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Abstract

*The Associated Press Stylebook* serves as the foundation for many style manuals throughout U.S. newsrooms. *Stylebook* entries often provide historical facts and data about phenomena, in addition to demonstrating proper usage or explaining grammar rules. The *Stylebook* also attempts to present itself a journalistically objective book as it seeks to reflect common language usage and societal values.

A critical discourse analysis of the entry titles, examples, and explanations in five *Stylebooks* (1977, 1987, 1997, 2007, and 2014) revealed that the *Stylebook* mirrors journalistic practices in a few ways. The *Stylebook* focuses its entries and references primarily on hard news, an area feted within mainstream journalism. Additionally, the *Stylebook* favors men in terms of language rules. However, this preference and the heavy use of male exemplars could be seen as journalistically objective because they show that common language often defaults toward men and that men dominate in hard news sectors such as politics, business, and the military. The *Stylebook* also replicates the cultural norm of a gender binary, i.e., there are only men and women. For now, *Stylebook* rules do not favor gender neutrality in cases where a person’s gender is known. However, the *Stylebook* rulings and depictions are not static. The *Stylebook* has been revised many times in the past 37 years. These changes illustrate U.S. society’s shifting viewpoints on gender and sexual orientation.

A strength of critical discourse analysis is in its prescriptive nature — in the ways it illuminates the potential for a text to better align with progressive cultural values. The final section notes places for stylistic improvements for both *Stylebook* editors and journalism as a whole.
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The Associated Press Stylebook (the Stylebook in subsequent references) considers itself the “bible for journalists” (Pruitt, 2014). As such, it carries significant influence on how U.S. media depict their stories (e.g., Cotter, 2014; Steiner, 2007). This power makes the Stylebook a target for praise and condemnation, especially in matters of gender. For instance, a Columbia Journalism Review column, in chiding a sexist lead in The New York Times, suggested that Stylebook guidelines would have kept the lead from making print (Seigel, 2013). The lead, on an obituary:

She made a mean beef stroganoff, followed her husband from job to job and took eight years off from work to raise three children. “The world’s best mom,” her son Matthew said.

But Yvonne Brill, who died on Wednesday at 88 in Princeton, N.J., was also a brilliant rocket scientist (Seigel, 2013).

The Stylebook has an entry that decries this sort of treatment, i.e., describing women in their domestic roles even though the story has nothing to do with their domesticity (Angione, 1977; Seigel, 2013). The obituary is about a “brilliant rocket scientist,” not about how Yvonne Brill makes beef stroganoff.

However, the Stylebook is not immune from public scorn. It was criticized for its depiction of transgender people in 2009 (Hess, 2009). A blogger for Washington City Paper expressed displeasure regarding an Associated Press story that referred to a transgender mayoral candidate as both a man and a woman. The blogger indicated that writing about transgender
people was relatively new terrain for journalists and said the following regarding the *Stylebook*: “With any other developing story, the AP will update its outdated, incorrect narrative when new information comes to light” (Hess, 2009). The *Stylebook* is looked to as a linguistic leader and generally responds to changes (Cotter, 2014).

The *Stylebook* also guides the way mass media present the news, a process called framing. The framing (wording) of events can influence decision-making (Kahneman & Tversky, 1981) as frames help people understand how to view events (e.g., Auerbach & Bloch-Elkon, 2005; Boomgaarden, de Vreese, & Semetko, 2011; Kitzinger, 2010; Nelson, Oxley, & Clawson, 1997; Van Gorp, 2007). Consider the difference between a pretty person and a gorgeous person. While both terms mean the person is aesthetically pleasing, gorgeous means that the person especially beautiful. Accordingly, journalistic style rules can influence frames. For instance, in 2015, the *Stylebook* changed its style on how it describes people who do not believe in climate change. *Stylebook* editors said: “Our guidance is to use *climate change doubters or those who reject mainstream climate science* and to avoid the use of *skeptics or deniers*” (Colford, 2015). While doubters, skeptics, and deniers all describe people who do not believe in climate change, the connotations of the terms vary greatly. The editors further explained their decision: “But those who reject climate science say the phrase denier has the pejorative ring of Holocaust denier so The Associated Press prefers climate change doubter or someone who rejects mainstream science” (Colford, 2015). Words are not simply interchangeable; they confer great meaning and are sites of political and cultural struggles. In fact, “our ways of talking do not neutrally reflect our world, identities and social relations but, rather, play an active role in creating and changing them” (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 1). Multiple factors, including language, help people make sense of the world and create
relationships between multiple groups (e.g., Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002; Taylor, 2013). Word selection then can be thought of as a requisite building block for framing because the selection of certain words allow for the creation of different imagery. There is a difference between calling a person crazy, odd, or eccentric. While all three mean a person deviates from mainstream behavior, each of those words connotes a different meaning. As such, the worlds are socially constructed, i.e., people’s understandings of society are learned, not inherent (Berger & Luckmann, 1967). Fairclough (2015) posited that there is a strong relationship between language and society in that social factors help determine what is communicated and how messages are communicated. The power to define relationships between groups cannot be understated; it is of paramount importance.

As the Stylebook is updated annually and is seen as a language leader, it is an important document in terms of understanding journalism and the broader society. This dissertation seeks to explore how the Stylebook has depicted men, women, and gender over time. Thus, a critical discourse analysis of entry titles, examples, and explanations in five Stylebooks, covering 37 years, was used because this method easily allows for the findings to be connected to both societal changes and broader power structures (e.g., Gee, 2014; Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002; Taylor, 2013; Wodak & Meyer, 2001).

**Why Does the Stylebook Matter?**

**The Associated Press**

For many U.S. journalists, the Stylebook provides a common reference point by which to understand key issues (Goodale, 2013) and also learn about journalistic culture (Paskin, 2010). Overall, the Associated Press itself can be seen as being a bellwether news organization (Kim, 2011). The Associated Press began in 1846 as New York City newspapers, spurred by the
creation of the telegraph, joined together to share news and costs (Mears, 2007). In 1849, leader of the AP consortium Daniel H. Craig decided that the Associated Press would collaborate with additional newspapers to share and sell content, which helped lay the foundation for the current incarnation of the Associated Press (Mears, 2007). In its initial years, the Associated Press primarily covered the United States and Canada, but by the early 1900s, it extended its operations to the Caribbean, Central American, and U.S. territories in Asia (Rantanen, 2006). The consortium began operations in South America in the 1910s, as other news services began to take notice of the rising global power and influence of both the United States and the U.S.-based Associated Press (Rantanen, 2006).

The Associated Press even used to have its own staff at local U.S. newspapers (Smethers, 2002). During the telegraph era, Associated Press journalists in the field used to send their copy in some sort of shorthand that needed to be deciphered. At its member newspapers, the Associated Press would employ a telegraph operator who would type the story for the local newspaper editors (Smethers, 2002). Much of the national and international news came from the Associated Press then (Smethers, 2002), and that is still the case in modern times (Ways, 2006). About 38% of U.S. daily newspapers in the 1910s were members of the Associated Press (248 U.S. 215 at 217 & 224, 1918), and the Associated Press got that figure in its first 70 years while competing with other news consortiums such as Reuters, United Press International, and Havas (Rantanen, 2006; Smethers, 2002). The Associated Press continued to grow tremendously in the following decades. It is composed of about 1,500 U.S. newspapers and has staff in 280 locations in 110 countries (Associated Press, 2014; Associated Press, n.d.). Additionally, the Associated Press is far more than a newspaper organization, as it has provided radio and video journalism for decades, too. It is easy to see why the Associated Press holds such lofty status. The
organization says its various content is seen by “more than one billion people every day” (Mears, 2007, p. 406). The content includes 2,000 stories a day, 1 million photos a year, and 50,000 videos annually (Associated Press, 2014). Associated Press stories can be seen as accessible to all audiences as its content likely resonates with “the average media consumer in the United States” (Hunt, 1992, p. 55). Now because of the Associated Press’s mobile app, all people can freely access Associated Press content anywhere, anytime.

The Associated Press is also credited for helping create standardization in modern U.S. journalism (Harcup, 2009; Mears, 2007). One of the major writing formats, the inverted pyramid, is often connected to the Associated Press (e.g., Harcup, 2009; Mears, 2007; Scanlon, 2003; Stephens, 2007). The inverted pyramid is taught in most journalism textbooks (e.g., Brooks et al., 2014; Itule & Anderson, 2000) and is seen as canon within the industry (e.g., Brooks et al., 2014; Itule & Anderson, 2000; Scanlon, 2003; Stephens, 2007). The inverted pyramid is simply the process of placing the most important information at the beginning of a news story and then telling the remainder of the story by mentioning the subsequent details by descending importance (Brooks et al., 2014; Itule & Anderson, 2000; Scanlon, 2003; Stephens, 2007). Journalists adopted the inverted pyramid for practical reasons; when transmitting news over telegraph wires, stories could get cut off for myriad reasons. Thus, it was critical to tell the most newsworthy information first. The example often given when detailing the history of the inverted pyramid is the Associated Press’s 1865 announcement that President Abraham Lincoln was shot: “The President was shot in a theater to-night and perhaps mortally wounded” (Scanlon, 2003; Stephens, 2007, p. 241). As seen here, the influence of the Associated Press on journalistic style has been felt for more than 140 years.
The Associated Press Stylebook’s Transmitting of Journalistic Norms

Maintaining tradition is a big part of the Associated Press as it and its *Stylebook* play a massive role in setting and upholding journalistic style. Steiner (2007) said the *Stylebook* serves as the foundation for other journalism stylebooks. More than 50,000 copies are sold each year, highlighting the primacy of the book (Schlisserman, 2010; Tenore, 2009).

The *Stylebook* as it is known today initially served as a guide for sending wire copy. It was 60 pages, and *Stylebook* editors had to rely on themselves and their own reference materials for grammatical guidance. (Fisher, 2007). In response to pressure for standardization, the Associated Press and another leading wire service at the time, United Press International, jointly updated their styles “at the request of subscribing newspapers” in 1960 (Vultee, 2012, p. 453). However, the Associated Press decided to change the book’s purpose into more of a “reference work” in the 1970s (Boccardi, 1977, p. iv). The book’s purpose changed from a guide for sending wire copy to becoming an all-around grammar and style manual for journalism. The revised *Stylebook*, which is similar in look and tone to today’s *Stylebook*, was released in 1977 (Associated Press, 2012; Fisher, 2007). Associated Press executive editor Louis D. Boccardi explained the rationale behind 1977 book titled *The Associated Press Stylebook and Libel Manual*:

Work on this revised Stylebook began almost two years ago. The orders were: Make clear and simple rules, permit few exceptions to the rules, and rely heavily on the chosen dictionary as the arbiter of conflicts.

As work progressed, we became convinced that while style would remain the chief purpose, there were many factual references we should include to make things easier for busy editors.
So we have a Stylebook, but also a reference work (p. iv).

After the mid-1980s, the Stylebook was updated annually (Associated Press, 2012; Cotter, 2014) as it “outlines basic rules on grammar, punctuation, usage and journalistic style, but it also reflects changes in common language, offers guidance on media law, explains AP’s news values and principles, and helps to navigate the ever-changing world of social media” (Pruitt, 2014).

From 1977 to 2014, the Stylebook made updates to business, sports, technology, and fashion. In 1983, all the sports entries were compiled into the Sports section (French, 1987), and that section has continued to grow from 1987 through 2014. It was 15 pages in 1987 and by 2014 it was 22 pages — an almost 50% increase. Also by 1987, a business section was created that included the business terms listed in the 1977 Stylebook, but also added a lot more terms. By 2014, elements of the Business terminology section were folded back into the main portion of the Stylebook while sections for food, fashion, religion, and social media entries were created.

While the Stylebook created, revised, and removed entries in the 37-year period, it always continued to grow. The Stylebook went from 276 pages in 1977 to 332 pages in 1987 to 334 pages in 1997 to 417 pages in 2007 to 503 pages in 2014. It should be noted that an entire section, Computer Terms, that was added by 1987 was removed by 1997. Even though a whole section and terms disappeared, the Stylebook still grew. The removal of the Computer Terms section is emblematic of a bigger trend, which is that the Stylebook responds to changes within the culture. In explaining the addition of the Computer Terms section, the Stylebook said, “Computers have rapidly reached a point where they affect every aspect of living. The following defines and gives correct spellings for common computer terms. Also listed are the jargon words and terms to be avoided” (French, 1987, p. 281). Thus, the changes seen over time cannot be explained in a vacuum. Any modifications must be explored with a gaze toward the societal
occurrences. For example, a quick glance at the Computer Terms showed that the terminology by
1997 was outdated as the technology changed rapidly. Also, the society became more familiar
with computers; 18% of U.S. adults had used a computer in 1984; by 1997, 53% of people used
computers daily (Kominski & Newburger, 1999). As such, a guide for general computer
terminology was no longer needed.

The Stylebook then can be considered a historical document. The Stylebook has shown
that it documents cultural shifts and major societal events. Because the Stylebook is a text that
tells how journalists should depict phenomena, it is an ideal text to understand journalistic
thinking. Carey (1974) said:

When we study the history of journalism we are principally studying a way in which men
in the past have grasped reality. We are searching out the intersection of journalistic style
and vocabulary, created systems of meaning, and standards of reality shared by writer
and audience. We are trying to root out a portion of the history of consciousness (p. 5).

How are Norms Transmitted?

In one way, the consciousness of a society can be considered a society’s culture as Walsh
(1993) posited that culture, “the way of life and the manner of living of a people” (Jenks, 1993,
p. 5), is always reproducing itself. From an educational function, Bourdieu (1973) would posit
that educators and educational materials tend to “transmit a cultural heritage” (p. 72) and that
language plays a key role in that transmission (Walsh, 1993). In school, students learn the
standards, norms, and expectations for an industry they wish to enter. Upon entering an industry,
the students-turned-professionals begin to adhere to and enforce these standards, norms, and
expectations (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). Walsh (1993) explained the concept: “Consequently,
within society, a dominant ideology emerges as a hegemonic culture which incorporates and
institutionalises the interests of the dominant class and serves as a social cement which binds the whole social order into a particular and prevalent pattern” (p. 228). Simply put, the elites in society control what is taught and what information is important to know. Then the students learn this information and learn to highly value the same concepts. Then when these students becomes industry professionals and teachers, they then transmit the same lessons and values, reifying the existing social structures. This process is essentially hegemony where the masses reproduce the ideologies and structures handed down from above.

Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) proffered that there is also a selfish reason for teachers and elites to maintain such formalization: It creates difference between the best and the rest. If canon did not exist or if there were no institutionalized conventions such as writing in inverted pyramid style, then what is the need for “elite” instructors or practitioners? Experts gain power by creating an aura surrounding their chosen professions as “professional knowledge and skills act as emblems of personal achievement, mystifying social constraints on access — as well as being membership cards for those who achieve access, and a means of excluding outsiders” (Fairclough, 2015, p. 90). However, Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) said that this creation comes at a price because an expert “cannot abdicate his ultimate protection, the professional use of professional language” (p. 110). The professional languages are found in professional texts and so, these professional texts carry with them a sort of confirmatory power within certain realms. Those who seek recognition as professionals rely on canonical material to legitimize their claims. Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) also saw traditional education as maintaining inequities as “the apparently purely academic culture of hierarchy always contributes to the defence and legitimation of social hierarchies, because academic hierarchies … always owe something to the social hierarchies which they tend to re-produce” (p. 152). Bourdieu (1998b) examined France’s
education structure and argued that instructors often taught required materials and provided no soul to the information transfer: “Their pedagogic action resembles a coach who passes on the structure of an exercise and the framework of learning over the knowledge itself” (p. 93). The lessons and norms passed down are done so willingly … and often without question.

The reproduction of journalism norms adheres to a structure similar to the one outlined by Bourdieu and Passeron (1977). In journalism, journalists have been conditioned to behave and perceive events in certain ways. With more than 90% of journalists having college degrees (Willnat & Weaver, 2014), it is clear that journalists receive and must show proficiency in reproducing formalized journalism style, rules, and norms. Journalism educators have often spent some time as practitioners, too (Steiner, 2007). Additionally, when former journalists enter academia or produce instructional works, they teach the standards they previously learned as well as industry norms, thereby reproducing the existing structure within journalism: “Given their professional experiences and their commitment to ‘realism,’ authors of reporting textbooks want to enforce standard newsroom procedures and socialize recruits into professional norms” (Steiner, 2007, p. 9). Often industry canon is just blindly recited by practitioners with nary a thought to the ideologies girding the rules (Bourdieu, 1998b; Greenberg, 2013; Holmes, 2005). These instructors are converting their knowledge and experiences into canon: “Codification is aimed at attaining minimal variation in form through setting down the prescribed language code in a written form — in grammars, dictionaries, pronouncing dictionaries, spelling books” (p. 85).

And so, if journalists influence the public via language, it would be apropos to examine what influences journalists’ language choices. While there is much research on the power of journalists’ words, far less attention is given to the manuals that journalists follow. The Associated Press Stylebook is the dominant style manual within journalism (e.g., Brown, 1978;
Cotter, 2014; Hines & Basso, 2003; Steiner, 2007). For the most part, journalists have to follow the *Stylebook’s* linguistic prescriptions (Brown, 1978; Cotter, 2014). Other mass communications professionals are encouraged to learn AP style as well (Hines & Basso, 2003). Even early on, journalism instructors were quick to encourage the *Stylebook’s* adoption in classrooms: “Every student majoring in journalism needs to learn to use it efficiently. … Students are told it is an indispensable reference and is required in advanced courses in reporting and editing” (Brown, 1978, p. 56-57). Other mass communications professionals are encouraged to learn AP style as well (Hines & Basso, 2003). As most newspapers rely on *Stylebook* rules, those in public relations can please editors by making their copy comport to the *Stylebook*: “A harried business reporter or city editor does not have the time to sift through the clutter of releases to correct sundry style errors. So, if you want your releases to be among the few that actually see newsprint, make a concerted effort to become AP savvy” (Hines & Basso, 2003, p. 16). It could be said then that the *Stylebook’s* language decisions have a powerful influence on society as a whole.

**Textbooks and Habitus**

Professional texts — style manuals, textbooks, dictionaries — hold a tremendous amount of power (Greenberg 2013; Steiner, 2007). When a person is defending oneself, having an authoritative source provides legitimacy for an argument. For example, psychotherapist Gary Greenberg (2013) described the power of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Health Disorders*: “When doctors said homosexuality was a disease, that was not an opinion, let alone, bigotry. It was a fact” (p. 5). Regardless of one’s beliefs, Greenberg said “you tell yourself whatever story you have to” (p. 6). Overall manuals are stronger than one’s own observations
and cannot be disregarded. Broadly speaking, any structures or items that are so-called objective lead to “absolute and immediate submission” (Bourdieu, 1998b, p. 4).

Most times people do not want to fight what is accepted orthodoxy in a field. Holmes (2005) summarized this observation well: “Systemic power typically goes unquestioned because it is firmly based in conventional wisdom” (p. 32). Orthodoxy can easily be a substitute for conventional wisdom. However, conventional wisdom is not necessarily bias-free. When examining canonical texts such as style manuals, Cameron (1996) said researchers are not so much concerned about “overt bias” as they are concerned about the “covert working of common sense professional judgements and widely-held stereotypes, which naturalize particular understandings of news events” (p. 315). For researchers, analyzing journalism’s canons must be partnered with deeper examinations of industry rituals. Jenks (1993) said, “Elements of a culture, as we experience them, are the surface appearance or manifestation of underlying patterns at a deeper level” (p. 9). These “underlying patterns” include what Bourdieu (1998b) termed “preexisting social differences” (p. 170). For journalism, this needs to include various socio-economic differences based on race, gender, and class (e.g., Harp, 2008; Poindexter, 2008b). The messages beneath the surface are often overlooked, but offer rich insights into a society and the culture of a specific industry.

Thus, an examination of journalism must include its textbooks because textbooks explain “how the profession ought to be practiced and who can practice it” (Steiner, 2007, p. 9). Tasked with a similar goal are style manuals, “whose prescriptions journalists are expected to observe and editors to enforce … Becoming familiar with the general principles of journalistic style, and with the specific rules that follow from them, is part of the socialization of professional journalists” (Cameron, 1996, p. 315). Cameron’s and Steiner’s statements can be placed under
Bourdieu’s (1973, 1998a) idea of habitus. One way to view habitus is as a “unity of style” (Bourdieu, 1998a, p. 8). What occurs with habitus is that members of a certain group adopt the mentalities that are popular within their circle. Essentially, there is a right way to do something and a wrong way to perform tasks, even a right and a wrong way to think. Habitus is indeed a powerful force for maintaining culture because it makes the accepted behavior and concepts seem normal, making it easy for people to just follow along and not question anything (Mander, 1987).

The *Stylebook* carries cache with the public as it helps regulate both grammar norms and word usage (e.g., Brooks, Pinson, & Wilson, 2013; Cotter, 2014; Steiner, 2007). Brooks, Pinson, and Wilson (2013) briefly explain in their media grammar textbook how much power the *Stylebook* power has regarding “arbitrary” language rules:

Actually, a bigger problem is that not everyone subscribes to the same rules of style, spelling and grammar. Among journalists, the most widely accepted standards for style are set by The Associated Press Stylebook and Briefing on Media Law and the most widely accepted spellings in the latest edition of Webster’s New World College Dictionary. We have tried to conform as much as possible to these (p. 11).

Even many influential grammarians defer to the *Stylebook* on seemingly “arbitrary” rules as the scope of the *Stylebook* even extends to the mundane. Consider the backlash when the *Stylebook* permitted writers to use “over” in lieu of “more than.” When the change was announced at the American Copy Editors Society annual conference, it was expected to “rock copy editors to their very cores” (Beaujon, 2014). The *Stylebook* must contain a lot of power if changing a minor grammar convention “will rock copy editors to their very cores.” The story even made *The Washington Post* (Petri, 2014).
The *Stylebook* can also be seen as a key decision-maker in terms of public culture. When *Stylebook* editors decided to depict spouses in a same-sex marriage as husbands or wives, they signaled a prominent shift in American culture in 2013 (Goodale, 2013). The entry **husband**, **wife** is as follows: “Regardless of sexual orientation, *husband* for a man or *wife* for a woman is acceptable in all references to individuals in any legally recognized marriage. *Spouse* or *partner* may be used if requested” (Christian, Froke, Jacobsen, & Minthorn, 2014, p. 124). In 2015, the U.S. Supreme Court issued a landmark decision recognizing all same-sex marriages. While the Associated Press’s acceptance of same-sex marriage cannot be proven to have influenced jurists, it certainly could not have hurt to have the “bible for journalists” (Pruitt, 2014) supporting same-sex marriage. The power of stylebooks in fomenting change should not be taken lightly: “Media style policies perform an influential gatekeeping function with regard to linguistic innovations” (Cameron, 1996, p. 329). Depending on the rulings of stylebook editors, these innovations will either be widely adopted or pushed to the fringes (Cameron, 1996).

Media elites, too, know the *Stylebook*’s power within mainstream culture (Brooks, Pinson, & Wilson, 2013). Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist-turned-immigrant activist Jose Antonio Vargas said he wanted to meet with *Stylebook* editors to discuss terminology regarding unauthorized immigrants (Weinger, 2012). Vargas wanted journalists to stop using “illegal immigrants,” and he felt if he could get the Associated Press and *The New York Times* to not use “illegal immigrants” then that would make a big statement to all journalists. Even though copy editors and reporters could reject *Stylebook* guidelines, it appears that these people lack the power to do so in many cases.

Therefore, habitus has to be connected to Shoemaker’s (1991) observation on gatekeepers that they tend to follow industry norms in order not to appear as major outliers. Habitus can also
be discussed in connection with Goodwin’s (1994) perspective of “professional vision,” which stems from “socially organized ways of seeing and understanding events that are answerable to the distinctive interests of a particular social group” (p. 606). This vision is not inherent; it is learned. Notions of habitus, professional vision, and formalization can all be folded into the concept of community of practice (CofP), defined as:

… an aggregate of people who, united by a common enterprise, develop and share ways of doing things, ways of talking, beliefs, and values – in short, practices. A CofP can develop out of a formally or informally constituted enterprise … Once launched, it has its own life and develops its own trajectory. The development of shared practices emerges as the participants make meaning of their joint enterprise, and of themselves in relation to this enterprise. Individuals make sense of themselves and others through their forms of participation in and contributions to the community. The community as a whole constructs a joint sense of itself through the relation between its practices and those of other communities (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1999, p. 186).

Textbooks help foster a community of practice. Steiner’s (2007) explanation for the purpose of textbooks makes the connection more explicit:

Textbooks articulate and celebrate a discipline’s paradigms and procedures, declaring canonical standards of knowledge. Textbooks for professional groups not only describe key practices, but also prescribe, albeit in ways that accommodate existing distributions of authority and power, how the profession ought to be practiced and who can practice it (p. 9).
Essentially professional texts describe what is important to know, and what is not important to know. It can be said then that manuals and textbooks are given the blessing from those who are the highest in a specific field, and therefore, the “rest” of the people have to follow its edicts.

**Language Reflects Societal Values and Hierarchies**

While power clearly exists in setting and modifying preferred language, power in society does not have to be taken by force; it can be gained through getting members of marginalized groups to acquiesce and adopt ideologies from those in various positions of dominance (e.g., Artz & Murphy, 2000; Fairclough, 2003; Walsh, 1993). This process is considered hegemony. Media assist with the dissemination of ideologies and the public’s adoption of those concepts: “The mass media, including movies, television, magazines, and books, tend to use accepted representations and standard professional practices drawn from cultural values, stereotypes, and social rituals that predominate in the United States today” (Artz & Murphy, 2000, p. 28). In other words, “The news media are both ‘a cause’ and an ‘effect’” (Tuchman, 1978, p. 189). Under hegemony, structures are never static; they are “fragile and resistant” (Lazar, 2005, p. 140). While society and traditions do shift (because they are fragile), dominant groups generally remain in charge (resistant). Power disparities within a society reinforce the idea that some marginalized groups have little power to change how they are perceived: “The identities of ethnic or sexual minorities are often shaped importantly by factors over which they have no control, such as popular prejudices” (Gunn, 2006, p. 133). For example, women participate in sport, but sport overall is perceived as masculine (e.g., Burstyn, 1994; Cahn, 1999). The perception of sport as masculine could have contributed to a lack of female representation in the *Stylebook*, i.e., it might never have occurred to editors that women were underrepresented because sport is thought to be male (Bien-Aimé, 2016a).
Just because the *Stylebook* calls for changes does not automatically mean its calls will be heeded. For example, the stereotyping of women exists despite journalism manuals advising students and practitioners not to do so. In her historical study of journalism textbooks, Steiner (2007) found that the 1970s heralded a change where textbooks and journalism began taking sexism and stereotypical language much more seriously. Recall Tuchman (1978) said the women’s movement was advocating for improved treatment of women during this era, too. Steiner heralded the 1977 *Stylebook* for its progressive stance. Here is its entry for women in 1977:

Women should receive the same treatment as men in all areas of coverage. Physical descriptions, sexist references, demeaning stereotypes and condescending phrases should not be used. …

—Copy should not assume maleness when both sexes are involved, as in *Jackson told newsmen* or in *the taxpayer … he* when it easily can be said *Jackson told reporters or taxpayers … they.*

—Copy should not express surprise that an attractive woman can be professionally accomplished, as in *Mary Smith doesn’t look the part but she’s an authority on …*

—Copy should not gratuitously mention family relationships when there is no relevance to the subject, as in *Golda Meir, a doughty grandmother, told the Egyptians today …* (Angione, 1977, p. 240).

Interestingly, the entry is unchanged in the 2014 *Stylebook* (Christian et al., 2014). What did change, though, was that by the 1980s textbooks stopped taking gender discrimination seriously,
save the advice to avoid using sexist pronouns and language (Steiner, 2007). Thus, any analysis of a call for change must factor in the strength of the push.

In describing the strength of a push for change, consider the *Stylebook’s women* entry. More specifically, notice the term newsmen. It used to be common to call journalists newsmen; this is because journalism used to be positioned as a profession for men (Steiner, 2007). The frame of newsmen gives the notion that journalism is a male industry. The genesis of a frame might rely on a group’s previously held beliefs (Nelson, Oxley, & Clawson, 1997). Frames then can work to help people interpret a phenomenon (Boomgaarden, de Vreese, & Semetko, 2011; Van Gorp, 2007). While not directly telling society journalism is for men, *The Associated Press Stylebook’s women* entry is still leaving room for the belief that journalism is for men. Today there is a movement to use more gender-inclusive labels as now people call newsmen (and newswomen by extension) journalists. Perhaps then it could be posited that overt gender discrimination is discouraged, but reinforcement of gender stereotyping occurs in more subtle ways.

“Preferred Usages”

With the power contained in language, it is not surprising then that there are always contestations over preferred usages (Fairclough, 2015). Examining who has the ability to set usage standards is critical in any discussion about language (e.g., Bourdieu 1973, 1998a; Fairclough, 2015; Wodak & Meyer, 2001). For standardization to occur, other — perhaps undesirable — forms have to perish (Fairclough, 2015). This effect is evident within language as “‘non-standard’ social dialects” are downgraded in favor of a proper form of communication (Fairclough, 2015, p. 84). Cultural elites and those influential in their specific fields set the scope for what can and cannot be discussed, and what words can be used within those circles.
(Bourdieu, 1998b; Fairclough, 2003, 2015; Mander, 1987; Walsh, 1993). To illuminate what is meant by scope, think about the idea of marriage. The preferred definition of marriage in *Webster’s New World College Dictionary* (Agnes, 2007), the official dictionary for *The Associated Press Stylebook*, is “the state of being married; relation between spouses; married life; wedlock; matrimony” (p. 881). This dictionary’s definition for marriage appears to mirror the 2014 *Associated Press Stylebook*’s entry for **husband, wife** in that now there is room for same-sex and heterosexual marriages.

There is a small difference, though, when reading the dictionary’s entire first definition for marry: “*a*) to join as spouses in wedlock *b*) to join (a man) to a woman as her husband, or (a woman) to a man as his wife” (p. 881). The message emanating from *Webster’s New World College Dictionary* in regard to marry offers some space for people not in two-person non-heterosexual relationships, but reflects that the societal norm for marry is generally between one man and one woman.

The 1988 *Webster’s New World College Dictionary* took a different tone on ideas of marriage. Marry was defined as “*a*) to join as husband and wife; unite in wedlock; *b*) to join (a man) to take a woman as her husband, or (a woman) to man as his wife” (Neufeldt & Guralnik, 1988, p. 829). Marriage had a similar definition: “state of being married; relation between husband and wife; married life; wedlock; matrimony” (Neufeldt & Guralnik, 1988, p. 829). In the 1987 *Associated Press Stylebook*, same-sex marriage seemingly was not even a consideration in public, based on its **husband, widower** entry: Use **husband**, not **widower**, in referring to the spouse of a woman who dies (French, 1987, p. 105). In the 1980s, marriage was viewed solely as a union between one man and one woman; today, the definition is much more flexible. That entry is far different from 2014’s **husband, wife** entry. Thus, language provides “potential set of
possibilities” for what is possible for society (Fairclough, 2003, p. 23). The relationship between language and society is not purely unidirectional. Changes in language could help signal/spur shifts in society, and changes in society can create changes in language.

**Project Overview**

Understanding that cultures shift over time, it would be beneficial to explore how the *Stylebook*, as a leading arbiter of journalistic grammatical norms, handles these changes. Cotter (2014) said, “Synchronically, the Stylebook shows what is relevant at a particular moment; diachronically, it shows what does change and the internal discussions along the way” (p. 382). Because U.S. society has experienced myriad changes from the 1970s through the 2000s, including significant shifts in how it perceives and describes gender and sexual orientation this dissertation proposed the following research questions:

- **RQ 1**: How do Stylebook entry titles depict gender?
  - RQ 1a) How have entry titles stayed the same?
  - RQ 1b) How have entry titles changed?
- **RQ 2**: How do Stylebook entry examples and explanations depict gender?
  - RQ 2a) How have entry examples and explanations stayed the same?
  - RQ 2b) How have entry examples and explanations changed?

To answer the research questions, this project examined five *Associated Press Stylebooks* (1977, 1987, 1997, 2007, and 2014). The analysis began with the 1977 *Stylebook* because the modern version of the *Stylebook* was created in 1977 (Associated Press, 2012; Boccardi, 1977; Fisher, 2007). By examining 10-year periods, the researcher was able to see cultural shifts occur and observe how the *Stylebook* to respond to those changes.
The answer was derived through a critical discourse analysis. *Stylebook* entries, examples, and explanations were examined to gauge not just whether men or women appear, but how they appeared. This project analyzed the types of entries in which men and women are seen. Additionally, the current project analyzed the linguistic nature of *Stylebook* depictions, i.e., did the *Stylebook* contain stereotypical depictions of men and women? A critical discourse analysis was used because it easily allowed for the findings to be connected to both societal changes and broader power structures (e.g., Gee, 2014; Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002; Taylor, 2013; Wodak & Meyer, 2001).

**My identity and this research**

As a former hard news copy editor and as a former sports copy editor, I feel have an intimate relationship with *The Associated Press Stylebook*. However, as a qualitative scholar, I must admit there are subjective reasons why data is included or excluded (e.g., Lindlof & Taylor, 2011; Maxwell, 2013; McCracken, 1988). Maxwell (2013) noted, “There is no such thing as ‘inadmissible evidence’ in trying to understand the issues or situations you are studying” (p. 87). Everything could mean something significant. Thus, qualitative research calls for much transparency because the researcher is also the primary data analyst (e.g., McCracken, 1988). However because investigators must be reflexive at all times, perhaps more “honest” projects are completed because good researchers should as clearly as possible explain how they made decisions and disclose parts of their identities when such disclosures would help others understand the choices made. These disclosures can be considered bracketing (e.g., Ahern, 1999; Gearing, 2004; Tufford & Newman, 2012). Tufford and Newman (2012) describe bracketing as “a mechanism to both protect and enhance the research process” (p. 87). Bracketing is not a single-step process; rather, bracketing must occur at every level of the research project (Ahern,
1999; Tufford & Newman, 2012). As a gender scholar who often relies on feminist theories, I do see feminist theories informing the literature review, questionnaire, and data analysis for my dissertation. In undertaking work regarding gender, feminist theories illustrate connections and raise questions that are often ignored. However, I endeavored to allow the data to speak, not force the data into a certain of theories. Maxwell (2013) smartly said that “no theory will accommodate all data equally well” (p. 49).

This project has been an eye-opening endeavor. I have used the Stylebook closely since I was 19 years old in my first journalism class, and every year I purchased a new copy. While I — and many editors I know — questioned Stylebook rulings, we almost always complied. There were certain rules I could recite from memory. The pages were dog-eared, and the books well worn. As an instructor, I have taught Stylebook canon; students need to know it to gain employment in public relations and journalism. However, as I delved further into my graduate school studies, I began to take a more critical eye into materials that are presented as orthodoxy.

When I examine media topics, I often look for the places where gender, race, class, and sexual orientation intersect. The search for the intersections often inspire my literature reviews and subsequent research questions, which makes sense. The literature a person knows should influence how that person understands events and that literature should also offer a window into what the researcher is seeing.

When it comes to data, I cannot separate my journalism background and my academic lens. When I analyze the Stylebook, I understand the mentalities of journalists who believe they are preparing news items and as such are seeking linguistic guidance from the Stylebook. From my perspective based on numerous conversations with people on copy desks across the country, journalists do not believe Stylebook editors have political agendas. However through my
academic lens, I have difficulty believing *Stylebook* entries, examples, and explanations are mere coincidences, either. Therefore, I believe these distinct identities help provide more nuance to my project.

That said, I cannot help but consider that my other identities as a heterosexual, Catholic, black man will inform the analysis, as well. I think my marginalization as a black man in some circles, and recognition of privilege in my other identities (Christian, heterosexual, and male), give me good tools to help with the examination. I have heightened sensitivities when it comes to be excluded or being overlooked, but I feel I also have awareness of potential places where editors might normalize certain practices without understanding that these behaviors could be reproducing some exclusionary ideologies, e.g., calling a man the best athlete in a sport while a similarly accomplished woman is called the best in the women’s version of the same sport (Billings, Halone, & Denham, 2002; Halbert & Latimer, 1994; Messner, Duncan, & Jensen, 1993).

All that said, a bracketing statement does not address the trustworthiness of a qualitative project. Because qualitative research is highly subjective, establishing more mechanisms to establish more credibility for the findings was necessary (e.g., Lindlof & Taylor, 2011; Maxwell, 2013). Maxwell (2013) raised the expectations for qualitative data by later writing that one of its purposes is “Generating results and theories that are understandable and experientially credible, both to the people you are studying and to others” (p. 31). To make the dissertation more “credible,” this project used Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) “truth value” (p. 290). Truth value identifies whether the researcher has addressed the multiplicity of the data. What multiplicity meant for this dissertation was that there were numerous realities and that people could interpret
the data differently based upon their diverse experiences and literature reviews (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

As such, Lincoln and Guba (1985) recommended “having the findings approved by the constructors of the multiple realities being studied” (p. 296). Lincoln and Guba described what Maxwell (2013) called “respondent validation,” having members of the sample review a researcher’s findings to make sure that the statements are in line with what they think (p. 126). For instance, Hardin and Shain (2006) conducted focus groups with female sports journalists to gauge their perceptions of the sports industry. The researchers later verified their findings with another female sports journalist who was not a focus group member. Hardin and Shain then used the themes that received consensus. However, both Maxwell (2013), and Lindlof and Taylor (2011) noted that verification with participants can be helpful, but are “not decisive” (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011, p. 279) in determining what data and findings can be used. This dissertation used one outside journalist to review the findings, a la Hardin and Shain (2006). The respondent was familiar with creating style manuals with newspapers; his particular experience was necessary because this former journalist will be more likely to have an understanding of The Associated Press Stylebook editors compared to other journalists, such as reporters. This dissertation departed from Hardin and Shain’s (2006) method in that it did not seek consensus in the findings, but that the findings made sense and were in good context.

Critical Discourse Analysis

Although studies have described discourse in a multitude of ways (e.g., Richardson, 2007; van Dijk, 1993), it can be understood as simply a pattern of language that indicates relationships within a society (Gee, 2014; Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002; Taylor, 2013; Wodak & Meyer, 2001). Gee (2014, p. 19) characterized discourse as “language-in-use.” To understand
whether the Stylebook reinforced gender norms, discourse analysis was an apropos method as its “interest is in how language is used to reinforce norms, legitimate existing social structures, subtly obscure or rationalize inequalities, play down problems and perpetuate an interpretation of society which supports some interests and obscures others” (Taylor, 2013, p. 77).

Unlike descriptive discourse analysis, which has a primary focus on language and grammatical structure (Gee, 2014), critical discourse analysis is more prescriptive in nature. As such, critical discourse analysts “speak to, and perhaps, intervene in, institutional, social, or political issues, problems, and controversies in the world. They want to apply their work to the world in some fashion” (Gee, 2014, p. 9). The application of their work can be “unabashedly normative” (van Dijk, 1993, p. 253). Hence, to be a quality critical discourse analysis, this dissertation made recommendations on how to improve, not only the Stylebook, but stylebooks in general.

Wodak and Meyer (2001) describe contextualizing critical discourse analysis around five areas: “what knowledge (valid at a certain place at a certain time) consists of; how this valid knowledge evolves; how it is passed on; what function it has for the constitution of subjects and the shaping of society and what impact this knowledge has on the overall development of society” (p. 32-33).

Pertaining to the first area of critical discourse analysis, understanding “what knowledge (valid at a certain place at a certain time) consists of” must be grounded in the temporality of the subject being studied: “Understanding the particular context within which the participants act and the influence that this context has on their actions” is vital to qualitative scholarship (Maxwell, 2013, p. 30). The researcher has to go beyond what is within and work to place the participants’ actions within the larger social framework. It is crucially important to have an
understanding of temporality when conducting research (e.g., Evans, 1999; Startt & Sloan, 2003). Taylor (2013) argued that analysts must be cautious of applying modern standards to mentalities that originated far in the past. Therefore, the literature from the previous chapter will allow for better data analysis because there is greater understanding the social landscapes at the times in which the *Stylebooks* were written. Discourse analysis allows for the tracing of specific language and ideas, and it looks at the avenues that facilitate the spread and perpetuation of those ideas. A critical researcher must attend to both the structural and ideological functions of those ideas, i.e., whose interests are served by the existing structure and what societal interests it reflects. Thus, jointly looking at the news events and journalistic practices will further the critical endeavor.

The second and third parts of discourse analysis are “how this valid knowledge evolves” and how this knowledge is disseminated. To describe the evolution of the stylebook and its subsequent language choices, this dissertation examined five books over five decades. Wodak and Meyer (2001) recommend setting some guidelines for what areas should be studied. For this dissertation, every entry in the stylebook will be explored. Sections that are not explicitly guidelines such as “Briefing on Media Law” or “Kills, correctives and clarifications” were not be analyzed. The addition of new entries, the language modifications within entries, and the entries that remain unchanged over time all indicate different ideologies and societal shifts.

The final two sections for critical discourse analysis, “what function it has for the constitution of subjects and the shaping of society” and “what impact this knowledge has on the overall development of society” are tightly linked to Wodak and Meyer’s (2001) suggestion that a researcher ground the artifact of study. This is a vast endeavor that calls for the researcher to justify using the selected text (Gee, 2014; Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). For this dissertation, one
must understand that journalists have the ability to create societal impressions of people and events through framing (e.g., Entman, 1993; Wang & Shoemaker, 2011). The *Stylebook* contains the preferred language and grammar usage for many American journalists; it is also the foundational text for many other journalism stylebooks (Steiner, 2007). Therefore, the *Stylebook* can be said to set the linguistic parameters journalists have with the public. Thus, the entries and the later *Stylebook* changes (or lack thereof) play a vital role in fostering shifts throughout societies. By examining each entry, one might be able gauge how the journalism industry understands gender.

**Process for Data Analysis**

All the entries from the 1977, 1987, 1997, 2007, and 2014 *Associated Press Stylebooks* that met the criteria described above were copied into Dedoose, a Web-based platform that can be used to analyze qualitative and quantitative research (Dedoose, n.d.). Qualitative researchers have used the Dedoose to identify codes and categories from transcriptions (e.g., LeBaron, Beck, Black, & Palat, 2014; Lunsford, 2014). This dissertation used Dedoose for the same purpose. The entries, definitions, and examples revealed notions about gender.

To analyze the entries, this project modified McCracken’s (1988) process for data analysis. While McCracken’s procedure is for interview transcripts, his recommendations can also be used for other qualitative text data. In place of interview transcriptions, the dissertation data were the individual entries in the five selected editions of the *Stylebook*. Because there are thousands of entries, a systematic process was necessary for analysis. For McCracken, there are five steps to analyzing the data, and that each step winnows the dataset.

Step 1 was paying attention to “utterances,” what immediately jumps out to researchers (McCracken, 1988, p. 44). Not all the entries were relevant for my analysis; not all the
definitions or the examples were relevant for the analysis. The analysis began in with the 1977 *Stylebook*. The initial utterances that I highlighted were entries that related to gender or contained examples that expressed gender, i.e., a masculine or feminine pronoun, or proper nouns for either men or women. These utterances were tagged and segmented out to create a smaller dataset. For the subsequent *Stylebooks*, I noted and tagged all the entries that were updated and entries that were added to later editions. Because the research questions focused on cultural understandings of gender norms, updates and additions that were related to gender were kept for the final dataset; the other updates and additions were removed for the analysis. Thus, it was possible to visually identify when relevant entries were created, updates, and/or remained the same.

Step 2 was identifying where there were connections within the data, i.e., similarities and/or differences (McCracken, 1988). The utterances found in Step 1 were placed within gender groups. All the utterances that had only female references received a code of “women only”; all the utterances that had only male references were code “men only”; and all the utterances that had male and female references were tagged “men and women.” Identifying gender was only one way the utterances were structured. The nature of the entries was also coded. Codes such as politics, business, nobility, sports were created and attached to entries. Multiple utterances were in multiple groups. For example, the *king* entry was initially coded as male only, politics, and sports because it contained elements only men and referred to political figures and sports. This flexibility was needed because data must be “played with” to maximize the researcher’s ability to find potential meanings. Subsequently, data that could not be placed within groups were removed.
Step 3 sought “refinement” and find “patterns and themes” within the groups (McCracken, 1988, p. 45). With the data placed in various groups, I gauged whether there are broader ideas that connected the data through thematic analysis, which focuses “on identifying and describing both implicit and explicit ideas within the data, that is, themes” (Guest, MacQueen, & Namey, 2012, p. 10). With data analysis beginning immediately (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011), I relied on the constant comparative method to document themes and/or patterns (McCracken, 1988). Broadly speaking, I took the highlighted entries and documented each grouping of entries as codes, providing formal names and definitions to the remaining highlighted entries that were placed together (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011). From there, I combined related codes into overarching categories (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011; McCracken, 1988). The categories were primarily based upon previous theories and findings described in the literature review (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011).

Step 4 was “judgment” as I evaluated what data remains and create links between the themes (McCracken, 1988, p. 46). This categorization of data was repetitive, but in each iteration I became more knowledgeable about the data: “Over time, as most of the incidents are coded and compared, the total number of categories usually begins to level out” (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011, p. 251). Categories collapsed within each other as the overlapping became apparent. Data that appeared useful initially was also discarded. Within Step 4, categories were placed into larger concepts. Concept names were primarily derived from existing literature (Morse, 2004). In this phase, I worked to ascertain how some categories were connected to one another, gauging how related categories existed under similar overarching frameworks. Similar to categories, the concepts needed to be defined explicitly so that no two concepts could be confused with each
other (Morse, 2004). These concepts will be explained in greater detail in the subsequent Results chapter.

Step 5 was harmonizing the refinement (McCracken, 1988). Here I united the codes, categories, and concepts into a narrative that explained the data (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011). The interpretation focused “on identifying and describing both implicit and explicit ideas within the data” (Guest, MacQueen, & Namey, 2012, p. 10), and how the codes, categories, and concepts are related to each other, perhaps shaping “common-sense understandings” located in a society (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 21). Essentially, the interpretation, located in the Discussion/Conclusion section, explained how The Associated Press Stylebook relates to gender portrayals within journalism and how U.S. society saw gender in different periods.

**Chapter 1 Conclusion**

Media work to shape the public’s perception of not just news events, but society in general (e.g., Auerbach & Bloch-Elkon, 2005; Boomgaarden, de Vreese, & Semetko, 2011; Kitzinger, 2010; Nelson, Oxley, & Clawson, 1997; Van Gorp, 2007). Through their choices in language, journalists have tremendous influence to both disrupt and reify existing societal norms, despite whether those choices are conscious or unconscious. One of the key linguistic texts in journalism is the *Stylebook* (e.g., Paskin, 2010; Steiner, 2007). The *Stylebook* helps set the rules U.S. journalists follow, and its editorial decisions grant legitimacy and visibility to some different groups within society.

The *Stylebook* can be seen as part of education’s canonical texts in that it is recommended material for journalism teachers and students (Paskin, 2010). Being a canonical text, the *Stylebook* has additional influence because educators and practitioners, regardless of field, are reluctant to question, let alone reject, industry orthodoxy (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977).
For journalism, former practitioners internalize industry norms and values; subsequently, when some of them enter teaching or another instructional position, they would often uncritically teach the same industry norms and values (Cameron, 1996; Steiner, 2007). This leads to a generational perpetuation of certain ideologies and mentalities. Thus for those interested in analyzing gender depictions within journalism, knowing what the Stylebook decided to highlight and how it depicted its entries likely reflected major conversations within journalism and wider society because Stylebook editors’ decisions resonated for grammarians (Beaujon, 2014) and for those seeking political change (Weinger, 2012).

This dissertation used critical discourse analysis to analyze gender depictions within five Stylebooks, ranging from 1977-2014. Before venturing into any results, one must examine journalism’s relationship to gender. More specifically, the next chapter explores gender portrayals in journalism.
Chapter 2: Gender and Journalism

As media can shape people’s interpretation of the world (e.g., Auerbach & Bloch-Elkon, 2005; Boomgaarden, de Vreese, & Semetko, 2011; Kitzinger, 2010; Nelson, Oxley, & Clawson, 1997; Van Gorp, 2007), their portrayals influence how society members relate to each other (e.g., Artz & Murphy, 2000; Gunn, 2006). Through their stories, journalists foster and reinforce notions of gender (e.g., Burstyn, 1994; Cahn, 1999; Lang, 1978; Ross & Sreberny, 2000). A culture’s ideas of gender play a major role in how that society positions individuals, in many cases specifically men and women (Benokraitis, & Feagin, 1995; Sreberny & van Zoonen, 2000). Thus, it is important to interrogate Western ideas of gender and how journalists reflect and shape these ideas through their work. Within this overview of gender and journalism, a review of journalistic canons must be conducted, as well. Just because journalists might portray cultural norms in their work does not mean their portrayals are consistent with industry principles. Canonical material, namely the Stylebook, cannot be spared from scrutiny in terms of looking to see how the Stylebook follow and did not follow its own — and other journalism — guidelines. Recall that the Stylebook is a big influence on industry norms (e.g., Cotter, 2014; Paskin, 2010), and its gender depictions might provide overt or latent support for journalism’s gender portrayals — and perhaps conversely overt or covert rejection.

Defining Gender

This paper operates from the idea that people’s worlds are socially constructed (Berger & Luckmann, 1967), i.e., many values and social norms are not innate, but rather are learned. It is through a social constructionist lens that this dissertation views gender. Gender serves as way of organizing life within societies (e.g., Benokraitis, & Feagin, 1995; Scott, 1999; Sreberny & van
Zoonen, 2000). For centuries, Western society has seen two groups, men and women and that differences between them were attributed to biology, aka, different sexual organs (e.g., Sreberny & van Zoonen, 2000). However, a social construction would say there are “imagined attitudes about women’s and men’s ‘proper’ roles” (Benokraitis, & Feagin, 1995, p. 14). Thus, gender and subsequent gender norms are social constructions (e.g., Butler, 1999; Hardin & Shain, 2005; Kent, 2012; Scott, 1999; Young & Fitzgerald, 2006).

Gender norms are based on the notion that people are heterosexual, and they can perform their gender by fulfilling “expected” societal roles and values (Butler, 1999). For instance, Western society views women as “kind,” “nurturing,” “imaginative” and describes them in term of their beauty (Cejka & Eagly, 1999, p. 416; Lips, 2005). There are also stereotypes assigned to men such as physical, dominant, aggressive, competitive, “mathematical,” and analytical (Cejka & Eagly, 1999, p. 416; Lips, 2005). It is through reinforcing these stereotypes that one can perform the correct gender. However, it must be noted that various societies also have notions of a “third gender” (e.g., Jami & Kamal, 2015; Scobey-Thal, 2014; Towle & Morgan, 2002). Third gender and transgender have often been, rightly or wrongly, used interchangeably by both scholars and the media (Jami & Kamal, 2015; Towle & Morgan, 2002). While a third gender can indicate “nonnormative gender practices” (Towle & Morgan, 2002, p. 473), the term should be used cautious as gender ideas are not constant across societies; as such, “activists need not invoke mythical gender warriors to support the idea that individuals should be free to express and embody themselves as they see fit or to justify their existence” (Towle & Morgan, 2002, p. 491). Ideas of gender performance can be complicated because of the wide variances in the human experience.
Societal stereotypes about gender performance are created and reinforced through language (e.g., Cejka & Eagly, 1999; Young & Fitzgerald, 2006). For example, consider the “fear of the feminine” (e.g., Blazina, 1997; Kierski & Blazina, 2010), i.e., that men are afraid to be feminized. Webster’s New World College Dictionary (2014) illuminates the fear of the feminine well through the word sissy. The first definition of sissy, is: “a) an effeminate boy or man b) a timid person or coward” (p. 1358). One can see that society encourages men to avoid being perceived with so-called feminine qualities. Essentially, it is bad for men to be seen as women. On the other hand, it is not entirely bad for women to be compared to men. After a Democratic presidential primary debate in October 2015, Washington Post columnist Dana Milbank (2015) lauded Hillary Clinton’s performance, saying she was a “man among boys.” Clinton is a woman, not a man. Milbank meant this as a compliment as his column was titled “Hillary Clinton towers over her debate rivals.” This example helps illustrate how Western society views men and women, often privileging.

Power differentials between men and women manifest themselves through gender and language (Scott, 1999), and inequality issues regarding gender are structural (Benokraitis, & Feagin, 1995). Understanding that structural concerns must be addressed, Scott (1999) pushes researchers to ask questions such as, “How have social institutions incorporated gender into their assumptions and organizations” (p. 70)? For example, the news media had used honorifics (Mr., Ms., Miss, Mrs.) for years, but that policy had fallen out of favor in journalism (Cloud, 1989). The objections were that men had one standard honorific (Mr.), but women were often described in relation to their marital statuses (Cloud, 1989; McConnell-Ginet, 2003). Based on honorifics it can be ascertained that men’s statuses are determined independent of women or spouses while women’s statuses are determined in conjunction with men or their spouses. Overall then, “Our
understanding of what it means to be male or female — in a particular group, in the community, in society, and in the world — underlies our interpretation of gender differentiation in language use” (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 1999, p. 187). Thus, common experiences and language help create our identities (Kent, 2012).

Gender is a major component of one’s societal identity, and a society’s perception of gender changes as time progresses (e.g., Scott, 1999; Sreberny & van Zoonen, 2000; Young & Fitzgerald, 2006). “Cultural symbols” such as can highlight cultural shifts (Scott, 1999, p. 70). The news media signal these changes, evidenced by the movement away from honorifics (Cloud, 1989) or more recently mainstream media are increasingly creating space for people who do not identify as either male or female by outlets beginning to adopt the singular “they,” instead of labeling individuals as he or she (Bien-Aimé, 2016b; Mullin, 2015). The Women’s Media Center’s style guide notes that the singular “they” has been used for more than 600 years, and that “‘You’ is also used as both singular and plural, and no major campaign has been mounted to change it — people seem to be able to understand when it is singular and when it is plural” (Maggio, 2014, p. 349). As evidenced by the singular “they,” linguistic and cultural battles are lengthy and constant.

**Gender Portrayals within Journalism**

If gender shifts over time (e.g., Scott, 1999; Sreberny & van Zoonen, 2000; Young & Fitzgerald, 2006), and the news media influences gender ideas (e.g., Burstyn, 1994; Cahn, 1999; Lang, 1978; Ross & Sreberny, 2000), then it is important to explore how journalism depicts gender. Women have been described with what could be described as feminine characteristics (Kahn, 1994), such as being “emotional” and “compassionate” in politics while male politicians are “unemotional” “objective” and “tough” (p. 195).
**Motherhood frame/domestic role.** Prominent women are also often defined in media by their reproductive capabilities (Bode & Hennings, 2012; Brown & Gardetto, 2000) or their roles in the domestic sphere: “Women are traditionally associated with increased coverage of family and motherhood” (Bode & Hennings, 2012, p. 238). The position of homemaker tends still to be yoked to female public figures. Brown and Gardetto (2000) analyzed 1996 media coverage of Hillary Clinton regarding “Whitewater” (p. 23) and reported, “Much of the discussion about Clinton has revolved around her role as a lawyer and public policymaker and how this might conflict with her role as wife and mother” (p. 28). The added focus on domestic lives occurs for female athletes, too, as sports media devote more attention to women’s home lives than male athletes’ home lives (Eastman & Billings, 2000; Koivula, 1999).

**Women depicted in terms of aesthetics.** The differences between coverage with men and women extend beyond their domestic lives. In comparing media coverage of 2008 vice presidential candidates, Bode and Hennings (2012) found that Republican Sarah Palin received more media coverage than her Democratic counterpart Joe Biden. However while Biden’s coverage tended to focus on more substantive issues such as foreign affairs and economics, journalists reported greatly on Palin’s family life and “physical appearance” (p. 236). The fixation on the appearance of women in politics is not new. Eleanor Roosevelt was criticized in the media for “her unladylike appearance in riding pants and other evidence of her inattention to her dress and personal appearance” (Lang, 1978, p. 151). Nor is the attention to aesthetics localized just to female politicians in the United States (Ross & Sreberny, 2000). However, it cannot be said that the media ignore how men look. For example, New Jersey Gov. Chris Christie has been the subject of comedians’ ridicule for years because he is obese. Regarding the tone of the jokes, one columnist said, “It is even arguable that if most of the jokes that high
profile comedians have made about Christie’s weight had been made about a female politician, some of them would have been out of a job” (Goff, 2014). While the jokes were sometimes very cruel, one could argue that because obesity is a significant health concern that coverage of Christie’s weight does hold merit; conversely, reporting on Hillary Clinton bangs has no connection to her capability to be president of the United States (Goff, 2014).

The special fixation with women’s bodies also extends outside politics. While bodies are treated and viewed uniquely in sports compared to other areas of society (Helstein, 2007), women’s bodies are viewed differently than men’s bodies within sports. Kane and Greendorfer (1994) noted that female athletes went from no media coverage to media coverage that sexualized them. According to Christopherson, Janning, and McConnell (2002), female athletes are also described in terms to make audiences aware of their femininity. Athletes’ identities as men or women have little to do with their athleticism.

To explain the abundance of media attention placed on female bodies, one should look at Fredrickson and Roberts’s (1997) “objectification theory” (p. 174). Daniels and Wartena (2011) provided a good definition: “Women’s bodies are scrutinized as objects for the pleasure and evaluation of others, specifically males. This objectification can occur within interpersonal and social encounters as well as individuals’ experiences with visual media” (p. 566). What is meant by object is that women are reduced from being people to objects to be gawked at and consumed, often sexually. Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) said various media place an emphasis on women’s bodies, and the researchers were not hopeful in terms of eliminating objectification either: “Confrontations with these images, then, are virtually unavoidable in American culture. In sum, the sexual objectification of the female body has clearly permeated the cultural milieu; it is likely to affect most girls and women to some degree” (p. 177).
A good explanation for the sexualization of women in media comes from Butler (1999). Butler wrote that men and women perform in certain ways to reinforce heterosexual gender norms. Essentially, women perform the female gender and men perform the male gender. It could be that because sport (e.g., Burstyn, 1994; Cahn, 1999) and politics (e.g., Lang, 1978; Ross & Sreberny, 2000) are considered male spaces as journalists create descriptions to make women perform their genders in order to avoid cognitive dissonance. From a gender performance standpoint, it would not make sense to see women in politics, for example. But if they are positioned as different from men by behaving “womanly” then it might be possible to reconcile the seemingly dissonant image. According to Butler (1999), maintaining heterosexual gender conventions is critical to keeping the current societal order, an order she argued is harmful to women: “The loss of gender norms would have the effect of proliferating gender configurations, destabilizing substantive identity, and depriving the naturalizing narratives of compulsory heterosexuality of their central protagonists ‘man’ and ‘woman’” (p. 187).

Praising female athletes’ beauty in sports eases the cognitive dissonance borne from seeing women in “male spaces.” This practice is called ambivalence, which is where a person is praised for an accomplishment but has that accomplishment undercut in the same breath (Duncan & Hasbrook, 1988). Christopherson, Janning, and McConnell (2002) analyzed metropolitan newspaper coverage of the 1999 U.S. women’s World Cup team and reported that the women often receive “contradictory” news coverage, i.e., they are described as superior athletes, but they were also described in ways that also played up their femininity. Duncan and Hasbrook (1988) and more contemporary scholars such as Antunovic and Hardin (2013), would argue that depictions of men’s mental capacities or athletic greatness would not tempered by mentions of their physical beauty.
One could say that there is nothing wrong with remarking on a female politician’s beauty. However, this behavior could also be seen as being subtly sexist. Through a subtle sexism lens, a person could believe it is normal to talk about women in terms of beauty or motherhood, for example (e.g., Sadker, Sadker, & Donald, 1989; Swim & Cohen, 1997; Swim et al., 2005). The normality of this thought process can be connected to gender stereotypes.

**Hard News**

Politics is part of hard news, a feted portion of journalism (e.g., Boukes & Boomgaard, 2015; Lehman-Wilzig & Seletzky, 2010; Thomson, White, & Kitley, 2008). Hard news encompasses very serious events thought to be highly important to a society, thus requiring journalists to report on the events quickly (e.g., Itule & Anderson, 2000; Lehman-Wilzig & Seletzky, 2010). Lehman-Wilzig and Seletzky (2010) said there is a gender component to hard news: “Surveys and interviews with female journalists around the world point to a dichotomy between news topics considered to be male (e.g., politics, crime, economics and education) and female topics such as human interest, consumerism, culture and social policy” (p. 39).

**Journalistic gatekeepers.** Could the reproduction of gender stereotypes in political and other news media be related to the composition of journalistic gatekeepers? Within journalism, key decision-makers have been men historically (Harp, 2008; Steiner, 2007; Tuchman, 1978). Currently, women are underrepresented in newspaper management (American Society of News Editors, n.d.b.) and in supervisory capacities local television and radio news stations (Papper, n.d.). In sports journalism, the problems are more acute because women are even less represented as standard employees and comprise a tiny portion of sports journalism supervisors (Hardin et al., 2013; Lapchick, Moss, Russell, & Scearce, 2011). In fact, the sports portion of 2012 The
Associated Press Stylebook affords women token status as women appear in less than 15% of sports entries (Bien-Aimé, 2016a).

With the elites in journalism being primarily men, some media scholars would argue that the news industry and the news presented are in masculine in nature (e.g., Harp, 2008; Poindexter, 2008a; Steiner, 2007; Tuchman, 1978; van Zoonen, 1998). The history of the profession shows journalism was a field originally designed for men. In the late 1800s, there was resistance to formal journalism schools in the United States as journalism schools was seen as not good for “masculine work” (Steiner, 2007, p. 12). However by the turn of the century, journalism schools started to provide some cache to reporters (Steiner, 2007). According to textbooks predating World War II, women were discouraged from entering journalism because they did not have the aptitude for the work, journalism would make them mannish, and that male sources would not trust them (Steiner, 2007).

There was some movement both from women and from institutional powers to improve conditions for female journalism throughout the years. Academia began providing classes on “writing for women readers,” and female journalists also wrote textbooks for future female journalists (Steiner, 2007, p. 14). After World War II, many, but not all, female journalists wrote exclusively in the women’s pages or society pages of newspapers (Tuchman, 1978; Steiner, 2007). Some of these legacies bear out today in some journalism norms such as female reporters often being placed on soft news stories (entertainment, food, culture, family, etc.), where readers will find more female sources (Chambers, Steiner & Fleming, 2004; Harp, 2008). By default (or by design), this leaves male reporters in charge of the more serious news, which tends to find itself in more prominent positions in news media (Harp, 2008; van Zoonen, 1998). Thus, these
types of normalized practices create the appearance that generally men make news and women, on average, are performing less important activities.

However, journalistic gatekeepers do not make all their choices based solely on their individual whims. They often take into account the wants of the consumer base (Shoemaker, 1991) or their views on what their customers’ desire (Hardin, 2005; Hardin et al., 2013; Knoppers & Elling, 2004). Making the distinction between audiences’ real desires and the perceived needs of the audience is critical because scholars (e.g., Hardin, 2005; Hardin et al., 2013; Knoppers & Elling, 2004) have reported that editors often do not use standardized methods to gauge their readers’ interests. Harp (2008) argued that news’s appearance was determined by its creators, and that these creators are not reflective of the communities they purport to represent:

In the United States white men have traditionally served as publishers, editors, and reporters for newspapers and other news outlets. This historical reality has resulted in a journalism culture based on masculine values. In other words, what is newsworthy has been defined by men and can be summed up in the newsroom adage “if it bleeds, it leads” (p. 273).

**Invisibility of women.** With journalism defined by men, women subsequently are not often visible in many news settings, such as hard news (Lehman-Wilzig & Seletzky, 2010; Tuchman, 1978) and sports (e.g, Cooky, Messner, & Hextrum, 2013; Eastman & Billings, 2000). Silver (1986) analyzed news reporting on state officials in Michigan newspapers. Her study found that even when controlling for women’s low representation in political office, females were cited as sources less than men. In a content analysis of how television news covered the first 100 of Bill Clinton’s presidency, Liebler and Smith (1997) found ABC, CNN, NBC, and
CBS used male sources almost five times more than they did female sources. This is particularly jarring because unlike Silver (1986), Liebler and Smith did not restrict their sources to solely political officeholders.

Media continued to ignore women after the turn of the century, as well. A Pew study of newspaper, online, and broadcast and cable news coverage found the following:

More than three quarters of all stories contain male sources, while only a third of stories contain even a single female source, according to the study, which was drawn from an examination of 16,800 news stories across 45 different news outlets during 20 randomly selected days over nine months (Project for Excellence in Journalism, 2005).

More recently, students at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, analyzed the sources New York Times reporters used in front-page stories and found that men were quoted more than three times as much as women (Layton & Shepard, 2013). The disparity became more apparent when accounting for the sex of the reporters. First, there were 214 male-only authored stories compared to 96 female-only stories. Second, the source disparity varied by the reporter’s sex: Female reporters had a 2:1 male-female source ratio, compared to 4:1 for male reporters.

Politics. While women are overshadowed by men, the coverage of women has progressed beyond a “curtain of silence” (Lang, 1978, p. 154), especially in politics. In an analysis of U.S. Senate and gubernatorial candidates, Kahn (1994) reported that male Senate candidates received about 95 paragraphs of coverage weekly compared to just 79 paragraphs for female candidates. However, gubernatorial candidates did not have gender discrepancies when it came to coverage. More progress has been made regarding the amount of coverage for female candidates as gender differences in the amount of coverage were not readily apparent in newspapers (Jalalzai, 2006)
and in local television (Lavery, 2013). Commenting on why the improved coverage exists, Jalalzai (2006) opined that, “As women have become more common as political actors, the media has become accustomed to reporting on them” and that scholars’ work documenting the unequal treatment of female politicians might have made journalists more cognizant of their previous bad practices (p. 624).

**Business.** However, massive gender disparities exist within business journalism. In his look at newspaper coverage from 1913-1983, Potter (1985) found that women were underrepresented in business and hard news in general; however, women received far more visibility in sensational or popular news, albeit still less than men. Supporting Potter’s work, Greenwald (1990) conducted a content analysis of business coverage in a Midwestern newspaper, and found that women were the subjects of .05% stories; men were story subjects 17.2% of the time. Almost half of the stories quoted men (49.4%); women were quoted in 6.1% of stories. Greenwald (1990) noted that many stories did not quote people or have human subjects because they were story briefs, such as store openings (p. 71). Moving into more contemporary times, progress can be found. In an analysis of leading American and Canadian business magazines, Grandy (2014) found the number of female sources in 2011-12 news articles was 15.2%. This was a substantial increase from 9.4% in 1991-92. Thus, Greenwald’s (1990) assertion still holds that business pages are geared “almost exclusively for men” (p. 69). Journalists’ preference for male sources still holds even though the number of women who are in the business world increased, maintaining the stereotype “of the executive and the financial expert as male” (Grandy, 2014, p. 586). Grandy made this assertion because business journalists cited women at a percentage far less than the number of women who were working in business.
Women as novelties. In many cases when women are cited, e.g., when they make prominent news, the reporting can make it come across as essentially a novelty. Tuchman (1978) and Poindexter (2008a) talk about the “first” phenomenon, where news stories focus on how certain women have broken into new fields. Journalists report on the newness of the occurrence and the event is deemed interesting, both of which are news values taught in school and reinforced within journalism (Brooks et al., 2014; Harcup, 2009). Regarding “novelty,” Brooks et al. (2014) said in their journalism textbook that novelty is a determinant of news because the events are “unusual or bizarre” (p. 7). This could provide a latent argument that when women make accomplishments in specific fields those gains are unexpected and contradict unchallenged norms. The novelty element within journalism can be connected to the practice of gender marking, which also works to trivialize women. Gender marking is using a gender adjective in labeling an activity done by one sex, but not by another (Billings, Halone, & Denham, 2002; Halbert & Latimer, 1994; Messner, Duncan, & Jensen, 1993). For instance in athletics, men are often called the best in their overall sport, while women are called the best within the “women’s” version of a particular sport. Gender marking is part of journalism history with “women’s pages.” There was real news, and then news for women. Poindexter (2008a) also challenges the journalism convention of “women’s news”: “Although historically, women are more likely than men to read local news and fashion and men are more likely to read sports and business, these topics and most topics covered in the news are not inherently female or male” (p. 72). Byerly (2007) argued processes such as gender marking and covering women as novelty acts serves to treat women as Others, essentially highlighting the fact they are not part of dominant culture and should be treated marginally. Steiner (2007) expanded on this thought saying “gender is still defined as a women’s problem. Thus, a disembodied sort of masculinity is implicit and
unproblematic, while a highly embodied (yet universalized) femininity looms as the exception” (p. 20). The mere existence of a women entry (See Chapter 1) in *The Associated Press Stylebook* highlights there is a gender issue within news. The entry has not been updated in almost 40 years; it still uses Golda Meir as its example of a female politician — Meir died in 1978. The continued use of Meir likely indicates that Steiner is correct in saying “gender is still defined as a women’s problem.” In addition, the Othering of women in media coverage can reinforce the maleness of news because there is little talk about the structures that permitted (and likely continue to permit) men to dominate most fields. Essentially, the discussion surrounding the pre-existing and existing male dominance is treated as normal and not news.

**Sports are for men.** Treating women as novelties is likely an outgrowth from what scholars (e.g., Lang, 1978; Tuchman, 1978) described as media’s previous practice of ignoring women as newsmakers. The amount of coverage devoted to women often pales in comparison to men. In an examination of 1998 sport media coverage, a study revealed that more than 90% of the content in ESPN’s *Sports Center* and CNN’s sports programs highlighted male athletes; *The New York Times* and *USA Today* used more than 80% of their sports sections on male athletes (Eastman & Billings, 2000). The inequities exist even when examining sports that members of both sexes played. For example, major newspapers devoted only 16% of NCAA basketball tournament coverage to the women’s tournament; the rest went toward the men’s version (Kian, 2008). The discrepancies are not restricted to traditional media, either. In an examination of 2010 Olympic coverage by NBCOlympics.com, USAToday.com, and Yahoo!, men received almost two-thirds of the coverage (Burch, Eagleman, & Pedersen, 2012). Sports news shows might even be going backward in terms of female athlete representation, according to research by Cooky, Messner, and Hetrurum (2013). Local Southern California television news programs have
reduced their coverage of women’s sports to 1.6% in 2009. That is down from 9% in 1999 and much lower than the 5% recorded in 1989. The researchers also reported that the visibility of women’s sports fell on *Sports Center* to 1.3% in 2009 from 2.2% in 1999.

**Journalism Principles**

So why does it matter whether journalists depict women in similar ratios to men or whether journalists adhere to societal stereotypes when they depict women? Journalists need to hold themselves to the principles they hold most dear if they are to meet their industry’s highest standards. With journalists’ power to shape culture (e.g., Artz & Murphy, 2000; Covert, 1981), one must explore journalists’ ethical responsibilities and connect these responsibilities to language use. The Society of Professional Journalists (2014) lists four main principles to follow: “seek truth and report it,” “minimize harm,” “act independently,” and “be accountable and transparent.” Within the first principle of seeking truth, the Society of Professional Journalists (2014) provided additional guidelines, two of which are useful for this dissertation: “Avoid stereotyping. Journalists should examine the ways their values and experiences may shape their reporting” and “Boldly tell the story of the diversity and magnitude of the human experience. Seek sources whose voices we seldom hear.”

Journalists have fallen short when it comes to not stereotyping even though *The Associated Press Stylebook* in its *women* entry already calls for journalists not to engage in gender stereotyping (Angione, 1977). Journalists have depicted women in stereotypical manners, such as motherhood and aesthetics. (e.g., Bode & Hennings, 2012; Christopherson, Janning, & McConnell, 2002; Kane & Greendorfer, 1994; Ross & Sreberny, 2000). That the *Stylebook* contradicts its own non-stereotyping edict through its *his, her* entry, saying that while reporters should not automatically make examples masculine — i.e., A politician must attend to his
constituents — use male pronouns in these instances (Christian et al., 2014). The Stylebook is condoning the preference of using men.

As to seeking “voices we seldom hear,” journalism has again not always met its ethical obligations. Whether through omitting women in sports (e.g., Burch, Eagleman, & Pedersen, 2012; Cooky, Messner, & Hestrum, 2013; Eastman & Billings, 2000; Kian, 2008) or hard news (e.g., Grandy, 2014; Greenwald, 1990; Layton & Shepard, 2013; Potter, 1985; Project for Excellence in Journalism, 2005), journalism has not always attracted diverse voices for stories. In fact, the Stylebook has struggled to depict gender diversity in its Sports section (Bien-Aimé, 2016a).

The two principles, “minimize harm” and “be accountable and transparent” have elements that are linked. Under minimize harm, the Society of Professional Journalists (2014) said, “Consider the long-term implications of the extended reach and permanence of publication. Provide updated and more complete information as appropriate.” Covert (1981) warned researchers to ponder the long-term implications of repeated media imagery. Additionally with language’s power to shape gender ideas (e.g., Cejka & Eagly, 1999; Young & Fitzgerald, 2006), repeated media imagery might reinforce stereotypes or shape public opinion. Words are not simple just words; even slight variations in language do matter. And while progress in coverage regarding gender has been made (e.g., Jalalzai, 2006; Lavery, 2013), the speed of the progress must be studied. The principle to “be accountable and transparent” advises journalists to both “Respond quickly to questions about accuracy, clarity and fairness” and “Acknowledge mistakes and correct them promptly and prominently. Explain corrections and clarifications carefully and clearly” (Society of Professional Journalists, 2014). The Stylebook need not make corrections per se regarding its gender depictions, but over time does its gender depictions more accurately
reflect the gains women have made throughout U.S. society in areas such as business, politics, and sports? Being more inclusive of women would be adhering to this principle of accuracy and fairness.

**Objectivity**

The Society of Professional Journalists’ (2014) principle of “act independently” appears to correspond with an analysis of the *Stylebook*. Act independently means that journalists should report honestly, without undue influence and without interference from sources or corporate influences. This principle connects well with the journalistic principle of objectivity. Objectivity is another staple of U.S. journalism in which journalists need to show their work with data, not assumptions (e.g., Brooks, Kennedy, Moen, Ranly, 2014; Kovach & Rosenstiel, 2007). Journalists are tasked to report the world as it is, and not report the world as something it is not (Schudson, 2001; Streckfuss, 1990). The *Stylebook* can also be seen as a journalistically objective text as it reflects usage of common language (Pruitt, 2014) and responds to cultural shifts (e.g., Christian et al., 2014; Colford, 2015; Pruitt, 2014). Thus, the *Stylebook* is essentially reporting things as they are at given times.

Objectivity bore out of an ethic of being more transparent, not inherently neutral (Streckfuss, 1990). From its earliest days, the U.S. press was unabashedly partisan in their coverage (Schudson, 2001; Kovach & Rosenstiel, 2006). As journalism became more professionalized, standards for reporters were raised and newer norms were introduced, such as formalized interviewing in the mid- to late 1800s (Schudson, 2001; Kovach & Rosenstiel, 2006). The professionalization also coincided with a shift in journalism economics. By the early 1900s, the financial model for newspapers changed, going away from loyalty to a political party, and more toward an advertising-based model, which is still the dominant model for U.S. media today.
(Schudson, 2001; Streckfuss, 1990). Additionally, coming out of World War I, there was much concern about propaganda from governments and businesses unduly influencing the public (Schudson, 2001; Streckfuss, 1990). Objectivity allowed for news media to bring some kind of evidentiary requirements for their reporting, differentiating themselves from pure propagandists, which in turn would raise the credibility of journalists’ work in the eyes of news consumers (Schudson, 2001; Streckfuss, 1990). To further professionalize the industry, the American Society of Newspaper Editors were working to create a journalism code of ethics (Saalberg, 1973; Society of Professional Journalists, 2014; Streckfuss, 1990). The aforementioned Society of Professional Journalists’ (2014) principles are based on the original American Society of Newspaper Editors ethics code.

Within modern journalism, objectivity’s definition has moved away from simply telling a story as it truly appears in the eyes of the journalist (e.g., Brooks et al. 2014; Kovach & Rosenstiel, 2007; Stephens, 2007). Today, there is a “hypersensitivity among the press to charges of bias,” i.e., if a dissenting viewpoint is not reported, then the media are deemed biased (Cunningham, 2003). However, there are numerous calls for journalists to return to previous ideas of objectivity, and not simply report two sides of an issue as equal, especially if one side is inaccurate (e.g., Brooks et al. 2014; Cunningham, 2003; Kovach & Rosenstiel, 2007).

**Prescriptive vs. descriptive.** Descriptivists could be seen through an objective journalism lens because they believe grammarians should follow the standards set by common culture (McIntyre, 2015a), and the notion of mirroring society is at the core of objective journalism. If one believes that news should reflect actual real-world experiences, then the imbalances that manifest themselves in journalism, e.g., a big gap between male and female sources (e.g. Grandy, 2014; Layton & Shepard, 2013; Project for Excellence in Journalism,
2005), would be permissible because while total balance would be ideal, the societal structure is not reflecting that. People in the descriptivist camp would likely argue that journalists and the Stylebook report on what is occurring in society, not actively trying to change it.

If journalists believe that they should actively look for and include underrepresented peoples, then they might be taking a normative stance, indicating that the existing structures are not fair, i.e., prescriptivists. Prescriptivists believe that selected experts should set the standards for others to follow, i.e., shape society (McIntyre, 2015a). Some prescriptivists would likely adopt elements of cultivation theory. One definition of cultivation theory argues that repeated exposure to mass media messages would then influence the perceptions that media consumers might hold (e.g., Gerbner, 1970; Potter, 2014). Gerbner (1970) said about mass media messages: “They will tell us much about the shared representations of life, the issues, the prevailing points of view that capture public attention, occupy people’s time, and animate their imagination” (p. 81). From this perspective, one can say how groups are depicted at different times in mass media might reflect or shape how the wider public perceives that group. There is a reason why activists such as Jose Antonio Vargas lobbied the Associated Press and The New York Times to change their depictions on “illegal immigrants” (Weinger, 2012). They believe that the media depictions influence public viewpoints (Vargas, 2012). Additionally under cultivation theory, the Stylebook would hold a significant share of cultural influence. While the book might not be known to the wider public, its recommendations ripple throughout the news media, which is consumed by a large swath of society. The labels might not sway public sentiment today, but it could normalize how the public perceives certain phenomena over time because of repeated messages.

Media portrayals have influence over how news consumers view events or groups. For instance, when a KKK rally was depicted as a “free speech issue” compared to “a potentially
explosive clash between two angry groups” viewers who saw the free speech frame were more tolerant of the KKK than viewers who saw the angry groups frame (Nelson, Clawson, & Oxley, 1997, p. 574). Knight and Giuliano (2001) found that people who read articles emphasizing an athlete’s beauty over athleticism perceived the athlete as “less talented” compared to people who read articles highlighting an athlete’s athleticism (p. 223). However, the effect of labeling is not absolute. Merolla, Ramakrishnan, and Haynes (2013) did not find using illegal, undocumented, or unauthorized influenced people’s opinions on immigration policies. This is not to say language’s immediate impact is non-existent. Merolla, Ramakrishnan, and Haynes (2013) reported that using amnesty vs. a pathway to legalization did influence people’s perceptions on policy.

Chapter 2 Conclusion

Gender is a social construction (e.g., Butler, 1999; Hardin & Shain, 2005; Kent, 2012; Scott, 1999; Young & Fitzgerald, 2006). Gender does not equate to differences in male and female sex organs; rather, gender describes how men and women “should” act, often from a heterosexual perspective (Butler, 1999). The prominence of gender norms, i.e., how men and women “normally” act, lead people to believe that assigning gender characteristics to men and women is acceptable and not harmful (Sadker, Sadker, & Donald, 1989; Swim & Cohen, 1997; Swim et al., 2005).

Journalism plays a key role in setting and maintain societal norms (Artz and Murphy, 2000), including ideas about gender. Journalism’s reproduction of gender stereotypes places the industry at odds with industry principles (Society of Professional Journalists, 2014). Stereotypes do not provide a fuller representation of a group or a society at large as stereotypes serve to silence those who operate outside of general “norms.” Journalism’s elites have overwhelming
been male (American Society of News Editors, n.d.b.; Hardin et al., 2013; Papper, n.d., Steiner, 2007), and perhaps that is a reason why women receive substandard and gendered coverage at times. For instance, women are the sources in fewer stories than men overall (Layton & Shepard, 2013; Project for Excellence in Journalism, 2005). The disparity in news sources could be because of journalism’s preference for hard news, areas often dominated by men (e.g., Harp, 2008; van Zoonen, 1998). Journalists describe women in their domestic roles more than they do for men (Bode & Hennings, 2012; Brown & Gardetto, 2000; Eastman & Billings, 2000; Koivula, 1999), reinforcing the notion that women are “supposed” to be in charge of the home and family. Women are also judged more on aesthetics than men (e.g., Bode & Hennings, 2012; Lang, 1978; Ross & Sreberny, 2000), even for women in sports (e.g., Christopherson, Janning, & McConnell, 2002; Kane & Greendorfer, 1994). Sports journalism is heavily geared toward men, both in terms of the journalists who cover sports (Hardin et al., 2013; Lapchick et al., 2011) and what is actually covered (e.g., Eastman & Billings, 2000; Cooky, Messner, and Hextrom, 2013).

The Stylebook is simply not a conservator of journalistic values and style (e.g., Brown, 1978; Hines & Basso, 2003; Vultee, 2012). It is also is a “cultural artifact” (Cotter, 2014, p. 392) and appears to follow the journalistic norm of objectivity as it depicts a time period’s common language (Pruitt, 2014). Through culturally specific word usage, the Stylebook shows how members of a society relate to each other and how a society views different groups in various eras (Cotter, 2014).

In the following chapter, this dissertation will detail how the various gender viewpoints of U.S. society have changed in the past 40 years through an examination of key historical developments within from the 1970s through the early 2010s.
Chapter 3: Developments in the U.S. from the 1970s to 2014

While the *Stylebook* can be seen as a “cultural artifact” (Cotter, 2014, p. 392), each *Stylebook* edition needs to be understood within the context of its respective time period as Evans (1999) and Startt and Sloan (2003) both say that subjects should be judged based on the values of their own times only. For example, the 1977 *Stylebook’s derogatory terms* entry said, “Do not use derogatory terms such as *krauts* (for Germans) or *niggers* (for Negroes) except in direct quotes, and then only when their use is an integral, essential part of the story” (Angione, 1977, p. 67). The references to niggers and krauts were removed only by the 2014 *Stylebook*. The country’s views on race … and perhaps Germans changed dramatically by 2014, likely evidenced best by the election of Barack Obama in 2008. Obama, who is the son of a black Kenyan father and a white Midwestern mother, rising to U.S. president would have appeared to be an impossible dream for many people living in the 1970s. Additionally, using any variation of nigger in popular media today can land people in controversy, e.g., black comedian Larry Wilmore at the White House Correspondents Dinner (Capehart, 2016; Derakhshani, 2016; Greene, 2016). It would be erroneous to judge past *Stylebook* editors’ decisions on leaving nigger in the *Stylebook* based upon current conceptions of race and race-appropriate language.

Thus, before attempting to study a phenomenon in history, a researcher must first gather facts and understand what is happening during the period under study (Tuchman, 1981). As this dissertation explores *Stylebook* depictions over time, and because the *Stylebook* is an important part of journalism (e.g., Cotter, 2014; Hines & Basso, 2003; Steiner, 2007; Vultee, 2012), it would be apropos then to examine some significant news events, particularly developments relating to gender, in the United States from the 1970s to 2014. By examining the stories
journalists deemed important such as in United Press International’s “Year in Review” editions on upi.com. For more than 100 years, UPI has been an important wire service in the United States and globally (e.g., Siegel, 1999; Stepp, 1984; United Press International, 2015).

Additionally, the Newseum, one of the leading journalism museums in the United States, consulted journalists and historians to compile top 100 news events of the 20th century (USA Today, 1999). The Newseum’s list was used in conjunction with media accounts and history textbooks.

1970s

The turbulence of the 1960s continued into 1970s experienced a lot of upheaval as U.S. ground troops left Vietnam in 1973, the Women’s Movement, and the Gay Rights Movement were gaining momentum and occurring simultaneously to the Civil Rights Movement, and President Richard Nixon was facing major troubles. Nixon’s Watergate investigation is seen as a seminal moment in U.S. journalism (e.g., Harcup, 2008; Kovach & Rosenstiel, 2007). Nixon’s subsequent resignation in 1974 would be profoundly seen in the Stylebook (see Chapter 5). The country also experienced severe economic woes with inflation and gasoline shortages.

Women’s Movement

The U.S. Women’s Movement began in the 1960s as the country was undergoing major cultural shifts (Thumim, 1998). One of those major changes was that more women were entering the labor force, offering new voices in how society views gender relations (Evans, 1992). In 1960, the number of women in the labor force was about 38%; by 1970 that number jumped to more than 43% (Fullerton, 1999). However, the figures for men were about 83% and 80%, respectively (Fullerton, 1999). The addition of more women working outside created “a gender-segregated economy that drew women into low-paid, low-status jobs, and a child-centred family
premised on the full-time services of a wife and mother. They could not abstract issues of rights from the underlying questions of identity” (Evans, 1992, p. 68). The representation of women was low in many fields, including politics where women were 3% of U.S. Congress members and 7% of elected state officials in 1971 (Center for American Women and Politics, 2016). With the domestic and economic roles of women changing, it is not surprising then to see a corresponding agitation for better treatment of women in general society, too. While women and men graduated high school at the same rate in 1972, 15.4% of men completed four years of college compared to 9% of women (United States Census Bureau, n.d.). Among the many significant developments relating to gender in the 1970s, Title IX cannot go unmentioned. Title IX, created in 1972, says: “No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance” (Office for Civil Rights, 2015).

Numerous scholars have described the wide-ranging benefits of Title IX in the classroom (e.g., Walters & McNeely, 2010) and providing more opportunities to women and girls in athletics (e.g., Hardin, Simpson, Whiteside, & Garris, 2007). For instance, less than 4% of girls played high school varsity sports in 1972 (Women’s Sports Foundation, 2011). Another event that helped women’s sports was the September 1973 “Battle of the Sexes” between Billie Jean King and Bobby Riggs (Spencer, 2000). King’s victory has been “perceived by some to have enhanced the status of women athletes in North America” (Spencer, 2000, p. 387).

Prior to Title IX’s creation, the Supreme Court issued a landmark decision that impacted women’s lives. The January 1973 Supreme Court ruling in Roe v. Wade allowed for “a woman’s right to bodily self-determination included the right to undergo an abortion during the first
trimester of pregnancy, when a fetus could not exist independently of her body” (Curry, 2010, p. 168). The effect of the ruling could be seen in a *New York Times* article almost a year after it was handed down:

The sweeping change that has resulted from the Court decision has removed much of the social stigma associated with the operation and has taken abortions out of the backrooms of the illegal abortionist and brought them into the mainstream of modern medical care.

While there are few official figures on the number of abortions performed since the Court decision, interviews conducted by *The New York Times* in a dozen major cities disclose that tens of thousands of abortions are being performed in cities where a year ago it was impossible to obtain the operation (*The New York Times*, 1973).

Greenhouse and Siegel (2011) argue that Roe v. Wade cannot simply be seen as a court case regarding abortion. Roe v. Wade must be seen in the context of society’s changing opinions on sexual mores and the government’s role in regulating the sexual behaviors of adults, too.

**Gay Rights Movement**

The Gay Rights Movement was also occurring during this upheaval regarding cultural understandings of sexual mores. The beginning of the U.S. Gay Rights Movement is generally thought have occurred with riots that occurred after New York City police raided the Stonewall Inn in 1969, a popular bar for gay people (e.g., Frank, 2014; Nagourney, 2009; Vider, 2015). Many activists were pushing for integration into mainstream society while others were more aggressive in terms of seeking better treatment for non-heterosexuals (Vider, 2015). The country’s attitudes toward non-heterosexuals was pretty hostile during that time (e.g., Frank, 2014; Vider, 2015). In CBS News’s 1967 controversial, yet landmark documentary, “The
Homosexuals” (Frank, 2014; Hartman, 2015), legendary journalist Mike Wallace said, “Most Americans are repelled by the mere notion of homosexuality. … A CBS poll shows two out of three Americans look on homosexuality with disgust, discomfort, or fear” (Hartman, 2015). Poor treatment by authorities mixed with a hostile public created enough a volatile situation that exploded with Stonewall (Frank, 2014).

The Gay Rights Movement sought increased dignity in myriad ways, including better job protections as many people could be fired just for being gay (Frank, 2014; Lewis, 1997; Vider, 2015), improved media portrayals and improved psychiatric diagnoses (Frank, 2014), i.e., gay people were assumed to have a mental disorder (Frank, 2014; Greenberg, 2013; Spitzer, 1981). While some things did improve in that the American Psychiatric Association removed homosexuality as a mental disorder (Frank, 2014; Greenberg, 2013; Spitzer, 1981) and in 1975, the U.S. government implemented action to eliminate its ban on hiring non-heterosexuals for most civil service jobs (Frank, 2014; Lewis, 1997). However, extending employment protection for non-heterosexuals was not too popular throughout much of the country in the 1970s (Associated Press, 1978), and similar battles continue throughout statehouses in the United States today. The end of the decade was also tumultuous because of the killings of San Francisco Mayor George Moscone and city supervisor Harvey Milk, the latter who “had achieved national recognition as one of the first openly gay men elected to public office” (Eyerman, 2012, p. 400).

1980s

The 1980s ushered in an era of conservatism in the U.S. executive branch as Ronald Reagan dominated the decade. The times were not staid, however. Relations United States and the U.S.S.R. began to thaw, and the Berlin Wall fell as the end of Communism neared. Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome was identified as one of the deadliest diseases of the late 20th
century, and women were making great strides at NASA and the Supreme Court. The Stylebook reflected many of these developments. For instance, the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks in the 1977 Stylebook (Angione, 1977, p. 210) became the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (Treaty) in the 1987 Stylebook as one treaty was agreed upon and a subsequent one was being discussed (French, 1987, p. 207). Additionally, the 1987 Stylebook contained a computer section, which was not in the 1977 edition. It is likely not a coincidence that the computer section came a decade after personal computers started being sold to the general public (USA Today, 1999).

AIDS

The illness was identified in 1981 and though to be limited to only non-heterosexuals (Altman, 1986; Frank, 2014). An article detailing the then-new idea that AIDS could be transmitted in ways other than blood transmissions, explained researchers’ previous notions on AIDS transmission:

Most experts have believed that male homosexuals become infected through tears that develop in rectal tissues during anal intercourse. According to this theory, the tears allow passage of the virus from contaminated semen into the recipient’s bloodstream where it can attack the type of white blood cells that many believe is the primary target of the virus (Altman, 1986).

While there was an “AIDS holocaust” (Frank, 2014, p. 6) among gay men, the disease was erroneously linked to primarily gay men in mainstream media. The Stylebook reflected the belief, too, in its AIDS entry for 1987 (see Chapter 6). Additionally, the public panic stemming from AIDS was quite severe. For instance, West Hollywood had to pass legislation banning businesses from refusing service to people with AIDS (Associated Press, 1986b) and insurance commissioners agreed to “prevent insurance companies from discriminating against
homosexuals, a group at high risk of being carriers of the main AIDS virus” (Associated Press, 1986a). The battle for anti-prejudice legislation and equality continued throughout the decade.

**Gains for Women**

As such, women continued to gain more visibility while holding prominent positions. Coming from outside the United States, Margaret Thatcher rose to becoming prime minister of Britain in 1979, which might have had some an impact on the depiction of politics and female politicians. Ponton (2010) writes about Thatcher, “She was, in British and European politics, a pioneer — the first female leader of a major political party, and the first to hold the highest political office” (p. 198). Thatcher was received favorably in the United States and was considered a strategic U.S. ally and a key cultural figure in the country, too (Cooper, 2014). Being a woman a male-dominated politics, Thatcher’s presence helped signal that Western political figures did not have to be male. Comparing 1971 to 1981, women also experienced most gains in Congress, going from 3% to 4%, and seeing much greater gains in statewide offices, comprising 11% of elected officials, up from 7%. (Center for American Women and Politics, 2016).

Another position that experienced gender diversity was the Supreme Court. In 1981, Sandra Day O’Connor became the first woman to serve on the Court in its then-nearly 200 years of existence (Greenhouse, 1981; Merritt, 2006). Recalling the previous decade’s low labor participation rate of women, it is not too surprising then that in the 1950s O’Connor was “refused a job at every law firm to which she applied, after graduating near the top of her law school class” (Greenhouse, 1981b). That said, the appointment of O’Connor allowed the country to in the words of Sen. Edward “Ted” Kennedy to “put one more ‘men only’ sign behind us” (Greenhouse, 1981a). O’Connor’s ascendency to the Supreme Court also:
… struck a chord with women and men around the world. Letters flooded the new
Chambers, offering congratulations and rejoicing in this affirmation of women’s ability to
lead. Citizens wrote movingly about how the appointment of a woman to the Supreme
Court had inspired them and their daughters to set higher goals (Merritt, 2006, p. 107).

And while she had a brilliant legal mind, O’Connor could not escape being judged, though not
maliciously, by her aesthetics. On O’Connor’s first day on the bench, Supreme Court Justice
Warren Berger told photographers, “You’ve never seen me with a better-looking Justice, have
you” (Greenhouse, 1981b).

*The New York Times* article did not take issue with Berger’s comments, comments like
these did not go totally unnoticed in the era or were directed solely at O’Connor. Sally Ride, the
first U.S. woman to go to space in 1983 (McKee, 2012; Robelen, 2012), had to endure
“conversational sexism” (Pogrebin, 1983). In a column for *The New York Times*, Letty Cottin
Pogrebin described an incident where she confronted a man over considering Ride, a physicist,
“NASA’s party girl” (Pogrebin, 1983). Journalists were not too much better with their language;
when Ride was training to be an astronaut, reporters asked her and her female colleagues
questions about who would cook on the space shuttle (McKee, 2012). Not surprisingly, these
types of comments frustrated Ride (McKee, 2012).

However, Ride’s rise did signify an increase in women in science fields (Marcus, 1983),
something that Ride herself championed (Robelen, 2012). Citing Labor Department statistics,
*The New York Times* reported that women went from .8% of engineers in 1972 to almost 6% of
engineers by 1983 (Marcus, 1983). Using figures from the American Association of Engineering
Societies, the same article reported similar gains in higher education as received about 5% of
undergraduate engineering degrees in 1977 compared to more than 12% in 1982 (Marcus, 1983).
Additionally, the rates of college graduation increased for both men and women from 1972 to 1982 as about 22% of men completed four years of college compared to 14% of women, up from 15.4% and 9%, respectively (United States Census Bureau, n.d.). Overall, women’s labor force participation increased from 43.3% in 1970 to 51.5% in 1980 (Fullerton, 1999).

1990s

The decade saw the total collapse of the Soviet Union, the first Gulf War, race riots in Los Angeles, the contentious Supreme Court appointment of Clarence Thomas, and the election of Bill Clinton as U.S. president, all in the early part of the decade. The 1990s also saw U.S. society continuing to adapt in its treatment of non-heterosexual people. Additionally, the world was forever changed by the introduction of the Internet. The 1997 Stylebook reflected this tech change by removing its computer section and new terminology such as Internet (Goldstein, 1997, p. 105). An excerpt of the entry said:

A decentralized network of host computers that are linked by high-speed lines. In later references, the Net is acceptable.

Some commonly used Internet terms:

BBS Bulletin Board System

Browser Software used to navigate the Internet.

HTML An acronym for hypertext markup language.

HTTP An acronym for hypertext transport protocol.

URL Universal Resource Locator, the computer address of a World Wide Web page.
Usenet A worldwide system of discussion areas called newsgroups (Goldstein, 1997, p. 105).

The ubiquity of the Internet in modern society makes this explanation look comical by modern standards, but the 1997 Internet entry was written for an audience that was still relatively new to computing and even less familiar to the World Wide Web.

Sexual Harassment

The Supreme Court confirmation hearings for Clarence Thomas and the presidency of Bill Clinton helped bring sexual harassment more into society’s purview (Black & Allen, 2001). Thomas was accused of making unwanted sexual advances toward Anita Hill when he was her supervisor at the Department of Education (Black & Allen, 2001), and testimony played out over Thomas’s 1991 televised confirmation hearings. A New York Times article called the hearings a part of “X-rated educational television” (Goodman, 1991). Thomas was confirmed, but the media coverage brought the gender disparity within Congress into clear focus, more specifically the Senate: “Women’s groups have moved to exploit the simmering anger of women who watched 14 men on the Senate Judiciary Committee and 98 men in the full Senate decide a matter that stirred deep anger among many of them” (Ifill, 1991). In 1991, women constituted 6% of Congress members and 18% of state elected officials, up from 4% and 11%, respectively in 1981 (Center for American Women and Politics, 2016).

Overall, workplaces were still heavily male spaces in 1990 as 76% of men were working, but women’s labor force participation increased to 57.5% (Fullerton, 1999). News accounts also described a “stigma” in mentioning sexual harassment, let alone addressing it (Musleah, 1991; Strom, 1991). A 1991 New York Times article summarized business culture thusly:
To be sure, women in the workplace are rarely subjected to the overt sexual harassment confronted by women miners when they first entered the mines 20 years ago. Like their male colleagues, they were stripped down and slathered in axle grease in a hazing ritual. Unlike the men, they were tied spread-eagled to wooden supports.

But neither is sexual harassment now merely a matter of misinterpreted flirtations or off-color jokes. Nude pinups of women remain in precinct locker rooms and on Wall Street trading floors and more than one female professional can recall a male supervisor who promised advancement and perquisites in exchange for sexual favors (Strom, 1991).

President Bill Clinton was repeatedly accused of asking for sexual favors from various female subordinates during his time in public office (Black & Allen, 2001; Bordo, 1998). In late 1998, Clinton was impeached in regard to having a physical relationship with White House intern Monica Lewinsky (Black & Allen, 2001; Bordo, 1998). Unlike Clarence Thomas, Clinton was not accused of unwanted sexual advances with Monica Lewinsky. However, Bordo (1998) explains the uneasy dynamic well:

> When subordinates don’t object, the situation becomes murkier, but that doesn't necessarily mean that harassment hasn't occurred. They may feel that their jobs and grades are at stake, but also, more subtly and yet profoundly, they may feel overwhelmed by the sheer power held by their bosses and teachers — the cultural power, that is, to control the language, interpretation, and “reality” of the situation (p. B6).

Women are not in many positions of power and are often subject to dismissive treatment. A new statistic, though, could signal some significant changes for women as in more women received college degrees (23.4%) than men (23%) (United States Census Bureau, n.d.).
Cultural Fights over Sexual Orientation

The workplace was also the site of battle over gay rights, a battle that has been continuously occurring. The federal government had considered homosexuality immoral, and thus the supposed immorality provided enough justification for the government to fire people who were known to be homosexual (Lewis, 1997). Recall that in the 1970s, the federal government decided that it could not fire people based on their sexual orientation, but that prohibition did not extend to the military (Lewis, 1997). While a candidate, Clinton said he would remove the ban on lesbian and gay people serving in the military (Friedman, 1993b). However, Clinton compromised with military leaders, crafting a “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy (e.g., Friedman, 1993a; Gordon, 1993; Greenhouse, 1993). Essentially, gay and lesbian soldiers had to keep their sexual orientations to themselves and not commit sexual acts with members of the same sex (Gordon, 1993). Though the policy did not go as far Clinton promised, it was still heralded as progress. Massachusetts Rep. Barney Frank, who is gay, told *The New York Times*, “The President made that choice … I wish he had made the other choice. But people who say that he could have gotten more are wrong. I give Bill Clinton credit for taking on a very tough political reality. I think he moved it some. He didn’t move it enough” (Friedman, 1993b).

Notably, a *New York Times* (1993) editorial called the prohibitions on homosexual a “fundamental unfairness” and took an extremely powerful stand in support of gay and lesbian people, saying in part:

Any sane policy would hold that what consenting adults do in private is nobody’s business. The new rules acknowledge as much by suggesting that criminal investigations should not ordinarily be squandered on such activity. But it remains grotesquely unfair
that talented, dedicated homosexuals can serve only if they stay hidden in the closet or are perpetually, provably celibate (p. A26).

However by 1997, “don’t ask, don’t tell” actually led the military increasing the number of gay and lesbian people it kicked out annually by 67% (Weiner, 1998).

Another controversial Clinton policy signed was the 1996 Defense of Marriage Act. It defined marriage as between “one man and one woman” and that no state had to recognize a same-sex marriage performed in another state (Manz, 2013). The impetus for the act was that Hawaiian state judges ruled that it was unconstitutional to deny same-sex marriages (Gray, 1996; Schmitt, 1996). The federal legislation passed the House and Senate with massive majorities (Gray, 1996; Schmitt, 1996). When the Senate voted on the Defense of Marriage Act, it also voted on “a separate bill that for the first time would have banned discrimination against homosexuals in the workplace” (Schmitt, 1996). The job anti-discrimination bill failed by one vote. The public sentiment at the time might have been encapsulated in this New York Times paragraph:

“People don’t want to go too far on changing marriage and traditional relationships,” said Senator James M. Jeffords, a Vermont Republican who supported the marriage bill and the anti-discrimination measure. “But the feeling is when someone wants to work someplace, they ought to be able to get a job” (Schmitt, 1996).

Jeffords’s position demonstrates how far U.S. society has moved because in the 1970s there was very little will among the general public in terms of granting job protections to gay and lesbian people (Associated Press, 1978).
Another significant cultural moment came the following year when television star Ellen DeGeneres announced that she was a lesbian and that her character on her hit show “Ellen” was a lesbian, too (Carter, 1997; Dow, 2001). DeGeneres’s character Ellen Morgan was the first “openly gay leading character” on television (Milvy, 1998). Mainstream media was pretty accepting of DeGeneres, perhaps signaling that “previously censored forms of sexuality were gliding rather easily out of the closet and into prime-time” (Dow, 2001, p. 124). Not everything went smoothly, however. The network that aired “Ellen,” ABC, had some reservations about the show, trying “add an on-screen advisory … warning parents to use discretion in allowing children to view it” (Carter, 1997). DeGeneres and ABC disagreed over show themes and the advisory (Carter, 1997). “Ellen” was taken off the air in 1998 (Dow, 2001); however, its legacy might be in that some popular TV shows that soon followed did have at least one prominent gay character (Dow, 2001; Milvy, 1998; Mink, 1998). There is some thought, though by no means definitive, that DeGeneres’s show helped it be “okay to be gay” (Dow, 2001, p. 124).

2000s

The 2000s were a period marked by profound changes after the terror attacks on September 11, 2001, less than nine months after the inauguration of George W. Bush. Air travel was changed, the Department of Homeland Security was created, and the United States has been fighting a war against terror ever since. Subsequently, the person in charge of the terror attack, Osama bin Laden, had his own entry in the Stylebook by 2007. A drive for increased security has pushed that desire up against individuals’ civil liberties, with the two often in some state of conflict. The conflict is highlighted best in the dispute over WikiLeaks’s 2010 release of sensitive documents relating to how the U.S. government was conducting the war on terror (Canon, 2013; Michael, 2015).
Not all the conflicts were new; the battle over same-sex marriage continued, reaching the Supreme Court. Additionally, transgender people gained more media visibility, and women continued to make strides in political and business representation. Most notably, Nancy Pelosi became the first female Speaker of the House in 2007 and Barack Obama became the first racial minority to be elected president in 2008. However, right before the 2008 elections, the Great Recession hit, crippling global financial markets, and leading to a housing collapse in the United States.

Improvements in Internet connectivity helped change how the world communicates as social media was introduced and quickly became one of the dominant platforms for message dissemination. Similar to the addition of the computer section in the 1980s, a Social Media Guidelines section was added to the Stylebook by 2014.

**Gains for Minorities and Women**

Women experienced significant increases in their political representations in the decade after the Clarence Thomas hearings. In 2001, women were 13.6% of people in Congress, more than double their 6% in 1991 (Center for American Women and Politics, 2016). Additionally, the number of women holding statewide office grew from 18% to 27% during the same period. However in 2011, women’s representation in Congress increased to almost 17%, but the number of female statewide elected officials fell to 22.1% (Center for American Women and Politics, 2016). When Nancy Pelosi officially became House Speaker in 2007, a *New York Times* article suggested, “Voters have grown more accustomed to women in powerful positions” (Toner, 2007). For all that progress, politics … and the media are still dominated by men. After 2006 election made Pelosi the presumptive Speaker, a *New York Times* column headline summarized the situation: “A historic event for women, still largely covered by men” (Stanley, 2006).
One of the reasons for overall increase in female politicians from the 1990s to the 2000s could be that there are more college educated women (United States Census Bureau, n.d.). Women continued to complete more years of college compared to men: 31.3% to 25.5% in 2001 and 36.1% to 28.4% in 2011. Most senators, representatives, governors, and modern presidents have college degrees (Hunt, 2015). Thus with more women in the available applicant pool, so to speak, then it is logical that more women would be in politics. Another trend that continued in the 2000s the changing gender demographics of the labor force. About 59% and 57% of women were working outside the home in 2004 and 2014, respectively; men’s figures were 73% and 69% for the same period (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2015).

Marriage

The debate over marriage was also changing in the 2000s. In 2004, a Massachusetts court permitted same-sex marriage (Greenhouse, 2004). That ruling sparked a new front in the societal dispute on what constitutes marriage. One position was as follows: “Gay rights advocates hailed this day, which fell on the 50th anniversary of the Supreme Court decision Brown v. Board of Education, as an occasion that evoked the triumphs — and the social vindication — of the civil rights era” (Greenhouse, 2004). The same article also noted the strong response from those opposed to same-sex marriage, namely President Bush:

“The sacred institution of marriage should not be redefined by a few activist judges,” Mr. Bush said. “All Americans have a right to be heard in this debate. I called on the Congress to pass, and to send to the states for ratification, an amendment to our Constitution defining and protecting marriage as a union of a man and a woman as husband and wife. The need for that amendment is still urgent, and I repeat that call today.”
Timing is everything, especially considering 2004 was a presidential election year, and Bush won re-election that year. Some news outlets theorized that the Massachusetts same-sex marriage court decision coupled with Bush’s call for a federal amendment might have helped him with the election (Dao, 2004; Lochhead, 2004). Numerous states had ballot initiatives seeking to ban same-sex marriage; all 11 passes, 9 with more than 60% of the vote (Dao, 2004).

The era has been littered with court cases and ballot initiatives regarding the status of same-sex marriage, but perhaps the next landmark decision came from what President Obama decided not to do. An “evolving” Obama instructed his administration not to support the Defense of Marriage Act (New York Times, 2011; Savage & Stolberg, 2011). A New York Times article detailed the impact of the decision and Obama’s position on same-sex marriage.

While the issue at hand is whether gay couples in the eight states that already legally recognize same-sex marriage may be discriminated against by the federal government, the administration’s decision raised anew the more fundamental question of whether same-sex couples should have a right to marry.

Mr. Obama takes a nuanced position on same-sex marriage, and the White House was careful to say on Wednesday that his position on that issue — he favors civil unions — remains unchanged. Many advocates of same-sex marriage, though, perceived the administration’s new legal stance as a signal that Mr. Obama would soon embrace their cause (Savage & Stolberg, 2011).

**WikiLeaks and Chelsea Manning**

Connected to the fallout from WikiLeaks was Army Private Bradley Manning, now known as Chelsea Manning. For this dissertation, it is the difference in gender and name that is
of most importance. Manning was accused and later convicted of leaking classified military
documents to WikiLeaks (Hackl, Becker, & Todd, 2016; Maxwell, 2015). In 2013, the day after
Manning was convicted, Manning released a statement identifying as a woman. This caused
much trouble around newsrooms:

Overnight, a whole host of news organizations were faced with the dilemma of deciding
whether to honor Manning’s request, changing the discussion from a focus on “Bradley”
to an emphasis on “Chelsea.” Questions surrounding audience familiarity with and
receptivity toward a discussion of Chelsea versus Bradley, the application of established
journalism style guidelines (e.g., AP style), public opinion toward transgender identity
issues, and relevant policy implications began to emerge as a central part of the debate,
with a number of news organizations weighing in on their preferred reporting practices
(Hackl et al., 2016, p. 468).

Journalists’ apprehension is somewhat understandable as previously the news media has been
criticized for its reporting on transgender people (Hess, 2009). In their content analysis
examining coverage of Manning, Hackl et al. (2016) found that U.S. media lagged behind
foreign media in referring to Manning as a woman. The authors also did note that the Associated
Press sent out an advisory regarding how to depict Manning.

However, there was some confusion within the Associated Press as it first said “For the
time being, AP stories will use gender-neutral references to Manning and provide the pertinent
background on the transgender issue. However, when reporting is completed, the AP Stylebook
entry on ‘transgender’ will be AP’s guide” (White, 2013). After speaking with Manning’s
lawyer, the Associated Press sent a revised updated; the following is an excerpt:
The use of the first name Chelsea and feminine pronouns in Manning’s case is in conformity with the transgender guidance in the AP Stylebook. The guidance calls for using the pronoun preferred by the individuals who have acquired the physical characteristics of the opposite sex or present themselves in a way that does not correspond with their sex at birth (White, 2013).

While acknowledging that the Associated Press did provide guidance, Hackl et al. (2016) said “journalists need to seek stronger guidance from media reference guides published by organizations such as GLAAD … and the NLGJA” (p. 483) to better report on transgender people.

Now that some historical context has been provided to understand Stylebook rulings in different eras, the research questions can be answered in the subsequent Results chapter.
Chapter 4: Results

Recall that this project used critical discourse analysis of entry titles, examples, and explanations five Stylebooks: 1977, 1987, 1997, 2007, and 2014 to answer the following research questions:

- RQ 1: How do Stylebook entry titles depict gender?
  - RQ 1a) How have entry titles stayed the same?
  - RQ 1b) How have entry titles changed?
- RQ 2: How do Stylebook entry examples and explanations depict gender?
  - RQ 2a) How have entry examples and explanations stayed the same?
  - RQ 2b) How have entry examples and explanations changed?

Hence, Chapter 3 provided essential context for critical discourse analysis. Also, it is important to recall the data analysis framework based on McCracken’s (1988) five-step process. Step 1 was documenting anything that appeared to be relevant in the Stylebook. In Step 2, the elements that were previous highlighted received preliminary codes (See Table 1).

Table 1: Initial codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men only</td>
<td>Entry titles or references contain only male names, leagues/teams, or pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women only</td>
<td>Entry titles or references contain only female names, leagues/teams, or pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men and women only</td>
<td>Entry titles or references contain both male and female names, leagues/teams, or pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>Entry titles or references describe sexual orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Entry titles or references describe one’s age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academia</td>
<td>Entry titles or references describe educational degrees or statuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty</td>
<td>Entry titles or references describe aesthetic qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>Entry titles or references describe a person’s nature, i.e., “The children are soft-spoken” (Angione, 1977, p. 110).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common noun</td>
<td>Entry titles or references contain common nouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/parents</td>
<td>Entry titles or references describe one’s domestic or familial roles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Foreign  Entry titles or references contain non-American names or mention “foreign” names/titles
Groups  Entry titles or references contain companies, teams, bands, or unions
Judge  Entry titles or references contain mentions to judicial positions
Lawyer  Entry titles or references contain mentions to legal positions
Military  Entry titles or references contain mentions to the armed forces
Religion  Entry titles or references contain mentions to religion or deities
Politics  Entry titles or references contain mentions to political figures and positions
Proper noun  Entry titles or references contain proper nouns
Sports  Entry titles or references contain mentions to sports or sports figures
Technology  Entry titles or references contain mentions to technology software, hardware, or platforms

Step 3 called for grouping together codes then subsequently creating and defining categories (See Table 2).

Table 2: Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>References to a person’s push for equality, qualifications, or justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>References to one’s beauty or fashion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard news</td>
<td>References to business, military, law, politics, or crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-updates</td>
<td>References that have not been updated in at least one Stylebook, but contain gender references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexuality</td>
<td>References that describe sexual orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>References that mention sports or sports figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updates</td>
<td>References whose changes indicate potential shifts in gender depictions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Step 4, categories were collapsed into defined concepts (See Table 3).

Table 3: Concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>References to a person’s push for equality, qualifications, or justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender binary</td>
<td>Entries and references that indicate the Stylebook considers only two genders: male and female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender shifts</td>
<td>Entries and references that depict how the culture has changed on understandings of gender and sexual orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male universal</td>
<td>Entries that demonstrate how men, not women, perform acts. See small businessmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsmakers</td>
<td>Entries and references to hard news, or sports and cultural elites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The concepts provided much for the content for the rest of this chapter. As for Step 5, the concepts were woven together to create one overarching explanation of the results, seen in the final chapter.

Overall, the *Stylebook*, though a journalistically objective text, does display various ideas about gender through its entry titles, explanations, and examples.

**Gender and Stylebook Titles**

As to answering RQ 1: How do *Stylebook* entry titles depict gender, the analysis has identified three concepts that connect *Stylebook* entry titles and gender: male universality, newsmakers, and gender binary. *Stylebook* entry titles indicate that society often views men as generic people and accompanying that generic maleness is an idea that most newsmakers are men. Additionally, the entry titles often reflect a preference for a gender binary.

**Male Universality**

Common noun entry titles represented a tilt toward men. Consider the *Stylebook*'s entry such as *fireman*, *firefighter*, which has stayed the same from 1977 through 2014. While this entry indicates men and women can both fight fires, the explanations for each entry demonstrate that maleness is either outright preferred or is seen as the industry standard. The *fireman*, *firefighter* explanation says:

The preferred term to describe a person who fights fire is *firefighter*.

One meaning of *fireman* is a person who tends fires in a furnace. *Fireman* is also an acceptable synonym for *firefighter* (Angione, 1977, p. 88).

The alternative definition of fireman, “a person who tends fires in a furnace,” shows that language deems a default person as a man. While the preferred term for a person who fights fires
is a firefighter, the *Stylebook* accepts fireman as a substitute for firefighter. The entry title and the entry definition do not mention women. The *Stylebook* does not state that journalists can use the term firewoman; if journalists want to describe women who fight fires, they are firefighters. However, if men fight fires, they are either firefighters or firemen.

The perception of firefighters being primarily men appears to be connected to the fact that most firefighters are men. Women constitute 4% of firefighters (Hulett, Bendrick Jr., Thomas, & Moccio, 2008). The depictions of other roles show their male roots such as mailman. The 1977 *Stylebook* says although letter carrier is preferred, men can be still called mailmen (Angione, 1977, p. 133). The mailman entry implies two significant details. First, mail delivery was initially a profession for men. The word mailman combined with this portion of the entry’s definition “because many women hold this job,” show that women were ostensibly new to the field of mail delivery. The data reflect this as in 1972 only 4% of city letter carriers were women (United States Postal Service, 2007). The numbers of female letter carriers rose significant in the intervening period as women were 40% of letter carriers (United States Postal Service, 2007). The *Stylebook*’s mailman entry changed, too, as the 2014 *Stylebook* removed the portion “because many women hold this job” (Christian et al., 2014, p. 153).

Similar to the fireman, firefighter entry, what is not said in the mailman entry is of special importance. What is not said is that “mailwoman” could be used. The *Stylebook* makes its preference clear. Mailman can be used, but if the person delivering the mail is a woman, then use “letter carrier.” And so, men can be labeled with two terms while women get only one. While one might assume that the *Stylebook*’s silence on a term such as “mailwoman” does not mean the term cannot be used, consider that the *Stylebook* makes itself especially clear in other positions where men and women hold the same jobs.
Similar to mailman, the national chairman entry title reflects the notion that male universality is considered normal. National chairman exists in the 2014 Stylebook even though a woman, Florida Rep. Debbie Wasserman Schultz, has led the Democratic National Committee since 2011 (Democratic National Committee, 2016). On its website, the Democratic National Committee calls Wasserman Schultz, the third woman to ever lead the organization (Allen & Ball, 2011), the national committee chair.

**Newsmakers**

Connected to its usage of male universality, the Stylebook reflected journalism’s depiction of men more than women as newsmakers. This dissertation defines newsmakers as people within prominent areas such as hard news, or sports or culture (See Table 1), and the Stylebook did not contain many people’s names as entry titles. However, the newsmakers in the Stylebook were primarily men. Starting with the 1977 edition, the names in the main section were mostly political leaders such as Harry S. Truman, Adolf Hitler, and Josef Stalin. All three individuals are men; they are also three of the most influential figures of the 20th century, even though the book is now written for a 21st century audience. The inclusion of Osama bin Laden by the 2007 Stylebook (Goldstein, 2007, p. 178) demonstrates the severity of the 9/11 terror attacks and the fact that the mastermind of the attack, i.e., newsmaker, was a male.

The addition of the Fashion section by the 2014 Stylebook allowed women to experience some representation as proper noun entry titles: Coco Chanel, Madame Gres, Donna Karan, Mary Quant, and Anna Wintour (Christian et al., 2014). All of these women, except for Wintour, became famous for their successful clothing designs. The Stylebook does also pay Wintour a high honor stating she is “widely considered the most powerful person in fashion, making or breaking trends and careers” (Christian et al., 2014, p. 448). The Fashion section does not
celebrate women only; Azzedine Alaia, Cristobal Balenciaga, Oscar de la Renta, Christian Dior, Alber Elbaz, Salvatore Ferragamo, Roy Halston Frowick, Marc Jacobs, Calvin Klein, Karl Lagerfeld, Ralph Lauren, Alexander McQueen, and Yves Saint Laurent all received entries, too. While women were recognized to a greater extent in the Fashion section, their representation was dwarfed when compared to that of men, five women to 13 men. The representation of men and women in the Fashion section almost identically matches the disparity between men and women regarding who are creative directors at top fashion companies (Friedman, 2015).

**Gender Binary**

While the *Stylebook* defaults to maleness in many cases such as national chairman, the national chairman entry itself is contradicted by the chairman, chairwoman entry, which does acknowledge that women lead companies, organizations, etc. The -man, -woman distinction in entries also indicates that the *Stylebook* portrays gender as a binary between male and female. The 2014 “patrolman, patrolwoman” entry makes clear that *Stylebook* editors takes its cues from various industries in terms of how they depict different jobs. Journalists are told, “Capitalize before a name only if the word is a formal title. In some cities, the formal title is police officer” (Christian et al., 2014, p. 198). Therefore, the *Stylebook* could be seen as reflecting the gender binary preferred by many segments in society.

Some *Stylebook* rules also show that editors seek to reify a gender binary. The usage of the -man, -woman difference is not capricious; for instance, the *Stylebook* has entries for congressman, congresswoman, anchorman, anchorwoman, and spokesman, spokeswoman. In spokesman, spokeswoman, the *Stylebook* explains, “But not spokesperson. Use a representative if you do not know the sex of the individual” (Christian et al., 2014, p. 241). The term spokesperson is not permitted; journalists must use an entirely different word if the sex of
the speaker is not known. Thus, representative confers no sex status while the Stylebook seeks to identify the sex status of “spokes…” The -persons entry more strongly shows the Stylebook’s preference to identify gender in certain cases. The entry says:

Do not use coined words such as chairperson or spokesperson in regular text.

Instead, use chairman or spokesman if referring to a man or the office in general. Use chairwoman or spokeswoman if referring to a woman. Or, if applicable, use a neutral word such as leader or representative.

Use chairperson or similar coinage only in direct quotations or when it is the formal description for an office (Christian et al., 2014, p. 200).

Again, similar to spokesman, spokeswoman — but this time more overtly — journalists are asked to switch to a “neutral word.” However, the Stylebook does respect people’s preference as in the case of Janet Yellen, who is in charge of the Federal Reserve. In the Federal Reserve entry, the Stylebook says, “Use Federal Reserve Board Chair Janet Yellen, her preference” (Christian et al., 2014, p. 97).

RQ 1a). As to how did entry titles stay the same in relation to gender, Stylebook entry titles that reflected the male universality concept with the hard news category appeared to be likely to remain constant. Recall that hard news as a variable code refers to business, military, legal, or political mentions (See Table 2). For instance, the national chairman entry is unchanged from 1977. The 1977 Stylebook explains the entry as: “Capitalize when used before the name of the individual who heads a political party: Democratic National Chairman Kenneth M. Curtis” (Angione, 1977, p. 147). The explanation for national chairman acknowledges that any person can lead a political party by stating the term individual. The language use within the
*Stylebook* is purposeful; if only men were permitted to lead a political party, the *Stylebook* would have said man, not individual.

Besides politics, the *Stylebook* also seems to treat business as male as evidenced by the *small-business man* entry title, originating from the 1977 *Stylebook* (Angione, 1977, p. 205). This is no mention of a “small-business woman.” *Small-business man* normalizes a relationship as men who primarily conduct business. From one standpoint, business ownership is male-dominated, as women own only about 36% of all U.S. businesses (National Women’s Business Council, 2012). That statistic shows progress, as about 30% of small businesses were female-owned in 1990 (National Women’s Business Council, 1990). In fact, the U.S. government thought the lack of female participation in business ownership was such a big issue that it created the National Women’s Business Council in 1988 (National Women’s Business Council, 1989). Couple those facts with the understanding that less than 5% of Fortune 500 chief executives are women (Fairchild, 2014), and it is relatively easy to see why business is viewed as male.

**RQ 1b**. The *Stylebook’s* entry titles regarding the variable code of sexuality were extremely likely to have changed over time. The *Stylebook’s* changes on entry titles reflects that society’s views about both gender norms and sexual orientation are changing, too. For example, 72% of adults were married in 1960 (Pew Research Center, 2010). That figure fell to 52% in 2008. Thus, that the movement away from labeling women by their marital statuses occurred at the same time Americans were shifting on marriage. The *Stylebook’s* style on divorced women reflected that. Its 1977 *divorcee* entry said:

The fact that a woman has been divorced should be mentioned only if a similar story about a man would mention his marital status.
When the woman’s marital status is relevant, it seldom belongs in the lead. Avoid stories that begin: *A 35-year-old divorcee ...*

The preferred form is to say in the body of the story that a woman is divorced (Angione, 1977, p. 71).

By 2014, the entry went from *divorcee* to *divorce*, signaling that a gendered term should not be used for one sex but not the other. The entry explanation also changed, too: “Use the same standards for men and women in deciding whether to mention marital status in a story. Avoid describing a woman as a woman as a *divorcee*, or a man as a *divorce*, unless used in an essential quote. When the news isn’t about a marital breakup, but marital status is relevant, say in the body of the story that the woman or man is divorced” (Christian et al., 2014, p. 78). The Stylebook recommends practically never using divorcee and offers additional guidelines on when to mention people’s divorces.

Concepts regarding marriage did not change solely for heterosexual people. In 2004, Massachusetts became the first U.S. state to recognize same-sex marriage (Belluck, 2004), and that ruling portended big changes in the Stylebook’s *husband, widower* entry. The entry, which stayed the same from 1977 through 1997, said, “Use *husband*, not *widower*, in referring to the spouse of a woman who dies” (Angione, 1977, p. 110). By 2007, the *husband, widower* entry was removed. By 2014, the Stylebook offered clarity, reviving and revising the *husband* entry. The entry now is *husband, wife*, and it says, “Regardless of sexual orientation, *husband* for a man or *wife* for a woman is acceptable in all references to individuals in any legally recognized marriage. *Spouse* or *partner* may be used if requested” (Christian et al., 2014, p. 124). The *spouse* entry was also changed to say “… when some of the people involved may be either gender” (Christian et al., 2014, p. 242). The Stylebook makes it clear that people can refer
to themselves as husband and husband, or wife and wife, or husband and wife, as long as the government approves the union. Noticeably, the preference is for a term that signifies gender and sexual orientation, as a subject must tell the journalist to use a different term.

The *Stylebook’s* relationship with gender identity has also shifted in the past 37 years. In 1977, it had a *sex changes* entry:

Follow these guidelines in using proper names or personal pronouns when referring to an individual who has had a sex-change operation:

If the reference is to an action before the operation, use the proper name and sex of the individual at that time.

If the reference is to an action after the operation, use the new proper name and sex:

For example:

*Dr. Richard Raskind was a first-rate amateur tennis player. He won several tournaments. Ten years later, when Dr. Renee Richards applied to play in tournaments, many women objected on the ground that she was the former Richard Raskind, who had undergone a sex-change operation. Miss Richards said she was entitled to compete as a woman* (Angione, 1977, p. 189).

The controversy with Richards reached media prominence in 1976 (Herman, 1976), and the *Stylebook* used that story as an avenue to discuss people who change sexes. The *Stylebook* did not openly push for identifying people’s previous identities unless an action occurred while the person was known under a different name. The entry remained in 1987 and 1997, but by 2007, *sex changes* was removed, and *transgender* seemed to take its place. It said:
Use the pronoun preferred by the individuals who have acquired the physical characteristics of the opposite sex or present themselves in a way that does not correspond with their sex at birth.

If that preference is not expressed, use the pronoun consistent with the way individuals live publicly (Goldstein, 2007, p. 247).

This entry remained the same in 2014, but transsexual was also added. That entry says, “A person who changes gender by undergoing surgical procedures” (Christian et al., 2014, p. 260).

**Gender and Stylebook Examples, Explanations**

Entry titles are not the only way through which the Stylebook depicts ideas about gender. The examples inside the entries provide much information for analysis. Regardless of entry type, there was an overwhelming reliance on male exemplars. Thus, the answer to RQ 2: How do Stylebook entry examples and explanations depict gender, is that the Stylebook often defaults to a male universality for newsmakers and average people. There is a preference toward men in terms of the proper nouns used for Stylebook examples, but also a preference toward men in the pronouns and common nouns used, as well, perhaps reflecting the male-source bias seen in journalism coverage.

**Newsmakers**

Many Stylebook entries detail how to depict various political phenomena, from legislative titles to party affiliation. The examples in these entries use usually male exemplars heavily. For instance, the party affiliation entry in the 1977 Stylebook names five male politicians and one woman, and the woman is mentioned last.
The **party affiliation** stayed the same through the 2007 edition of the *Stylebook*. By 2014, it was updated; however, similar to the 1977 entry, only one woman mentioned, and she was still mentioned last.

Political examples are pervasive throughout the *Stylebook*, even in entries that are non-political. The **ellipsis** entry details how to use that punctuation mark. The entry has not been updated since 1977, and the entry is more explicit than other entries about its use of a political event: “Brief examples of how to use ellipses are provided after guidelines are given. More extensive examples, drawn from the speech in which President Nixon announced his resignation, are in the sections below marked CONDENSATION EXAMPLE and QUOTATIONS” (Angione, 1977, p. 77). The sections containing Nixon’s speech are extensive. The **ellipsis** entry is one of the longer entries in all the *Stylebook* editions, taking up nearly a full page; in contrast, the typical *Stylebook* page contains more than 10 entries. The excerpt from Nixon’s speech total about a half-page.

**Male Universality**

Not all of the entries were that lengthy in their references to politics, but politics were still used often for example, such as in the 2014 **acting** entry: “Always lowercase, but capitalize any formal title that may follow before a name: *acting Mayor Peter Barry*” (Christian et al., 2014, p. 4). Even in the **foreign names** entry, which is consistently updated through different *Stylebook* editions, picks political names as its examples, generally all men. In the 2014 *Stylebook*, three of the examples were leading international political figures — Charles de Gaulle, Anwar Sadat, and bin Laden — and one was a famous military figure, Baron Manfred von Richthofen (Christian et al., 2014), aka the Red Baron (Tyson, 2003). All the names mentioned in the entries were male.
The inclusion of the Red Baron in the foreign names entry helps highlight that the Stylebook has a lot of entries and references to the military and law enforcement. These entries are again overwhelmingly male. In the 2014 Marines entry, the Stylebook contains the following, “Capitalize Marine when referring to an individual in a Marine Corps unit: He is a Marine” (Christian et al., 2014, p. 155). The 2014 National Guard entry has a similar portion. It says, “When referring to an individual in a National Guard unit, use National Guardsman: He is a National Guardsman” (Christian et al., 2014, p. 155). Note that in each entry how the default person is “he.” Additionally, consider that a soldier in the National Guard is a National Guardsman, not a guardsman or a guardswoman. The entries both have origins in the 1977 Stylebook, and there were few women in the military then. Women comprised 2% of enlisted troops in 1973; that number has risen to 14% in 2010 (Patten & Parker, 2011). Thus, the Stylebook’s italics examples are reflecting the fact that most troops are men.

Conversely, there appears to be more gender parity in the composition of royal families. The Stylebook details the names of pertinent British royal family members and their ranks, titles of which both men and women hold prominence. There are many references to nobility within the Stylebook, including queen, queen mother, king, His Majesty, Her Majesty, prince, princess, in addition to a whole section titled nobility. In addition to the large number of entries, the nobility entry, at almost two full pages, is one of the longest in the Stylebook. Outside of a few sports entries, nobility and related entries are rare places where many female proper nouns appear. 2014 Excerpts from nobility are as follows:

*Queen Elizabeth II, Queen Elizabeth II of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the queen. Kings George and Edward. Queen Mother Elizabeth, the queen mother.*
... Use Prince or Princess before the names of sovereign’s children: Princess Anne, the princess; Prince Charles.

In references to the queen’s husband, first reference should be Prince Philip (not Duke of Edinburgh, commonly used in Britain).

The male heir to the throne normally is designated Prince of Wales, and the title becomes, in common usage, an alternate name. Capitalize when used: The queen invested her eldest son as Prince of Wales. The prince is married. His wife, Camilla, is called the Duchess of Cornwall.

Prince Charles’ eldest son is Prince William. Prince William’s wife, the former Kate Middleton, is the Duchess of Cambridge (Christian et al., 2014, p. 180).

Unlike many of the other italics examples that contain proper nouns, women are featured as much as men in the nobility entry.

Overall, women frequently appear in the Stylebook, most often appearing with men in some format. The Stylebook aims to create a gender balance in many of its entry examples — i.e., using male and female pronouns together or having a female name and a male name in an entry. This is not to say that women do not appear by themselves, i.e., part time, part-time in 1977: “Hyphenate when used as a compound modifier: She works part time” (Angione, 1977, p. 163). While there is nothing overtly sexist about many of the entries with female-only examples, there is one substantial difference between them and male-only examples: The male-only examples have a preponderance of proper nouns; the female-only examples have a preponderance of common nouns. The owner entry uses two male owners of sports teams as its italics examples, Ted Turner (Angione, 1977) and later Jerry Jones (Christian et al., 2014).
RQ 2a). In relation to gender, Stylebook explanations and examples that were usually left unchanged focused on hard news—generally business—and sports exemplars, often focusing primarily on men. However, depictions of women in an advocacy frame tended to remain static, too.

The Stylebook demonstrates a preference for hard news, i.e., serious news such as politics and business that is thought to affect many people’s lives (e.g., Itule & Anderson, 2000; Lehman-Wilzig & Seletzky, 2010) within the Stylebook, similar to overall journalism’s preference for hard news (e.g., Boukes & Boomgaarden, 2015; Lehman-Wilzig & Seletzky, 2010; Thomson, White, & Kitley, 2008). The sources for much hard news stories are men (e.g., Layton & Shepard, 2013; Project for Excellence in Journalism, 2005). The Stylebook also reflects media’s male preference for hard news in both its entry titles, entry explanations, and entry examples. The Stylebook rarely references women in its business entries, too. Besides **small-business man**, the maleness of business entries can be seen further in the explanation of some entries, such as **hedging** and **profit-taking**, which are both unchanged from 1987. The 1987 **hedging** entry says:

A method of selling for future delivery whereby a dealer protects himself from falling prices between the time he buys a product and the time he resells or processes it. A miller, for example, who buys wheat to convert to flour will sell a similar quantity of wheat he doesn’t own at near the price at which he bought his own. He will agree to deliver it at the same time his flour is ready for market. If at that time the price of wheat and therefore flour has fallen, he will lose on the flour but can buy the wheat at a low price and deliver it at a profit. If prices have risen, he will make an extra profit on his
flour which he will have to sacrifice to buy the wheat for delivery. But either way he has protected his profit (French, 1987, p. 264-265).

The profit-taking says:

Avoid this term. It means selling a security after a recent rapid rise in price. It is inaccurate if the seller bought the security at a higher price, watched it fall, then sold it after a recent rise but for less than he bought it. In that case, he would be cutting his losses, not taking his profit (French, 1987, p. 267).

In both entries, the generic person is a man. It is rare that the Stylebook does this. In most cases, the Stylebook describes people with gender-neutral nouns, such as individual, person, etc. It is within the italics examples that gender is often employed, as seen in the entries mentioned earlier. However, the hedging entry goes further by taking a generic businessperson, i.e., a miller, and making that person a man.

Stylebook editors generally did not make changes to entries that are gender-neutral, or entries that are relatively straightforward are grammatical rules. Grammatical rules often do not change, and so the Stylebook’s entries for punctuation have remained the same, as well. Consider this 1977 excerpt from periods:

END OF AN INDIRECTION QUESTION: He asked what the score was.

… INITIALS: John F. Kennedy, T.S. Eliot. (No space between T. and S., to prevent them from being placed on two lines in typesetting.)

Abbreviations using only the initials of a name do not take periods: JFK, LBJ . …

The rules for periods in basic English grammar have not changed, and so the *Stylebook* has not changed this entry. The mentions of John Kennedy and T.S. Eliot again reflect the practice of using proper nouns for men.

Besides newsmakers and hard news, *Stylebook* examples often reference sports, even in non-sports entries such as *periods* where the entry said, “He asked what the score was.” These sports-related examples generally used male exemplars. Consider the 1977 *first quarter, first-quarter* and *hit-and-run* entries. *First quarter, first quarter* says: “Hyphenate when used as a compound modifier: *He scored in the first quarter. The team took the lead on his first-quarter goal*” (Angione, 1977, p. 88). The 1977 *Stylebook* explains *hit and run* (v.) *hit-and-run* (n. and adj.) as: “*The coach told him to hit and run. He scored on a hit-and-run. She was struck by a hit-and-run driver*” (Angione, 1977, p. 106). While the entry does include women, this entry and other like it describe only men as being involved in sports.

Women are not completely obscured, though. The *Stylebook* addresses women’s professional competency in a way that it does not do for men. A few entries examples highlight this point well. To illustrate, here is an excerpt from the *hyphen* entry:

**COMPOUND MODIFIER:** When a compound modifier — two or more words that express a single concept — precedes a noun, use hyphens to link all the words in the compound except the adverb *very* and all adverbs that end in *ly*: *a first-quarter touchdown, a bluish-green dress, a full-time job, a well-known man, a better-qualified woman, a know-it-all attitude, a very good time, an easily remembered rule* (Angione, 1977, p. 110).

*Entitled* says:
Use it to mean a right to do or something. Do not use it to mean *titled*.

Right: *She was entitled to the promotion.*

Right: *The book was titled “Gone With the Wind”* (Angione, 1977, p. 78-79).

The *-ly* entry says, “Do not use a hyphen between adverbs ending in *-ly* and adjectives they modify: *an easily remembered rule, a badly damaged island, a fully informed woman* (Angione, 1977, p. 110). For the *entitled*, *hyphen*, and *-ly* entries, attention is called to a woman’s competence. Because there are no references to a man competence, one might think that men are already assumed to be qualified for anything.

References to women’s rights are also sprinkled through the *Stylebook*. Some are especially obvious, such as the 1977 *compared to, compared with* entry:

Use *compared to* when the intent is to assert, without the need for elaboration, that two or more items are similar: *She compared her work for women’s rights to Susan B. Anthony’s campaign for women’s suffrage.*

Use *compared with* when juxtaposing two or more items to illustrate similarities and/or differences: *His time was 2:11:10, compared with 2:14 for his closest competitor* (Angione, 1977, p. 52).

Context is important in understanding the genesis of these entries. In 1977, Women’s Rights Movement was ongoing and the 50th anniversary of women being able to vote — aka women’s suffrage — was a significant even that was not in the distant past (*New York Times*, 1970). In the *compared to, compared with* entry, a woman’s identity was linked to activism on behalf of
women while the man is once again portrayed as an athlete. The activism frame can be seen in the *stanch, staunch* entry, too:

*Stanch* is a verb: *He stanched the flow of blood.*

*Staunch* is an adjective: *She is a staunch supporter of equality* (Angione, 1977, p. 208).

Again, the appeal to the Women’s Rights Movement is overt and geared toward women.

**RQ 2b.** With an eye on cultural shifts, one can see that the Women’s Right Movement made a significant impact in the United States, especially in politics. Corresponding shifts occurred within the *Stylebook* to mirror societal changes in female representation in politics and also in norms when it comes to media depictions of women and non-heterosexuals.

Obvious changes in the *Stylebook* occurred with the inclusion of women throughout more hard news entries such as in politics and government. The 1977’s *Stylebook’s Supreme Court of the United States* entry mentioned only men. Throughout the history of the United States, all the Supreme Court justices were men. However, that changed in 1981 when Sandra Day O’Connor was appointed to the Supreme Court (Greenhouse, 1981a; 1981b; 1981c). The 1987 *Supreme Court of the United States* entry reflected the addition of O’Connor and a new chief justice:

Capitalize *U.S. Supreme Court* and also *the Supreme Court* when the context makes the *U.S.* designation necessary.

The chief justice is properly the *chief justice of the United States*, not *of the Supreme Court: Chief Justice William Rehnquist*.

The proper title for the eight other members of the court is *associate justice*. When used as a formal title before a name, it should be shortened to *justice* unless there are special
circumstances: Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, Associate Justice Sandra Day O'Connor (French, 1987, p. 209).

When O'Connor retired in 2006 (Greenhouse, 2006), the Stylebook continued to use a woman to for the associate justice example, swapping in Ruth Bader Ginsberg for O’Connor (Christian et al., 2014).

The gains for women were not seen only in the Supreme Court. The Center for American Women and Politics (2016) reported that only 4% of elected officials in Congress were women. That number grew to 5% by 1987, but doubled to 10.1% by 1997. Excerpts from the legislative titles entry in the 1977 Stylebook showed the paucity of women in politics at that time by not including women at all. That entry remained the same in 1987, but by 1997, there was a little movement, “... Add U.S. or state before a title only if necessary to avoid confusion: U.S. Sen. Nancy Kassebaum spoke with state Sen. Hugh Carter” (Goldstein, 1997, p. 117). However by the release of the 2014 Stylebook, historic events were occurring all over the U.S. political landscape: Barack Obama became the first racial minority to become president of the United States, Nancy Pelosi was the first woman to be named House speaker, and women were almost one-fifth of all elected officials in Congress (Center for American Women and Politics, 2016). The 2014 legislative titles entry reflected these societal shifts mentioning Obama, and two female politicians, including Pelosi. And while women are still greatly outnumbered by men, women’s visibility in the entry is significantly better than the zero from 1977.

The “Key Terms and Definitions” within the Social Media Guidelines section also demonstrated increased visibility for women, but in a different manner. Consider the entries crowdsourcing and subscribe. Crowdsourcing says:
The practice of asking a large collection of individuals online to help gather information or produce ideas. Twitter is one common platform used for crowdsourcing. A blogger or journalist might crowdsource ideas for his or her writing, or a company might crowdsource a commercial from amateur video submissions (Christian et al., 2014, p. 370).

The subscribe entry says, “A method of keeping track of public updates from Facebook users without necessarily adding them as a friend. The feature must be enabled by a user to allow users to subscribe to his or her updates” (Christian et al., 2014, p. 374). In both entries, the use of his or her requires further examination. First, the Stylebook is contradicting its own rule. The his, her entry that is unchanged from 1977 said: “Do not presume maleness in constructing a sentence, but use the pronoun his when an indefinite antecedent may be male or female: A reporter tries to protect his sources. (Not his or her sources, but note the use of the word reporter rather than newsman)” (Angione, 1977, p. 106). While the usage of “his or her” is prohibited, the crowdsourcing and subscribe entry explanations seem to indicate a conscious decision to include women more conspicuously.

The Stylebook also has modified potentially problematic entries over the decades, especially when exploring entries with the aesthetics category code. For instance, 1977 equally as entry said:

Do not use the words together; one is sufficient.

Omit the equally shown here in parentheses: She was (equally) as pretty as Marilyn.

Omit the as shown here in parentheses: She and Marilyn were equally (as) pretty

(Angione, 1977, p. 80).
Pretty can be seen as sexist because women are consistently judged by their aesthetics (e.g., Daniels & Wartena, 2011; Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997), and because the Stylebook did not portray men based on their attractiveness. By the 1997 Stylebook, pretty was changed and the entry read:

… Omit the equally shown here in parentheses: She was (equally) as wise as Marilyn.

Omit the as shown here in parentheses: She and Marilyn were equally (as) liberal (Goldstein, 1997, p. 72).

By the 2014 edition, “liberal” was also replaced with “wise” (Christian et al., 2014, p. 89).

The Flaunt, Flout entry initially also labeled women by aesthetics. It said:

To flaunt is to make an ostentatious or defiant display: She flaunted her beauty.

To flout is to show contempt for: He flouts the law (Angione, 1977, p. 82).

By 1997, the woman “flaunted her intelligence” (Goldstein, 1997, p. 81). The Complement, Compliment follows a similar trajectory. In 1977, it said:

*Complement* is a noun and verb denoting completeness or the process of supplementing something: The ship has a complement of 200 sailors and 20 officers. The hat complements her dress.

*Compliment* is a noun or verb that denotes praise or the expression of courtesy: The captain complimented the sailors. She was flattered by the compliments on her outfit. (Angione, 1977, p. 52).
By 1997, the entry changed “The hat complements her dress” to “The tie complements his suit” (Goldstein, 1997, p. 45). The entry depicts a man and a woman in aesthetic terms. By 2014, “She was flattered by the compliments on her outfit” became “She was flattered by the compliments on her project” (Christian et al., 2014, p. 57). The reference to women’s aesthetics transformed into complimenting her professional competence.

The *every day, everyday* entry was changed, too. In 1977, the entry said, “*He goes to work every day. She wears everyday shoes*” (Angione, 1977, p. 82). By 1997, it was reversed: “*She goes to work every day. He wears everyday shoes*” (Goldstein, 1997, p. 75). However, by 2014, the entry is just *every day* (adv.), *everyday* (adj.) (Christian et al., 2014, p. 92).

It should be also noted that *Stylebook* examples appeared to be moving away from calling women liberal. Besides the change from “liberal” to “wise” in the *equally as* entry between the 1997 and 2014 *Stylebooks*, there was a similar modification in the *directions and regions* entry. An excerpt from the entry said, “She has a Southern accent. He is a Northerner. Nations of the Orient are opening doors to Western businessmen. The candidate developed a Southern strategy. She is a Northern liberal” (Angione, 1977, p. 69). By the 2014 *Stylebook*, the sentence containing “Northern liberal” was removed.

The changes to women’s portrayals extended outside of entry examples as the *Stylebook* has experienced modifications for its rules for how to portrayal women and non-heterosexuals. The battle over honorifics described in Chapter 2, i.e., Mr., Ms., Mrs., and Miss, could be seen clearly in the *courtesy titles* entry. In 1977, the entry read thusly:

> In general, do not use the courtesy titles Miss, Mr., Mrs. or Ms. on first reference. Instead use the first and last names of the person: Betty Ford, Jimmy Carter.
Do not use Mr. in any reference unless it is combined with Mrs.: Mr. and Mrs. John Smith, Mr. and Mrs. Smith.

On sports wires, do not use courtesy titles in any reference unless needed to distinguish among persons of the same last name.

On news wires, use courtesy titles for women on second reference, following the woman’s preference.

MARRIED WOMEN: The preferred form on first reference is to identify a woman by her own first name and her husband’s last name: Susan Smith. Use Mrs. on first reference only if a woman requests that her husband’s first name be used or her own first name cannot be determined: Mrs. John Smith.

On second reference, use Mrs. unless a woman initially identified by her own first name prefers Ms.: Carla Hills, Mrs. Hills.

If a married woman is known by her maiden last name, precede it by Miss on second reference unless she prefers Ms.: Jane Fonda, Miss Fonda.

UNMARRIED WOMEN: For women who have never been married, use Miss or Ms. on second reference according to the woman’s preference.

For divorced women and widows, the normal practice is to use Mrs. on second reference. Use Miss if the woman returns to the use of her maiden name. Use Ms. if she prefers it.

MARRITAL STATUS: If a woman prefers Ms., do not include her marital status in a story unless it is clearly pertinent (Angione, 1977, p. 59).
The entry is primarily about women. As Cloud (1989) and McConnell-Ginet (2003) noted that women’s identities were predominantly formed by their relation to men, instead of independent of their relationship to men. However, female athletes received equal treatment to male athletes because neither received an honorific or courtesy title.

By 1987, Stylebook rules offered women more flexibility in how they could be portrayed:

… MARRIED WOMEN: The preferred form on first reference is to identify a woman by her own first name and her husband’s last name: Susan Smith. Use Mrs. on first reference only if a woman requests that her husband’s first name be used or her own first name cannot be determined: Mrs. John Smith.

On second reference, use Mrs. unless a woman initially identified by her own first name prefers Ms.: Carla Hills, Mrs. Hills; or no title: Carla Hills, Hills.

If a married woman is known by her maiden last name, precede it by Miss on second reference unless she prefers Ms.: Jane Fonda, Miss Fonda, Ms. Fonda; or no title, Jane Fonda, Fonda.

UNMARRIED WOMEN: For women who have never been married, use Miss, Ms. or no title on second reference according to the woman’s preference.

For divorced women and widows, the normal practice is to use Mrs. or no title, if she prefers, on second reference. But if a woman returns to the use of her maiden name use Miss, Ms. or no title if she prefers it.

MARITAL STATUS: If a woman prefers Ms. or no title, do not include her marital status in a story unless it is clearly pertinent (French, 1987, p. 55-56).
In 10 years, while the *Stylebook* clearly preferred courtesy titles for women, women now were given the option to refuse them. By the 2007 *Stylebook*, the use of courtesy titles was limited to: “When it is necessary to distinguish between two people who use the same last name, as in married couples or brothers and sisters, use the first and last name. … When a woman specifically requests it” (Goldstein, 2007, p. 62). Women are now treated equally to men, and the entry makes that rule especially clear.

Some *Stylebook* guidelines went away, such as the one for hurricanes. In 1977, the **hurricane** entry said:

> Capitalize *hurricane* when it is part of the name that weather forecasters assign to a storm: *Hurricane Hazel*.

But use *it* and *its* — not *she, her or hers* — in pronoun references.

And do not use the presence of a woman’s name as an excuse to attribute sexist images of women’s behavior to a storm. Avoid, for example such sentences as: *The fickle Hazel teased the Louisiana coast* (Angione, 1977, p. 109).

To that point, all hurricanes carried female names; the male names were added to the hurricane rotation for the Pacific Ocean in 1978 and the Atlantic Ocean in 1979 (National Hurricane Center, n.d.). However, it was not until 2007 that the entry was updated, albeit slightly, but still significantly.

> Capitalize *hurricane* when it is part of the name that weather forecasters assign to a storm: *Hurricane Hazel*.

But use *it* and *its* — not *she, her or hers or he, him or his* — in pronoun references.
And do not use the presence of a woman’s name as an excuse to attribute sexist images of women’s behavior to a storm. Avoid, for example such sentences as: *The fickle Hazel teased the Louisiana coast* (Goldstein, 2007, p. 118).

While the entry looks almost identical to the one from 1977, it contains one key difference, the inclusion of male pronouns. From 1977 through 2007, there were plenty of hurricanes with male names that caused severe damage in the United States including Hugo in 1989, Andrew in 1992 and Ivan in 2004 (National Hurricane Center, n.d.). By 2014, the *hurricane* entry dropped the final paragraph warning journalists not to use sexist language while reporting on hurricanes (Christian et al., 2014, p. 124), perhaps reflecting that the guideline was no longer needed.

However, guidelines on depicting lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer people are in flux as society is making significant shifts in its perception and treatment of LGBTQ individuals. Accordingly, *Stylebook* entries have evolved in its depiction of sexual orientation. From the beginning, *Stylebook* editors were careful not to frame non-heterosexual people as deviant. The 1977 *admit, admitted* entry said:

> These words may in some contexts give the erroneous connotation of wrongdoing.

> A person who announces that he is a homosexual, for example, may be acknowledging it to the world, not admitting it. *Said* is usually sufficient (Angione, 1977, p. 6).

During the creation of the modern *Stylebook* in the mid-1970s, there was much social conflict regarding the rights of non-heterosexuals. The “modern gay rights movement” began soon after police raided a New York gay bar — the Stonewall Inn in 1969 (Nagourney, 2009). It is from this context that the 1977 *admit, admitted* entry was created. The entry warns journalists about using admit because of its potentially negative connotations, and then uses an example to
demonstrate how it might marginalize someone, in this case a “homosexual.” The entry remained the same through at least the 1997 Stylebook. By 2007, “homosexual” was replaced with “recovering alcoholic” (Goldstein, 2007, p. 7).

Between 1977 and 2007, the Gay Rights Movement achieved many successes. In 1993, gays and lesbians, who were previously banned from serving in the military, were permitted to serve, as long as they did not announce their sexual orientation (Greenhouse, 1993). About a decade later, Massachusetts recognized same-sex marriage (Belluck, 2004). Amid these societal shifts, the Stylebook changed its admit, admitted entry.

The Stylebook’s entries for gay and lesbian, lesbian underwent significant changes as well. In 1977, the gay entry said:

Do not use as a noun meaning a homosexual unless it appears in the formal name of an organization or in quoted matter.

In a story about homosexuals, gay may be used as an adjective meaning homosexual (Angione, 1977, p. 95).

The lesbian, lesbian entry in 1977 was different: “Lowercase in references to homosexual women, except in names of organizations” (Angione, 1977, p. 128). The Stylebook allows for women to be lesbians, but men are called homosexual or a gay man because gay can be used as an adjective. Notably, gay can be used as an adjective for homosexual women, too.

In 1987, the entries stayed the same, but in 1997 gay was truncated and broadened: “Acceptable as popular synonym for homosexual (n. and adj.)” (Goldstein, 1997, p. 87). Gay became fully acceptable for both men and and women as nouns and adjectives. Also, the removal of the male component of the entry structured gay as a more encompassing term.
While homosexuality was removed from the admit, admitted entry by 2007, the gay entry was modified and expanded. The gay entry said:

Used to describe men and women attracted to the same sex, though lesbian is the more common term for women. Preferred over homosexual except in clinical contexts or references to sexual activity.

Include sexual orientation only when it is pertinent to a story, and avoid references to “sexual preference” or to a gay or alternative “lifestyle” (Goldstein, 2007, p. 103).

The Stylebook has made it clear in the gay entry that lesbian is preferred for women and not to label gay as an alternative or preference. Additionally, the expanded gay entry might be interpreted as a replacement of the example in the admit, admitted example. The 2014 Stylebook also essentially deleted the lesbian entry, leaving only the words, “See gay” (Christian et al., 2014, p. 148).
Chapter 5: Conclusions and Discussion

Summary of Findings

Many *Stylebook* entries provide historical facts and data about cultural, historical and political phenomena, in addition to relaying rules for usage or explaining grammar rules. Often when examples are used, the examples contain both male and female nouns and pronouns. However, the perceived balance does not mean that the *Stylebook* is free of gender ideologies. *Stylebook* entry titles, examples, and explanations reflect cultural norms at various periods and the status of women in the wider society. Clearly, women have become more visible in areas such as the law and politics in the past few decades, and the *Stylebook* has acknowledged that with modifications to its entries. Concurrently, the *Stylebook* has responded to ideas of what could be seen as sexist or patronizing to women, revising examples that could be seen as problematic. Ideas surrounding non-heterosexuality have also evolved from 1977-2014, and *Stylebook* entries—as well as the law—have changed with the times to reflect this evolution. However, with all that said, there is still a strong indication that society and subsequently the *Stylebook* still view men as the standard for many things, including language.

**Entry Titles**

The *Stylebook* often defaults to using men as generic people and it portrays newsmakers as men in its entry titles and entry examples. Also, *Stylebook* entry titles tend to reflect a preference for a gender binary. The *Stylebook* has few people as entry titles. However, the people who were entry titles in the early versions of the *Stylebook* were male political or military figures. When the *Stylebook* added a Fashion section by 2014, then women as proper nouns
became visible. However, men outnumbered women in the Fashion section in a similar manner to how men outnumber women in the fashion industry (Friedman, 2015).

In terms of male universality, entry titles showed how society viewed regular people and jobs as masculine. For instance, the fireman, firefighter and mailman entries make it clear that women were (and perhaps still are) outsiders to these fields. Both of these entries allow men to be considered the norm because the Stylebook did not make any reference to firewoman or mailwoman. Instead, women in those fields are given gender-neutral terms, firefighters and letter carriers.

The reason why journalists cannot say firewoman or mailwoman, for instance, is because Stylebook edicts are pretty explicit on gender depictions, usually defaulting to some type of gender binary. A gender binary can be seen in entry titles such as chairman, chairwoman and patrolman, patrolwoman. Trying to use a gender-neutral term, in lieu of a term that confers gender such as spokesperson, is prohibited (Christian et al., 2014, p. 241).

Additionally, entry titles on sexuality changed as societal attitudes shift, but these changes still reinforce a gender binary. From the 1960s to present day, U.S. cultural opinions on sexual orientation underwent a massive transformation (Pew Research Center, 2010). The Stylebook shifted accordingly, perhaps best evidenced by the husband, widower entry in the 1977 Stylebook. This entry did not indicate that people could not get married to members of the same sex. But by the 2014 Stylebook, the entry changed to husband, wife. The switch from widower to wife and the resulting entry specifying that heterosexual and same-sex married couples can use the terms husband and wife. This change corresponding to shifting legal and cultural attitudes on same-sex marriage.
Examples and Explanations

*Stylebook* entry examples and explanations generally rely on male exemplars. For instance, the examples and explanations in the legislative titles and party affiliation entries are primarily men because men are the overwhelming majority of the elected officials (Center for American Women and Politics, 2016). Additionally, the vast majority of military personnel are men (Patten & Parker, 2011); accordingly, the pronoun “he” was used as the generic person in the Marines and National Guard *Stylebook* examples.

As evidenced by the numerous military and political entries, the *Stylebook* reflects the journalism industry’s preference for hard news (e.g., Itule & Anderson, 2000; Lehman-Wilzig & Seletzky, 2010). Many of the sources for hard news stories are men (e.g., Layton & Shepard, 2013; Project for Excellence in Journalism, 2005), and many of the exemplars for hard news entries in the *Stylebook* are men, too. Often, the explanations and examples for the hard news entries were male-dominated and remained that way consistently since 1977.

There also appears to be a trickle-down effect between societal changes and *Stylebook* examples and explanations. Remember that examples in entries such as the Supreme Court of the United States did not name any women in 1977. Ostensibly this is because there were no women on the U.S. Supreme Court in 1977. That changed in 1981 when Ronald Reagan appointed Sandra Day O’Connor to the Supreme Court. The 1987 *Stylebook* had an O’Connor reference; her inclusion was noteworthy because O’Connor was the only woman on the court. Other examples, including those in legislative titles and party affiliation, also mirrored women’s gains in politics over time because as the number of female politicians increased, those entries added more women, albeit the *Stylebook*’s increase was modest. The changes that
occurred in real life eventually “trickled down” into the *Stylebook*, essentially making the *Stylebook* a contemporary reflection of society at different periods.

The depiction of women has changed over time in examples, too. Remember the *equally* as entry in 1977. An excerpt said, “… *She was (equally) as pretty as Marilyn. … She and Marilyn were equally (as) pretty*” (Angione, 1977, p. 80). The example changed by 1997 to “*She was (equally) as wise as Marilyn. … She and Marilyn were equally (as) liberal*” (Goldstein, 1997, p. 72). A deliberate effort was made to avoid describing women in terms of aesthetics. This change corresponds with the substantial high-profile conflicts regarding women’s treatment in the workplace and the inappropriate sexualization of female employees at that time (e.g., Bordo, 1998; Ifill, 1991; Musleah, 1991; Strom, 1991).

The popular culture also prompted changes to *Stylebook* entries. Prior to the late 1970s, all hurricanes were given female names (National Hurricane Center, n.d.). Subsequently, the *Stylebook* in 1977 through 1997 warned journalists not to use female pronouns for hurricanes and warned journalists against attaching sexist language to hurricanes. As more prominent hurricanes began to have male names, the *Stylebook* modified the entry by 2007, telling journalists to avoid using male and female pronouns and deleted the sexist language warning by 2014. Thus, the *Stylebook’s* changes to the entry appear to mirror the findings of Jalalzai (2006) in that increased awareness of undesired practices leads to journalists making coverage changes, i.e., the sexist language warning might have been deleted because journalists stopped depicting hurricanes with feminine stereotypes.
Discussion

Representativeness Matters

It is clear throughout the every edition of the Stylebook that men are viewed as being active participants in historical events. Men such as Stalin, Truman, and Hitler receive their own entries in the main section, but no women receive their own entries, unless they are in the Fashion section. While one can argue whether any 20th Century women rivaled the importance of Stalin, Truman, or Hitler, one can also see that the use of male entry titles, but not female, reflects journalism’s practice of using more men than women in news stories (e.g., Layton & Shepard, 2013; Project for Excellence in Journalism, 2005). However, there are factors outside of journalism that appear to influence gender representation in media. This dissertation indicates that inclusivity and representation in various industries matter a great deal in terms of media portrayal and media diversity. For instance, hardly any women appeared in the 1977 Stylebook’s political entries and examples. Through the years, women’s numbers in politics has increased and the Stylebook has showed increased visibility of women in politics, too. The Stylebook’s replication of societal phenomenon supports Tuchman (1978), who wrote, “To become news, an event must be noticed” (p. 191). The modifications in the Stylebook acknowledged women’s gains by raising the profiles of women in the entries.

However, gains must be made in real life before they can be shown in objective journalistic circles. The Stylebook — and more specifically journalists — cannot create a reality that does not exist. If women are not on the Supreme Court, the Supreme Court of the United States entry cannot have real women in it. The more that women are in position to be newsmakers, the more that women can be represented as newsmakers in stories and the Stylebook, too. Thus, the critiques regarding poor media representation of various groups must
also be connected to larger structures. Layton and Shepard’s (2013) findings that men are quoted at two to four times as much as women in *New York Times* front page articles must be comprehended within the societal landscape in which male elected congressional figures outnumber women four to one (Center for American Women and Politics, 2016) and that less than 5% of Fortune 500 chief executives are women (Fairchild, 2014). However, an increase in the gender diversity in an industry is not always directly reflected in corresponding media. For example, Grandy (2014) noted that while the number of women in business leadership increased, the number of female managers quoted in business stories was still lower than the number of female managers in business.

**Journalistically objective.** Journalism strives for objectivity, which means depicting the world the way it is (Schudson, 2001; Streckfuss, 1990). Because the *Stylebook* responds to the society (e.g., Christian et al., 2014; Colford, 2015; Pruitt, 2014), it can be seen as objective. Within notions of representation and objectivity, now is a good time to explore Tuchman’s (1978) comment, “The news media are both ‘a cause’ and an ‘effect’” (p. 189). Language reflects the range of possibilities in a society (Fairclough, 2003). It is easy to understand that more representation widens the perceived range of possibilities, i.e., if an individual sees a number of people who are similar to that individual doing an activity, then that individual will likely have an enhanced belief that his or she can do that activity. However, it is somewhat ambiguous whether a societal shift makes a change in language or whether changes in language prompt a change in culture.

Taking a normative approach can lead to a few possible outcomes. If journalists and the *Stylebook* try to paint a picture of what a society or institution “should” look like, perhaps media then can influence change within media consumers. Thus, this media-as-activist position seeks to
insert the media as active shapers of society. Clearly, this can be a positive tactic. If media
trumpet anti-racism or anti-misogynist discourse, it can advance society. But who has the moral
authority to decide what is good and what is bad? In this vein, taking an activist stance puts a lot
of power in the hands of people who might not have a broad constituency. A normative approach
could also exacerbate existing problems. If structures that are inherently unequal, i.e., too few
women in politics and business, are portrayed as balanced, it could be that media consumers
would perceive these same structures to be fair because they are depicted as fair. Essentially, an
act that was done to promote equality might actually serve to be impeding societal progress by
masking inequities. However, the *Stylebook* — and mainstream journalism as a whole — is
objective. For those seeking improved representation in journalism and the *Stylebook*, they must
push for improvement in various facets of society as the *Stylebook* and mainstream journalism
can depict society only as it currently exists.

**Understanding the culture.** The changes in the *courtesy titles* entry show how society
has decoupled women’s identities from the marital statuses. This changes over time
corresponded to changes in how U.S. society views marriage. As a percentage, the number of
American adults who are married has dropped significantly since 1960 (Pew Research Center,
2010). Thus, the movement away from labeling women by their marital statuses occurred at the
same time Americans were shifting their thoughts on marriage overall. While determining a
definitive cause-and-effect relationship is likely not possible, it can be said with some certainty
that the *Stylebook*’s changes on honorifics was not done in isolation of popular culture trends. It
should also be noted that perhaps sports might have been seen as more democratic than other
areas of media regarding the use of courtesy titles. The *Stylebook* recommended that no courtesy
titles should be used in sports stories, evidently treating men and women similarly in this one area.

Also, the *Stylebook* is able to display the evolution of cultural phenomena. For example, in the 1980s, AIDS was thought of as a disease that targets primarily gay men (Altman, 1986; Frank, 2014). The *Stylebook* reflected that idea in its 1987 AIDS entry. A portion of the entry said, “AIDS is most often transmitted through sexual contact, mostly between homosexual males” (French, 1987, p. 8). A decade later, thoughts about AIDS had changed as society realized the disease does not primarily target gay men. The *Stylebook*’s 1997 AIDS entry reflected that as there is no reference to homosexual males.

There also appears to be a relationship to how the *Stylebook* has depicted same-sex marriage and Americans’ attitudes on same-sex marriage. In 1996, only 27% of Americans supported “gay” marriage and 65% opposed it (Pew Research Center, n.d.). The husband, widower and spouse entries at that time did not even mention that men and men, or women and women could be married. In 2014 *Stylebook*, the husband, wife says, “Regardless of sexual orientation, husband for a man or wife for a woman is acceptable in all references to individuals in any legally recognized marriage” (Christian et al., 2014, p. 124). The spouse entry also makes room for same-sex marriage entry (Christian et al., 2014, p. 242). The entry was changed in 2013 (Goodale, 2013). The change on same-sex also corresponded to when half the American public supported same-sex marriage (Pew Research Center, n.d.). The number of people supporting same-sex marriage has continued to increase.

Again, there is a chicken-and-egg question: Does the *Stylebook*’s change on same-sex marriage help push U.S. society toward majority approval of same-sex marriage or did U.S. society’s majority approval of same-sex marriage facilitate the changes in the *Stylebook*? The
Stylebook cannot manufacture support for a position in that it seems highly improbable that the Stylebook could take a position that 99% of society opposes and then flip public opinion. It is much more likely that the Stylebook can amplify, regardless of whether its editors intentionally or unintentionally mean to do so, different calls within society. Clearly, changing the policy on how journalists depict same-sex marriage or how to depict women has to resonate with the public at some level. Resonating with the public falls in line with objectivity as journalists are encouraged to report what is occurring at the time (e.g., Brooks, Kennedy, Moen, Ranly, 2014; Kovach & Rosenstiel, 2007). Most likely then, the Stylebook reproduces mainstream thoughts and mentalities regarding different issues.

**Liberal beginnings.** However the Stylebook entries and references appear reflect liberal leanings, at least in when the Stylebook was reconstructed in 1977. The Stylebook’s 1977 admit, admitted entry took care in warning journalists to not label homosexuality as something of which to be ashamed. Psychiatrists, though, were not exactly unified on how to view homosexuality (Spitzer, 1981). Homosexuality was removed as a mental disorder in 1973, but it was relabeled as a “disturbance” as part of a “compromise” (Spitzer, 1981, p. 210).

The disagreements among medical professionals did not stop Stylebook editors from seemingly taking a stand on homosexuality. The inclusion of homosexual in an unrelated Stylebook entry might have been a covert signal on how editors (or perhaps even journalists) viewed non-heterosexual people. This position could perhaps be seen as quite brave for its time, considering the social turmoil in the 1970s. The introductory paragraphs of this 1978 New York Times article illustrate the tension:
Four times in the last year voters have rejected local ordinances that guaranteed rights for homosexuals. More referendums loom in the future, and in at least one of them the focus of the debate is changing.

On Tuesday, voters in Eugene Ore., joined those in Dade County, Fla., which includes Miami; St. Paul, and Wichita, Kan., in overturning law barring discrimination against homosexuals. The vote in Eugene ran about 2 to 1 against the ordinance.

In California later this year, the battle may narrow its focus from broad antidiscrimination ordinances to the issue of whether homosexuals should be allowed to teach, counsel or supervise in state schools.

An initiative has been circulated saying that the state should dismiss or prevent the hiring of a teacher, teacher’s aide, counselor or school administrator who is openly homosexual or who advocates, solicits or promotes homosexual acts (Associated Press, 1978).

Across the country, people were strongly opposed to granting discrimination protection to homosexuals. In fact, some wanted to go a step further and deny homosexuals the right to even been openly homosexual. In this light, the 1977 *Stylebook’s* admit, admitted entry can be viewed as a supportive statement for homosexuals. The entry changed by 2007 as attitudes on lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people changed significantly, according the aforementioned Pew polls. That entry might have been culturally out of date and needed to be modernized.

Additionally, the *Stylebook’s* initial references toward equality for women and women’s qualifications can be acknowledging the fight women were (and still are) making for a more equitable society. The references in the 1977 *Stylebook* are especially noteworthy because
Tuchman (1978) argued that mainstream media ignored the Women’s Rights Movement. The *Stylebook* did not. From “*She is a staunch supporter of equality*” (Angione, 1977, p. 208) in the *stanch, staunch* entry to *She compared her work for women’s rights to Susan B. Anthony’s campaign for women’s suffrage* (Angione, 1977, p. 52) in the *compared to, compared with* entry, the *Stylebook* showed the rhetoric and feelings of the time.

**Moving into the mainstream.** Over the years, *Stylebook* entries and references did not appear to be as bold compared to the entries and references in 1977. For instance, references to women’s liberalism were removed over time. In the *equally as* entry, “*She and Marilyn were equally (as) liberal*” (Goldstein, 1997, p. 72) became “*She and Marilyn were equally (as) wise*” (Christian et al., 2014, p. 89). The sentence, “She is a Northern liberal” (Angione, 1977, p. 69) was just taken out of the 2014 *Stylebook’s directions and regions* entry. The 1977 *Stylebook* was designed primarily with journalists in mind (Boccardi, 1977). The *Stylebook* now bills itself as “an essential tool in newsrooms, classrooms and boardrooms alike” (Pruitt, 2014, Foreword). There is a lucrative market for the *Stylebook* (Schlisserman, 2010; Tenore, 2009), and perhaps its positioning as less overtly political might be related economics.

**Current Cultural Battle**

*Stylebook* editors have been asked to opine on a growing cultural battle on whether to use the singular they (Cotter, 2014; Klinger & Hare, 2015; McIntyre, 2015b). Some mainstream media outlets are beginning to allow an individual who does not identify as male or female to use the singular they (Bien-Aimé, 2016b; Mullin, 2015). The American Psychological Association also permits the singular they for people who reject gender binaries (Lee, 2015). So far, the *Stylebook* has not adopted the singular they; the Associated Press says the *Stylebook* reflects common language (Pruitt, 2014), and so it could be surmised that as more leading entities adopt
the singular they, the *Stylebook* would also permit its usage. Thus, it could be that *Stylebook* editors are seeking some type of critical mass before making a change as they did when they permitted journalists to use *over* in lieu of *more than* (Beaujon, 2014; Petri, 2014). The explanation for the change was, “We decided on the change because it has become common usage. We’re not dictating that people use ‘over’ — only that they may use it as well as ‘more than’ to indicate greater numerical value” (Beaujon, 2014). However, identifying what criteria constitutes a critical mass appears to be difficult.

Returning back to the singular they, perhaps examining the *Stylebook*’s history would provide some answers. Social change does not happen overnight; it often occurs through a long and arduous process. The 1978 article describing the battles over legislation that would have protected lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people from discrimination could have been transported into the current era. Various ordinances and rulings continue to rock the country (Katz & Eckholm, 2016). Thus, expecting a decision to come quickly on the singular they might not be forthcoming for perhaps at least a decade.

Where change might occur relatively quickly is within entries such as *chairman, chairwoman* and *spokesman, spokeswoman*. *Stylebook* entries want journalists to identify the gender of the person and use a different gender-neutral word for people whose gender is not known. The first sign that *Stylebook* editors might be more open to allowing the singular they would be if the entries above were changed to add a line that specified that chairperson or spokesperson was allowed for people who do not wish to identify their gender or do not conform to a gender binary. That simple addition would be a landmark step and might portend to bigger changes. The *courtesy titles* entry followed a similar progression where change was incremental, but each change sought to grant women more autonomy for how they want to be presented.
Also the history of the *Stylebook* suggests that major modifications within the guide often occur in conjunction with a change in prominent newsmakers. As more women entered politics and the Supreme Court, political and judicial entries changed accordingly. If U.S. society had a leading political figure rejecting binary gender labels, then an overhaul of the *Stylebook* would likely occur in regard to depictions of gender. There is already some precedence for this as Fed Chair Janet Yellen did not want to be called a chairwoman, instead calling herself Fed Chair. The *Stylebook* told journalists to depict her accordingly. While one could say that the *Stylebook* made an exception for Yellen, the *Stylebook*’s exception could be a first signal toward wider changes to the **chairman, chairwoman** entry in the coming years. In any event, as stated earlier, representation matters.

Continuing the theme of representation, Hillary Clinton’s historic presidential candidacy could portend significant changes to *Stylebook* entry titles and examples. If Clinton were to win the 2016 election, she could usher in a new era for politics-based entry titles and examples where more might be mentioned. Based on the idea that the *Stylebook* is journalistically objective, *Stylebook* editors might find it necessary to add more women in politics-based entries because of the potential increased visibility of female politicians led by Clinton. It will be something to note and study in the coming years.

**Future Research**

Besides analyzing how *Stylebook* editors react to Clinton’s presidential run in subsequent *Stylebook* editions, researchers have plenty of additional areas of the *Stylebook* to examine. Clearly interviews with past and current *Stylebook* editors would be beneficial. Exploring how they perceive the role of the *Stylebook*, their roles as editors, and getting additional insight into how the *Stylebook* is modified each year would be tremendously important, not just to journalists
and grammarians, but also to academic scholarship. Scholars have described the power of linguistic standard bearers (e.g., Bourdieu 1973, 1998a; Fairclough, 2015; Wodak & Meyer, 2001). Understanding the backgrounds, mindsets, and processes of Stylebook editors would enrich journalism, linguistics and discourse research.

Additionally, the Stylebook is afforded a lot of power in terms of setting standards. However, can researchers quantify the Stylebook’s influence to some extent? More specifically, there are two aspects that would be important to know. 1.) Does media representation change people’s views? While Merolla, Ramakrishnan, and Haynes (2013) did not find that various immigrant labels did not influence people’s opinions on immigration policies, does labeling affect people’s perceptions of unauthorized immigrants? The Stylebook’s influence on labeling is considered strong within in media circles (Weinger, 2012). But does how the Stylebook calls something really influence readers’ perceptions and/or the perceptions of the groups being labeled? 2.) Do journalists feel empowered to deviate from the Stylebook? The Stylebook is the basis of other media stylebooks (Steiner, 2007). However, how often do media stylebooks deviate from the Stylebook and how much do journalists feel they can deviate from Stylebook edicts?

Hackl et al. (2016) also described that journalists should use additional stylebooks when reporting on transgender people. Various media organizations have created stylebooks or have online guides for how to report on their respective groups. It would be beneficial to know how many journalists know about these materials and do these materials translate well into newsrooms, i.e., can journalists use these materials in their work routines. Having this information will greatly aid the organizations’ creations of future stylebooks because they will
know how to craft them for maximum efficiency. Currently, it is unclear whether the creation of these guidelines leads to actual use among media professionals.

**Stylebook Recommendations**

This paper would not be complete without recommendations as a critical discourse analysis must endeavor to make improvements to the phenomena under study (Gee, 2014; van Dijk, 1993). Thus, this portion of the dissertation looks at how to improve stylebooks overall.

**Inclusivity**

One of the biggest findings in this project was that the *Stylebook* reinforced the primacy of men in society. Male references outnumbered female references in the entries, and while that might be partially because men outnumber women in a number of industries, that is an insufficient reason to not include women in more entries. Editors have to make conscious decisions that can override potentially unconscious biases. For instance, the paucity of female references in sports is jarring despite the fact that mainstream media repeatedly ignores female athletes (e.g., Cooky, Messner, & Hextrum, 2013). Making an active choice to include the references from the Women’s National Basketball Association or even agate from a Women’s World Cup match could go a long way in validating the gains women have made in sports and simultaneously demonstrate that sports are not just for men.

This call for inclusivity comes with the understanding that stylebooks are political texts and must be understood that way. Having sections for food and fashion, but not for sexuality or race, is a political decision. Stylebooks do not have to wade in and decide who is good and who is bad, or even what legislative policies should and should not be enacted. However, the decisions on what entries are added, removed, or updated come from some value system, not a value-less position. There is nothing that proves that being more inclusive decreases the
perceived fairness of a text or the value of said text. Perhaps by raising the profiles of underrepresented groups, stylebooks could tacitly raise awareness in newsrooms that often ignore or disregard said groups. Seeking out diverse voices is a key journalism tenet (Society of Professional Journalists, 2014).

**Timeliness**

Editors of the *Stylebook* over time have changed examples and entries because the examples and entries might not have been offensive at the times of their creation, likely came to be viewed as problematic in another era. But stylebooks appear to have a tendency to become stale in terms of cultural references. For example, here is an excerpt in the *Stylebook*'s **attorney**, **lawyer** entry, which has not been updated since 1977, “Do not abbreviate. Do not capitalize unless it is an officeholder’s title: *defense attorney Perry Mason, Perry Mason, attorney District Attorney Hamilton Burger*” (Angione, 1977, p. 77). Perry Mason and Hamilton Burger are both primary characters in the “Perry Mason” series that was popular in the late 1950s through the mid-1960s, just before the boom of the Women’s Movement (Thumim, 1998). While its **composition titles** entry has been updated slightly to include some passing mentions of computer games, many of the examples it uses were programs popular when the *Stylebook* was created. An excerpt of the 1977 entry reads:

> “EXAMPLES: “*The Star-Spangled Banner,*” “*The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich,*”
> “*Gone With the Wind,*” “*Of Mice and Men,*” “*For Whom the Bell Tolls,*” “*Time After Time*” the NBC-TV “*Today*” program, the “*CBS Evening News,*” “*The Mary Tyler Moore Show*” (Angione, 1977, p. 58).

“The Mary Tyler Moore Show” aired its final episode in 1977. Similar to the **attorney**, **lawyer** entry and the **district attorney**, which also refers to Hamilton Burger from the “Perry Mason”
show, the *Stylebook* does not change many pop culture references. A lesson to be learned from the *Stylebook* is that all stylebooks need complete overhauls periodically, perhaps every 10 years. Cultural landscapes change and stylebooks must adapt accordingly. Thus, all people need to know that the *Stylebook* and journalistic style is a living thing.

Though the *Stylebook* has some issues with timeliness, its editors have provided a good template for how to keep entries relevant in real time. The *Stylebook* has a Twitter account and a webpage where readers, editors, and sources can query editors and make recommendations for improvements. *Stylebook* editors also have journalists and experts from various fields contribute to help inform entries (Pruitt, 2014). Media companies should adopt the practices of the *Stylebook* in this regard; readers and those who care about style should be able to have a place ask questions and make suggestions to improve media coverage and media depictions. Media companies should be proactive and make it easy for the public to have a voice in its media.

**Completeness**

No stylebook will ever be the definitive source on anything. Topics can be studied and described at a surface level or in great depth. Stylebooks should refer to other manuals for additional information. Compare the level of detail between the *Stylebook* and GLAAD’s (n.d.) Media Reference Guide on how they each explain transgender. The 2014 *Stylebook* uses 48 words to explain transgender while GLAAD (n.d.), which advocates on behalf of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals, uses almost 2,200 words. Manuals might disagree with each other. For example, the Women’s Media Center Guide to Fair and Accurate Language (Maggio, 2014) disagrees with the *Stylebook* on “man.” The *Stylebook* says for **man, mankind**:
Either may be used when both men and women are involved and no other term is convenient. In these cases, do not use duplicate phrases such as *a man or a woman* or *mankind and womankind*.

Frequently the best choice is a substitute such as *humanity, a person or an individual* (Angione, 1977, p. 134).

The Women’s Media Center says the following for *man*: “(adult male human being) this narrow definition is the only acceptable nonsexist usage for the noun. Dictionaries list two major definitions for ‘man’: (1) adult male, (2) human being. However, studies have shown that people ‘hear’ only the first meaning of the word” (Maggio, 2014, 222). The best way to solve a disagreement is not to bury one’s head in the sand and pretend there are no alternatives. It is better to throw ideas into the marketplace of ideas and let people sort things out. Journalists and editors are smart enough to make informed decisions, but they need the necessary tools to become informed. Essentially, if a person knows nothing about a topic, then that individual needs more information compared to a person who is somewhat familiar with that same topic (Hackl et. al, 2016). Hence, stylebooks should refer to one another when more information can be gleaned, regardless of whether the stylebooks themselves agree.

**Limitations**

While a critical discourse analysis offered a lot of needed flexibility in terms of examining the *Stylebook* longitudinally, the method does have some limitations. Perhaps the biggest limitation is that representational differences between men and women were not quantified. Replicating this study as a numeric content analysis might yield more data to help explain how men and women are portrayed in the *Stylebook*. Secondly, because no interviews were conducted, this dissertation could only speculate as to why certain decisions were made. It
could be that some changes highlighted in this study were merely coincidental while other editorial decisions that this paper did not describe were significant in editors’ eyes. The 10-year *Stylebook* increments also captured the general speed by which updates were made, but what remains unclear is the exact speed by which editors made changes. When Sandra Day O’Connor reached the Supreme Court in 1981, was she in the 1982 *Stylebook*?

**Chapter 5 Conclusions**

*Stylebook* entry titles, examples, and explanations have changed with the times, reflecting the gains made by women and non-heterosexuals in various facets over the past four decades. Those gains, though, cannot obscure that men still dominate in high-profile areas. The *Stylebook*, being a journalistically objective text, mirrors male dominance within society and also shows how English tends to default to a male-based standard. Because this dissertation is a critical discourse analysis, some recommendations for news media to improve stylebooks as whole would be to refer to other style guides at times, be transparent with the public on style decisions, solicit the public’s opinions on style rules, and work to make stylebooks more inclusive in terms of entry titles, examples, and explanations.
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