ABSTRACT

Title of Document:	**AN ANALYSIS OF PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS OF SITTING AND FORMER VICE PRESIDENTS: SO CLOSE AND YET SO FAR**
	Neil H. Mansharamani Doctor of Philosophy, 2014
Directed By:	Dr. Kathleen E. Kendall and Dr. James F. Klumpp Department of Communication

This study examines the presidential campaign communication of American sitting and former vice presidents. In recent history, four sitting U.S. vice presidents have run for president with only one (George H. W. Bush) succeeding. Three, Richard Nixon in 1960, Hubert Humphrey in 1968, and Albert Gore in 2000, lost close elections, with Nixon and Gore losing in very close and controversial contests. In the two cases of former vice presidents who ran for president, Nixon prevailed in 1968, whereas Walter Mondale failed in 1984. All of these candidates faced similar rhetorical problems attributable to their vice presidential status, particularly in defining their relationship with the president and their role in the administration. This study is a content analysis and historical analysis of campaign speeches, statements made during debates, and television advertisements by sitting and former vice presidents in the elections of 1960, 1968, 1984, 1988, and 2000. The purpose is to understand each vice president's discourse regarding both the president and the administration in which he served; and better appreciate how the inherent rhetorical situation that accompanies a superior-subordinate relationship is illustrated in these types of campaigns. Results showed that some vice presidents (e.g.

Richard Nixon) chose to discuss their president/administration more often, while others chose to almost never discuss their president/administration (e.g. Al Gore). This analysis shows that when a vice president seeks election to the presidency, he has tended to pursue one or more of the following strategies: run on the administration's record; minimize the record and argue that if elected, he will produce better results; emphasize their own personal involvement and achievements in the administration; or mostly avoid discussing the president/administration.

AN ANALYSIS OF PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS OF SITTING AND FORMER VICE PRESIDENTS: SO CLOSE AND YET SO FAR

By

Neil Hiro Mansharamani

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2014

Advisory Committee:
Professor Kathleen E. Kendall, Co-Chair
Professor James F. Klumpp, Co-Chair
Professor Robert N. Gaines, Member
Professor Irwin L. Morris, Member
Professor Kristjana Lyn Maddux, Member

Acknowledgements

There are many people who have encouraged and supported me in completing my dissertation and accomplishing my degree. I am grateful to my advisors, Dr. Kathleen E. Kendall and Dr. James F. Klumpp, for their guidance and wisdom throughout my coursework, examinations, and dissertation research and writing. I am especially appreciative of their enduring patience, underserving as it may have been at times. Dr. Kendall helped me think through every component of the dissertation. She was a continuous source of positive energy. Dr. Klumpp offered me a chance to conduct an independent study with him in content analysis, without which I could not have completed this study.

I'm also grateful to all of my dissertation committee members, including Dr. Robert N. Gaines, Dr. Kristjana Lyn Maddux, and Dr. Irwin L. Morris. I also want to thank Dr. Mari Boor Tonn, who served on the committee for my exams and dissertation proposal. I thank my four coders: Cole Donovan, Jeff De Tora, Girish Chaskar and Guergana Stoytcheva. They made the coding process productive and fun.

I also want to thank Dr. Edward L. Fink, Dr. Leah Waks, and Dr. Andrew Wolvin, for helping make my experience at the University of Maryland fulfilling and fun.

I would be remiss not to acknowledge the late Dr. Bernard Brock, whom I met as a first year undergraduate at Wayne State University, in Detroit. When I told him I was taking a job as a speechwriter, he told me not to let it prevent me from earning this degree. This dissertation is the fulfillment of the promise I made to Dr. Brock.

Speaking of Wayne State, I also want to thank my debate and speech coaches, Dr. George Ziegelmueller and Dr. Jack Kay, Ruth Kay, and my Master's program advisor,

Dr. Craig Allen Smith. My studies with Craig during the 2000 election started me on a pursuit to study the presidential campaign communication of vice presidents.

On a personal level, I thank Lisa Langone and Paulette Langone for their love and encouragement. Their many statements of praise, gentle inquires about my progress, and help in solving problems kept me going during tough times and helped me see the light at the end of the tunnel. I want to thank Spike for volunteering to conduct my final defense for me. He would have done a good job. I'm grateful for the love and support of my parents, Hiro and Indra Mansharamani. I love all of you very much. I thank my friend and fellow graduate student, David Payne, for helping me prepare for the defense, and for making a pact with me to come in to school on the weekends to work on our dissertations.

When I left Maryland shortly after finishing my coursework and became a speechwriter at the Federal Aviation Administration, I had the good fortune of meeting Anthony Willett, who became my friend and professional mentor. Each Monday, Tony would ask me how much time I spent on my dissertation over the previous weekend. Over time, the question became simply, "How much?"

As I think about the support and encouragement I have received from these people and countless others, I turn my thoughts toward supporting the growth and success of all those who cross my path.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

A political cartoon published one month before Election Day in 1960 depicted

Richard Nixon, the incumbent vice president and a former naval officer, leaning over the

side of a ship as he talks to a man. The ship, named *U.S. World Position*, is banged up,

with cracks in the windows and floors, and cobwebs abound. Nixon, dressed in an

officer's uniform says, "She's in great shape and I'm the guy to repair her" ("She's in

great," 1960).

If it's in great shape, then why would it need fixing?

The cartoon appears to suggest that Nixon had been making conflicting

statements in the 1960 presidential campaign. Nixon hailed the progress of the

Eisenhower-Nixon years, implying by association that he deserved some credit. He

argued that the U.S. standing in the world had not declined during the Eisenhower-Nixon

years, a charge made by his opponent John F. Kennedy. Nixon, however, went on to

discuss ways in which U.S. standing could be strengthened.

The somewhat contradictory stance speaks to the conflicting roles that Nixon and

other vice presidents have to contend with in their presidential bids. Not only must vice

presidents contend with an opponent, but their relationship with the president and their

association with the presidential administration, play a complex role in their ability to

create a positive public image and ultimately a winning electoral coalition.

This dissertation will (1) discuss why the presidential campaigns of sitting and

former vice presidents are worthy of study, reviewing the literature on vice presidents; (2)

offer new research questions, discuss the texts to be studied and the research

methodology used; (3) provide a historical/contextual review of the campaigns of six vice

presidents studied here; (4) report the results of the study; and (5) discuss the results and conclusions of the study.

Study Rationale

In recent history, political parties have often turned to sitting or former vice presidents to be their standard bearer in presidential elections. This had not always been the case. After the Constitution was amended in 1804[1], and prior to 1960, there were only two instances when a sitting or former vice president received a party nomination for president: Martin Van Buren (1836), and John C. Breckenridge (1860), with Van Buren successfully being elected president. During this time period, the vice presidency was never considered a stepping stone to being <u>elected</u> president. In fact, a vice president stood a much greater chance of ascending to the presidency because of the death of a president (Waugh, 1956). John Nance Garner, vice president under Franklin Roosevelt, summarized the futility of the vice presidency, reportedly saying that the office "is not worth a bucket of warm spit" (Cox, 2013, pg# 1).

Since 1960, however, there have been four instances when a sitting vice president has received his party's nomination for President: Richard Nixon in 1960, Hubert Humphrey in 1968, George H. W. Bush in 1988, and Al Gore in 2000; and two instances when a former vice president has done so: Richard Nixon in 1968, and Walter Mondale in 1984.[2] When one compares this success rate to the time period between 1804 and

---

[1] Elections prior to 1804, thus prior to the 12th Constitutional amendment, are not considered because a different voting method was used to elect the president and vice president. Under that method, a person became vice president if he received the second most votes for president.

[2] I am excluding elections in which a former vice president was a sitting president at the time of their presidential campaign such as Lyndon Johnson (1964), Richard Nixon (1972), Gerald Ford (1976), and George H. W. Bush (1992). This exclusion is made because once each person became president, he was

1956, it's clear that the modern vice president is a much more competitive candidate for president.

A thorough study is needed to explain the unique presidential campaign situation of a sitting or former vice president. First, the trend of nominating vice presidents will likely continue, and a thorough examination will help us understand and explain these elections. Even if vice presidents are not nominated in the future, this examination can help us understand the challenges that current or former members of the incumbent administration would have if they run for president. The challenges they would face are likely to be similar to those faced by a vice president. Second, on a wider level, an analysis of these campaigns will give us a better understanding of a rhetorical situation that inherently exists in life and is played out in the dilemmas that vice presidents face in their presidential campaigns.

Political parties will likely continue to nominate sitting vice presidents for presidential contests in the future. Nelson (2001) noted the vice presidency is now the "primary stepping stone to a presidential nomination" (p. 55). This is because the vice presidential office has evolved, most strikingly since the middle of the 20th century, in a way that better positions the occupant to be their party's standard bearer for president. Williams (1954) noted that the increased quality of the candidates tapped for vice president has heightened the prestige of the office, leading to vice presidents being seen as more credible.

---

likely perceived differently by the public. The presidential primary campaigns of Hubert Humphrey in 1972 and 1976, and Dan Quayle in 2000 account for the only other instances when a former vice president has run for president since 1960. Because Humphrey (in 1972 and 1976) and Quayle did not receive their party's nominations for president, their campaigns are also excluded from this analysis.

In addition, the responsibilities of vice presidents have increased in more recent times, thus further contributing to their credibility. Prior to Nixon, the vice presidency afforded few opportunities for real responsibility. A vice president's main duty was to serve as president of the Senate, whose only real power was in the rare cases of having to cast a tie breaking vote. America's first vice president, John Adams said that the vice presidency was "the most insignificant office that ever the invention of man contrived or his imagination conceived" (Waugh, 1956, p. 38). In fact, Vice President Theodore Roosevelt took law courses at night, because his duties were so sparse. And when Harry Truman was first approached to be Franklin Roosevelt's running mate in 1944, he objected, saying that all the vice presidents in history "were about as useful as a cow's fifth teat" (Waugh, 1956, p.166).

The expansion of the federal government and the presidency during the New Deal years, including the greater role the U.S. played in international affairs, however, started to create a larger and more prominent role for future vice presidents (Goldstein, 1982). Also, in the nuclear era, it was realized that the vice president must be kept more informed. So in 1949, vice presidents were given a seat on the National Security Council (Goldstein, 1982).

Nixon's vice presidency (1953-1961) was considered revolutionary in that unlike previous officeholders, he played a major role in foreign policy and presided over cabinet and National Security Council meetings (Kengor, 2000). Subsequent vice presidents such as Walter Mondale, George H. W. Bush and Al Gore were reported to have played even bigger roles than Nixon, thus further expanding the prestige, responsibility, and visibility of the office of vice president (Kengor, 2000; CNN.com, 2012).

A third reason accounting for greater presidential viability involves the way in which the vice president is now selected. Baumgartner (2006) and Goldstein (1982) noted that because contemporary presidential nominees can pick their own running mates, these vice presidents are more likely to receive substantive assignments and become trusted advisors. Previously, presidential nominees had to accept the running mate chosen by party leaders or bosses. Often this choice was made to achieve geographical or ideological balance on the ticket, or provide a "consolation prize" to someone who lost out on the presidential nomination but had a large voting constituency (Waugh, 1956).

Fourth, the televised age has ushered in a kind of celebrity factor that benefits the vice president simply because he is a notable officeholder, regardless of his activities. Goldstein (1982) noted that "with the exception of the president, presidential candidates, and an occasional cabinet member, senator, congressman or governor, vice presidents and vice-presidential candidates receive greater media attention than other public figures (p. 11-12)." This attention contributes to the perception of vice presidents as serious candidates and often frontrunners for the presidential nomination. Also, because the 22nd amendment, enacted in 1951, limits a president to two terms, vice presidents are able to plan their presidential bids and try to position themselves for the nomination, albeit within the constraints imposed by their office.

These reasons have substantially improved the sitting vice president's public visibility as well as their support among party officials. Public visibility is a huge asset in modern times because presidential nominees are selected when rank and file party

members caucus or cast votes in primaries, in contrast to a previous era when nominees were selected by party leaders or bosses.

But while modern vice presidents are nominated for president more often than their predecessors, their success rate in the general election has been poor. Of the four sitting vice presidents nominated since 1960, three of four lost in the general election. In fact, since 1804, only two sitting vice presidents have ever been elected president: Martin Van Buren in 1836 and George H. W. Bush in 1988. Running as a former vice president, Nixon prevailed in 1968, while Mondale lost in 1984. This study will give us a better understanding of the previous and future presidential campaigns waged by sitting and former vice presidents.

This study will also provide a better understanding and appreciation of the rhetorical situation that inherently exists in life and is played out in these campaigns – the situation when one person is a subordinate figure in a relationship with a superior figure. Such is the case with the vice president who serves with, and under, the president. The vice president running for the presidency faces a significant challenge when discussing his partnership with the president, and negotiating between his dual role of vice president and presidential nominee.

The next section will discuss this rhetorical situation on three levels: an inherent level, through the insight of academic scholars, and finally on a media-constructed level.

Rhetorical Situation: The Inherent Level

Bitzer (1968) defines a rhetorical situation as "…the nature of those contexts in which speakers or writers create rhetorical discourse: How should they be described?

What are their characteristics? Why and how do they result in the creation of rhetoric?" (p.1). Bitzer argues that this context includes an *exigence,* which he defines as "an imperfection marked by urgency [that is] capable of positive modification" (p.6-7). In simpler terms, this means that someone is faced with a challenging situation in which certain acts of communication can be employed to bring about a solution.

There is an inherent rhetorical situation that exists in life, which is played out in the presidential campaign of a vice president. This rhetorical situation focuses on how a subordinate, within a superior-subordinate pairing, is able to use communication to rise to the level of a superior. In this case, the vice president is the subordinate to the president. When vice presidents run for president, they are seeking to establish the kind of positive image that will enable them to become the "superior" figure. This requires vice presidents to contend with an *exigence* that includes the many negative perceptions and conflicts that come from being a subordinate vice president.

The nature of this rhetorical situation is seen in numerous social relationships outside of politics, including familial relationships. For instance, the relationship between parent and child mirrors the relationship between president and vice president. Children are dependent on the parent, until they are able to be self-sufficient. Just as children lack independence and maturity, the vice president is thought to be lacking "presidential" character traits such as independence and leadership ability (Kincade, 2000; Nelson 2002). And just as children are to be seen and not heard, the vice president must be seen and not heard (or heard in only limited and tightly controlled situations). FDR's first vice president, John Nance Garner said that "the way to survive this job is to keep your mouth shut" (Goldman, 1969, p. 263).

Several observers have described the relationship between the president and vice president in parent-child terms. Turque (2000) remarked that "the vice presidency makes dutiful sons of nearly all who hold it" (p. 356). Democratic political strategist Bob Shrum (2002) said that, "All vice presidents have this problem with 'infantilization,' that is, they stand behind the guy and they look like a kid" (p. 46). In fact, Gore political advisor Carter Eskew said that to the public, Gore was "known by his paternity" (Eskew, 2001). In other words, the public knew about him only through his association with Bill Clinton.

Vice presidents and vice presidential running mates have often been referred to as children. In 1952, when Eisenhower weighed dumping Nixon from the ticket after the press reported on accusations that Nixon accepted secret money from California businessmen, Nixon said, "I must admit that it made me feel like the little boy caught with jam on his face" (Nixon quoted in Barber, 1972, p. 367). After Nixon delivered the "Checkers Speech" in response to these allegations, Eisenhower reportedly told him "you're my boy" (Summers, 2000, p. 121). Then at the start of the Eisenhower administration, Nixon was dubbed "Ike's errand boy," (Summer, 2000, p. 145; Barber, 1972, p. 368). And Hubert Humphrey even summarized his own elevation to the vice presidency by saying: "Hell, I was just little Hubert from South Dakota. Now just think, I occupy the second highest office in the land" (Goldman, 1969, p. 262).

Freud's oedipal theory, which provides insight into the parent and child dynamic, further supports this point. According to Freud, young boys secretly wish to kill their fathers, and marry their mothers. But because he fears castration, the boy sublimates his

desire for the mother, identifies with the father, and eventually becomes an adult who can have a relationship with an appropriate adult female.

Using this Freudian lens, one might see that a vice president may harbor the desire to possess their "father's" (president's) bride – the country. However, for fear of "castration," (i.e. being cut off from the policy and governing process) the vice president refrains from expressing any overtures toward the "bride," and does not oppose the president. This is consistent with Barber's (1972) description of Nixon's approach after Eisenhower suffered a heart attack in 1955: "Nixon scrupulously avoided moves which might be interpreted as reaching for power; for example, he presided over the Cabinet from his own chair, not the president's" (p. 370). Barber (1972) described Nixon's autobiographical discussion of his own activities during that time period as constantly needing to "avoid the appearance of a power grab" (p. 371).

This theory may suggest an additional reason for why a vice president seeking the presidency may have a hard time distancing himself from the president. For example, this may be why Hubert Humphrey was so reluctant to break from Lyndon Johnson during his 1968 presidential campaign. Humphrey was reportedly "heartbroken" when supporters urged him to publicly oppose Johnson's Vietnam policy, and reportedly said he would prefer to lose the election rather than allow the appearance that he was turning against President Johnson (Goldstein, 1997).

In fact, the story of King Oedipus includes the role of the "spear carrier," another role of subordinate status played by the vice president. Upon becoming vice president, Dan Quayle said, "I am the spear carrier for one person and that person is George Bush" (Devroy, 1988, p. A1). In Roman times, a spear carrier was intensely loyal to the King.

Eventually, the vice president who runs for president must be "his own man," because as Kincade (2000) says, vice presidents are seen as lacking the independence and character required to be president. But again, at what point should the "son" become his "own man?" A vice president who runs for president must strike an effective balance between playing a subordinate and being independent. For instance, does he do it before, during, or after the nominating convention? At all of these times, the incumbent president is <u>still in office</u>, and has the power to help or hurt the vice president. Meanwhile, additional questions arise, such as whether the vice president can "cut the umbilical cord" and "stand on his own two feet?" Or will his presidential campaign be seen as a "failure to launch?" Is the association with their respective president "wind at their back," or maybe "ice on their wings?" Some degree of both?

The relationship between president and vice president also mirrors the relationship between husband and wife during a previous era in which wives were considered a subordinate, or supportive figure. Bostdorff (1991) described vice presidential discourse as feminine and comedic. Bostdorff likened vice presidents to being the presidents' "wives," because they wait for the "call" to be the running mate, and then are expected to be loyal, supporting figures that perform only the roles that the president allows them to perform.[3]

Many observers have described vice presidents this way. Recalling when he was selected to be the vice presidential running mate, Hubert Humphrey said President

---

[3] The vice president does have some specific duties as authorized in the Constitution. These duties include presiding over the Senate, breaking ties in the Senate, and succeeding the president if he dies, resigns or is otherwise unable to discharge the duties of President (Gillon, 1997; Waugh, 1956). The vice president also has duties established by statute, such as serving as a member of the National Security Council, a policy since 1949 (Goldstein, 1982); and other obscure duties such as chairing the National Space Council (Quayle, 1997).

Johnson told him, "this is a marriage for which there is no divorce, and that I had to be brought in to harness so to speak with the administration" (Caouette, 2011, p. 22). Former Vice President Dan Quayle even referred to the relationship between president and vice president as a "marriage of convenience" (Quayle, 1997, p. 117). During the 1988 election, journalist Mark Shields (1988) also invoked this analogy when he said that George Bush was Reagan's "faithful co-pilot," and that his conduct resembled the late Lurleen Wallace, who ran as a surrogate for her husband George Wallace in the 1966 Alabama Governor's race (p. A23). On his television show, political commentator Sean Hannity (2008) even likened the process of selecting a vice presidential running mate to "asking your wife to marry you."

In another similarity, families are traditionally referred to by the husband's name (e.g. "The Smith Family"). While a presidential administration may include the vice president's name as in the "Johnson-Humphrey administration," it is more often known by the president's name, the "Johnson administration."

This relationship is also husband-wife like in that just as the role and position held by husbands and wives have become more equal in the U.S., the relationship between president and vice president has become somewhat more equal. In fact, by 1977, Carter was referring to his vice president, Walter Mondale, as his "equal partner" (Barnes, 2001, p, 814). Interestingly, the rise of Second Wave feminism[4] in the mid 20th century, which symbolized a move toward greater equality between the sexes, corresponds with the

---

[4] Vice President Nixon's 1960 campaign is considered to have occurred in a new era in which vice presidents are now seen as presidential contenders. The early 1960's is also thought to be the time that Second Wave Feminism began, a movement which focused on the more unofficial inequalities that women experienced.

increased responsibilities and prestige of the vice president, and the perception of vice presidents as being "presidential material."

When a divorce occurs, there are expectations about the male and female roles. There are similar elements that are played out in the "divorce" between the president and vice president. If a woman decides, for example, to be independent, and seek a divorce, some may vilify her for not standing by her man. Others may criticize her for staying in a marriage that she no longer finds satisfying. Others may be concerned about the woman's well being – "Can she survive on her own?" These same criticisms and questions are often put forward when the sitting vice president runs for president. Should he remain loyal, or break from the president? To put it a little differently, do you "dance with the one that brought you?" If he chooses to break, when is the right time? Is he capable of running without the assistance of the president? Will the president fundraise for the vice president?

In both of these relationships, husband-wife and parent-child, the subordinate has to determine when to stay loyal, and serve as a subordinate, and when to establish their independence. Both choices entail consequences.

Rhetorical Situation: Academic Scholars' Observations

This rhetorical situation has also been observed by academic scholars. Kincade (2000) discussed the "vice-presidential dilemma" which includes the numerous conflicts and negative image perceptions that vice presidents experience when they run for president, and are linked to their relationship with the president. For instance, a vice president must remain loyal to the president and the president's policies, but also

demonstrate independence and articulate his own vision for the country. Vice presidents cannot, however, openly challenge their president. To do so may incur a rebuke from the president, and might raise questions about the vice president's judgment and integrity, because he chose to be the president's running mate in the first place.

Consistent with Kincade, Natoli (1985) asserted that the vice president must "simultaneously strike an independent note and not alienate the president under whom he has served. That president still wields power that can help or hurt the heir apparent" (p. 104). To illustrate these difficulties, Goldstein (1997) pointed to the case of Hubert Humphrey:

> Humphrey's problems running for president are instructive. An incumbent vice president must negotiate between the desire to establish an independent identity and the likely need to avoid offending the chief executive by criticizing his policies. Future vice presidents may hope they encounter circumstances less difficult and presidents more forgiving than did Humphrey. (p. 120)

The last sentence of Goldstein's quote suggests that both the prevailing conditions in the nation as well as the relationship between president and vice president are important factors that affect a vice president's presidential bid. All presidential candidates deal with the former, but only vice presidents, and arguably other administration officials, face the latter circumstance as well.

How does this affect the public's perception of vice presidents? Nelson (2002) noted that "the public that values loyalty in a vice president disdains that quality as soon as he bids to become president" (pg. #25).

Kincade also noted that vice presidents must avoid the taint of any scandals of the president or the administration, but also demonstrate their active participation in the administration to support claims of their experience and capability. Again, it is a challenging task to accomplish both goals. For instance, the claims of robust involvement by vice presidents George H. W. Bush and Al Gore in their respective administrations seemed inconsistent with statements made by each one that they were unaware of unethical or illegal actions taking place such as the Iran-Contra affair (Bush) and the Buddhist Temple fundraising scandal (Gore). These statements are consistent with a point made by Bostdorff (1991) that vice presidents are oriented to the Burkean pentadic term of *scene*, in that they are caught up in activities swirling around them, which they were unaware of, and therefore can't be held accountable. These are not exactly the kinds of passive behaviors we expect to hear from a leader.

Finally, Kincade noted that vice presidents are often seen as lacking the independence and character to become president. Certainly this perception is shaped in part by the vice president being in the shadow of the president, being seen and not heard (or only heard in limited and controlled ways), being loyal and not publicly questioning the president. For example, early in his 1988 presidential campaign, George H. W. Bush suffered from the perception that he was a "wimp" and Reagan's "lap dog" (Sperling, 1987, p. 16).

These negative perceptions of them start to form as soon as they are tapped as running mates. Goldstein (1982) noted vice presidential candidates have to toe the line of the presidential campaign which often requires them to abandon their own public policy stands. For example, when George H. W. Bush became Reagan's running mate in 1980,

14

he had to abandon his support for the Equal Rights Amendment and abortion rights, and embrace supply-side economic policies that he once dismissed as "voodoo economics." In changing positions, however, vice presidents run the risk of establishing the image of a "flip-flopper."

Goldstein (1982) also notes that vice presidents/vice presidential running mates often diminish their own credibility with intelligent voters when they make laudatory remarks about their president/presidential candidate. Perhaps this is because many of these statements sound inauthentic – we suspect they're saying it because they are bound by loyalty to say it. For example, in 1964, running mate Humphrey said that Johnson was "a giant of a man" (Mazo, 1964, p. 1). In 1976, running mate Mondale said that Carter was "this marvelous man who's from the soil himself" (Charlton, 1976, p. 32). In 1980, running mate George H. W. Bush said that Reagan was a "decent, compassionate man" who "cares deeply" (Sulzberger, 1980, p. 9). In a 1984 interview with *The New York Times Magazine*, Bush made what could have been one of the biggest statements in fealty ever made: "I'm for Mr. Reagan—blindly" (Rothenberg, 2000, p. 29). Perhaps this was why Bush felt challenged by the "vision thing," when he started his 1988 presidential campaign.

Another way in which vice presidents/vice presidential candidates cultivate a negative image is by playing the role of a partisan attacker, so as to allow the president/presidential candidate to remain above the fray (Goldstein, 1982). For example, Richard Nixon detailed his role as the attack dog when he was Dwight Eisenhower's running mate in 1952: "The plan was for General Eisenhower to stress the positive aspects of his 'Crusade to Clean Up the Mess in Washington.' I was to hammer

away at our opponents on the record of the Truman Administration…" (Nixon, 1962, p.77). While being the "attack dog" or "hatchet man" may help the ticket win, vice presidents/vice presidential candidates run the risk of tarnishing their own character and likability, and in the process, negatively affect their own presidential bid in the future.

Pomper (2001) also discussed two challenges for sitting vice presidents who run for president, both of which center around the sitting president. He noted that, "Vice presidents always labor under a burden of appearing less capable than the sitting chief executive, and there is a normal inclination on the part of the electorate to seek a change" (p. 210). Pomper's observation suggests at least two things. First, it underscores the point made earlier by Goldstein that both the prevailing national conditions and the vice president's relationship with the president come together to affect a vice president's presidential bid. Second, the "less capable appearance" resembles that of the dutiful son or wife, because of their traditional role as subordinate figures, and raises the issue of competence, as an image trait that the vice president must establish when they run for president.

These challenges are significant because scholars have noted that the popularity and performance of the sitting president may be a significant factor in determining the outcome of the vice president's presidential bid. For instance, Cohen (2001) found that when the president is popular, his vice president is also popular. But when the president is unpopular, the vice president is unpopular as well. DeCell and Lichtman (1990) argued that the incumbent party's ability to maintain control of the presidency is based primarily on the performance of the incumbent presidential administration and thirteen

keys can be used to predict success or failure.[5] They argue that if a candidate from the

incumbent party has five or more keys turned against him, he will not be successful.

DeCell and Lichtman's theory suggests that the vice president's success is to a large

extent, dependent on the success of the president and the administration.

In addition, scholars have noted that a President's discourse may affect the vice

president's presidential bid. Winkler (1991) found that image repair discourse by

incumbent presidents often created rhetorical constraints for the vice president's

presidential bid. For example, Johnson's decision not to run for reelection in 1968, and

focus on achieving peace in Vietnam may be considered a good example. Even though

discussing what he would do about Vietnam may have benefited his presidential

campaign, Humphrey was compelled to stay quiet because it could undercut Johnson's

peace negotiation efforts.

Also, Murphy and Stuckey (2002) noted that even when presidents try to

rhetorically assist the presidential bids of their vice presidents, they "almost invariably

cast vice presidents as subordinates, diminishing the[ir] perceived capacity…" (p. 47).

An example when this occurred may include a remark made by Bill Clinton, five days

before Election Day in 2000, on a nationwide broadcast of the Tom Joyner radio show.

He said that electing Al Gore president would be the "next best thing" to a third Clinton

---

[5] These keys are: (1) the incumbent party has gained seats in the U.S. House of Representatives in the
midterm election than they had in the previous election, (2) the incumbent party's nomination is not
seriously contested, (3) the president is running for reelection as the incumbent party's candidate, (4) a
significant third-party or independent candidate is not present, (5) there is no economic recession during the
campaign, (6) real per capita economic growth has at least equaled the mean growth during the previous
two fiscal terms, (7) the current administration has conducted major national policy changes, (8) no
sustained social unrest has occurred, (9), the current administration has avoided major scandal, (10) the
current administration has suffered no major setback in foreign or military affairs, (11) the current
administration has made major accomplishments in foreign or military affairs, (12) the candidate of the
incumbent party has charisma or is a national hero, and (13) the candidate of the challenging party lacks
charisma and is not a national hero.

term and that "someone has to be there if this [Republican] crowd stays" in the majority in Congress, to "stop their extremist action." ("Campaign for," 2002, p. 262; Sanger, 2000, p. 24). This comment could hardly be considered a ringing endorsement of Gore. Also, in a separate instance, Clinton jokingly told people to vote for Gore, because there's a 22nd amendment. In other words, Clinton is saying "vote for my vice president, because I'm not allowed to run for another term."

This section has thus far discussed the inherent rhetorical situation of a subordinate who seeks to reach the level of a superior, and how this is applicable to the presidential campaigns of vice presidents. This section has also discussed scholars' insight into this rhetorical situation, and the dilemmas and difficulties faced by vice presidents as they contend with this situation. One can begin to envision a range of nuanced explanations of the factors contributing to the outcome of a vice president's presidential bid. For instance, an <u>unpopular</u> president who strongly <u>supported</u> his vice president's presidential campaign would probably be a liability. Also, a <u>popular</u> president, who demonstrated a <u>lack of support</u>, or lukewarm support, for the vice president's presidential campaign, would probably also be a detriment. This is further complicated by a situation where a president's job approval may be high, but his personal popularity might be low, or vice versa. How might these unique circumstances advantage or constrain a vice president who is running for president?

This paper will turn to how the media plays a role in constructing this rhetorical situation.

Rhetorical Situation: Media-Constructed Dilemma

Vatz (1973) contends that the rhetorical situation is itself created by rhetoric. He says, "No situation can have a nature independent of the perception of its interpreter or independent of the rhetoric with which he chooses to characterize it" (p.154). He continues that, "meaning is not discovered in situations, but *created* by rhetors. As soon as one communicates an event or situation he is using evocative language" (p. 157). This view differs from Bitzer (1968) who believed that situations are objectively located in reality, observed by those involved, and invite fitting rhetorical response. In the context of this study, Vatz's (1973) argument suggests that the rhetorical situation that affects vice presidents when they run for president is one that is not merely observed, but rather constructed by the rhetors involved, including the media.

Media coverage can shape the public's perception of the vice president's campaign by making salient certain candidate image issues, and by employing certain news frames. This section will look at some of the themes that the media focuses on in their coverage of vice presidents who run for president.

McCombs and Shaw (1972) advanced the theory that the mass media performs an agenda setting function, in that they determine which election issues and topics the public thinks are important. The theory suggests that while the media may not tell us what to think, they do tell us what to think about. In elections in which a vice president runs for president, the media tends to focus on the relationship between the president and vice president, and how the vice president must negotiate their role in the administration versus their need to launch their own presidential bid.

Whereas *agenda setting* focuses more on *which* issues and topics are covered, *framing* focuses more on *how* they are covered (Weaver, 2007). Entman (1993) says that "to frame is to *select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation and/or treatment recommendation* for the item described" (p. 52, italics in original).

In coverage of U.S. political news, the media often employs a conflict frame, in which there is an emphasis placed on the disagreements between conflicting parties, including organizations or individuals (Cappella & Jamieson, 1997; de Vreese, Peter, and Semetko, 2001). While we would expect the media to highlight the conflict between competing candidates, the media also highlights any perceived conflicts, actual or suggested, between the president and vice president, in the latter's bid for the presidency. This occurs because scholars have noted that the media has a melodramatic imperative (Nimmo and Combs, 1983, Hahn, 1998). For instance, in 2000, CNN's *Talk Back Live* devoted an hour-long episode to the question of whether President Bill Clinton was an asset or a liability for Vice President Al Gore (Ryan and Smith, 2000).

In 1960, the media highlighted instances of perceived conflict between Nixon and Eisenhower. For instance, during the first presidential debate, one of the reporters on the questioning panel asked Nixon about an embarrassing comment that President Eisenhower made about him:

Mr. Vice President, since the question of executive leadership is a very important campaign issue, I'd like to follow Mr. Novins' question. Now Republican campaign slogans – you'll see them on signs around the country as you did last

week - say it's experience that counts - that's over a picture of yourself; sir uh -

implying that you've had more governmental executive decision-making uh -

experience than uh - your opponent. Now, in his news conference on August

twenty-fourth, President Eisenhower was asked to give one example of a major

idea of yours that he adopted. His reply was, and I'm quoting; "If you give me a

week I might think of one. I don't remember." Now that was a month ago, sir,

and the President hasn't brought it up since, and I'm wondering, sir, if you can

clarify which version is correct - the one put out by Republican campaign leaders

or the one put out by President Eisenhower? (pg. #22)

In this question, the panelist pointed to differing characterizations between Eisenhower

and Nixon's campaign, as to the latter's involvement in the White House, and asked

Nixon to determine which version is correct. This question suggested a conflict existed

between Nixon's campaign and Eisenhower and cast doubt on Nixon's claim that he was

more qualified than Kennedy to be president because of his experience in the Eisenhower

administration. This puts Nixon in the position of having to decide whether to agree or

disagree with President Eisenhower, or somehow explain that there is no conflict.

Similarly, in the third debate, Nixon was posed a question that invited him to

either affirm or negate the Eisenhower record.

Uh - Mr. Nixon uh - before the convention you and Governor Rockefeller said

jointly that the nation's economic growth ought to be accelerated; and the

Republican platform states that uh - the nation needs to quicken the pace of

economic growth. Uh - Is it fair, therefore, Mr. Vice President, to conclude that

you feel that there has been insufficient economic growth during the past eight

years; and if so, what would you do beyond uh - present Administration policies

uh - to step it up?

This question illustrates very clearly the loyalty versus independence dilemma for the

vice president. Should Nixon defend the Eisenhower economic record, or argue that it's

insufficient and that he is the man to fix it? Or does he try to pull off a balancing act?

Second, the media shape the expectation that the vice president needs to break

from the president and establish his independence. As Entman said, *framing* can also

include a *treatment recommendation*. In recommending this treatment to the vice

president, the media often bring up the example of Hubert Humphrey's 1968 presidential

campaign.

For instance, during the 1984 election, an editorial by the *Christian Science

Monitor* discussed Walter Mondale's ability to separate himself from his past with Carter

saying that "In 1968 Hubert Humphrey took too long to part with Lyndon Johnson over

Vietnam; once free of that burden, he almost overtook Richard Nixon" ("Mondale's

America," 1984, p. 13).

Journalist Richard Benedetto (1999) discussed Humphrey in regard to Al Gore's

2000 campaign:

Vice president Hubert Humphrey was in a similar box on Vietnam when he ran

for president in 1968. To break from Lyndon Johnson's policies would have been

disloyal. Only at the end of the campaign did he outline his own Vietnam policy.

By then it was too late. (p. 1A)

Economist Robert Kuttner (2000) also used Humphrey as an example when offering advice to Gore:

> People of my generation (and youngsters who studied the '60s in college) will vividly remember that in 1968 the Democratic candidate, Vice President Hubert Humphrey, waited just too long to break with President Lyndon Johnson's Vietnam bombing policy. The delay cost Humphrey the election. Maybe Gore should 'do a Humphrey' on Clinton's China policy… (p. 4)

Perhaps stories like this contributed to Gore's decision to distance himself from Bill Clinton early in the campaign.

Furthermore, CNN political analyst Bill Schneider advised Gore to use his nomination acceptance speech to establish independence from Clinton. Instead of citing the cautionary tale of Humphrey, Schneider cited George H. W. Bush's 1988 convention speech as a positive example of how Bush established his independence from Reagan. After showing a clip of Bush's speech, Schneider said, "Advice to Gore: Make this the defining speech of your career where you show you're your own man" (CNN.com Inside Politics, pg# 60).

But establishing independence from the president is no easy task for a vice president. German (2001) conducted a study of news photos of Al Gore and his opponent, George W. Bush, and found an interesting difference that relates to the vice president's dilemma. German found that photos of Bush often showed him accompanied by his family. Photos of Gore, however, often showed him accompanied by Clinton, or with Clinton on the same page. These photos reinforce the vice president's association with the president, and all of the previously discussed complexities that come with that,

including that it may serve to resubordinate Gore in the eyes of the public. So while the media were calling on Gore to separate himself from Clinton, the media were also visually reinforcing their association with each other. In this way, the media engaged in *priming*, in that they were encouraging the public to form certain opinions about the vice president.

Journalist Michael Barone also discussed the difficulty for vice presidents to separate themselves from the president. In an article titled *The Vice President's Problem,* Barone aptly constructed George H. W. Bush's rhetorical situation in 1988. He said that Bush's campaign was dealing with "a genuinely difficult problem not solved since 1836: How do you convert an incumbent vice president into a plausible president?" (p. C7). Barone used both Humphrey's 1968 campaign and Richard Nixon's 1960 campaign as cautionary tales:

> Bush needs to find some approach between the two extreme solutions to the vice-presidential problem. One is the slavish loyalty practiced by Hubert Humphrey, out of fear of Lyndon Johnson, until his Sept. 30 Salt Lake City speech differing, though only marginally, from Johnson's Vietnam policy. That helped him rise from 28 percent to 43 percent in the polls – almost enough to win a three-way race, though not nearly enough in a two-way contest . . . .Even as he avoids the Humphrey problem, Bush must avoid the opposite extreme, adopted by Richard Nixon in 1960, of accepting the opposition's premises. Though part of a popular and successful administration, Nixon embraced the views of President Eisenhower's liberal critics. In the "treaty of Fifth Avenue," he surrendered to Nelson Rockefeller's demands for stronger civil rights and higher defense

spending platform planks, though he could have won on the floor. In the famous

first debate, he accepted John Kennedy's framing of the issue – we have to get

America moving again – and said he differed only on means, not ends. (p. C7)

Barone's article suggests that vice presidents have to negotiate their relationship

with the president carefully. They can't overdo it in either direction. This is similar to

the point that scholars Kincade and Natoli made.

To summarize, the media coverage of a vice president's presidential bid often

tends to focus on the drama and conflict that may exist in the relationship between the

president and vice president. The media call on the vice president to disabuse us of the

notion that there is discord in the administration (such as in the case of Nixon and

Eisenhower), but also establishes the expectation that the vice president must break from

the president or administration, and demonstrate that he is his "own man" (such as in the

above examples of journalists giving advice to Mondale, Gore and G.H.W. Bush, and by

referring to cases when Hubert Humphrey broke from Lyndon Johnson). These media

constructions create additional burdens for the vice president, who must now tread

carefully in discussing their relationship with the president, and determining the timing

and manner in which they will break from the president, and be their "own man."

The previous sections have looked at how a vice president who runs for president

faces a rhetorical situation – they must use discourse to go from being a subordinate to a

superior. They must demonstrate that they are their "own man," while maintaining

loyalty to the president. They must demonstrate competence by claiming credit for

positive achievements within the administration, but avoid the taint of any administration

scandals. They must alter the public's general perception of them as being weak,

dependent figures, to one in which they are seen as leaders, who are strong and independent. In short, they must establish some of the ideal image qualities that voters believe a president should have.

The next section will discuss some of the key image characteristics that voters expect to see in a president. This section will help us better understand how the vice president's relationship with the president/administration affects their ability to establish these key image characteristics.

Rhetorical Situation: Image

Benoit and McHale (2004) define image in political communication as "the impression of a candidate for office held by voters. . . . formed out of a myriad of messages – messages from the candidate, from opposing candidates, from the news media, and from friends and acquaintances" (p. 49). Nimmo and Savage (1976) and Natchez and Bupp (1968) concluded that candidate image is the single most determining factor in voting behavior. Stamm, Burgess, Jordan, and Lim (1985) also contended that candidate image trumps issues as a factor in voter decision making.

A candidate's image is in part a judgment of their personal character. Aristotle said that in political speaking, it is particularly important that an orator's character be perceived as good. Aristotle argued that ethos, or a speaker's credibility, may be their most effective means of persuasion. He said, "Persuasion is achieved by the speaker's personal character when the speech is so spoken as to make us think him (sic) credible. We believe good men (sic) more fully and more readily than others" (p.153). Aristotle continues that while this is generally true, it is "absolutely true where exact certainty is

impossible and opinions are divided" (p. 153). Such is the case of U.S. presidential campaigns. Aristotle cited three particular qualities an orator should demonstrate to inspire the confidence and trust of others in their character: "good sense, good moral character and goodwill" (p. 161).

Contemporary research has found support for the personal attributes cited by Aristotle. In a study conducted by Sigel (1966), subjects selected honesty, intelligence and independence, in that order, as the three most important personal characteristics a president should have. Intelligence is akin to Aristotle's label "good sense," and honesty is consistent with Aristotle's label of "good moral character."

Sigel's finding that the public values independence in a president, helps us understand the push for why the vice president must be "his own man" when he runs for president, and helps us understand Nelson's (2002) point that while the public values loyalty in a vice president, they disdain that same quality when the vice president seeks the presidency. Sigel (1966) also found that the public wants the president to possess three other traits consistent with independence: be a strong figure, put forth their own ideas and have a resistance to pressure. Supporting these findings, Nimmo and Savage (1976) found that the personal traits of perceived strength, integrity and empathy are important image factors for voters when forming candidate impressions.

Akin to honesty, the traits of genuineness (Kjeldahl, Carmichael and Mertz, 1971) and sincerity (Benoit and McHale, 2004) were found to be important categories that voters used to judge candidates. Nimmo and Mansfield (1985, cited in Hellweg, 2004) also found that voters believe an ideal presidential candidate should possess the traits of honesty and intelligence, and found support for traits such as integrity, careful analysis in

27

decision-making, reasoned statesmanship and leadership, firm issue stands, and a willingness to consult with others.

Ideal candidate image traits have been found to be stable over time. Trent, Short-Thompson, Mongeau, Nusz, and Trent (2001) found that honesty, talking about the nation's problems, and having high moral character were highly ranked categories by the public across the presidential elections of 1988 through 2000. While the importance of these categories was stable across these elections, these scholars also found that contextual factors might influence image criteria in specific elections. For instance, the image categories of having high moral character and faithfulness to one's spouse were found to be increasingly important across these elections. This finding may be a result of contextual factors such as the Clinton-Lewinsky affair, and Clinton's impeachment during the 1990's. In a follow-up survey during the 2004 presidential election, Trent, Short-Thompson, Mongeau, Metzler and Trent (2005) found that voters continued to rank being honest, talking about the nation's problems and having high moral character very high when assessing a presidential candidate.

Some scholars have stressed the importance of competence as a candidate image trait. McCroskey, Jensen, and Todd (1972, cited in Hellweg, 2004) found that competence was an important factor in public-figure credibility, along with the traits of character, composure, extroversion, and sociability. Miller, Wattenberg and Malanchuk (1986, cited in Hellweg, 2004) also argued that competency, integrity, reliability, charisma and personal aspects (e.g. personal background and appearance) are important in candidate evaluation.

Other scholars have argued that likability is an important factor. In the popular press, candidate likability is often summarized by the "Which candidate would you rather have a beer with?" or "Who would you rather see on the evening news for the next four years?" test. In a study of the 1976 presidential campaign, Roberts (1981) concluded that voters first assess the likability of a candidate before considering their stand on the issues. Smith (1990) supported this contention, saying that "Elections pick people, not policies. Most voters seem to prefer candidates with whom they can identify. Nasty, intense, unfriendly, secretive, or awkward candidates experience difficulty, even when their positions are compelling" (p. 111). Also, the categories of extroversion, sociability, empathy, charisma and personal aspects – all mentioned by scholars in this section – are akin to likability, and support the claim that likability is an important factor for voters when they assess presidential candidates.

Candidate image may be especially important as a factor in influencing the crucial middle-of-the-electorate voters who often determine the outcome of presidential elections. Sigel (1964) found that independent voters, who lack strong partisan leanings, are more prone to being influenced by candidate's attempts to shape their image. Natchez and Bupp (1968) drew a similar conclusion that voters whose votes switch back and forth between parties are more susceptible to candidate and campaign imagery.

Some have made the point that image is assessed in comparison to others (Hellweg and Dionisopoulous, 1989, cited in Hellweg, 2004). This finding may suggest that while a vice president's image is assessed in comparison to their opponent, it may also be assessed in comparison to their president. This comparative process would help

us understand the observation made by Pomper (2001) in an earlier section, that vice presidents are always seen as less capable than the president.

One of the most powerful ways that presidential candidates can establish a positive image is through television ads. West (1997) notes that "the visual aspect of campaign advertising is crucial because it is the one that is most remembered by viewers. . . .Pictures carry an emotional impact that is much more powerful than the spoken word" (p.5). West (1997) asserts that production elements are used to craft a positive personal image for the candidate, and craft a negative personal image of the opponent. For instance, politicians use images like the American flag and their family to create a positive perception for themselves, and use unfavorable images to describe their opponent (West, 1997). Trent and Friedenberg (2004) also noted that:

> The importance of imagery is evidenced each time we see yet another television commercial of a candidate surrounded by family, talking earnestly with a senior citizen, walking through a peanut field, or standing in front of a sea of flags. Television commercials that present candidates in such situations are clearly designed to build or maintain certain perceptions of the candidate. (p. 70)

Also, because ads can be voiced by other people than the candidates themselves (e.g. family members, celebrities, man in the street, professional narrators), they might be a more suitable medium than speeches or debates to cultivate a positive personal image about the candidate. This is because when others make positive statements about the candidate, we give it more credibility than we would if the candidate made positive statements about themselves.

Similarly ads can enable a candidate to attack their opponent, by doing it in voices other than their own. Attacks can be voiced by professional actors or narrators instead of the candidate, unlike with speeches and debates, where the vice president would have to do the attacking himself, which may compromise their likability and their ability to create the image of a leader[6].

In summary, research has determined that certain image traits are very important for a candidate when running for president. These traits include: honesty, integrity, genuineness (or authenticity), character, intelligence, competence, independence and likability. A vice president who runs for president must seek to establish a public image that includes these traits.

The challenge for vice presidents is that their status as vice president, and their relationship with the president, colors voter's perceptions of them. In other words, the rhetorical exigence facing vice presidents is that they have to contend with image problems that come from being a subordinate in a superior-subordinate relationship. As previously discussed, vice presidents are often seen as dependent, lacking in leadership ability, and creatures (or even victims) of circumstance. While the public likes the fact that vice presidents are loyal, they disdain that quality once the vice president decides to run for president.

Further complicating the situation is that vice presidents are somewhat constrained in their ability to modify their image. As Kincade argued, vice presidents cannot establish their independence by openly questioning their president without running the risk of compromising their own credibility and authenticity. Questions can

---

[6] All of the campaign ads examined in this study took place before candidates were required to approve ads in their own voice.

31

arise, by the media or their opponent, about why the vice president "stood by their man" for four or eight years, but now is trying to package themselves as somebody new. "Will the real VP please stand up?"

Also, as scholars Natoli and Goldstein pointed out, if vice presidents veer too far towards establishing their own independence, they could possibly incur the rebuke of the president, in a way that could be politically (or even financially) detrimental, or embarrassing. For example, in an effort to strengthen his leadership and competence image in 1960, Nixon claimed he had acquired decision making experience as part of the Eisenhower administration. But when asked about Nixon's claims in a televised press conference, Eisenhower said he needed a week to think about of any contributions that Nixon made, and followed up by saying that "no one can make the decision except me" (Democratic National Committee, 1960). Similarly, in 1968, Hubert Humphrey was repudiated after he sought to create distance from Johnson by suggesting that some troops could come from Vietnam soon. Johnson responded by saying that, "no man could predict when troops are coming home" (Oberdorfer, 1968). The historical contextual review will examine some of the more unique challenges that each vice president faced, resulting from the prevailing conditions at the time of their campaigns.

Another challenge to image modification is that unlike many other candidates, vice presidents are typically already well known to the public. Flanigan and Zingale (2002) noted that the images of well-known candidates cannot be modified as easily as the images of unknown candidates. While being well known can be a benefit toward helping vice presidents secure delegates in partisan primaries, it also presents a challenge

in that they may have to work harder during the general election to modify image deficiencies.

Chapter 2: Research Questions and Method

Research Questions

The research questions for this study of six vice presidents or former vice presidents are as follows:

1. How did Nixon in 1960 negotiate his association with Eisenhower or the administration in his campaign speeches, televised ads, and debates?

2. How did Humphrey in 1968 negotiate his association with Johnson or the administration in his campaign speeches, televised ads, and debates?

3. How did Nixon in 1968 negotiate his association with Eisenhower or the administration in his campaign speeches, televised ads, and debates?

4. How did Mondale in 1984 negotiate his association with Carter or the administration in his campaign speeches, televised ads, and debates?

5. How did Bush in 1988 negotiate his association with Reagan or the administration in his campaign speeches, televised ads, and debates?

6. How did Gore in 2000 negotiate his association with Clinton or the administration in his campaign speeches, ads, and debates?

These election years (1960, '68, '84, '88, 2000) are examined because they represent all of the election years in the modern era (since 1960) in which a sitting or former vice president has received his party's presidential nomination. The presidential campaigns of Vice President Van Buren (1836) and Vice President Breckenridge (1860)

are excluded from this analysis, because they took place in a much earlier era, and therefore, useful comparisons with the more recent elections would be difficult to make.

The methods used to answer these questions will be a content analysis and a historical-contextual analysis. Content analysis is a useful method to analyze a large number of texts and allows for systematic comparison between the three different types of texts and between the six campaigns studied here. In conducting the content analysis, it is logical to categorize the vice president's discussion or depiction of their president/administration in terms of instances when they praised, defended, criticized, minimized, discussed in neutral terms or declined to discuss the president. These categories enable us to systematically identify each vice president's choice to align with or distance himself from his president/administration. If the vice president discusses or depicts the president/administration often, and mostly with praise or defense, this would suggest that he thought it politically beneficial to either demonstrate loyalty, run on the administration's record, and/or associate with the president as a person. If the vice president, however, criticizes, minimizes, or declines to discuss or depict the president/administration, this would suggest that he thought it politically beneficial to distance himself from the president/administration either to establish his independence, perhaps avoid or reduce the taint of any administration scandals, and/or suggest that his election to the presidency could deliver better results than the current administration.

The categories used for this analysis are conceptually similar to the ones developed by Benoit, Blaney, and Pier (1998) – attacks, acclaims and defenses – in their functional analysis of political campaigns. In this study, however, the categories are

uniquely applied to reveal insight into how the vice president seeks to manage his relationship with the president or the administration, during a presidential run.

By providing a more systematic look at many communication instances across three different types of texts, over the course of the general election campaign, the content analysis can point us to trends in the vice president's presidential campaign discourse that can be more fully understood through a historical or critical analysis. For instance, if the content analysis revealed that vice presidents typically include similar rhetorical strategies in response to their rhetorical situation, this could point the critic to conduct a generic analysis. Critics have used generic analysis to better understand presidential rhetoric. Campbell and Jamieson (1990) note that presidents face recurring rhetorical situations in speeches like Inaugurals, State of the Unions, war messages, veto messages, farewell addresses, and others. Presidents generally use similar themes each time a speech of this type is given. Through a generic analysis, a critic can compare the rhetorical strategies of different presidents to see how well their discourse achieved the rhetorical end for a given kind of speech, and look for unique or exceptional examples of a given type that might change the genre of that speech. A generic analysis can potentially be used to help us understand vice president's presidential campaign rhetoric, if we find that all vice presidents employ similar rhetorical strategies in response to the rhetorical situation facing them in their presidential bid.

In order to conduct a historical analysis, this study will look at the historical and contextual factors that affected each of the six campaigns studied here. These factors include the prevailing conditions at the time, including the national political climate, and the traditions imposed by the vice presidential office, as well as discourse by prevailing

actors at the time, including the president, the media, the vice president's opponent, and even the vice president himself. These factors serve to create opportunities and constraints that affect the vice president's rhetorical choices during his presidential bid. This analysis will help give us a better understanding and appreciation for the rhetorical discourse used by these vice presidents when they run for president, and enable us to assess how well this discourse served to construct a positive presidential image.

Texts

I will examine the following texts:

1. Ten television ads sponsored by each sitting or former vice president's campaign, or their nominating party.[7]

2. Five speeches by each sitting or former vice president including: the announcement and nomination acceptance speeches, a speech in September, a speech in October, and an election week final appeal.

3. The transcripts of all presidential debates in which a sitting or former vice president participated (1960, 1984, 1988, and 2000).[8]

In total, this study will examine 57 television ads, 30 speeches and 11 debates that aired or occurred during the general election (i.e. between the nominating convention and Election Day). See appendix B for a full list of all texts used in this study. These three

---

[7] Only eight ads by Nixon's 1960 campaign, and only nine ads by Gore's 2000 campaign are analyzed, because livingroomcandidate.org did not have 10 ads for these two campaigns.

[8] Presidential debates did not take place in 1968.

types of discourse – television ads, speeches and debates – were selected because they are all important forms of presidential campaign communication, and they attract significant media attention. Other types of presidential campaign communication are excluded so that the study can be kept to a manageable level.

With the exception of announcement speeches, texts from the primaries are excluded because the rhetorical situation facing the vice president is not the same during the primaries as it is during the general election. Primaries generally take place with voters of a specific party, and the vice president's association with the president of their own party is far less problematic in the primaries than in the general election. Therefore, the vice president would be likely to negotiate his relationship with the president/administration differently during the primaries than he would during the general election. Also, drawing systematic conclusions across these six elections is easier to do by limiting the study to the texts in the general election phase. The primaries varied significantly across these six elections because in some years primary contests were very limited, or took place under a different set of rules. For instance, three of the six candidates studied here ran for president before the 1972 McGovern-Fraser Commission rules for primaries went into effect. An exception is made for the announcement speech, which is included in this study. This is because this speech attracts a lot of media coverage and is aimed at a more national audience, rather than a particular state's primary or caucus.

Televised Ads

Televised political ads are an important form of presidential campaign communication, evidenced by the fact that two-thirds of the candidate's budget is

devoted to producing and airing them (Just, Crigler, Alger, Cook, Kern, and West, 1996). Televised political ads have many functions including making a candidate more well-known, image-making, targeting late or undecided voters, reinforcing a candidate's supporters, and explaining the issues (Devlin, 1986).

The ads analyzed in this study were sponsored by either the vice president's presidential campaign or their political party, and aired during the general election phase of the campaign. Ads produced and aired by advocacy groups (e.g. 1988's Willie Horton ad, produced by the National Security PAC) are excluded from this study. Because the study focuses on how each vice president attempted to negotiate his relationship with the president/administration, ads by advocacy groups would not be relevant.

The televised ads examined in this study were viewed on livingroomcandidate.org, a website by the *Museum of the Moving Image: The Living Room Candidate, Presidential Campaign Commercials, 1952-2012*. The museum curator chose certain ads to be included on the website because they were regarded by journalists and historians as being important ones of that presidential election**.** These ads were chosen as texts because the website provided a common, easy-to-view site to conduct coding. The vast majority of these ads were also included in *The Annenberg/Pew Archive of Presidential Campaign Discourse* compact disk.

The following subquestions will be asked when examining the television ads: A. In what percentage of the television ads did the sitting/former vice president, either through discussion or visual depiction, praise, defend, minimize, criticize, discuss neutrally, or decline to mention, his president/administration?

B. Does the answer to subquestion A differ from election to election? This question allows us to consider how the context of the particular election may have influenced the vice president's decisions to discuss the president and/or the administration in their television ads.

Speeches

Speeches are a key staple of campaign rhetoric dating back to the polis in ancient Greece. This study will include an analysis of announcement speeches and nomination acceptance addresses because they attract heavy media coverage and discussion. Trent and Friedenberg (2004) note that "the announcement address is the centerpiece of a rhetorical situation created by the candidate's need to formally announce their candidacy to the public" (p. 229). Candidates use announcement speeches to signal their intent to run, discourage competition, explain why they are running, suggest their likelihood of winning and to initiate major campaign themes (Trent and Friedenberg, 2004).

The nomination acceptance speeches are particularly important because they are often described as a "legitimation ritual" where the candidate lays official claim to the nomination (Farrell, 1978; Ritter, 1980). These speeches are also a defining moment when the nominee introduces him or herself to the general electorate. For vice presidents who run for president, acceptance speeches may be a reintroduction because, as previously discussed, political observers often frame the convention speech as one in which they need to step out from the President's shadow and establish their own vision for the country. Through the acceptance address, the candidate attempts to assume the role of party leader, unify the party, and advance a strong persuasive message for the

campaign (Trent and Friedenberg, 2004). Hart (2000) argues that party conventions are an important way for the candidate to engage the voting public. Conventions "inspire political imagination, to get the party faithful to envision a broader, brighter, grander set of possibilities" (Hart, 2000, p. 104). Other than nationally televised presidential debates, nomination acceptance speeches usually garner the widest audience for the presidential campaign (Ritter, 1980), and unlike other speeches, it is usually broadcast in its entirely.

The third speech examined will be one made in the final week before the election. Presumably, this final appeal would be what the candidate believed was his most effective campaign message. The fourth and fifth speeches will be ones delivered in the September and October time frame of the election year. Speeches four and five are included to increase the sample size and to have speeches that take place in the middle of the general election campaign, to balance out the ones in the beginning and the end.[9]

The following subquestions will be asked when examining these speeches:

A. In what percentage of speech units, did the sitting/former vice president praise, defend, minimize, criticize, discuss neutrally, or decline to discuss, his president/administration?

B. Did the results of subquestion A differ from election to election? This question allows us to consider how the context of a particular election may have influenced the vice president's decisions to discuss the president and/or the administration in their speeches.

---

[9] Nixon's 1960 campaign is the only one where the announcement speech could not be found. To replace it, I selected an additional speech he delivered in the month of September, 1960.

<u>Presidential Debates</u>

Presidential debates are highly-watched events, with viewership ranging from 40 to 93 million people (Hartlaub, 2004; Carmody, 1992). Debates help shape the electorate's perceptions of each candidate's image (Carlin, 1992) and character (Leon, 1993, Hinck, 1993), help voters learn about issues (Jamieson and Adasiewicz, 2000), and reinforce voter preferences (Benoit, McKinney, and Holbert, 2001).

Presidential debates also provide a unique feature not found with speeches or ads: the raising of issues by others, such as the questioners (e.g. moderators, panelists, audience members) or opponents. In the case of vice presidents who run for president, they have to contend with the raising of issues about the president or the presidential administration, and they are prompted to make a response. Debate texts were obtained from the Commission on Presidential Debates website: www.debates.org.

The following subquestions will be asked for presidential debates:

A. In each sitting/former vice president's speaking turns, did they praise, defend, criticize, minimize, discuss neutrally, or decline to discuss, respectively, their president/administration?

B. Who initially prompted the topic of the president/administration: the questioner (moderator, panelist, or citizen), the opponent, both the questioner and the opponent, or the vice president himself?

This question provides evidence about the vice president's level of willingness to discuss the president or the administration. For example, if the vice president discusses the president/administration often, when no one else in the debate has prompted it, or uses one of his turns to go back and respond to comments made about the

president/administration, then this may indicate a deliberate decision to align himself with the president/administration. On the other hand, if the vice president does not discuss the president/administration despite numerous prompts by questioners or the opponent, this may indicate a deliberate strategy to distance himself from the president/administration.

C. Are certain responses characteristic of certain prompts?

D. Do the answers to subquestions A, B, C differ election to election?

Subquestion D allows us to consider how the context of the particular election may have influenced the vice president's decisions to discuss the president and/or the administration in the debates.

Coding

Five coders including the author analyzed the texts to gather data. Because this study had a predetermined category system to examine the vice president's discourse, and was not looking at audience reception of the discourse, trained coders were preferable to lay coders. Specifically, the training included a discussion of the kinds of triggers in the text that would indicate that the vice president was discussing or depicting the president or the administration. These triggers included, but were not limited to: instances when the sitting or former vice president refers to the president by name, or says "The President," or "he," or refers to the administration with identifiers such as "our administration," or "the last eight years," or "we," or refers to a part of the administration's record, or in the case of ads, when the president is shown. Coder training included a discussion of how to better determine when words like "he" and "we"

are being used to refer to the president/administration. Coders practiced by analyzing

sample texts by candidates in other presidential elections than the ones studied here.

To more accurately assess intercoder reliability, coded content was separated into

two categories: manifest and latent (Holsti, 1969). Manifest content includes the content

in which coders had to identify instances when the vice presidents referred to the

president/administration. This process entailed using the triggers mentioned in the

previous paragraph.

When coders identified such instances, they were then required to render a more

interpretive judgment (i.e. a latent judgment) about whether it was predominately a

statement of praise, defense, minimization, criticism, or one that is neutral. These units

of analysis represent the latent content. Because the analysis involves making

interpretive judgments about the predominant nature of the statements, coding must be

done by humans, not computers.

Judgments of manifest content are relatively easier to make because the coder is

only required to determine if something is present or not. Because latent content requires

the coder to make more interpretive judgments, we expect to see a greater amount of

disagreement between coders, and therefore, lower levels of interrater percent agreement

for latent content than for manifest content.

Percent agreement and other measures including Fleiss' kappa and Cohen's kappa

will be used to measure inter-rater agreement. Recal, a free web-based tool, available at

http://dfreelon.org/utils/recalfront/ will be used to conduct calculations. For percent

agreement, an inter-coder reliability measure of >.80 will be acceptable, as this

correlation is considered a good measure of reliability (Reinard, 1998).

In practice coding, when interrater agreement reached a level of .90 or greater, the training ended, and the study began. If at least .90 was not achieved, the training continued, and inter-coder disagreements were discussed and resolved.

Each ad in its entirety was a unit to be coded. In the debates, each speaking turn was coded, including those taken by the questioner, opponent and vice president. Because speeches are lengthy, each speech text was broken up into smaller topic units. This was done by looking for logical breaks when the speaker transitioned to a new topic within his speech. For example, if a candidate shifted from the topic of jobs to the topic of education, this would qualify as a logical break. Then if he shifted to a discussion on the Cold War, this would qualify as another logical break, and so on. This method was also used for the opening and closing statements during the debates, as these statements are more like prepared speeches.

Data

This set of data will reveal whether each vice president chose to align or distance themselves from their president/administration, and allowed the researcher to compare how one vice president's approach compared to the approach taken by others. Also, this set of data will also enable us to see if vice presidents treated their president/administration differently across the three studied communication mediums (speeches, television ads, and debates), and therefore, help us gain a better understanding of how these mediums are used in presidential campaigns. To the larger issue laid out earlier in this study, this set of data will provide greater insight into the rhetorical situation that accompanies a subordinate who is seeking to replace a superior. This

analysis may help us understand not only future elections in which a vice president runs for president, but also cases when a lieutenant governor runs for governor, or cases when a first lady, presidential cabinet members, or members of the president's own party run for president.

The next section will conduct a historical-contextual review of the five vice presidents whose communication texts are being analyzed in this study. Specifically, I will look at the historical and contextual conditions that existed during their vice presidency. This section will reveal that many of the problems identified in the previous section significantly affected each vice president. In all cases, the vice president's association with the president and the administration, created both opportunities and challenges for them.

Chapter 3: Historical-Contextual Review

Richard Nixon (1960, 1968)

As vice president, Nixon's activities would both assist him as a future presidential candidate, and also create certain challenges. To his benefit, Nixon gained valuable experience and fame by performing assignments that were unprecedented for a vice president. Kengor (2000) noted that Eisenhower wanted Nixon to be involved, and gave him a substantial role through which he could demonstrate leadership. For instance, Nixon ran cabinet meetings when President Eisenhower was absent, and served as an effective liaison between the administration and Congress (Sidey, Cannon, Ferrell, Untermeyer, Apple Jr., and Neustadt, 1997). Eisenhower also sought Nixon's advice on a variety of issues including Cuba and Russia (Greenstein, cited in Kengor, 2000).

In addition, Nixon took several high-profile foreign trips including his 1958 trip to Latin America, and his 1959 trip to Russia when he took part in the "kitchen debates" with Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev (Sidey, Cannon, Ferrell, Untermeyer, Apple Jr., and Neustadt, 1997; Kengor, 2000). Summers (2000) noted that "Nixon had traveled the world more than any American leader had done before, building up a breadth of knowledge on international affairs unequaled in his time" (p. 140).

Following the Latin America trip, Nixon's popularity rose to an all-time high (Kengor, 2000; Witcover, 1992), and pulled ahead of Kennedy in the polls for the 1960 presidential election (Kengor, 2000). Nixon also benefited from the popularity of President Eisenhower, who had won two landslide elections, served mostly during a time of peace and prosperity, and left office with a 59% approval rating (Brummer, 1989).

Performing substantive assignments, leading cabinet meetings, taking high-profile foreign trips, and being associated with a popular president were all advantages that helped Nixon receive his party's nomination.

Nixon had also proved to be an effective campaigner for the Eisenhower-Nixon ticket in 1952 and 1956, and for other Republican Party candidates. For instance, in 1952, he took on the role of the attack dog, when he criticized Democrats for being the party of "communism, Korea, and corruption" (Kengor, 2000, p. 52-53). Historian Stephen Ambrose (1983) noted that Eisenhower appreciated that Nixon could do the mudslinging in campaigns, allowing him to assume the high ground.

Taking the low road may have ingratiated Nixon with party officials and President Eisenhower, which certainly helped him earn his presidential nomination. Yet he also ran the risk of being publicly disliked, and lacking the "presidential" qualities of leadership and statesmanship.

Nixon's 1960 presidential bid was also damaged by Eisenhower's comment at the press briefing that if he had a week he might be able to think of a major idea of Nixon's that he adopted (Kengor, 2000). Kengor (2000) notes that Eisenhower made this comment out of frustration with the press, regretted it, and immediately apologized to Nixon.

But the comment dogged Nixon. It was used against him in an ad titled "Nixon's Experience?" run by the Democratic National Committee in support of John F. Kennedy. In the ad, the narrator opens by saying:

Every Republican politician wants you to believe that Richard Nixon is "experienced." They even want you to believe that he has actually been making

48

decisions in the White House. But listen to the man who should know best, the

president of the United States. A reporter recently asked President Eisenhower

this question about Mr. Nixon's experience.

Then a reporter is shown asking the President: "I just wondered if you could give us an

example of a major idea of his that you had adopted in that role as the, as the decider and,

and final—." Eisenhower replies: "If you give me a week I might think of one. I don't

remember."

The narrator continues: "At the same press conference, President Eisenhower

said: 'No one can make a decision except me.'" This statement was a denunciation of the

claim made by Nixon's campaign that he had acquired executive decision-making

experience in the Eisenhower administration.

The narrator continues by cuing up Ike's damning line against Nixon again: "If

you give me a week, I might think of one. I don't remember." The narrator concludes

the ad by saying: "President Eisenhower could not remember, but the voters will

remember. For real leadership in the 60's, help elect Senator John F. Kennedy president"

(Democratic National Committee, 1960).

Eisenhower's comment was also widely quoted in the newspapers (Goldstein,

1982), and it was referenced in a question for Nixon at the first presidential debate – a

debate historically regarded as pivotal to the outcome of the election. Nixon's claims of

experience may have been a way for him to demonstrate his leadership skills. Had

Eisenhower, given his credibility and popularity, been able to recall something for the

reporters, it could have helped Nixon in a close election. Instead, Ike's comment may

have worked to resubordinate or "reinfantalize" Nixon.

49

In 1968, when Nixon ran for president a second time, his presidential campaign was strengthened by the public's dissatisfaction with the Johnson administration and its handling of the Vietnam War and riots in many urban areas. Joe McGinnis' book, *The Selling of the President* discusses many ways in which Nixon's 1968 campaign made use of advances in color television and editing to create powerful television spots. Also, Nixon still benefited from strong name recognition and experience, and had, by this time, developed a somewhat more elder statesmanlike image. This time, his opponent, Hubert Humphrey, experienced the problems of being a sitting vice president.

Hubert Humphrey (1968)

Goldstein (1997) described Humphrey's vice presidential status as being a "mixed blessing" to his presidential prospects (p. 117). Humphrey certainly benefited from high name recognition, and enjoyed the support of Johnson loyalist voters and party loyalists because of his partisan work (Goldstein, 1997).

For many reasons, however, being vice president negatively affected Humphrey's presidential fortunes. For one thing, his support of Johnson's Vietnam policy created a rift between him and the liberal constituency he had established during his lengthy political career. Humphrey was known as a liberal champion of civil rights and social welfare. In 1948, before the Democratic National Convention, he gave a stirring speech championing civil rights (Humphrey, foreword for Engelmayer and Wagman, 1978). As a U.S. Senator, Humphrey was the original sponsor of the Medicare program, and guided the Civil Rights Bill through the Senate in 1964, which was ultimately signed by

President Johnson. Humphrey was also a champion of other liberal causes including the Peace Corps, the Food for Peace program, and arms control efforts (Garrettson III, 1993).

In February of 1965, shortly after taking his vice presidential office, Humphrey, in an internal memo to Johnson, expressed opposition to the U.S. military presence in Vietnam (Goldstein, 1982). He was subsequently excluded from Johnson's inner circle (Garrettson, 1993). Only after Humphrey made several public statements in support of Johnson's Vietnam policy, was he allowed back (Neustadt, 1997).

But these supportive statements would negatively affect his presidential bid. Television had provided horrifying images of the war, including U.S. soldiers maimed and dead (Engelmayer and Wagman, 1978). At the start of 1968, 17,000 Americans had been killed (Engelmayer and Wagman, 1978), and Johnson's approval rating stood at 36% by March (Goldman, 1969). Johnson's negative approval ratings could potentially hurt Humphrey's poll ratings, because as previously noted by Cohen (2001), when the president is unpopular, the vice president is unpopular as well.

While Humphrey's support for the war demonstrated loyalty to Johnson, and ensured his continued access in the administration, he engendered great opposition from liberals and others who were opposed to the war. Historian Michael Beschloss (1999) noted that by muffling his opposition to the Vietnam War, Humphrey invited voters to believe that he would continue the war effort.

When Johnson declared he would not seek reelection in late March of 1968, Humphrey's campaign got off to a late start. Then after formally launching his campaign, he was dealt another setback when Johnson forbade administration officials from taking part in Humphrey's campaign (Goldstein, 1997). Johnson's order was consistent with his

decision to distance his administration from partisan politics when he publicly announced he would not seek reelection and would concentrate on ending the Vietnam War (Goldstein, 1997). His refusal to assist Humphrey, however, may have been motivated by other more personal reasons as well. Goldstein (1997) speculated that Johnson could not bear to see his staff support his longtime subordinate.

Humphrey's nomination acceptance speech at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago was marred by anti-war protests that would turn violent. Protestors held signs that read, "Stop the war! Stop the War!" and "Sieg Heil, Seig Heil" (White, 1969, p. 289). The Chicago police engaged the protestors with tear gas, arrests and lethal weapons. After Humphrey had received the nomination, Senator Eugene McCarthy, his rival in the primaries, declined to endorse him (White, 1969). Humphrey had to find a way to win back the support of his liberal base.

Johnson, however, constrained Humphrey by threatening to "dry up every Democratic dollar from Maine to California" if Humphrey spoke out against the war (Beschloss, 1999, pg#15).

By September, the number of Americans killed in Vietnam reached 28,000 (White, 1969). With Johnson's approval rating standing at 42% in late September 1968, Humphrey's association with him was problematic (Gallup, 2011). On September 27th, a Gallup poll showed him losing to Nixon by a margin of 43% to 28%. Also, some disaffected blue collar Democrats were attracted to third party candidate George Wallace, who had gone from 9% in the national polls in May to an astonishing 21% in mid to late September (White, 1969).

But Humphrey's ability to separate himself from Johnson and an unpopular war was difficult   Goldstein (1997) summarized his dilemma:

> Distancing himself from the administration's policies on Vietnam was not easy or without risk. If Humphrey separated himself from Johnson's policies, he exposed himself to the charge of being hypocritical and disloyal, and of undermining Johnson's negotiating hand. Moreover, Humphrey's comments might prompt a public rebuke from Johnson. (p. 118)

Johnson did, in fact, publicly rebuke Humphrey at one point. In September, while speaking to reporters in Philadelphia, Humphrey said that in early 1969, or late 1968, some troops could start to come home regardless of the outcome of the peace talks (White, 1969). In Denver, later that day, Humphrey said he would have been comfortable accepting the minority plank at the convention that called for an unconditional bombing halt. Secretary of State Dean Rusk immediately repudiated these comments (White, 1969). The next day, President Johnson announced in a speech to the American Legion that "no man could predict when troops would come home" (Oberdorfer, 1968). The reference to "no man" could be interpreted as Johnson's indirect, but not-so-subtle way of negating Humphrey's comment, and reestablish Humphrey as his subordinate. Also, because Johnson was trying to achieve a peace deal, he could not allow talk about the possible withdrawal of U.S. troops, because this may result in a loss of leverage in the peace talks. But in rebuking Humphrey, Johnson undermined his presidential campaign and diminished his credibility. Even late in the fall campaign, when Johnson announced a bombing halt, he told Humphrey in an October

31st phone call not to "brag on this. You have to give me credit" (Johnson, 1968).

Humphrey agreed.

Clearly, Humphrey faced numerous rhetorical constraints. One was his personal loyalty to Johnson and the concern about the protection of U.S. troops in Vietnam, whose lives could be jeopardized if he spoke out too strongly against the war. Humphrey was also reportedly concerned that if he broke too far away from his own administration's stance, he would alienate Democratic hawks in key states like Texas (Nossiter, 1968).

Humphrey's problems certainly illustrate the parent-child dynamic discussed earlier. In terms of the parent-child analogy, Humphrey had to be "seen and not heard" on the subject of Vietnam. He was still Johnson's boy, not his "own man." This constrained his ability to demonstrate his own independence and leadership capabilities to the American people. At that time, his role as a supportive figure could also have been seen as wife-like in that era.

Walter Mondale (1984)

Humphrey had been a mentor to Walter Fritz Mondale (Lechelt, 2009). In fact, Mondale was appointed to the U.S. Senate seat vacated by Humphrey upon his ascension to the vice presidency after the 1964 election. Unlike Humphrey's relationship with Johnson, however, Vice President Mondale was fortunate to have a very good relationship with President Carter.

Mondale knew that for him to play an influential role, and better position himself to run for president in the future, he had to establish and maintain loyalty to Carter. In a memo to Carter following their 1976 election victory, Mondale wrote that "I fully

recognize that my personal and political success is totally tied to you and the achievements of your administration" (Barnett, cited in Lechelt, 2009, p. 39).

Carter did not fear political competition from Mondale, and thus took greater advantage of his talents. Carter referred to Mondale as an "equal partner," (Barnes, 2001, p, 814), which certainly contrasted with Eisenhower's "you're my boy" remark to Nixon in 1960. According to Mondale's chief of staff Richard Moe, Carter told his cabinet and staff that "if you get a request from Fritz, you treat it as if it were a request from me." (Moe, cited in Lechelt, 2009, p. 41).

Carter gave Mondale close access. He was the first vice president to have an office in the West Wing (Quayle, 1997; Barnes, 2001). Also, during Mondale's tenure, the tradition of the private weekly lunch between the president and vice president began (Gillon, 1997; Kengor, 2000).

Mondale avoided minor committee chairmanships, instead becoming a general advisor to the president. He performed this role at a level that Goldstein (1982) described as "unprecedented for a vice president" (p. 173). In this capacity, Mondale received access to briefings from intelligence agencies, including daily CIA briefings, and was encouraged to attend economic policy group discussions (Kengor, 2000). Mondale also had his own staff including his own foreign policy advisors (Kengor, 2000), which meant that he wasn't dependent on Carter's staff or on any of the executive departments for information.

Mondale played a significant role in the administration's foreign policy. One of his major areas of focus was on accomplishing the second round of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, also known as SALT II treaty, with the Soviets (Lechelt, 2009). He

helped craft the treaty, and build support for it, both with the public and in Congress (Lechelt, 2009). Mondale also played a big role in securing the passage of the Panama Canal treaty in the Senate (Kengor, 2000).

In addition, Mondale took several overseas trips to communicate the foreign policy priorities of the Carter administration. His trips were more substantive than those made by his vice presidential predecessors (Lechelt, 2009). He served as a diplomat to China and the Middle East (Lechelt, 2009). In the summer of 1978, Mondale's trips to Israel to meet with Prime Minister Menachem Begin, and trips to Egypt to meet with President Anwar Sadat, laid the groundwork for the 1979 Camp David Accords, Carter's biggest foreign policy triumph (Gillon, 1992; Kengor, 2000). During these negotiations, Mondale's credibility with the Israelis enabled him to stress the Carter administration's point to Begin about removing Israeli settlements in the Sinai (Lechelt (2009).

Because of his unprecedented and robust role, Mondale is credited with institutionalizing the vice presidency as a key player in the presidential administration (Lechelt, 2009). Close access to the president and the flow of information, serving as a general advisor and having his own staff, enabled Mondale to serve as an independent voice within the administration (Light, cited in Kengor, 2000).

Publically, however, Mondale, like his vice presidential predecessors, did not have free reign. For example, in June of 1977, Mondale wanted to deliver a speech to reassure Jewish voters about concerns over Carter's Middle East policy, including announcing new administration goals that would satisfy Israel. But administration officials compelled Mondale to simply reaffirm administration policy. His speech angered Mondale's Jewish friends, prompting some to liken his role in Carter's

administration to Humphrey's need to support Johnson's Vietnam policy, a policy which Humphrey disagreed with privately and which fostered alienation from his liberal base (Lewis, cited in Kengor, 2000).

The Carter administration, however, was plagued by numerous problems including economic stagflation, high interest rates, gas shortages, and the taking of American hostages in Iran. In their 1980 reelection bid, Mondale took on the role of "party unifier" after the primary challenge from Senator Edward Kennedy, and also the role of "administration cheer leader," which included the difficult task of defending Carter's economic record (Hunt, 1980, p. 30). While Mondale attacked Reagan, Hunt (1980) observed that he refrained from too much "hatchet work." (p. 30). Hunt speculated that Mondale wanted to maintain a likeable image in preparation for a 1984 presidential bid (p. 30). At campaign's end, Carter and Mondale failed in their reelection effort.

Tying this back to the rhetorical situation, Mondale's loyalty pledge to Carter in his early memo sowed the seeds of the dilemma faced by vice presidents who seek the presidency. Mondale's loyalty certainly put him in a position to receive more substantive assignments, and build on his professional record. His loyalty, however, also may have created constraints for his ability to demonstrate his independence when he ran for president in the future. Mondale's decision to avoid too much "hatchet work" was an effort to preserve a positive, public image for a future presidential bid.

In his 1984 campaign for the Democratic presidential nomination, Mondale certainly did benefit from his superior name recognition and experience, benefits resulting from his service as vice president. In the general election, however, his

association with the failed Carter administration could only have been a drawback against popular incumbent Ronald Reagan. In fact, drawing attention to Mondale's connection to Carter was part of the Reagan campaign strategy (Schram, 1984; Perl and Russakoff, 1984).

George H. W. Bush (1988)

George Bush's vice presidency also provided benefits and drawbacks for his presidential bid. As vice president, Bush benefited from the way that Mondale expanded the role of the office. He maintained close access to President Reagan, through weekly lunches, having an office in the West Wing, having access to the president's papers and briefings, and serving as one of the President's closest advisors, particularly in the area of foreign policy (Lechelt, 2009).

Reagan allowed Bush to preside over National Security Council (NSC) meetings in his absence (Untermeyer, 1997). Bush acted as a congressional liaison, and served as Reagan's surrogate on several foreign trips, for instance meeting with Deng Xiaoping of China, and numerous Soviet leaders (Lechelt, 1989; Untermeyer, 1997). Through his role as a foreign policy advisor, and his direct access to Reagan, Bush helped convince the president that Soviet Secretary General Mikhail Gorbachev was somebody with whom they could negotiate (Lechelt, 2009).

Lechelt (2009) notes that Bush expanded the role of vice president, beyond what Mondale had, by not only serving as an advisor, but also accepting delegated tasks and responsibilities. For instance, Bush chaired the Special Situations Group, an interdepartmental group assembled to ensure emergency foreign policy coordination

(Lechelt, 2009, Kengor, 2000). In doing so, Bush became the first vice president in history to head up a major interagency foreign policy administrative committee (Kengor, 2000). Bush also chaired the administration's Task Force on Regulatory Reform, and won the support of many conservatives who had been distrustful of him (Untermeyer, 1997). This distrust existed because he was considered a "Republican-establishment moderate" who had challenged Reagan in 1980 (Lechelt, 2009, p. 89). In chairing the task force, however, Bush strengthened his ties with his party's conservative base, unlike Hubert Humphrey, whose support of Johnson's Vietnam policy had badly strained his ties with his liberal base.

Given Reagan's popularity and the public's general satisfaction with the status quo, Bush stood to benefit politically from association with Reagan, as he started his campaign for the 1988 Republican presidential nomination. Reagan left office with a 68 percent overall approval rating and high ratings for his handling of both foreign (71%) and economic (62%) policy (Brummer, 1989). Bush would have the ability to run on the administration's accomplishments. As Kincade pointed out, however, Bush had to balance loyalty to Reagan, and citing administration achievements, with the need to demonstrate his own independence and assert his own ideas. Representative Jim Leach (R-Iowa) spoke to Bush's rhetorical situation, saying that, "He's got to make it clear he's future-oriented, that he symbolizes something different than [Reagan] but in no sense be perceived as disloyal" (Hoffman, 1987, p.A4).

The Iran-Contra scandal, however, created a potentially significant problem for Bush's presidential campaign. As discussed, Bush was a major player in Reagan administration policy, particularly in foreign affairs. In a 1986 interview with Business

Week, Bush spoke about his role, saying, "I'm in on everything. If your policies aren't working, I can't say 'Wait a minute, I'm not to blame.'" (Business Week, 1986, cited in Lechelt, 2009). But after the scandal broke later that year, Bush said he was "out of the loop" and that he was "deliberately excluded" from key meetings when Iran-Contra dealings were discussed (Rothenberg, 1988, p. 29). These statements created a contradiction for Bush, and a potential dilemma for his 1988 presidential bid. His claims of experience and strong knowledge in foreign policy reduce the plausibility of his denial of knowledge about the Iran-Contra dealings. As Kincade points out, vice presidents face the difficult task of trying to establish their gravitas through active participation in the administration, and yet somehow avoid the taint of any administration scandals. Bush's "out of the loop" and "deliberately excluded" comments are consistent with Bostdorrf's analysis that vice presidents are oriented according to the Burkean term of "scene." In other words, they are caught up in the larger environment of events, rather than bearing responsibility for their actions.

Another problem for Bush was the perception that he was a "wimp." In fact, the cover story for Newsweek's October 19, 1987 issue was titled *George Bush: Fighting the 'Wimp Factor'* (Solomon, 2011)**.** This perception is understandable because vice presidents serve in the shadow of the president, and as noted in a previous chapter by Pomper (2001), vice presidents always appear less capable than the president. In Bush's case, it may have been more pronounced because he served with a President who was perceived to be a very strong figure.

The "wimp" perception of Bush is somewhat ironic, however, considering that he was a fighter pilot in World War II, whereas Reagan had merely acted and provided voice

60

work for military training films during the war. In fact, Bush had been the youngest pilot in the naval air corps in 1943. He flew bombing missions against the Japanese over the Pacific, crash-landed twice, and won the Distinguished Flying Cross (Rothenberg, 1988). Yet the American public knew him as the mild-mannered, loyal vice president who served President Reagan. The "wimp" perception could only negatively affect his ability to create the image of a strong leader during his bid for the presidency. In the rhetorical situation faced by vice presidents, the public tends to, as noted by Kincade, view vice presidents as lacking in leadership ability.

Al Gore (2000)

Gore's vice presidency also provided benefits and drawbacks to his presidential campaign. At least until Gore ran for president in 2000, he had a good relationship with President Clinton. He had weekly lunches with the president, was a top advisor to the president, and served as a congressional liaison. Gore was instrumental in securing support for the Clinton administration's effort to pass the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). Many political observers note that Gore performed very well in his televised debate about the North American Free Trade Agreement against vocal opponent and former presidential candidate Ross Perot. (Lechelt, 2009). Gore also had unprecedented authority in the foreign policy arena, chairing key commissions with leaders such as Russia's Victor Chernomyrdin and South Africa's Thabo Mbeki (Kengor, 2000).

Behind the scenes, Gore was disciplined and capable of making timely decisions, unlike Clinton who would often deliberate at much greater length (Lechelt, 2009). Gore

61

was also very assertive. For instance, when Clinton vacillated over details of the 1993

budget bill, Gore told him, "You can get with the God damn program!" (Nelson, 2001,

p.59). Clinton later credited this legislation with putting the economy back on the right

track.

Gore's discipline, decision making abilities and assertiveness spoke to his

leadership capabilities. His role as vice president, however, precluded him from

exhibiting these capabilities in public. Ironically, while presidents often overshadow

their vice presidents, Kengor (2000) noted that Gore had to be cautious not to

overshadow Clinton.

Kincade's claim that vice presidents are perceived as lacking leadership ability

appears to be true in Gore's case. A May 2000 poll showed that Gore was perceived to

be a weaker leader than his opponent George W. Bush (Berke and Elder, 2000). This

finding seems somewhat ironic considering that Gore had the greater amount of executive

and governmental experience.

Gore's loyalty to Clinton certainly enhanced his chances of becoming his party's

presidential nominee. Clinton had made numerous statements praising Gore, for instance

during his 2000 State of the Union address (Clinton, 2000). This level of support was

unprecedented, as presidents traditionally avoid endorsing candidates of their own party

until after the primary season.

But Gore's association with Clinton and the administration also created problems

for his presidential campaign. Gore was embroiled in scandal due to allegations that he

engaged in questionable campaign fundraising practices – including by hosting White

House coffees, making phone calls to solicit funds from his government office, and

participating in a fundraising effort at a Buddhist temple – to support the Clinton-Gore

1996 reelection effort (Burger, 2000; Broder, 1999). According to news reports, Gore

claimed he wasn't paying attention in meetings when these issues were being discussed,

and took restroom breaks because he drank a lot of iced tea ("Memo says Gore," 2000).

Gore's failure to recall details from these meetings were thought to be less than plausible,

given that he had a reputation for being a master of detail. Gore also suggested he

couldn't be held accountable anyway because there was "no controlling legal authority"

(Burger, 2000, p. 6). Like George H. W. Bush's comments about Iran-Contra, Gore's

comments regarding the fundraising scandal are consistent with Bostdorrf's analysis that

vice presidents are often described using the Burkean term of "scene." In other words,

they are caught up in the larger environment of events, rather than bearing responsibility

for their actions.

Then, after the 1999 House vote to impeach Clinton over issues surrounding the

Lewinsky affair, Gore enthusiastically defended Clinton, saying that the impeachment

was "a great disservice to a man I believe will be regarded in the history books as one of

our greatest presidents" (Turque, 2000, p. 356). Stanley (2001) noted that Gore's remark

"seemed more loyal than accurate" (p. 45).

The impact of Gore's comment on his presidential bid can be better understood by

turning back to the discussion of the rhetorical situation facing vice presidents –

specifically their ability to transform their image from one of a subordinate to that of a

superior. The insight provided by Kincade and Natoli is particularly relevant here – that

vice presidents must remain loyal, but also establish their independence when they run

for president. Certainly, Gore's statement established his loyalty, helping to maintain the

support of President Clinton and Clinton supporters. But the comment would later prove problematic, because it publicly portrayed Gore as subordinate, and lacking in leadership ability. Recall the observation by Goldstein (1982) that vice presidents often diminish their own credibility with intelligent voters when they make over-the-top statements about their president. Also, recall the assertion by Nelson (2002) that while the electorate appreciates loyalty in a vice president, they disdain that attribute in him once he runs for president.

Six months after the impeachment trial, Gore tried to distance himself from the scandal. In an episode of the ABC News program *20/20,* Gore was asked about the Clinton-Lewinsky affair. Regarding Clinton's behavior, Gore said that "what he did was inexcusable, and particularly as a father, I felt that it was terribly wrong, obviously" (Seelye, 1999, p. A26). Gore's conflicting stances of loyalty, then distancing himself certainly didn't enable him to cultivate the image of a leader. He ran the risk of undermining his authenticity, and also ran the risk of running afoul of Clinton, whose support would be important at least in the primaries. Following the *20/20* interview, news reports cited White House aides saying that Clinton was very upset about Gore's statements ("Clinton upset," 1999).

Six months later, Gore took another step toward independence on the issue of whether six-year old Elian Gonzalez should be returned to Cuba. The Clinton administration's position was that the boy should be returned to his father in Cuba. Gore, however, supported allowing the child's case to be heard in family court (Chen, 2000; Chinni, 2000), consistent with prior statements he had made on the issue during the primary campaign. But this move was widely reported by the media as pandering to the

Cuban American community of Florida, a key battleground state (Benedetto, 2000). Stanley (2001) noted that Gore's credibility as a leader was undermined. Also, Gore's ability to establish his independence was cast in a negative light by a media that chose to draw attention to the conflict between his position and that of Clinton's.

The public's attitude toward Bill Clinton, as a president, and as a person, and the public's level of satisfaction with the status quo also provided a mixed set of circumstances for Gore. While Clinton's job approval rating in the year 2000 was consistently around 60%, his personal approval rating was around 27% (Simon, 2001). A poll in early November of 2000 showed that three fifths of likely voters in the major battleground states of Michigan, Pennsylvania and Florida disliked Clinton as a person (Brownstein, 2000). A poll asking people if they supported change or continuity revealed a 48-48 percentage split (Greenberg, 2001).

These results certainly complicated the way that Gore would discuss his association with Clinton and the administration during his presidential campaign. Page (2000) summed up the difficulty for Gore:

> More than any other factor, voters' clashing views of Clinton's competence and character have made this an election driven by desires for both continuity and change. That's complicated things for Gore, who wants a share of the credit for the Clinton administration achievements but not blame for the scandals. (p. 1A)

Page's summary suggests that for Gore, the great economy and positive achievements may have been "wind at his back," but the scandals were "ice on his wings."

Gore's dilemma reaffirms Kincade's contention that when vice presidents run for president, they have to try and get credit for the administration's achievements, but avoid the taint of any scandals. Gore's post-impeachment praise of Clinton publicly associated him with the Clinton scandal, and the taint that flowed from it. But Gore found it difficult to get credit for the administration's achievements. Gore campaign strategist Carter Eskew (2001) noted that despite numerous attempts, Gore was unable to get credit for the prosperous economy during Clinton's presidency. As a result, Eskew said the campaign turned toward a message focusing on the future, rather than on past accomplishments.

The Clinton scandals, including the Lewinsky affair, questionable campaign fundraising practices, Whitewater and others, all served to make the issue of honesty and integrity in the White House a much more salient issue. Observers said that the country was experiencing a "Clinton Fatigue." Gore's association with the Clinton administration, and more directly his praising of Clinton after impeachment, and his role in the questionable fundraising practices all created problems for his own presidential bid.

Moreover, there was a perception that Gore had made numerous statements in recent years that were thought to be exaggerated or untrue. These statements included saying he created the internet, claiming that as a child he sang a union song that hadn't been written until after he became an adult, claiming he and his wife Tipper were the inspiration for the novel, *Love Story*, and using an analogy that his mother-in-law spent less on prescription drugs for her dog, than she paid for those prescriptions for herself. George W. Bush's campaign stoked the perceptions of Gore's lack of honesty. One of

their main messages was that Gore reinvented himself at every turn and would say or do anything to get elected (Kurtz, 2000). For instance, in his Republican convention speech, George W. Bush's running mate Dick Cheney had put forth a set of attacks against Gore's character, tying him to the Clinton administration scandals over the past eight years.

Additional questions about Gore's honesty were raised after the first two presidential debates. After the first debate, the media scrutinized his frequent sighs, interruptions and exaggerated claims including that a high school girl was forced to stand in her classroom because there were not enough desks, and claiming that he accompanied FEMA director James Lee Witt down to Texas to assess wildfire damage (Jones, 2000; Hallow, 2000). Then Gore's more subdued tone in the second debate (in contrast to his more aggressive tone in the first debate) was criticized as an example of reinventing himself (Jones, 2000). At this point in the campaign, according to a Washington Post-ABC News poll, Gore found himself trailing Bush in the polls, 48% to 44%, with fewer than half of the voters saying he was honest and trustworthy, a substantial drop from the previous month when six in ten voters held that view ("What are you," 2000; Balz & Morin, 2000). After the third debate, however, polls showed that viewers thought Gore won the debate (Montgomery, 2000). Certainly questions about his trustworthiness, exacerbated by his association with the scandal-plagued and veracity-challenged Clinton administration, and coupled with perceptions of rudeness in the first debate, could only negatively affect his ability to establish the public image of an ideal presidential candidate, who is honest, has good moral character, and is likeable.

In the end, Gore won the popular vote, but failed to secure the 270 electoral votes necessary to be elected president. Controversy arose because of ballot problems in Palm Beach County where many voters had punched votes for both Al Gore and third party candidate Pat Buchanan. Also, there was a belief that many people who voted for Buchanan may have intended to vote for Gore because the majority of Palm Beach voters were registered Democrats. While Gore pursued a recount of all the ballots in Florida, the U.S. Supreme Court suspended the effort in the Bush v. Gore decision on December 12, 2000.

The previous sections of this paper have looked at how the vice presidency has both strengthened and weakened a candidate's chances of becoming a presidential nominee. Studying the presidential campaigns of vice presidents sheds light on how one deals with the rhetorical situations associated with being part of a superior-subordinate relationship. This research may also help us understand other types of elections, involving the superior-subordinate relationship, such as when a Lieutenant Governor runs for Governor, a Deputy Mayor runs for Mayor, or campaigns in which a member of the President's own party, or a member of the incumbent administration runs for president. For example, Senator John McCain, though he wasn't George W. Bush's vice president, experienced the challenges of being associated with him in the 2008 presidential election (Cafferty, 2008). Similarly, Hillary Clinton's role in Bill Clinton's administration complicated her runs for the New York Senate in 2000 and for the Democratic presidential nomination in 2008, when she had to answer for her husband's policy choices such as the controversial North American Free Trade Agreement. If she runs for president in 2016, she will be associated with not one, but two previous presidential

administrations. During interviews for her book tour in the spring of 2014, Clinton has already faced questions about her failed health care policy efforts during her husband's term, and her record as Obama's Secretary of State.

Through the historical and contextual analysis, one can see that certain factors affected the vice president's bid for the presidency, including his relationship with the president, and the specific duties he was asked to perform. In all instances, the vice president's association with the president created both opportunities and difficulties for the vice president's presidential campaign. Because the vice president's success is affected by his relationship with the president, it is useful to look at how they negotiate their relationship with the president, during their presidential campaign.

In this chapter I will report the data obtained from the content analysis. This data will provide answers to the research questions and subquestions presented earlier, including whether vice presidents chose to align or distance themselves from their president/administration, and how their choices compared to the choices made by other vice presidents.

Intercoder Reliability

Interrater agreement was calculated for all coded items, and then separately for manifest and latent content. Separate calculations were also made for each type of text: ads, speeches and debates.[10] The percent interrater agreement for all coded items was 86.698%. For manifest content, percent agreement was 93.233%; and for latent content it was 60.203%. Because manifest judgments are easier for coders to make, we would expect that interrater agreement would be higher. Because latent judgments are more difficult for coders to make, we would expect that interrater agreement would be lower.

For ads, total percent agreement between raters was 92.241%, with agreement on manifest content at 97.255% and on latent content at 55.714%. For speeches, total percent agreement between raters was 89.434%, with agreement on manifest content at 94.559% and on latent content at 65.402%. For debates, total percent agreement between raters was 86.698%, with agreement on manifest content at 93.233% and on latent content at 60.203%. See Table 1.

---

[10] Intercoder agreement calculations for the debates include the opening and closing statements.

Table 1: Percent interrater agreement for manifest, latent and all coded items for ads, speeches and debates.

Percent Interrater Agreement	Manifest Content	Latent Content	All Coded Items (Manifest + Latent)
Ads	97.255%	55.714%	92.241%
Speeches	94.559%	65.402%	89.434%
Debates	92.227%	58.119%	84.920%
Total	93.233%	60.203%	86.698%

Other types of interrater agreement tests including Cohen's kappa and Fleiss' kappa were employed. See Tables 2-3 in Appendix B. These measures take into account the percent of agreement one could expect to get just by chance. Scholars have noted, however, that using kappa as a measure of rater agreement can be problematic (Karelitz and Budescu, 2013; von Eye and von Eye, 2008). Kappa measures are marginal-dependent, meaning that these measures take into account the probabilities with which coders will select coding categories. As noted by von Eye and von Eye (2008), "if [kappa] is used as a measure of the degree of agreement as suggested by some authors, it will fail to indicate that agreement is strong when a marginal distribution is uneven" (p. 310). Thus, even when percent agreement is high, kappa measures can be low.

Analysis of Televised Ads

A. In what percentage of the television ads did the sitting/former vice president, either through discussion or depiction, praise, defend, minimize, criticize, discuss neutrally, or neglect to mention, his president/administration?

Nixon 1960

Of the eight ads studied, Nixon praised Eisenhower/administration in 62.5% of the ads, defended, minimized and criticized or used neutral terms in 0% of the ads, and did not mention Eisenhower/administration in 37.5% of the ads. See Table 4.

Table 4. Percentage of Television Ads that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in 1960.

Praised = 62.50%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 37.50%
Undeterminable = 0%

Humphrey 1968

Of the ten ads studied, Humphrey praised Johnson in 10% of his ads, defended, minimized, criticized, or used neutral terms in 0%, and did not mention Johnson/administration in 90% of the ads. See Table 5.

Table 5. Percentage of Television Ads that Humphrey discussed Johnson/administration in 1968.

Praised = 10%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None =   90%
Undeterminable = 0%

Nixon 1968

Nixon did not discuss or depict Eisenhower/administration in any of his ads. See

Table 6.

Table 6. Percentage of Television Ads that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in 1968.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Mondale 1984

Mondale did not discuss or depict Carter/administration in any of his ads. See

Table 7.

Table 7. Percentage of Television Ads that Mondale discussed Carter/administration in 1984.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Bush 1988

Bush did not mention Reagan or the Reagan administration in 90% of his ads. In

one ad that showed a still shot of Bush and Gorbachev shaking hands, Reagan was seen

standing with a warm effusive smile. Coders determined Reagan was depicted in a

"neutral" way in this ad. One could argue that Reagan was depicted in a positive way,

and therefore being "praised" in this ad. See Table 8.

Table 8. Percentage of Television Ads that Bush discussed Reagan/administration in 1988.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 10%
None = 90%
Undeterminable = 0%

Gore 2000

Gore did not discuss or depict Clinton or the Clinton administration in any of his

2000 ads. See Table 9.

Table 9. Percentage of Television Ads that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in 2000.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

B. Does the answer to subquestion A differ election to election?

This question helps us to make systematic comparisons between elections, and allows us to better understand how the circumstances of that particular election might have affected each vice president's choices. Nixon (1968), Mondale (1984) and Gore (2000) did not mention, discuss, or depict their respective president/administration in their respective television ads. Neither of the two former vice presidents (Nixon '68, Mondale '84) mentioned their president in their ads. Humphrey (1968) and H. W. Bush (1988) discussed or depicted their respective president/administration in only 10% of their respective television ads. Humphrey praised Johnson/administration, while Bush depicted Reagan in a neutral, but arguably positive way.

Nixon's (1960) ads were the clear exception. He discussed or depicted Eisenhower/administration in the majority of the ads studied here -- 62.5%. In one particular ad titled, "Best Qualified," Eisenhower was shown for the entire one-minute duration delivering a speech to a cheering crowd in which he made a strong endorsement of Nixon.

None of the vice presidents used their ads to criticize or minimize their respective president/administration.

Analysis of Speeches

A. In what percentage of speech units, did the sitting/former vice president praise, defend, minimize, criticize, discuss neutrally, or neglect to mention, his president/administration?

Nixon 1960

Nixon's 5 speeches were broken up into a total of 77 speech units. Across all 77 units, Nixon praised Eisenhower/administration in 18.18% of the units, defended in 6.49%, minimized in 2.60%, criticized in 0%, and used neutral terms in 2.60%. Nixon did not mention Eisenhower/administration in 68.83% of the units, and 1.30% of the speech units were undeterminable. See Table 10.

Table 10. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration across all five speeches.

Praised =   18.18%
Defended =   6.49%
Minimized =   2.60%
Criticized =   0%
Neutral terms =   2.60%
None =   68.83%
Undeterminable =   1.30%

The results for each of Nixon's speeches are as follows:

Nixon Speech #1 – Nomination Acceptance Address, July 28, 1960

This speech was broken up into 18 speech units. In this speech, Nixon praised Eisenhower/administration in 22.22% of the coded units, defended 0%, minimized 5.56%, criticized 5.56%, used neutral terms 0%, and did not mention Eisenhower/administration in 66.67% of the units, with 5.56% of the units undeterminable. For the one speech unit that was "undeterminable," four out of five coders determined that it was either "praise" or "defense" and therefore a positive statement of Eisenhower/administration. Viewed this way, Nixon praised or defended Eisenhower in 27.78% of the speech units in this speech. See Table 11.

Table 11. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his 1960 Nomination Acceptance Address.

Praised = 22.22%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 5.56%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 66.67%
Undeterminable = 5.56%

Nixon Speech #2 - "The Need for Leadership" – August 17, 1960

This speech was broken up into 19 speech units. Nixon praised

Eisenhower/administration in 10.53% of the units, defended in 5.26%, criticized in 0%,

minimized in 5.26%, used neutral terms in 5.26%, and did not discuss

Eisenhower/administration in 73.68% of the units. See Table 12.

Table 12. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his 1960 "The Need for Leadership" speech.

Praised = 10.53%
Defended = 5.26%
Minimized = 5.26%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 5.26%
None = 73.68%
Undeterminable = 0%

Nixon Speech #3 – Saginaw, MI speech, September 20, 1960

This speech was broken up into 11 speech units. Nixon praised

Eisenhower/administration in 9.09% of the units, defended in 9.09%, criticized,

minimized and used neutral terms in 0%, and did not discuss Eisenhower/administration

in 81.81% of the units. See Table 13.

Table 13. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his 1960 "Saginaw, MI" speech.

Praised = 9.09%
Defended = 9.09%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 81.81%
Undeterminable = 0%

Nixon Speech #4 - Hartford, CT speech, October 17, 1960

This speech was broken up into 23 speech units. Nixon praised

Eisenhower/administration in 8.70% of the units, defended in 13.04%, minimized,

criticized and used neutral terms in 0%, and did not mention Eisenhower/administration

in 78.26% of the units. See Table 14.

Table 14. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his 1960 Hartford, CT speech.

Praised = 8.70%
Defended = 13.04%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 78.26%
Undeterminable = 0%

Nixon Speech #5 - CBS TV Election Eve Broadcast, November 7, 1960

This speech was broken up into 6 speech units. Nixon discussed

Eisenhower/administration in 100% of these speech units. He praised

Eisenhower/administration in 83.33% of the units, defended, minimized, criticized in 0%,

used neutral terms in 16.67%, and did not mention Eisenhower/administration in 0% of

the units. See Table 15.

Table 15. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in
his 1960 CBS TV Election Eve Broadcast.

Praised = 83.33%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 16.67%
None = 0%
Undeterminable = 0%

<u>Humphrey 1968</u>

Humphrey's 5 speeches were broken up into a total of 69 speech units. Across all

speech units, Humphrey praised Johnson/administration in 20.29% of the units, defended

in 0%, minimized in 1.45%, criticized in 0%, used neutral terms in 5.80%, and did not

discuss Johnson/administration in 71.01% of the units, with 1.45% of the units

undeterminable. See Table 16.

Table 16. Percentage of speech units that Humphrey discussed Johnson/administration across all five speeches.

Praised =   20.29%
Defended =   0%
Minimized =   1.45%
Criticized =   0%
Neutral terms =   5.80%
None =   71.01%
Undeterminable =   1.45%

The results for each of Humphrey's speeches are as follows:

Humphrey Speech #1 – Announcement Speech, April 27, 1968

This speech was broken up into 10 speech units. Humphrey praised

Johnson/administration in 20% of the units, defended, minimized, and criticized in 0%,

used neutral terms in 10%, and did not discuss Johnson/administration in 60% of the

units, with 10% of the units undeterminable. See Table 17.

Table 17. Percentage of speech units that Humphrey discussed Johnson/administration in his 1968 Announcement speech.

Praised = 20%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 10%
None = 60%
Undeterminable = 10%

Humphrey Speech #2 – Nomination Acceptance Address, August 29, 1968

This speech was broken up into 13 speech units. Humphrey praised

Johnson/administration in 23.08% of the units, defended, minimized, criticized and used

neutral terms in 0%, and did not discuss Johnson/administration in 76.92% of the units.

See Table 18.

Table 18. Percentage of speech units that Humphrey discussed Johnson/administration in his 1968 Nomination acceptance address.

Praised = 23.08%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 76.92%
Undeterminable = 0%

Humphrey Speech #3 – Salt Lake City, Utah Address, September 30, 1968

This speech was broken up into 12 speech units. Humphrey praised Johnson/administration in 8.33% of the units, defended in 0%, minimized in 8.33%, criticized in 0%, used neutral terms in 16.67%, and did not discuss Johnson/administration in 66.67% of the units. See Table 19.

Table 19. Percentage of speech units that Humphrey discussed Johnson/administration in his 1968 Salt Lake City, UT Address.

Praised = 8.33%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 8.33%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 16.67%
None = 66.67%
Undeterminable = 0%

Humphrey Speech #4 – NY Garment District Speech, October 30, 1968

This speech was broken up into 12 speech units. Humphrey praised Johnson/administration in 16.67% of the units, defended, minimized, criticized and used neutral terms in 0%, and did not mention Johnson/administration in 83.33% of the units. See Table 20.

Table 20. Percentage of speech units that Humphrey discussed Johnson/administration in his 1968 NY Garment District speech.

Praised = 16.67%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 83.33%
Undeterminable = 0%

Humphrey Speech #5 – Houston Astrodome Speech, November 3, 1968

This speech was broken up into 22 speech units. Humphrey praised

Johnson/administration in 27.27% of the units, the most in any of the five speeches

studied here. He defended, minimized and criticized in 0%, used neutral terms in 4.55%,

and did not mention Johnson/administration in 68.18% of the units. See Table 21.

Table 21. Percentage of speech units that Humphrey discussed Johnson/administration in his 1968 Houston Astrodome speech.

Praised = 27.27%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 4.55%
None = 68.18%
Undeterminable = 0%

Nixon 1968

Nixon's 5 speeches were broken up into a total of 68 speech units. Across all of these units, Nixon praised Eisenhower/administration in 10.29% of the units, defended, minimized, and criticized in 0%, used neutral terms in 1.47%, and did not mention Eisenhower/administration in 86.76% of the units, with 1.47% of the units undeterminable. See Table 22.

Table 22. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration across all five speeches.

Praised =   10.29%
Defended =   0%
Minimized =   0%
Criticized =   0%
Neutral terms =   1.47%
None =   86.76%
Undeterminable =   1.47%

The results for each of Nixon's speeches are as follows:

Nixon Speech #1 – Announcement Speech, January 31, 1968

This speech was broken up into 4 speech units. Nixon did not mention Eisenhower/administration in any of the units. See Table 23.

Table 23. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his 1968 Announcement speech.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Nixon Speech #2 – Nomination Acceptance Address, August 8, 1968

This speech was broken up into 29 speech units. Nixon praised

Eisenhower/administration in 10.34% of the units, defended, minimized, criticized, and

used neutral terms in 0%, and did not discuss Eisenhower/administration in 86.21% of

the units, with 3.45% of the units undeterminable. See Table 24.

Table 24. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his 1968 Nomination Acceptance address.

Praised = 10.34%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 86.21%
Undeterminable = 3.45%

Nixon Speech #3 – Washington, DC, Radio Address, September 19, 1968

This speech was broken up into 11 speech units. Nixon did not discuss

Eisenhower/administration in any of the units. See Table 25.

Table 25. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his 1968 Washington DC, Radio address, September 19.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Nixon Speech #4 – Washington DC, CBS Radio Address, October 24, 1968

This speech was broken up into 15 speech units. Nixon praised

Eisenhower/administration in 26.67% of the units, defended, minimized, or criticized in

0%, used neutral terms in 6.67%; and did not discuss Eisenhower/administration in

66.67% of the units. See Table 26.

Table 26. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his 1968 Washington DC, CBS Radio address, October 24.

Praised = 26.67%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 6.67%
None =   66.67%
Undeterminable = 0%

Nixon Speech #5 – Washington DC, CBS Radio Address, October 30, 1968

This speech was broken up into 9 speech units. Nixon did not mention

Eisenhower/administration in any of the units. See Table 27.

Table 27. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his 1968 Washington DC, CBS Radio, October 30.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Mondale 1984

Mondale's 5 speeches were broken up into a total of 62 speech units. Across all units, Mondale praised Carter/administration in 3.23% of the units, defended, minimized or criticized in 0%, used neutral terms in 1.61%, and did not mention Carter/administration in 95.16% of the units. See Table 28.

Table 28. Percentage of speech units that Mondale discussed Carter/administration across all five speeches.

Praised = 3.23%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 1.61%
None = 95.16%
Undeterminable = 0%

The results for each of Mondale's speeches are as follows:

Mondale Speech #1 – Announcement Speech, February 21, 1983

This speech was broken up into 16 speech units. Mondale praised Carter/administration in 6.25% of the units, defended, minimized, criticized and used neutral terms in 0%, and did not discuss Carter/administration in 93.75% of the units. See Table 29.

Table 29. Percentage of speech units that Mondale discussed Carter/administration in his 1984 Announcement address, February 21, 1983.

Praised = 6.25%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 93.75%
Undeterminable = 0%

Mondale Speech #2 – Nomination Acceptance Address, July 19, 1984

This speech was broken up into 13 speech units. Mondale praised

Carter/administration in 7.69% of the units, defended, minimized, criticized or used

neutral terms in 0%, and did not mention Carter/administration in 92.31% of the units.

See Table 30.

Table 30. Percentage of speech units that Mondale discussed Carter/administration in his 1984 Nomination Acceptance address, July 19.

Praised = 7.69%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 92.31%
Undeterminable = 0%

Mondale Speech #3 – Portland, Oregon Speech, September 5, 1984

This speech was broken up into 13 speech units. Mondale did not discuss

Carter/administration in any of these units. See Table 31.

Table 31. Percentage of speech units that Mondale discussed Carter/administration in his 1984 Portland, OR speech, September 5.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Mondale Speech #4 – Stanford University Stump Speech, October 17, 1984

This speech was broken up into 16 speech units. Mondale did not praise, defend,

minimize or criticize Carter/administration. He discussed Carter/administration in neutral

terms in 6.25% of the units, and did not mention Carter/administration in 93.75% of the

units. See Table 32.

Table 32. Percentage of speech units that Mondale discussed Carter/administration in his 1984 Stanford University stump speech, October 17.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 6.25%
None = 93.75%
Undeterminable = 0%

Mondale Speech #5 – Pershing Square speech, November 5, 1984

This speech was broken up into 4 speech units. Mondale did not discuss

Carter/administration in any of the units. See Table 33.

Table 33. Percentage of speech units that Mondale discussed Carter/administration in his 1984 Pershing Square speech, November 5.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Bush 1988

      Bush's 5 speeches were broken up into a total of 108 speech units. Across all units, Bush praised Reagan/administration in 16.67% of the units, defended in 0%, minimized in 1.85%, criticized in 0%, used neutral terms in 3.70%, and did not discuss Reagan/administration in 77.78% of the units. See Table 34.

Table 34. Percentage of speech units that Bush discussed Reagan/administration across all five speeches.

Praised =   16.67%
Defended =   0%
Minimized =   1.85%
Criticized =   0%
Neutral terms =   3.70%
None =   77.78%
Undeterminable =   0%

      The results for each of Bush's speeches are as follows:

Bush Speech #1 – Announcement Speech, October 12, 1987

      This speech was broken up into 26 speech units. Bush praised Reagan/administration in 15.38% of the units, defended in 0%, minimized in 3.85%, criticized in 0%, used neutral terms in 7.69%, and did not discuss Reagan/administration in 73.08% of the units. See Table 35.

Table 35. Percentage of speech units that Bush discussed Reagan/administration in his 1988 Announcement speech, October 12, 1987.

Praised = 15.38%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 3.85%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 7.69%
None = 73.08%
Undeterminable = 0%

Bush Speech #2 – Nomination Acceptance Address, August 18, 1988

This speech was broken up into 32 speech units. Bush praised Reagan/administration in 18.75% of the units, minimized in 3.13%, defended or criticized in 0%, discussed in neutral terms in 3.13%, and did not discuss Reagan/administration in 75% of the units. See Table 36.

Table 36. Percentage of speech units that Bush discussed Reagan/administration in his 1988 Nomination Acceptance address, August 18.

Praised = 18.75%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 3.13%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 3.13%
None = 75%
Undeterminable = 0%

Bush Speech #3 - Gaddi Vasquez Campaign Breakfast Speech, September 14, 1988

This speech was broken up into 13 speech units. Bush praised

Reagan/administration in 23.08% of the units, defended, minimized or criticized in 0%,

discussed in neutral terms in 7.69%, and did not discuss Reagan/administration in

69.23% of the units. See Table 37.

Table 37. Percentage of speech units that Bush discussed Reagan/administration in his
1988 Gaddi Vasquez Campaign Breakfast speech, September 14.

Praised = 23.08%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 7.69%
None = 69.23%
Undeterminable = 0%

Bush Speech #4 - Dearborn, MI Speech, October 19, 1988

This speech was broken up into 23 speech units. Bush praised

Reagan/administration 8.70%, defended, minimized, criticized, or discussed in neutral

terms in 0%, and did not discuss Reagan/administration in 91.30% of the units. See

Table 38.

Table 38. Percentage of speech units that Bush discussed Reagan/administration in his 1988 Dearborn, MI speech, October 19.

Praised = 8.70%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 91.30%
Undeterminable = 0%

Bush Speech #5 - Notre Dame Speech, November 1, 1988

This speech was broken up into 14 speech units. Bush praised

Reagan/administration in 21.43%, defended, minimized, criticized or discussed in neutral

terms in 0%, and did not discuss Reagan/administration in 78.57% of the units. See

Table 39.

Table 39. Percentage of speech units that Bush discussed Reagan/administration in his 1988 Notre Dame speech, November 1.

Praised = 21.43%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 78.57%
Undeterminable = 0%

Gore 2000

Gore's 5 speeches were broken up into a total of 114 speech units. Across all units, Gore praised Clinton/administration in 2.63% of the units, defended in 0%, minimized in 3.51%, criticized or discussed in neutral terms in 0%, and did not discuss Clinton/administration in 93.86%. See Table 40.

Table 40. Percentage of speech units that Gore discussed Clinton/administration across all five speeches.

Praised = 2.63%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 3.51%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 93.86 %
Undeterminable = 0%

The results for each of Gore's speeches are as follows:

Gore Speech #1 – Announcement Speech, June 16, 1999

This speech was broken up into 27 speech units. Gore praised Clinton/administration 3.70% of the units, minimized in 3.70%, and defended, criticized or discussed in neutral terms in 0%, and did not discuss Clinton/administration in 92.59%. See Table 41.

Table 41. Percentage of speech units that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in his Announcement speech, June 16, 1999.

Praised = 3.70%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 3.70%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 92.59%
Undeterminable = 0%

Gore Speech #2 – Nomination Acceptance Address, August 17, 2000

This speech was broken up into 35 speech units. Gore praised

Clinton/administration in 5.71% of the units, defended in 0%, minimized in 2.86%,

criticized or discussed in neutral terms in 0%, and did not discuss Clinton/administration

in 91.43% of the units. See Table 42.

Table 42. Percentage of speech units that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in his Nomination Acceptance address, August 17.

Praised = 5.71%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 2.86%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 91.43%
Undeterminable = 0%

Gore Speech #3 – Audobon Society Speech, September 29, 2000

This speech was broken up into 17 speech units. Gore did not discuss

Clinton/administration in any of the units. See Table 43.

Table 43. Percentage of speech units that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in his Audobon Society speech, September 29.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Gore Speech #4 – Philadelphia, PA Speech, October 24, 2000

This speech was broken up into 15 speech units. Gore did not praise, defend,

criticize or discuss in neutral terms Clinton/administration. He minimized

Clinton/administration in 6.67% of the units, and did not discuss Clinton/administration

in 93.33% of the units. See Table 44.

Table 44. Percentage of speech units that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in his Philadelphia, PA speech, October 24.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 6.67%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 93.33%
Undeterminable = 0%

Gore Speech #5 – St. Louis, MO Speech, November 6, 2000

This speech was broken up into 20 speech units. Gore did not praise, defend, criticize or discuss in neutral terms Clinton/administration. He minimized in 5% of the units, and did not discuss Clinton/administration in 95% of the units. See Table 45.

Table 45. Percentage of speech units that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in his St. Louis, MO speech, November 6.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 5%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 95%
Undeterminable = 0%

B. Did the results of subquestion A differ from election to election?

This question helps us to consider how the context of the particular election may have influenced the vice president's decisions to discuss the president and/or the administration in their television ads. The results showed that each vice president's discussion of their respective president/administration varied both in quantity and quality. Nixon (1960), Humphrey (1968), and Bush (1988) all spoke about their respective president/administration frequently and often with praise, whereas Nixon (1968), Mondale (1984), and Gore (2000) rarely spoke about their respective presidents/administrations.

On average, Nixon (1960) praised or defended Eisenhower/administration in roughly 25% of the speech units across all of his speeches. In his election eve broadcast, Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in 100% of the speech units, praising him in 83.33% of these units. This amount far exceeded any other vice president's mentioning of their president/administration in their election week speech, or any other speech studied here.

Humphrey (1968) praised or defended Johnson/administration in more than 20% of the speech units across all speeches studied here.

Bush (1988) praised Reagan/administration in 16.67% of the speech units across all speeches studied here, and did so substantially in his election week speech (21.43% of the speech units).

Looking at Nixon's 1968 speeches, on average, he praised Eisenhower/administration in roughly 10% of the speech units across all speeches. In

most speeches, he never mentioned Eisenhower/administration, except for his nomination

acceptance speech (when he praised him in 10.34% of his speech units) and in his CBS

radio address on October 24, when he praised him much more (26.67% of the speech

units). In the speeches studied here, Nixon's discussion of Eisenhower/administration in

1968 seems somewhat opposite of the approach he took in his 1960 campaign. In 1960,

Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in all of his speeches. In 1968, he mostly

avoided discussion of Eisenhower/administration, except for two speeches.

Mondale (1984) made virtually no mention of Carter/administration. He declined

to discuss Carter/administration in 95.16% percent of his speech units across all speeches,

praising in only 3.23%, and discussing in neutral terms in only 1.61%.

Similar to Mondale (1984), Gore (2000) rarely mentioned his

president/administration in his speeches. He declined to discuss Clinton/administration

in 93.86% of the speech units across all speeches, praising in only 2.63%, and

minimizing in 3.51% of the units across all speeches.

Nixon (1960) and Gore (2000) did minimize their respective

presidents/administrations more so than the other vice presidents. Nixon (1960)

minimized Eisenhower/administration in 2.60% of his speech units across all five

speeches. Gore minimized Clinton/administration in 3.51% of his speeches units across

all five speeches. In comparison, Bush minimized Reagan/administration in 1.85% of his

speech units across all five speeches. Bush minimized more so in his announcement and

nomination acceptance addresses (3.85% and 3.13% respectively).

<u>**Analysis of Debates**</u>

A. In each sitting/former vice president's speaking turns, did he praise, defend, criticize, minimize, discuss neutrally, or decline to discuss, his president/administration?

Nixon-Kennedy 1960 Debate #1

Nixon's opening statement was broken up into 10 speech units[11]. Nixon praised Eisenhower/administration in 20% of these units, defended in 20%, minimized in 10%, criticized or discussed in neutral times 0%, and did not discuss Eisenhower/administration in 50% of the units. After the opening statement, Nixon had 10 speaking turns in the first debate. Nixon praised Eisenhower/administration in 20% of the turns, defended 10%, minimized 10%, did not criticize, discussed using neutral terms 10%, and did not discuss at all in 40% of the units, with 10% of the units undeterminable. For the unit that coders found to be undeterminable, three out of five coders did judge it to be either "praise" or "defense," and therefore, a positive statement of Eisenhower/administration. Viewed this way, 40% of Nixon's speaking turns were coded either as praise or defense of Eisenhower/administration. Nixon's closing statement was broken up into 4 speech units, and in this speech, he did not discuss Eisenhower/administration at all. See Tables 46-48.

---

[11] Like the speeches, any opening and closing statements in debates were coded by breaking them up into more manageable speech units.

Table 46. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his Debate #1 opening statement.

Praised = 20%
Defended = 20%
Minimized = 10%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 50%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 47. Percentage of his 10 debate turns that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in Debate #1.

Praised = 20%
Defended = 10%
Minimized = 10%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 10%
None = 40%
Undeterminable = 10%

Table 48. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his Debate #1 closing statement.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Nixon-Kennedy 1960 Debate #2

Nixon had 13 speaking turns. He praised Eisenhower/administration in 30.77% of the turns, defended in 15.38%, did not minimize or criticize, discussed in neutral terms in 7.69%, and did not discuss Eisenhower/administration in 46.15% of the turns. There were no opening or closing statements in this debate. See Table 49.

Table 49. Percentage of his 13 debate turns that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in Debate #2.

Praised = 30.77%
Defended = 15.38%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 7.69%
None = 46.15%
Undeterminable = 0%

Nixon-Kennedy 1960 Debate #3

Nixon had 13 speaking turns. He praised Eisenhower/administration in 23.08% of his turns, defended in 7.69%, minimized in 15.38%, criticized in 0%, discussed in neutral terms in 15.38%, and did not discuss Eisenhower/administration in 38.46% of his turns. There were no opening or closing statements in this debate. See Table 50.

Table 50. Percentage of his 13 debate turns that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in Debate #3.

Praised = 23.08%
Defended = 7.69%
Minimized = 15.38%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 15.38%
None = 38.46%
Undeterminable = 0%

Nixon-Kennedy 1960 Debate #4

Nixon's opening statement was broken up into 8 speech units. In this speech, Nixon praised Eisenhower/administration in 62.5% of the units, defended, minimized criticized and used neutral terms in 0%, and did not discuss Eisenhower/administration in 37.5%. After the opening statement, Nixon had 7 speaking turns. He praised Eisenhower/administration in 42.86% of the turns, defended, minimized and criticized in

0%, discussed Eisenhower/administration in neutral terms in 14.29% of the turns, and did

not discuss Eisenhower/administration in 28.57% of the turns, with 14.29% of the turns

undeterminable. For the unit that was "undeterminable," three out of five coders judged

it to be either "praise" or "defense," and therefore, a positive statement of

Eisenhower/administration. Viewed this way, 57.15% of Nixon's speaking turns

included either praise or defense of Eisenhower/administration. Nixon's closing

statement was broken up into 6 speech units, and in this speech, he praised

Eisenhower/administration in 16.67% of the units, defended in 16.67%, minimized in

16.67%, criticized or use neutral terms in 0%, and did not discuss

Eisenhower/administration in 50% of the units. See Tables 51-53.

Table 51. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in
his Debate #4 opening statement.

Praised = 62.5%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 37.5%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 52. Percentage of his 7 debate turns that Nixon discussed
Eisenhower/administration in Debate #4.

Praised = 42.86%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 14.29%
None = 28.57%
Undeterminable = 14.29%

Table 53. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in
Debate #4 closing statement.

Praised = 16.67%
Defended = 16.67%
Minimized = 16.67%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 50%
Undeterminable = 0%

Mondale-Reagan 1984 Debate #1

Mondale had 24 speaking turns in this debate. He did not praise, defend,

minimize or criticize Carter/administration in any of these turns. He discussed

110

Carter/administration in neutral terms in 4.16% of his turns, and did not discuss

Carter/administration in 87.5% of his turns, with 8.33% of the turns undeterminable. In

one of the two cases that were undeterminable, 4 out of 5 coders determined that it was

either "praise" or "defense" and therefore a positive statement of Carter/administration.

Viewed this way, Mondale praised or defended Carter/administration in 4.17% of his

speaking turns in Debate #1. Mondale's closing statement was broken up into 6 speech

units, and in this statement, he did not discuss Carter/administration at all. See Tables

54-55.

Table 54. Percentage of his 24 debate turns that Mondale discussed Carter/administration
in Debate #1.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 4.16%
None = 87.5%
Undeterminable = 8.34%

Table 55. Percentage of his speech units that Mondale discussed Carter/administration in his Debate #1 closing statement.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Mondale-Reagan 1984 Debate #2

Mondale had 22 speaking turns in this debate. He did not discuss Carter/administration at all. Mondale's closing statement was broken up into 4 speech units, and in this statement, he did not discuss Carter/administration at all. See Tables 56-57.

Table 56. Percentage of his 22 debate turns that Mondale discussed Carter/administration in Debate #2.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 57. Percentage of speech units that Mondale discussed Carter/administration in his Debate #2 closing statement.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

H. W. Bush-Dukakis 1988 Debate #1

Bush had 23 speaking turns in this debate. He praised Reagan/administration in 21.74% of his turns, defended 8.70%, never minimized, criticized or discussed in neutral terms, and did not discuss Reagan/administration in 69.57% of his turns. Bush's closing statement was broken up into 4 speech units, and in this statement, Bush praised Reagan/administration in 25% of the units, did not defend, minimize, criticize or discuss in neutral terms, and did not discuss Reagan/administration in 75% of his turns. See Tables 58-59.

Table 58. Percentage of his 23 debate turns that H. W. Bush discussed Reagan/administration in Debate #1

Praised = 21.74%
Defended = 8.70%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 69.57%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 59. Percentage of speech units that H. W. Bush discussed Reagan/administration in his Debate #1 closing statement.

Praised = 25%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 75%
Undeterminable = 0%

H. W. Bush-Dukakis 1988 Debate #2

Bush had 23 speaking turns in this debate. He used a majority of his turns to discuss Reagan/administration in either a positive or neutral way. He praised Reagan in 34.78% of his turns, defended 4.35%, did not minimize or criticize, used neutral terms in 13.04% of the turns, and did not discuss Reagan/administration in 47.83% of the turns. Bush's closing statement was broken up into 4 speech units, and in this statement, Bush praised Reagan/administration in 25% of the units, did not defend, minimize, criticize or discuss in neutral terms, and did not discuss Reagan/administration in 75% of the units. See Tables 60-61.

Table 60. Percentage of his 23 debate turns that Bush discussed Reagan/administration in Debate #2.

Praised = 34.78%
Defended = 4.35%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 13.04%
None = 47.83%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 61. Percentage of speech units that H. W. Bush discussed Reagan/administration in his Debate #2 closing statement.

Praised = 25%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 75%
Undeterminable = 0%

Gore-Bush 2000 Debate #1

Gore had 41 speaking turns in this debate. In 92.68% of the turns, he did not discuss Clinton/administration. He minimized Clinton/administration in 2.44% of the turns, with 4.88% of the turns undeterminable. In one of the two cases that were "undeterminable," four out of five coders judged it to be either "praise" or "defense," therefore indicating that it was a positive statement about Clinton/administration. Viewed this way, Gore praised or defended Clinton in 2.44% of his turns. Gore's closing statement was broken up into 3 speech units. In these 3 units, Gore did not discuss Clinton/administration at all. See Tables 62-63.

Table 62. Percentage of his 41 debate turns that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in Debate #1.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 2.44%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 92.68%
Undeterminable = 4.88%

Table 63. Percentage of speech units that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in his Debate #1 closing statement.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Gore-Bush 2000 Debate #2

Gore had 47 speaking turns in this debate. Gore defended Clinton/administration in 2.13% of his turns, but also criticized in 2.13% of his turns. Gore did not praise, minimize, or discuss in neutral terms in any of his turns. In 93.62% of the turns, Gore did not discuss Clinton/administration at all, with 2.13% of his turns undeterminable. Gore's closing statement was broken up into 4 speech units, and he did not discuss Clinton/administration at all. See Tables 64-65.

Table 64. Percentage of his 47 debate turns that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in Debate #2.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 2.13%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 2.13%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 93.62%
Undeterminable = 2.13%

Table 65. Percentage of speech units that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in his Debate #2 closing statement.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Gore-Bush 2000 Debate #3

Gore had 29 speaking turns in this debate. He praised Clinton/administration in 17.24% of the turns, and discussed in neutral terms in 3.45% of the turns. He did not discuss Clinton/administration in 79.31% of the turns. Gore's closing statement was broken up into four speech units. In this statement, Gore praised Clinton/administration in 25% of the units, and did not discuss Clinton/administration in 75% of the units. See Tables 66-67.

Table 66. Percentage of his 29 debate turns that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in Debate #3.

Praised = 17.24%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 3.45%
None = 79.31%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 67. Percentage of speech units that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in his Debate #3 closing statement.

Praised = 25%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 75%
Undeterminable = 0%

B. Who initially prompted the topic of the president/administration: the questioner (moderator, panelist, or citizen), the opponent, both the questioner and the opponent, or the vice president himself?

This question helps us understand how eager the vice president was to discuss their president/administration. If a vice president is often the first one to discuss their president/administration, without the prompting of his opponent or the questioner, this suggests a choice to more closely link themselves to their president/administration. If, on the other hand, a vice president refuses to discuss their president/administration, despite several prompts by their opponent or the questioner, this data would suggest that the vice president chooses to distance themselves from the president/administration.

Nixon-Kennedy 1960 Debate #1:

This debate was broken up into 10 prompt-response pairs. Of these pairs, results show that Eisenhower/administration was brought up in 7 pairs, and was initially prompted by: the Questioner in 30% of the pairs, Kennedy in 20% of the pairs, and Nixon in 20% of the pairs. In 30% of the pairs, no one brought it up. See Tables 68a and 68b.

Table 68a. The percentage of prompt-response pairs in which the questioner, the opponent and the vice president respectively was the initial prompter of the president/administration as a topic in Nixon-Kennedy debate #1.

Questioner	= 30.00%
Kennedy(Opponent)	= 20.00%
Nixon (VP)	= 20.00%
No One Brought It Up	= 30.00%

Table 68b. The nature of the initial prompt and the nature of the vice president's response to the initial prompt (praise, defend, minimize, criticize, neutral, none) in Nixon-Kennedy debate #1.

PR 1	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 6	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Kennedy	None	Nixon	Minimize
Nixon	None	Kennedy	None
PR 2	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 7	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	Neutral	Questioner	None
Nixon	Neutral	Kennedy	Criticize
Kennedy	Criticize	Nixon	Defend
PR 3	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 8	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Kennedy	None	Nixon	Praise
Nixon	None	Kennedy	None
PR 4	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 9	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	Neutral	Questioner	None
Nixon	Undeterminable	Kennedy	None
Kennedy	None	Nixon	None
PR 5	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 10	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	Neutral
Kennedy	Criticize	Nixon	Praise
Nixon	None	Kennedy	Minimize

Nixon-Kennedy 1960 Debate #2

This debate was broken up into 13 prompt-response pairs. Of these pairs, results

show that Eisenhower/administration was brought up in 10 pairs, and was initially

prompted by: the Questioner in 15.39% of the pairs, by Kennedy in 30.77% of the pairs,

and Nixon in 30.77% of the pairs. In 23.08% of the pairs, no one brought it up. See

Tables 69a and 69b.

Table 69a. The percentage of prompt-response pairs in which the questioner, the opponent and the vice president respectively was the initial prompter of the president/administration as a topic in Nixon-Kennedy debate #2.

Questioner	= 15.39%
Kennedy (Opponent)	= 30.77%
Nixon (VP)	= 30.77%
No One Brought It Up	= 23.08%

Table 69b. The nature of the initial prompt and the nature of the vice president's response to the initial prompt (praise, defend, minimize, criticize, neutral, none) in Nixon-Kennedy debate #2.

PR 1	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**	**PR 8**	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**
Questioner	Undeterminable	Questioner	Criticize
Nixon	Defend	Kennedy	Criticize
Kennedy	Criticize	Nixon	Praise
PR 2	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**	**PR 9**	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Kennedy	Criticize	Nixon	Neutral
Nixon	Defend	Kennedy	None
PR 3	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**	**PR 10**	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Nixon	None	Kennedy	None
Kennedy	None	Nixon	None
PR 4	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**	**PR 11**	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Kennedy	Criticize	Nixon	Praise
Nixon	None	Kennedy	None
PR 5	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**	**PR 12**	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Nixon	Praise	**Kennedy**	Neutral
Kennedy	Criticize	Nixon	None
PR 6	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**	**PR 13**	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Kennedy	Criticize	Nixon	None
Nixon	None	Kennedy	None
PR 7	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**		
Questioner	None		
Nixon	Praise		
Kennedy	Criticize		

Nixon-Kennedy 1960 Debate #3

This debate was broken up into 13 prompt-response pairs. Of these pairs, results show that Eisenhower/administration was brought up in 9 pairs, and was initially prompted by: the Questioner in 23.08% of the pairs, Kennedy in 23.08% of the pairs, and Nixon in 23.08% of the pairs. In 30.77% of the pairs, no one brought it up. See Tables 70a and 70b.

Table 70a. The percentage of prompt-response pairs in which the questioner, the opponent and the vice president respectively was the initial prompter of the president/administration as a topic in Nixon-Kennedy debate #3.

Questioner	= 23.08%
Kennedy(Opponent)	= 23.08%
Nixon (VP)	= 23.08%
No One Brought It Up	= 30.77%

Table 70b. The nature of the initial prompt and the nature of the vice president's response to the initial prompt (praise, defend, minimize, criticize, neutral, none) in Nixon-Kennedy debate #3.

PR 1	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**	**PR 8**	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Kennedy	Neutral	Nixon	Minimize
Nixon	Praise	Kennedy	None
PR 2	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**	**PR 9**	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Nixon	Neutral	Kennedy	Criticize
Kennedy	Neutral	Nixon	None
PR 3	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**	**PR 10**	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	Neutral
Kennedy	Criticize	Nixon	Minimize
Nixon	Defend	Kennedy	Criticize
PR 4	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**	**PR 11**	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**
Questioner	Neutral	Questioner	None
Nixon	Neutral	Kennedy	None
Kennedy	Neutral	Nixon	None
PR 5	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**	**PR 12**	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Kennedy	None	Nixon	None
Nixon	Praise	Kennedy	None
PR 6	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**	**PR 13**	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**
Questioner	Neutral	Questioner	None
Nixon	Praise	Kennedy	None
Kennedy	Neutral	Nixon	None
PR 7	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**		
Questioner	None		
Kennedy	None		
Nixon	None		

Nixon-Kennedy 1960 Debate #4

This debate was broken up into 7 prompt-response pairs. Of these pairs, results

show that Eisenhower/administration was brought up in all 7 pairs, and was initially

prompted by: the Questioner in 28.57% of the pairs, Kennedy in 28.57% of the pairs, and

Nixon in 42.86% of the pairs. See Tables 71a and 71b.

Table 71a. The percentage of prompt-response pairs in which the questioner, the
opponent and the vice president respectively was the initial prompter of the
president/administration as a topic in Nixon-Kennedy debate #4.

Questioner	= 28.57%
Kennedy (Opponent)	= 28.57%
Nixon (VP)	= 42.86%
No One Brought It Up	= 00.00%

Table 71b. The nature of the initial prompt and the nature of the vice president's response to the initial prompt (praise, defend, minimize, criticize, neutral, none) in Nixon-Kennedy debate #4.

PR 1	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 5	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Nixon	Undeterminable	Nixon	None
Kennedy	Criticize	Kennedy	Neutral
PR 2	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 6	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Kennedy	None	Kennedy	Criticize
Nixon	Praise	Nixon	None
PR 3	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 7	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	Neutral	Questioner	Neutral
Nixon	Praise	Nixon	Praise
Kennedy	Criticize	Kennedy	Praise
PR 4	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.		
Questioner	None		
Kennedy	None		
Nixon	Neutral		

Mondale-Reagan 1984 Debate 1

This debate was broken up into 8 prompt-response pairs. Of these pairs, results show that Carter/administration was brought up in all 8 pairs, and was initially prompted by: the Questioner in 25% of the pairs, Reagan in 50% of the pairs, and Mondale in 25% of the pairs. See Tables 72a and 72b.

Table 72a. The percentage of prompt-response pairs in which the questioner, the opponent and the vice president respectively was the initial prompter of the president/administration as a topic in Mondale-Reagan debate #1.

Questioner	= 25.00%
Reagan (Opponent)	= 50.00%
Mondale (VP)	= 25.00%
No One Brought It Up	= 00.00%

Table 72b. The nature of the initial prompt and the nature of the vice president's response to the initial prompt (praise, defend, minimize, criticize, neutral, none) in Mondale-Reagan debate #1.

PR 1	Discussion of Carter/Admin.	PR 5	Discussion of Carter/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Reagan	None	Reagan	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Reagan	None	Reagan	None
Questioner	Criticize	Questioner	None
Mondale	None	Mondale	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Mondale	None	Mondale	None
Reagan-rebuttal	Criticize	Reagan-rebuttal	None
Mondale-rebuttal	None	Mondale-rebuttal	Undeterminable
PR 2	Discussion of Carter/Admin.	PR 6	Discussion of Carter/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Mondale	None	Mondale	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Mondale	None	Mondale	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Reagan	Criticize	Reagan	Criticize
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Reagan	None	Reagan	None
Mondale-rebuttal	None	Mondale-rebuttal	Neutral
Reagan-rebuttal	None	Reagan-rebuttal	Criticize

PR 3	Discussion of Carter/Admin.		PR 7	Discussion of Carter/Admin.
Questioner	None		Questioner	None
Reagan	None		Reagan	Criticize
Questioner	Neutral		Questioner	None
Reagan	None		Reagan	None
Questioner	None		Questioner	None
Mondale	None		Mondale	None
Questioner	None		Questioner	None
Mondale	None		Mondale	None
Reagan-rebuttal	None		Reagan-rebuttal	Undeterminable
Mondale-rebuttal	None		Mondale-rebuttal	None
PR 4	**Discussion of Carter/Admin.**		**PR 8**	**Discussion of Carter/Admin.**
Questioner	None		Questioner	None
Mondale	None		Mondale	None
Questioner	None		Questioner	None
Mondale	None		Mondale	None
Questioner	None		Questioner	None
Reagan	Criticize		Reagan	None
Questioner	None		Questioner	None
Reagan	None		Reagan	None
Mondale-rebuttal	None		Mondale-rebuttal	Undeterminable
Reagan-rebuttal	Criticize		Reagan-rebuttal	None

Mondale-Reagan 1984 Debate 2

This debate was broken up into 8 prompt-response pairs. Of these pairs, results

show that Carter/administration was brought up in 5 pairs, and was initially prompted by:

the Questioner in 37.5% of the pairs, Reagan in 25% of the pairs, and Mondale in 0% of

the pairs. In 37.5% of the pairs, no one brought it up. See Tables 73a and 73b.

Table 73a. The percentage of prompt-response pairs in which the questioner, the opponent and the vice president respectively was the initial prompter of the president/administration as a topic in Mondale-Reagan debate #2.

Questioner	= 37.50%
Reagan (Opponent)	= 25.00%
Mondale (VP)	= 00.00%
No One Brought It Up	= 37.50%

Table 73b. The nature of the initial prompt and the nature of vice president's response to the initial prompt (praise, defend, minimize, criticize, neutral, none) in Mondale-Reagan debate #2.

PR 1	Discussion of Carter/Admin.	PR 5	Discussion of Carter/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Mondale	None	Mondale	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Mondale	None	Mondale	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Reagan	None	Reagan	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Reagan	None	Reagan	None
Mondale-rebuttal	None	Mondale-rebuttal	None
Reagan-rebuttal	None	Reagan-rebuttal	Criticize
PR 2	**Discussion of Carter/Admin.**	**PR 6**	**Discussion of Carter/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Reagan	Criticize	Reagan	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Reagan	None	Reagan	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Mondale	None	Mondale	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	Neutral
Mondale	None	Mondale	None
Reagan-rebuttal	Undeterminable	Reagan-rebuttal	None
Mondale-rebuttal	None	Mondale-rebuttal	None

PR 3	Discussion of Carter/Admin.
Questioner	None
Mondale	None
Questioner	None
Mondale	None
Questioner	None
Reagan	None
Questioner	Neutral
Reagan	None
Mondale-rebuttal	None
Reagan-rebuttal	None

PR 7	Discussion of Carter/Admin.
Questioner	None
Mondale	None
Questioner	None
Mondale	None
Questioner	Neutral
Reagan	Criticize
Questioner	None
Reagan	None
Mondale-rebuttal	None
Reagan-rebuttal	Criticize

PR 4	Discussion of Carter/Admin.
Questioner	None
Reagan	None
Questioner	None
Reagan	None
Questioner	None
Mondale	None
Questioner	None
Mondale	None
Reagan-rebuttal	None
Mondale-rebuttal	None

PR 8	Discussion of Carter/Admin.
Questioner	None
Reagan	None
Questioner	None
Mondale	None

Bush-Dukakis 1988 Debate #1

This debate was broken up into 23 prompt-response pairs. Of these pairs, results show that Reagan/administration was brought up in 17 pairs, and was initially prompted by: the Questioner in 21.74% of the pairs, Dukakis in 43.48% of the pairs, and H. W. Bush in 8.70% of the pairs. In 26.09% of the pairs, no one brought it up. See Tables 74a and 74b.

Table 74a. The percentage of prompt-response pairs in which the questioner, the opponent and the vice president respectively was the initial prompter of the president/administration as a topic in Bush-Dukakis debate #1.

Questioner	= 21.74%
Dukakis (Opponent)	= 43.48%
H. W. Bush (VP)	= 08.70%
No One Brought It Up	= 26.09%

Table 74b. The nature of the initial prompt and the vice president's response to the initial prompt (praise, defend, minimize, criticize, neutral, none) in Bush-Dukakis debate #1.

PR 1	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 13	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	Criticize
Bush	None	Bush	None
Dukakis	None	Dukakis	Criticize
PR 2	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 14	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	Neutral	Questioner	None
Dukakis	None	Dukakis	None
Bush	Defend	Bush	None
PR 3	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 15	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Dukakis	Criticize	Dukakis	Neutral
Bush	None	Bush	Praise
PR 4	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 16	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
Dukakis	Criticize	Dukakis	Criticize
PR 5	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 17	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	Neutral
Bush	Praise	Bush	Praise
Dukakis	None	Dukakis	Criticize

PR 6	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None
Dukakis	Undeterminable
Bush	None

PR 7	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None
Dukakis	None
Bush	None

PR 8	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None
Bush	None
Dukakis	None

PR 9	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None
Bush	None
Dukakis	Criticize

PR 10	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None
Dukakis	None
Bush	Praise

PR 11	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None
Dukakis	Criticize
Bush	None

PR 12	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None
Bush	None
Dukakis	None

PR 18	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None
Dukakis	Criticize
Bush	None

PR 19	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None
Dukakis	Criticize
Bush	Defend

PR 20	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	Neutral
Bush	Praise
Dukakis	Criticize

PR 21	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None
Bush	None
Dukakis	None

PR 22	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	Neutral
Dukakis	None
Bush	None

PR 23	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None
Dukakis	Criticize
Bush	None

Bush-Dukakis 1988 Debate #2

This debate was broken up into 22 prompt-response pairs. Of these pairs, results show that Reagan/administration was brought up in 15 pairs, and was initially prompted by: the Questioner in 21.74% of the pairs, Dukakis in 17.39% of the pairs, and H. W. Bush in 26.09% of the pairs. In 34.78% of the pairs, no one brought it up. See Tables 75a and 75b.

Table 75a. The percentage of prompt-response pairs in which the questioner, the opponent and the vice president respectively was the initial prompter of the president/administration as a topic in Bush-Dukakis debate #2.

Questioner	= 21.74%
Dukakis (Opponent)	= 17.39%
H. W. Bush (VP)	= 26.09%
No One Brought It Up	= 34.78%

Table 75b. The nature of the initial prompt and the nature of the vice president's response to the initial prompt (praise, defend, minimize, criticize, neutral, none) in Bush-Dukakis debate #2.

PR 1	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 12	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Dukakis	Criticize	Dukakis	None
Bush	None	Bush	Neutral
PR 2	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 13	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Dukakis	None
Dukakis	None	Bush	None
PR 3	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 14	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	Criticize	Questioner	None
Bush	Defend	Bush	Praise
Dukakis	None	Dukakis	Criticize
PR 4	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 15	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Dukakis	None	Bush	Praise
Bush	None	Dukakis	None
		Questioner	None
		Bush	Praise
PR 5	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 16	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	Neutral	Questioner	None
Dukakis	None	Dukakis	Criticize
Bush	Praise	Bush	None
PR 6	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 17	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	Neutral	Dukakis	None
Dukakis	Neutral	Bush	None
PR 7	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 18	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	Neutral
Bush	Praise	Bush	Praise
Dukakis	None	Dukakis	None

137

PR 8	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 19	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	Neutral	Questioner	None
Dukakis	None	Bush	None
Bush	Praise	Dukakis	None
PR 9	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 20	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Dukakis	None	Dukakis	Criticize
Bush	Praise	Bush	None
PR 10	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 21	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Dukakis	Criticize
Dukakis	None	Bush	None
PR 11	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 22	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	Criticize
Bush	None	Bush	Neutral
Dukakis	None	Dukakis	Criticize

Gore-Bush 2000 Debate 1

This debate was broken up into 36 prompt-response pairs. Of these pairs, results show that Clinton/administration was brought up in 12 pairs, and was initially prompted by: the Questioner in 0% of the pairs, Bush in 30.56% of the pairs, and Gore in 2.78% of the pairs. In 66.67% of the pairs, no one brought it up. See Tables 76a and 76b.

Table 76a. The percentage of prompt-response pairs in which the questioner, the opponent and the vice president respectively was the initial prompter of the president/administration as a topic in Gore-Bush debate #1.

Questioner	= 00.00%
W. Bush (Opponent)	= 30.56%
Gore (VP)	= 02.78%
No One Brought It Up	= 66.67%

Table 76b. The nature of the initial prompt and the nature of the vice president's response to the initial prompt (praise, defend, minimize, criticize, neutral, none) in Gore-Bush debate #1.

PR 1	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 19	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	Neutral
Bush	Neutral		
PR 2	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 20	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	Neutral
Bush	None	Gore	None
		Bush2	None
PR 3	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 21	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Gore	None
Gore	None		
PR 4	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 22	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	Criticize	Bush	None
Gore	None	Gore	None
Bush 2	Criticize		
Gore 2	None	PR 23	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Bush 3	None	Questioner	None
Gore 3	None	Bush	Criticize
Bush 4	None		
Gore 4	None		
PR 5	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 24	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Gore	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
Gore 2	None	Gore2	None
Bush 2	Criticize		
Gore 3	None	PR 25	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Bush 3	None	Questioner	None
Gore 4	None	Bush	None
Bush 4	None	Gore	None

Gore 5	None	Bush2	None
		Gore2	None
		Bush3	None
PR 6	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 26**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
Bush	Criticize	Gore	None
PR 7	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 27**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
Bush	Criticize	Gore	None
Gore 2	None	Bush2	None
Bush 2	None	Gore2	None
PR 8	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 28**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Gore	None
Gore	None	Bush	Praise
PR 9	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 29**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
		Gore	Minimize
PR 10	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 30**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	Criticize
Gore	None	Gore	Undeterminable
Bush 2	None	Bush2	Criticize
		Gore 2	Undeterminable
		Bush 3	None
PR 11	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 31**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Gore	None
		Bush	None
PR 12	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	Gore2	None
Questioner	None	Bush2	None
Bush	None	Gore3	None

		Bush3	None
PR 13	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 32**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	Criticize
		Gore	None
PR 14	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 33**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
PR 15	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 34**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
Bush	None		
PR 16	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 35**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Gore	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
PR 17	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 36**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
Bush	None	Gore	None
		Bush2	None
PR 18	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**		
Questioner	None		
Bush	None		

Gore-Bush 2000 Debate #2

This debate was broken up into 76 prompt-response pairs. Of these pairs, results

show that Clinton/administration was brought up in 15 pairs, and was initially prompted

by: the Questioner in 1.32% of the pairs, Bush in 15.79% of the pairs, and Gore in 1.32%

of the pairs. In 81.58% of the pairs, no one brought it up. See Tables 77a and 77b.

Table 77a. The percentage of prompt-response pairs in which the questioner, the opponent and the vice president respectively was the initial prompter of the president/administration as a topic in Gore-Bush debate #2.

Questioner	= 01.32%
W. Bush (Opponent)	= 15.79%
Gore (VP)	= 01.32%
No One Brought It Up	= 81.58%

Table 77b. The nature of the initial prompt and the nature of the vice president's response to the initial prompt (praise, defend, minimize, criticize, neutral, none) in Gore-Bush debate #2.

PR 1	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 40	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Gore	None
Gore	None		
PR 2	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 41	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Gore	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
		Gore2	None
		Bush2	None
PR 3	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 42	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
		Gore	None

PR 4	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 43	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Gore	None
Bush	Praise		
PR 5	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 44	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
PR 6	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 45	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	Undeterminable	Bush	Undeterminable
		Gore	Undeterminable
PR 7	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 46	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
Bush	None		
PR 8	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 47	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	Neutral	Bush	None
		Gore	None
PR 9	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 48	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	Neutral	Questioner	None
Bush	Criticize	Bush	None
Gore	Defend		
PR 10	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 49	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
PR 11	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 50	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	Praise	Gore	None
		Bush	None
PR 12	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 51	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None

Bush	Praise	Gore	None
Gore	None		
Bush2	None		

PR 13	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 52**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Gore	None

PR 14	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 53**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Gore	None

PR 15	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 54**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Gore	None

PR 16	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 55**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
		Gore	None
		Bush2	None

PR 17	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 56**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
		Gore	None

PR 18	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 57**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	Criticize

PR 19	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 58**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Gore	None

PR 20	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 59**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None

PR 21	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 60**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None

Bush	None		Gore	None
			Bush	None

PR 22	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**		**PR 61**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None		Questioner	None
Bush	None		Bush	Criticize

PR 23	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**		**PR 62**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None		Questioner	None
Bush	None		Gore	None
			Bush	None

PR 24	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**		**PR 63**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None		Questioner	None
Bush	None		Bush	Praise

PR 25	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**		**PR 64**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None		Questioner	None
Bush	None		Gore	None

PR 26	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**		**PR 65**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None		Questioner	None
Bush	Praise		Gore	None

PR 27	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**		**PR 66**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None		Questioner	None
Gore	Criticize		Bush	None

PR 28	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**		**PR 67**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None		Questioner	None
Gore	None		Bush	None

PR 29	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**		**PR 68**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None		Questioner	None
Gore	None		Bush	None
			Gore	None
			Bush2	Criticize

PR 30	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**		**PR 69**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None		Questioner	None
Bush	Praise		Bush	None

		Gore	None

PR 31	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 70**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
Gore	None		

PR 32	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 71**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	Praise	Bush	None

PR 33	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 72**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
Bush	None		

PR 34	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 73**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
Bush	None		

PR 35	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 74**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	None

PR 36	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 75**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Gore	None

PR 37	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 76**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Gore	None
		Bush	None
PR 38	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	Gore2	None
Questioner	None	Bush2	None
Bush	None	Gore3	None

PR 39	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None
Bush	None

Gore-Bush 2000 Debate #3

This debate was broken up into 30 prompt-response pairs. Of these pairs, results show that Clinton/administration was brought up in 9 pairs, and was initially prompted by: the Questioner in 0% of the pairs, Bush in 13.33% of the pairs, and Gore in 16.67% of the pairs. In 70% of the pairs, no one brought it up. See Tables 78a and 78b.

Table 78a. The percentage of prompt-response pairs in which the questioner, the opponent and the vice president respectively was the initial prompter of the president/administration as a topic in the Gore-Bush debate #3.

Questioner	= 00.00%
W. Bush (Opponent)	= 13.33%
Gore (VP)	= 16.67%
No One Brought It Up	= 70.00%

Table 78b. The nature of the initial prompt and the nature of the vice president's response to the initial prompt (praise, defend, minimize, criticize, neutral, none) in Gore-Bush debate #3.

PR 1	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 16	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Gore	Praise
Bush	None	Bush	None
PR 2	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 17**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
		Gore	Praise
PR 3	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 18**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**

Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Gore	None
Gore	None	Bush	Criticism
Bush 2	None		

PR 4	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 19**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Gore	None
Gore	None		

PR 5	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 20**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
Bush	Criticize		

PR 6	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 21**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
Gore	None	Gore	None

PR 7	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 22**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
		Gore	None
		Bush	None

PR 8	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 23**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
		Gore	Praise

PR 9	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 24**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None

PR 10	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 25**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Gore	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
		Gore2	None
		Bush2	None

PR 11	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 26	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Gore	None
		Bush	None

PR 12	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 27	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	Neutral	Bush	None
Questioner2	Neutral	Gore	None
Gore	None		
Bush 2	None		

PR 13	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 28	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
		Gore	None

PR 14	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 29	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Gore	Praise
Gore	Praise	Bush	Criticism
Bush2	None		
Gore2	None		
Bush3	Criticism		
Gore3	None		

PR 15	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 30	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	Praise	Gore	None
Gore	Neutral	Bush	None

C. Are certain responses characteristic of certain prompts?

When the questioner or the opponent brings up the president/administration, they are prompting the vice president to discuss the subject. This question can point us to whether there are discernable patterns in the vice president's responses to these prompts.

For example, if the questioner or the opponent were to make a criticism, or even a critical inquiry, about the president/administration, we want to know if the vice president refutes it or ignores it. If he refutes it, does he do it by praising, defending, minimizing or using neutral terms about the president/administration? Or does the vice president acknowledge and accept the criticism?

There were some discernable patterns in the vice president's responses to prompts. In 1960, when a questioner or Kennedy would prompt the topic of Eisenhower/administration, Nixon would almost always respond with a praise, defense or neutral statement. In 1984, when Reagan would prompt the topic of Carter/administration, which he did often, Mondale would almost always ignore these prompts by not responding about Carter/administration. Similarly, when the questioner would prompt the topic of Carter/administration, Mondale ignored these prompts as well. In both 1988 presidential debates, if the questioner made a neutral statement about Reagan/administration, George H. W. Bush would often respond by praising Reagan/administration, but often he would not respond to Dukakis' criticisms of Reagan/administration. In the first debate in 2000, George W. Bush used 9 of his speaking turns to criticize Clinton/administration. In every case, Gore did not respond with a comment about Clinton/administration, except for one instance, which was "undeterminable" by coders. In the second debate in 2000, George W. Bush praised Clinton/administration in 7 speaking turns, criticized Clinton/administration in 4 speaking turns, and used one of his speaking turns to make neutral comments about Clinton/administration. In every case, except one, Gore did not respond with a comment

about Clinton/administration. In the third debate, Gore responded to Bush's criticisms more often.

D. Do the answers to subquestions A, B, and C differ election to election?

Yes, while Nixon (1960) and Bush (1988) often discussed their respective presidents/administrations in their debates, Mondale (1984) and Gore (2000) did so far more rarely. In 1960, Nixon would often praise or defend Eisenhower/administration, and would bring it up on his own at least as often as the Questioner or Kennedy would prompt it, and in the fourth debate, brought it up more often than either the Questioner or Kennedy. In 1988, George H.W. Bush would often praise Reagan/administration, but in the first debate, Dukakis was more often the initial prompter, whereas is the second debate, H. W. Bush was more often the initial prompter. Mondale virtually never mentioned Carter/administration, even when the Questioner or Reagan would prompt it. In the first and second debate in 2000, Gore almost never mentioned Clinton/administration, even though his opponent George W. Bush prompted it most of the time. Coders also determined that Gore criticized Clinton/administration in Debate #2, something no other vice president did across any of their ads, speeches and debate statements. In the third debate, however, Gore began to discuss Clinton/administration much more often with praise, and was most often the initial prompter of the topic. In fact, in the third debate, Gore even made a point of responding to a question Bush repeatedly asked in the first debate – "Why haven't they done it?" Gore also praised Clinton/administration in 25% of his speech units in his Debate #3 closing statement.

Chapter 5: Discussion

This study has looked at the unique rhetorical situation facing vice presidents who run for president. I used a content analysis to systematically determine how each vice president negotiated their association with their president/administration. This study will now turn to a discussion of the results.

Finding #1: Nixon (1960) strongly aligned with Eisenhower/administration more than any other vice president.

Because Eisenhower was popular, we would expect Nixon to discuss him often in 1960. Nixon did so in all of the communication channels studied here – ads, speeches and debates. In stark contrast to the other vice presidents, Nixon is the only one to devote a substantial number of ads to discussing his president/administration, doing so in five out of eight (62.5%) of his ads studied here. That Nixon discussed and depicted Eisenhower/administration in most of his television ads may be a particularly strong sign of his desire to align himself with Eisenhower/administration. This is because ads (like speeches, but unlike debates) are in the direct control of the candidate's campaign, and therefore the content reflects a more conscious choice.

Nixon mentioned Eisenhower/administration often in his speeches, including doing so in 100% of the speech units in a televised speech he gave a day before Election Day. Nixon's heavy praising of Eisenhower/administration in this speech (83.33% of his speech units), suggests that he felt that reaffirming his association with Eisenhower/administration would be the best rhetorical approach to take, because

presumably, a candidate would use what he thought were his most effective arguments in the final days of the campaign.

During all four debates, Nixon often praised Eisenhower/administration, and often brought it up without being prompted by a questioner or Kennedy. In fact, the results show that as the debates went on, Nixon was increasingly the one who would be the first to bring up Eisenhower/administration. In the third debate, Nixon was just as often the first one to bring up Eisenhower/administration in the prompt-response pair, as was the questioner or Kennedy. In the fourth debate, Nixon was most often the initial prompter, bringing up Eisenhower/administration in 42.86% of the prompt-response pairs. This trend toward more initial prompting of Eisenhower/administration as the debates went on provides further support that Nixon chose to strongly align himself with Eisenhower/administration.

Nixon may also have felt the need to strongly associate himself with the popular Eisenhower/administration to repair any perceived political damage resulting from Eisenhower's remark at the press conference – "If you give me a week I might think of one. I don't remember," – in response to a question about which of Nixon's ideas he had adopted. Nixon may have felt the need to counteract the negative effect of this statement, as it was used against him in a television ad for Kennedy, brought up in the first presidential debate by one of panelists, and widely quoted in the newspapers. In fact, one of Nixon's ads studied here titled *Best Qualified* – shows President Eisenhower giving a speech in front of a cheering crowd, with large pictures of Nixon and his running mate Henry Cabot Lodge hanging behind him. Eisenhower provides a solid endorsement of Nixon, praising his "experience, maturity and knowledge." Given Eisenhower's

popularity, his endorsement of Nixon, and praising of Nixon's knowledge could help

further Nixon's image as a capable leader who is intelligent – a trait that Sigel (1966) and

Nimmo and Mansfield (1985, cited in Hellweg, 2004) found to be important for a

presidential candidate.

History.com (2013) reports that this ad was designed to repair the damage done

by Eisenhower's comment at the press briefing. Nixon may also have felt it necessary to

stress his association with Eisenhower, in lieu of the president's inability to campaign for

him due to poor health. Whatever his exact motivation, these results show that in trying

to achieve a balance between loyalty and independence, Nixon tilted strongly toward

loyalty. By often citing the record of the Eisenhower administration in various ads,

speeches and debates, Nixon may have helped himself by establishing the image of

competence, a trait that image scholars McCroskey, Jensen, and Todd (1972, cited in

Hellweg, 2004), and Miller, Wattenberg and Malanchuk (1986, cited in Hellweg, 2004)

found to be important for political candidates. But Nixon's strong reinforcement of his

association to Eisenhower may also have worked to suggest that he couldn't stand on his

own. This may have compromised his ability to establish the image traits of strength and

independence – traits that scholars Sigel (1966) and Nimmo and Savage (1976) said the

public values in a president.

Finding #2: Nixon (1960) defended his president more than any other vice president.

Nixon defended his president/administration far more often than other vice

presidents did theirs, doing so in the debates and in many of his speeches. Because of the

argumentative nature of debates, one might expect Nixon to defend

Eisenhower/administration in the debates, which he did in 9.72% of all of his debate turns

and speech units in his opening and closing statements. In doing so, Nixon was

exhibiting the qualities of a good debater. Yet, Nixon defended

Eisenhower/administration in 6.49% of the units in his five speeches studied here. To put

this in comparative perspective, there was not a single instance in which any other vice

president *defended* their president/administration in their speeches studied here. In his

speeches, Nixon would bring up an attack made by one of his critics about

Eisenhower/administration and then refute it. For example in one of the speeches studied

here, Nixon brings up and refutes an attack made by Kennedy that America has not been

progressing during the Eisenhower years:

> … some of you may have heard the stories that have been going around a great
>
> deal to the effect, particularly in speeches by our opponents, that America has
>
> been standing still for the last seven and a half years. We haven't been moving.
>
> Oh we're not moving. We've got to get going again and the way to get going
>
> again, they say give us the reins and we will cross the new frontiers. . . .Listen,
>
> anybody that says America has been standing still for the last seven years hasn't
>
> been traveling in America. He's been traveling someplace else or he's got blinders
>
> on, one of the two. I ask you to judge for yourself. Travel around this country.
>
> Look at the new developments. Look at the new schools, the new highways.
>
> (1960, Annenberg CD-ROM)

While Nixon does refute his opponent's charge, he also repeats the charge more than

once, giving it salience.

Nixon's use of defense in his speeches was an unexpected finding, because in

speeches one is not subject to direct and immediate attacks from opponents, as they are in

debates. Nixon's approach seems consistent with James David Barber's (1972) description of his rhetorical style: "Nixon lives in a fighting world; his writing and speaking are full of the imagery of combat. He sees himself as forever engaged in battles…" (p. 363).

Nixon's large use of *defense* may have created a problem for his campaign, as he may have spent too much time on his opponent's ground. Benoit and Airne (2005) note three drawbacks for a candidate when they employ defense:

> They make the candidate appear reactive rather than proactive. Given that one usually is attacked over one's weaknesses, defenses are likely to take a candidate off-message. Furthermore, one must identify an attack to refute it. This means that defending against an attack may remind or inform voters of an alleged weakness. (p. 227)

Being reactive and being off message certainly runs counter to the image of a leader that is capable of articulating a positive future vision. And reminding voters of alleged weaknesses can certainly cast doubt on Nixon's competence, an important candidate image trait discussed by McCroskey, Jensen, and Todd (1972, cited in Hellweg, 2004) and Miller, Wattenberg and Malanchuk (1986, cited in Hellweg, 2004).

Finding #3: Humphrey praised Johnson/administration, even as he arguably had good reasons to disassociate himself.

Because Johnson was unpopular in 1968, we would expect that Humphrey would not discuss him often. Yet, Humphrey praised Johnson in 20.29% of his speech units across all five of his speeches. Humphrey praised Johnson more (27.27% of his speech units) at the speech in Houston – one of his final speeches before Election Day – than in

his other speeches studied here. At the Houston event, Humphrey explicitly reaffirmed

his loyalty, saying that: "I have been, at least I have tried to be, and I will continue to be

for all the years to come, his faithful friend, and during these months of his presidency,

his loyal vice president, and proud of it" (1968, Annenberg CD-ROM). Humphrey also

said of Johnson, "Thank God for such leadership" (1968, Annenberg CD-ROM).

Statements like these serve to reinforce his image as that of the subordinate, dutiful son,

or traditional wife. Doing so, however, makes some sense because Johnson was present

at the event, it was Johnson's home state, and Humphrey needed Texas to win the

election. While it probably helped him win Texas, national media coverage of the event

may have reinforced Humphrey's connection to an unpopular president, and could have

hurt him in other parts of the country.

Humphrey's choices to praise Johnson and reaffirm his association with the

Johnson administration seems to have been affected by the rhetorical constraints he

faced, including his fear of rebuke by Johnson, his concern that U.S. troops and the peace

process could be put at risk if he spoke too strongly against Vietnam, and his personal

feelings about Johnson. Recall that he was reportedly "heartbroken" at the prospect of

breaking from Johnson and said that he would rather lose the election than allow the

appearance that he was turning against his president (Goldstein, 1997). White (1969)

aptly summarized Humphrey's constraints: "[He] could not attack his own

administration—nor did he dare defend the issue before the electorate and the divided

party. Thus a man of peace committed to a war, Humphrey waffled and wobbled" (p.

341).

In reinforcing his association with Johnson, Humphrey may have left himself open to the perception that he was weak, dependent on Johnson, and unable to take a firm stand on an important issue. As a result, he compromises his ability to establish an image of someone who is strong, independent and capable of taking a firm stand – three traits that Sigel (1966), Nimmo and Savage (1976) and Nimmo and Mansfield (1985) say the public values in a president.

Finding #4: Humphrey's break from Johnson in his Salt Lake City speech may not have been as strong as some commentators might believe.

Humphrey's Salt Lake City address, delivered on September 30, 1968 has been judged by scholars and other political observers as the one when he distanced himself from Johnson's policy on Vietnam. For instance, scholar Bernard Brock (1969) asserted that in this speech, Humphrey "outlined his present stand on Vietnam, a policy that appeared to differ significantly from the administration's" (p. 34). Also, many other observers, including the previously cited Benedetto (1999), Kuttner (2000), and the July 23, 1984 editorial by the Christian Science Monitor titled "Mondale's America" made the same assertion, and followed it with the argument that had Humphrey broken from Johnson earlier in the campaign he would have won the election. The results of this study show that these observations are perhaps over simplified to some extent.

Humphrey did create more space between himself and the president by shedding his traditional vice-presidential seal, and introducing himself not as the vice president, but as a "citizen and as a candidate for president of the United States" (1968, Annenberg CD-ROM). In this speech, Humphrey tried to establish the image of an independent figure

and a leader, two traits that presidential candidate image scholars note are important. Because vice presidents are seen as lacking the traits of independence and leadership, it was imperative that Humphrey do this. He says that "For the past four years, I have spoken my mind about Vietnam, frankly and without reservation, in the cabinet and in the National Security Council--and directly to the president" (1968, Annenberg CD-ROM). After saying that he would continue to support Johnson for the remainder of the president's term, Humphrey signals a break from Johnson by saying "But 112 days from now, there will be a new president … a new administration and new advisers" (1968, Annenberg CD-ROM). He says the new president will make a "complete reassessment" of the policy toward Vietnam, and that "As president, I would be willing to stop the bombing of the North as an acceptable risk for peace because I believe it could lead to success in the negotiations and a shorter war" (1968, Annenberg CD-ROM).

But in some ways, this speech can also be seen as a validation of Johnson's Vietnam policy. For one thing, Humphrey still made the point of praising Johnson in 8.33% of the units in this speech. Humphrey praised the accomplishments of Johnson's Vietnam policy, saying that "other nations of Southeast Asia—given the time we have bought for them—have strengthened themselves" and that in South Vietnam, a "constitution has been written…elections have been stepped up…and the South Vietnamese Army has increased its size and capacity, and improved its equipment, training and performance" (1968, Annenberg CD-ROM). Humphrey concluded this section of the speech by saying that "in contrast to a few months ago—we see peace negotiations going on. We see a stronger Southeast Asia. We see a stronger South Vietnam" (1968, Annenberg CD-ROM). While appearing not to speak for the

160

administration, Humphrey is making a case for the Johnson administration's success. In this sense, Humphrey appeared to be running on the record of the Johnson administration.

Humphrey used these successes of the administration as the basis for what choices he would make, if elected president. Humphrey called for a "de-Americanization of the war" and that this can be possible next year "if the South Vietnamese Army maintains its present rate of improvement" (1968, Annenberg CD-ROM). Humphrey implies that we are in a position to bring troops home, because of the "present rate of improvement," which can be seen as an accomplishment of the administration's Vietnam policy. In addition, Johnson had already been working toward a "de-americanization of the war" as he had called for in his March 31 resignation speech (Solberg, 1984). So Humphrey's campaign for president can be seen as an effort to accomplish the unfinished business of the Johnson administration. Johnson's eventual bombing halt on October 31, 1968, to start the peace talks may have functioned as evidence to support the claims Humphrey made in this address about the administration's accomplishments. Some people may have gone to the polls in 1968 to vote for Humphrey because he would symbolize the fruition of Johnson's efforts rather than the repudiation of these efforts.

Second, Humphrey's position can be seen as consistent with the Johnson administration's position that a bombing halt can only occur if the North Vietnamese agree to a reciprocal military suspension. At first, Humphrey appeared to be offering something new when he said:

As president, I would stop the bombing of the North as an acceptable risk for

peace because I believe it could lead to success in the negotiations and thereby

shorten the war. This would be the best protection for our troops. (1968,

Annenberg CD-ROM)

This sounded straightforward and became a signal for many anti-war Democrats to rally

around Humphrey. But Humphrey went on to suggest what could be interpreted as a

conditional pledge to halt the bombing. He said,

In weighing that risk—and before taking action—I would place key importance

on evidence—direct or indirect—by deed or word—of Communist willingness to

restore the demilitarized zone between North and South Vietnam. Now if the

government of North Vietnam were to show bad faith, I would reserve the right to

resume the bombing (1968, Annenberg CD-ROM).

How was this different from the Johnson administration's standard position? By saying

he "would place importance on key evidence…of Communist willingness," he is

imposing a condition of reciprocity onto North Vietnam, just as Johnson demanded

reciprocity as a condition for halting the bombing as well.

Also, Humphrey noted the penalty for non-compliance. If Hanoi shows "bad

faith" then the bombing will resume – consistent with Johnson's resumptions of bombing

on previous occasions. Humphrey continued to call for reciprocity when he said, "We

can bring our forces home from South Vietnam, if the North Vietnamese agree to bring

theirs home at the same time" (1968, Annenberg CD-ROM). Thus, Humphrey continues

to place conditions on the ending of the war. Humphrey may have been deliberately

ambiguous to send different messages to different audiences. He may have intended to

send one message to anti-war Democrats that he shared their views and would bring

about an end to the war. He may also have wanted to maintain his "complete and

unswerving" loyalty pledge to Johnson and allow Johnson to have the maximum possible leverage during the Paris peace talks.

Humphrey's bombing halt proposal was consistent with Johnson's policy during the past year. For instance, in the summer of 1967, in a plan called the "San Antonio" formula, Johnson offered a limited bombing pause in exchange for peace talks. Also, in March of 1968, according to Pentagon Paper #134, the administration announced a plan to remove a large portion of land in North Vietnam from the bombing campaign, and if North Vietnam reciprocated with a military reduction of their own, a full and total bombing halt might follow (Sheehan, 1971). In both of these efforts, North Vietnam refused to accept the conditions of reciprocity. Humphrey's bombing halt proposal was similar in that it called for reciprocity from North Vietnam, and therefore is consistent with Johnson's policy.

Evidence from different sources suggested that the speech was not a significant break from Johnson. First, North Vietnam said that Humphrey's position was "nothing new" from the Johnson administration as he was calling for the same conditions of reciprocity, and dismissed it as a campaign maneuver (Smith, 1968, p. 1). Second, Johnson administration officials had said privately that Humphrey had not made a significant break from administration policy (Gwertzman, 1968). Johnson also privately told Senator Everett Dirksen (R-Illinois) in a phone call that Humphrey's position was not a significant divergence from the administration. Johnson said, "It interpreted, I think—a literal interpretation would show there's no great difference in our present policy. I think his intention is to try to do that without and still leave the impression that there is—get what I mean? ("Telephone conversation between," 1968). Humphrey's way

163

of balancing loyalty with independence was to stick closely to Johnson's policy, but create the appearance that he was breaking from the policy.

Third, when asked to clarify his position in post-speech interviews, Humphrey was ambiguous and evasive, saying:

> What I have said is my position. I haven't tried to equate positions with the Administration or with the critics. If this happens to agree with some parts of Administration policy, well and good; if it disagrees, that's the way it has to be. If it agrees with some position somebody else has taken, well and good; if it disagrees, so be it. I can't outguess the newspapers, the columnists, the Administration, and Hanoi—I just can't outguess them. (Apple, 1968, p. 26)

Humphrey's rebuttal may have functioned to convey his independence from Johnson, his critics, and North Vietnam. Again, he invites the audience to see him as an independent person. In addition, his ambiguity both in the speech and in his rebuttal statement may have functioned to keep both hawks and doves unclear as to what his ultimate decisions would be on Vietnam.

Fourth, Eugene McCarthy, whose youth and anti-war constituency was the support that Humphrey badly needed, did not think Humphrey's position was a break from Johnson. He said Humphrey's remarks in the Salt Lake city speech were "good openers for twenty-five cent poker" and added that he did not consider it a "significant move from Johnson" (Eisele, 1972, p. 393). Thus, while Humphrey's speech may have benefited him politically, by rallying the liberal base, and by helping establish the image traits of independence, leadership, and strength, his position on Vietnam was very much consistent with Johnson's policy.

Finding #5: Nixon's 1968 campaign contrasted with his 1960 campaign in how he discussed Eisenhower/administration.

In his 1968 campaign, Nixon seemed to take an opposite approach from his 1960 campaign, in terms of how he negotiated his relationship with Eisenhower/administration. In his 1960 speeches, Nixon often discussed Eisenhower/administration. In 1968, he rarely discussed Eisenhower/administration, except for a brief mention in his nomination acceptance address, and a lengthy mention in one particular speech: a Washington DC address on CBS radio in October, when he praised Eisenhower/administration often (26.67% of his speech units).

Similarly, Nixon's 1968 television ads were also fundamentally different from his 1960 television ads. Nixon often discussed or depicted Eisenhower in his 1960 television ads, but never did so in his 1968 television ads. In 1968, as a former vice president, Nixon did not have to answer for the Eisenhower-Nixon administration. Because of the high profile problems in the country, including the Vietnam War and rising crime and rioting in urban areas, Nixon may have decided that staying on the offensive and attacking his opponent's record would be a better way to campaign. This approach was in contrast to his more *defensive* style in 1960. Having run as a sitting vice president himself only eight years prior, Nixon may have understood better than most what arguments might be most effective against incumbent vice president Humphrey. Also, because presidential debates were not held in 1968, Nixon did not have to face direct questions or attacks about Eisenhower/administration, in which he would have to respond.

Finding #6: Mondale hardly mentioned Carter/administration.

In his 1984 campaign, Mondale never mentioned Carter/administration in the television ads studied here. Of the five speeches studied here, Mondale discussed Carter/administration in three speeches, albeit minimally. Two of the three speeches were the announcement and the nomination acceptance address, where mentioning Carter/administration makes some sense because these two speeches are at least somewhat more geared toward Democratic Party audiences.

During the debates, Mondale made a neutral comment about Carter/administration in one of his turns in the first debate, but did not discuss Carter/administration at all in the second debate. Even as Reagan criticized Carter/administration several times, Mondale never defended Carter. Mondale's refusal to discuss Carter/administration in the debates, even when the questioner or Reagan brought Carter/administration up (which they did 14 times across both debates), indicates a strong desire on Mondale's part to keep the focus off his own connection to Carter/administration. His approach makes sense because of the unpopularity of the Carter administration. Because Mondale was not a sitting vice president in 1984, he may have thought it unnecessary to be loyal to Carter/administration, and could instead concentrate his attacks on Reagan's record. In doing so, Mondale helps establish his independence, an important candidate image trait. Also, as competence and strength are important candidate image traits, Mondale also mitigates the perception of incompetence and weakness by directing attention away from his past association with the Carter administration.

Finding #7: Bush demonstrated a more balanced approach than other vice presidents in terms of the way he negotiated his relationship with President Reagan.

Like Nixon in 1960, George H. W. Bush discussed Reagan/administration often in 1988. Doing so made sense, because Reagan, like Eisenhower, was a popular president. H. W. Bush praised Reagan/administration fairly often in the speeches. He heavily praised Reagan in his election week speech at Notre Dame University (in 21.43% of the speech units) suggesting that he thought aligning himself with Reagan/administration was one of his best arguments for his candidacy and/or because the speech was being given in Indiana, a conservative state where Reagan most certainly was popular. H. W. Bush also praised Reagan/administration very often in the debates, and in the second debate, did so more often on his own, rather than when others prompted him, suggesting a strong willingness to align himself with Reagan/administration.

Unlike Nixon in 1960, however, Bush did not discuss Reagan/administration in any of his television ads, and depicted him in only one television ad.

We can speculate on some reasons why Bush chose not to use his ads to convey his association with his president/administration. First, Bush had many advantages coming in to the 1988 election, including a strong economy and the unequivocal backing of a popular sitting president, and the administration's foreign policy accomplishments, particularly with U.S.-Soviet relations. These advantages may have given Bush flexibility in his rhetorical choices. He could be more selective in determining how to use his speeches, ads and debates to craft a balance between associating himself with Reagan/administration and cultivating a more independent persona. This balance has to be achieved by vice presidents who run for president, as has been argued by previously

cited scholars including Natoli (1985), Goldstein (1997), and Kincade (2000). Also, as Sigel (1966) found, independence is among the top three traits that the public believes a president should possess. Bush may have chosen to use his 30 and 60 second ads to cultivate a positive and independent image of himself (and cultivate a negative image of his opponent), and use his speeches and debates to discuss his association with Reagan/administration, as these formats would accord him more time.

Second, because ad production techniques had substantially improved since 1960, Bush had more options about how to use ads than Nixon did in 1960. West (1997) points out that while ads in the 1950's were rudimentary and often of the "talking head" style, more recent ads are much more visually exciting, using catchy visuals, color and sound.

For instance, one of Bush's ads titled, *Family/Children*, plays soft background music, and shows George Bush hugging and playing with his grandchildren. The ad opens with one of the grandkids running in slow motion. His wife, Barbara Bush talks about her husband, saying,

> I wish people could see him as I see him. Thousands of people see him, and you
> know, I always loved the time someone said to George, 'How can you run for
> president – you don't have any constituency!' and George said, 'Well, you know,
> I've got a great big family, and thousands of friends,' and that's what he has!

Then as pictures of Bush appear on screen – as a young WWII soldier, as U.N. ambassador, and as he takes the oath of office for vice president and in other settings – a male announcer says,

> For more than forty years, George Bush has met every challenge his country and
> the world have offered up to him. The truth is, the more you learn about George

Bush, the more you realize that perhaps no one in this century is better prepared to

be President of the United States.

Bush's depiction of family in his ads helps him establish his likability, an image trait that

Roberts (1981) and Smith (1990) argued is important for president candidates to possess.

Also, recall that West (1997) and Trent and Friedenberg (2004) noted that images of

family in television ads can help candidates establish a positive image because pictures

carry a more powerful emotional weight than the spoken word.

Bush also used many of his ads to attack opponent Michael Dukakis. One of the

most famous of these is the *Revolving Door* ad, which was analyzed in this study. This

ad combined images of prisoners going through a revolving door and prison guards

armed with guns, along with ominous sounds of clanging metal to create a "soft on

crime" image of Dukakis. By cultivating an image of Dukakis as weak, this ad may have

serve to establish Bush's strength in comparison, because as Hellweg and Dionisopoulous

(1989) noted, a candidate's image is assessed in comparison to others, like their

opponent. And as Sigel (1966) found, strength is an image trait that the public values in a

candidate.

In the one ad that includes a depiction of Reagan, Bush skillfully aligns himself

with Reagan, while also establishing his independence, leadership and strength, three

important image traits. The ad titled, *Gorbachev*, opens showing Bush shaking hands

with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, with Reagan standing to the side smiling. All

three men are standing in front of the south side of the White House. Then the camera

zooms in on Bush and Gorbachev, excluding Reagan from the frame. This ad allows

Bush to both connect himself to the popular Reagan, and invite voters to transfer their

positive feelings from Reagan – including perceptions of his image as a leader -- onto

Bush. Also, by showcasing Bush with the Soviet leader, Bush elevates his stature, and

suggests that he has the strength and gravitas to be president, as Sigel (1966) argued was

important. With the image of the White House as a backdrop, and Bush's firm

handshake and serious look, this ad makes Bush appear presidential. In doing so, this ad

helps Bush shed the "lapdog" and "wimp" image. This ad was also thematically

consistent with a point Bush made in his nomination acceptance address when he said our

nation was at a "watershed" moment in our relations with the Soviet Union, and posed

the question, "when you have to change horses in midstream, doesn't it make sense to

switch to the one who's going the same way?" (1988, Annenberg CD-ROM). The

thematic consistency supports the notion that Bush has integrity, an important image trait

that Nimmo and Savage (1976), Nimmo and Mansfield (1985, cited in Hellweg, 2004)

and Miller, Wattenberg and Malanchuk (1986, cited in Hellweg, 2004) argue were

important.

Finding #8: Gore broke strongly from Clinton/administration throughout his

campaign, but reconnected himself in the final debate.

In 2000, Gore made no mention of Clinton/administration in his ads, and rarely

did so in the speeches. In the first and second debate, Gore never praised

Clinton/administration, defended only once, and even minimized once. In the first debate

in 2000, George W. Bush used 9 of his speaking turns to criticize Clinton/administration.

In every case, Gore did not respond with a comment about Clinton/administration, except

for two instances, which were "undeterminable" by coders. Without being prompted,

Gore minimized Clinton/administration in one of his speaking turns. In the second debate in 2000, George W. Bush praised Clinton/administration in 7 speaking turns, criticized Clinton/administration in 4 speaking turns, and used one of his speaking turns to make neutral comments about Clinton/administration. In every case, except one where he defended Clinton/administration, Gore did not respond with a comment about Clinton/administration. Gore also made the point of criticizing the Clinton administration in one of his speaking turns. Also, Gore never mentioned Clinton's name at any time during all three debates.

While it's understandable that Gore would personally distance himself from Clinton because of the Lewinsky scandal, one might expect he would discuss the administration's record more often, as Clinton's job approval rating was high, and there were many achievements to cite such as the strong job growth, projected budget surpluses, welfare reform, crime reduction, and peace in Bosnia and Northern Ireland. At a minimum, one might expect that Gore would defend the Clinton administration record from his opponent's attacks, because he was a member of the administration.

Gore's failure to praise or defend Clinton may have been an attempt on his part to distance himself from Clinton, and therefore, distance himself from the Clinton scandals. Additionally, however, Gore may have chosen a strategy of staying on the offensive and attacking Bush, rather than be on the defensive by rebutting attacks against Clinton/administration. Also, this data reveals that Gore's approach in his ads, speeches, and first two debates was in line with the strategy of focusing on the future, which his campaign strategist Carter Eskew had noted was a decision made in June of 2000, after

Gore failed to gain poll traction when he would cite the Clinton administration's accomplishments.

In the third debate however, Gore's discussion of Clinton/administration shot up considerably. He praised Clinton/administration in 17.24% of his speaking turns, discussed Clinton/administration neutrally in 3.45% of his speaking turns, and praised Clinton/administration in 25% of the speech units in his closing statement. Also, in the third debate, Gore was most often the first one to bring up Clinton/administration within the prompt-response pair. In the third debate, Gore began responding to a criticism by George W. Bush about Clinton/administration that he made been making since the first debate held two weeks earlier. Bush repeatedly charged that Clinton and Gore had failed to keep promises made on issues like prescription drugs for seniors, Social Security, Medicare, and promoting a bipartisan climate in Washington. In the first debate, Gore chose not to rebut these charges. But when Bush made the same charge in the third debate, Gore jumped at the opportunity to respond, saying: "Hey, I've got to answer that, Jim. Medicare -- I cast the tie-breaking vote to add 26 years to the life of Medicare. It was due to go bankrupt in 1999…" (2000, Commission on Presidential Debates).

Later in the debate: Gore made a similar response saying that:

I am a person who keeps promises. And, you know, we've heard a lot about -- from the governor about not much being done in the last eight years, as if the promises that I made eight years ago have not been kept. I think the record shows otherwise. We have gone from the biggest deficits eight years ago to the biggest surpluses in history today. Instead of high unemployment, we now have the lowest African-American unemployment, the lowest Latino unemployment ever

172

measured. 22 million new jobs, very low unemployment nationally. Instead of

ballooning the debt and multiplying it four times over, we have seen the debt

actually begun to be paid down. (2000, Commission on Presidential Debates)

While Gore is citing the Clinton administration's record, it's interesting to note

that in both of these two examples, Gore discusses it in terms of what <u>he</u> did – the vote <u>he</u>

cast, and the promises <u>he</u> made, rather than discuss Clinton's role in it. This tactic may

be an attempt to get credit for Clinton administration accomplishments, but also strike an

independent chord in order to craft the image of a leader. In this way, Gore is attempting

to solve the challenges that Kincade noted earlier – the need for a vice president to

demonstrate independence, claim credit for administration achievements (but avoid the

taint of scandals), and also demonstrate their independence. These are also image traits

that several scholars including Sigel (1966), Nimmo and Mansfield (1985) and

McCroskey, Jensen and Todd (1972) noted are important ones for presidential candidates

to possess. Also, by stressing that "I am a person who keeps promises," Gore is

attempting to establish his integrity, another candidate image trait that Nimmo and

Savage (1976) found to be an important one. This effort may have been especially

important for Gore, because of Bush's attack that Gore was prone to reinventing himself.

Gore's greater praising of Clinton/administration in the third debate, and the fact

that he brought up Clinton/administration more often on his own without being prompted,

and brought this topic up more than the questioner or his opponent, was in marked

contrast to the first two debates, where he rarely discussed Clinton/administration, even

when he was prompted numerous times by the questioner or his opponent. These

findings suggest that Gore may have made a strategic rhetorical shift in the third debate,

because, as previously discussed in the historical/contextual review, his first two debate performances were viewed poorly, and he was losing ground in the polls so late in the election cycle.

Gore's choice to almost never discuss Clinton/administration in his ads, speeches and debates (except for the final debate) may have been viewed as incongruent with the role Gore played as vice president for eight years, when he often praised and defended Clinton, even during the controversial impeachment process. Gore's fluctuations, affirming, disavowing, and then reaffirming Clinton/administration may have bolstered a negative characterization of him by the media and his opponent George W. Bush – that he was somebody who was prone to reinventing himself, and would say or do anything to become president. This perception of Gore implied that he not only lacked integrity, but also strength, two important candidate image traits.

Concerns about Gore's authenticity and honesty may have affected his ability to cultivate a positive public image. These problems partly stemmed from his association with the truth-challenged Clinton administration. Recall that Trent, Short-Thompson, Mongeau, Nusz, and Trent (2001) found that honesty, talking about the nation's problems, and having high moral character were highly ranked categories by the public across the presidential elections of 1988 through 2000, and that the image categories of having high moral character and faithfulness to one's spouse were found to be increasingly important across these elections. This finding may be a result of contextual factors such as the Clinton-Lewinsky affair, and Clinton's impeachment during the 1990's. Thus, Clinton's scandals may have primed the public to focus more heavily on honesty and character in the 2000 election. Gore's reinventions and exaggerations during

174

the campaign may have been viewed more negatively in this election climate, than they otherwise might have been had Gore not been Clinton's vice president, or had he run for president in a different election year.

Finding #9: Vice presidents generally use the nomination acceptance speech to break from the president/administration.

Each vice president discussed their president/administration in differing amounts across the speeches, ads and debates studied here. The nomination speech was one constant in which it was observed that vice presidents make a point of praising their president, and signaling some kind of break with them, in which they establish their independence and state their own vision for the country. This becomes a way to balance loyalty to the president with being "their own man." This section provides a look at how each vice president balanced their loyalty with their need to establish independence. This analysis can point us to a way to apply genre analysis to understand how well future vice presidents are able to conduct this rhetorical move in their presidential nomination acceptance.

While all vice presidents made a point of paying tribute to their president/administration, Nixon (1960), Mondale, Bush, and Gore were more explicit in signaling a break. Humphrey was much more subtle and implicit. In contrast, Nixon (1968) didn't directly signal a break from Eisenhower. Instead he mentioned Eisenhower as one reason why his campaign would prevail.

Nixon (1960)

> Nixon said,
>
> It was only eight years ago that I stood in this very place after you had nominated
>
> as our candidate for the president, one of the great men of our century, and I say
>
> to you tonight that for generations to come Americans, regardless of party, will
>
> gratefully remember Dwight Eisenhower as the man who brought peace to
>
> America, as the man under whose leadership Americans enjoyed the greatest
>
> progress and prosperity in history, but above all they will remember him as the
>
> man who restored honesty, integrity and dignity to the conduct of government in
>
> the highest office of this land. (1960, Annenberg CD-ROM)

Then Nixon cautiously starts to signal his independence from Eisenhower/administration.
He says:

> My fellow Americans, I know now that you will understand what I next say
>
> because the next president of the United States will have his great example to
>
> follow; because the next president will have new and challenging problems in the
>
> world of utmost gravity. This truly is the time for greatness in America's
>
> leadership. First, we are proud to offer the best eight-year record of any
>
> administration in the history of this country. But, my fellow Americans, that isn't
>
> all, and that isn't enough, because we happen to believe that a record is not
>
> something to stand on but something to build on, and building on the great record
>
> of this administration we shall build a better America. We shall build an America
>
> in which we shall see the realization of the dreams, the dreams of millions of
>
> people not only in America but throughout the world for a fuller, freer, richer life
>
> than men have ever known in the history of mankind. (1960, Annenberg CD-

ROM)

While Nixon praises Eisenhower's character and accomplishments, Nixon suggests that it "isn't enough," and that his presidency would do better. In doing so, Nixon tries to establish himself as an independent figure, and one who has his own ideas, two image traits that Sigel (1966) found the public values in a president.

Humphrey (1968)

In his convention speech, Humphrey's break from Johnson was more implicit and subtle than the other vice presidents. Like the others, Humphrey began by paying tribute to Johnson. He said:

And what we are doing is in the tradition of Lyndon B. Johnson, who rallied a grief-stricken nation when our leader was stricken by the assassin's bullet and said to you and said to me, and said to all the world, "Let us continue." And in the space, and in the space of five years since that tragic moment, President Johnson has accomplished more of the unfinished business of America than any of his modern predecessors. And I truly believe that history will surely record the greatness of his contribution to the people of this land. And tonight to you, Mr. President, I say thank you. Thank you, Mr. President. (1968, Annenberg CD-ROM)

Given Johnson's unpopularity, Humphrey's praise of Johnson was perhaps a bit too effusive. Recall Goldstein's (1982) observation that vice presidents often hurt their credibility with intelligent voters when they make such glowing statements about the

president. Humphrey went on to cite three particular accomplishments of the Johnson

administration: negotiating the nuclear test ban treaty and working toward a nuclear

nonproliferation treaty; reaching an agreement to prevent the use of weapons in outer

space; and getting America moving again by improving the standard of living (1968,

Annenberg CD-ROM).

Humphrey then went on the make not-so-explicit statements to suggest that he

would represent a break from Lyndon Johnson. He said that this was "the end of an era

and the beginning of a new day" (1968, Annenberg CD-ROM). About Vietnam, he said,

"if there is any one lesson that we should have learned, it is that the policies of tomorrow

need not be limited by the policies of yesterday (1968, Annenberg CD-ROM). These

statements may have been too weak and subtle for him to establish his independence

from Johnson, and thus be "his own man." Not only did Humphrey fail to fulfill this

expectation, but he also may have failed to use his convention speech to "get the party

faithful to envision a broader, brighter, grander set of possibilities" (Hart 2000, p. 104).

Hart (2000) noted that this is one of the purposes of a presidential nomination acceptance

speech.

Perhaps unconsciously, Humphrey was attempting to declare he was his own man

when he quoted the poet Thomas Wolfe: "to every man his chance, to every man

regardless of his birth his shining golden opportunity, to every man the right to live and

to work and be himself, and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can

combine to make him. This is the promise of America" (1968, Annenberg CD-ROM).

Moments later, in speaking about freedom from dictatorship, he said, "'Let me live my

own life, let me live in peace, let me be free,' say the people" (1968, Annenberg CD-

ROM). Perhaps Humphrey was expressing his unconscious desire to be free from the burden of loyalty to Johnson.

Of all the vice presidents who had to break from their president, Humphrey arguably had the most difficult set of circumstances. Johnson was unpopular, yet Humphrey also had an obligation to the troops and didn't want to undermine Johnson's peace negotiation efforts by speaking too forcefully on how his policies might differ if he became president.

George. H. W. Bush (1988)

George H. W. Bush said,

For seven and a half years I have helped a president conduct the most difficult job on earth. Ronald Reagan asked for, and received, my candor. He never asked for, but he did receive, my loyalty. Those of you who saw the president's speech this week, and listened to the simple truth of his words, will understand my loyalty all these years. But now you must see me for what I am: the Republican candidate for president of the United States. And now I turn to the American people to share my hopes and intentions, and why--and where--I wish to lead. (1988, Annenberg CD-ROM)

Bush goes on to state his vision ("thing"): "I seek the presidency for a single purpose, a purpose that has motivated millions of Americans across the years and the ocean voyages. I seek the presidency to build a better America. It is that simple--and that big" (1988, Annenberg CD-ROM). Bush then connects back to his association with Reagan: "But I am here tonight--and I am your candidate--because the most important work of my

life is to complete the mission we started in 1980. How do we complete it? We build it"
(1988, Annenberg CD-ROM).

Like other vice presidents, Bush praises Reagan, and then makes the proverbial
"I'm my own man" statements. And just like Nixon, Bush says he seeks to "build a
better America." Unlike Nixon and Gore, however, Bush doesn't suggest that his
presidency would outdo or make up for the current administration's shortcomings. He
discusses it as a continuation of the Reagan revolution that started in 1980.

Al Gore (1988)

Gore's break from his president was perhaps the clearest and most direct of all the
sitting vice presidents in their nomination speeches. After his wife Tipper introduces
him, Al Gore passionately kisses her, in what many saw as a moment where he not only
shed a stiff wooden image, but also showed that he wasn't Bill Clinton, and would
represent a departure from Clinton's sexual scandals. As he opens his speech, Gore
speaks about his love for his wife, another subtle way to break from Clinton. Gore then
says:

> For almost eight years now, I've been the partner of a leader who moved us out of
> the valley of recession and into the longest period of prosperity in American
> history. I say to you tonight: millions of Americans will live better lives for a
> long time to come because of the job that's been done by President Bill Clinton.
> Instead of the biggest deficits in history, we now have the biggest surpluses. The
> highest home ownership ever. The lowest inflation in a generation. Instead of

losing jobs, we have 22 million new jobs. . . . And our progress on the economy is

a good chapter in our history. (2000, pg# 12-18)

Then Gore starts to disassociate himself and establish his independence:

But now we turn the page and write a new chapter. And that's what I want to

speak about tonight. This election is not an award for past performance. I'm not

asking you to vote for me on the basis of the economy we have. Tonight, I ask for

your support on the basis of the better, fairer, more prosperous America we can

build together. (2000, pg# 19-22).

Gore's citing of the Clinton economic record is potentially beneficial, as it can help him

establish the image of competence. But in attributing the economic success to the "job

that's been done by President Clinton," Gore excludes himself from the frame. In doing

so, Gore may be losing the political benefits of the Clinton administration's record. On

the other hand, his strong break from Clinton could help him establish the image trait of

independence, and distance himself from the Clinton scandals. By using the metaphor of

a book, and turning the page and starting a new chapter, Gore firmly severs his

connection with Clinton, and frames the election toward the unknown future.

Mondale (1984)

Mondale first started his transition from subordinate to superior by reintroducing

himself to the American people: "I'm Walter Mondale. You may have heard of me--but

you may not really know me" (1984, Annenberg CD-ROM). He went on to discuss his

life, including to saying that his parents taught him to "stand on my own." This helps to

establish the presidential image traits of independence and strength, attributes that Sigel (1966) and Nimmo and Savage (1976) argued were important.

Mondale then briefly references his association with Carter, and then tries to frame the election around the future, not the past. He said,

> In 1976, an honest, caring man--Jimmy Carter--picked me as his running mate, and I was elected vice president. And in 1980, Ronald Reagan beat the pants off us. So tonight, I want to say something to those of you across our country who voted for Mr. Reagan--to Republicans, to Independents, and yes, to some Democrats: I heard you. And our party heard you. After we lost, we didn't tell the American people that they were wrong. Instead, we began asking you what our mistakes had been. For four years, I listened to the American people--all of you. I traveled what seemed like every acre of America. We are wiser, stronger, and focused on the future. If Mr. Reagan wants to rerun the 1980 campaign, fine. Let them fight over the past. We're fighting for the American future--and that's why we're going to win. (1984, Annenberg CD-ROM)

Mondale praises Carter's character traits of honesty and caring, perhaps linking himself to these traits in the process. Then he seeks to establish his independence. By saying that he spent the last four years listening to America, he cultivates the image of someone who is in touch rather than out of touch. Knowing that Reagan's strategy would be to link him to Carter, Mondale attempts to frame the election around the future, not the past. This framing helps create a space in which he can establish his vision for the country, and take the offensive against Reagan's record, rather than defend his involvement with the Carter administration. His pick of Geraldine Ferraro as his running mate helps frame the

election as being about the future, as the discourse about his campaign would be about the prospect of opening doors of future opportunity for women.

Nixon (1968)

In his second presidential bid, Nixon did not discuss Eisenhower at all in his ads, and far less in his speeches than he did in 1960. In his nomination acceptance speech, Nixon's reference to Eisenhower was noteworthy. He took a moment to connect himself to Eisenhower, but did not have a moment where signaled a break from him. This approach was in contrast to the other vice presidents who followed a fairly tight pattern of praising the president, then signaling a break from him. Nixon said:

> We're going to win for a number of reasons: first a personal one. General Eisenhower, as you know, lies critically ill in the Walter Reed Hospital tonight. I have talked, however, with Mrs. Eisenhower on the telephone. She tells me that his heart is with us. And she says that there is nothing that he lives more for and there is nothing that would lift him more than for us to win in November and I say let's win this one for Ike! We are going to win because this great convention has demonstrated to the nation that the Republican party has the leadership, the platform and the purpose that America needs. (1968, Annenberg CD-ROM)

By referring to him as "General," Nixon avoids appearing like the subordinate and loyal vice president. He also invites voters to remember that the hero of the Second World War, and the one who brought the Korean War to a ceasefire, was supporting him for president. In doing so, Nixon invites voters to believe that he would be better able to handle the Vietnam War than his opponent, Hubert Humphrey. Also, his concern for the

ailing Eisenhower helps him establish the image of someone who has empathy, a trait that Nimmo and Savage (1976) found to be important for candidates.

Perhaps because Nixon was now a <u>former</u> vice president, he didn't feel the need to establish a break from the president he served with. His eight-year removal from the vice presidency, may have helped him sufficiently establish his independence, enough so that he could safely and selectively reestablish his association with Eisenhower in a useful way.

Finding #10: Nixon and Gore used minimizing as a way to "be their own man."

Minimizing is one method in which vice presidents can establish their independence or disassociate themselves from the president/administration. This helps them to position themselves as superiors instead of subordinates. Any time a vice president downplayed the record of the administration, suggested it was insufficient, or suggested that his own presidency would produce better results, coders determined it to be a case of minimizing.

Nixon and Gore made the most use of minimizing as a way to negotiate their relationship with the president. Nixon often minimized in the following ways:

In his convention speech, he said:

But, my fellow Americans, that isn't all, and that isn't enough, because we happen to believe that a record is not something to stand on but something to build on, and building on the great record of this administration we shall build a better America. (1960, Annenberg CD-ROM).

In his opening statement of the first debate, Nixon cited numerous accomplishments of the Eisenhower years. Then he minimized the record by saying,

> But, good as this record is, may I emphasize it isn't enough. A record is never something to stand on. It's something to build on. And in building on this record, I believe that we have the secret for progress, we know the way to progress. And I think, first of all, our own record proves that we know the way. (1960, Annenberg CD-ROM).

In the prompt-response pair #8 in the third debate, Nixon answered a question about union laws in the following way:

> The record in handling them has been very good during this administration. We have had less man-hours lost by strikes in these last seven years than we had in the previous seven years, by a great deal. And I only want to say that however good the record is, it's got to be better. Because in this critical year - period of the sixties we've got to move forward, all Americans must move forward together, and we have to get the greatest cooperation possible between labor and management. We cannot afford stoppages of massive effect on the economy when we're in the terrible competition we're in with the Soviets. (1960, Commission on Presidential Debates).

In this statement, Nixon was accepting the premise of Kennedy's argument, that we have to "get America moving again" as Barone (1988) observed.

Similarly, in his Debate #4 closing statement, Nixon said,

Now the second point we have to understand is this, however. America has not

been standing still. But America cannot stand pat. We can't stand pat for the

reason that we're in a race, as I've indicated. We can't stand pat because it is

essential with the conflict that we have around the world that we not just hold our

own, that we not keep just freedom for ourselves. It is essential that we extend

freedom, extend it to all the world. And this means more than what we've been

doing. It means keeping America even stronger militarily than she is. It means

seeing that our economy moves forward even faster than it has. It means making

more progress in civil rights than we have so that we can be a splendid example

for all the world to see - a democracy in action at its best. (1960, Commission on

Presidential Debates)

Like Nixon, Gore often minimized Clinton accomplishments as a way to show

that his presidency would offer something new and better. Gore would briefly cite

certain administration accomplishments, but then put greater emphasis on how it wasn't

enough and that he would do more. For example, in discussing the great economy in his

convention speech, Gore declared, "And for all of our good times, I am not satisfied"

(2000, pg# 28). He said,

Together, let's make sure that our prosperity enriches not just the few, but all

working families. Let's invent in health care, education, a secure retirement, and

middle class tax cuts. I'm happy that the stock market has boomed and so many

businesses and new enterprises have done well. This country is richer and

stronger. But my focus is on working families - people trying to make house

186

payments and car payments, working overtime to save for college and do right by their kids. . . .So often, powerful forces and powerful interests stand in your way, and the odds seemed stacked against you -- even as you do what's right for you and your family. (pg# 23-26)

Gore's implies that the Clinton economy only benefits "the few," and that he would broaden it to include "all working employees." By minimizing Clinton's economic accomplishments, Gore empathizes with the struggles of working families. By showing empathy, Gore cultivates an important candidate image trait, as noted by Nimmo and Savage (1976).

Regarding the issue of crime, Gore said in his convention speech:

To make families safer, we passed the toughest crime bill in history, and we're putting 100,000 new community police on our streets. Crime has fallen in every major category for seven years in a row. But there's still too much danger and there's still too much fear. So tonight I want to set another new, specific goal: to cut the crime rate year after year -- every single year throughout this decade. (2000, pg# 124-125)

Gore went on to say specifically that we would "fight to add another 50,000 new police … fight for a crime victims' bill of rights … [and] fight to toughen penalties on those who misuse the Internet to prey on our children and violate our privacy" (2000, pg# 126-128)

By citing administration accomplishments, then minimizing those achievements and suggesting that their presidency would perform better, vice presidents attempt to claim credit for achievements, but also demonstrate that they are "their own man" and have their own ideas and vision for the country. The challenge with minimizing as a

rhetorical move is that it may serve to negate the record of the administration that the vice president was a member of. If the record of the current administration wasn't "good enough," then it raises some doubt that a member of the current administration could make a difference if they are elected president.

Finding #11: Gore criticizes the Clinton administration

Gore is the only one of the six vice presidents to have leveled a criticism against his president/administration, albeit in only one instance. In prompt-response pair #27 in the second debate, Gore was responding to whether the Clinton administration's response to the Rwandan genocide was sufficient. Gore said,

Fine. We did, actually, send troops into Rwanda to help with the humanitarian relief measures. My wife Tipper, who is here, actually went on a military plane with General Sholicatchvieli [sic] on one of those flights. But I think in retrospect we were too late getting in there. We could have saved more lives if we had acted earlier. But I do not think that it was an example of a conflict where we should have put our troops in to try to separate the parties for this reason, Jim. One of the criteria that I think is important in deciding when and if we should ever get involved around the world is whether or not our national security interest is involved, if we can really make the difference with military forces. We tried everything else. If we have allies in the Balkans we have allies, NATO, ready, willing and able to go and carry a big part of the burden. In Africa we did not. Now, we have tried -- our countries tried to create an Africa crisis response team there, and we've met some resistance. We have had some luck with Nigeria, but

188

in Sierra Leon, and now that Nigeria has become a democracy, and we hope it
stays that way, then maybe we can build on that. But because we had no allies and
because it was very unclear that we could actually accomplish what we would
want to accomplish about putting military forces there, I think it was the right
thing not to jump in, as heartbreaking as it was, but I think we should have come
in much quicker with the humanitarian mission. (2000, Commission on
Presidential Debates)

Gore's criticism was noteworthy because it's the only instance in this study when coders
noted that a vice president criticized his president/administration. As scholars Goldstein
(1997) and Natoli (1985) noted, vice presidents may incur a rebuke from the president if
they veer too far toward independence. But because this happened only once, and about
a subject that was not one of the major campaign issues, Gore's choice to criticize
probably did not hurt him. It may have served to establish some degree of independence
from Clinton.

Finding #12: George W. Bush praises the Clinton administration

An interesting finding occurred in the coding of George W. Bush's statements in
the second debate. Bush actually praised Clinton/administration often (12.07% of his
debate turns), and certainly more than Gore had done. This mostly occurred in the first
half of the debate which focused on foreign policy. This finding was surprising as it is
uncommon for a nominee of one party to praise the incumbent president/administration
who is a member of the other party. A finding like this did not occur in the other
elections studied here.

While Bush's discourse toward Clinton/administration is not within the scope of this study (except to see how Gore responded to it), we can speculate on why this occurred. Martel (1983) argues that in some instances, candidates will find it useful to "throw bouquets," during presidential debates. In other words, candidates find it useful to compliment their opponent's handling of situations either in office or on the campaign. Martel says this tactic has several purposes including to "project the 'tosser' as fair-minded" and to "diminish the object of the compliment as an issue for debate or as a criterion for the voter's choice" (p.90).

Bush used a variation of this tactic. He threw bouquets at the Clinton administration's conduct in foreign policy, not Gore directly. Bush's use of this tactic may have been an effort to establish a more fair-minded, "above the trenches" image. In doing so, Bush's attacks on Clinton/administration in domestic policy and personal character seem more reasonable, because he doesn't come off as an overly partisan attack dog. By seeming more fair minded, Bush also enhances his likability, and serves to position himself as more moderate – something that a presidential candidate strives to achieve in the general election as part of an effort to win the middle of the electorate. In throwing bouquets for foreign policy, Bush also reaffirms the sentiment that "politics stops at the water's edge," which helps him establish a leadership image and was consistent with his "uniter, not a divider" campaign theme. Also, Bush may have wanted to diminish foreign policy as an issue in the election, because it was an area where his knowledge and experience was considered weak (and Gore's was considered strong). Moreover, Flanigan and Zingale (2010) noted that in 2000, Republicans had lost the image of being the party best able to handle foreign affairs, an advantage they had held in

previous elections. Instead of debating foreign affairs, Bush may have preferred to keep the debate focused on likability and character, areas where he felt he had an advantage over Gore. Recall that likability was noted to be an important candidate image trait (Robert, 1981; and Smith, 1990), as was character (Aristotle; Trent, Short-Thompson, Mongeau, Nusz and Trent, 2001; Trent, Short-Thompson, Mongeau, Metzler and Trent, 2005; and McCroskey, Jensen and Todd, 1972).

Finding #13: The questions in the 2000 debates focused less on the president/administration than the questions in the 1960, 1984 and 1988 debates.

While not within the scope of this study, it was interesting to note that the moderator in the 2000 debates prompted the topic of president/vice president far less frequently than the questioners in the 1960, 1984 and 1988 debates. Of the 31 questions asked by the moderator across the three debates in 2000, only 2 (6.45%) were about Clinton/administration. In contrast, the questioners in the 1960 debates brought up Eisenhower/administration in 23.46% of all questions asked; the questioners in the 1984 debates brought up Carter/administration in 8.06% of all questions asked; and the questioners in the 1988 debates brought up Reagan/administration in 21.74% of all questions asked.

This suggests that the moderator in 2000 was pursuing a set of questions that were more consistent with the approach that Gore wanted to take. As Gore sought to avoid discussion of Clinton/administration and stay on the offensive against Bush (at least until the third debate), the moderator's questions supported that effort. One thing to point out is that unlike the debates in 1960, 1984, and 1988 where there was a panel of questioners,

all of the debates in 2000 were conducted with a single moderator, Jim Lehrer. Even as

the third debate was town-hall style where citizens asked the questions, the moderator

determined who those questioners would be. Also, the moderator asked <u>all</u> of the follow-

up questions, which made up half of all the questions asked in the debate. He was in full

control of the questions and was able to determine the approach.

Chapter 6: Conclusions

This analysis has found that in some cases there are patterns in the way that vice presidents negotiate their relationship with the president. In other cases there are not. Vice presidents use their nomination acceptance speech to honor their association with the president/administration, and then make statements to declare that they are their own man. Nixon (1960), Mondale, Bush and Gore were more explicit in accomplishing both parts of this equation. While Humphrey handled the first part well by praising Johnson effectively, he was arguably too subtle in declaring his independence. Similar to Humphrey, Nixon (1968) was clear in his praising of Eisenhower, but did not signal any break from him, perhaps because after eight years out of office, the need for him to establish his independence from Eisenhower was already accomplished. Thus he could safely praise Eisenhower without becoming "resubordinated" or "reinfantilized."

Another clear pattern was that vice presidents rarely use their ads to discuss their president/administration. Because ads are more conducive to image making, as pictures carry more emotional weight, and because there is limited time (30 and 60 seconds usually), vice presidents may prefer to use their ads in simple ways to establish a positive image, including their independence and likability, and reserving discussion of the president/administration to formats where they have more time, such as speeches and debates. Nixon (1960) was the only exception. He discussed Eisenhower/administration in a majority of his television ads studied here. This may be because ad production techniques were more limited in 1960, with the talking head style often being the method of choice. Also, because Nixon was the first sitting vice president in a century to run for president, and because television was so new, he may not have fully appreciated the need

193

to establish an image of independence, and the ways in which television could help him do so.

A third clear pattern that emerged was that neither sitting nor former vice presidents criticize their own administration. Of the nearly 1500 individual items coded, the lone exception was Gore's one instance of criticism against the Clinton administration in an answer he gave in the second debate. While there is a need for vice presidents to establish their independence and distance themselves from any scandals of the administration, criticizing one's own president/administration is not seen as a way to do it. Criticism may bring about two significant costs. First, it would likely turn off the party base, and the vice president needs their support. Second, criticizing one's own president may raise questions about the vice president's integrity and judgment, because after all, the vice president chose to be the president's running mate. This may hurt the vice president's ability to establish a presidential image.

In some ways, there were inconsistent patterns in the way that vice presidents would negotiate their relationship with the president. Unlike other vice presidents, Nixon defended his president/administration much more than others. Nixon and Gore used minimizing more often than other vice presidents, by saying that as good as the president/administration's record is, it's not enough, and I can do better.

Also, while most sitting vice presidents (e.g. Nixon, 1960, Humphrey and H.W. Bush) cited their administration's accomplishments, Gore was a notable exception. Even as he had many accomplishments to brag about, Gore almost completely avoided citing the record in all ads, speeches and debates (except for the third debate). When Gore did

cite the administration's record in the final debate, he emphasized his role individual and efforts, rather than credit Clinton, or himself and Clinton together.

This analysis shows that when a vice president seeks election to the presidency, he has tended to negotiate his relationship with the president using one or more of the following approaches: 1.) either run on the administration's record (e.g. Nixon, 1960; Humphrey, 1968; Bush 1988); 2.) argue that it was insufficient and if elected, they will produce better results (e.g. Nixon, 1960; Humphrey, 1968; Gore 2000); 3.) emphasize their own personal involvement and efforts in the administration, rather than the president (e.g. Gore, 2000); or 4.) mostly avoid discussing the president/administration (e.g. Nixon, 1968; Mondale, 1984; Gore, 2000).

Vice presidents face a complicated set of circumstances when they run for president. Their campaign is affected by their relationship with the president and their role in the presidential administration. Any member of the presidential administration will face a similar complicated path if they run for president. Like vice presidents, secretaries of state and other cabinet officials are expected to be loyal to the president, and this loyalty may compromise their ability to establish themselves as independent figures. Also, they may be forced to answer questions concerning scandals or unpopular policies resulting from that administration.

Many observers believe that Hilary Clinton will run for president in 2016. Clinton is associated with two previous administrations, having served as Secretary of State in the Obama administration, and as First Lady in the Clinton administration. These associations may complicate her bid in some similar ways as it would for a vice president. On the other hand, because a Secretary of State is more removed from day-to-

day politics, they may not suffer from the perception of being a "lap dog" in the same way that vice presidents might.

Future studies should examine the presidential campaign communication of those who were nominees of the president's party, but were not vice presidents. These campaigns would include those run by Taft (1912), Hoover (1928), Stevenson (1952), McCain (2008), and possibly Clinton (2016). This study would enable us to compare and contrast the way they negotiated their relationship with president/administration, with the way that vice presidents have done. How is the rhetorical situation faced by these candidates similar or different from the rhetorical situation faced by vice presidents?

Based on this study, which was limited to only six campaigns, it is difficult to suggest recommendations for how vice presidents who run for president should negotiate their relationship with the president/administration. With that in mind, the study results point us to some tentative recommendations. First, because of the emotional weight they carry, television ads that discuss or depict the president, could serve to subordinate the vice president. Thus, vice presidents should not use their television ads to discuss or depict the president. Instead, television ads offer a good opportunity to craft a more independent and likable personal image. This image can be established with creative use of imagery, including American flags, family and other things to evoke positive emotion.

Second, vice presidents should make a respectful, but explicit break from the president in their nomination acceptance speeches. Humphrey failed to make an explicit break from Johnson and the administration's Vietnam policy. A month later, in his Salt Lake City address, he was more explicit in establishing his independence, albeit only marginally in regard to his position on Vietnam.

Third, if the record is good, vice presidents should cite the administration's accomplishments in speeches and debates. Ultimately, I think that voters vote retrospectively. They are more likely to accept a candidate who says we've made a certain amount of progress, and we need to take the same approach if we want it to continue. The progress is not to be taken for granted, and can be undone if their opponent is elected. In short, don't change horses in midstream. Or to evoke a different, and more cynical, metaphor – trust the devil you know, not the one you don't. Vice presidents should skillfully leverage the success of current accomplishments as proof that their approach works, and that their new proposals (which can be offered as a way to establish their independence) will work as well, because they are based on the same fundamental governing approach. Vice presidents should, however, take into account the unique circumstances of each election, and adapt their strategies accordingly.

Another suggestion to vice presidents is in regards to how they utilize the president in their campaign. As Pomper (2001) noted, vice presidents labor under the burden of appearing less capable than the president. Popular presidents can elevate their vice president's stature by bringing themselves down a notch.

For instance, a president could discuss ways in which the vice president played a leadership role behind the scenes, something that would be inappropriate for the vice president to discuss on his own. If done successfully, discourse like this may serve to change the image of a vice president from being the lapdog, wimp, faithful co-pilot, son, or traditional wife, to one who was the "person behind the curtains." In other words, the vice president was in certain instances the true leader of the administration. Doing this for their vice president would require a sitting president to subordinate their own ego,

which many presidents might find difficult, if not impossible. If the vice president is

elected, however, it could help to solidify a positive legacy for the president, and allow

him to cultivate the perception that he is secure with himself, and made the right

judgment in selecting the vice president as his running mate. Just as a president deems it

worthwhile to spend their political capital to advocate for certain policies, they might also

find it worthwhile to spend some "legacy capital" to support their vice president's bid.

   For example, in his Democratic convention address in 2004, Clinton elevated

John Kerry's stature by throwing himself, along with Kerry's opponents Bush and

Cheney, under the proverbial bus. Clinton said,

> Now let me tell you what I know about John Kerry. I've been seeing all the
>
> Republican ads about him. Let me tell you what I know about him. During the
>
> Vietnam War, many young men, including the current President, the Vice
>
> President and me, could have gone to Vietnam and didn't. John Kerry came from
>
> a privileged background. He could have avoided going, too. But instead he said,
>
> "Send me." When -- when they sent those swift boats up the river in Vietnam,
>
> and they told them their job was to draw hostile fire, to wave the American flag
>
> and bait the enemy to come out and fight, John Kerry said, "Send me." (pg#33)

Here Clinton suggests that Kerry possessed, at least in one respect, a greater level of

character than the current president, vice president, and himself, a former president. This

approach invites people to view Kerry as highly capable of being president.

   Similarly, in his 2012 convention speech, Clinton also brought himself down a

little in order to bolster Barack Obama's reelection effort. He said:

President Obama started with a much weaker economy than I did. Listen to me, now. No President -- No president, not me, not any of my predecessors, no one could have fully repaired all the damage that he found in just four years. Now -- But he has -- he has laid the foundation for a new, modern, successful economy of shared prosperity. And if you will renew the President's contract you will feel it. You will feel it. (pg# 36)

Clinton, widely credited for presiding over the strong economy of the 1990's, argues that President Obama has had a tougher economic challenge than he himself had. In doing so, he subtly suggests that Obama may be doing as good a job or better than he had done, even if people don't realize it yet.

In his 2000 convention speech, Clinton could have chosen to do something similar for Gore. For instance, he could have provided examples of Gore's behind the scenes leadership. Maybe something like,

When we were debating whether to commit troops in Bosnia as part of a peacekeeping force, I wasn't sure what to do. Al Gore pushed for it. He made the case for why sending troops was a good idea. And look at the result. Not a single American life lost. That's the kind of leadership and judgment we need in a president.

Statements like this one may have helped Gore to establish the image traits of leadership and strength, and show that he has the ability to take firm issue stands. And because the president would be making these statements, and even doing so reluctantly, at some expense to his own ego, it might be seen as more persuasive than if the vice president said these things about himself.

Limitations of the Study

Content analysis is a useful research tool in studying political discourse for a number of reasons. It allows us to systematically study large amounts of text and it enables us to discover rhetorical trends. Content analysis also provides a certain degree of objectivity, or intersubjectivity, which helps to mitigate the bias that results from the analyst's own dispositions. Content analysis can also be of assistance to the rhetorical critic, because it can reveal rhetorical trends that could be further illuminated through a rhetorical or historical-critical analysis. For instance, this study found that vice presidents almost always use their presidential nomination acceptance speeches to demonstrate some sort of break from the president they served with. This finding enables the rhetorical critical to focus on how vice presidents attempt to achieve this objective, and how each vice president's rhetorical choices compares to that of other vice presidents.

But content analysis reaches the limits of its usefulness because of the complexity in how the vice president discusses the president/administration in ads, speeches and debates. Some rhetorical moves may be so subtle that coders don't always pick them up. Also, coders may have had difficulty discerning between certain categories like praise vs. defense, praise vs. neutral, or minimize vs. criticize. In the speeches and debates, there were some statements made by vice presidents that were considered "undeterminable," meaning that at least three out of five coders didn't render the same judgment. If a statement was coded by the five coders as "praise, defense, neutral, neutral, and none," this was considered "undeterminable." Nixon (1960), Humphrey (1968), Nixon (1968),

and Bush (1988) each had a statement in one of their speeches that was "undeterminable." In the debates, Nixon (1960) had two debate turns that were "undeterminable," Mondale had two, and Gore had three.

The interrater percent agreement of all coded items was 86.698%, which is considered acceptable. When coding just the latent content (which the findings are mostly drawn from), interrater agreement was 60.203%. This number may be somewhat concerning. On the other hand, because latent content involves making more interpretive judgments, the threshold of acceptability is lower than it would be for manifest content.

While more time devoted to coder training may have increased the interrater agreement of the latent content, these interrater agreement results suggest that a vice president's negotiation of his relationship with the president/administration may in some instances be a very creative rhetorical act. Content analysis can point us to general rhetorical tendencies, but is limited in its ability to identify creative rhetorical nuances that may be taking place in a particular textual unit. Rhetorical analysis would provide a more robust understanding of these texts, but may be less reliable than content analysis. There is a tradeoff between reliability and analytical robustness. Holsti (1969) noted that "as categories and units of analysis become more complex, they may yield results that are both more useful and less reliable" (p. 142).

Reducing the number of categories by, for instance, combining praise and defense into one category such as "praise or defend," and combining minimize and criticize into "minimize or criticize," may have resulted in higher rates of interrater agreement, because coders don't have to make fine distinctions. Doing so, however, would have caused us to miss the way in which Nixon, in contrast with all other vice presidents, often

employed *defense* when discussing Eisenhower in his 1960 campaign. Holsti (1969) continues that, "[content analytic] reliability is a necessary condition for valid inquiry but, paradoxically, the cost of some steps taken to increase reliability may be a reduction in validity" (p. 142). Holsti goes on to note that "…the analyst may be forced to strike some balance between reliability and relevance of categories and units; the coefficient of reliability cannot be the sole criterion for making such decisions" (p. 142).

Closing Thought

Most vice presidents who run for president have lost. While it's painful enough to lose the presidential election, the vice president, as president of the Senate, experiences the additional pain of being required to certify the election results in the Senate. The vice president is also obligated to have a front row seat during the new president's inaugural address. This study has hopefully provided a better understanding of how these vice presidents have used communication to address the rhetorical situation that faces them when they run for president.

Appendix A: Texts Examined

Speeches by Nixon (1960)

Nixon, R. M. (1960, July, 28). 1960 Republican nomination acceptance speech. In The
Annenberg School for Communication (Eds.), *The Annenberg/Pew Archive of
Presidential Campaign Discourse* [CD-ROM]. Philadelphia: University of
Pennsylvania.

Nixon, R. M. (1960, August 17). "The need for leadership: An address in Greensboro,
N.C., by Vice President Richard Nixon," Online by G. Peters and J. T. Wooley,
The American Presidency Project. Retrieved from
http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=25385

Nixon, R. M. (1960, September 20). Stump speech in Saginaw, Michigan. In The
Annenberg School for Communication (Eds.), *The Annenberg/Pew Archive of
Presidential Campaign Discourse* [CD-ROM]. Philadelphia: University of
Pennsylvania.

Nixon, R. M. (1960, October 17). Stump speech in Hartford, Connecticut. In The
Annenberg School for Communication (Eds.), *The Annenberg/Pew Archive of
Presidential Campaign Discourse* [CD-ROM]. Philadelphia: University of
Pennsylvania.

Nixon, R. M. (1960, November 7). CBS-TV – Election eve broadcast. In The Annenberg
School for Communication (Eds.), *The Annenberg/Pew Archive of Presidential
Campaign Discourse* [CD-ROM]. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania**.**

Speeches by Humphrey (1968)

Humphrey, H. H. (1968, April 27). HHH – Washington declaration of candidacy for presidential nomination. Hubert H. Humphrey Papers, Minnesota Historical Society. Retrieved from http://www.4president.org/speeches/hhh1968 announcement.htm

Humphrey, H. H. (1968, August 29). 1968 Democratic nomination acceptance speech. In The Annenberg School for Communication (Eds.), *The Annenberg/Pew Archive of Presidential Campaign Discourse* [CD-ROM]. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Humphrey, H. H. (1968, September 30). Televised speech on foreign policy, Salt Lake City, Utah. In The Annenberg School for Communication (Eds.), *The Annenberg/Pew Archive of Presidential Campaign Discourse* [CD-ROM]. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Humphrey, H. H. (1968, October 30). Stump speech in Garment District, New York City, New York. In The Annenberg School for Communication (Eds.), *The Annenberg/Pew Archive of Presidential Campaign Discourse* [CD-ROM]. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Humphrey, H. H. (1968, November 3). Stump speech in Houston, Texas. In The Annenberg School for Communication (Eds.), *The Annenberg/Pew Archive of Presidential Campaign Discourse* [CD-ROM]. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Speeches by Nixon (1968)

Nixon, R. M. (1968, Jan. 31). Richard M. Nixon Letter to the Citizens of New

      Hampshire. Retrieved from http://www.4president.org/speeches

      /nixon1968announcement.htm

Nixon, R. M. (1968, August 8). 1968 Republican nomination acceptance speech. In The

      Annenberg School for Communication (Eds.), *The Annenberg/Pew Archive of*

      Presidential Campaign Discourse [CD-ROM]. Philadelphia: University of

      Pennsylvania.

Nixon, R. M. (1968, September 19). Radio address, Washington, DC. In The Annenberg

      School for Communication (Eds.), *The Annenberg/Pew Archive of Presidential*

      Campaign Discourse [CD-ROM]. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Nixon, R. M. (1968, October 24). Radio address, Washington, DC. In The Annenberg

      School for Communication (Eds.), *The Annenberg/Pew Archive of Presidential*

      Campaign Discourse [CD-ROM]. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Nixon, R. M. (1968, October 30). CBS Radio, Washington, DC. In the Annenberg School

      for Communication (Eds.), *The Annenberg/Pew Archive of Presidential*

      Campaign Discourse [CD-ROM]. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Speeches by Mondale (1984)

Mondale, W. F. (1983, February 21). Mondale for president committee announcement

      speech. Retrieved from http://www.4president.org/speeches/mondale

      1984announcement.htm

Mondale, W. F. (1984, July 19). 1984 Democratic nomination acceptance speech. In The

    Annenberg School for Communication (Eds.), *The Annenberg/Pew Archive of*

    Presidential Campaign Discourse [CD-ROM]. Philadelphia: University of

    Pennsylvania.

Mondale, W. F. (1984, September 5). Rally in Portland, Oregon. In The Annenberg

    School for Communication (Eds.), *The Annenberg/Pew Archive of Presidential*

    Campaign Discourse [CD-ROM]. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Mondale, W. F. (1984, October 17). Stump speech, Stanford University. In The

    Annenberg School for Communication (Eds.), *The Annenberg/Pew Archive of*

    Presidential Campaign Discourse [CD-ROM]. Philadelphia: University of

    Pennsylvania.

Mondale, W. F. (1984, November 5). Election eve speech, Pershing Square, Los Angeles,

    CA. In The Annenberg School for Communication (Eds.), *The Annenberg/Pew*

    Archive of Presidential Campaign Discourse [CD-ROM]. Philadelphia:

    University of Pennsylvania.

Speeches by Bush (1988)

Bush, G. H. W. (1987, October 12). George Bush announcement speech: Houston, TX.

    George Bush Presidential Library & Museum. Retrieved from

    http://www.4president.org/speeches/georgebush1988announcement.htm

Bush, G. H. W. (1988, August 18). 1988 Republican nomination acceptance speech. In

    The Annenberg School for Communication (Eds.), *The Annenberg/Pew Archive*

of Presidential Campaign Discourse [CD-ROM]. Philadelphia: University of

Pennsylvania.

Bush, G. H. W. (1988, September 14). Stump speech in Orange, California. In The

Annenberg School for Communication (Eds.), *The Annenberg/Pew Archive of*

Presidential Campaign Discourse [CD-ROM]. Philadelphia: University of

Pennsylvania.

Bush, G. H. W. (1988, October 19). Speech at University of Michigan, Dearborn campus.

In The Annenberg School for Communication (Eds.), *The Annenberg/Pew*

Archive of Presidential Campaign Discourse [CD-ROM]. Philadelphia:

University of Pennsylvania.

Bush, G. H. W. (1988, November 1). Stump speech, Notre Dame University, South Bend,

Indiana. In The Annenberg School for Communication (Eds.), *The*

Annenberg/Pew Archive of Presidential Campaign Discourse [CD-ROM].

Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Speeches by Gore (2000)

Gore, A. A., Jr. (1999, June 16). Remarks as prepared for delivery by Al Gore:

Announcement of candidacy, Carthage, TN. Retrieved from

http://www.4president.org/speeches/gore2000announcement.htm

Gore, A. A., Jr. (2000, August 17). Remarks as prepared for delivery by Al Gore:

Democratic National Convention. Retrieved from

http://www.4president.org/speeches/gorelieberman2000convention.htm

Gore, A. A., Jr. (2000, September 29). Vice President Al Gore delivers remarks regarding the environment. *FDCH Political Transcripts*. Retrieved from http://web.lexis-nexis.com. Search terms: Gore, Speech, Transcript, Remarks, September.

Gore, A. A., Jr. (2000, October 24). The 2000 campaign; Gore's stump speech: A clear choice, with clear visions for the future. *The New York Times*, p. A26. Retrieved from http://web.lexis-nexis.com. Search terms: Gore, Transcript.

Gore, A. A., Jr. (2000, October 30): Vice President Al Gore delivers remarks at rally, Green Bay, Wisconsin. *FDCH Political Transcripts.* Retrieved from http://web.lexis-nexis.com. Search terms: Gore, Speech, Transcript, Remarks, October.

Televised Ads, Nixon (1960)

Independent Television Committee In Support of Nixon-Lodge (1960, no month and date). Most Important Issue. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008*. Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1960

Independent Television Committee In Support of Nixon-Lodge (1960, no month and date). Peace. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008*. Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1960

Independent Television Committee In Support of Nixon-Lodge (1960, no month and date). Best Qualified. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate:*

Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1960

Independent Television Committee In Support of Nixon-Lodge (1960, no month and

date). Civil Rights. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate:*

Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1960

Independent Television Committee In Support of Nixon-Lodge (1960, no month and

date). Taxes. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate:*

Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1960

Independent Television Committee In Support of Nixon-Lodge (1960, no month and

date). Lodge. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate:*

Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1960

Independent Television Committee In Support of Nixon-Lodge (1960, no month and

date). Economic Strength. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room*

Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1960

Independent Television Committee In Support of Nixon-Lodge (1960, no month and

date). Freedom. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate:*

Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1960

Televised Ads, Humphrey (1968)

Citizens for Humphrey-Muskie (1968, September 29). Mother and Child. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008*. Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968

Citizens for Humphrey-Muskie (1968, no month and date). E.G. Marshall. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008*. Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968

Citizens for Humphrey-Muskie (1968, no month and date). Voting Booth. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008*. Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968

Citizens for Humphrey-Muskie (1968, no month and date). Every American. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008*. Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968

Citizens for Humphrey-Muskie (1968, no month and date). Law and Order Democrat. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008*. Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968

Citizens for Humphrey-Muskie (1968, no month and date). What's Nixon Done? *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential*

Campaign Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968

Citizens for Humphrey-Muskie (1968, no month and date). Bomb (Nuclear Treaty).

Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential

Campaign Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968

Citizens for Humphrey-Muskie (1968, no month and date). Civil Rights. *Museum of the*

Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign

Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968

Citizens for Humphrey-Muskie (1968, no month and date). Frank Sinatra. *Museum of the*

Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign

Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968

Citizens for Humphrey-Muskie (1968, no month and date). Laughter. *Museum of the*

Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign

Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968

Televised Ads, Nixon (1968)

Nixon-Agnew Victory Committee (1968, no month and date). The First Civil Right.

Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential

Campaign Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968

Nixon (1968, October 27, 1968). Convention. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living*

Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved

from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968

Nixon-Agnew Victory Committee (1968, no month and date). Failure. *Museum of the*

Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign

Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968

Nixon-Agnew Campaign Committee (1968, no month and date). Vietnam. *Museum of the*

Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign

Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968

Nixon-Agnew Victory Committee (1968, no month and date). Unite. *Museum of the*

Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign

Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968

Nixon-Agnew TV Committee (1968, no month and date). Crime. *Museum of the Moving*

Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-

2008. Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968

Nixon-Agnew Victory Committee (1968, no month and date). Youth. *Museum of the*

Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign

Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968

Nixon-Agnew Victory Committee (1968, no month and date). Child's Face. *Museum of*

the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign

Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968

Nixon-Agnew Victory Committee (1968, no month and date). Reach Out. *Museum of the*

Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign

Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968

Nixon-Agnew Victory Committee (1968, no month and date). Decisions. *Museum of the*

Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign

Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968

Televised Ads, Mondale (1984)

Mondale/Ferraro, Inc. (1984, September 9). Table. *Museum of the Moving Image, The*

Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008.

Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1984

Mondale/Ferraro, Inc. (1984, October 3). Loopholes. *Museum of the Moving Image, The*

Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008.

Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1984

Mondale/Ferraro, Inc. (1984, no month and date). Fighter. *Museum of the Moving Image,*
The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008.
Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1984

Mondale/Ferraro, Inc. (Production date: 1984, October 29). Arms Control 5. *Museum of*
the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign
Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from
www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1984

Mondale/Ferraro, Inc. (Production date: 1984, October 13). Orbiting. *Museum of the*
Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign
Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from
www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1984

Mondale/Ferraro, Inc. (Production date: 1984, October 16). Failure 3. *Museum of the*
Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign
Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from
www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1984

Mondale/Ferraro, Inc. (Production date: 1984, September 8). Ticket. *Museum of the*
Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign
Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from
www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1984

Mondale/Ferraro, Inc. (Production date: 1984, September 9). Rollercoaster. *Museum of*
the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign
Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from
www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1984

Mondale/Ferraro, Inc. (Production date: 1984, Sept. 9). Limo. *Museum of the Moving*

> *Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-*
>
> *2008*. Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1984

Mondale/Ferraro, Inc. (Production date: 1984, Sept. 9). House. *Museum of the Moving*

> *Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-*
>
> *2008*. Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1984

Televised Ads, Bush (1988)

Bush-Quayle '88 (1988, September 7). The Mission. *Museum of the Moving Image, The*

> *Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008*.
>
> Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1988

Bush-Quayle '88 (1988, September 13). Harbor. *Museum of the Moving Image, The*

> *Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008*.
>
> Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1988

Bush-Quayle '88 (1988, September 26). Gorbachev. *Museum of the Moving Image, The*

> *Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008*.
>
> Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1988

Bush-Quayle '88 (1988, October 3). Revolving Door. *Museum of the Moving Image, The*

> *Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008*.
>
> Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1988

Bush-Quayle '88 (1988, October 17). Tank Ride. *Museum of the Moving Image, The*

> *Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008*.
>
> Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1988

Bush-Quayle '88 (Production date: 1988, August 31). Family/Children. *Museum of the*

Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign

Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1988

Bush-Quayle '88 (Production date: 1988, October 18). Credibility. *Museum of the*

Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign

Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1988

Bush-Quayle '88 (Production date: 1988, October 20). Father-in-Law. *Museum of the*

Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign

Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1988

Bush-Quayle '88 (Production date: 1988, November 2). Bush America. *Museum of the*

Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign

Commercials 1952-2008. Retrieved from

www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1988

Bush-Quayle '88 (Production date: 1988, November 2). The Risk. *Museum of the Moving*

Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-

2008. Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1988

Televised Ads, Gore (2000)

Gore/Lieberman, Inc. (Original air date: 2000, August 22). 1969. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008*. Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/2000

Gore/Lieberman, Inc. (Original air date: 2000, August 31). Bean Counter. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008*. Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/2000

Gore/Lieberman, Inc. (Original air date: 2000, September 9). Ian. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008*. Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/2000

Democratic National Committee (Original air date: 2000, September 16). Accountability. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008*. Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/2000

Gore/Lieberman, Inc. (Original air date: 2000, October 7). Down. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008*. Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/2000

Gore/Lieberman, Inc. (Original air date: 2000, October 10). Morph. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008*. Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/2000

Democratic National Committee (Original air date: 2000, October 18). Word. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008*. Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/2000

Democratic National Committee (Production date: 2000, October 20). Question. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008*. Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/2000

Democratic National Committee (Production date: 2000, October 23). Matters. *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008*. Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/2000

Debates

Commission on Presidential Debates (1960, September 26). *The first Kennedy-Nixon presidential debate.* Retrieved from www.debates.org

Commission on Presidential Debates (1960, October 7). *The second Kennedy-Nixon presidential debate.* Retrieved from www.debates.org

Commission on Presidential Debates (1960, October 13). *The third Kennedy-Nixon presidential debate.* Retrieved from www.debates.org

Commission on Presidential Debates (1960, October 21). *The fourth Kennedy-Nixon presidential debate.* Retrieved from www.debates.org

Commission on Presidential Debates (1984, October 4). *The first Reagan-Mondale presidential debate.* Retrieved from www.debates.org

Commission on Presidential Debates (1984, October 21). *The second Reagan-Mondale presidential debate.* Retrieved from www.debates.org

Commission on Presidential Debates (1988, September 25). *The first Bush-Dukakis presidential debate.* Retrieved from www.debates.org

Commission on Presidential Debates (1988, October 13). *The second Bush-Dukakis presidential debate.* Retrieved from www.debates.org

Commission on Presidential Debates (2000, October 3). *The first 2000 Gore-Bush presidential debate.* Retrieved from www.debates.org

Commission on Presidential Debates (2000, October 11). *The second Gore-Bush presidential debate.* Retrieved from www.debates.org

Commission on Presidential Debates (2000, October 17). *The third 2000 Gore-Bush presidential debate.* Retrieved from www.debates.org

Tables for Intercoder Reliability

Table 1: Percent interrater agreement for manifest, latent and all coded items for ads, speeches and debates.

Percent Interrater Agreement	Manifest Content	Latent Content	All Coded Items (Manifest + Latent)
Ads	97.255%	55.714%	92.241%
Speeches	94.559%	65.402%	89.434%
Debates	92.227%	58.119%	84.920%
Total	93.233%	60.203%	86.698%

Table 2: Fleiss' kappa calculations for manifest, latent and all coded items for ads, speeches and debates.

Fleiss' Kappa	Manifest Content	Latent Content	All Coded Items (Manifest + Latent)
Ads Observed Agreement Expected Agreement	.114 .973 .969	.200 .557 .447	.655 .922 .775
Speeches Observed Agreement Expected Agreement	.072 .946 .941	.406 .654 .417	.672 .894 .678
Debates Observed Agreement Expected Agreement	.046 .922 .919	.462 .581 .222	.604 .849 .620

Total	.056	.481	.628
Observed	.932	.602	.867
Agreement	.928	.233	.642
Expected Agreement			

Table 3: Cohen's kappa calculations for manifest, latent and all coded items for ads, speeches and debates.

Cohen's Kappa	Manifest Content	Latent Content	All Coded Items (Manifest + Latent)
Ads	Undefined	.219	.657
Speeches	.072	.407	.673
Debates	.037	.464	.605
Total	.053	.482	.629

Tables for Analysis of Ads

Table 4. Percentage of Television Ads that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in 1960.

Praised = 62.50%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 37.50%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 5. Percentage of Television Ads that Humphrey discussed Johnson/administration in 1968.

Praised = 10%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None =   90%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 6. Percentage of Television Ads that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in 1968.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 7. Percentage of Television Ads that Mondale discussed Carter/administration in 1984.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 8. Percentage of Television Ads that Bush discussed Reagan/administration in 1988.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 10%
None = 90%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 9. Percentage of Television Ads that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in 2000.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Tables for Analysis of Speeches

Table 10. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration across all five speeches.

Praised = 18.18%
Defended = 6.49%
Minimized = 2.60%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 2.60%
None = 68.83%
Undeterminable = 1.30%

Table 11. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his 1960 Nomination Acceptance Address.

Praised = 22.22%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 5.56%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 66.67%
Undeterminable = 5.56%

Table 12. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his 1960 "The Need for Leadership" speech.

Praised = 10.53%
Defended = 5.26%
Minimized = 5.26%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 5.26%
None = 73.68%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 13. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his 1960 "Saginaw, MI" speech.

Praised = 9.09%
Defended = 9.09%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 81.81%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 14. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his 1960 Hartford, CT speech.

Praised = 8.70%
Defended = 13.04%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 78.26%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 15. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his 1960 CBS TV Election Eve Broadcast.

Praised = 83.33%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 16.67%
None = 0%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 16. Percentage of speech units that Humphrey discussed Johnson/administration across all five speeches.

Praised = 20.29%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 1.45%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 5.80%
None = 71.01%
Undeterminable = 1.45%

Table 17. Percentage of speech units that Humphrey discussed Johnson/administration in his 1968 Announcement speech.

Praised = 20%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 10%
None = 60%
Undeterminable = 10%

Table 18. Percentage of speech units that Humphrey discussed Johnson/administration in his 1968 Nomination acceptance address.

Praised = 23.08%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 76.92%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 19. Percentage of speech units that Humphrey discussed Johnson/administration in his 1968 Salt Lake City, UT Address.

Praised = 8.33%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 8.33%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 16.67%
None = 66.67%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 20. Percentage of speech units that Humphrey discussed Johnson/administration in his 1968 NY Garment District speech.

Praised = 16.67%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 83.33%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 21. Percentage of speech units that Humphrey discussed Johnson/administration in his 1968 Houston Astrodome speech.

Praised = 27.27%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 4.55%
None = 68.18%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 22. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration across all five speeches.

Praised =   10.29%
Defended =   0%
Minimized =   0%
Criticized =   0%
Neutral terms =   1.47%
None =   86.76%
Undeterminable =   1.47%

Table 23. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his 1968 Announcement speech.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 24. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his 1968 Nomination Acceptance address.

Praised = 10.34%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 86.21%
Undeterminable = 3.45%

Table 25. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his 1968 Washington DC, Radio address, September 19.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 26. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his 1968 Washington DC, CBS Radio address, October 24.

Praised = 26.67%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 6.67%
None = 66.67%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 27. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his 1968 Washington DC, CBS Radio, October 30.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 28. Percentage of speech units that Mondale discussed Carter/administration across all five speeches.

Praised =   3.23%
Defended =   0%
Minimized =   0%
Criticized =   0%
Neutral terms =   1.61%
None =   95.16%
Undeterminable =   0%

Table 29. Percentage of speech units that Mondale discussed Carter/administration in his 1984 Announcement address, February 21, 1983.

Praised = 6.25%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 93.75%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 30. Percentage of speech units that Mondale discussed Carter/administration in his 1984 Nomination Acceptance address, July 19.

Praised = 7.69%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 92.31%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 31. Percentage of speech units that Mondale discussed Carter/administration in his 1984 Portland, OR speech, September 5.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 32. Percentage of speech units that Mondale discussed Carter/administration in his 1984 Stanford University stump speech, October 17.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 6.25%
None = 93.75%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 33. Percentage of speech units that Mondale discussed Carter/administration in his 1984 Pershing Square speech, November 5.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 34. Percentage of speech units that Bush discussed Reagan/administration across all five speeches.

Praised =   16.67%
Defended =   0%
Minimized =   1.85%
Criticized =   0%
Neutral terms =   3.70%
None =   77.78%
Undeterminable =   0%

Table 35. Percentage of speech units that Bush discussed Reagan/administration in his 1988 Announcement speech, October 12, 1987.

Praised = 15.38%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 3.85%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 7.69%
None = 73.08%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 36. Percentage of speech units that Bush discussed Reagan/administration in his 1988 Nomination Acceptance address, August 18.

Praised = 18.75%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 3.13%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 3.13%
None = 75%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 37. Percentage of speech units that Bush discussed Reagan/administration in his 1988 Gaddi Vasquez Campaign Breakfast speech, September 14.

Praised = 23.08%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 7.69%
None = 69.23%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 38. Percentage of speech units that Bush discussed Reagan/administration in his 1988 Dearborn, MI speech, October 19.

Praised = 8.70%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 91.30%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 39. Percentage of speech units that Bush discussed Reagan/administration in his
1988 Notre Dame speech, November 1.

Praised = 21.43%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 78.57%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 40. Percentage of speech units that Gore discussed Clinton/administration across
all five speeches.

Praised =   2.63%
Defended =   0%
Minimized =   3.51%
Criticized =   0%
Neutral terms =   0%
None =   93.86 %
Undeterminable =   0%

Table 41. Percentage of speech units that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in his Announcement speech, June 16, 1999.

Praised = 3.70%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 3.70%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 92.59%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 42. Percentage of speech units that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in his Nomination Acceptance address, August 17.

Praised = 5.71%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 2.86%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 91.43%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 43. Percentage of speech units that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in his Audobon Society speech, September 29.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 44. Percentage of speech units that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in his Philadelphia, PA speech, October 24.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 6.67%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 93.33%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 45. Percentage of speech units that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in his St. Louis, MO speech, November 6.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 5%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 95%
Undeterminable = 0%

Tables for Analysis of Debates

Table 46. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his Debate #1 opening statement.

Praised = 20%
Defended = 20%
Minimized = 10%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 50%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 47. Percentage of his 10 debate turns that Nixon discussed
Eisenhower/administration in Debate #1.

Praised = 20%
Defended = 10%
Minimized = 10%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 10%
None = 40%
Undeterminable = 10%

Table 48. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in
his Debate #1 closing statement.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 49. Percentage of his 13 debate turns that Nixon discussed
Eisenhower/administration in Debate #2.

Praised = 30.77%
Defended = 15.38%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 7.69%
None = 46.15%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 50. Percentage of his 13 debate turns that Nixon discussed
Eisenhower/administration in Debate #3.

Praised = 23.08%
Defended = 7.69%
Minimized = 15.38%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 15.38%
None = 38.46%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 51. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in his Debate #4 opening statement.

Praised = 62.5%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 37.5%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 52. Percentage of his 7 debate turns that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in Debate #4.

Praised = 42.86%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 14.29%
None = 28.57%
Undeterminable = 14.29%

Table 53. Percentage of speech units that Nixon discussed Eisenhower/administration in Debate #4 closing statement.

Praised = 16.67%
Defended = 16.67%
Minimized = 16.67%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 50%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 54. Percentage of his 24 debate turns that Mondale discussed Carter/administration in Debate #1.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 4.16%
None = 87.5%
Undeterminable = 8.34%

Table 55. Percentage of his speech units that Mondale discussed Carter/administration in his Debate #1 closing statement.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 56. Percentage of his 22 debate turns that Mondale discussed Carter/administration in Debate #2.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 57. Percentage of speech units that Mondale discussed Carter/administration in his Debate #2 closing statement.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 58. Percentage of his 23 debate turns that H. W. Bush discussed Reagan/administration in Debate #1

Praised = 21.74%
Defended = 8.70%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 69.57%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 59. Percentage of speech units that H. W. Bush discussed Reagan/administration in his Debate #1 closing statement.

Praised = 25%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 75%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 60. Percentage of his 23 debate turns that Bush discussed Reagan/administration in Debate #2.

Praised = 34.78%
Defended = 4.35%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 13.04%
None = 47.83%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 61. Percentage of speech units that H. W. Bush discussed Reagan/administration in his Debate #2 closing statement.

Praised = 25%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 75%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 62. Percentage of his 41 debate turns that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in Debate #1.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 2.44%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 92.68%
Undeterminable = 4.88%

Table 63. Percentage of speech units that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in his Debate #1 closing statement.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 64. Percentage of his 47 debate turns that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in Debate #2.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 2.13%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 2.13%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 93.62%
Undeterminable = 2.13%

Table 65. Percentage of speech units that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in his Debate #2 closing statement.

Praised = 0%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 100%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 66. Percentage of his 29 debate turns that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in Debate #3.

Praised = 17.24%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 3.45%
None = 79.31%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 67. Percentage of speech units that Gore discussed Clinton/administration in his Debate #3 closing statement.

Praised = 25%
Defended = 0%
Minimized = 0%
Criticized = 0%
Neutral terms = 0%
None = 75%
Undeterminable = 0%

Table 68a. The percentage of prompt-response pairs in which the questioner, the opponent and the vice president respectively was the initial prompter of the president/administration as a topic in Nixon-Kennedy debate #1.

Questioner	= 30.00%
Kennedy(Opponent)	= 20.00%
Nixon (VP)	= 20.00%
No One Brought It Up	= 30.00%

Table 68b. The nature of the initial prompt and the nature of the vice president's response to the initial prompt (praise, defend, minimize, criticize, neutral, none) in Nixon-Kennedy debate #1.

PR 1	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 6	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Kennedy	None	Nixon	Minimize
Nixon	None	Kennedy	None
PR 2	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 7	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	Neutral	Questioner	None
Nixon	Neutral	Kennedy	Criticize
Kennedy	Criticize	Nixon	Defend
PR 3	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 8	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Kennedy	None	Nixon	Praise
Nixon	None	Kennedy	None
PR 4	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 9	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	Neutral	Questioner	None
Nixon	Undeterminable	Kennedy	None
Kennedy	None	Nixon	None
PR 5	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 10	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	Neutral
Kennedy	Criticize	Nixon	Praise
Nixon	None	Kennedy	Minimize

Table 69a. The percentage of prompt-response pairs in which the questioner, the opponent and the vice president respectively was the initial prompter of the president/administration as a topic in Nixon-Kennedy debate #2.

Questioner	= 15.39%
Kennedy (Opponent)	= 30.77%
Nixon (VP)	= 30.77%
No One Brought It Up	= 23.08%

Table 69b. The nature of the initial prompt and the nature of the vice president's response to the initial prompt (praise, defend, minimize, criticize, neutral, none) in Nixon-Kennedy debate #2.

PR 1	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 8	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	Undeterminable	Questioner	Criticize
Nixon	Defend	Kennedy	Criticize
Kennedy	Criticize	Nixon	Praise
PR 2	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 9	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Kennedy	Criticize	Nixon	Neutral
Nixon	Defend	Kennedy	None
PR 3	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 10	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Nixon	None	Kennedy	None
Kennedy	None	Nixon	None
PR 4	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 11	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Kennedy	Criticize	Nixon	Praise
Nixon	None	Kennedy	None
PR 5	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 12	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Nixon	Praise	**Kennedy**	Neutral
Kennedy	Criticize	Nixon	None
PR 6	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 13	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Kennedy	Criticize	Nixon	None
Nixon	None	Kennedy	None
PR 7	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.		
Questioner	None		
Nixon	Praise		
Kennedy	Criticize		

Table 70a. The percentage of prompt-response pairs in which the questioner, the opponent and the vice president respectively was the initial prompter of the president/administration as a topic in Nixon-Kennedy debate #3.

Questioner	= 23.08%
Kennedy(Opponent)	= 23.08%
Nixon (VP)	= 23.08%
No One Brought It Up	= 30.77%

Table 70b. The nature of the initial prompt and the nature of the vice president's response to the initial prompt (praise, defend, minimize, criticize, neutral, none) in Nixon-Kennedy debate #3.

PR 1	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 8	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Kennedy	Neutral	Nixon	Minimize
Nixon	Praise	Kennedy	None
PR 2	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 9	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Nixon	Neutral	Kennedy	Criticize
Kennedy	Neutral	Nixon	None
PR 3	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 10	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	Neutral
Kennedy	Criticize	Nixon	Minimize
Nixon	Defend	Kennedy	Criticize
PR 4	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 11	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	Neutral	Questioner	None
Nixon	Neutral	Kennedy	None
Kennedy	Neutral	Nixon	None
PR 5	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 12	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Kennedy	None	Nixon	None
Nixon	Praise	Kennedy	None
PR 6	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.	PR 13	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.
Questioner	Neutral	Questioner	None
Nixon	Praise	Kennedy	None
Kennedy	Neutral	Nixon	None
PR 7	Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.		
Questioner	None		
Kennedy	None		
Nixon	None		

Table 71a. The percentage of prompt-response pairs in which the questioner, the opponent and the vice president respectively was the initial prompter of the president/administration as a topic in Nixon-Kennedy debate #4.

Questioner	= 28.57%
Kennedy (Opponent)	= 28.57%
Nixon (VP)	= 42.86%
No One Brought It Up	= 00.00%

Table 71b. The nature of the initial prompt and the nature of the vice president's response to the initial prompt (praise, defend, minimize, criticize, neutral, none) in Nixon-Kennedy debate #4.

PR 1	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**	**PR 5**	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Nixon	Undeterminable	Nixon	None
Kennedy	Criticize	Kennedy	Neutral
PR 2	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**	**PR 6**	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Kennedy	None	Kennedy	Criticize
Nixon	Praise	Nixon	None
PR 3	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**	**PR 7**	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**
Questioner	Neutral	Questioner	Neutral
Nixon	Praise	Nixon	Praise
Kennedy	Criticize	Kennedy	Praise
PR 4	**Discussion of Eisenhower/Admin.**		
Questioner	None		
Kennedy	None		
Nixon	Neutral		

Table 72a. The percentage of prompt-response pairs in which the questioner, the opponent and the vice president respectively was the initial prompter of the president/administration as a topic in Mondale-Reagan debate #1.

Questioner	= 25.00%
Reagan (Opponent)	= 50.00%
Mondale (VP)	= 25.00%
No One Brought It Up	= 00.00%

Table 72b. The nature of the initial prompt and the nature of the vice president's response to the initial prompt (praise, defend, minimize, criticize, neutral, none) in Mondale-Reagan debate #1.

PR 1	Discussion of Carter/Admin.	PR 5	Discussion of Carter/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Reagan	None	Reagan	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Reagan	None	Reagan	None
Questioner	Criticize	Questioner	None
Mondale	None	Mondale	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Mondale	None	Mondale	None
Reagan-rebuttal	Criticize	Reagan-rebuttal	None
Mondale-rebuttal	None	Mondale-rebuttal	Undeterminable
PR 2	Discussion of Carter/Admin.	PR 6	Discussion of Carter/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Mondale	None	Mondale	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Mondale	None	Mondale	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Reagan	Criticize	Reagan	Criticize
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Reagan	None	Reagan	None
Mondale-rebuttal	None	Mondale-rebuttal	Neutral
Reagan-rebuttal	None	Reagan-rebuttal	Criticize
PR 3	Discussion of Carter/Admin.	PR 7	Discussion of Carter/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Reagan	None	Reagan	Criticize
Questioner	Neutral	Questioner	None
Reagan	None	Reagan	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Mondale	None	Mondale	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Mondale	None	Mondale	None
Reagan-rebuttal	None	Reagan-rebuttal	Undeterminable
Mondale-rebuttal	None	Mondale-rebuttal	None
PR 4	Discussion of Carter/Admin.	PR 8	Discussion of Carter/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Mondale	None	Mondale	None

Questioner	None		Questioner	None
Mondale	None		Mondale	None
Questioner	None		Questioner	None
Reagan	Criticize		Reagan	None
Questioner	None		Questioner	None
Reagan	None		Reagan	None
Mondale-rebuttal	None		Mondale-rebuttal	Undeterminable
Reagan-rebuttal	Criticize		Reagan-rebuttal	None

Table 73a. The percentage of prompt-response pairs in which the questioner, the opponent and the vice president respectively was the initial prompter of the president/administration as a topic in Mondale-Reagan debate #2.

Questioner	= 37.50%
Reagan (Opponent)	= 25.00%
Mondale (VP)	= 00.00%
No One Brought It Up	= 37.50%

Table 73b. The nature of the initial prompt and the nature of vice president's response to the initial prompt (praise, defend, minimize, criticize, neutral, none) in Mondale-Reagan debate #2.

PR 1	Discussion of Carter/Admin.	PR 5	Discussion of Carter/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Mondale	None	Mondale	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Mondale	None	Mondale	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Reagan	None	Reagan	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Reagan	None	Reagan	None
Mondale-rebuttal	None	Mondale-rebuttal	None
Reagan-rebuttal	None	Reagan-rebuttal	Criticize
PR 2	**Discussion of Carter/Admin.**	**PR 6**	**Discussion of Carter/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Reagan	Criticize	Reagan	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Reagan	None	Reagan	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Mondale	None	Mondale	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	Neutral
Mondale	None	Mondale	None
Reagan-rebuttal	Undeterminable	Reagan-rebuttal	None
Mondale-rebuttal	None	Mondale-rebuttal	None
PR 3	**Discussion of Carter/Admin.**	**PR 7**	**Discussion of Carter/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Mondale	None	Mondale	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Mondale	None	Mondale	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	Neutral
Reagan	None	Reagan	Criticize
Questioner	Neutral	Questioner	None
Reagan	None	Reagan	None
Mondale-rebuttal	None	Mondale-rebuttal	None
Reagan-rebuttal	None	Reagan-rebuttal	Criticize
PR 4	**Discussion of Carter/Admin.**	**PR 8**	**Discussion of Carter/Admin.**

Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Reagan	None	Reagan	None
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Reagan	None	Mondale	None
Questioner	None		
Mondale	None		
Questioner	None		
Mondale	None		
Reagan-rebuttal	None		
Mondale-rebuttal	None		

Table 74a. The percentage of prompt-response pairs in which the questioner, the opponent and the vice president respectively was the initial prompter of the president/administration as a topic in Bush-Dukakis debate #1.

Questioner	= 21.74%
Dukakis (Opponent)	= 43.48%
H. W. Bush (VP)	= 08.70%
No One Brought It Up	= 26.09%

Table 74b. The nature of the initial prompt and the vice president's response to the initial prompt (praise, defend, minimize, criticize, neutral, none) in Bush-Dukakis debate #1.

PR 1	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 13	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	Criticize
Bush	None	Bush	None
Dukakis	None	Dukakis	Criticize
PR 2	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 14	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	Neutral	Questioner	None
Dukakis	None	Dukakis	None
Bush	Defend	Bush	None
PR 3	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 15	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None

Dukakis	Criticize	Dukakis	Neutral
Bush	None	Bush	Praise
PR 4	**Discussion of Reagan/Admin.**	**PR 16**	**Discussion of Reagan/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
Dukakis	Criticize	Dukakis	Criticize
PR 5	**Discussion of Reagan/Admin.**	**PR 17**	**Discussion of Reagan/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	Neutral
Bush	Praise	Bush	Praise
Dukakis	None	Dukakis	Criticize
PR 6	**Discussion of Reagan/Admin.**	**PR 18**	**Discussion of Reagan/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Dukakis	Undeterminable	Dukakis	Criticize
Bush	None	Bush	None
PR 7	**Discussion of Reagan/Admin.**	**PR 19**	**Discussion of Reagan/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Dukakis	None	Dukakis	Criticize
Bush	None	Bush	Defend
PR 8	**Discussion of Reagan/Admin.**	**PR 20**	**Discussion of Reagan/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	Neutral
Bush	None	Bush	Praise
Dukakis	None	Dukakis	Criticize
PR 9	**Discussion of Reagan/Admin.**	**PR 21**	**Discussion of Reagan/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
Dukakis	Criticize	Dukakis	None
PR 10	**Discussion of Reagan/Admin.**	**PR 22**	**Discussion of Reagan/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	Neutral
Dukakis	None	Dukakis	None
Bush	Praise	Bush	None
PR 11	**Discussion of Reagan/Admin.**	**PR 23**	**Discussion of Reagan/Admin.**

Questioner	None		Questioner	None
Dukakis	Criticize		Dukakis	Criticize
Bush	None		Bush	None
PR 12	**Discussion of Reagan/Admin.**			
Questioner	None			
Bush	None			
Dukakis	None			

Table 75a. The percentage of prompt-response pairs in which the questioner, the opponent and the vice president respectively was the initial prompter of the president/administration as a topic in Bush-Dukakis debate #2.

Questioner	= 21.74%
Dukakis (Opponent)	= 17.39%
H. W. Bush (VP)	= 26.09%
No One Brought It Up	= 34.78%

Table 75b. The nature of the initial prompt and the nature of the vice president's response to the initial prompt (praise, defend, minimize, criticize, neutral, none) in Bush-Dukakis debate #2.

PR 1	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 12	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Dukakis	Criticize	Dukakis	None
Bush	None	Bush	Neutral
PR 2	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 13	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Dukakis	None
Dukakis	None	Bush	None
PR 3	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 14	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	Criticize	Questioner	None
Bush	Defend	Bush	Praise
Dukakis	None	Dukakis	Criticize
PR 4	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 15	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Dukakis	None	Bush	Praise
Bush	None	Dukakis	None
		Questioner	None
		Bush	Praise
PR 5	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 16	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	Neutral	Questioner	None
Dukakis	None	Dukakis	Criticize
Bush	Praise	Bush	None
PR 6	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 17	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	Neutral	Dukakis	None
Dukakis	Neutral	Bush	None
PR 7	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 18	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	Neutral
Bush	Praise	Bush	Praise
Dukakis	None	Dukakis	None

PR 8	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 19	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	Neutral	Questioner	None
Dukakis	None	Bush	None
Bush	Praise	Dukakis	None

PR 9	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 20	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Dukakis	None	Dukakis	Criticize
Bush	Praise	Bush	None

PR 10	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 21	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Dukakis	Criticize
Dukakis	None	Bush	None

PR 11	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.	PR 22	Discussion of Reagan/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	Criticize
Bush	None	Bush	Neutral
Dukakis	None	Dukakis	Criticize

Table 76a. The percentage of prompt-response pairs in which the questioner, the opponent and the vice president respectively was the initial prompter of the president/administration as a topic in Gore-Bush debate #1.

Questioner	= 00.00%
W. Bush (Opponent)	= 30.56%
Gore (VP)	= 02.78%
No One Brought It Up	= 66.67%

268

Table 76b. The nature of the initial prompt and the nature of the vice president's response to the initial prompt (praise, defend, minimize, criticize, neutral, none) in Gore-Bush debate #1.

PR 1	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 19	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	Neutral
Bush	Neutral		
PR 2	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 20	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	Neutral
Bush	None	Gore	None
		Bush2	None
PR 3	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 21	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Gore	None
Gore	None		
PR 4	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 22	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	Criticize	Bush	None
Gore	None	Gore	None
Bush 2	Criticize		
Gore 2	None	PR 23	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Bush 3	None	Questioner	None
Gore 3	None	Bush	Criticize
Bush 4	None		
Gore 4	None		
PR 5	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 24	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Gore	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
Gore 2	None	Gore2	None
Bush 2	Criticize		
Gore 3	None	PR 25	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Bush 3	None	Questioner	None
Gore 4	None	Bush	None
Bush 4	None	Gore	None

Gore 5	None	Bush2	None
		Gore2	None
		Bush3	None
PR 6	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 26**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
Bush	Criticize	Gore	None
PR 7	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 27**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
Bush	Criticize	Gore	None
Gore 2	None	Bush2	None
Bush 2	None	Gore2	None
PR 8	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 28**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Gore	None
Gore	None	Bush	Praise
PR 9	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 29**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
		Gore	Minimize
PR 10	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 30**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	Criticize
Gore	None	Gore	Undeterminable
Bush 2	None	Bush2	Criticize
		Gore 2	Undeterminable
		Bush 3	None
PR 11	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 31**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Gore	None
		Bush	None
PR 12	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	Gore2	None
Questioner	None	Bush2	None
Bush	None	Gore3	None

270

		Bush3	None
PR 13	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 32**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	Criticize
		Gore	None
PR 14	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 33**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
PR 15	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 34**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
Bush	None		
PR 16	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 35**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Gore	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
PR 17	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 36**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
Bush	None	Gore	None
		Bush2	None
PR 18	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**		
Questioner	None		
Bush	None		

Table 77a. The percentage of prompt-response pairs in which the questioner, the opponent and the vice president respectively was the initial prompter of the president/administration as a topic in Gore-Bush debate #2.

Questioner	= 01.32%
W. Bush (Opponent)	= 15.79%
Gore (VP)	= 01.32%
No One Brought It Up	= 81.58%

Table 77b. The nature of the initial prompt and the nature of the vice president's response to the initial prompt (praise, defend, minimize, criticize, neutral, none) in Gore-Bush debate #2.

PR 1	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 40**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Gore	None
Gore	None		
PR 2	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 41**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Gore	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
		Gore2	None
		Bush2	None
PR 3	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 42**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
		Gore	None
PR 4	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 43**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Gore	None
Bush	Praise		
PR 5	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 44**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**

Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
PR 6	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 45**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	Undeterminable	Bush	Undeterminable
		Gore	Undeterminable
PR 7	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 46**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
Bush	None		
PR 8	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 47**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	Neutral	Bush	None
		Gore	None
PR 9	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 48**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	Neutral	Questioner	None
Bush	Criticize	Bush	None
Gore	Defend		
PR 10	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 49**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
PR 11	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 50**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	Praise	Gore	None
		Bush	None
PR 12	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 51**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	Praise	Gore	None
Gore	None		
Bush2	None		
PR 13	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 52**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None

Gore	None	Gore	None
PR 14	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 53**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Gore	None
PR 15	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 54**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Gore	None
PR 16	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 55**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
		Gore	None
		Bush2	None
PR 17	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 56**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
		Gore	None
PR 18	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 57**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	Criticize
PR 19	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 58**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Gore	None
PR 20	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 59**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
PR 21	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 60**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Gore	None
		Bush	None
PR 22	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 61**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	Criticize

PR 23	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 62	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Gore	None
		Bush	None

PR 24	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 63	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	Praise

PR 25	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 64	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Gore	None

PR 26	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 65	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	Praise	Gore	None

PR 27	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 66	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	Criticize	Bush	None

PR 28	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 67	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None

PR 29	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 68	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
		Gore	None
		Bush2	Criticize

PR 30	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 69	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	Praise	Bush	None
		Gore	None

PR 31	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 70	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
Gore	None		

275

PR 32	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 71	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	Praise	Bush	None
PR 33	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 72**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
Bush	None		
PR 34	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 73**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
Bush	None		
PR 35	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 74**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
PR 36	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 75**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Gore	None
PR 37	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 76**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Gore	None
		Bush	None
PR 38	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	Gore2	None
Questioner	None	Bush2	None
Bush	None	Gore3	None
PR 39	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**		
Questioner	None		
Bush	None		

Table 78a. The percentage of prompt-response pairs in which the questioner, the opponent and the vice president respectively was the initial prompter of the president/administration as a topic in the Gore-Bush debate #3.

Questioner	= 00.00%
W. Bush (Opponent)	= 13.33%
Gore (VP)	= 16.67%
No One Brought It Up	= 70.00%

Table 78b. The nature of the initial prompt and the nature of the vice president's response to the initial prompt (praise, defend, minimize, criticize, neutral, none) in Gore-Bush debate #3.

PR 1	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 16**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Gore	Praise
Bush	None	Bush	None
PR 2	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 17**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
		Gore	Praise
PR 3	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 18**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Gore	None
Gore	None	Bush	Criticism
Bush 2	None		
PR 4	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 19**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Gore	None
Gore	None		
PR 5	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 20**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None

Bush	Criticize		

PR 6	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 21**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
Gore	None	Gore	None

PR 7	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 22**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
		Gore	None
		Bush	None

PR 8	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 23**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None
		Gore	Praise

PR 9	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 24**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Bush	None

PR 10	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 25**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Gore	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
		Gore2	None
		Bush2	None

PR 11	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 26**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Gore	None	Gore	None
		Bush	None

PR 12	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**	**PR 27**	**Discussion of Clinton/Admin.**
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	Neutral	Bush	None
Questioner2	Neutral	Gore	None
Gore	None		
Bush 2	None		

PR 13	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 28	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Bush	None
		Gore	None
PR 14	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 29	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	None	Gore	Praise
Gore	Praise	Bush	Criticism
Bush2	None		
Gore2	None		
Bush3	Criticism		
Gore3	None		
PR 15	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.	PR 30	Discussion of Clinton/Admin.
Questioner	None	Questioner	None
Bush	Praise	Gore	None
Gore	Neutral	Bush	None

References

Ambrose, S. E. (1983). *Eisenhower. Volume II: The President.* New York: Simon and
Schuster.

Apple, Jr., R. W. (1968, October 2). Humphrey stands on Vietnam talk: Says It "speaks
for itself"—declines to elaborate. *The New York Times*, p. 26.

Aristotle. (1990). From Rhetoric. In P. Bizzell & B. Herzberg (Eds.), *The rhetorical
tradition: Readings from classical times to the present* (pp. 151-194). Boston:
Bedford Books.

Barber, J. D. (1972). *The presidential character: Predicting performance in the White
House.* London: Prentice Hall.

Balz, D., & Morin, R. (2000, October 17). Bush has slim lead on eve of 3rd debate;
Gore's credibility rating down in poll. *The Washington Post*, p. A01. Retrieved
from http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/? Search term: Al Gore.

Barnes, J. A. (2001, March 17). The imperial vice presidency. *National Journal, 33*(11),
814. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.proxy-
um.researchport.umd.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ulh&AN=4261255&site=e
host-live

Barone, M. (1988, May 29). The Vice President's problem. *The Washington Post,* p. C7.
Retrieved from http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/? Search term:
Ronald Reagan, popularity.

Baumgartner, J. C. (2006). *The American vice presidency reconsidered*. Westport, CT:
Praeger.

Benedetto, R. (1999, March 22). Foreign policy surfaces as 2000 election issue. *USA Today*, p. 1A.

Benedetto, R. (2000, April 11). Polls push Bush ahead after Gore's stance on Elian case. *USA Today*, p. 13A. Retrieved from http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/? Search term: Gore, Elian Gonzales.

Benoit, W. L., Blaney, R., & Pier, P. M., (1998). *Campaign '96: A functional analysis of acclaiming, attacking, and defending.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Benoit, W. L., & McHale, J. P. (2004). Presidential candidates' personal qualities: Computer content analysis. In K. L. Hacker (Eds.), *Presidential candidate images.* (pp. 49-63). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Benoit, W. L., McKinney, M. S., & Holbert, R. L. (2001). Beyond learning and persona: extending the scope of presidential debate effects. *Communication Monographs, 68*(3), 259-273. doi: 10.1080/03637750128060

Benoit, W. L., & Airne, D. (2005). A functional analysis of American vice presidential debates. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 41*, 225-236.

Berke, R. L. & Elder, J. (2000, May 16). Polls show Bush ahead of Gore, with leadership a crucial issue. *New York Times,* p. A1.

Beschloss, M.R. (1999, April 11). Foreign policy's big moment. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/1999/04/11/opinion/foreign-policy-s-big-moment.html?pagewanted=all&src=pm

Bitzer, L. F. (1968). The rhetorical situation. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 1, 1-14.

Bostdorff, D. (1991). Vice-presidential comedy and the traditional female role: An examination of the rhetorical characteristics of the vice-presidency. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 55*, 1-27.

Brock, B. (1969). 1968 Democratic campaign: A political upheaval. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 55,* 26-35.

Broder, D. S. (1999, April 25). Script for an upset. *The Washington Post*, p. B7.

Brownstein, R. (2000, November 2). Campaign 2000; Gore turns down offer by Clinton to visit critical states. *Los Angeles Times*, p. A1.

Brummer, A. (1989, January 19). Reagan enjoys US loyalties to the end: Departing President receives record approval rating. *The Guardian*, n.p.

Burger, T. J. (2000, August 13). The scandals that won't die. *Daily News*, p. 6. Retrieved from http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/? Search term: Al Gore, iced tea.

Bush, G. H. W. (1988, August 18). 1988 Republican nomination acceptance speech. In The Annenberg School for Communication (Eds.), *The Annenberg/Pew Archive of Presidential Campaign Discourse* [CD]. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Cafferty, J. (2008, July 2). Cafferty: How should McCain deal with Bush's negatives? *CNN Transcript, posted: 02:01 PM ET July 2, 2008*. Retrieved from http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2008/07/02/cafferty-how-should-mccain-deal-with-pres-bush%E2%80%99s-negative-numbers/

Carlin, D. P. (1992). Presidential debates as focal points for campaign arguments. *Political Communication, 9*, 251-265.

Campaign Calendar Highlights (2002). In The Institute of Politics, Harvard University

    (Eds.), *Campaign for president: The managers look at 2000.* Hollis, NH: Hollis

    Publishing Co.

Caouette, M. (2011). Hubert H. Humphrey: The art of the possible. Retrieved from

    http://www.hhh.umn.edu/news_events/Centennial/pdf/ArtofthePossibleTranscript.

    pdf

Cappella, J. N., & Jamieson, K. H. (1997). *Spiral of cynicism: The press and the public*

    good. New York: Oxford University Press.

Carmody, J. (1992, October 17). Glued to the debates: Up to 93 million viewers watched

    Richmond forum. *The Washington Post*, p. D1. Retrieved from

    http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/? Search term: Presidential

    Debates, viewers.

Charlton, L. (1976, September 16). Mondale shows wit in accepting supporting role in

    the campaign. *The New York Times*, p.32. Retrieved from

    http://search.proquest.com/hnpnewyorktimesindex/docview/122921382/fulltextP

    DF/13A7AB67EE521027BA3/2?accountid=14696 Search term: Walter Mondale

Chen, E. (2000, April 27). Gore says Elian case is a distraction; Politics: Vice President

    maintains his distance from White House handling of issue, criticizes Congress'

    reaction too. *Los Angeles Times*, p. A15. Retrieved from http://www.lexisnexis.

    com/hottopics/lnacademic/? Search term: Gore, Elian Gonzalez.

Chinni, D. (2000, April 27). Elian and the pander zone. *The Christian Science Monitor*, p.

    21. Retrieved from http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/? Search

    term: Gore, Elian Gonzalez.

Clinton upset by Gore's remarks. *The Daily Telegraph,* p. 21. Retrieved from LexisNexis

    Academic. Search term: Gore.

Clinton, W. J. (2000, January 27). *The state of the union address*. Retrieved from

    http://www.insidepolitics.org/speeches/clinton00.htm

Clinton, W. J. (2004, July 26). *2004 Democratic national convention address.* Retrieved

    from http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/convention2004/billclinton

    2004dnc.htm

Clinton, W. J. (2012, September 5). *Democratic national convention keynote address*.

    Retrieved from http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/convention2012

    /wjclinton2012dnc.htm

CNN.com (2012, August 12). VP picks: The 5 best and 5 worst. Retrieved from

    http://www.cnn.com/2012/08/11/politics/gallery/vp-picks-the-5-best-and-5-

    worst/index.html

CNN.com Inside Politics (2000, May 31). George W. Bush making inroads in the West;

    Lazio touring New York on 'The Mainstream Express.' Retrieved from

    http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0005/31/ip.00.html

Cohen, J. E. (2001). The polls: Popular views of the vice president and vice presidential

    favorability. *Presidential Studies Quarterly, 31*(2), 349-357.

Commission on Presidential Debates (1960a, September 26). *The first Kennedy-Nixon

    presidential debate.* Chicago, IL. Retrieved from www.debates.org

Cox, P. (2013). John Nance Garner on the vice presidency – In search of the proverbial

    bucket. *Briscoe Center For American History*. Retrieved from

    http://www.cah.utexas.edu/news/press_release.php?press=press_bucket

DeCell, K., & Lichtman, A. J. (1990). *The thirteen keys to the presidency.* Lanham, MD: Madison Books.

Democratic National Committee (1960, no month and date). Nixon's Experience? *Museum of the Moving Image, The Living Room Candidate: Presidential Campaign Commercials 1952-2008*. Retrieved from www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1960

Devlin, L. P. (1986). An analysis of presidential television commercials, 1952-1984. In L. L. Kaid, D. Nimmo, & K. R. Sanders (Eds.), *New Perspectives on Political Advertising*. (pp. 21-54). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

de Vreese, C. H., Peter, J., & Semetko, H. A. (2001). Framing politics at the launch of the Euro: A cross-national comparative study of frames in the news. Political Communication, 18, 107–122. doi: 10.1080/105846001750322934

Devroy, A. (1988, December 3). Quayle weighs his role: Activist Senate presidency a possibility. *The Washington Post,* p. A1. Retrieved from http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/hottopics/lnacademic/? Search term: Quayle

Eisele, A. (1972). *Almost to the presidency: A* biography of two American politicians. Blue Earth, MN: The Piper Company.

Engelmayer, S. D., & Wagman, R. J. (1978). *Hubert Humphrey: The man and his dream.* New York: Metheun.

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.

Eskew, C. (2001). Carter Eskew and Bob Shrum. In K. H. Jamieson, & P. Waldman

    (Eds.), *Electing the president 2000: The insider's view*. (pp. 49-78). Philadelphia:

    University of Pennsylvania Press.

Farrell, T. B. (1978, November). Political conventions as legitimation ritual.

    Communication Monographs, 45, 293-305.

Flanigan, W. H., & Zingale, N. H. (2002). *Political behavior of the American electorate,*

    (10nth ed). Washington DC: CQ Press.

Flanigan, W. H., & Zingale, N. H. (2010). *Political behavior of the American electorate,*

    (12th ed). Washington DC: CQ Press.

Gallup (2011, October 10). Presidential job approval center. Retrieved from

    http://www.gallup.com/poll/124922/presidential-approval-center.aspx

Garrettson III, C. L. (1993). *Hubert Humphrey: The politics of joy.* New Brunswick, NJ:

    Transaction Publishers.

German, K. (2001, April 6). *New York Times photographic coverage of the 2000*

    presidential campaign: Assessing factors of attention, credibility and emotion.

    Paper presented at the Central States Communication Association convention,

    Cincinnati, OH.

Gillon, S. M. (1992). *The Democrats' dilemma: Walter F. Mondale and the liberal*

    legacy. New York: Columbia University Press.

Gillon, S. M. (1997). A new framework: Walter Mondale as vice president. In H. Walch

    (Eds.), *At the president's side: The vice presidency in the twentieth century*. (pp.

    144-154). Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.

Goldman, E. F. (1969). *The tragedy of Lyndon Johnson.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Goldstein, J. K. (1997). More agony than ecstasy: Hubert H. Humphrey as vice president. In H. Walch (Eds.), *At the president's side: The vice presidency in the twentieth century.* (pp. 103-123). Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.

Goldstein, J. K. (1982). *The modern American vice presidency: The transformation of a political institution.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Greenberg, S. (2001). Stanley Greenberg. In K. H. Jamieson, & P. Waldman (Eds.), *Electing the president 2000: The insider's view*. (pp. 79-118). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Gwertzman, B. (1968, October 2). U.S. officials find no break with Johnson. *The New York Times*, p. 1.

Hahn, D. F. (1998). *Political communication: Rhetoric, government, and citizens.* State College, PA: Strata Publishing, Inc.

Hallow, R. Z. (2000, October 10). Honesty questions hurt Gore in polls; 'Sighs and lies' trigger decline. *The Washington Times,* p. A1. Retrieved from http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/? Search term: Gore

Hannity, S. (Executive Producer). (2008, June 22). Hannity & Colmes [Television broadcast]. New York and Washington, DC: Fox News Channel.

Hart, R. (2000). *Campaign talk: Why elections are good for us?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hartlaub, P. (2004, October 15). 51 million viewers tuned in for final presidential face-off. *San Francisco Chronicle*, p. A18. Retrieved from http://www.lexisnexis.com/ hottopics/lnacademic/? Search term: presidential debates, viewers.

Hellweg, S. A. (2004). Campaigns and candidate images in American presidential

elections. In K. L. Hacker (Ed.), *Presidential candidate images*. (pp. 21-47).

Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Hinck, E. A. (1993). Enacting the presidency: Political argument, presidential debates,

and presidential character. Westport, CT: Praeger.

History.com. (2013, November 3). Campaign spot: Best qualified (1960), Video Clip

(1:02) Retrieved from: http://www.history.com/videos/campaign-spot-nixons-

experience-1960#campaign-spot-nixons-experience-1960

Hoffman, D. (1987, May 26). Bush steps gingerly from Reagan shadow; Cautious quest

avoids criticism of president. *The Washington Post,* p.A4. Retrieved from

http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/hottopics/lnacademic

/? Search term: George Bush.

Holsti, O. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, MA:

Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Hunt, A. R. (1980, September 24). The Mondale campaign. *The Wall Street Journal*, p.

30. Retrieved from

http://search.proquest.com/hnpwallstreetjournal/docview/134505340/13AC2B629

093B65A52C/1?accountid=14696 Search term: Hunt.

Jamieson, K. H., & Adasiewicz, C. (2000). What can voters learn from election debates?

In S. Coleman (Ed.), *Televised election debates: International perspectives* (pp.

25-42). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Johnson, L. (1968, October 31). *LBJ Tapes*. C-SPAN Radio.

Jones, (2000, October 21). Substance and style of the presidential campaign. *CBS News Transcripts*. Retrieved from http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/hottopics/lnacademic/? Search term: 2000 debates

Just, M. R., Crigler, A. N., Alger, D. E., Cook, T. E., Kern, M., & West, D. (1996). *Crosstalk: Citizens, candidates, and the media in a presidential campaign.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Karelitz, T. M., & Budescu, D.V. (2013). The effect of the raters' marginal distributions on their matched agreement: A rescaling framework for interpreting kappa. *Multivariate Behavioral Research,* 48, 923-952. doi 10.1080/ 00273171.2013.830064

Kengor, P. (2000). *Wreath layer or policy player? The vice president's role in foreign policy.* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Kincade, V. (2000). *Heirs apparent: Solving the vice presidential dilemma.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Kjeldahl, B. O., Carmichael, C. W., Mertz, R. J. (1971). Factors in a presidential candidate's image. *Speech Monographs, 38*(2), 129-131.

Kurtz, H. (2000, July 28). Voters miss picture in media album of Bush, Gore; Study cites disconnect between public, press. *The Washington Post*, p. A16. Retrieved from http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/hottopics/lnacademic/? Search term: Al Gore, iced tea.

Kuttner, R. (2000, January 17). Should Gore do a Humphrey? *The American Prospect*, p. 4.

Lechelt, J. (2009). *The vice presidency in foreign policy: From Mondale to Cheney.* El

    Paso, TX: LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC.

Leon, M. (1993). Revealing character and addressing voter's needs in the 1992

    presidential debates: A content analysis. *Argumentation & Advocacy,* 30, 2, p.88

    Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.proxy-

    um.researchport.umd.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ufh&AN=9610313465&sit

    e=ehost-live

Mazo, E. (1964, September 6). Humphrey terms Johnson a "giant:" Opens campaign with

    talk in Minnesota – he calls Goldwater irresponsible. *The New York Times*, p. 1.

    Retrieved from

    http://search.proquest.com/hnpnewyorktimesindex/docview/115622596/13A7AF

    D3D8A592B758C/1?accountid=14696 Search Term: Humphrey

McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda setting function of mass media.

    Public Opinion Quarterly, 36(2), 176-187, doi: 10.1086/26799.

Memo says Gore may have lied about money. (2000, May 3). *St. Petersburg Times,* p.

    8A. Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic. Search term: Gore, iced tea

Mondale's America. (1984, July 23). *The Christian Science Monitor*, p. 13.

Montgomery, R. (2000, October 31). Cult of likability. *Grand Forks Herald*, p. A1.

    Retrieved from http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy-

    um.researchport.umd.edu/hottopics/lnacademic/?

Murphy, J. M., & Stuckey, M. E. (2002). Never cared to say goodbye: Presidential

    legacies and vice-presidential campaigns. *Presidential Studies Quarterly, 32*, 46-

    66.

Martel, M. (1983). *Political campaign debates: images, strategies, and tactics*. New York: Longman.

Natchez, P. B., & Bupp, I. C. (1968). Candidates, issues, and voters. *Public Policy, 17*, 409-437.

Natoli, M. D. (1985). *American prince, American pauper: The contemporary vice presidency in perspective.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Nelson, M. (2002, November 30). The curse of the vice presidency. *American Prospect.* Retrieved from

http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=the_curse_of_the_vice_presidency

Nelson, M. (2001). The election: Ordinary politics, extraordinary outcome. In M. Nelson (Eds.), *The Election of 2000*. (pp. 55-91). Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

Neustadt, R. E. (1997). Vice presidents as national leaders: Reflections past, present, and future. In H. Walch (Eds.), *At the president's side: The vice presidency in the twentieth century*. (pp. 183-196). Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.

Nimmo, D., & Combs, J. E. (1983). *Mediated political realities.* New York: Longman.

Nixon, R. M. (1962). *Six crises*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Nossiter, B. (1968, September 29). Humphrey race: The old politics with a faint of the new. *The Washington Post*, p. A12.

Oberdorfer, D. (1968, September 25). Rep. Laird says LBJ plans troop cuts. *The Washington Post,* p. A7.

Page, S. (2000, Sept. 7). Why good times, the Internet, aging boomers, peace abroad & President Clinton could decide who wins your vote. *USA Today*, p. 1A. Retrieved

from http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/? Search term: Bill

Clinton, personal approval.

Perl, P., & Russakoff, D. (1984, August 31). Teamsters endorse GOP ticket; Reagan,

Bush win their only nod from a big union. *The Washington Post,* p. A1. Retrieved

from LexisNexis Academic. Search term: Mondale, Carter.

Pomper, G. M. (2001, Summer). The 2000 presidential election: Why Gore lost. *Political

Science Quarterly, 116*(2), 201-223.

Quayle, D. (1997). Standing firm: Personal reflections on being vice president. In H.

Walch (Eds.), *At the president's side: The vice presidency in the twentieth

century*. (pp. 169-179). Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.

Reinard, J. C. (1998). *Introduction to communication research.* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA:

McGraw-Hill.

Ritter, K. W. (1980, Fall). American political rhetoric and the jeremiad tradition:

Presidential nomination acceptance addresses, 1960-1976. *Central States Speech

Journal, 31*, 153-71.

Roberts, C. L. (1981, Winter). From primary to the presidency: A panel study of images

and issues in the 1976 election. *The Western Journal of Speech Communication,

45*, 60-70.

Rothenberg, R. (1988, March 6). In search of George Bush. *The New York Times,* p. 29.

Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic. Search term: In search of George Bush.

Ryan, T., & Smith, D. (Executive Producers). (2000, August 15). *CNN's Talk Back Live*

[Television broadcast]. Atlanta: Cable News Network. Retrieved from

http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0008/15/tl.00.html

Sanger, D. E. (2000, November 3). The 2000 campaign: The president; Clinton says if he
can't run, Gore is 'next best thing.' *The New York Times*, p. A24. Retrieved from
http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/? Search term: Bill Clinton, Al
Gore.

Schram, M. (1984, August 26). GOP polls reflect minimal boost from made-for-TV
convention. *The Washington Post,* p. A13. Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic.
Search term: Mondale, Carter.

Seelye, K. Q. (1999, June 16). Gore terms Clinton affair 'inexcusable.' *The New York
Times,* p. A26. Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic. Search term: Gore.

"She's in great shape and I'm the guy to repair her." [Editorial cartoon] (1960, October
2). *The New York Times*, p. E8.

Shields, M. (1988, October 22). The third-term strategy. *The Washington Post*, p. A23.
Retrieved from http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/? Search term:
George Bush.

Shrum, B. (2002). Bob Shrum. In The Institute of Politics, Harvard University (Eds.),
Campaign for president: The managers look at 2000. Hollis, NH: Hollis
Publishing Co.

Sidey, H., Cannon, J., Ferrell, R. H., Untermeyer, C., Apple R. W., Jr., & Neustadt, R. E.
(1997). Defining a public role for vice presidents: A symposium. In H. Walch
(Eds.), *At the president's side: The vice presidency in the twentieth century*. (pp.
197-214). Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.

Sigel, R. S. (1966). Image of the American presidency: Part II of an exploration into popular views of presidential power. *Midwest Journal of Political Science, 10*(1), 123-137.

Simon, R. (2001). *Divided we stand: How Al Gore beat George Bush and lost the presidency.* New York, NY: Crown Publishers.

Smith, C. A. (1990). *Political Communication*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Smith, H. (1968), October 2). Hanoi aides reject Humphrey's plan: Find "nothing new" in bid to halt bombing. *The New York Times*, p.1.

Solberg, C. (1984). *Hubert Humphrey*: *A biography*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Solomon, J. (2011, March 28 & April 4). A wimp he wasn't. *Newsweek*, p.48.

Sperling, G. (1987, May 5). George Bush - a strong candidate? *Christian Science Monitor*, p. 16. Retrieved from http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy-um.researchport.umd.edu/hottopics/ lnacademic/? Search term: Bush

Stanley, H. W. (2001). The nominations: The return of party leaders. In M. Nelson (Eds.), *The Election of 2000*. (pp. 27-53). Washington, D.C.: CQ Press

Sulzberger, A. O., Jr. (1980, November 1). Bush pushes drive to win democrats. *The New York Times*, p. 9. Retrieved from http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/? Search term: Bush

Summers A. (2000). *The arrogance of power: The secret world of Richard Nixon*. New York: Penguin Group.

Telephone conversation between President Johnson and Senator Everett Dirksen (1968, October 1). Posted on U.S. Department of State: Office of the Historian website.

Foreign relations of the United States, 1964-1968, Volume VII, Vietnam,

    September 1968-January 1969, Document 42. Retrieved from:

    http://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1964-68v07/d42

Sheehan, N. (1971). *The pentagon papers as published by The New York Times*. New

    York: Quadrangle books.

Trent, J. S., & Friedenberg, R. V. (2004). *Political campaign communication: Principles*

    and practices, fifth edition. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Trent, J. S., Short-Thompson, C., Mongeau, P. A., Metzler, M. S., & Trent, Jimmie D.

    (2005). The idealized presidential candidate: A vision over time. *American*

    Behavioral Scientist, 49, 130-156. doi: 10.1177/0002764205279437.

    http://abs.sagepub.com/content/49/1/130

Trent, J. S., Short-Thompson, C., Mongeau, P. A., Nusz, A. K., & Trent, Jimmie D.

    (2001). Image, media bias, and voter characteristics: The ideal candidate from

    1988-2000. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 44, 2101-2104. doi:

    10.1177/00027640121958519 http://abs.sagepub.com/content/44/12/2101

Turque, B. (2000). *Inventing Al Gore*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Untermeyer, C. (1997). Looking forward: George Bush as vice president. In H. Walch

    (Eds.), *At the president's side: The vice presidency in the twentieth century*. (pp.

    157-168). Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.

Vatz, R. E. (1973). The Myth of the Rhetorical Situation. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 6(3),

    154-161.

von Eye, A., & von Eye, M. (2008). On the marginal dependency of Cohen's κ.

    European Psychologist, *13*(4): 305-315. doi 10.1027/1016-9040.13.4.305.

Waugh, E. W. (1956). *Second consul: The vice presidency: our greatest political problem*. Indianapolis, IN. The Bobbs-Merrill Co, Inc.

What are you thinking? Pollsters are busy getting a taste of public opinion. (2000, October 17). *The Washington Post*, p. C15. Retrieved from http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/? Search term: Al Gore

Weaver, D. H. (2007). Thoughts on agenda setting, framing, and priming. *Journal of Communication, 57*, 142-147. doi: 10.1111/j. 1460-2466.2006.00333.x

White, T. H. (1969). *Making of the president 1968.* New York: Atheneum Publishers.

Witcover, J. (1992). *Crapshoot: Rolling the dice on the vice presidency.* New York: Crown Publishers, Inc.

Williams, I. G. (1954). *The American vice presidency: New look.* Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Winkler, C. (1991). Crises of confidence: Rhetorical constraints for incumbent party successors. *Political Communication and Persuasion, 8*, 17-27.