honors for her contributions to the planning and production of local and national news coverage. A member of the Washington, D.C., Newseum Advisory Committee, Sproul has also served as President and Vice President of the board of the National Press Foundation. At the Shorenstein Center Sproul is investigating an economic and editorial model for the future of exit polling.

Sidney Verba is Harvard's Carl H. Pforzheimer University Professor. From 1984 until 2007 he was Director of the Harvard University Library. Professor Verba spearheaded Harvard's partnership with Google to digitize thousands of books in the public domain. At Harvard, Professor Verba has been Chair of the Department of Government, Associate Dean of the Faculty for Undergraduate Education, Associate Provost, and Chair of the Board of Directors of the Harvard University Press. In addition, Professor Verba is an award-winning author of over twenty books, including *The Private Roots of Public Action: Gender, Equality, and Political Participation*, and numerous articles on American and comparative government. Much of his writing is on the role of citizen engagement and activism in a democracy, with an emphasis on issues of equality in American political, social, and economic life. Professor Verba received his B.A. from Harvard and his Ph.D. from Princeton. He has taught at Princeton, Stanford, the University of Chicago, and at Harvard for over thirty years.

Linda Wertheimer is National Public Radio's Senior National Correspondent and has had a three-decade-long career with NPR. Before her current post, Wertheimer spent thirteen years as a host of NPR's news magazine, "All Things Considered." She joined NPR at the network's inception in 1971. From 1974 to 1989, she covered national politics and Congress, serving as Congressional and then National Political Correspondent. Prior to joining NPR, Wertheimer worked for the BBC in London and for WCBS Radio in New York. She is the author of *Listening to America: Twenty-five Years in the Life of a Nation as Heard on National Public Radio*, which celebrates NPR's history.

The Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy is a research center at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government. It was established in 1986 to promote a greater understanding of the media by public officials, to improve coverage by media professionals of government and politics, to better anticipate the consequences of public policies that affect the media and the First Amendment, and to increase knowledge about how the media affect our political processes and governmental institutions. The Center includes a faculty of scholars and practitioners who, through their research and teaching programs, are creating a body of knowledge about the press, politics and public policy in theory and in practice.

Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University
79 John F. Kennedy Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
www.shorensteincenter.org

Joan Shorenstein Center
PRESS • POLITICS



• PUBLIC POLICY •

Harvard University
John F. Kennedy School of Government