

“I’M IN AND I’M IN TO WIN”: THE 2008 AND 2016 INTERNET ANNOUNCEMENT VIDEOS OF HILLARY CLINTON FOR PRESIDENT

Nichola D. Gutgold :: Johnna Purcell

PRETHODNO PRIOPĆENJE / DOI: 10.20901/ms.9.17.6 / PRIMLJENO: 22.03.2018.

ABSTRACT *It is well known that a first impression may indeed set the tone for an entire relationship. In politics that first impression is likely to be the announcement speech. Hillary Clinton had a more complicated relationship with that first political impression than most politicians because she had been in the eye of the international public long before she ran for President of the United States. This article compares her two presidential announcement speeches – from 2008 and 2016 – in an effort to gauge what impressions she was trying to make in the hearts and minds of the United States voters, even though they no doubt had already formed an impression of her from her many years as the First Lady, the Senator from New York, and after the 2008 election as the Secretary of State.*

KEYWORDS

RHETORIC, ANNOUNCEMENT SPEECH, PRESIDENT, USA, HILLARY CLINTON

Authors note _____

Nichola D. Gutgold :: Penn State University, Lehigh Valley Campus, USA ::
ngutgold@psu.edu

Johnna Purcell :: Penn State University, Schreyer Honors College, USA ::
johnnapurcell146@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Hillary Clinton is one of the most well-known women in the political world. The only woman in United States history to transition from her role as First Lady into her own national political career, she served two terms as a New York Senator, was the first non-symbolic female candidate for President of the United States, and when she lost to Barack Obama, she became a member of his "team of rivals" to serve the country as Secretary of State. In 2016 when she won the democratic nomination for president, she became the first woman in United States history to be nominated for President by a major party ticket. Though she lost in a surprising election result to a political newcomer, the internationally known real estate billionaire and reality television personality Donald Trump, her place in history is unquestionable.

This article examines the two presidential announcement videos of Hillary Clinton from 2008 and 2016. How a presidential candidate introduces himself or herself to the nation is important and revealing. Referred to as "surfacing", this early communication by a candidate sets the stage for the campaign (Trent, 2005: 18). This initial introduction to the electorate is crucial for a candidate and may alter a candidate's momentum and thereby his or her victory. Important to note, however, is that Hillary Clinton was in no way a newcomer to voters in the United States. They had been well acquainted with both Hillary Clinton and her husband, former president Bill Clinton for more than twenty years. Since Clinton's bid for the presidency in 2008 there has not been a woman who has run for president until Clinton again in 2016. This is important to keep in mind as we suggest that the challenges that Clinton faced in her announcement videos are different than those faced by male candidates. Diana Carlin and Kelly L. Winfrey (2009), in their detailed and often cited analysis of sexism in the 2008 presidential campaign, sum up many of the problems that Clinton faced her first time around as a presidential contender. Using common stereotypes of women in corporations developed by Rosabeth Moss Kanter (1993), language theories, and media framing, Carlin and Winfrey's (2009) essay uncovers the common gendered stereotypes that surfaced in the 2008 campaign. The analysis notes that "there was a considerable amount of negative coverage of both candidates, and that such coverage has the potential to cast doubt on a woman's suitability to be Commander-in-chief" (Carlin and Winfrey, 2009: 326). Some of the gendered stereotypes that Hillary Clinton and Sarah Palin encountered include an emphasis on the sexuality of each woman. Palin, who ran for Vice President alongside the Republican candidate John McCain, was portrayed as a sex symbol and Clinton as an unattractive, old woman (*Ibid.*: 2009: 332). The authors of the article discuss how the media often mentioned their role as a "mother" as the first or second thing about a female candidate and refer to this as negative (*Ibid.*: 332-336). Palin was frequently described as a governor, mother of five, reformer, creationist, runner-up to Miss Alaska, suggesting that her motherhood is one of her qualifications to serve as President (see also Miller and Peake, 2013; Wasburn and Wasburn, 2011).

Although the ideologies of Sarah Palin and Hillary Clinton could not be more different, they were both political women angling for support in a national political contest, and it may have prompted the media to focus on their gender and stereotype them in a way that may not have happened if there had been more women in the race (Carlin and Winfrey, 2009: 8). As Liesbet van Zoonen (2006) argues, there are few female politicians who can bypass the personalization of politics. Unlike the former President of Finland Tarja Halonen or German Chancellor Angela Merkel, Sarah Palin and Hillary Clinton were not able to keep the media from separating the personal from the political (*ibid.*). As Clinton campaign staffer Jennifer Palmieri (2018: 126) underscores in her post-election book: "All our leaders had been men. Our history – the canon of American stories we treasured and that told us who we are – were all based on men. Hillary didn't fit the narrative." Similarly, Amy Chozick (2018: 3) in her book that recounted covering Hillary Clinton's two presidential campaigns suggests that "no one in modern politics, male or female, has had to withstand more indignities, setbacks and cynicism." The way to tell the story of a woman angling for the most powerful position in the world was yet not known — not in 2008 and not in 2016.

In this article we contend that a dramatic change in her approach and presence in her announcement speeches reflect an acknowledgement of some of the problems she faced in 2008 and a resolve to succeed through changing tactics. After a detailed analysis of each announcement, this article suggests whether or not her change in presentation improved her rhetorical effectiveness as a candidate in 2016.

HILLARY CLINTON'S ANNOUNCEMENT SPEECHES

At first glance, announcement speeches may seem a straightforward necessity of any candidate's campaign. However, a presidential announcement speech is critical to setting the momentum and tone of a candidate's campaign. Therefore, these rhetorical opportunities must be closely formulated and coordinated within the greater goals of the campaign. The announcement speech signals to the country what kind of candidate and leader he or she plans to be. It reveals the themes and stances that will be taken and attempts to re-shape a weak image or strengthen a favorable one. An announcement speech is also a chance to get voters to like a candidate, which is an important goal in modern-day media-saturated political campaigning.

In a widely cited book *Political Campaign Communication: Principles and Practices* by Judith Trent *et al.* (2011), the functions and merits of announcement speeches are discussed within the context of a candidate's campaign and their potential term in office. Trent *et al.* (2011) assert that the campaign announcement speech serves several additional purposes beyond the obvious signal of a candidate's intent to run. Additionally, announcement speeches serve to discourage prospective opponents, indicate why the candidate has chosen to run, and develop major themes of the candidates' campaign (Trent *et al.*, 2011: 11). Candidates are often trying to signal to voters that they are like voters themselves and that they care about the same issues that voters care about.

Clinton in 2008: "I'm In, and I'm In To Win."¹

In 2008 Clinton faced off with a relative political newcomer, the young and photogenic, Barack Obama. The race was long, and the nation's craving for change insatiable. The eloquent, Ciceronian, and inspiring Illinois senator, who burst on to the national stage in 2004 with an incredibly effective speech at the Democratic National Convention, caught the imagination of the country. Barack Obama displayed a tremendous natural political talent. Hillary Clinton, though a tough competitor, was bested for the nomination by him. But when she cozied up, soft lit in her toney Georgetown home, and made her campaign announcement speech, Hillary Clinton was the one to beat for President in 2008.

Seated on a stylish sofa in her well-appointed living room, Hillary Clinton warmly looked into the camera on January 20, 2007, and announced that she would seek the Democratic nomination for President.² It came as no surprise. The thought that Hillary Clinton was as much a presidential possibility as her husband was a sentiment that followed her around from Yale Law School, where she met her husband, to Arkansas, when she served as first lady in her husband's governorship, and to the White House, as the moniker "Billary" and the sentiment "buy one, get one free" became part of the national subconscious about this modern, outspoken, well-educated woman who simply would not be relegated to the traditional sphere of domesticity so often occupied by political spouses. In 2003 Clinton's colorful pollster Mark Penn was measuring Hillary Clinton's presidential appeal, with an eye toward the 2004 election. Joshua Green (2008) notes how polling suggested that her prospects were "reasonably favorable," but that Clinton herself never seriously considered running: "Instead, over the next three years, a handful of her advisors met to prepare for 2008. They believed the biggest threat was John Edwards." Amy Sullivan (2005) wrote in Washington Monthly magazine:

Over the last five years, Clinton has developed into perhaps the most interesting politician in America. She has a reputation for bipartisanship in the Senate, forming partnerships with some of her most conservative Republican colleagues, including Senator Bill Frist, Republican from Tennessee, Senator Rick Santorum, Republican from Pennsylvania, and Senator Sam Brownback, Republican from Kansas. She has quietly, but firmly, assumed a leadership role in her own caucus. And she has shown vision and backbone in a party that is accused of having none.³

Therefore, it is not remarkable or surprising that she ran for President, or even that she announced it on the internet. What is remarkable is that she almost won the nomination, making her the first woman in the United States to be a front-runner, non-symbolic candidate for the presidency. When Barack Obama won the Democratic nomination in 2008, he agreed to allow Hillary Clinton's name to be placed into nomination at the Democratic National Convention in August, acknowledging her significant contribution to the democratic process and her achievement in the race. Larry Scanlon, political director of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, said:

¹ Parts of this chapter were originally published in Gutgold Nichola (2009) *Almost Madam President: Why Hillary Clinton 'Won' in 2008*. Lexington Books.

² <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GPMhQmHFxAw> (02/02/2018).

³ <https://washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/julyaugust-2005/hillary-in-2008-3/> (03/07/ 2018).

She sought to be the first woman nominated for president. She came up a little short, but she made it easier for the next female candidate to get the brass ring. Many in the Democratic Party would like to celebrate that. I think that they should celebrate that (Nicholas, 2008).⁴

Her assertive line, that she is "in to win" gave no doubt that she was not going to be categorized as testing the waters. Clearly, Hillary Clinton was running for President. What is often the case with women candidates for President, is that the media are quick to cast them as vice presidential contenders instead. Hillary Clinton would have none of that. While her message was masculine, her style could not have been more feminine. Indeed, her message was in many ways a study of contrasts: there was a hint of entitlement in her "in to win" and yet, she called for a conversation, indicating that she wanted to hear from the American people. Her decision to sit on a sofa, in her home with family photos featuring her daughter Chelsea and her husband, former President Bill Clinton in the background, was a soft, friendly approach. She was doing her best to be likable. It was not surprising that Bill Clinton would have a role in the campaign, but the emergence of the young adult Chelsea Clinton as an articulate voice for her mother was notable. Famously shielded from the press as the first daughter, Chelsea Clinton played a minimal role in Hillary Clinton's 2006 Senate re-election campaign. Her presence in the presidential campaign, however, was wholeheartedly welcomed by the press and the public, especially since there were already a number of photogenic children of candidates, including the young families of Senator Barack Obama and former Senator John Edwards. Seeing Chelsea Clinton in the photographs in the living room was also a non-verbal announcement of the well-raised and well-educated young woman she had become. Having delivered Chelsea Clinton to adulthood in relative obscurity could be seen as an ethos builder for Hillary Clinton since women candidates are more often seen through the lens of motherhood than male candidates are judged by their fatherhood (see Deason *et al.*, 2015). Certainly, as the campaign progressed, and Sarah Palin was announced as the vice-presidential candidate on the Republican ticket, the motherhood lens became even more prominent.

The setting of the internet speech embodied feminine political rhetoric. When we first look at the scene, we take in a familiar figure: former First Lady and Senator from New York, Hillary Clinton. We are reminded of her domestic side, the one of mother as we glimpse the framed family photos in the setting. Clinton begins: "I announced today that I am forming a presidential exploratory committee. I'm not just starting a campaign, though: I'm beginning a conversation – with you with America". She had the appearance of a matriarch in a made-for-TV drama. Her suggestion to "have a conversation" is intimate and suggests interpersonal communication rather than public campaigning. Her choice to launch her campaign over the internet (which was also widely broadcast over television) suggests a personal connection of participation and communication. She used personal experience to back up her claim that she would be an effective president. Her experiential evidence:

⁴ <http://articles.latimes.com/2008/aug/15/nation/na-clinton15> (15/05/2018).

I grew up in a middle-class family in the middle of America, and we believed in that promise. I still do. I've spent my entire life trying to make good on it. Whether it was fighting for women's basic rights or children's basic health care. Protecting our Social Security or protecting our soldiers. It's a kind of basic bargain, and we've got to keep up our end.

Clinton closed her announcement with an intimate request: "So let's talk. Let's chat. Let's start a dialogue about your ideas and mine. Because the conversation in Washington has been just a little one-sided lately, don't you think?" The presidential announcement speech by Hillary Clinton was a sophisticated communication strategy and it is a unique presidential announcement artifact. It created a personal, warm, likable connection to voters. It adopted a modern technology to relate to younger voters and offered a chatty, interpersonal conversational speech of presidential announcement that was unlike any of her competitors in 2008.

There has never been a time in American history when a first lady built upon her experience of her first lady tenure to provide evidence that she was prepared to be the leader of the free world, but that was part of Hillary Clinton's pitch as a presidential candidate in 2008. She also had her tenure in the Senate, but she drew from her eight years in the White House to run successfully for the Senate and she continued to draw on those first lady experiences in her stump speeches for President.

A Washington Post-ABC News poll released on January 2, 2007 showed Clinton was the favorite of 41 percent of Democrats, more than double the support of any of her rivals. She was emphatic about her reasons for seeking the presidency. She repeated often on the campaign trail:

I am worried about the future of our country, and I want to help put it back on the right course, so that we can work together to meet the challenges that confront us at home and abroad. I believe that I am in the best position to be able to do that.

And she repeated her mantra: "I'm in to win. And that's what I intend to do" (Healy, 2007). The most "battle tested" of all the Democratic candidates is how Patrick Healy (2007) of The New York Times described Hillary Clinton the day after Hillary Clinton declared herself "in to win." And indeed, Hillary Clinton faced battles when she ran for the Senate although before that she had been forever criticized by the press for being a first lady that participated in a wider sphere of influence than tradition allows. In the United States, the roles of First Lady and elected officials could not be more different. While Robert Watson (1997: 807) notes that first ladies regularly fulfill both private and public roles, first ladies who use their white glove pulpit for controversial issues are often judged harshly by the public. The promise that Bill Clinton made on the campaign trail for the presidency that voters would "get two for the price of one" was not what voters bargained for. Although there had been a few exceptions, for example, former First Lady Betty Ford became a champion for breast cancer awareness and – after her White House years – for drug and alcohol recovery. Hillary Clinton had a rough first ladyship when she wielded power that made much of the American public uncomfortable. Most notably, her

work on the healthcare initiative made her an unelected policymaker, which raised the ire of those who may have preferred her to stay in a small sphere of influence more akin to a traditional woman's role. Hillary Clinton is not the first lady to experience backlash for fitting into an impossible standard in the public eye. As Carl Sferrazza Anthony (1990: 9) pointed out in his first lady scholarship, "by facing challenges with their own unique approaches, they consequently changed the public role [of first lady]." This is utterly true for Hillary Clinton.

Karrin Vasby Anderson (2002: 106) notes that Hillary Clinton was aware that when she enacted a more traditional role her popularity rose. In her autobiography, *Living History* (2004), Hillary Clinton recounts an encounter with Clinton's advisor James Carville that occurred shortly after a trip to Nepal where she and Chelsea were photographed atop an elephant. She explains, "when we got back to Washington, James Carville remarked: "Don't you just love it? You spend two years trying to get people better health care and they tried to kill you. You and Chelsea rode an elephant and they loved you!" (Clinton, 2004: 102). Indeed, Hillary Clinton received constant criticism during her husband's presidency for presenting herself in a way that many Americans considered unorthodox for a first lady. She was always received more favorably when her motherhood and other domestic attributes, or ceremonial aspects of her first ladyship were more strongly in focus.

As the First Lady, Hillary Clinton served as a spokesperson throughout America and the world when she ardently attempted to gain support for universal healthcare. She spoke about children's and women's rights and repeatedly defended her husband against several incriminating charges. As the equally educated political spouse of her husband, she met criticism for her public role, yet she could not deny her political acumen. Lisa M. Burns (2008: 48) aptly notes that "the question of woman's "proper" place in political culture is as relevant today as it has been during any historical period." No stranger to rhetorical situations that demanded rhetorical agility, her skills would be tested in a way they had never been tested before. While Anderson (2002) views the candidacy of a spokesperson first as the "logical next step", many critics of Hillary Clinton were not as supportive as logic might suggest. Clearly, Hillary Clinton had to launch her presidential bid with rhetorical care.

How would Hillary Clinton re-introduce herself to the American people, not as first lady, but instead an elected senator in her own right and strike the right balance between a powerful policy maker and a populist "every woman" who is likable enough to win their vote? How would she highlight just enough of her first lady experience to create an ethos that demonstrated leadership without dredging up details of Clinton White House drama that many Americans would just as soon forget? Would accentuating her feminine side win over voters or was that only a side of her that people wanted to see when she was First Lady? When she ran for the Senate while finishing up her duties as First Lady, Hillary Clinton faced similar exigencies as a public speaker and a public figure. She successfully fulfilled the need to meet people of New York, not as a celebrity first lady, but as a political powerhouse in her own right. She managed to do that and started to be thought of as a political figure who would fight for New Yorkers' needs. She not only won a Senate seat

but she won re-election to the Senate in 2006. Originally labeled a "carpetbagger" for running for Senate from New York, a state she had never lived in, former First Lady Hillary Clinton was not only successful in her bid, she was a popular senator. How did she do it? One of the ways she got to know New Yorkers and allowed them to get to know her was not by talking, but by listening. Hillary Clinton embarked upon a "listening bus tour" of all parts of New York after her entrance into the Senate race. She made it her goal to visit sixty-two counties in the state of New York, spending time with New Yorkers, talking to them in small-group settings according to the principles of retail politics.

To announce herself as a presidential candidate, Hillary Clinton did the electronic version of a listening tour, one that would be aided with "a little help from modern technology."⁵ Hillary Clinton's groundbreaking choice of using the internet to announce her candidacy for President in 2008 spoke to her style of communication. This new style of announcement allowed for a different analysis of the effect of campaign rhetoric through the use of YouTube comments. YouTube comments allowed voters to have a direct dialogue with both Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton through their perspective YouTube channels, both of which the candidates actively used throughout the 2008 election cycle.

YouTube has been described as the arena of the people. It is a place where individuals may express and release their opinions in a manner that is untouched and unfiltered by conventional media sources (Arthurs *et al.*, 2018). Because of its one-on-one nature, the use of the online video can be perceived as more personal than other traditional media forms: "The success of YouTube comes from the user-to-user social experiences that differentiates it from traditional context broadcasters" (Wattenhofer *et al.*, 2012). Through comments on YouTube videos, voters have the chance to be in a dialogue with the candidates, and Hillary Clinton was one of the first presidential candidates to utilize YouTube to directly reach voters (see Burgess and Green, 2009).

The standard for the content of announcement speeches has shifted between approaches based upon political issues and approaches based upon the candidate's character. While candidates' performance in both arenas holds significant influence over a candidate's success, candidates generally choose to focus on one area over another. In a quantitative analysis of the content of presidential announcement speeches, William Benoit and Mark Glantz (2012: 24) found that candidates began to discuss policy more and character less. Hillary Clinton's speech was no exception to this rule. She wanted voters to know that she came from "the middle of America" and that she grew up in a "middle class family". Although much better than coming from a rich family, her narrative did not have the drama of her husband's or that of Barack Obama's. This is a point she would make after her disappointing loss in 2016. Throughout her 2008 speech, Clinton vocalized her issue stances while showing her character. Throughout the announcement, Clinton spoke about finding solutions to problems such as ending the war in Iraq, making America energy independent, and reforming Medicare and Medicaid. Secretary Clinton spent relatively no time in the speech acknowledging her own character traits that would make her suitable for the job of Commander-in-chief. Despite the absence of direct reference,

⁵ Hillary Clinton 2008 presidential announcement, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GPMhQmHFXAw> (10/02/2018).

Clinton's character was very much present in the announcement. Her posture, hand positions, attire, and tone all said what her words did not linger on; that she was ready to be President and that she possessed the skill and character to succeed.

Hillary Clinton's 2016 internet announcement speech: "I'm getting ready to run for President."⁶

When Hillary Clinton ran for President again in 2016 she was seen as a political insider and for many Americans that meant more of the same. Even worse, she was part of a political dynasty. Young voters flocked to Bernie Sanders, a little-known Vermont senator, who promised an unruly solution. Her rhetoric was not soaring and while she did not have a stamina issue, as Donald Trump continued to assert, she did have an excitement deficit. Not true for Donald Trump. Even detractors of the P.T. Barnum-like reality show billionaire would tune in to see him bombastically debate. And when he promised to "make America great again," his slogan caught fire much more successfully than the four or five slogans Hillary Clinton's campaign seemed to be testing as the campaign progressed (see for instance Kayam, 2018).

The video opens with upbeat music and the voice over that announces: "I'm getting ready to do a lot of things – a lot of things!" We first see a woman tending to her garden and sharing: "It's spring – so we're starting to get the gardens ready, and my tomatoes are legendary here in my own neighborhood." Next, a young mother explains: "My daughter is about to start kindergarten next year, and so we're moving so she can belong to a better school." Two Spanish-speaking brothers announce: "My brother and I are starting our first business!" while another mother adds: "After five years of raising my children, I am now going back to work." A young couple, including a very pregnant woman, says, "Every day we're trying to get more and more ready and more prepared", and the man says, "Baby boy, coming your way!" A young female student says: "Right now I'm applying for jobs. It's a look into what the real world will look like after college." An LGBT couple shares: "I'm getting married this summer to someone I really care about." A cute child exuberantly shared: "I'm gonna be in a play, and I'm going to be in a fish costume" and starts singing... "from little tiny fishes" and an almost retired person says: "I'm getting ready to retire soon. Retirement means reinventing yourself in many ways." A couple of dog owners declare: "Well, we've been doing a lot of home renovations, but most importantly we just want to teach our dog to quit eating trash!" while a factory worker pronounces: "I've started a new career recently. This is a fifth-generation company, which means a lot to me. This country was founded on hard work, and it really feels good to be a part of that."

The video and audio montage of Americans plunging confidently into new tasks is reminiscent of Ronald Reagan's 1980 campaign "Morning in America" because, as Gil Troy (2007: 5) wrote, "his Hollywood slick, small town faith in America as a shining 'city upon a hill' restored many Americans' confidence in themselves and their country." The upstart of the Americans in this video harkens to the same feeling of confidence a plunging in that Americans felt when they supported Reagan and believed that everything was fresh and new. Starting a new job, planting a garden, having a child and getting married are

⁶ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N708P-A45D0> (02/02/2018).

activities that people undertake when they believe in something. Every person featured – even the retiree – is optimistically embracing the exciting opportunity of what is ahead. And, then, Hillary Clinton shares what she is getting ready to do, too, perhaps in that same spirit of optimism and excitement for the future.

At first, we see the back of Hillary Clinton as she is talking with a man in a New York Yankees baseball cap, and then we see Hillary Clinton seated, with a cup of coffee, listening to a man with grey hair. We hear Hillary Clinton say, "I'm getting ready to do something too". The camera then faces her head on and she says: "I'm running for President". We then hear her voice as we see video of laborers. Here voiceover continues: "Americans have fought their way back from tough economic times. But the deck is still stacked in favor of those at the top." Again, the camera shows Clinton and she says: "Everyday Americans need a champion, and I want to be that champion. So, you can do more than just get by. You can get ahead, and stay ahead. Because when families are strong, America is strong." The camera again focuses on Clinton who says: "So I'm hitting the road to earn your vote, because it's your time. And I hope you'll join me on this journey."

That we see and hear much less of Hillary Clinton in her 2016 announcement speech than we did in her 2008 one may have been a tactical decision on the part of the Clinton campaign. Having been in the national public eye since 1991, the campaign may have felt the need to quash "Hillary overload" and present her in a much less visible and voluble way. Yale psychologist Victoria Brescoll, in her 2011 study found that the rules of the power game differ for men and women. Using actual speech data from the U.S. Senate, she discovered a significant relationship between power and volubility (i.e., the total time senators spoke on the Senate floor). Because of this difference, "volubility not only plays an important role in establishing power hierarchies but also in communicating one's power to others" (Brescoll, 2011: 623). However, while male senators show a significant relationship between power and volubility, female senators do not. Furthermore, Brescoll found that being conceived of as overly talkative can deflate women's power, not enhance it.

When Brescoll studied CEOs she found that "a female CEO who talked disproportionately longer than others in an organizational setting was rated as significantly less competent and less suitable for leadership than a male CEO who talked for an equivalent amount of time" (*ibid.*: 635). Brescoll's findings point to an obvious "double-bind" that Hillary Clinton has been tasked to overcome in her campaign(s). The job of a candidate for President is to talk in a variety of settings for nearly two years. Conventional political wisdom would assert that this volubility and visibility would only help a candidate. However, for a female candidate, there is strong evidence that talking for several years in public forums may actually do more harm to than good to their candidacy. As the first female nominee from a major political party, Hillary Clinton is breaking new ground in deciphering the nature of being a woman running for President and discerning whether it is possible for a candidate to talk too much.

Clinton's strategy in the 2016 campaign is a grand experiment to find the appropriate balance of talking and listening for a female candidate for president. In her post-campaign

book, *What Happened* (2017), Hillary Clinton ruminates about her choices to speak for others instead of herself. She describes how her choices were based on research that Facebook executive Sheryl Sandberg revealed to her: "For men, likability and professional success are correlated. The more successful a man is, the more people like him. Women – opposite: The more professionally successful we are, the less people like us" (Clinton, 2017: 125). Hillary Clinton may be a listener according to her friends and colleagues, but the success of a candidate still lies in their rhetorical presence and abilities. Furthermore, in *What Happened* Hillary Clinton simply reveals that she did not think her story was riveting enough to capture the imagination of voters. She describes her childhood as "perfectly ordinary" and that "We yearn for that show stopping tale – that one-sentence pitch that captures something magical about America; that hooks you and won't let go. Mine wasn't it" (*Ibid.*: 112). She compared her Midwestern upbringing with her husband's well-worn political narrative: "that Bill Clinton lived for a while on a farm with no indoor plumbing, his father had died before he was born, he stopped his stepfather from beating his mother, he became the first in his family to go to college" (*Ibid.*: 112). Hillary Clinton also reiterates Barack Obama's riveting multi-cultural upbringing: "Raised by a teenage mom and his grandparents, his father was Kenyan, he spent part of his childhood living in Indonesia, worked as a community organizer and law professor" (*Ibid.*). She explains that her narrative, of growing up in a "white, middle-class family in Park Ridge, a suburb, is a story that many would consider perfectly ordinary" (*Ibid.*).

Despite what most voters and historians see as a trailblazing life - one of just 27 women out of 235 students at Yale Law School, the first woman partner at the oldest law firm in Arkansas, the first woman to chair the national board of the Legal Services Corporation, the First Lady to be elected to public office, the first woman Senator from New York, and the first woman to be nominated for president by a major political party and win the national popular vote – the Clinton campaign, and Hillary Clinton herself did not choose to underscore any of these biographical points in her campaign. In her 2016 campaign, Clinton and her team sought to find a balance of speaking, listening, visibility, and silence that would convince American voters to elect her Madam President. Hillary Clinton's action-oriented and forward-thinking "getting ready" harkened back to the "Morning in America" theme of Ronald Reagan, and featured other "everyday Americans" more than it featured the candidate herself. Instead of re-telling her upbringing in Middle America, like she did in 2008, she decided that showing others would make up for what she perceived as her less than riveting biography.

CONCLUSION

The 2008 campaign saw the emergence of a charismatic political star, Barack Obama who captured the hope of the nation and derailed Hillary Clinton's quest for the presidency. The 2016 campaign was one the most negative and uninspiring in United States history. However, Hillary Clinton had to navigate the constraints that women seeking elected office face in public life, and her circumstances are unprecedented. She was the First Lady, a senator, the failed presidential candidate in a close fight for the 2008 nomination, Secretary

of State and finally, in 2016, the nominee for the Democratic Party. Perhaps her campaign believed that the public had grown weary of Hillary Clinton in the eight years since her 2008 announcement speech. She knew she was not a political natural like her husband or Barack Obama, and so her tactic in her announcement speech was vastly different in 2016. These two announcement speeches, eight years apart, offer insight into the ever-evolving public image of Hillary Clinton. Perhaps her long time in the international public sphere made her campaign wary about over-exposure, and thus chose to show more of others that Hillary Clinton in the 2016 video. Certainly, the research by Sheryl Sandberg that suggested showing others, instead of Clinton, a powerful, accomplished woman, was an influence. In 2008, she was introducing herself as a presidential possibility, but by 2016 it was clearly established in the minds of Americans that she was presidential. Furthermore, soaring, inspirational rhetoric is not Hillary Clinton's strength. The 2016 announcement video advanced the themes of her campaign, starting with her listening tour, and focusing on the goals of one of her several campaign tag lines: "everyday Americans." The effort of the Clinton campaign to focus on Hillary Clinton as a listener, more than a speaker, may be found in the campaign throughout the primary and the general election. The differences in the announcement videos by Hillary Clinton hint to the challenges that women candidates must confront: to be seen and not as much heard, to focus on others and to be the leader that touts not their own physical presence or persona, but what she can do for others.

References

- >Anderson, Vasby Karrin (2002) From Spouses to Candidates: Hillary Rodham Clinton, Elizabeth Dole, and the Gendered Office of U.S. President. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 5 (1): 105-132. DOI: 10.1353/rap.2002.0001.
- >Anthony, Carl Sferrazza (1990) *First Ladies: The Saga of the Presidents' Wives and Their Power 1789-1961*. New York: William Morrow and Company.
- >Arthurs, Jane, Drakopoulou, Sophia and Gandini, Alessandro (2018) Researching YouTube. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* 24 (1): 3-15. DOI: 10.1177/1354856517737222.
- >Benoit, William L. and Glantz, Mark J. (2012) A Functional Analysis of 2008 General Election Presidential TV Spots. *Speaker & Gavel* 49 (1): 22-41.
- >Brescoll, Victoria (2011) Who Takes the Floor and Why. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 56 (4): 622-641. DOI: 10.1177/0001839212439994.
- >Burgess, Jean and Green, Joshua (2009) *YouTube: Online Video and Participatory Culture*. Cambridge: Polity.
- >Burns, Lisa M. (2008) *First Ladies and the Fourth Estate; Press Framing of Political Wives*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press.
- >Carlin, Diana and Winfrey, Kelly L. (2009) Have You Come a Long Way, Baby? Hillary Clinton, Sarah Palin, and Sexism in 2008 Campaign Coverage. *Communication Studies* 60 (4): 326-343. DOI: 10.1080/10510970903109904.
- >Chozick, Amy (2018) *Chasing Hillary*. New York: Harper.
- >Clinton, Hillary (2017) *What Happened*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- >Clinton, Hillary (2004) *Living History*. New York: Scribner.
- >Deason, Grace, Greenlee, Jill S. and Langner, Carrie A. (2015) Mothers on the campaign trail: implications of Politicized Motherhood for women in politics. *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 3 (1): 133-148. DOI: 10.1080/21565503.2014.992792.

- >Green, Joshua (2008) The Front-Runner's Fall. *The Atlantic*. <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2008/09/the-front-runner-s-fall/306944/> (03/07/2018).
- >Gutgold Nichola (2009) *Almost Madam President: Why Hillary Clinton 'Won' in 2008*. Lexington Books.
- >Healy, Patrick (2007) Clinton's Success in Presidential Race Is No Sure Thing. *Nytimes.com*. <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/01/21/us/politics/21dems.html> (02/02/2018).
- >Kanter, Rosabeth Moss (1993) *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- >Kayam, Orly (2018) The Readability and Simplicity of Donald Trump's Language. *Political Studies Review* 16 (1): 73–88. DOI: 10.1177/1478929917706844.
- >Miller, Melissa K. and Peake, Jeffrey S. (2013) Press Effects, Public Opinion, and Gender: Coverage of Sarah Palin's Vice-Presidential Campaign. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 18 (4): 482–507. DOI: 10.1177/1940161213495456.
- >Nicholas, Peter (2008) Clinton to get moment in the convention sun. *LATimes*. <http://articles.latimes.com/2008/aug/15/nation/na-clinton15> (03/07/2018).
- >Palmieri, Jennifer (2018) *Dear Madam President: An Open Letter to the Women Who Will Run the World*. New York: Grand Central Publishing.
- >Sullivan, Amy (2005) Hillary in 2008? *Washington Monthly*. <https://washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/julyaugust-2005/hillary-in-2008-3/> (03/07/2018).
- >Trent, Judith, Friedenber, Robert, Denton, Robert (2011) *Political Campaign Communication: Principles and Practices*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- >Trent, Judith (2005) Surfacing in 2004: The Democrats Emerge, pp. 1-28 in Denton, Richard (ed.) *The 2004 Presidential Campaign, a Communication Perspective*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- >Troy, Gil (2007) *Morning in America: How Ronald Reagan Invented the 1980's*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. DOI: 10.1515/9781400849307.
- >Van Zoonen, Liesbet (2006) The Personal, the Political and the Popular. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 9 (3): 287-301. DOI: 10.1177/13675494060666074.
- >Wasburn, Philo C. and Wasburn, Mara H. (2011) Media Coverage of Women in Politics: The Curious Case of Sarah Palin. *Media, Culture & Society* 33 (7): 1027–1041. DOI: 10.1177/0163443711415744.
- >Washington Post (2009) *Clinton 41% Favorite*. <http://www.washingtonpost.com> (21/01/2015).
- >Watson, Robert (1997) The First Lady Reconsidered: Presidential Partner and Political Institution. *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 27 (4): 805-818.
- >Wattenhofer, Mirjam, Wattenhofer, Roger and Zack Zhu (2012) *The YouTube Social Network*. <http://www.researchgate.net> (10/02/2018).

"U IGRI SAM I TU SAM KAKO BIH POBIJEDILA": ANALIZA NAJAVNIH VIDEOOGLASA HILLARY CLINTON NA PREDSDJEDNIČKIM IZBORIMA 2008. I 2016. GODINE

Nichola D. Gutgold :: Johnna Purcell

SAŽETAK Poznato je da prvi dojam može presudno utjecati na cjelokupni odnos. Taj prvi dojam u politici se često uspostavlja putem najavnih videooglasa. Stvaranje prvog dojma bilo je puno složenije za Hillary Clinton nego za većinu ostalih političara, s obzirom na to da je ona bila prisutna u javnosti puno prije nego što se kandidirala za predsjednicu SAD-a. Ovaj članak uspoređuje njezina dva predsjednička videooglasa – onaj iz 2008. i onaj iz 2016. Cilj je analize utvrditi kakav je dojam Hillary Clinton htjela ostaviti na američke birače, iako nema sumnje da su oni već ranije stvorili sliku o njoj iz vremena koje je provela kao Prva dama, zatim kao senatorica iz New Yorka i konačno, nakon predsjedničkih izbora 2008., kao ministrica vanjskih poslova.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI

RETORIKA, NAJAVNI VIDEOOGLASI, PREDSDJEDNIK, SAD, HILLARY CLINTON

Bilješka o autoricama _____

Nichola D. Gutgold :: Sveučilište Penn State, Lehigh Valley Campus, USA ::

ngutgold@psu.edu

Johnna Purcell :: Sveučilište Penn State, Schreyer Honors College, USA ::

johnnapurcell146@gmail.com