LSE Media and Communications

Media@LSE Working Paper Series
Editors: Bart Cammaerts, Nick Anstead and Richard Stupart

Berniebros and Vagina Voters

Content Analysis of Gendered Facebook Communication in the 2016 U.S. Democratic Presidential Primary

MEREDITH EPSTEIN

Published by Media@LSE, London School of Economics and Political Science ("LSE"), Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE. The LSE is a School of the University of London. It is a Charity and is incorporated in England as a company limited by guarantee under the Companies Act (Reg number 70527).

Copyright, MEREDITH EPSTEIN © 2017.

The author has asserted their moral rights.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior permission in writing of the publisher nor be issued to the public or circulated in any form of binding or cover other than that in which it is published. In the interests of providing a free flow of debate, views expressed in this paper are not necessarily those of the compilers or the LSE.

ABSTRACT

This study examines the Facebook discussions of male and female Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders supporters during the 2016 U.S. Democratic Presidential Primary through the lenses of gendered political communication and gendered interpersonal communication. Content analysis is utilized to investigate what elements of gendered political communication and gendered interpersonal communication were present and whether men or women supporting either candidate were more likely to employ them. Access to 91 personal Facebook profiles obtained through an innovative sampling and ethical two-step informed consent procedure gives rare insight into political Facebook conversations on private walls.

This research suggests that in political Facebook discussions during the primary, women agree more than men while men disagree more and are more likely to make patronizing comments than women. Both men and women are more likely to disagree with men and men are more likely to patronize other men. Soft issues and references to personality, family, and appearance are more prevalent in comments about Clinton than Sanders. Men are more likely than women to mention a gender stereotype and are more likely to use a gendered slur. While multiple differences are identified in the behavior of male and female commenters and the content of comments about Clinton and Sanders, little difference is noted in the behavior of supporters of the two candidates.

1 INTRODUCTION

On the morning of November 9th, 2016, Americans who had been following the polls and predictions of the media expected to wake up to the news of the election of the first female president in their country's two hundred and forty year history (Kurtzleben, 2016a; Vogel & Isenstadt, 2016; Bialik & Enten, 2016). And yet, despite the apparent inevitability of her victory, the United States failed to elect Hillary Clinton and put a woman in the oval office for the first time. In the wake of the defeat of a female candidate who has been called the most qualified person to ever run for president to a confirmed misogynist with arguably the least experience of any major party nominee, it is pressing that we deeply and broadly examine the ways gender played a role in the 2016 election (Kantor, 2016; Yomtov, 2016). Worldwide, women still lag behind men in obtaining elected office, especially executive office, and the recent American presidential election serves as a reminder of the challenges facing women running for office and the need to identify those barriers in order to dismantle them (Bode, 2016; Inglehart & Norris, 2013).

One observed phenomenon that raised concerns about how the gender of the candidates and their supporters was impacting the 2016 election was the emergence of the newly minted 'Berniebro.' The term 'Berniebro' was coined to describe male, most often white, fervent supporters of Senator Bernie Sanders who were found to be harassing female supporters of Secretary Clinton online with misogynistic language and threatening female journalists and Democratic Party officials with violence and rape (Meyer, 2015; Traister, 2015; Ross, 2016; Borchers, 2016; Bump, 2016; Goff, 2016; Stein, 2016). Sanders himself acknowledged and tried to discourage the sexist behavior of some of his supporters saying, 'we don't want that crap' (Tesfaye, 2016). Much was written about male supporters of Sanders 'mansplaining' the election to women (Goldberg, 2015; Sanchez, 2016). 'Mansplaining' is a neologism that has gained prominence in the popular lexicon to describe the situation where a man explains something to a woman in a patronizing or infantilizing manner (Rothman, 2012; Crockett, 2016; MacMillen, 2017; Hickey, 2017). The 'mansplaining' of 'Berniebros' was particularly pronounced when arguing that women who planned on voting for Clinton were 'vagina voters' and accusing them of only voting for the former Secretary of State because she's a woman while dismissing any arguments about the merits of the candidate herself or the potential benefit of electing the first female president (Traister, 2015; Traister, 2017; Goldberg, 2015; Day, 2016; Warnke, 2016; Kurtzleben, 2016b).

While differences in traditional media coverage of male and female candidates has long been noted, it was the gendered interactions between the supporters of male and female candidates online that stood out in the 2016 primary (Murray, 2010; Kittilson & Fridkin, 2008; Campus, 2013; Traister, 2017). Rebecca Traister, after interviewing Secretary Clinton post-election, concluded that 'explicit' negative gendered media coverage appeared to have decreased since Clinton's 2008 run, but that 'online commentary, the more subtle but also more intimate social-media disparagement' led Clinton to

believe that "a lot of implicit [bias] was just raging below the surface" and "that there were still very deep, raw feelings about gender that had not been resolved" (Traister, 2017).

Spurred by observations by journalists, lay people, and the candidates themselves, this study aims to shed light on the online interactions of male and female Sanders and Clinton supporters to see what gendered elements were at play and if there was a difference in how men and women supporters of the two candidates talked to each other about the election. In order to understand how gender played a role in the online discussions about the Democratic Presidential candidates, these interactions will be contextualized within the frame of gendered political communication in the traditional media as well as gendered interpersonal communication. Gendered political coverage of female candidates such as a disproportionate focus on the appearance, personality, and family of women candidates as well as gender stereotypes perpetuated by the media may have been replicated from traditional media sources and fed into conversations that took place online (Belt, 2012). Differences in the interpersonal communication tendencies of men and women may also have contributed to how often men and women utilized affiliative, disagreeing or patronizing language towards one another (Wood, 2009; Park et al, 2016; Herring, 2003).

2 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The two main bodies of theories this study draws upon are Gendered Political Communication and Gendered Interpersonal Communication. This work is also situated in the realm of Online Political Communication and Online Interpersonal Communication and how they intersect with gender.

2.1 Gendered Political Communication

The research into the traditional media's political coverage of female candidates has found that women running for office are often portrayed using gender stereotypes which place them in a 'double bind', that their personality, appearance, and family is brought up more often than for male candidates, and that soft issues are focused on more than hard issues (Jamieson, 1997; Murray, 2010; Adams, 2016; Campus, 2013; Kittilson & Fridkin, 2008; Belt, 2012;). The cumulative impact of this gendered coverage disadvantages women candidates and especially acts as a barrier for women running for executive office (Murray, 2010; Jalalzai, 2008; Kittilson & Fridkin, 2008).

2.1.1 Male image of power

Since positions of political power have over time been held by far more men than women, Campus argues that there is a 'male image of power' that leads to an association of so-called masculine attributes with the ideal qualities of leadership (Campus, 2013, pg. 10). While men are traditionally thought of as 'ambitious, confident, dominant and assertive', women are more often thought of as being 'kind, helpful, warm and gentle' (Campus, 2013, pg. 11). The fact that stereotypically masculine traits such ambition, dominance, and assertiveness are thought of as necessary for successful political

leadership and that stereotypically feminine traits are not can disadvantage women running for office.

2.1.2 The double bind

Because the image of an ideal office holder is male, when women run they can face a set of 'contradictory expectations' that place them in a so called 'double bind' (Jamieson, 1997, pg. 23; Murray, 2010). Since office, especially executive office, can be seen as incompatible with expectations about women, women candidates face 'lose-lose scenarios' where they can be seen as too masculine or too feminine, too strong or too weak, too young or too old, or too attractive or not attractive enough (Murray, 2010, pg. 16; Jamieson, 1997; Belt, 2012). For instance, if a woman has children and is running for office then people might think she should be home raising them. If her children are grown, then she is too old. If she doesn't have children then she might be perceived as unnatural or a lesbian (Murray, 2010).

2.1.3 Gender stereotypes

In addition to the above mentioned stereotypes and double-binds, women are often seen as more honest than men which can be advantageous for female candidates running in places where corruption has been an issue (Jalalzai, 2008). Women candidates often have to deal with being negatively viewed as ambitious, an accusation rarely hurled at male candidates, and potential women candidates can see their likeability take a hit when it appears they might actually run for a higher office (Traister, 2017; Nguyen, 2017; Filipovic, 2017). Women in general and especially women running for office can have their voices critiqued as too loud or shrill (Cheng, 2016). Women candidates can also disproportionately run up against claims that they are unqualified (Malone & Azari, 2016).

2.1.4 Gendered issue focus and coverage

Differences have been documented in the amount and type of issues and topics covered in the media for women candidates. Overall, women candidates receive less media coverage than their male counterparts and less coverage pertaining to their issue positions (Kittilson & Fridkin, 2008; Murray, 2010). It is also widely noted that the appearance, personality, and family of women running for office are more frequently brought up by the media (Murray, 2010; Belt; 2012; Kittilson & Fridkin, 2008). The 'horserace' or viability/electability frame are more often utilized for women candidates as well as the 'first woman' frame (Murray, 2010; Kittilson & Fridkin).

Due to gender stereotypes, women are seen as more adept at handling 'soft issues' such as education and health care whereas men are seen at better at dealing with 'hard issues' such as the economy, military, and foreign affairs and the media tends to cover soft issues more for female candidates and hard issues more for male candidates (Herrnson et al., 2003; Kittilson & Fridkin, 2008; Murray, 2010; Belt, 2012).

2.1.5 Negative impact

Gender stereotypes and gendered political coverage in the media make it harder for women to get elected and present extra challenges for women striving for executive office.

The media's perpetuation of gender stereotypes that portray women as less suited for political leadership than men and the many double binds female candidates face hurt their chances of election. Murray argues that "gendered stereotypes in the media set in and serve to erode public confidence in a woman candidate, causing a decline in the woman's credibility and popularity" (Murray, 2010, pg. 5).

The obstacles that gendered political communication pose for female candidates are even more pronounced for women running for executive office. Due to the male ideal image of leadership, women candidates can be seen as unsuited for executive office (Murray 2010). Jalalzai puts forth that "gender affects access to executive office in all countries, as politics is reinforced as a masculine domain with men depicted as the norm or 'natural' leaders" (Jalalzai, 2008, pg. 206). In addition, while being seen as competent on soft issues can sometimes be beneficial when running for lower office, skill and experience with hard issues is much more salient for candidates running for executive office and the focus on soft issues rather than hard issues for women candidates can be extremely detrimental for women seeking executive office (Herrnson et al., 2003; Belt, 2012; Murray, 2010; Jalalzai, 2008).

2.2 Gendered Interpersonal Communication

In the 1970s there was a rise in the study of the differences in how men and women communicate (Wood, 2009). The study of gendered differences in communication has spanned many disciplines and has not been uncontroversial. Park et al. write:

> *The study of gender differences in language has a long history that spans gender studies, psychology, linguistics, communication, and computational linguistics, among other fields. Investigating gender differences has been, at times, considered controversial, although a consensus has emerged that gender remains an important variable worthy of scientific investigation. (Park et al., 2016, pg. 2)*

The controversy surrounding studying gendered differences in communication and language has largely stemmed from a concern that accentuating the differences between men and women can increase inequity between the sexes and disadvantage women (Dindia, 2006). However, Lakoff disagrees and believes that 'linguistic imbalances are worthy of study because they bring into sharper focus real-world imbalances and inequities. They are clues that some external situation needs changing, rather than items that one should seek to change directly' (Lakoff, 1975, pg. 73). This study

adheres to Lakoff's notion that researching differences in the communication between men and women can highlight existing disparities in circumstance in order to address them.

When talking about gendered differences in communication, it is worth noting that gender is socially constructed (Butler, 1993). The differences in gendered communication patterns found in children and adults is influenced by society's expectations about gender rather than strictly biologically inherent (Wood, 2009). It is also important to note that there are many more similarities than differences in the communication of men and women and that the illumination of a difference does not mean it is overwhelming or true of everyone identifying with a certain gender (Dindia, 2006). In addition, men and women use the same elements of communication patterns to varying degrees and communication trends vary over time and cultural context (Wood, 2009).

2.2.1 Differences in men and women's communication patterns

Differences in gendered communication patterns are shaped in childhood by cultural forces and are noticeable by the age of five (Maltz & Borker, 1982; Wood, 2009; Dindia, 2006). The patterns formed in childhood then largely carry over to adulthood (Maltz & Borker, 1982; Wood, 2009; Dindia, 2006). Generally, girls' social interactions encourage relationship building, equality, including everyone, and expressing support (Wood, 2009; Maltz & Borker, 1982; Dindia, 2006). The social interactions of boys favor the attainment of status and dominance, challenging and competing with others, and attracting and sustaining attention (Wood, 2009; Maltz & Borker, 1982; Dindia, 2006).

Overall, adult women's communication patterns tend to emphasize affiliative language and agreeing and supporting others to maintain social relationships (Wood, 2009; Park et al., 2016; Maltz & Borker, 1982). Meanwhile, men's communication is more characterized by assertive language, disagreeing with others, and efforts to gain control and dominance (Wood, 2009; Park et al., 2016; Maltz & Borker, 1982). Men tend to talk more often and for longer intervals and interrupt more frequently than women and women are more likely to be ignored than men (Fraser, 1990; Wheelan & Verdi, 1992; Wood, 2009).

2.3 Online Gendered Interpersonal Communication

The differences in gendered interpersonal communication offline are largely consistent with patterns found online. In online communication, women are more likely to issue agreeing and supporting statements, apologize, post shorter messages than men, qualify their statements, and be polite (Herring, 2003; Herring & Stoerger, 2013; Park et al., 2016). Men are more likely to disagree and challenge other commenters, use profane and sexual language, write longer messages, state their views forcefully, and issue threats and insults (Postmes, Spears, & Lea, 1998; Herring, 2003; Herring & Stoerger, 2013). Women also are more likely to receive unsolicited sexual comments (Herring & Stoerger, 2013). While not every man and woman communicates online in ways that conform to these patterns, computer models and people can very often accurately discern the gender of an online

communicator with unspecified gender based on these patterns which supports the research that there are gender differences in online communication (computer models have had up upwards of 90% accuracy in their gender predictions) (Park et al., 2016; Herring, 2003; Herring & Stoerger, 2013). Men receive more responses to their online posts and are more likely to be retweeted than women (Herring, 2003; Herring & Stoerger, 2013). Women are more likely than men to stop posting when they do not receive a response to their posts (Herring, 2003; Herring & Stoerger, 2013). Women are more often the targets of online threats and harassment which can dissuade them from online participation (Herring, 2003; Herring & Stoerger, 2013). Men have greater control over the creation of online platforms and how they are mediated based on their higher attainment of computer science degrees and experience (due to societal expectations and structures), which may contribute to online communication mirroring offline gendered imbalances (Herring & Stoerger, 2013).

2.4 Online Political Communication

2.4.1 Increase in the importance of online political discussions

Since 2008, social media has played an increasingly large role in political campaigns with more people getting their political news, encountering campaign messaging, and discussing the election online (Woolley, Limperos, & Oliver, 2010; Gibson, Römmele, & Williamson, 2014; Vaccari, 2012; Owen, 2016). Supporters of candidates are able to spread campaign messages to their online network and may inform and sway the votes of their online connections, especially in primaries where voters cannot just use party affiliation to make a decision and are more open to learning about a candidate's positions and experience (Vaccari, 2012). Potential voters may also have more trust in the messages from their social network than messages they receive from a campaign or source not personally known to them (Vaccari, 2012). Facebook is the most popular social media platform in the United States with 79% of American adults using the site ("Facebook remains the most popular social media platform," 2016).

2.4.2 Gendered differences during online political discussions

Some studies have found that men are more likely to post political content on social networking sites, while others have found no difference between men and women (Bode, 2016). Bode theorizes that on social networking sites where relationship maintenance is particularly salient, that women should be more attuned to fostering friendly relationships and avoiding relationship tension by posting about politics which may annoy or alienate their friends (Bode, 2016). Bode found that men are more likely to post about politics on social media, but that they are not more likely than women to like or comment on political posts, which is a less visible social media activity (Bode, 2016). Bode found that women were not more or less likely to agree or disagree with political posts than men (Bode, 2016). However, Bode relied on survey data about people's recollections of their online behavior and not actual observed behavior which can be unreliable (Bode, 2016).

2.4.3 Online space replicating larger media patterns

Online user-generated political content has been found to largely echo traditional media sources in terms of its use of gendered stereotypes and gendered issue focus (Belt, 2012). Belt argues that

> *A new generation of Internet content creators takes its cues from what it already sees in old media and augments it. Moreover, citizen-produced videos lack an editorial filter. The combination of these two elements results in an even greater intensity of sexist and simplistic portrayals of female candidates (pg. 220).*

As social media gains importance in political discussions and message spreading, it is important to address if and how gendered elements of traditional political communication and interpersonal communication are reproduced online.

2.5 Conceptual Framework

The main aspects of gendered political communication studies that frame this research are the findings that women candidates are often portrayed in the media with gender stereotypes, that the appearance, family, and personality of women candidates are disproportionately covered than for men, and that soft issues are covered more for women running for office than for men. One reason for undertaking this research is the notion that this gendered political coverage negatively impacts female candidates' chances of electoral success.

The limited study into user-generated online political communication to date suggests that gendered political communication elements in the traditional media are echoed in online content. This study aims to discover if elements of gendered political communication are reproduced by individuals online and whether men or women or supporters of different candidates were more likely to utilize those elements during the primary. Facebook was selected as the platform to study as it is the most widely-used social media site.

From the study of gendered interpersonal communication both offline and online, this research is aimed at discovering whether the patterns of women agreeing more and men disagreeing and patronizing more applied in online political conversations during the Democratic primary.

2.6 Research Objectives, Potential Contribution, and Research Questions

This study seeks to uncover what elements of gendered political communication and gendered interpersonal communication were present in the Facebook discussions of Clinton and Sanders supporting men and women during the 2016 Democratic Presidential Primary. Furthermore, an aim of this study is to identify if any subset of voters (i.e. female Clinton supporters (FH), male Clinton

supporters (MH), female Sanders supporters (FB), and male Sanders supporters (MB))[1] was more likely to utilize certain gendered political communication or gendered interpersonal communication elements.

The goal of this research is to contribute to our understanding of how gender was relevant in the election between Clinton and Sanders amidst much lay speculation and specifically how it was relevant in the interactions between male and female supporters of the candidates. The study seeks to determine if gendered political communication elements that are largely researched in the traditional news media are also present in the discussions of individuals online. Another potential contribution of this research is improving our understanding of political online gendered interpersonal communication, a subject yet to be deeply investigated. What this study will most assuredly add to the field is a look at the political interactions of friends and acquaintances on personal Facebook walls. The research access to personal Facebook walls, laboriously and ethically acquired for this study, is still exceedingly rare and any information gleaned from this research will contribute to our limited academic knowledge of the interactions on personal Facebook walls and shed light on the political conversations and gendered interactions that take place there.

Research Question 1- What gendered interpersonal communication patterns and gendered political communication elements played a role in the Facebook discussions of progressive men and women during the 2016 U.S. Democratic Presidential Primary?

Research Question 2- Which (if any) subsets of voters (i.e. men, women, Clinton supporters, Sanders supporters, FHs, MHs, FBs, or MBs) were the most likely to employ the above patterns and elements?

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Overall strategy

In order to answer the questions of what gendered political communication and interpersonal communication elements were present in the Facebook conversations of men and women during the Democratic primary and if any subset of voter was more likely to use a certain element or pattern, I decided to conduct content analysis of the Facebook comments on the walls of men and women who supported either Clinton or Sanders during the primary. One of the benefits of this methodology is

[1] N.B. The H stands for Hillary and the B stands for Bernie. While in the body of the paper I refer to the candidates by their full titles or last name out of professional decorum and respect, the abbreviations refer to their first names. This is to prevent confusion since the "C" which would have been used to refer to Clinton supporters was used to refer to commenters (vs. participants) in the codebook.

that Facebook acts as an archive preserving the actual interactions between commenters as opposed to a survey or interviews that would rely on the year-old memories and interpretation of participants.

To find relevant political discussions about the primary and gain access to Facebook walls, I needed to identify men and women who supported Clinton and Sanders and acquire their informed consent to study the comments on their walls. I identified potential participants by sampling individuals who liked or shared Facebook posts from Clinton or Sanders' accounts. I decided to focus on the period between February and March 2016, deeming it a period of the most concentrated voting, when over half of states held their elections or caucuses but before it was certain that Clinton would be the nominee. I wanted to capture discussions at a time when the primary was active and hotly contested and when if someone liked a post from Clinton, I could be relatively certain they were supporting her over Sanders and not just supporting her as the Democratic nominee in the general election.

3.2 Content Analysis

Content analysis was selected as the appropriate method for this study based on its strength systematically handling unstructured textual interpersonal interactions produced outside a research context (Krippendorff, 2004; Weber, 1985; Hansen, 1998). Content analysis provides a quantitative tool for studying difference that will allow me to answer the research questions concerning the identification of communication elements that were utilized and the difference in their usage by several cohorts of commenters (Leiss, Klein & Jhally, 1988; Krippendorff, 2004; Hansen, 1998). Although content analysis and quantitative methods in general have been critiqued as being unable to handle latent material and meaning, this study is focused on identifying the presence of communication elements and the difference in their use and is therefore well suited to a quantitative method (Thomas, 1994; Hansen, 1998). Reflecting reflexively on my position as someone who fits into one of the four main cohorts in the study, I chose content analysis because of its strength at limiting bias in results with structured coding rules and intercoder replicability (Gunter, 2000).

In addition to analyzing the data gathered from content analysis with descriptive statistics, I will use chi-squared tests where appropriate to see if there is a statistically significant association between the use of certain gendered political communication and interpersonal communication elements and the gender and or candidate preference of commenters (Agresti & Finlay, 2014; Krippendorff, 2004).

3.3 Sampling of posts

I went through all the Facebook photo posts of Clinton and Sanders from February and March 2016 and eliminated any that mentioned a specific state, issue, or surrogate. I wanted to prevent skewing my sample of participants to those living in a particular state, favoring a particular issue, or only liking a post because they are supportive of the surrogate. This left me with 30 posts from the Clinton Facebook page and 22 posts from the Sanders Facebook page. I then used a random number generator

to order the two lists of posts. I alternated sampling from Clinton and Sanders posts in the order they were randomly assigned.

3.4 Sampling of participants

Given that optimally I wanted an even number of people from each of the four cohorts in the sample (FH, MH, FB, and MB), I initially selected 25 men and 25 women who liked or shared each post to reach out to. Due to the fact that women may be more likely to engage in less visible online political behaviors such as liking versus sharing a post, I sampled 40 people who liked a particular post and 10 people who shared the post to try to ensure that some of the participants would be likely to have shared posts on their walls that would then have comments I could code and not just liked the posts of others (Bode, 2016). First, I would pull up the list of those who liked the post and scroll down and click the 'see more' button twice to eliminate the tail end of the list in case those at the beginning of the list were outliers. Then I would select every tenth person who liked the post. When I reached a total of either 20 men or women, I would stop selecting that gender and continue until I had 20 of each gender. I repeated this process for those who shared the post, but selected five men and five women. I skipped anyone who clearly does not currently reside in the United States or whose wall posts and comments were not entirely in English. Since my study is focused on the discussion of political candidates in America, I limited my study to people living in the United States. I would have liked to include the walls of Americans who speak other languages, but since I only speak English, I could only code comments in English. Once I identified potential participants, I messaged them an invitation to be part of the study.

3.5 Participant recruitment

When a potential participant was selected, I would send them a Facebook friend request and a private message inviting them to be a part of the study. I intended to use a separate professional Facebook profile with my name and academic information to reach out to potential participants, but Facebook identified it as a duplicate profile and shut it down so I used my own personal profile. The message to potential participants provided an introduction and my academic affiliation, outlined my research topic, informed them that the study would entail looking at the comments on their Facebook walls, invited them to participate in the study, told them they could request a copy of the final study, encouraged them to ask any questions, and described the two-step process to give consent to participate. The two-step process to consent was to accept my friend request and reply to the message saying 'I [NAME], am 18 or over and consent to this study of my Facebook wall.' Some participants adhered directly to the outlined two-step process. Many participants asked questions that I would answer before giving their consent and some gave their consent in their own words.

3.6 Study sample

I reached out to 1000 potential participants and ended up with 91 people giving consent to be in the study by the date I closed the recruitment process. Overall I had a 9.1% participation rate. Ideally I wanted to have around the same number of participants from each of the four cohorts. After sending 900 invitations to an equal number of Sanders and Clinton supporters, I had more Sanders supporters than Clinton supporters agree to participate. Instead of continuing to sample equally, I sampled an additional Clinton post and reached out to a batch of 25 men and 25 women. I still had fewer Clinton-supporting women in the study and sampled one last post where I reached out to 50 Clinton-supporting women.

I ended up with 14 FHs, 23 MHs, 25 FBs, and 29 MBs agreeing to participate in the study. The participation rates of the four cohorts was 4.7% for FHs, 9.2% for MHs, 11.1% for FBs, and 12.9% for MBs.

3.7 Sampling of comments

For each of the 91 participants, I looked at all the posts on their Facebook walls from February and March 2016. I coded posts and comments by the participant and their Facebook friends that mentioned Clinton or Sanders. I did not code any posts that did not contain original content. For instance, if someone shared a political post, but did not write their own thoughts about it and no one commented on their post, I did not code that post. I excluded posts without original content because the study is primarily concerned with how people talked to each other about the election and the candidates. Once I had completed coding all the comments from March and February or had coded 50 comments from that wall, I stopped. I stopped at 50 comments due to time constraints and because I didn't want any one wall to dominate the results. The study includes 1592 coded comments.

3.8 Design of codebook

The unit of analysis for coding was an individual Facebook comment. I designed the codebook in three sections; post and commenter characteristics, gendered interpersonal communication, and gendered political communication (Appendix A). In the first section, I recorded the gender and candidate preference of the wall owner, the gender and candidate preference of the commenter, and how many combined likes and shares the comment received.

For the gendered interpersonal communication section, I coded whether or not a comment was agreeing, disagreeing, or patronizing and if so, if the comment was directed at another specific commenter of the same or opposite gender from the commenter. I chose to include agreement, disagreement, and patronizing language in the study based on their identification as key elements in the different patterns of men and women's online and offline communication by Maltz & Borker, Wood, Dindia, Park et al., and Herring & Stoerger.

In the section of the codebook dealing with gendered political communication, I created categories for gendered negative stereotypes, gendered issue focus, and gendered slurs referencing both candidates as well as a section for the first woman frame. For gendered stereotypes I included dishonesty, age, ambition, unqualified, and loud/shrill as these are elements that can appear as part of gendered stereotypes or as part of a double-bind (Jamieson, 1997; Murray, 2010; Jalalzai, 2008; Traister, 2017; Nguyen, 2017; Filipovic, 2017; Cheng, 2016; Malone & Azari, 2016). In order to avoid bias towards codes that would only apply to Clinton, I made sure to include age and appearance, which based on following the election, I knew occasionally came up in reference to Sanders. While in the literature honesty comes up in the positive sense as an attribute stereotypically associated with women, I chose to code examples where dishonesty came up along with the other attributes that tend to come up in a negative sense. For gendered focus, I included personality, family, and appearance since these are some of the most cited topics that are brought up more for women candidates (Murray, 2010; Belt; 2012; Kittilson & Fridkin, 2008). I included gendered slurs given the tendency of men to use more profanity in online communication than women and the reports of gendered and sexualized online harassment from the election (Herring & Stoerger, 2013; Meyer, 2015; Traister, 2015; Ross, 2016; Borchers, 2016; Bump, 2016). The first woman frame was identified by Murray and Kittilson & Fridkin as an element of gendered political communication and was meant to capture instances where the historic nature of Clinton's run was mentioned in a positive light or used to accuse those of voting for her as only doing so because she is a woman.

3.9 Pilot Study and Intercoder Reliability

I conducted a pilot study and two intercoder reliability tests with a second coder, one for the pilot and one for the updated codebook for this dissertation. With reflexivity in mind, I intentionally chose a British male intercoder to ensure that my position as an American woman who voted in the Democratic primary was not skewing my coding.

During the initial pilot, the percent agreement for intercoder reliability fell between 50% and 93% for all the variables. I improved the codebook in preparation for this dissertation by clarifying instructions for codes, reorganizing a confusing counting method for comments, and adding a section to the codebook for topics that came up in the pilot that without their own designation might be coded under an existing code and muddle the results. The new 'grab bag from pilot' category included smart, stupid, electability in the general election (positive and negative), Wall Street (positive and negative), and qualified in a positive sense. In the second round of ICR with a sample of 10% of the comments, the percent agreement increased to between 92.4% and 100% for all variables.

3.10 Coding

When coding the gender of a participant or commenter, I first looked to the pronoun chosen by the Facebook user. If no pronoun was listed, I turned to the name and picture of the user. This study aimed to be trans inclusive by coding gender by self-identifying gender cues chosen by the user. Out

of of all the potential participants and commenters in the study, only one potential participant sampled appeared to identity as gender non-binary. That individual did not respond to my invitation so this study did not require a strategy to code non-binary individuals.

When coding for the candidate preference of a commenter, I coded each individual comment based on whether I could determine if the commenter supported Clinton, Sanders, a Republican, or whether the commenter declared themselves undecided or I could not tell their preference (coded as Unknown). After I coded all the comments, I went back and assigned each commenter a Stable Candidate Preference based on the candidate preference I could glean from all their comments. For instance, if for Commenter X, four comments were inconclusive but they expressed a preference for Clinton in two other comments, their stable candidate preference would be for Clinton. This system appeared to work well as only five out of 492 commenters exhibited any conflict in their stable candidate preference (i.e comments that indicated a preference for different candidates). If there was a conflict, their Stable Candidate Preference was marked as Unknown.

3.11 Ethics

Since gaining access to private Facebook walls is a rather new research avenue, I encountered several interesting ethical considerations designing this study. First, I needed to ensure that participants I invited to the study would be able to give informed consent. To that effect, I formulated a two-step informed consent process. The two-step process, described above, guaranteed that potential participants read my message and explicitly consented to the study in addition to accepting my friend request. Many potential participants accepted my friend request, but did not reply to my message. Although I then had access to their walls, they were not included in the research since I could not know what their intent was when they accepted the request or if they had even read my message. This was why the two-step process was so important.

Other studies with access to personal Facebook walls through controlling a Facebook group have sent messages to group members telling them about a study and offering the ability to opt-out (Sarabia & Estevez, 2016). I do not consider that method ethically sound and it would not work in cases where you do not already have access to a Facebook group whose members are in the population you wish to study. I made sure to ask potential participants to confirm they were 18 years old or above. Two potential participants responded that they were not yet 18 and were excluded from the study.

The second important ethical quandary I contended with was the study of comments by commenters on the walls of the participants, who unlike the participants, would not be approached to give informed consent. I justified the inclusion of their comments in this study on several grounds. I viewed the participants as wall owners with ownership over the content on their Facebook walls since they have the ability to delete and change content and to control access to who sees what. Commenters on the walls of other Facebook users have no reasonable expectation of privacy since their comments can be seen by anyone the wall owner chooses including the wall owner's Facebook

friends or even the general public depending on their privacy settings (Moreno et al., 2013). I informed participants that the comments on their walls would be studied if they consented to the research. Furthermore, my data was anonymized with no names being used and the comments were analyzed in aggregate, not individually. No quotes were taken from comments and no identifying information was gathered besides gender and apparent candidate preference so the commenters cannot be identified.

Overall, I determined that the study causes no harm to participants or commenters. I did not interact with participants beyond inviting them to the study and answering questions and the anonymized and aggregate nature of the data and how it is reported cannot be connected to any individuals (Moreno et al., 2013).

One of the areas where I think this study can add to future research is its unique ethical recruitment process of online participants.

4 RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Observations about sampling

Sample saturation: Towards the end of the participant sampling process I started to reach saturation. A few people appeared in the sample more than once. I also saw that a later post that I sampled already had likes from six participants who had already agreed to the study.

Non-original content: For this study, I only coded posts that included original content from participants and their Facebook friends. This means that many political posts which were shares of images, videos, articles, and memes but did not have any new comments on them were excluded from the study. For example, one recruited participant posted 31 posts about Sanders in one day with no comments or likes. Those 31 posts were not coded as they had no original content. There were recruited participants who shared political posts, but did not have original political content during February or March and so their wall was not ultimately included in the study. Enthusiasm for sharing posts on Facebook about the two candidates therefore cannot be concluded from this study since the total number of political posts was not tallied.

Inappropriate behavior from participants: In the course of the recruitment process, I encountered a smattering of inappropriate behavior from men in my sample. In particular, four men interacted with me through Facebook messages in ways that made me uncomfortable and attempted to breach proper academic/professional boundaries.

4.2 Topics outside the coding frame

Certain comments included topics that did not fit into my coding frame. For instance, anti-racism and immigration policies came up multiple times but did not fit neatly into a hard or soft issue

categorization and so were excluded. For Clinton, 'evil','soulless', and 'Hillary for Prison' came up, but were not easily coded. Depending on context, those phrases were coded under personality or dishonesty, but their frequency might have warranted more clarification or separate codes. On one wall, there were also anti-Semitic posts in reference to Sanders that did not fit in the coding frame. Topics that came up multiple times, but were not specifically about a candidate and therefore excluded, were claims by Sanders supporters that the Democratic party is corrupt and complicit in election fraud in the primaries and that the mainstream media is corrupt and cannot be trusted. Disparaging remarks about supporters of another candidate or calls for supporters of both candidates to pull together were similarly excluded.

Aggression was a category originally included in my coding frame, but it is excluded from my analysis given that the coding became muddled. Aggression was a code meant to include anger, profanity, name-calling, and dramatic emphasis, especially as directed at other commenters. Comments in all caps and the use of exclamation marks were coded under aggression, but it became clear that their use could just be a sign of excitement or even affiliation. While there were clear examples of aggressive comments in the sample, the coding of exclamation points and capitals diluted the code to the point where it is not useful. I recommend that any further studies clarify codes for aggression and create subcategories.

4.3 Summary of data

Out of the 91 participants who agreed to be in the study, 66 had original political content on their walls which was coded. Figure 1 and Figure 2 provide a breakdown of participants with and without original content on their walls.

Figure 1: Participants with original content on walls

Participant cohort	Participants with original content on walls	% of walls with original content
Female Hillary (FH)	8	12.1%
Male Hillary (MH)	15	22.7%
Female Bernie (FB)	19	28.8%
Male Bernie (MB)	24	36.4%
Total	66	100%

Figure 2: Participants with no original content on their walls

Participant cohort	Participants with no original content on walls	% of walls with no original content as percent of cohort
Female Hillary (FH)	6	42.9%
Male Hillary (MH)	8	34.8%
Female Bernie (FB)	6	24.0%
Male Bernie (MB)	5	17.2%
Total	25	

Figure 3 shows the breakdown of the 1592 comments by which participant cohort's walls they were written on.

Figure 3: Comments by Participant Cohort

Participant cohort	Comments on walls	% of all comments
Female Hillary (FH)	98	6.2%
Male Hillary (MH)	521	32.7%
Female Bernie (FB)	353	22.2%
Male Bernie (MB)	620	38.9%
Total	1592	100%

MBs generated the greatest number of comments in the study (33.5%) followed by FBs (29.5%), MHs(11.2%), Male Unknowns (MUs) (10.3%), and FHs (7.4%) (Figure 4). Women wrote 42.5% of the comments and men wrote 57.4%. Sanders supporters were responsible for 63.0% of the comments followed by Clinton supporters (18.6%), Unknowns (15.5%), and Republicans (2.8%).

Figure 4: Comments by Commenter Gender and Stable Candidate Preference

Commenter cohort	Number of comments	% of all comments
Female Clinton	118	7.4%
Female Sanders	470	29.5%
Female Unknown	82	5.2%
Female Republican	7	.44%
Male Clinton	178	11.2%
Male Sanders	534	33.5%
Male Unknown	164	10.3%
Male Republican	39	2.4%
Total	1592	100%

492 individual commenters were identified and their breakdown by gender and Stable Candidate Preference can be seen in Figure 5.

Figure 5: Individual commenters by Commenter Gender and Stable Candidate Preference

Commenter cohort	Number of individual commenters	% of all commenters
Female Clinton	25	5.1%
Female Sanders	144	29.3%
Female Unknown	47	9.6%
Female Republican	4	.8%
Male Clinton	30	6.1%
Male Sanders	153	31.1%
Male Unknown	73	14.8%
Male Republican	16	3.3%
Total	492	100%

4.4 Analysis of data

4.4.1 Agreement

In total, there were 367 cases where commenters agreed with a post or another commenter accounting for 23.1% of overall comments. Women agreed more than men with women agreeing in 30.4% of their comments and men agreeing in 17.6% of their comments (Figure 6). The association between gender and agreement is statistically significant at all conventional levels (Chi-squared p value< .001).

Figure 6: Agreement by Commenter Gender

		Agree			
		No Agreement		Agreement	
		Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
CGender	Women	471	69.6%	206	30.4%
	Men	754	82.4%	161	17.6%

Pearson Chi-Square Tests

		Agree
CGender	Chi-square	36.123
	df	1
	Sig.	.000*

Results are based on nonempty rows and columns in each innermost subtable.

*. The Chi-square statistic is significant at the .05 level.

Sanders supporters had the highest percent of comments that exhibited agreement at 25.9% of their total comments, followed by 19.5% for Unknowns, 18.9% for Clinton supporters, and 6.5% for Republican supporters. We can reject the null hypothesis that there is no association between candidate preference and agreement at all conventional levels of significance given the p value of .001 (Figure 7). When looking exclusively at the comments of Sanders and Clinton supporters, we see that there is still an association between candidate preference and agreement that is significant at the 5% level of significance (p=.014) (Figure 8).

Figure 7: Agreement by Commenter Stable Candidate Preference

		Agree			
		No Agreement		Agreement	
		Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
CCanRECODE	Hillary	240	81.1%	56	18.9%
	Bernie	744	74.1%	260	25.9%
	Unknown	198	80.5%	48	19.5%
	Republican	43	93.5%	3	6.5%

Pearson Chi-Square Tests

		Agree
CCanRECODE	Chi-square	16.254
	df	3
	Sig.	.001*

Results are based on nonempty rows and columns in each innermost subtable.

*. The Chi-square statistic is significant at the .05 level.

Figure 8: Agreement by Candidate Preference for Clinton and Sanders

		Agree			
		No Agreement		Agreement	
		Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
CCanRECODE	Hillary	240	81.1%	56	18.9%
	Bernie	744	74.1%	260	25.9%

Pearson Chi-Square Tests

		Agree
CCanRECODE	Chi-square	6.049
	df	1
	Sig.	.014*

Results are based on nonempty rows and columns in each innermost subtable.

*. The Chi-square statistic is significant at the .05 level.

The three way contingency table for agreement broken down by commenter gender and a candidate preference for Clinton or Sanders shows that FBs had the highest percent of comments that included agreement with 32.6%, followed by FHs (28.0%), MBs (20.0%), and MHs (12.9%). For women, we fail to reject the null hypothesis that there is no association between a candidate preference for Clinton or Sanders and agreeing comments (p=.338) (Figure 9). For men, there remains an association between a Clinton or Sanders candidate preference and agreeing comments that is significant at the 5% level

of significance (p=.033). When controlling for gender, an association between candidate preference for Clinton or Sanders and agreeing comments is no longer significant overall, however a partial association remains for male commenters.

Figure 9: Agreement by Commenter Gender and Candidate Preference for Clinton and Sanders

				Agree			
				No Agreement		Agreement	
				Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
CGender	Women	CCanRECODE	Hillary	85	72.0%	33	28.0%
			Bernie	317	67.4%	153	32.6%
	Men	CCanRECODE	Hillary	155	87.1%	23	12.9%
			Bernie	427	80.0%	107	20.0%

Pearson Chi-Square Tests

				Agree
CGender	Women	CCanRECODE	Chi-square	.918
			df	1
			Sig.	.338
	Men	CCanRECODE	Chi-square	4.530
			df	1
			Sig.	.033*

Results are based on nonempty rows and columns in each innermost subtable.

*. The Chi-square statistic is significant at the .05 level.

4.4.2 Agreement with same or opposite gender commenter

In cases where a commenter directly agreed with another commenter, women agreed with other women 54.7% of the time and with men 45.3% of the time whereas men agreed with other men 50.5% of the time and with women 49.5% of the time (Figure 10). We fail to reject the null hypothesis that there is no association between Commenter gender and which gender they agree with at any conventional level of significance (p value=.528).

Figure 10: Agreement with Same or Opposite Gender Commenter by Commenter Gender

		Agreeopgen			
		Agree w/opgen		Agree w/samegen	
		Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
CGender	Women	58	45.3%	70	54.7%
	Men	50	49.5%	51	50.5%

Pearson Chi-Square Tests

		Agreeopgen
CGender	Chi-square	.398
	df	1
	Sig.	.528

4.4.3 Disagreement

The data indicates that male commenters disagreed more than female commenters. Men disagreed in 13.7% of their comments while women disagreed in 7.1% of their comments (Figure 11). The association between gender and disagreement is significant at all conventional levels (p<.001).

Figure 11: Disagreement by Commenter Gender

		Disagree			
		No Disagreement		Disagreement	
		Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
CGender	Women	628	92.9%	48	7.1%
	Men	790	86.3%	125	13.7%

Pearson Chi-Square Tests

		Disagree
CGender	Chi-square	17.266
	df	1
	Sig.	.000*

Results are based on nonempty rows and columns in each innermost subtable.

*. The Chi-square statistic is significant at the .05 level.

When disagreement is broken down by Commenter Stable Candidate Preference, we see that Republicans disagreed the most (23.9% of their total comments), followed by Unknowns (17.5%), Clinton supporters (12.8%), and Sanders supporters (8.1%) (Figure 12). We can reject the null hypothesis that there is no association between Commenter Stable Candidate Preference and disagreement at all conventional levels of significance (p<.001).

Figure 12: Disagreement by Commenter Stable Candidate Preference

		Disagree			
		No Disagreement		Disagreement	
		Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
CCanRECODE	Hillary	258	87.2%	38	12.8%
	Bernie	922	91.9%	81	8.1%
	Unknown	203	82.5%	43	17.5%
	Republican	35	76.1%	11	23.9%

Pearson Chi-Square Tests

		Disagree
CCanRECODE	Chi-square	28.428
	df	3
	Sig.	.000*

Results are based on nonempty rows and columns in each innermost subtable.

*. The Chi-square statistic is significant at the .05 level.

Examining the disagreeing comments of just Clinton and Sanders supporters, we see there is still a relationship between Stable Candidate Preference and disagreement (Figure 13). We can reject the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between a candidate preference for Sanders and Clinton and disagreement at the 5% significance level (p=.013).

Figure 13: Disagreement by Candidate Preference for Clinton or Sanders

		Disagree			
		No Disagreement		Disagreement	
		Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
CCanRECODE	Hillary	258	87.2%	38	12.8%
	Bernie	922	91.9%	81	8.1%

Pearson Chi-Square Tests

		Disagree
CCanRECODE	Chi-square	6.228
	df	1
	Sig.	.013*

Results are based on nonempty rows and columns in each innermost subtable.

*. The Chi-square statistic is significant at the .05 level.

Male Clinton supporters had the highest percent of disagreeing comments (16.3%), followed by MBs (10.5%), FHs (7.6%), and FBs (5.3%) (Figure 14). The chi-squared tests for the three way contingency table reveal that for women commenters, we fail to reject the null hypothesis that there is no association between a candidate preference for Clinton or Sanders and disagreeing comments (p=.340). For men, there remains an association between supporting Clinton or Sanders and disagreeing comments that is significant at the 5% significance level (p=.039). When controlling for gender, an association between candidate preference for Clinton or Sanders and disagreeing comments is no longer significant overall, however a partial association remains for male commenters.

Figure 14: Disagreement by Commenter Gender and Candidate Preference for Clinton or Sanders

				Disagree			
				No Disagreement		Disagreement	
				Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
CGender	Women	CCanRECODE	Hillary	109	92.4%	9	7.6%
			Bernie	444	94.7%	25	5.3%
	Men	CCanRECODE	Hillary	149	83.7%	29	16.3%
			Bernie	478	89.5%	56	10.5%

Pearson Chi-Square Tests

				Disagree
CGender	Women	CCanRECODE	Chi-square	.911
			df	1
			Sig.	.340
	Men	CCanRECODE	Chi-square	4.280
			df	1
			Sig.	.039*

Results are based on nonempty rows and columns in each innermost subtable.

*. The Chi-square statistic is significant at the .05 level.

4.4.4 Disagreement on Participant Walls

There was a higher percentage of disagreeing comments on the walls of male participants (13.5%) compared to the walls of female participants (6.8%). The association between the gender of a wall owner and disagreeing comments is significant at all conventional levels of significance ($p<.001$) (Figure 15).

Figure 15: Disagreeing Comments by Gender of the Participant/Wall Owner

		Disagree			
		No Disagreement		Disagreement	
		Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
PGender	PWomen	576	93.2%	42	6.8%
	PMen	842	86.5%	131	13.5%

Pearson Chi-Square Tests

		Disagree
PGender	Chi-square	17.337
	df	1
	Sig.	.000*

Results are based on nonempty rows and columns in each innermost subtable.

*. The Chi-square statistic is significant at the .05 level.

The walls of Clinton supporters had a higher percent of disagreeing comments (18.2%) than the walls of Sanders supporters (8.0%) (Figure 16). We can reject the null hypothesis that there is no association between disagreeing comments and wall owner candidate preference at all conventional levels of significance ($p<.001$).

Figure 16: Disagreeing Comments by Wall Owner Candidate Preference

		Disagree			
		No Disagreement		Disagreement	
		Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
PCandidate	PHillary	369	81.8%	82	18.2%
	PBernie	1049	92.0%	91	8.0%

Pearson Chi-Square Tests

		Disagree
PCandidate	Chi-square	34.688
	df	1
	Sig.	.000*

Results are based on nonempty rows and columns in each innermost subtable.

*. The Chi-square statistic is significant at the .05 level.

With regard to the walls of the four cohorts of participants, the most disagreement was found on the walls of MHs (19.3%), followed by the walls of FHs (14.3%), MBs (10.2%), and FBs (5.4%) (Figure 17).

Figure 17: Disagreeing comments by Wall Owner Gender and Candidate Preference

				Disagree			
				No Disagreement		Disagreement	
				Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
PCandidate	PHillary	PGender	PWomen	84	85.7%	14	14.3%
			PMen	285	80.7%	68	19.3%
	PBernie	PGender	PWomen	492	94.6%	28	5.4%
			PMen	557	89.8%	63	10.2%

4.4.5 Disagreement with same or opposite gender commenter

When disagreeing directly with another commenter, both men and women disagreed more often with men (78.4% and 66.7%) (Figure 18). The association between commenter gender and the gender the disagreeing comment was directed towards is significant at all conventional levels of significance ($p<.001$).

Figure 18: Disagreement with same or opposite gender by Commenter Gender

		Disagreeopgen			
		Disagree w/opgen		Disagree w/samegen	
		Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
CGender	Women	26	66.7%	13	33.3%
	Men	22	21.6%	80	78.4%

Pearson Chi-Square Tests

		Disagreeopgen
CGender	Chi-square	25.555
	df	1
	Sig.	.000*

Results are based on nonempty rows and columns in each innermost subtable.

*. The Chi-square statistic is significant at the .05 level.

The cell count was too small in some cases to determine whether there was a statistically significant association between Commenter Stable Candidate Preference and disagreement with the same or opposite gender (Figure 19). Overall, supporters from each of the four candidate preference categories disagreed more frequently with commenters of the same gender (Figure 19). But this should be understood within the context that most disagreeing comments came from men and men disagreed more with other men than with women.

Figure 19: Disagreement w/ same or opposite gender by Commenter Stable Candidate Preference

		Disagreeopgen			
		Disagree w/opgen		Disagree w/samegen	
		Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
CCanRECODE	Hillary	10	29.4%	24	70.6%
	Bernie	30	43.5%	39	56.5%
	Unknown	7	20.0%	28	80.0%
	Republican	1	33.3%	2	66.7%

4.4.6 Patronizing

Overall, there were 48 patronizing comments, accounting for 3.0% of comments in the sample. Men made 40 patronizing comments while women made eight. Men were over three times more likely to make a patronizing comment then women. Patronizing comments accounted for 4.4% of all comments by men and 1.2% of the comments made by women (Figure 20). The association between Commenter Gender and patronizing comments is significant at all conventional levels of significance (p<.001).

Figure 20: Patronizing Comments by Commenter Gender

		Patronize			
		Not Patronizing		Patronizing	
		Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
CGender	Women	668	98.8%	8	1.2%
	Men	875	95.6%	40	4.4%

Pearson Chi-Square Tests

		Patronize
CGender	Chi-square	13.505
	df	1
	Sig.	.000*

Results are based on nonempty rows and columns in each innermost subtable.

*. The Chi-square statistic is significant at the .05 level.

Republicans had the highest percentage of patronizing comments within their total comments with 13% of their comments being patronizing, followed by Clinton supporters (3.0%), Sanders supporters (2.8%) and Unknowns (2.0%) (Figure 21). We can reject the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between Commenter Stable Candidate Preference and patronizing comments at all conventional levels of significance (p=.001) (Figure 21). However, when a chi-squared test is done for patronizing comments by just Clinton and Sanders supporters, there is no significant association shown (p=.821) (Figure 22). The association shown in the first test is therefore likely due to the higher percentage of patronizing comments by Republicans than the three other candidate preference categories.

Figure 21: Patronizing Comments by Commenter Stable Candidate Preference

		Patronize			
		Not Patronizing		Patronizing	
		Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
CCanRECODE	Hillary	287	97.0%	9	3.0%
	Bernie	975	97.2%	28	2.8%
	Unknown	241	98.0%	5	2.0%
	Republican	40	87.0%	6	13.0%

Pearson Chi-Square Tests

		Patronize
CCanRECODE	Chi-square	16.794
	df	3
	Sig.	.001*

Results are based on nonempty rows and columns in each innermost subtable.

*. The Chi-square statistic is significant at the .05 level.

Figure 22: Patronizing Comments by Commenter Preference for Clinton/Sanders

		Patronize			
		Not Patronizing		Patronizing	
		Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
CCanRECODE	Hillary	287	97.0%	9	3.0%
	Bernie	975	97.2%	28	2.8%

Pearson Chi-Square Tests

		Patronize
CCanRECODE	Chi-square	.051
	df	1
	Sig.	.821

4.4.7 Patronizing towards same or opposite gender commenter

Women only made four patronizing comments directed at a specific other commenter in total, of which half were directed at other women and half at men. Men made a total of 33 direct patronizing comments with 87.9% directed at other men (Figure 23). The cell count was too small for a conclusive chi-squared test of association.

Figure 23: Patronizing comments towards same or opposite gender by Commenter Gender

		Patronizeopgen			
		Patronizing opgen		Patronizing samegen	
		Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
CGender	Women	2	50.0%	2	50.0%
	Men	4	12.1%	29	87.9%

All seven patronizing comments directed at another commenter made my MHs were directed at other men (Figure 24). Both FHs and FBs each made only one direct patronizing comment towards another woman and a man respectively. 89.5% of the direct patronizing comments made by MBs were directed at other men while 10.5% were directed at women. The cell count was too small for a chi-squared test.

Figure 24: Patronizing comments towards same or opposite gender by Commenter Gender and Stable Candidate Preference

				Patronizeopgen			
				Patronizing opgen		Patronizing samegen	
				Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
CCanRECODE	Hillary	CGender	Women	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
			Men	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
	Bernie	CGender	Women	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
			Men	2	10.5%	17	89.5%
	Unknown	CGender	Women	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
			Men	2	40.0%	3	60.0%
	Republican	CGender	Women	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
			Men	0	0.0%	2	100.0%

4.4.8 Gendered Stereotypes

For Clinton, dishonesty was the gendered negative stereotype that came up most often, appearing in 59 comments representing 84.3% of the negative stereotypes referring to Clinton (Figure 25). Ambition came up four times, accounting for 5.7% of stereotypes aimed at Clinton followed by age and unqualified which each up three times and each made up 4.3% of comments about Clinton that

included stereotypes (Figure 25). Loud/shrill came up once and comprised 1.4% of comments that include stereotypes about Clinton.

For Sanders, dishonesty was also the most common negative stereotype, appearing in 14 comments accounting for 53.8% of comments about Sanders with gendered negative stereotypes (Figure 26). Unqualified came up 8 times and age came up 4 times for 30.8% and 15.4% of comments containing gendered stereotypes about Sanders. Ambition and loud/shrill did not come up in reference to Sanders.

Figure 25: Total Clinton Gendered Negative Stereotypes

		Count	Column N %
HGenNegStereo	Dishonesty	59	84.3%
	Ambition	4	5.7%
	Age	3	4.3%
	Unqualified	3	4.3%
	Shrill	1	1.4%

Figure 26: Total Sanders Gendered Negative Stereotypes

		Count	Column N %
BGenNegSt	Dishonesty	14	53.8%
	Ambition	0	0.0%
	Age	4	15.4%
	Unqualified	8	30.8%
	Shrill	0	0.0%

Men made 72.9% of the comments about Clinton being dishonest (Figure 27). Overall, men made 57.4% of all comments so they brought up Clinton as dishonest more often than would be expected based on their share of total comments. Of the 70 comments including negative gendered stereotypes about Clinton, 20 (28.6%) were made by women while 50 were made by men (71.4%). Men made a greater percentage of comments including negative gendered stereotypes about Clinton (71.4%) than their percentage of total comments (57.4%).

Sanders supporters made 93.2% of the dishonest comments about Clinton. Of the dishonest comments about Clinton made by Sanders supporters, 70.9% were made by men. 53.2% of comments by Sanders supporters were made by men so Sanders supporting men generated a higher percentage of comments about Clinton referencing dishonesty than would be expected based on their percentage of comments overall. Looking at Sanders supporters comments is useful to rule out the possibility of

male Republican commenters skewing the percent of male commenters making stereotypical comments about Clinton since Republican men made more comments than Republican women.

Figure 27: Clinton Gendered Negative Stereotypes by Commenter Gender

		CGender			
		Women		Men	
		Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
HGenNegStereo	Dishonesty	16	27.1%	43	72.9%
	Ambition	3	75.0%	1	25.0%
	Age	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
	Unqualified	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
	Shrill	0	0.0%	1	100.0%

Men made 80.8% of the 26 comments that included a reference to Sanders and a negative stereotype (Figure 28).

Figure 28: Sanders Gendered Negative Stereotypes by Commenter Gender

		CGender			
		Women		Men	
		Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
BGenNegSt	Dishonesty	4	28.6%	10	71.4%
	Ambition	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Age	1	25.0%	3	75.0%
	Unqualified	0	0.0%	8	100.0%
	Shrill	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

As indicated in Figure 29 and Figure 30, men supporting Clinton and Sanders had a similar percent of their total comments include a negative stereotype about the opposing candidate as did women supporting Clinton and Sanders with men having a higher proportion than women (MH- 8.4%, MB- 8.3%, FB 4.2%, FH 3.4%). Men were approximately twice as likely as women to include a gender stereotype in a comment.

Figure 29: Clinton Gendered Negative Stereotypes by Clinton/Sanders Men and Women

		CCanRECODE							
		Hillary				Bernie			
		CGender				CGender			
		Women		Men		Women		Men	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
HGenNegStereo	None	119	100.0%	178	99.4%	457	95.8%	500	91.7%
	Dishonesty	0	0.0%	1	0.6%	16	3.4%	39	7.2%
	Ambition	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	0.6%	1	0.2%
	Age	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.4%
	Unqualified	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.2%	2	0.4%
	Shrill	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.2%

Figure 30: Sanders Gendered Negative Stereotypes by Clinton/Sanders Men and Women

		CCanRECODE							
		Hillary				Bernie			
		CGender				CGender			
		Women		Men		Women		Men	
		Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %	Count	Column N %
BGenNegSt	None	115	96.6%	164	91.6%	476	99.8%	543	99.6%
	Dishonesty	3	2.5%	7	3.9%	1	0.2%	1	0.2%
	Ambition	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Age	1	0.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.2%
	Unqualified	0	0.0%	8	4.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Shrill	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

4.4.9 Gendered Focus: Personality, Family, and Appearance

When examining how frequently personality, family, and appearance was referenced for both candidates compared to hard or soft issues, Clinton's personality, family and appearance came up in 34.7% of comments versus 13.8% for Sanders (Figure 31, Figure 32). Personality was mentioned in 16.3% of Clinton's gendered focus comments in comparison to 10.8% for Sanders, family came up in 14.3% of Clinton comments compared to 1.5% for Sanders, and appearance came up in 4.1% of comments mentioning Clinton compared to 1.5% mentioning Sanders. Given that Secretary Clinton is married to a former president, it would make sense for her husband to be brought up more than Sanders' wife. If we exclude mentions of family and just look at comments that mention personality and appearance as a percent of comments that mention those two topics and hard and soft issues, those categories still come up more for Clinton than Sanders (23.8% vs. 12.5%). However, the relatively small cell counts in certain categories should be noted, such as appearance which was only mentioned in two comments referencing Clinton and one comment referencing Sanders.

Figure 31: Clinton Gendered Focus

		Count	Column N %
HGenfocus	Personality	8	16.3%
	Family	7	14.3%
	Appearance	2	4.1%
	Hard issue positive	6	12.2%
	Hard issue negative	15	30.6%
	Soft issue positive	7	14.3%
	Soft issue negative	4	8.2%

Figure 32: Sanders Gendered Focus

		Count	Column N %
BGenFocus	Personality	7	10.8%
	Family	1	1.5%
	Appearance	1	1.5%
	Hard issue positive	27	41.5%
	Hard issue negative	16	24.6%
	Soft issue positive	11	16.9%
	Soft issue negative	2	3.1%

4.4.10 Gendered Issue Focus

In terms of comments referencing hard or soft issues, hard issues came up most often for both candidates with negative comments the most prominent for Clinton and positive the most common for Sanders (Figure 33, Figure 34). Soft issues were brought up in a greater percentage of comments referencing Clinton (34.4%) than Sanders (23.2%). With respect to mentions of personality, family, and appearance and hard and soft issues, no substantial trends emerged in differences between the cohorts.

Figure 33: Clinton Gendered Issue Focus

		Count	Column N %
HGenfocus	Hard issue positive	6	18.8%
	Hard issue negative	15	46.9%
	Soft issue positive	7	21.9%
	Soft issue negative	4	12.5%

Figure 34: Sanders Gendered Issue Focus

		Count	Column N %
BGenFocus	Hard issue positive	27	48.2%
	Hard issue negative	16	28.6%
	Soft issue positive	11	19.6%
	Soft issue negative	2	3.6%

4.4.11 Grab Bag

Looking at the codes under the "grab bag" category that were added as a result of topics that came up in the pilot study, electability in the general election in a positive frame was brought up the most for both candidates (33.3% of grab bag comments for Clinton and 50.0% for Sanders) followed by qualified in a positive frame (25.0% for Clinton and 18.8% for Sanders) (Figure 35, Figure 36). Wall Street came up in a negative light equally for both candidates (12.5%).

Figure 35: Clinton grab bag frequency table

		Count	Column N %
HGrabbag	Wall St. negative	3	12.5%
	Wall St. positive	0	0.0%
	Qualified positive	6	25.0%
	Smart	0	0.0%
	Stupid	2	8.3%
	Electability in the general pos	8	33.3%
	Electability in the general neg	5	20.8%

Figure 36: Sanders grab bag frequency table

		Count	Column N %
BGrabbag	Wall St. negative	2	12.5%
	Wall St. positive	0	0.0%
	Qualified positive	3	18.8%
	Smart	0	0.0%
	Stupid	1	6.3%
	Electability in the general pos	8	50.0%
	Electability in the general neg	2	12.5%

4.4.12 Likes and Shares

In the study, women had a higher average of likes and shares per post with an average of 3.0 likes and shares per comment compared to 2.2 for men. When the top two and bottom two outlying comments were removed, women had an average of 2.7 likes/shares per comment compared to 2.1 for men. Sanders supporters had a higher average number of likes and shares than Clinton supporters with an average of 2.2 compared to 1.6. FBs had the highest average of the commenter cohorts with a 4.0 average followed by MBs with an average of 2.7, MHs with an average of 2.0, and MUs with 1.5 likes and shares per comment. FHs came in 5th just above FRs, FUs, and MRs with an average of .9 likes and shares per comment.

The exclusion of posts without original comments needs to be considered when looking at the likes and shares coded for this study since not all political posts were included. It is beyond the scope of this study to fully examine the previous finding that women are less likely to receive responses to their online posts and that men are more likely to continue posting even when they receive no response (Herring & Stoerger, 2013). There were plenty of participants in this study who continued to share multiple political posts a day with no response in terms of likes or comments or only a few likes.

4.4.13 First Woman Frame

The first woman frame appeared in 15 comments: nine in a positive way and six in a negative way. The nine positive comments were made by two Clinton supporting men (eight comments from one commenter and one from another). The six negative comments were made by two Sanders supporting women and four Sanders supporting men.

4.4.14 Gendered Slurs

Gendered slurs were used six times in reference to Clinton and once in reference to Sanders. While gendered slurs only came up seven times in the original content coded for this study, they did appear in non-original images and memes that were shared. The one gendered slur about Sanders was from an FH. Five of the Clinton gendered slurs were made by MBs, and one by an FB. While the observations were too few for a chi-squared test, it is worth noting that of all the comments made by Sanders supporters, 53.6% were made by men and 46.8% were made by women while 83.3% of the gendered slurs referring to Clinton were made by MBs and 16.7% were made by an FB. Thus male Sanders supporters used a higher proportion of gendered slurs than their proportion of comments overall as compared to female Sanders supporters.

4.5 Discussion

The research questions that guided this study sought to identify which elements of gendered interpersonal and political communication were present in the Facebook discussions of Sanders and Clinton supporters and whether men, women, Clinton supporters, Sanders supporters or any

combination thereof were more likely to employ any of those elements. The gendered interpersonal communication patterns of women agreeing more than men and men disagreeing and patronizing more than women were found. Gendered slurs made up a small percentage of comments, but did come up and were mostly made by Sanders supporting men. In terms of gendered political communication elements, personality, family, and appearance were mentioned more in conjunction with the female candidate in the study and soft issues made up a greater share of comments for Clinton than for Sanders which adheres to prior research into gendered political communication in the traditional media. In terms of gendered stereotypes, dishonesty was the most prominent for Clinton while dishonesty and being unqualified were the most prevalent for Sanders. Ambition and shrillness were used to describe Clinton, but not Sanders which suggests a gendered connection, but further study is needed given the small number of occurrences in the data. This study indicates that men were more more likely to employ gendered stereotypes than women. The first woman frame came up in discussion, but represented only .9% of total comments. Overall, while there were significant differences noted in the behavior of male and female commenters and differences in gendered political communication elements brought up in relation to the two candidates, there were few differences observed in the behavior of Clinton and Sanders supporters. The only notable differences between Clinton and Sanders supporters was Clinton supporting men being more likely to disagree and less likely to agree than male Sanders supporters. Sanders supporting men were the most likely to make comments that included gendered slurs, but the sample size is too small to draw any firm conclusions.

An analysis of the elements of gendered interpersonal communication present in the Facebook discussions of Clinton and Sanders supporters reveals that women were more likely to agree than men and men were more likely than women to disagree and make patronizing comments. These findings are consistent with the pattern identified in previous research into men and women's online and offline communication (Maltz & Borker, 1982; Wood, 2009; Dindia, 2006; Park et al., 2016; Herring & Stoerger, 2013).

Interestingly, both men and women were more likely to disagree with men and men appeared to direct most of their patronizing comments towards other men. Women made so few patronizing comments that the data was inconclusive as to if women were more likely to direct their patronizing comments towards one gender over another. I have not encountered previous research that suggests whether men and women are more likely to disagree with the same or opposite gender. The finding that both genders were more likely to disagree with men could be due to the fact that since disagreement is a common characteristic of male communication, that both genders are more comfortable expressing disagreement with men than they are with women. Perhaps both genders view expressing disagreement with women as more likely to cause offense since disagreement is not as acceptable in women's communication patterns. The discovery that men were more likely to direct patronizing comments at other men is somewhat unexpected given lay observations about men

making patronizing comments towards women and, specifically, 'mansplaining' the election to women (Traister, 2015; Traister, 2017; Goldberg, 2015; Day, 2016; Warnke, 2016; Kurtzleben, 2016b; Rothman, 2012; Crockett, 2016; MacMillen, 2017; Hickey, 2017). A potential explanation of the frequency of men making patronizing comments towards other men is the same as the potential explanation for men making more disagreeing comments towards other men. Additionally, men may more readily escalate disagreement between themselves to a place where they would make patronizing comments since men are more likely to seek dominance in their conversations and, unlike women, men are not as likely to strive to avoid conflict in their communication (Maltz & Borker, 1982; Wood, 2009; Dindia, 2006; Park et al., 2016; Herring & Stoerger, 2013). The attention in the media and popular culture given to men making patronizing comments or explanations towards women may not be because men are more likely to exhibit such behavior to women over men, but that such behavior stands out to women as women are much less likely to patronize others (as exhibited by the literature cited above and this research). Perhaps men do not consider other men patronizing them as particularly out of the ordinary and worth noting. While the data is too sparse for a conclusive chi-squared test, in the study, male Clinton supporters made no patronizing comments towards women while male Sanders supporters directed 10.5% of their patronizing comments towards women. Therefore even though male Sanders supporters directed the majority of their patronizing comments towards other men, in the sample they still were more patronizing to women than their Clinton supporting male counterparts, which if this pattern held for the general population could have contributed to the narrative surrounding the 'mansplaining' of 'Berniebros' (Goldberg, 2015).

In terms of the difference in interpersonal communication patterns between supporters of the different candidates, Sanders supporting men were more likely than Clinton supporting men to make agreeing comments while the reverse was true for disagreeing comments. One possible explanation for this is that in the study there were many more MBs than MHs (and more FBs than FHs) so MBs simply might have had more commenters to agree with while MHs had more commenters to disagree with.

One area where both commenter gender and candidate preference impacted behavior was in the likelihood to use gendered slurs. Sanders supporting men made five out of seven of the comments containing gendered slurs. Although the number of comments was relatively small, it is still worth noting that men supporting a male candidate were the most likely to employ gendered slurs. This fits with the finding in previous studies that, in general, men are more likely to use profanity in online discussions (Postmes, Spears, & Lea, 1998; Herring, 2003; Herring & Stoerger, 2013).

With respect to gendered stereotypes, dishonesty came up the most for both candidates, but was particularly pronounced for Clinton. The attention paid to Clinton's supposed dishonesty may not only be due to the email scandal and stories about paid Wall St. speeches, but due to the fact that since honesty is a trait often associated with women that any perceived breach in honesty is treated extra harshly for women candidates. Besides dishonesty, the other four stereotypes (ambition, age,

unqualified, and shrill) came up fewer than 10 times for each candidate. However, all four were mentioned in relation to Clinton while ambition and shrill did not come up at all for Sanders. This may suggest that accusations of being overly ambitious and shrill may be particularly salient for female candidates, but more study is needed. Unqualified came up more for Sanders than Clinton (30.8% vs. 4.3% of comments containing stereotypes). The difference in mentions of unqualified for both candidates may be due to the wider range of political office held by Clinton over her career as compared to Sanders. Men supporting Clinton and Sanders were about twice as likely as women to use a gendered stereotype about the opposing candidate.

The fact that personality, family, and appearance came up more for Clinton than Sanders and that soft issues were brought up more in relation to Clinton than Sanders is consistent with prior studies of gendered political communication in the traditional media (Murray, 2010; Belt; 2012; Kittilson & Fridkin, 2008; Herrnson et al., 2003). This study suggests that in the Facebook conversations between Sanders and Clinton supporters in the primary that the gendered political communication patterns of focusing more on the personality, family, and appearance of female candidates and of soft issues being more highly associated with female candidates echoes those found in the traditional media. These findings are concerning given that these patterns are thought to negatively impact women's chances at electoral success, especially for executive office (Herrnson et al., 2003; Belt, 2012; Murray, 2010; Jalalzai, 2008).

On the whole, the methodology chosen for this study was well suited to answering the research questions set forth. The sampling, recruiting, and coding procedures were time intensive but yielded some interesting and statistically significant results that shed light on the heretofore largely unexamined arena of gendered political and interpersonal discussions taking place on personal Facebook walls. The codebook could have been improved by narrowing the coding frame for aggressive comments. Further studies should consider including non-original political content. Sharing memes, videos, news articles and political messages is a major way people discuss and share information and opinions about campaigns and future research should delve into the ways that gender plays a role in these types of content. Unfortunately, this research could only contend with discussions in English, but hopefully future studies will tackle discussions in other languages commonly spoken in the United States. A larger study including more walls, comments, and a longer time frame could be useful in untangling patterns that are suggested by this research but had too few occurrences to yield solid conclusions. Additionally, the study of online gendered political and interpersonal communication could benefit from an intersectional study that includes the dimension of race. During the primary, numerous sources noted the phenomenon of Sanders supporters directing patronizing comments towards women and African American voters accusing them of not understanding how to vote in their best interest and race should be taken into account for a fuller understanding of the interactions at play during gendered political discussions (Ross, 2016; Goff, 2016; Blow, 2016; Herring & Stoerger, 2013).

5 CONCLUSION

This study contributes to our understanding of gender in interpersonal political communication online and offers a template for sampling and ethically obtaining access to personal Facebook walls. The rare view into the Facebook discussions on personal walls afforded by this research reveals that the noted gendered interpersonal communication patterns of women agreeing and men disagreeing and patronizing more were also a component of the online discussions of men and women during the Democratic primary. This research produced the interesting finding that during these online political discussions, men and women are more likely to disagree with men and men are more likely to patronize other men. It would be worthwhile for future research to examine the gendered direction of disagreeing and patronizing comments in other contexts to see if the pattern holds in different scenarios or was unique to this one. A key new finding of this research was that a greater focus on soft issues and the personality and appearance of a female candidate, an element of gendered political communication in the traditional media, was mirrored in political discussions on personal Facebook walls. Men were also found to be more likely to use gendered slurs and negative gendered stereotypes, although more research to support or counter these findings could be clarifying.

One of the biggest implications of this study is that elements of gendered political communication in the traditional media that are known to harm women candidates' electoral chances were also found in the online discussions of individuals during the Democratic primary. The fact that men in the study were more likely to disagree, patronize, and use gendered slurs and stereotypes points to differences in interpersonal gendered political communication patterns that impact the landscape of political discussion in the United States. These differences matter given that political messages shared via social networks may be more potent than messages shared directly by campaigns or the media and may especially influence voters during primaries (Vaccari, 2012). Differences in the behavior of men and women during online interpersonal political interactions may be even more relevant when candidate support is unevenly split between genders as was the case in the 2016 Presidential general election.

Women running for office face considerable obstacles, especially when they seek executive office. Not only does the traditional media erect barriers to female candidates with gendered political coverage, but online political discussions, which are increasingly important to the American political process, pose many of the same barriers. On top of reproducing facets of gendered political communication, online political discussions have the added complexity of people interacting with each other following patterns of interpersonal communication influenced by gender.

6 REFERENCES

Adams, K. (Presenter). (2016, June 9). Hillary Clinton: The more competent women are, the less likeable they are judged to be....[Radio program]. In *The Kaye Adams Programme*. *BBC Radio Scotland*. Retrieved from http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p03xrytc

Agresti, A., & Finlay, Barbara. (2014). *Statistical methods for the social sciences*(Fourth edition, Pearson New International ed.).

Belt, T. (2012) "Viral Videos: Reinforcing Stereotypes of Female Candidates for President." In Women and the White House: Gender, Popular Culture and Presidential Politics, edited by Justin S. Vaughn, 205–26. University Press of Kentucky.

Bialik, C. & Enten, H. (2016). The Polls Missed Trump. We Asked Pollsters Why. *FiveThirtyEight*. Retrieved from

https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/the-polls-missed-trump-we-asked-pollsters-why/

Blow, C. (2016). Stop Bernie-Splaining to Black Voters. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from

https://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/11/opinion/campaign-stops/stop-bernie-splaining-to-black-voters.html?_r=0

Bode, L. (2016). Closing the gap: gender parity in political engagement on social media. *Information, Communication & Society*, *4*, 587-603

Bode, L., Vraga, E. K., Borah, P., & Shah, D. V. (2014). A new space for political behavior: Political social networking and its democratic consequences. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *19*(3), 414–429.

Borchers, C. (2016). The Bernie Bros are out in full force harassing female reporters. *The Washington Post.* Retrieved from

https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/06/07/the-bernie-bros-are-out-in-full-force-harassing-female-reporters/?utm_term=.c79e3c98c8be

Bump, P. (2016). Who, exactly, are the 'Berniebros?'. *The Washington Post.* Retrieved from

https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/02/08/are-the-berniebros-a-problem-of-politics-or-one-of-internet-culture/?tid=a_inl&utm_term=.8065ab5ec936

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter.* New York, NY: Roudedge. Retrieved from

http://eng5010.pbworks.com/f/ButlerBodiesThatMatterEx.pdf

Campus, D. (2013) Women Political Leaders and the Media. Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan. (see chapter 2)

Cheng, W. (2016). The Long, Sexist History of 'Shrill' Women. *Time*. Retreived from http://time.com/4268325/history-calling-women-shrill/

Crockett, E. (2016). Jimmy Kimmel "mansplaining" to Hillary Clinton was a perfect sendup of campaign trail sexism. *Vox*. Retrieved from

http://www.vox.com/2016/3/25/11303996/jimmy-kimmel-hillary-clinton-mansplaining

Davis, R. (2016). Polling Results Estimate 94 Percent Of Black Women Voters Chose Hillary Clinton. *Essence*. Retrieved from http://www.essence.com/news/politics/most-black-women-voted-for-hillary-clinton

Day, L. (2016). Misogyny Is a Window That Goes Up and Down. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/lori-day/misogyny-is-a-window-that_b_10010500.html

Dindia, K. (2006). Men are From North Dakota, Women are From South Dakota. In Dindia, K., & Canary, D. (Eds.). *Sex differences and similarities in communication* (2nd ed.) (pp-3-20). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dow, B. (2009). Feminist approaches to communication. In W. Eadie (Ed.), 21st century communication: A reference handbook. (pp. 82-90). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Facebook remains the most popular social media platform. (2016, November 10). *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/2016/11/11/social-media-update-2016/pi_2016-11-11_social-media-update_0-01/

Filipovic, J. (2017). Your Criticism Might Be Valid. It Might Also Be Sexist. *Cosmopolitan.* Retrieved from http://www.cosmopolitan.com/politics/a8800321/elizabeth-warren-sexism/

Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy. *Social Text*, 25/26: 56-80.

Friedman, A. (2016). Katherine Clark is taking on the trolls. *Elle*. Retrieved from

http://www.elle.com/culture/tech/a37728/katherine-clark-harassment-abuse-legislation/

Gibson, R., Römmele, A., & Williamson, A. (2014). Chasing the Digital Wave: International Perspectives on the Growth of Online Campaigning. *Journal of Information Technology and Politics*. 11(2), 123-129.

Gibson, R., Williamson, A., & Ward, S. (2010). The Internet and the 2010 Election: Putting the Small "p" Back in Politics. *Hansard Society.* Retrieved from http://leftfootforward.org/images/2010/07/InternetElection2010.pdf

Goff, K. (2016). The Racist Side of Bernie Sanders Supporters. *The Daily Beast*. Retrieved from

http://www.thedailybeast.com/the-racist-side-of-bernie-sanders-supporters

Goldberg, M. (2015). Men Explain Hillary to Me. *Slate*. Retrieved from

http://www.slate.com/articles/double_x/doublex/2015/11/hillary_clinton_bernie_sanders_sexist_coverage_some_men_want_to_mansplain.html

Gunter, B. (2000) Media Research Methods, London: Sage

Hansen, A. (1998). *Mass communication research methods*. New York: New York University Press. Chapter 5: Content Analysis.

Herring, S.C. (2003). Gender and Power in On-line Communication. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.) *The Handbook of Language and Gender*. (pp. 202-228) Retrieved from https://is.muni.cz/el/1423/podzim2012/SAN230/um/the_handbook_of_language_and_gender.pdf

Herring, S.C. and Stoerger, S. (2013). Gender and (A)nonymity in Computer-Mediated Communication. In J. Holmes, M. Meyerhoff, & S. Ehrlich (Eds.), *Handbook of Language and Gender, 2nd edition.* Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/59ba/4c93a3d83fc5015febc5364546330c381ff2.pdf

Herrnson, P.S., Lay, J.C. & Stokes, K. (2003). Women running "as women": candidate gender, campaign issues, and voter-targeting strategies. *The Journal of Politics*, 65.1, 244–255. Retrieved from

http://jcelestelay.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/herrnson_lay_stokes.pdf

Hickey, A. (2017). 9 Sex Moves Any Sexist Guy Will Love To Try. *Buzzfeed*. Retrieved from

https://www.buzzfeed.com/agh/sex-moves-any-sexist-guy-will-love-to-try?utm_term=.lsLRRj0gk#.srXmm7XWw

Inglehart, Ronald, and Pippa Norris. (2003) Rising Tide. Cambridge University Press. (pdf) ebook

Jalalzai, F. (2008) "Women Rule: Shattering the Executive Glass Ceiling." Politics & Gender 4. no. 2: 205-32

Jamieson, K.H. (1997) Beyond the Double Bind: Women and Leadership. New York: Oxford University Press Inc,. Ch. 2 Hillary Clinton pp.22-52

Kantor, J. (2016). Cheering for the First Female President, Until They Weren't. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/10/us/elections/shock-women-clinton-supporters.html?_r=0

Kittilson, Miki, and Kim Fridkin. (2008) "Gender, Candidate Portrayals and Election Campaigns: A Comparative Perspective." Politics & Gender 4, no. 3 pp 371-392

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis : An introduction to its methodology* (The Sage CommText series ; 5). Beverly Hills ; London: Sage. 2nd ed.

Kurtzleben, D. (2016a). 4 Possible Reasons The Polls Got It So Wrong This Year. *NPR.* Retrieved from

http://www.npr.org/2016/11/14/502014643/4-possible-reasons-the-polls-got-it-so-wrong-this-year

Kurtzleben, D. (2016b). Is It OK To Vote For Hillary Clinton Because She's A Woman? *NPR*. Retrieved from

http://www.npr.org/2016/04/11/473792646/is-it-ok-to-vote-for-clinton-because-she-s-a-woman-an-8-year-old-weighs-in

Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and Woman's Place. *Language in Society*. 2(1): 45-80. Retrieved from https://web.stanford.edu/class/linguist156/Lakoff_1973.pdf

Lavrakas, P.J. (2008). Intercoder Reliability. *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods.* Retrieved from http://methods.sagepub.com/reference/encyclopedia-of-survey-research-methods/n228.xml

Leiss, W., Kline, S., & Jhally, S. (1988). Social communication in advertising : Persons, products and images of well-being (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Lerner, S. (2016). Men I Otherwise Like and Respect. *Medium.* Retrieved from

https://medium.com/@sarahlerner/men-i-otherwise-like-and-respect-a34c414f55a1#.dc1pi2u1z

Malone, C. & Azari, J. (2016). Thinking They're 'Unqualified' Is A Big Reason More Women Don't Run For Office. *FiveThirtyEight*. Retrieved from

https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/why-calling-hillary-clinton-unqualified-smacks-of-sexism/

Maltz, D. N., & Borker, R. (1982). A cultural approach to malefemale miscommunication. In J. J. Gumperz (Ed.), Language and social identity (pp. 196–216). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Meyer, R. (2015). Here comes the Berniebro. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from

http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/10/here-comes-the-berniebro-bernie-sanders/411070/

Monsour, M. (2006). Gendered communication in friendships. In B. Dow & J. T. Wood (Eds.),

Moreno, M.A., Goniu, N., Moreno, P.S., & Diekema, D. (2013). Ethics of Social Media Research: Common Concerns and Practical Considerations. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking*. 16(9): 708–713.

Nguyen, T. (2017). Elizabeth Warren Gets a Reality Check. *Vanity Fair*. Retrieved from

http://www.vanityfair.com/news/2017/02/elizabeth-warren-2020-poll-trump

Owen, D. (2016.) "New Media and Political Campaigns." In *Oxford Handbook of Political Communication*. Oxford University Press.

Park, G., Yaden, D.B, Schwartz, H.A, Kern, M.L, Eichstaedt, J.C, Kosinski, M.,... Seligman, M.E.P. (2016). Women are Warmer but No Less Assertive than Men: Gender and Language on Facebook. *PloS One*, 11(5).

Postmes,T., Spears, R. & Lea, M. (1998) Breaching or building social boundaries? SIDE effects in computer-mediated communication. *Communication Research, 25*(6), 689-715.

Murray, R. editor ; foreword by Pippa Norris., (2010) Cracking the highest glass ceiling : a global comparison of women's campaigns for executive office

Rappeport, A. (2016). Gloria Steinem and Madeleine Albright Rebuke Young Women Backing Bernie Sanders. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from

https://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/08/us/politics/gloria-steinem-madeleine-albright-hillary-clinton-bernie-sanders.html?_r=0

Ross, J. (2016). Bernie Sanders's most vitriolic supporters really test the meaning of the word 'progressive'. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/03/10/bernie-sanderss-most-vitriolic-supporters-really-test-the-meaning-of-the-word-progressive/?tid=a_inl&utm_term=.2b68ce396917

Rothman, L. (2012). A Cultural History of Mansplaining. *The Atlantic.* Retrieved from

https://www.theatlantic.com/sexes/archive/2012/11/a-cultural-history-of-mansplaining/264380/

Ruiz, M. (2016). Hillary Clinton Supporters Aren't Just Voting for Her "Because She's a Woman." *Vogue*. Retrieved from

http://www.vogue.com/article/hillary-clinton-supporters-not-voting-for-her-because-shes-a-woman

Sarabia, I. & Estevez, A. (2016). Sexualized Behaviors on Facebook. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 61(C): 219-226.

Stein, S. (2016). Bernie Sanders Supporters Unleash Sexist, Nasty Attacks On Nevada's Dem Chair. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/bernie-sanders-nevada-dem chair_us_573b4b8de4b0aee7b8e7dfa2?section=politics

Tesfaye, S. (2016). "We don't want that crap": Sanders repudiates sexist "Bernie Bro" supporters. *Salon.* Retrieved from http://www.salon.com/2016/02/08/we_dont_want_that_crap_sanders_repudiates_sexist_bernie_bro_supporters/

Thomas, S. (1994), Artifactual Study in the Analysis of Culture: A Defense of Content Analysis in a Postmodern Age. *Communication Research*, 21: 683-697.

Traister, R. (2015). The Bernie Bros vs. the Hillarybots. *New York Magazine*. Retrieved from

http://nymag.com/thecut/2015/11/bernie-sanders-bros-are-coming-for-the-hillary-clinton-bots.html

Traister, R. (2017). Hillary Clinton Is Furious. And Resigned. And Funny. And Worried. *New York Magazine*. Retrieved from

http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2017/05/hillary-clinton-life-after-election.html

Umrigar, T. (2016). Bernie Bros made me finally recognize misogyny in America. *The Huffington Post.* Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/thrity-umrigar/bernie-bros-sexism_b_9847092.html

Vaccari, C. (2012) From echo chamber to persuasive device? Rethinking the role of the Internet in campaigns. *New Media & Society*, 15(1): 109-127.

Vogel, K.P. & Isenstadt, A. (2016). How did everyone get it so wrong? *Politico*. Retrieved from

http://www.politico.com/story/2016/11/how-did-everyone-get-2016-wrong-presidential-election-231036

Warnke, M. (2016). Don't appreciate the significance of Hillary Clinton's nomination? Too bad. This moment doesn't belong to you. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from

http://www.latimes.com/opinion/opinion-la/la-ol-woman-for-president-hillary-historic-moment-let-us-celebrate-20160729-snap-story.html

Weber, R. (1985). *Basic content analysis* (Sage university paper. Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences. 07409). Beverly Hills ; London: Sage.

Wheelan, S.A. & Verdi, A.F. (1992). Differences in Male and Female Patterns of Communication in Groups: A Methodological Artifact? *Sex Roles*, 27 (1-2): 1-15.

Womack, L. (2016). Stop Pretending You Don't Know Why People Hate Hillary Clinton. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/larry-womack/stop-pretending-you-dont-_b_12191766.html

Women in U.S. Congress 2015. (2016). Retrieved from http://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/women-us-congress-2015

Wood, J.T. (2009). Gender. In W.F Eadie (Ed.). *21st Century Communication: A Reference Handbook*. (pp. 371-379). Retrieved from https://danielciurel.files.wordpress.com/2011/10/21stcenturycommunication2.pdf

Woolley, J.K., Limperos, A.M., & Oliver, M.B. (2010). The 2008 Presidential Election, 2.0: A Content Analysis of User-Generated Political Facebook Groups. *Mass Communication and Society,* 13 (5): 631-652

Yomtov, J. (2016). Where Trump ranks among least experienced presidents. *USA Today*. Retrieved from https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/onpolitics/2016/11/08/donald-trump-experience-president/93504134/

7 APPENDICES

7.1 Appendix A: Codebook

First post characteristics

Participant #

P1…

Participant gender

Woman- 1

Man- 2

Participant candidate preference

Hillary Supporter- 1

Bernie Supporter- 2

Date of 1st post in thread

Month/Day

Thread number

1…..

Comment number (0 for first post)

0,1….

Likes/shares on post/comment (add likes and shares)

1……

First article/post about

Hillary-1

Bernie-2

Both or other- 3

First post positive or negative?

Neutral-0

Positive-1

Negative-2

Commenter profile

Commenter ID #

C1……

Commenter gender

Woman- 1

Man- 2

Unknown- 3

Commenter candidate preference (Leave a 3 unless certain of preference based on this comment's content.)

Hillary-1

Bernie-2

Unknown-3

Republican- 4

Re-code of candidate preference (Leave blank until finished with coding all comments on the wall. Did the commenter identify a stable preference for a candidate looking back at all their comments?)

Hillary-1

Bernie-2

Unknown-3

Republican-4

Gender communication pattern of comments

Agree (any agreement noted, agree with statement, show support/thanks/affiliating language)

No-0

Yes-1

Agree in direct response to other commenter/participant (agreeing with specific commenter, or original content from commenter. Does not include agreeing with first post if a re-post/share. Code as no if agree with a mixed gender group, yes if a single gender group)

No-0

Yes-1

Agreement with other commenter of opposite gender

N/A- 0

Yes-1

Agree with same gender-2

Disagree (any disagreement noted)

No-0

Yes-1

Disagree in direct response to other commenter/participant (Disagreeing with specific commenter, or original content from commenter. Does not include disagreeing with first post if a re-post/share. Code as no if disagree with a mixed gender group, yes if a single gender group)

No-0

Yes-1

Disagree with other commenter of opposite gender

N/A-0

Yes-1

Disagree with same gender- 2

Infantilize/Patronize (e.g. you don't know what you're talking about, X candidate is best for your demographic, I have X degrees and know more than you, etc.)

No-0

Yes-1

Infantilize/Patronize in direct response to other commenter/participant (Infantilizing/patronizing with specific commenter. Does not include general bragging)

No-0

Yes-1

Infantilize/Patronize in direct response to commenter of opposite gender

N/A-0

Yes-1

Infantilize/patronize with same gender- 2

Anger/Aggression (escalation, name-calling, all caps, curse words, !!!!….)

No-0

Yes-1

Anger/Aggression in direct response to other commenter/participant (calls out the commenter by name, is not just generally displaying anger, but displaying anger directed towards another commenter)

No-0

Yes-1

Anger/Aggression in direct response to opposite gender commenter/participant

N/A-0

Yes-1

Anger/aggression towards same gender- 2

Gendered political communication

Hillary-Gen. Negative stereotypes (can pick more than one)

None-0

Dishonest/untrustworthy-1

Ambitious-2

Age-3

Unqualified (unqualified for job, inexperienced, can't get anything done)-4

Loud/shrill-5

Hillary-Gendered focus (can pick more than one)

None-0

Personality (likeability, warm/cold, any personality trait mentioned)- 1

Family-2

Appearance (could be positive or negative)-3

Hard issue positive (economy, foreign policy etc.)- 4

Hard issue negative- 5

Soft issue positive (education, healthcare, etc.)- 6

Soft issue negative- 7

Hillary-Grab bag from pilot (can pick more than one)

None-0

Wall street negative- 1

Wall street positive- 2

Qualified positive (i.e. best for the job, experienced, great president)- 3

Smart- 4

Stupid- 5

Electability in the General positive (i.e will win presidency/beat Republican)- 6

Electability in the General negative (i.e will lose presidency/lose to Republican)- 7

Hillary- Gendered slur (e.g. cunt, bitch, witch, whore, Shillary, dick etc.)

No-0

Yes-1

First woman frame

None-0

Negative (i.e. only voting because woman)- 1

Positive (great to have first woman president, cracking glass ceiling, good for young girls)- 2

Bernie- Gen. Negative stereotypes (can pick more than one)

None-0

Dishonest-1

Ambitious-2

Age-3

Unqualified-4

Loud/shrill-5

Bernie- Gendered focus (can pick more than one)

None-0

Personality(likeability, warm/cold, any personality trait mentioned)- 1

Family-2

Appearance (could be positive or negative)-3

Hard issue positive (economy, foreign policy etc.)- 4

Hard issue negative- 5

Soft issue positive (education, healthcare, etc.)- 6

Soft issue negative- 7

Bernie- Grab bag from pilot (can pick more than one)

None-0

Wall street negative- 1

Wall street positive- 2

Qualified positive (i.e. best for the job, experienced, great president)- 3

Smart- 4

Stupid/not smart- 5

Electability in the General positive (i.e will win presidency/beat Republican)- 6

Electability in the General negative (i.e will lose presidency/lose to Republican)- 7

Bernie- Gendered slur (e.g. cunt, bitch, witch, whore, Shillary, dick etc.)

No-0

Yes-1