THE IMPACT OF GENDER ON THE USE OF METAPHORS IN MEDIA REPORTS
COVERING THE 2003 GULF WAR IN IRAQ

_____

A Thesis presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
at the University of Missouri-Columbia

_____

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

_____

by
SUSAN B. HOLLINGSWORTH

Dr. Don Ranly, Thesis Supervisor

DECEMBER 2006

The undersigned, appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, have examined the thesis entitled

THE IMPACT OF GENDER ON THE USE OF METAPHORS IN MEDIA REPORTS
COVERING THE 2003 GULF WAR IN IRAQ

Presented by Susan B. Hollingsworth

a candidate for the degree of Master of Arts

and hereby certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

_____
Don Ranly

_____
Glenn Leshner

_____
Debbie Dougherty

_____
Mary Kay Blakely

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Don Ranly has long been my hero of the spoken and written word. He is a passionate, albeit tough, teacher whose classes I took as often as I could, and I learned so much from him over the years. His wisdom and support through the process that has lead to the completion of this degree has been invaluable. He has proven to be a good guide and someone whom I hold dear.

Glenn Leshner was my methods person, and it was from him that I learned that if I was not going to do it right, I might as well not do it at all. I had numbers, and far too many of them, and rather than allowing me to brush them aside when I perceived that I had taken on too big a project, he made me look at them long and hard and then explain them in detail. This was a difficult task, but he, relentlessly at times, held me to it. Glenn was a tough task-master, and for this I (now) thank him.

MK Blakely is probably the reason I thought an advanced degree was a good idea. We walked and talked many years ago, at the beginning of this journey, and she actually made me feel that this was not only a good thing, but something that I could do and do well. There were points along the way that I doubted her, and being the wise one she is, she recognized this and reminded me that this was within my reach whenever she knew I needed reminding.

Debbie Dougherty was the outside member of the committee. I could think a very long time about how to thank her and never get the wording just right because she did so much for me that it almost goes beyond description. This woman is the epitome of style, class, grace, smarts, verve, and she is not short on pluck either. In other words, she is

really something else- a description that does not come even remotely close to defining the giant human she is. She is the reason I stuck this out. She is the reason I did not cave in when the going got tough and though I have not (yet) taken a class from her, she has taught me more about scholarship and courage than anyone I know.   I have embarrassed us both by saying such things in the past, so sorry, Debbie, but thanks.

Doing graduate work while working full time plus is a big, sometimes seemingly insurmountable endeavor, but this group of scholars, along with the journalism school's incredible student advocate, the ever unflappable Amy Lenk, pulled me along. I thank you all.

And there are two other faculty members whom I must thank; they are my adviser, Fritz Cropp, and my incredible, wonderful friend, confidant and husband, Marc Linit. Though these two men had decidedly different roles in this process, they shared one thing in that they both helped keep me afloat by making me laugh; a couple of times with tears at the ready. I never left Fritz's office without feeling better than I did when I went in, and I am not certain I can even pinpoint what it was we ever talked about. And I have never left Marc Linit's side without knowing that this man believes in me. It is difficult not to believe in oneself with the kind of support and love a husband like this has to offer. Thanks, Bootey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

1. INTRODUCTION

War throughout history has profoundly influenced gender. In every known case, past and present, cultures have met the challenges of war by assembling groups of fighters who were primarily, and usually exclusively, male. (Goldstein, 2001). War is seen as a masculine activity and a test of manhood (Wilson, 1992), and military service becomes a marker of masculinist patriotism (Jorgensen, 1992). War impacts the lives of each member of society it touches, yet in our society it remains quintessentially male gendered. This gendering has the tendency to masculinize the heroes who gallantly rush off to war to keep their nation safe (from other men), and to feminize the women's role as the virtuous, peaceful, supporting wife and mother quietly awaiting her man's return from the front (Wilson, 1992).

Many societies have lived by war or perished by war, but very few have mobilized women to fight (Goldstein, 2001). Despite this fact, women, who have been instrumental in every war this nation has known, have managed to serve in the military in combat roles from the Revolutionary War onward (Peach, 1997). They have abetted war efforts, suffered and died as a result of war, yet they are still metaphorically located in the private sphere (Adams, 1997), and their experience in and thoughts about war have largely been omitted from the discourse.

Nations, still, are masculine entities: they are (mostly) created and ruled by men and their actions are judged by a masculine standard (Haslanger, 2003). In the public domain, greater power is generally accorded to men than women, and it is therefore generally the case that conflict and its resolution become a male prerogative (Taylor &

Bernstein Miller, 1994) because, "despite far-reaching political, social, and technological changes, the warrior still seems to be a key symbol of masculinity" (Morgan, 1994. p. 165), and the maiden that of femininity. Yet, with more than 200,000 active servicewomen in the U.S. military (U.S. Census Bureau, 2003), one must question why our society clings so tightly to the perception of this gendered ideology as natural and inevitable, perhaps even right and good (Bucholtz, 2003).

Feminist scholars offer convincing evidence that perceptions of gender can matter more than facts (Lenz & Myerhoff, 1985; Rakow, 1986).   And though these tropes on the social identities of men and women, past and present, do not denote what men and women really are in time of war (Kummel, 2002), the fact remains that the existence of this dichotomous system of meaning affects us all nonetheless. Whether we want to or not, we see ourselves and others against the templates of this gender-divided community (Cohn, 1993) upon which patriarchy depends (Steeves, 1987) and hegemony thrives.

The media are largely instrumental in projecting the reality of war and often frame war with metaphors. Metaphoric language shapes thought, and because war is so pervasive in our metaphorical understanding, we need to be especially observant of the use of metaphors that configure war (Lule, 2003). One of the more common postmodern war metaphors is known as the nation as a person metaphor, where a single masculine pronoun is used to refer to all the people of the nation (Cohn, 1993). An example of this is seen in our current war in Iraq where we are told that the war is not being waged against the Iraqi people, but only against one person, Saddam Hussein. Ordinary American citizens are using this metaphor when they say, "Saddam is a tyrant who must be stopped" (Lakoff, 2003 p. 1). Additionally, the nation as a person metaphor uses

2

language that is often wrapped up in physical battles eliciting the prowess of the male

hero over the male villain, with women almost always playing the role of the victim

(Lakoff, 2003).

Another common metaphor is the sports metaphor. By using sports as a

metaphor, the perpetuation of male dominance in war, as in public life, is seen as

unproblematic (Jorgensen, 1992). The interchangeability of the language from the

domains of war and sports, particularly football, blurs the distinctions so the participation

in war loses its own reality to be replaced by the glory of the spectacle or the competition

(Cooke, 1993).

The use of both the sports and nation as a person metaphor is associated with a

predominantly male language, a language that women may feel distinctly uncomfortable

using (Wilson, 1992) because they have long been excluded from the worlds of sports

and war. Yet, now that women have (seemingly) greater agency in the matters of war, as

war reporters and soldiers, their voices will be represented in the media's discourse in

significant numbers, and the metaphors they choose to frame war will reflect their

experiences in the world of war.

The very taken-for-grantedness of culture can blind members to important

assumptions. In the creation of hegemonic meanings, in order for one meaning to be

regularly produced, it had to win a kind of credibility, legitimacy, or taken-for-

grantedness for itself (Hall, 1982). This study will look to see if the taken-for-grantedness

of the male warrior and the female victim remain, or if women's increased presence and

prominence is introducing new metaphors in the media.

This study is important because human history is marked by warfare (Weinstein & White, 1997), and women's exclusion from that history was not caused by their absence; they were silenced (Cinco, 1999). A news blackout of women's war experiences, or distortions of these experiences, inadvertently hides many crucial issues that would otherwise improve the public's understanding of war (Zoch & Turk, 1998).   It is profoundly important to know what women think about war and what happens to women during and following periods of war, and it is vital to hear it from women themselves.   Women, because of their role as peripheral to matters of war, may have different insights and understandings about war in our society.

To carry out this study, a content analysis was conducted on war reports in *The New York Times* and on National Public Radio's (NPR's) *Morning Edition* during three one-week periods over a six-month time span, beginning the first week of the war in March 2003.

The New York Times was chosen because it is our nation's paper of record, and it is important to examine the type of presence women's voices have therein today, particularly since past studies have shown that women had rarely been quoted on the front page of that prestigious paper in matters of international importance (Zoch & Turk, 1998). Success for women at *The New York Times* is vital because it says that the most prestigious paper in the country thinks it is important that women do the same jobs as men professionally (Mills, 1988).

NPR's *Morning Edition* was chosen in order to expand the study by including another news genre. *Morning Edition* was selected because of its large audience. NPR reported an increased listenership during the intense news cycle following the September

4

11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the U.S. From Fall 2000 to Fall 2001, *Morning Edition* jumped from 10.7 to 13 million listeners (NPR, 2001).

Wartime may not be the ideal time for new metaphors to emerge on the scene, particularly if they are contrary to the party line (Dowler, 2002). But, it will be interesting to see if an increased presence of women in the media and the military offers differing points of view from those expressed by men, or an increase in women sources. Although women don't always do stories that involve women or use women as sources, men do so with far less regularity (Mills, 1988).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

One of the fundamental findings of cognitive science is that people think in terms of frames and metaphors. Ortony (1975) believes that metaphors provide a compact version of an event without having to spell out detail. Powerful language and metaphors set a tone, provide direction and gain commitment (Edelman, 1977). Metaphors can help make sense of reality. Lackoff and Johnson (1980) argue that metaphors are pervasive not just in language but in thought and action. Lakoff (2003) suggests that metaphoric facts can become so familiar that when the facts no longer fit the frames, the frames and metaphors are kept and the facts ignored. And Wilson (1992) reminds us that if we are unaware of metaphors we risk being imprisoned by them.

The mass media's ability to impact the construction of reality by framing images of reality in a predictable and patterned way (McQuail, 1994) plays a large part in this phenomenon. Because of these patterns, we come to accept even outdated versions of reality, such as women's peripheral role in matters of war, because they have come to seem natural.

Looking through a framing theory lens and placing gender at the center of analysis of the reporting on the war in Iraq, this study will explore whether the media reports on war offer an accurate reflection of the times or if they are trapped in notions about women's place in the private sphere, even as told by women who are undeniably in the public sphere.

Framing Theory

One of the most fertile areas of current research in journalism and mass

communication involves the concept of framing (Meyer, 1999; Reese, 2001; & Benford

& Snow, 2000). Framing, a theory used in various fields throughout the social sciences,

is an issue of selection and salience (Entman, 1993). To frame is "to select some aspects

of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way

as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation,

and/or treatment recommendation for the item described" (Entman, 1993, p. 52).

A frame is a "central organizing idea or storyline that provides meaning to an

unfolding strip of events. The frames suggest what the controversy is about, and what is

the essence of the issue" (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989 p. 3). Media frames also serve as

working routines for journalists that allow them to quickly identify and classify

information and to package it for efficient relay to their audiences (Gitlin, 1980).

Selecting a frame for a story is one of the most important decisions a journalist

makes and identifying and developing alternative frames is a high journalistic practice

(Smith, 1997). Frames organize news stories and other discourses by their patterns of

emphasis, interpretation, and exclusion (Carragee & Roefs, 2004). The texts contain

frames, evidenced by the presence or absence of certain keywords, stereotypes, sources

of information, facts and judgments (Entman, 1993). Communicators make framing

judgments in deciding what to say, guided by frames, which are often called schemata of

interpretation (Goffman, 1974), that organize their belief systems.

Journalists provide salience to some ideas over others (St. Clair, 2003), and,

thereby, convey a dominant frame (Entman, 1993). To identify a meaning as dominant is

to suggest its meaning is congruent with the most common audience schemata. Dominant

frames often require no examination or explanation (Shoemaker & Reese, 1996), and

they can attain great social power. Frames, once entrenched, are hard to dispel (Lakoff,

2003).

Being able to designate salience reflects the social power of journalism, which

lies precisely in the inclusion of certain voices and the exclusion of others (McCombs &

Bell, 1996). It matters profoundly what and who gets represented, what and who

regularly and routinely gets left out, and how things, people, events and relationships are

represented (Hall, 1986). News indicates to the reader who is in possession of knowledge

that is important enough to report (Zoch & Turk, 1998).

Placement can also make bits of information more salient, as can associating them

with culturally familiar symbols (Entman, 1993). Symbolic elements work together to

constitute a frame. They include images, catch phrases, depictions and metaphors

(Reese, 2001). Once a term, a frame, an idea, a symbol or a metaphor is widely accepted,

to use another is to risk the communicator's credibility with their audience because the

dominant frame is seen as natural.

Journalists actively construct frames to structure and make sense of incoming

information and package it in an efficient manner that is culturally familiar. The

information they receive, combined with their existing assumptions of the political and

social world (Donsbach, 1981) is eventually reflected in the way journalists frame news

coverage. It can be expected that journalists, like their audiences, are equally susceptible

to the very frames they use to describe events (Scheufele, 1999) in that they use those same frames in their reports (Fishman, 1980). McCombs & Estrada (1997) see framing as the prism through which journalists see events or issues as they process the news. They see news as received not as reality or even as a perceived reality, but as a social construction in which the news has been framed.

If frames decide what content is relevant to discussion of a social concern (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989), then frames need to be fully understood. Frames are means of community building (Pan & Kosicki, 2001), and it is important to explore how different points of view (frames) are contested or struggled over in the public arena. Frames structure our understanding of social phenomena by defining the roles varied individuals, groups, organizations and institutions play. A particular group may seem essential. Some groups may be left out entirely. Frames outline the ways that various beliefs, values and actions are related (Hertzog & McLeod, 1995).

Framing is central in the democratic process because the political elites control the framing of many issues (Zaller, 1992).   News stories, then, become a forum for framing contests in which political actors compete by sponsoring their preferred definitions of issues.

> Media frames. . . do not develop in a vacuum. The ability of a frame to dominate news discourse depends on multiple complex factors, including its sponsor's economic and cultural resources, its sponsor's knowledge of journalistic practices, and its resonance with broader political values or tendencies in American culture. (Gamson, Croteau, Hoynes, & Sasson 1992, 385)

An examination of frame sponsorship acknowledges that access to news as a political resource is distributed inequitably within American society and that this inequality has profound implications for the framing of issues (Carragee & Roefs, 2004).

9

Given the practices of journalism and the significance of resources in the successful sponsoring of frames, framing contests routinely favor political elites as sources (Gitlin, 1980; Tuchman, 1978).

The frames of one or another stakeholder groups become ascendant when they resonate with the values and experiences of public life. What happens is a cyclical process similar to that described by Noelle-Neumann (1984) in her Spiral of Science theory. As one side of an issue gains support, it gains potency to drive out advocacy for the opposing side. When groups see one frame is resonating, they adjust their rhetoric. Groups that find their position enhanced by the resonant frame use its terminology to promote their point of view (Miller & Riechert, 2001).

Framing Theory and War

Framing theory is regarded as especially relevant to the study of media in political life (Reese, 2001), and particularly in times of war. The media's agenda is an important issue in framing because we know that government sources are vital to the media in times of war and framing shows how government officials could actually form the basis of public opinion during these times (Iyengar, 1991). This is a critical concept when analyzing news of war in a foreign country because, for most people, it is only through the media that they receive information regarding the war, so, as Brooten (2004) explains, the metaphors used to frame war help determine how the citizenry talks and thinks about the war.

The routines involved in the media/military relationship have their own logic that shapes news content beyond the simple suppression or censorship of news. They impose an interpretive framework that works against alternative perspectives. As with other media-source relationships, the strong dependence of journalists on the military for information can produce co-optation, leading to uncritical acceptance of military frames (Brooten, 2004). This is often signified in news discourse by use of "we" and similar terms that identify reporters with governmental and military interests (Shoemaker & Reese, 1996).

Political ideologies are framed in metaphorical terms. The frames and metaphors put forth through the language used by military and defense analysts has demonstrated how the body of language used by these experts increasingly shapes how we talk and think about war and act to exclude other ways of speaking about war (Cohn, 1993). War can be viewed as a manifestation of maleness, and a use of the metaphors of war strengthens the individual's sense of maleness, a spirit of assertive maleness and a predominantly male culture (Wilson, 1992). The metaphors may be seen as attempts to maintain a culture, which is characterized by its maleness (Wilson, 1992). Like all other metaphors, political metaphors hide aspects of reality. But in the area of politics, metaphors matter more because they constrain our lives.

A threat to a nation toggles an ideal of masculinity from the rational man to the passionate patriot. The patriot puts country before self and the nation before the individual. Patriots are permitted to sacrifice innocents, override democratic institutions and forgo rational debate (Haslanger, 2003). Furthermore, it is feminine and unpatriotic

11

to consider the individuals who may suffer, the points of view of the enemy or to govern

one's actions by the values of reason, democracy and freedom (Haslanger, 2003).

Del Zotto (2002) found:

> By focusing almost exclusively on the metaphors, strategies and discourses of
> the elite actors, and relegating the role of non-elite actors as mere casualties,
> the media misses a very important aspect of war; namely, that war is an
> intimate affair. It is under these more intimate conditions of war that we often
> find the root causes of conflict and where we also see women playing a central
> rather than peripheral role in addressing such conflict. (p. 142)

Feminism and Framing

From its inception, feminism has not quite known whether to fight men or to join

them; whether to lament sex differences and deny their importance or to acknowledge

and even valorize such differences (Elshtain, 1987) and on what issues (Freedman, 2001).

That may be one reason why there is no consensus on the exact meaning of the word

feminist. However, one could argue that all feminists call for changes in the social,

economic, political or cultural order, to reduce and eventually overcome the

discrimination against women (Freedman, 2001). And, nearly all feminist theory is

grounded in a concern about the subjugated status of women (Cirksena & Cuklanz,

1992).

One of the fundamental beliefs of feminism is that gender is culturally constructed

(Vargus, 2002) and not biologically constructed. Yet, the eagerness of some scientists to

establish a biological basis for gender difference, and the public's eagerness to take these

findings up, shows that we put a good deal of work into emphasizing, producing and

enforcing the dichotomous categories of male and female (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet,

2003) because they seem natural, and to do otherwise would go against the status quo and social mores of the times.

Generally speaking, most feminists believe that individuals are not born with gendered traits. Gender is learned. Gender is a system of meaning, a way of constructing male and female (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003). Gender is determined by the composite of shared expectations and norms within a society concerning appropriate female and male behaviors, characteristics and roles (Strickland & Duvvury, 2003). The status quo of gender roles forms the major source of social inequality (Moser & Peak, 1987) because it repeatedly locates women in a subordinate position.

Gender discourse, then, is the phenomenon of symbolically organizing the world into gender-associated opposites or binaries (Cohn, 1993), and language is the primary means through which we maintain these gendered divisions (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003) that we are so used to that we do not even think about them. The impact of gender discourse in matters of war is that some issues get left off the table for discussion (Cohn, 1993) simply because they are seen as unimportant, or are written off merely because they offer a woman's perspective.

Challenging gender discourse requires more than making sure that women's voices are heard, it must also include an analysis and understanding about how certain ways of thinking become devalued and silenced (Brooten, 2004). It is precisely because gender seems natural and beliefs about gender seem to be obvious truth that we need to step back and examine the language that is used to perpetuate patriarchy (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003), and to discover if women use or refrain from using this language.

13

The basic insight produced by feminist theory of the 20th century is that women in patriarchy are constructed as the other, as whatever men are not. Femininity is seen as masculinity inverted (Cameron, 1985). Feminist ontology, or the study of how we are, suggests that the gendering process is grounded in ideas from the Enlightenment, a European philosophical movement dating from the 1700's. During this period, thinking was organized into the dualisms under which we live today: mind/body, public/private, nature/culture, reason/emotion, political/personal (Bleir, 1987), aggressive/passive, confrontational/accommodating, abstract/particular (Cohn, 1993), and the list goes on.

The assumption underlying these pairs of supposed opposites is that one of them is associated with maleness and the other with femaleness, leading to the conclusion that male is opposite of female. This system of dichotomies encode many meanings that may be quite unrelated to male and female bodies (Cohn, 1993), yet it acts to shape a system of meanings, images and words that dichotomize the world and how we think about it. These gender categories and assumptions guide how men and women in different contexts conceptualize themselves and how a society defines the sexes (Macionis, 1992). The result is that we live in a culture built on a particular set of gendered assumptions structured to amplify if not produce gender asymmetries and inequalities, with the set of terms most associated with masculinity consistently favored over the set associated with femininity, gendering them in the process (Cohn, 1993) to the disadvantage of women (Vargus, 2002).

Contemporary feminists have analyzed the Enlightenment's construction of the public/private split in order to demarcate a public realm of reason and subjective sovereignty as essentially abstract, disinterested and above-all male (Fuller & Waugh,

14

1998). Public space has always been about the business of men (Haslanger, 2003), and

women were excluded from public and ritual speech and seen as incompatible with the

sphere of rhetoric (Cameron, 1985). This was due, in large part, to the fact that women

were gendered as irrational and emotional, and this made it easy to exclude them from the

polity (Cirksnea & Cuklanz, 1992).

Excluding women from public discourse is a political act; much the same way the

battle over news frames is a political process (Norris, 1997).   Gurevitch and Levy (1985)

argued that "the media ought to be seen as a site on which various social groups,

institutions, and ideologies struggle over the definition and construction of social reality"

(p.19). And if that is so, women's voices must, necessarily, be a part of the struggle. The

institutions and texts of mass media largely structure public life and suffuse it with

meaning. News media are integral to the process of initiating, perpetuating and even

expanding identities of persons associated with or thrust in the political-public realm

(Vargus, 2002).

The media have direct access to the public in a way that few groups have, and

according to Tuchman (1978) news workers are among a society's most powerful social

actors when it comes to constructing social reality by producing and reproducing social

meanings. Today, women have increased opportunities to frame the world from their

perspective. As journalists they can use more women sources, and they can find more

women in the military to use as sources of authority. Women in the media, the military

and many professional situations are familiar with the way society, and the media in

particular, frame women as the opposite and lesser sex. As women who are making it in

traditionally male professions, they would be more likely to refrain from using metaphors

that suggest their inferior status, and, more importantly, use their positions to bring forth

new frames and metaphors that reflect their experiences.

Women have shifted from the observers role to the participants role in war

matters in the public sphere, and, as Virginia Woolf (1938) reminds us, women, as

spectators from "the threshold of the private house," might bring different perspectives

as they become participants in public life because their outsider's position gives them an

important vantage point from which to contribute to public debate. (p.18)

H1: Women reporters use more women sources than men reporters.

Gender Ideology and Framing

Ideology is the system of beliefs by which people explain, account for, and justify

their behavior, and interpret and assess that of others. Gender ideology is the set of

beliefs that govern people's participation in the gender order, and by which they explain

and justify that participation (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003). The dominant ideology

in Western society is based on the male/female dichotomy that is publicly understood and

frequently justified (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003). It does not simply prescribe that

males and females should be different, it insists that they simply are different. This view

is referred to as essentialism (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003).

Gender theorists have often used a framing approach to explore how the media

use traditional frames, which are built around the dominance of men (Fountaine &

McGregor, 2003). This framing made it difficult for women to be considered as anything

other than outsiders (Fountaine & McGregor, 2003) because it is the male domain that is

16

associated with the public sphere and matters of politics, reason, justice, objectivity, power and war. The female identity is seen as far removed from public matters and of war and its discourse (Goldstein, 2001) because of their supposed position in the private sphere.

In any attempt to understand the function of gender, attention to metaphors in media presentations and discussions makes sense because during wartime gender becomes especially important in structuring discourse (Brooten, 2004). War's destruction brings into being a gallery of particular male and female identities that we divide into male soldiers on the battlefront and women on the home front. But this reduction overlooks or eliminates many alternatives for both males and females (Elshtain, 1987). Perhaps this is why women have acquiesced for so long about their perceived role in matters of war; because beyond their reproductive roles, women are stereotypically gendered to be the keepers of a group's culture, expected to preserve tradition in the home and reflect the virtue of the nation (Goldstein, 2001). To do otherwise would compromise their gender ideology, their womanhood and their patriotic duty.

Gender stereotypes are pervasive in our culture, and the media play an important role in gender hegemony. The popular press is largely responsible for the way in which women and men are portrayed as fundamentally different. One of the core beliefs of our society is that women and men are the opposite sexes (Kahn & Yoder, 1989). Men are framed as masculine, strong, ambitious, successful, rational, and non-emotional. Women are framed as feminine, attractive, deferential, unaggressive, emotional, nurturing and

concerned with people and relationships (Goldstein, 2001). Such frames are found

repeatedly in the popular press, which perpetuates the myths.

We in the West are the heirs of a tradition that assumes an affinity between

women and peace, between men and war, and a tradition that consists of culturally

constructed and transmitted myths and memories. In time of war, men and women take

on the personas of just warrior and beautiful souls (Elshtain, 1987). "Men fight as

avatars of a nation's sanctioned violence. They are the life takers. Women work and

weep and sometimes protest. They are the life givers and the collective 'other' to the

male warrior" (Elshtain, 1987. p.4).

Elshtain (1987) explains that by:

> Viewing themselves through the lens of this construction, men see edifying tales
> of courage, duty, honor, glory as they engage in the acts of protection, defense
> and daring: heroic deed doing. Women see edifying stories of nobility, sacrifice,
> duty, and quiet immortality as they engage in defensive acts of protection, the
> non-heroics of taking care of. (p. 165)

This limits the role of women, particularly as a role model or hero (Dowler, 2002).

Ways of thinking become common sense when we cease to notice their

provenance, and this happens when they occur continually in enough places in everyday

discourse (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003). A discourse may have a privileged status

in society by virtue of the power of the people who engage in it. It can be heard in more

places and get more airtime associated with voices of authority (Reese, 2001). This is

certainly the case in the discourse of war in the media, where men have long been the

privileged knowers of such matters.

When the topic is war, female voices, and feminist voices in particular, are

ignored (Douglas, 1994). Over recent decades, a body of women-centered theory has

18

begun to look critically at the way in which political and media institutions function to exclude or limit women from their operational orbits (Benhabib, 1992; Zoonen, 1994; Holland, 1987). It is an unreal image presented when women, who make up 52 percent of the population, are rarely quoted on issues of national or international importance, or are seldom quoted on the front page of *The New York Times* (Zoch & Turk, 1998).

While Tuchman's (1978) symbolic annihilation, which is the study of the media's condescending, trivializing and omission of women's voices, remains an important reference point, Fountaine & McGregor (2003) question whether media reports reflect the current reality of women's involvement with war. They found that Tuchman's (1978) trivialization still occurs, and there is evidence that female perspectives are still omitted in some areas.

Hegemony and Framing War

Historically, women have not had an equal opportunity to frame war in the media because of their role in the private sphere. Yet, if as a normative ideal, public deliberation is the essence of democracy (Pan & Kosicki, 2001), then an absence of women's voices in the media's discourse of war falls directly in line with the definition of hegemony. The media have long written women's participation in war into roles more compatible to the domestic realm such as helpmate to the male warrior, and in so doing, have not only devalued that role (Dowler, 2003) but also ignored the multiple additional roles women have performed and their reactions to those experiences.

19

Hegemony is a Marxist concept derived largely from the work of Antonio

Gramsci, a leading Italian Marxist. He was an intellectual, a journalist and a major

theorist who spent his last eleven years in Mussolini's prisons (Burke, 1999). While in

prison, he produced the influential series of essays posthumously assembled as *The*

Prison Notebooks. It was in *The Prison Notebooks* that Gramsci developed the concept of

hegemony to describe a condition in which the supremacy of a social group is achieved

not only by physical force but also through consensual submission of the very people

who were dominated (Litowitz, 2000).

The most effective kind of domination takes place when both the dominant and

dominated classes believe that the existing order, with perhaps some marginal changes, is

satisfactory, or at least represents the most that anyone could expect, because things

pretty much have to be the way they are (Gramsci, 1971). Put simply, Litowitz (2000)

explains:

> domination requires the establishment of an entire way of life as standard and
> expected, the identification of the dominated with the dominators, and the subtle
> establishment of the prevailing ideology as natural and inevitable, indeed
> commonsensical. When domination reaches the internal world of the actors,
> resistance is almost unthinkable. (P. 524)

Gramsci (1971) claimed that the mass media are tools that ruling elites use to

perpetuate their power, wealth, and status by popularizing their own philosophy, culture

and morality. According to Boggs (1976) Gramsci maintained that:

> Hegemony. . .might be defined as an 'organizing principle' that is diffused by the
> process of socialization into every area of daily life. To the extent that this
> prevailing consciousness is internalized by the population it becomes part of
> what is generally called 'common sense' so that the philosophy, culture and
> morality of the ruling elite comes to appear as the natural order of things. (p.39)

In an influential analysis of Gramsci, Raymond Williams (1960) identifies hegemony as something that is largely unconscious, as opposed to ideological belief structures that can be consciously articulated and contested. He feels that hegemony is so deeply ingrained that it can scarcely be brought into the open and challenged. Hegemony, Litowitz (2000) explains is not the type of phenomenon that can be directly observed. Individuals do not blurt out: "I am subject to hegemony" (p.17). Rather, hegemony is diagnosed through a kind of social criticism where we stand outside of our practices and institutions and see that they are one-sided to an extent that we did not recognize while we were operating within their boundaries (Litowitz, 2000).

To others, hegemony is virtually indistinguishable from ideology. Eagleton (1991) admits hegemony and ideology have a substantial overlap and can be difficult to distinguish in many cases. Like hegemony, ideology structures the common understanding of the nature of the world that is shared by members of a society. Ideology is the system of beliefs by which people explain, account for, and justify their behavior, and interpret and assess that of others (Eckert &McConnell-Ginet, 2003). A dominant ideology also typically owes its success not to brute power and conscious imposition, but to the ability to convince people that it is not in fact a matter of ideology at all, but simply natural, the way things are (Hertzog & McLeod, 2001).   Hegemony is the process by which ideology is naturalized.

The media play an influential role in the hegemonic process through the control of content and how they frame that content. Even in free, democratic societies, the media are obliged to uphold their state's official policies regarding any given war (Del Zotto, 2002). Therefore, many aspects of war, including, if not especially, the complexities of

women's experiences in war, may contradict a government's official position (Eldridge, 1995). Owners and managers of media industries can reproduce the content of ideas favorable to them far more easily than other social groups because they manage key socializing institutions, thereby guaranteeing that their points of view are constantly and attractively cast into the public arena (Zaller, 1992). Being key parts of the economic system that are controlled by those with economic power, mass media carry an ideology consistent with those interests, which helps ensure that society will continue in its present form (Shoemaker & Reese, 1996).   And in our society, one key form is patriarchy.

Women Framing News

The masculine character of news is recognized in the choice of sources and spokespersons who are overwhelmingly male. "News is not simply mostly about and by men, it is overwhelmingly seen through men"   (Hartley, 1982 p.146). However, there is currently an increase in the number of women in the military, politics, and other professions (Schudson, 2003), and with these increases there will be more women framing news and their frames may not reinforce their subordinate position in society because powerful, professional women may not see themselves in such a position.

Historically, women were badly underrepresented in front-page news stories (Hernandez, 1994) and coverage of politics (Norris, 1997). When women were included as news sources, they tended to be defined in terms of their relationship to the principal (typically male) news actor in a particular story (Carter, Branston & Allan, 1998). They were routinely presented either as an anonymous example of uninformed public opinion,

as housewife, consumer, neighbor, or relative of the man in the news, or as a victim. Thus, not only did they speak less frequently, they tended to speak as passive reactors and witnesses to public events rather than as participants in those events (Holland, 1987).

Female sources were quoted less frequently in stories on the front page of the "A" section than on the front of the metro or local section, no matter the sex of the reporter (Bybee, 1990). In addition, both the length of attributions by female sources and the length of the stories in which female sources appeared were shorter than those of male sources. A study on news sources conducted by Howard (2002) found that after U.S. politicians, unclassified citizens were the most common individual type of source, providing 20 percent of all quotes. While women made up only 15 percent of total sources, they represented more than double that share, 40 percent, of the ordinary citizens in the news. Thus, men are quoted as the vast majority of authoritative voices while presenting women as non-experts. More than half of the women (52 percent) who appeared on the news were presented as average citizens, whereas only 14 percent of male sources were.

Stories featuring males, stories in which males are identified within the story - in the headline or in the first paragraph - were more likely to appear on the front page. Women were generally identified later on in the story than men when the stories appeared on the front page (Armstrong, 2004). These results expand Zoch & Turk's (1998) findings that female sources not only appeared less frequently, but when they did appear, they were quoted less often and given shorter quotes.

In two separate investigations, the Global Media Monitoring Project (GMMP) (1995) found in an examination of the day's news on January 18, 1995, in 71 countries that

women were the subject of news reports on radio, television and newspapers just 17 percent of the time. Five years later, a more in-depth GMMP (2000) investigation took place on February 1, 2000, in 70 countries. The main findings revealed little change. Women in the world's media that day were found to be just 18 percent of the news subjects.

Northwestern University's Media Management Center (2000) analyzed all stories for a week in 2000 from 100 newspapers. Men were quoted in 93 percent of the 3,500 front-page stories, women in 50 percent, and women were only about 20 percent of the sources overall.   Similarly, Zoch & Turk (1998) found that 69.2 percent of front-page sources were men, compared to 17.3 percent women.

Though women's voices remain largely left out of the discourse, when they are present, women use more women as sources. News stories by women reporters have more women news subjects than do those by men reporters (Gallagher, 2001). Women are more likely to write about social problems and protests. They also use ordinary people as sources more often (Chambers, Steiner & Fleming, 2004), relying less on official sources. Women approach international news differently, both in the way they select topics and the angles from which they choose to cover those topics (Gallagher, 2001).

Women have brought a different perspective to war coverage, a more human dimension to war news (Trotta, 1991). Men focus on conflict and numbers of the dead, and zero in on positions and strategy, while women tend to look at the impact on the greatest number of people, frequently civilians trying to hold their lives together (Trotta, 1991).

Men have long been the great war-story tellers, either as soldiers or war correspondents, legitimated in that role because they have been there or because they have greater entrée into what it must be like (Elshtain 1987). Today, women have that same entrée and their frames and metaphors of war can no longer be blatantly omitted, and should be examined.

H2: Women reporters use different types of sources than men reporters in their war reports.

Gendered Framing of War

Despite it being a male-dominated bastion of masculine tradition and practice, some women have managed to serve in the military, including in combat roles, from the revolutionary war onward (Peach, 1997). Whether as camp followers, nurses, revolutionaries, spies, soldiers in disguise, or as regular female soldiers and as supreme commanders, women have engaged in a multitude of classifications and trades and continue to do so (Elshtain, 1987).

Women have historically served the war effort by providing the much needed day-to-day maintenance of war such as feeding and caring for the troops and relinquishing male children to the cause (Del Zotto, 2002). Women have also served as collateral or pawns in the warfare process though systematic rape and forced prostitution (Goldstein, 2001). Women as non-state actors have also served as voices of resistance (Tickner, 1996). Women's roles have been varied and invaluable, yet still considered peripheral.

Women were permitted to serve their country, but they were encouraged to do so in ways befitting their sex, and in a manner that did not interfere with men who dealt with the real issues of war (Carter, et al., 1998). Women were expected to continue providing unrewarded domestic support, but it was of paramount importance that they understood that theirs was a role of auxiliary, adjunct, accessory or assistant (Goldstein, 2001). And though many women were called on to perform male tasks and act in unwomanly ways, it was to be understood that the subordination had to be undermined for the war effort, but this was only for the duration (Goldstein, 2001).

WWII marked the first time large numbers of women served in the United States military, with some 277,000 on active duty on May 31, 1945. Afterwards, the military decided it would be prudent to keep some women, besides nurses, on active duty in the event of a national emergency (Sadler, 1997). But they were not considered for combat.

What defines combat is deeply debated (Peach, 1997) to this day. As Goldstein (2001) explains, the Gulf War made it hard for the U.S. military to maintain the distinction between combat and noncombat primarily because more than half of the 375 U.S. soldiers killed were support personnel not combat troops. The pentagon followed the rule that if a soldier were female she must not have been in combat and could not receive combat medals, which are highly valued in military culture.

Defining what constitutes ground combat is even more difficult (Sadler, 1997). Women were barred from the major American fighting forces in the Gulf War to ensure that they were kept out of harm's way. But they were not out of harm's way. Women were exposed to direct combat, hostile fire and capture. The war highlighted the

26

impossibility of defining the front line from which women were supposedly banned

(Sadler, 1997).

As Hanson (2002) explains:

In the decade between the Gulf War and the current campaign against terrorism, women in the U.S. military have commanded warships and air squadrons, piloted fighters and bombers. They have meted death and died themselves alongside male colleagues in the present Central Asia conflict. It's not your father's (or grandfather's) battlefield anymore, but that transformation is no longer attracting much attention from the present day Pyle's out there dodging bullets. (P. 46)

One likely reason for the lack of media attention is that many Americans still find

the concept of a woman warrior disconcerting. Woman making war is menacing because

it shatters the traditional metaphor that men fight and women nurture (Hanson, 2002).

Allen (1996) feels that when women act in untraditional ways they become

unmanageable in a media environment. Therefore, journalists will either attempt to

reframe the women's behavior or ignore it entirely. Melissa Herbert (1998) points out

there is no ready category in our culture for the woman as professional combat soldier.

Therefore, journalists struggle to fit the military woman into a familiar or comfortable

niche. They are either threatening, supermacho beings whose femininity or sexual

orientations are in doubt, or they are frail, unreliable beings whose military competence is

open to question. Hanson (2002) feels the victim label is obviously damaging to a

member of the armed forces. Yet this image of frailty has been a hallmark of reports on

military women in these stereotyped, hegemonic descriptions.

Women's omission is due more to the fact that:

Journalism is a very tradition bound craft. Staying with traditional ways of selecting, writing and editing stories allows journalists to cope quickly with time restrictions, the pressure of passing editorial approval and secure their careers in a highly competitive environment. (Lemmert, 1988, p. 17)

Augusta Del Zotto (2002) feels that it is women's role as non-elite actors that leads to their omission from media discourse. He explains:

> Non-state actors are groups or individuals who directly or indirectly participate in the war process, but who do not represent the 'official' voices of war such as the government or the military. . . However, the media in their relentless pursuit of speed and simplicity tend to reduce the complexity of war to a set of maneuvers, orders and declarations made solely by state actors. In this way, women's voices are rarely heard in the media's coverage of war. . . . The end result is a distorted, gendered framing of war. (p. 142)

Sources Impact Frames

How reporters gather news and the types of sources they use are important because in framing that picture journalists determine not only what information is presented to the public but also what images of society are presented (Zoch & Turk, 1998). News, clearly, is not made by journalists alone, but is the result of interactions and dialogues between journalists and other individuals and between news and other discourses (Allan, 1998).

News is a product of transactions between journalists and their sources. Sources are the deep, dark secret of the power of the press (Sigal, 1986). Much of this power is exercised not by news institutions themselves but by the sources that feed them information. But not all sources are equally likely to be contacted by journalists (Shoemaker & Reese, 1996). Those with economic or political power are more likely to influence news reports than those who lack power (Gans, 1979, Shoemaker & Reese, 1996).

The sources used tell readers of the significance of a story (Dickerson, 2001). Sources function as reporters. They are para journalists (Schudson, 2003). News represents who are the authorized knowers and what are their authorized versions of reality. Sources have a tremendous effect on mass media content because journalists cannot put in their news reports what they do not know (Shoemaker & Reese, 1996). Therefore, news is not necessarily what happens but what a news source says happened because the news does not happen until there is an exchange of information between journalists and their sources (Zoch & Turk, 1998).

News sources are encouraged to speak to the social world in certain preferred ways. Studies of media/source relations show that journalists tend to rely primarily upon white, middle-class, middle-aged, professional males as sources, particularly when expert opinions are being assessed (Beasley, 1993; Holland, 1987). Reporters need to interview not just sources, but authoritative sources. This need gives great power to high-level government officials (Schudson, 2003) because they are considered to be the authorized knowers of important matters.

Journalists often prefer official sources because journalists and their editors believe that official sources have important things to say (Palertz & Entman, 1981) and tend to accept the things official sources say as being factual (Shoemaker & Reese, 1996). Official sources often meet the definitions of reliability, trustworthiness, authoritativeness and articulateness (Zoch & Turk, 1998). Government officials provide a commanding validation of the news product (Shoemaker & Reese, 1996). Because news organizations are constrained by time and money, they have a thirst for a readily

available, reliable flow of information (Schudson, 2003). Using the government as a main source of information is the journalistic law of the least effort (Schudson, 2003).

Theoretically, the news media have countless resources available to them as a raw product. Practically, though, they depend heavily on interviews with individuals for their information. Shoemaker & Reese (1996) found that the Washington press corps made little use of documents in doing their research, preferring to rely on sources and each other. Sigal (1986) found a clear tendency for *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* reporters, members of organizations that could presumably afford to gather news through whatever means they chose, to rely on routine channels of information; those being official proceedings, press releases, press conferences and nonspontaneous events such as speeches and ceremonies (Shoemaker & Reese, 1996).

News is dominated by the knowers, the incumbent president, presidential candidates, and federal, state and local officials (Gans, 1979). The defense analysts and experts have increasingly taken a place among the primary and most sought after sources of information for mainstream media news outlets, whose journalists tend to rely on symbiotic relationships with a limited range of official sources, and then report directly what they say, sometimes even glorifying them (Gans, 2003; McChesney, 1999).

An increasingly important component of the source routine is the expert, the person relied on by journalists to put events into context and explain the meaning of news. Because the objectivity routine prevents reporters from overtly expressing their point of view, they must find experts to provide understandable analysis of the meaning of news events. The choice of experts has an important influence on how that meaning is shaped (Shoemaker & Reese, 1996). Soley (1992) has analyzed the experts and

30

concluded that they constitute a narrow, homogeneous, and elite group who are presented as objective and nonpartisan, but are largely conservative, associated with Washington think tanks, former Republican administrations and prestigious East Coast universities. They are also, largely, male.

Metaphors Frame

News coverage, like all communication, operates in and is replete with metaphors and other symbolic devices that provide a shorthand way of suggesting the underlying storyline (Cappella & Jamieson, 1997). These devices provide the rhetorical bridge by which discrete bits of information are given a context and relationship to one another (London, 1993). News stories are about not merely what is said, but how what is said is said (Cappella & Jamieson, 1997). Metaphoric choice reveals how the storyteller wants the story to be framed.

Conceptual metaphor theory, with its origins in Lakoff & Johnson (1980), suggests that metaphors are conceptual in nature and they are integral to human understanding and an inescapable aspect of human thought. They play a central role in the way we think and talk about the world (Lakoff, 1993). A conceptual metaphor is the use of a term from one domain of discourse to give meaning to a term from a different domain (Sarbin, 2003). Therefore, metaphoric language not only shapes thought it can also influence how a concept is perceived and understood (Lakoff, 2003).

Metaphor is not just a literary trope used to evoke an image over an emotion, but a major factor in structuring our selves and our views of reality (Lakoff & Johnson,

31

1980). Because so many of the concepts that are important to us are either abstract or not clearly delineated in our experience, we need to get a grasp on them by means of metaphors from other concepts that we understand in clearer terms (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Abstract reasoning occurs through out-of-awareness application of conceptual metaphors that are located in the cognitive unconscious (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) and help us reason about and analyze the world. Neither good nor bad, metaphor may be the only way for humans to comprehend and frame profound and complex issues (Lule, 2003).

The acceptance of a metaphor, which forces us to focus only on those aspects of our experience that it highlights, leads us to view the entailments of the metaphor as being true (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) and provides grounds for certain inferences. Culturally prominent metaphors are reinforced in everyday conversation and provide a basis for abstract concepts and ultimately shape our communicative behavior (Ritchie, 2003). These metaphors are so prevalent in the discourse that they can become truths so obvious that it takes a conscious effort to become aware of them (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). When collectively we come to share a linguistic construction, language shapes our institutions as well, in that the very distinctions and classifications we make come to affect our future thinking and behaviors (McMillan & Cheney, 1996).

Metaphors Framing War

Abstractions and enormously complex situations such as war are routinely understood via metaphor (Lakoff, 1991). When discussing war, the most compelling and

common metaphors are those capable of enacting dramas of national politics in human terms while capturing the workings of hegemonic masculinity (Wahl-Jorgensen, 2000). Many such chosen metaphors are those associated with sports (Jorgensen, 1992), and those that depict the nation as a person (Lakoff, 2003).

It has long been noted that we understand war as a competitive sport, like football (O'Barr and Conley, 1992). Football is a game that requires the use of rationality, strategy, and other technical knowledge stereotypically considered the domain of male disciplines (Easlea, 1987). The metaphor highlights teamwork, preparedness, the spectators of the world arena, the glory of winning and the shame of defeat (Lakoff, 1991).

Media coverage of the 1991 Gulf War often used patterns and conventions of play-by-play football commentary. According to Lewis Lapham (1992):

> The Pentagon produced and directed the war . . . with a script that borrowed elements of "Monday Night Football." . . . The synchronization with prime-time entertainment was particularly striking on Super Bowl Sunday. ABC News intercut its coverage of the game in progress in Tampa with news of the bombing in progress in the Middle East, and the transitions seemed entirely in keeping with the spirit of both events. The newscasters were indistinguishable from the sportscasters, all of them drawing diagrams in chalk and talking in similar voices about the flight of a forward pass or the flare of a Patriot missile. (p. 258-259)

This metaphoric language is taken very seriously (Lakoff, 1993), and we have become so accustomed to speaking of war in sports metaphors that it no longer seems strange to see American flags sewn on professional athlete's uniforms and helmets, but this remains terribly odd to non-Americans (Boose, 1993). For us it is a natural connection. Like football players, the fate of soldiers lies preeminently in the hands of their superiors, be they generals or coaches. That relationship lends itself to the

interchangeability of terms in these two kinds of male territorial games (McBride, 1995).

For football embodies manly virtues such as fortitude, courage, discipline, desire, and, above all, domination (McBride, 1995). It is not surprising, then, that men are much more likely to use such metaphors than women (O'Barr & Conley, 1992).

It was through such a sports and game discourse that the American public was connected to the Gulf War in 1991 (Boose, 1993). But it was not only the soldiers and reporters who expressed themselves in this manner, it was the general staff as well. General Colin Powell warned the president before the commencement of hostilities that he would have to be prepared for the ultimate test, the Super Bowl itself, in waging this war (McBride, 1995).

It is important to distinguish what is metaphorical from what is not. Pain, dismemberment, and death are not metaphorical. They are real (Lakoff, 1991). While the rest of the world may have been puzzled or offended by the slaughter of Iraqi soldiers in term of football metaphors, Americans understood the connection (Boose, 1993). It takes tremendous conscious effort to give attention to and care for the living, suffering and dying human beings who are banished from the discourse (Cohn, 1993) if we talk of war as though it were a game.

> H3: Women reporters and sources will use sports metaphors less frequently than men reporters and sources.

The metaphor that depicts the nation as a solitary person is used hundreds of times a day in our current war in Iraq (Lakoff, 2003) as well as in the first Gulf War. It was Saddam's army, Saddam's nuclear capacity, Saddam's chemical weapons and Saddam's rape of Kuwait (McBride, 1995). In this personification of Saddam, the war is not being

34

waged against the Iraqi people, but only against this one person. War in this metaphor is a fight between two people, a hand-to-hand combat (Lakoff, 2003).

Metaphors are more important than just literary devices used to evoke an image over an emotion. They constitute powerful forms of language that can influence how a concept is perceived and understood (Wilson, 1992). The nation as a person metaphor puts us in the role of the just warriors who are not killing people or destroying a nation, rather, for example, George is giving Saddam a good pounding, or bodily removing him from where he does not belong. Our emotional response is to get fired up about giving a bully what is coming to him (Cohn, 1993), and our intellectual response is left largely unchecked.

Far from simply describing the world, metaphors are prescriptive linguistic devices that guide and shape thinking (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; McMillan & Cheney 1996). When a metaphor is used that depicts Saddam as our sole enemy, it hides the fact that the thousands of bombs that will be dropped will not be dropped on that one person. They will kill many thousands of people; people that, according to the metaphor, we are not going to war against (Lakoff, 2003). When people are replaced by states in such a fairy tale, what results is a scenario for a just war. The just war has the structure of classical fairy tales in that it is either a self-defense story or a rescue story (Lakoff, 2003).

If America starts a war it must be seen as acting selflessly, as a hero. Killing and maiming of innocent bystanders does not make one much of a hero. America appears as classic hero only if you do not look at how metaphor is applied to the situation. The just war metaphor hides vital truth and allows us to think of Kuwait, for example, as the defenseless maiden to be rescued in the fairy tale (Lakoff, 2003). The villain in the fairy

tale of the just war may be cunning, but he cannot be rational. You just do not reason

with a demon, nor do you enter into negotiations with him (Lakoff, 1996).

War metaphors often reinforce patriarchy (Manning, 1979) as is the case wherein

the classical victim is innocent (Lakoff, 2003) and the war is framed as a rescue scenario.

Enemy males are those from whom women and children need protection. They become

killable killers (Ruddick, 1993), and women become victims. While women represent a

population that is severely and distinctly victimized by conflict, the tendency to

disproportionately portray women as victims perpetuates inaccurate assumptions about

their contributions to war and their proper place in the private sphere. Women are not

solely passive victims; they are often powerful agents (Strickland & Duvvury, 2003), yet

our current metaphors do not reflect that power.

H4: Women reporters and sources use the just war metaphor less
frequently than men reporters and sources

Metaphors must be exposed, belabored and used up through interpretation and

criticism (Sontag, 1990) in order to reveal the unconscious system of metaphors we use

to comprehend reality (Lakoff, 1991). Masculinity is back in vogue in the United States

(Dowler, 2002). Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the male hero has

become a prevailing cultural icon, invoking a narrative of strength to a nation seeking

emotional grounding (Tickner, 2002).   Not all men want to be put in this killer role, but

the military needs one version of masculinity, because it hides war's ugliness (Ruddick,

1993). Yet, in our postmodern wars women have more opportunities to articulate their

thought on and roles in war, and their voices could threaten to undermine our culture's

war myths (Cooke, 1993).

36

H5: Women reporters and sources introduce new metaphors of war.

Analyzing Metaphor

As one researcher on metaphor has pointed out, it is still the case that "(a)ny serious study of metaphor is almost obliged to start with the works of Aristotle" (Ortony, 1979, p. 3). Most researchers of metaphor, however, have scarcely a good word to say about Aristotle because they feel he undervalued metaphor and believed it to be merely an ornamental extra in language (Mahon, 1999).

Aristotle also considered the use of metaphor a sign of genius, believing that the individual who could make unusual connections was a person of special gifts (Mahon, 1999). Though many present day researchers criticize Aristotle for his views on metaphor it is to him that we owe the terms in which the debate was framed for many hundreds of years. Even those who propose new or different ideas for the analysis of metaphor must do so against the Aristotelian tradition (Kirby, 1997). That tradition asserts that crafting good metaphors depends upon being able to perceive likenesses, presumably likenesses in things that seem dissimilar, or at least likenesses that might not initially suggest themselves (Kirby, 1997).

Current research asserts something similar and a working definition of the word metaphor is the capacity to perceive a resemblance between elements from two separate domains of experience and to link them together in linguistic form (Gardner, 1982). Metaphor is an understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another, with the other rarely noticed as such (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). It is the terms that create

the things experienced. It is the topic or tenor (Richards, 1936), the primary subject

(Black, 1962) or the target (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) of the metaphor.

The other term is the something else used to convey something about the target.

It is the vehicle (Richards, 1936), the subsidiary subject (Black, 1962) the secondary

subject (Black, 1979) or the source (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Since the term target and

source are now commonly used, they will be the terms used herein. There are a number

of different models to consider when analyzing metaphor. Mac Cormac's (1985) model

incorporates the notion of words as defined by fuzzy sets and he envisions metaphor "as a

cognitive process by which new concepts are expressed and suggested" and "as a cultural

process by which language itself changes" (p.5). The model proposed by George Lakoff

(1980), and the one used by this research, conceives of metaphor as a process of mapping

from a source domain to some target domain. In metaphor theory terms, a target domain

A, metaphorically coupled with a source domain B, yields a transformed domain A-as-B.

It is important to note that in order to make a metaphor possible in the first place,

there must be some sort of resemblance between the target and the source. It is this

similarity that is the basis on which the difference between the two can become

productive (Forceville, 2004). For instance, in the metaphor *love is a battlefield,* a

minimal resemblance between the two domains is that in both two parties are engaged in

a type of relationship with one another (Forceville, 2004).

Some theorists believe that metaphoric processes have not always been possible

in the human brain. Mithen (1998) suggests that the brain of humans before the Upper

Paleolithic period in Europe (100,000 to 300,000 years ago) was a domain-specific brain.

The domains of experience were isolated from each other. Thus, early human beings

were not capable of metaphoric thought. The cognitively fluid brain came about in the Upper Paleolithic period allowing the interpretations of knowledge in one domain in terms of knowledge in another domain.

Today, we use metaphors all the time. In fact, they are so commonplace we often fail to notice them (Lakoff & Turner, 1989). Many scholars now recognize that metaphor is essential for how people communicate about abstract, difficult to talk about ideas such as time, emotion, morality and politics (Gibbs, 1999). For such topics metaphor is necessary and not just ornamental (Ortony, 1975)

What happens is that metaphors organize and inform the unknown (the vehicle) in terms of the known (the source). At least one feature typically associated with the source is projected (Black, 1962) or mapped (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) onto the target. Both the target and the source are part of seemingly infinitely expanding networks of (true or untrue) facts, meanings, emotions and etc. For this reason it is common to talk about target and source domains. In each metaphor at least one, but often more than one, feature from the source domain is mapped into a corresponding feature in the target domain (Forceville, 2004).

There is usually a structural relationship between a number of elements in the source domain and corresponding elements in the target domain, which enable the mapping feature from source to target. It is often the structural character of the mapping which makes metaphors interesting, insightful and persuasive (Forceville, 2004). Not all features or characteristics of a source are mappable. Which features are to be mapped depends on many circumstances. Often the surrounding text of a metaphor gives clues as to which features should be mapped (Forceville, 2004).

39

Metaphors can provide new or alternative views of a given target domain by linking it with an unexpected source domain or mapping unexplored features from a familiar source domain to the target. The target domain structure resulting from *the world is a stage* is a very different one from that which emanates from *the world is a battlefield.* Each source domain highlights certain features in the target domain and hides others (Forceville, 2004).

Thus, metaphors are not hidden comparisons as Aristotle suggested. They are, however, fundamentally asymmetrical. They are the linguistic vehicles through which something new is selected (Krippendorff, 1993). And it is the emergence of new metaphors and who might be introducing them that will be explored in this study. There are linguistic metaphors that are highly likely to produce new ways of thinking and analogical reasoning. They should therefore be expected to have high degrees of incongruity, vitality, cognitive demand and connotative power (Cameron, 1999). In other words, they should stand out in the text, making them fairly easy to identify.

Personal history may, and often does, influence the choice of the kinds of metaphors people use (Deignan, 1999). Many of our metaphors vary because our experiences vary (Cameron, 1999). The kinds of metaphors we use depend on the diverse concerns and interests that govern our life. Our concerns and interests may be general or personal, but both influence significantly the metaphors we employ to understand the world around us (Kovecses, 2005).

Due to the fact that past research has shown differences in the way men and women talk and think about war, we expect to find some differences as well.

In order to uncover the emergence of new metaphors in this study, the researcher

selected the metaphors in each article. The idea that the researcher examines the text and

unilaterally decides what is and is not metaphorical is perhaps the commonest approach

to identification (Low, 1999). Along with the speed and ease with which the procedure

can be carried out, there is often a chance that the researcher is well versed with the text.

The more the researcher reads (and reflects upon) the text, the more metaphors will be

identified (Low, 1999).

3. METHOD

In order to determine if women's voices have a significant presence in the media on the war in Iraq and to determine if they employ new metaphors and refrain from using the nation-as-a-person and sports metaphors that reinforce hegemonic masculinity, content analysis was conducted on articles *in The New York Times* and National Public Radio's (NPR) *Morning Edition*. These two organizations were selected not as a means of comparison of one to the other, but because of their size, both reaching a national audience and beyond. They were also chosen because of their reputations. *The New York Times* was chosen because of its status as the paper of record in the United States, and NPR because of its public radio, noncommercial status. Both organizations have diverse news staffs, and both had women and men providing war news in the period leading up to the war and after the war in Iraqi began in March 2003. Additionally, both had male and female war correspondents reporting from Iraq.

The units of analysis are what have been termed text strings, the quotes from sources, and the self-sources provided by the reporter, in the articles in *The New York Times* and the transcribed *National Public Radio's* (NPR) *Morning Edition* reports online. They were analyzed the week before the war began on March 6 through March 12, 2003, the week the war began on March 19 through March 26, 2003, and six months after the war began on September 19 through September 26, 2003.

For *The New York Times* stories, a Lexus Nexus Academic search was conducted. Under the *Guided News Search* category, a *News* Category was selected. *Major Newspapers* was the news source, with key words of *Iraq* and *war* selected. The dates

from 3/7/03 to 3/13/03, 3/19/03 to 3/26/03, 9/19/03 through 9/26/03 were each put in

during three separate searches.

For the NPR stories, the NPR *Morning Edition* online site was used. Selecting

Archives, the terms *Iraq* and *War* were selected. In the *That I heard* column, *since 1996*

was selected (note, the options herein are *past 7 days, past 30 days*, *past 90 days*, *past*

year and *since 1996*) and under the *While listening to* category, *Morning Edition* was

selected). The stories were in reverse chronological order and the dates of interest to this

study (noted above) were retrieved and analyzed. After navigating the pages by date, a

pattern becomes apparent to the user and the specific dates have URL's such as the

following:

www.npr.org/rundowns/calendar/monthly_calendar.php?month=3&year=2003&prgId=3

<http://www.npr.org/rundowns/calendar/monthly_calendar.php?month=3&year=20

03&prgId=3> , which makes navigating much simpler because a researcher can plug

days, dates and years into the above code.

Operational Definitions

The Aristolean view of understanding metaphor is a process of finding the shared

ground between different things: similarities within differences (Cameron, 1999).

Conceptual metaphor theory (CMT), with its origins in Lakoff & Johnson (1980), is one

of the central areas of research in the field of cognitive linguistics. In the CMT

framework, metaphors are analyzed as stable and systematic relationships between two

conceptual *domains*. In a metaphorical expression like *the committee has kept me in the*

dark about this matter, the language and conceptual structure from the *source* domain of

vision is used to depict a situation in the *target* domain of knowledge and understanding.

A *mapping* tells us how elements in the two domains line up with each other. Because the

mapping is principled, ignorance is associated with darkness as well as other conditions

which preclude sight (Grady, Oakley & Coulson, 1999).

The metaphor *love is a journey* allows us not only to simply map words

from the source domain *journey* to the target domain *love*, but also to reason about love

using concepts from the world of traveling. However, that reasoning goes beyond the

scope of this study. This study is looking for the presence of new metaphors of war and

will not use the more recent framework, proposed by Fauconnier and Turner (1998) and

referred to as blending theory (BT), which analyzes metaphor differently by looking at

different cognitive process that occur in understanding metaphor. Those cognitive

processes are not part of this study. CMT posits relationships between pairs of mental

representations, while blending theory (BT) allows for more than two. It is the

relationship between the pairs that are of interest and for the purpose herein the simpler A

is B explored in the CMT of metaphor will be implemented in order to enable any newly

emerging metaphors to be more easily identifiable.

Coding Categories

1) Date- the date the article first appeared in *The New York Times* or on NPR. Repeated
articles will not be counted.

2) News source (1-NYT, 2-NPR)- indicate in which medium the story was presented.

3) Reporter (1- male, 2- female, 3- unknown)- indicate where there is certainty in gender and list as unknown when it is not possible to tell. Many reporters have websites with their pictures online. Therefore, names like Carol, Lee, Pat or names otherwise unrecognizable as to gender will either be further explored online or the content will be explored for further clues (such as he/she said). Where there is any uncertainty, the unknown category will be used.

4) Source (1-male, 2-female, 3-unknown)- where there is any uncertainty, the unknown category will be used.

5) Source profession (1-government official, 2-military, 3-faculty, 4-medical professional, 5-business professional, 6-expert, 7- non-expert/citizen 8-unknown)

6) Source relationship to story (1-victim, 2-hero, 3-relative, 4-expert, 5- non-expert/citizen, 6- unknown)- as previous studies have reported that women have a tendency to use fewer official sources, categories 5 and 6 will enable this study to see if women use fewer official sources today, and, if so, what type of sources they do use.

7) Metaphor used. Many studies have investigated metaphors used to explain war and this study will make use of a number of those findings in order to generate a list of metaphors we may encounter as well as to create categories that do not fit any of the pre-existing ones in order to discover emerging metaphors. Some of the previously defined metaphors are:

7-1- *Nation as a Person*. In this metaphor Lakoff (1991) explains a state is seen as a person, engaging in social relations within a world community. Its landmass is its home. It lives in a neighborhood, and has neighbors, friends and enemies. States can be peaceful or aggressive, responsible or irresponsible, industrious or lazy. Additionally, the ruler stands for the state, thus we can refer to Iraq by referring to Sadam Hussein (Lakoff, 1991)

7-2 *The Fairly Tale of the Just War* - exists within the *nation as a person* metaphor with the villain, the victim and the hero as the cast of characters. The fairy tale of the just war is seen as a subset of the nation as a person metaphor. As Lakoff (1991) explains, the fairy tale has an asymmetry built into it. The hero is moral and courageous, while the villain is amoral and vicious.

7-3- *Sports Metaphor*- Lakoff's (1991) research states that we understand war as a competitive game like chess, or as a sport, like football or boxing. It is a metaphor in which there is a clear winner and loser, and a clear end to the game. The metaphor highlights strategic thinking, teamwork, preparedness, the spectators in the world arena, the glory of winning and the shame of defeat.

7-4- *War as a Natural Event* - examples are: war erupts, war breaks out, bombs rain, scuds shower (Reese, 1999).

7-5- *War as a Contest* - Reese (1999) indicates examples of this are when war is referred to as a turkey shoot, a showdown, or when there is a reference to war being a pummel, pound, punch or knock out.

7-6- W*ar as Politics* - Lakoff (1991) explains Clausewitz's Metaphor: war is politics pursued by other means. War in terms of political cost-benefit analysis. Each nation-state has political objectives, and war may best serve those objectives. The political gains are to be weighed against acceptable costs. When the costs of war exceed the political gains, the war should cease.

7-7- *Dehumanization of the Enemy* - Reese (1999) points to examples such as calling the enemy crafty, peculiar, surprising, unpredictable, mysterious, horrifying, unreliable, weak, haphazard, desperate, unspeakable, bizarre, demonic, devilish, satanic, criminal, ruthless, cruel, complex, random, particularly when we are: meticulous, successful, precise, accurate, careful, scrupulous, tough, cool calm, swift, decisive, effective, confident, cautious, eager, enthusiastic

7-8-M*ake Killing Abstract* - examples of this are when we speak of war or enemy lives as suppressing assets, collateral damage, neutralizing targets, acquire assets or soften up target (Reese, 1999)

7-9- *The Strict Father Morality* - Similar to # 7, the strict father morality is where there is evil loose in the world. We must show our strength and wipe it out. Retribution and vengeance are called for. If there are casualties or collateral damage, so be it (Lakoff, 2001).

8- Metaphor Used - Source- to find the source and target used in any given metaphor the simple method of A is B. For example, in the statement *life is a journey*. In this metaphor, the target domain is life and the source domain is space. The person leading a life is a traveler.   In other words, to find the source in the content we look for the A. Source categories will be collected and categorized and finally combined by likeness.

9- Metaphor Used- Target- in this category we are looking for the B, what targets are used to help us understand the various concepts of war. Target categories will be collected and categorized and combined by likeness.

Inter-coder reliability

In order to ensure that each coder had a tendency to assign the same metaphors to the same text strings as each other and to those the researcher identified, and thus, establish intercoder reliability, the researcher set up a sample test of 100 of the 2,915 text strings as a pre test. Though 100 is a small sample compared to the number of text strings in the study, the researcher was certain that the first pre-test would not be the only pre-test required because of the researcher's familiarity with how difficult it is to code latent content, which metaphor, almost by definition, tends to be. The researcher used text strings provided by either unnamed sources or reporters who shared a byline because this would be data that would not be analyzed because it was not gender identifiable. The initial 100 text strings were selected randomly.

Though it is acceptable, yet less than ideal, for the researcher to be one of the coders, since there were only two coders it seemed appropriate for the researcher to take part in the pre-test coding due to her familiarity with the content. The first pre-test proved partially successful and partially unsuccessful, in that the coders could easily identify (and agree upon with a success rate of over 90%) the previously identified metaphors. Yet, they had great difficulty identifying, and, more importantly, naming categories of the newly emerging metaphors. However, a great deal was learned in the discussion following the first pre-test and that knowledge was incorporated into the second pre-test.

The researcher set up the second pre-test with a new set of 100 text strings that also would not be included in the final data analysis and the researcher and the coders

now had coding categories that consisted of the nine pre-existing metaphors and the three newly emerging metaphors they identified, in agreement, from the first pre-test. In the second pre-test, the additional categories were included and named: war's imminence, time for war, and diplomacy. These three had been repeatedly identified in the first pre-test, and by all three coders.

After the second pre-test was completed, a troubling pattern seemed to emerge. All three coders were in agreement to a very high degree regarding all the pre-existing metaphors as well as the three new metaphors identified on the previous test. It seemed it was much easier for the coders to recognize the metaphors once they had been categorized, and still difficult for them to identify and name the new ones.

At that point the researcher worried about bias: were they only seeing these metaphors because they had been instructed to? After some in depth investigating, the answer proved to be no because, in every case, the coders found these metaphors themselves. Discussion was only required to agree upon what they should be called. Thus, the coders identified them, just failed to name them the same as each other or as the researcher named them.

Once the bias concerns were alleviated,, we reviewed the results of the second pre-test and compiled the categories each coder had come up with. One coder (along with the researcher) identified a number of instances where the metaphor of patriotism was present. The other coder (along with the researcher) came up with a number of instances where the use of a metaphor wherein peace would be achieved through war was identified. Thus, it became apparent that the more familiar the coders became with the content, the more metaphors emerged and because the researcher was intimately familiar

with the content it was initially more likely for her to identify both the coders' metaphors in the text strings.

At this point the researcher set up a third pre-test. Again, this was not difficult due to the number of text strings available due to the unnamed sources in the data and the shared byline text strings. The researcher told the coders to create as many categories they wished, even if they were uncertain if the categories actually contained metaphors. This was more an exercise in getting them to select language about war, which, we already know is a difficult topic to discuss, especially without metaphor, and we would see what sort of categories we came up with and eliminate or combine them once the analysis was complete.

Following the third pre-test we experienced similar results. Metaphors become easier to identify once they have been exposed (Sontag, 1990). Therefore, for what we hoped would be the final pre-test, we went with the following categories:

Pre-existing metaphors	Newly Emerging Metaphors	
Just War	Time's Up	Strike
Nation as Person	Go It Alone	Invader
Sports	Refer/connect with 9/11	Offensive
Natural Event	More Time	Military Option
War As a Contest	End of Diplomacy	Quick War
War As Politics	No To War	Failed Diplomacy
Dehumanizing the Enemy	Compromise	Emotional Side: War
Make Killing Abstract	Game (Not Sport)	Anti Bush/U.S.
Strict Father	Theatre Performance	Inevitable
	Nation of People	Brinkmanship
	Support Troops	Fight
	Threat	Coalition
	Campaign	Intelligence
	Target	Peace/Anti-War
	Attack	Face
	Strange Use of Peace	Resistance

Following intense discussion about our findings, we decided to eliminate some categories because they were merely words that did not appear to have any hidden meaning, and we also discovered that some of our categories could be combined because the language was used for similar purposes. For example, we combined time's up, ultimatum and end of diplomacy into the one category of Time's Up. We discarded the brinkmanship category for two reasons, the first one being that it seemed to contain hidden meaning but we were unable to identify it or explain what that hidden meaning was, and the second reason being that it was almost exclusively used by unnamed military officials and it would not be in the final analyzed data.

Additionally, though the nation as a person metaphor described in Lakoff's (2003) research contains the just war metaphor, we split the nation as a person and the just war metaphor into two separate categories because we could not achieve accuracy when we had them as one category. We achieved over 90% agreement on both of these metaphors as long as they were in different categories, a phenomenon the researcher was unable to understand or explain.

Thus, with this new list of categories in hand, the researcher put together all 300 test strings, arranged them in a new, random manner and the three did a fourth pre-test and the researcher analyzed the results. All the categories that found the three coders in a more than 90% agreement were considered firm and would have a place in the final analysis. Categories where two of the three coders were in more than 90% agreement were also added to the list. Some categories were compressed and others eliminated all together.

For example, the target category, which repeatedly found people speaking of targets that would be hit, rather than people, was merged into the make killing abstract category. Anti-war and peace were merged into the no to war category. Face was discarded altogether. Although it was used several dozen times in the data, there were decisions that had to be faced, facing war, losing face and how to face an outcome and etc., we simply could not agree on its metaphorical meaning, so we eliminated it.

It is important to note that we left four categories that could well have been grouped together as they all addressed the metaphor of time. We kept them separate in order to see if gender had any impact on how the metaphor was used to deliver such decidedly different messages of time's up, we need more time, war's imminence and those who tried to promote a quick war.

After much discussion, we ended with the following categories with which we coded the data:

Metaphor Categories

1	Just war	14- Go It Alone
2	Nation as person	15- Refer/Connect with 9/11
3	Sports	16- Game (Not sports)
4	Natural Event	17- Theatre Performance
5	War As a Contest	18- Nation of People
6	War As Politics	19- Patriotism
7	Dehumanizing the Enemy	20- Attack
8	Make killing Abstract	21- No To War
9	Strict father	22- Strange Use of Peace
10	Time's Up	23- Resistance
11	More Time	24- Emotional Side
12	Imminence of War	25- Diplomacy
13	Quick War	26- Coalition
		27- Intelligence

A statistical analysis program was used to evaluate the results of the five

hypotheses, and a chi square analysis was performed to determine whether the use of

metaphor was dependent upon gender. Chi square is a non-parametric test of statistical

significance for bivariate tabular analysis (also known as crosstabs). Bivariate tabular

analysis is good for examining relationships between pairs of discrete variables, such as

gender and metaphor usage.

The units of observation were the quotes from the sources, and the self-sources,

the words and phrases of the reporters used in the articles, herein referred to as text

strings. Each text string was itemized by the researcher who read each report and

identified every sentence, quote, or phrase that had any sort of reference to war.

Each text string was assigned a number on an excel sheet and that number

corresponded to the original text so that the language could be easily, further explored if

the need arose. The main spreadsheet contained all the pertinent information related to

the text strings including media source, date, gender of reporter and gender of source. A

second spreadsheet was created for the coders that contained only the phrase and its

corresponding number in order to eliminate or deter bias. The coders did not know the

gender of the persons whose language they were analyzing, nor did they know their titles

or the media from which they originated.

Once the coders and the researcher finished analyzing all the metaphors, the

researcher coded each text string and assigned it with a zero or a one for each metaphor.

For example, each text string was examined to see if it contained one or more of the

metaphors in the categories that were created. If a text string contained the Nation As a

Person Metaphor, it was assigned a one in that category; if not it was assigned a zero. This was done for every category for every metaphor, and thus, an 804 page Excel document was created that assigned each text string with 28 metaphor category columns and each column either contained a zero or a one. This would enable the SPSS program to test whether or not gender had an impact on certain metaphor use.

4. RESULTS

There were 249 stories analyzed in this study; 165 from *The New York Times* and 84 from *National Public Radio's Morning Edition*. The units of observation were the text strings, which were made up of the quotes (provided by the source) and the self-sources (provided by the reporter). Of the 249 stories, 174 were written by male reporters, 67 by female reporters and eight stories had a byline shared by both a male and a female reporter. The male reporters contributed 70% of the stories, the female reporters 27% and the shared bylines 3%.

Of the 1,727 quotes analyzed, 1,166 were from male sources, 154 were from female sources and 407 were unidentified, mostly military and Bush administration, officials. Male voices represented 68% of the quotes, female voices 9% and unidentified sources 22.5%. The self-sources were 1,189 in number, and of those self-sources 883 were from male reporters, 257 from female reporters and 49 from the reporters who shared the byline on the story. Male voices represented approximately 70.3% of the data, female voices represented 14.1%, unnamed sources made up 13.9% of the data and the remaining 1.7% could not be identified as they were from the shared byline self sources (Appendix A).

Of the 154 women sources, 37 were represented as professionals or voices of authority, for a total of 24% of the time. Of those, eight quotes came from women officials from other countries. Of the remaining 29, six were quotes from Condoleezza Rice, then National Security Adviser, and five were quotes from Diane Feinstein, the democratic senator from California. Of the remaining 18 quotes from professional

women, five quotes came from two military women, one of whom was a soldier who ran

the mess hall who told the story of purchasing every Snicker's bar she could find in

Australia. The other soldier was a sergeant, but she was in the story because her father

was a soldier of importance and her story was more about him than her.

The remaining 117 quotes were from non-professional women sources. Therefore,

more than 77% of the women sources in this study were nonprofessionals, or not noted as

such. These women may well have held professional titles, but this information was not

present in the data. There were quotes from 20 wives, 19 mothers, six sisters, three

daughters, one girlfriend and two classmates of soldiers. Thus, more than 31% of the

women sources were in the report because of their relationship to a male warrior.

Metaphors Identified In the Data

All of the nine metaphors introduced by previous research and examined in this

study were readily available in the data.

The pre-existing war metaphors were:

1. The just war
2. The nation as a person,
3. War in sports terminology
4. War as a natural event
5; War as a contest
6. War as politics
7. Dehumanization of the enemy
8. Make killing abstract
9. The strict father

Of those nine, five were found to show a significant difference in the way women and men used them (Table 1).

There were also some newly emerging metaphors identified. After analyzing all the data and creating categories for each new metaphor, 18 categories of emerging war metaphors were identified.

The newly emerging metaphors were labeled:

1. *Time's Up*- this metaphor suggested that time had simply run its course. There was no time left for anything but to go to war as too much time had already been wasted,
2. *Go it Alone*- Those who wanted to go it alone were willing to do so no matter the cost and no matter who agreed with them or who opposed their decision.
3. *Refer to 9/11*- there were a number of references to the terrorist attacks of September 11 which metaphorically linked the war in Iraq to those attacks as well as linking Saddam Husein with Osama Bin Laden.
4. *More Time*- those who wanted more time felt that time would help avert war. They were hopeful that time would afford an opportunity to find a solution that did not result in the United States going to war with Iraq.
5. *War as a Game* (not sports)- war was referred to as a children's game, a parlor game, a card game as well as a game of chess
6. *Scenario*- there were many references to the stage, and the various scenarios that occur on a stage as though this war were some sort of theatrical production. Included in this category were references to being poised as if one were acting.
7. *Nation of People*- in direct opposition to the nation as a person, there were many who spoke of the unknown, unseen people of the nation. Those who used this metaphor cared about the people of the nation more than they cared about eliminating Saddam Hussein. They could not make the connection between eliminating Saddam and killing innocent victims.
8. *Patriotism*- those who used this metaphor associated being a patrio with being pro war. Anyone who opposed this war was not a patriot and could not act in a patriotic manner. You were either patriotically for this war or unpatriotically against it.
9. *Imminence of War* – in the days leading up to the war, those who used this metaphor spoke as if war could not be averted; it was coming no matter what anyone did or said. Nothing could be done to prevent the war from happening, in spite of the fact that many people were offering a variety of alternatives.
10. *Attack*- this metaphor had two distinct meanings depending upon whether the U.S. was being attacked or doing the attacking. The military spoke of attacks by the Iraqis to the U. S. soldiers, while U.S. soldiers only attacked cities, buildings or locales- not the Iraqi people.

11. *No to war-* people who used this metaphor simply wanted their audiences to know that they thought war was not the answer, no matter the explanation. War was not an option for them.

12. *Peace by Means of War-* by killing people and invading a country, we were somehow doing the right thing. This metaphor was different that the rescue scenario because it did not suggest a rescue mission, but something that necessarily had to be done for the sake of all involved.

13. *Resist-* this metaphor claimed surprise that the Iraqi people did not welcome the invading forces with open arms. There was a tone of incredulity in those who used this metaphor. They were quite surprised that the Iraqi people would resist their attempt to help them.

14. *Quick War-* as long as the war was thought to be quick, in and out, not too much killing, it was deemed alright by those who used this metaphor. A quick war also was an inexpensive (in dollars) war.

15. *Emotional Side of War-* war and what it does to people. War as something frightening or scary or that which kills people or leaves them in a dire situation.

16. *Diplomacy-* diplomacy was also used by opposing thoughts on the war. If one were pro war, diplomacy was no longer working. If one opposed the war, more diplomacy was needed. The metaphor seemed to be about talking, but it was called diplomacy.

17. *Coalition-* the coalition of the willing were those who approved of this war and coalition troops were referred to often but it was rare that it was stated who made up the coalition.

18. *Intelligence-* intelligence was equated with that which wis beyond reproach. If something were reported by intelligence or as containing intelligence, it was to be taken as a fact and not questioned..

Of those 18, eight were found to show a significant difference in the way women and men used them (Table 2).

Test of Hypotheses

H1: Women reporters use more women sources than men reporters in their war reports.

This hypothesis was confirmed. Based on a chi-square analysis of the data, though neither male nor female reporters used women sources with any great regularity, women reporters did use more women sources proportionally than their male colleagues ($\chi^2_{(d.f.=1)}$ =43.804; p> 0.001). Of the 944 gender identifiable sources male reporters used in this study, they used women as sources 10% of the time. Of the 298 instances where female reporters used gender identifiable sources, they used female sources 16% of the time.   Therefore, even with such small numbers to analyze due to the lack of women's voices in this study, female reporters used female sources 63% more often than their male colleagues.

H2: Women reporters use different types of sources than men reporters.

The data did not support a clear confirmation or rejection of this hypothesis. Based on a count of pre-existing categories, there was no significant difference in the types of sources used by male and female reporters. There was a weak but significant trend in the tendency of male reporters to use more military and government officials than female reporters ($\chi^2_{(d.f.=1)}$ = 2.749; p > 0.097). However, male reporters were more likely to use unidentified sources than female reporters ($\chi^2_{(d.f.=1)}$ = 8.109; p > .003), quoting them 25% of the time, while women quoted them 7.36% of the time.

H3: Women reporters and sources use sports metaphors less frequently than men reporters and sources.

The data did not support this hypothesis. There was no significant difference in the way male and female reporters and sources used the sports metaphor (Table 1). The $\chi^2_{(d.f.=1)}$ 0.007; p= 0.933.

H4: Women reporters and sources use the nation-as-a-person metaphor less frequently than men reporters and sources

This hypothesis was confirmed. Use of the nation as a person metaphor was dependent on the gender of the reporter and source (Table 1).   Male reporters and sources used it more than two times as often as women reporters and sources. The $\chi^2_{(d.f.=1)}$ = 8.632; p= 0.003.

H5: Women reporters and sources introduce new metaphors of war.

The data did support this hypothesis, but only in one instance. The *Time's Up* metaphor shows significance (p= 0.05) in how men and women use it, with women using it proportionally more often (5.5%) then men (3.6%) (Table 2).

Pearson Chi Square Analysis

Chi Square analysis was used to look at gender relationships, and of the 27 variables examined, 11 significant relationships were found. Of the nine preexisting metaphors examined by other researchers, this study found there to be a significant difference between the way men and women use them in five instances (Table 1).

59

Table 1. Pre-existing Metaphors Used by Men and Women

Metaphor	N Male	N Female	% Male	% Female	χ^2 (d.f.=1)	P
Just War	68	3	3.3	.7	8.4	**.004**
Nation Person	202	20	9.9	4.8	10.7	**.001**
Sports	9	2	.4	.5	.0	.907
Nature	41	3	2.0	.7	3.2	.073
Contest	157	18	7.7	4.3	5.8	**.016**
Politics	42	2	2.1	.5	4.8	**.028**
Dehumanize	19	1	.9	.2	2.0	.155
Abstract	222	19	10.9	4.6	15.4	**.000**
Strict Father	26	2	1.3	.5	1.9	.167

Bold numbers indicate significance

Of the 18 newly emerging metaphors, seven significant relationships were found (Table 2).

Table 2. Newly Emerging Metaphors Used by Men and Women

Metaphor	N Male	N Female	% Male	% Female	$\chi^2_{(d.f.=1)}$	P
Time's Up	73	23	3.6	5.5	3.587	**.058**
Go It Alone	6	1	.3	0 .2	0.033	.855
Refer 9/11	74	14	3.6	3.4	0.059	.808
More Time	45	2	2.2	0 .5	5.270	**.022**
Game	25	0	1.2	0.0	5.123	**.024**
Scene	31	0	1.5	0.0	6.368	**.012**
Nation People	24	2	1.2	0.5	1.576	.209
Patriot	44	6	2.2	1.4	0.861	.353
Imminence	108	18	5.3	4.3	0.639	.424
Attack	161	14	7.9	3.4	10.556	**.001**
No To War	122	27	6.0	6.5	0.179	.672
Peace	16	5	.8	1.2	0.729	.393
Resist	43	7	2.1	1.7	0.298	.585
Quick War	25	5	1.2	1.2	0.000	.975
Emotional Side	40	10	2.0	2.4	0.358	.549
Diplomacy	108	4	5.3	1.0	14.787	**.000**
Coalition	76	7	3.7	1.7	4.326	**.038**
Intelligence	23	0	1.1	0.0	4.709	**.030**

Bold numbers indicates significance

5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study focused on three main topics: 1) the metaphors being used to discuss the war in Iraq that began in March of 2003, 2) whether men and women, both sources and reporters, used different or similar metaphors in discussing and reporting the war, and 3) whether the gender of the reporter impacted the gender of the sources used.

The work posed five hypotheses. Of these five hypotheses, two were confirmed by the data, two were not supported by the data and one was not clearly confirmed or rejected by the data.

Hypotheses Results Examined

H1: Women reporters use more women sources than men reporters.

This hypothesis was confirmed. Though there were a very small number of women sources found in this study (99 women sources of the 1,256 total sources used by male reporters and 48 women sources of the 358 total sources used by female reporters), women reporters used women sources more often than their male colleagues (Appendix A).

There could be any number of reasons for this outcome, though none were confirmed in this study. However, one reason could be that women reporters are aware of the fact that women sources are underrepresented in media reports, particularly media reports on war, and this war posed an opportunity for women reporters, many of whom may have found themselves unexpectedly on the war beat, to seek out women's voices to

use in their war reports in order to broaden the viewpoint of war by including voices they have known to be traditionally excluded.

Since frames organize news stories by their patterns of emphasis, interpretation, and exclusion (Carragee & Roefs, 2004), and women seem to be more sensitive to the symbolic annihilation proposed by Tuchman (1978), perhaps by choosing to frame their stories with women's voices, women reporters consciously framed, or attempted to re-frame, the news by seeking out women sources because the opportunity presented itself and journalists, regardless of their gender, tend to be a savvy group who are able to recognize opportunity when faced with it, especially, perhaps, an opportunity to tell the news in a new and unique manner.

It could also be that women reporters, either consciously or unconsciously, are more comfortable seeking out female sources because they are aware that women bring different perspectives to war talk that reflect their experiences in the world of war, and those perspectives may be shared by the female reporters. If frames help structure which parts of reality become noticed, and women know their thoughts on war have long gone unnoticed, then it could be that this is a conscious attempt by women reporters to make women's perceived realities of war more salient (Entman, 1993).

Additionally, the media worldview has traditionally led us to believe that women have no access to information about war that would be of use to the public. While there certainly are women who belie this particular construction of reality, Zock & Turk (1998) contend that women are not represented in the higher echelons of organizations in proportion to their total number in the population, and therefore are less likely to be identified as viable sources. However, if a large number of sources in the news are

currently military officials unwilling to be identified, as this study found, perhaps this is a

brilliant plan for female reporters to seek out sources who have power and who are

willing to go on the record about their beliefs. The public, after all, relies on the media to

get reliable, intelligent, responsible information about the war.   If the military and

government officials are unwilling to provide this information, they may also be,

unwittingly, allowing women a major entry into the world of the word on war.

H2: Women reporters will use different types of sources than their male counterparts

Results of this hypothesis were conflicting. Women and men reporters used very

similar types of sources, yet, again, because the number of women sources were so few, it

is difficult to determine if women would have had a tendency to use different sources had

there been more data from women from which to analyze.

However, an interesting find within this study is how often male reporters used

unnamed sources as compared to how often women reporters used them. Given the fact

that most of the unnamed sources were government and military officials, whom one can

hardly help from assuming are mostly, if not entirely, male, it is interesting to note that

male reporters used these sources 14.6% of the time, while women used them 8.3% of the

time. Additionally, both male and female reporters used more unnamed sources than

female sources.

This suggests that men's voices are still accepted as voices of authorities and even

unnamed, unidentifiable sources are still more of an authority on war matters than

women's voices. Another interesting finding is that of the many unnamed sources used

by both male and female reporters, female reporters used not only unnamed sources, but, in some cases, they used sources that could almost be categorized as sources. To clarify, 75% of the time that female reporters used what this study classified as unnamed sources, they cited countries and inanimate objects in their reporting. Examples being: *Russia insists* and *France and Germany expressed anger*. Additionally, they cited things such as *slogans stated*, the *report asserts*, *the resolution noted* and etc. They also pluralized their source quite frequently reporting things such as *officials say*, *democrats feel*, *leaders suggest*, *diplomats reported* and etc. Male reporters did this also, but not nearly as often. Women used these unnamed non-sources 61% of the time.

It is difficult to determine what this pattern suggests. Do women reporters have less access to particular unnamed sources than their male counterparts? Or, is it merely the fact that if unnamed sources have become so acceptable in the media reports on war, what risk is there, if any, in merely reporting the general perceived mood of the people one encounters? If so many officials, who are those who should be held most accountable for what it is they say about matters of war, are unwilling to go on the record, what real difference is there in citing a feeling or a mood, or in a reporter merely using their moxie and gleening the general feeling they get due to the privileged standing their reporter status affords them?

H3 Women reporters and sources will use sports metaphors less often than men reporters and sources.

This hypothesis was not supported. The sports metaphor was nearly absent from these data, with male reporters using it only nine times and female reporters using it merely twice. Perhaps this was so because the sports metaphor was over-used in the previous Gulf War and the media were criticized for this over use. Or, perhaps it was because these two elite media organizations wished to distance themselves from the more common language used in the previous war. Or, more importantly, perhaps it is because the president and the military and administrative officials refrained from using this metaphor and the public and the media followed suit.

H4 Women reporters and sources will use the nation as a person metaphor less often than men reporters and sources.

This hypothesis was confirmed, and the difference was highly significant (Table 1). The *Nation As A Person* metaphor was the 2nd most common metaphor used within these data, and men used it more than twice as often as women. Many reporters and sources spoke of Saddam Hussein as though they knew him personally and as if he was the only person living in all of Iraq. The data were laden with quotes such as *Saddam has made his final mistake*, and *the war to defeat Saddam has begun*, and *Saddam has little time left.* Men used this metaphor more than twice as often as women, seemingly, because this is the language of the brut or the bully, a language traditionally associated with maleness.

The same held true for the *Just War* metaphor which was used much as Lakoff (2003) had suggested; the war in Iraq was depicted as a rescue mission. Lakoff's (2003)

study analyzed the *Just War* metaphor as something contained within the *Nation As A Person,* metaphor, but this study, as explained earlier, analyzed them separately. The data showed significance in how men and women used it, with men much more comfortable with this metaphor, using it nearly five times more often than women. Taken together under the Nation As A Person metaphor, it would have been the most common metaphor found in the study by far.

Examples of the Just War were: The United States was depicted as *liberating Iraq*, *saving the Iraqi people from tyranny, stabilizing this world we live in* and *removing the iron fist, for the peace of the world and benefit of the Iraqi people*. This language suggests that our going into Iraq was not about killing the Iraqi people, though many lives were lost, it was about rescuing lives. And rescuing, it seems, is still largely attributed to maleness and is spoken of in male language.

H5 Women reporters and sources will introduce new metaphors of war that are not used by their male counterparts.

The data did not support this hypothesis except in one instance. Of all the newly emerging metaphors found in this study, both men and women used them, some showing a significant difference in use, but there was only one instance where women used a certain metaphor proportionally more than men did, and this was with the Time's Up metaphor. As Table 2 indicates, women used this metaphor 5.5% of the time while men used it 3.6%. And, though it is just significant ($p > .058$), it is worthy of note since it is the only instance.

The remainder of the data did not support this hypothesis. This could be due to the small number of women's voices contained within this study. It is difficult to surmise what women might say about war if they are not afforded an opportunity to speak their thoughts on war. It is equally difficult to know what women's thoughts are about war if there realities concerning war are deemed uninformed and undesirable. We have become so accustomed to men telling our war tales that we, even in modern, of not post modern society, have accepted this traditional voice of war, right or wrong, as its voice of authority. New metaphors and new frames are called for to capture these profound changes in ways of seeing ourselves and our world (Kennedy, 2005)

Significant Metaphors Explored In Previous Studies

The pre-existing metaphors were very easy to identify because many of them were nearly verbatim quotes from the results of previous research. As is often the case with metaphors, they linger because they are deeply rooted in our vocabulary and they require little explanation, they merely need to sound familiar in order for them to be understood.

The same held true for war as a contest. War was often depicted as a fight between two men. It was termed a fistfight and a showdown and a contest of men. Examples being, *the United States is still preparing the knockout-punch,* and *the American attacks punched a hole in Mr. Hussein's prestig*e, and *for all the talk about waging a punishing air campaign, the United States has been holding back some punch*.

68

And one official declared that *the Iraqis lacked the armored punch.* Not surprisingly, men used this metaphor almost twice as often as women.

War As Politics was also prevalent, and there were many examples of war in terms of political cost-benefit analysis. There was much discussion of the cost of war in monetary terms, but very little discussion of the cost of war in human life terms, with men using this metaphor four times more often than women. Though this is not brutish language, it reinforces Trotta's (1991) notion that it is women who bring the perspective of lost lives into war news, while men focus on the business of war. This proved true within these data. *The dollar cost of the conflict, incremental costs of war, costs based on length of war. With the U.S Secretary of the treasury offering: the cost of the war will be small. We can afford the war, and we'll put it behind us.* If US and British troops continue to face resistance as they march on Baghdad, it could make for a long and costly war.

Making Killing Abstract was, not surprisingly, the most widely used metaphor. War, death and killing are difficult topics to discuss without using metaphor, and making killing abstract seems to be a very helpful way for people to communicate about and cope with this difficult topic. Apparently it is easier to think of war in terms of abstract things such as *strikes* hitting a wide variety of *targets* or *striking nodes* that were hitting *centers or* cities or buildings, than it is to think of war and speak of it in terms of maiming and killing people.

That was evidenced by the repeated references by both reporters and sources to language such as: *After the initial strikes in the early morning hours in Baghdad, the skies were quiet again, but additional strikes are expected soon.* And*, the strike was*

aimed at Saddam Hussein and several of his top officials, and *today's air strikes against*

Baghdad have drawn condemnation and regret. As well as the almost romantic notion of

American and British warplanes flew through moonlit skies to strike targets and

President Bush did not apologize for the decision to use force against Iraq. He

characterized the war as a strike against tyranny and terrorism. Additionally, the

operation had a name: Valiant Strike.

Significant, Newly Emerging Metaphors

Of the newly emerging metaphors, seven were found to show a significant

difference in gender specific use. Three of them made use of the concept of the value of

time to express views on the subject. The three could have been merged into one

category, but we re left separate in order to explore how the metaphor was used to see

how the concept of time, which is so important in our society that it is almost a value in

and of itself, was used to voice both opposition to and support for war. The categories

were labeled *Time's Up*, *More Time* and *Quick War*. Of the three, *Time's Up* and *More*

Time showed a significant difference in how men and women used it, and *Quick War* did

not. Interestingly, men and women used it exactly the same proportionally, or 2.1% of

the time (Table 2).

Those using the *Time's Up* metaphor spoke in terms of the fact that it was urgent

that now was the time to go to war. Though they faced opposition from those who

suggested that alternate methods to avoid war had not been fully explored, their response

was that time had simply run out. Some examples of this type of language are: *Saddam is*

70

out of time, *as the hourglass empties*, *time for negotiating has run out*, and now it is time *to back our diplomacy with the credible threat of force.* Therefore, it seems that this metaphor also relies on the language of the brute. Though this brut only emerges after his patience has been tested, it also has an air of *Strict Father* metaphor to it. Though the *Time's Up* metaphor approached significance (.058), women used it more often then men.

The *More Time* advocates used time in a very different manner, they felt that time, and more of it, was of the essence. All that was needed to avert war or to prove its justification was more time. They called for *more time to search for a peaceful solution*, *more time to find any evidence of weapons*, that more time would be *welcome*, and they wanted *more time to disarm Iraq*. More time and peace were quite often used together when using this metaphor, and those using it often delivered their message with a tone of imploring, if not pleading. This was not language of the enforcer, but more language directed toward.

Initially, it was thought that this metaphor would be used more often by women than by men partly based on Trotter's (1991) research that found that women take a different point of view of war and often focus on that which impacts the greatest number of people or innocent civilians, there was an expectation that this would turn out to be a woman's metaphor. That turned out not only not to be the case, but the data also showed that women rarely used this metaphor. Men used it more than four times more often; not men from the U.S. military or government officials, but largely male authorities from other countries.

There was a category labeled *Game* (not sports), and there were many references to war as a game and a variety of them. Quite interestingly, there were children's games

referenced such *as Saddam Hussein is the master of where's the pea* and that this

particular war was a *cat and mouse game* or that the *regime would collapse like a house*

of cards. The war was referred to as *an anxious guessing game*, a *balance of power*

game, and a *game that could begin at any time*. And, there were several references to an

endgame. Thus, unlike the sports metaphor, which uses language of male physical

prowess and might, this game metaphor borrows language from the schoolyard and the

parlor. There was not a single incidence of a woman reporter or source using this

metaphor.

The word attack was categorized and examined not as a metaphor per se, but

because it was found repeatedly in the data and it was one of the few words used that

actually sounded as though it had something to do with war. Attacking someone or

something conjures an unpleasant image. While analyzing the uses of the word it became

apparent that this word was indeed used metaphorically, and purposefully, as a cover up

word. It seems that the majority of uses of the word attack when used by U.S. military

and government officials was very different when the word was used as something the

U.S. did as opposed to something the Iraqis did. For the U.S., an attack was associated

with a political milestone. Additionally, the U.S. did not attack the Iraqi people. The

U.S. attacked Saddam, Iraq, Baghdad, Tirkrit, a variety of buildings and locations and

Iraqi positions, but not the people.

In contrast, when the U.S. was being attacked the language was decidedly

different. Our *soldiers* were being attacked. There *were deadly attacks against*

American forces and *American soldiers under guerilla attack*. This word also provided

the use of the term terror attack; a term that directly, succinctly linked Saddam Hussein

with Osama Bin Laden. Additionally, the U.S. was always only the victims of terror

attacks and never ones who engaged in them.

The *diplomacy* metaphor users were primarily male. Again, the word diplomacy

is a bit of a stretch as a metaphor goes, but it was used so readily and so matter of factly

in the text that is seemed worthy of inspection as it seemed to be a catchall phrase for

anyone using it. Both pro and anti war users made use of this metaphor. Examples are:

diplomacy has run its course and *hoping diplomacy would make violence unnecessary*.

It was also used to criticize the president: *I am saddened, saddened that the president*

failed so miserably at diplomacy that we are now forced to war. And here is one whose

meaning remains completely unclear: *Bush may have already moved beyond diplomacy*.

The *diplomacy* metaphor was the most highly significant in the difference between the

way men and women used it, with men using it five times more often than women. In

fact, there were only two instances in the data where women, both reporters, used it.

The *coalition* metaphor users spoke frequently of the coalition forces and rarely

indicated who made up this coalition. The coalition metaphor was used mainly by British

and U. S. officials. *As hundreds of coalition troops swept in just after dawn* and the Iraqi

people were told *to follow the instructions of the coalition* who were launching *the first*

stage of the coalition attack against Iraq, and a senior Iraqi official struck a posture of

defiance today in the face of advancing coalition forces. Additionally, there were

repeated references, almost exclusively by President Bush, of the *coalition of the willing*.

The repeated use of this metaphor belied the fact that there was no coalition to

speak of. It was masterful use of metaphor by the administration and it seemed fairly

powerful, though, interestingly, it was not readily picked up by the public or the press

73

other than when they were quoting the president and other military and government official. However, in spite of that fact, the public repeatedly heard mention of the coalition, especially from the President, who is in a better position to delegate metaphors in a time of war than just about anyone else, so many must have assumed that a coalition did indeed exist. Though there were 83 gender identifiable references to the coalition (with many more made by unnamed officials, and only seven by women), one example by the president seems to drive the point of the repeated use of war metaphor home and how so much can be said and not said, in a metaphorical soundbyte: *On my orders, coalition forces have begun striking selected targets of military importance to undermine Saddam Hussein's ability to wage war.* In that one sentence the president used three metaphors being examined in this study.

The *intelligence* metaphor users were also mostly U. S. military or government officials. Named male sources used it, but much less frequently, and there was not a single instance of a woman reporter or source using the *intelligence* metaphor in these data. There was also not one explanation of what or whom intelligence was, but the public was to understand that if the stated source was intelligence, then it was unquestionable and needed little explanation or elaboration. Examples being: *new information based on intelligence, finds Iraq is making new weapons while destroying old,* and *the CIA and the rest of the American intelligence community concluded that Baghdad has chemical weapons*.

Additionally, there were different types of intelligence: *US military received what has been called fresh intelligence about a meeting or the presence of Iraqi leaders, possibly including Saddam Hussein,* and *Mr. Bush decided to work on fresh intelligence*

74

indicating an opportunity to decapitate the country's leadership early in the war. Along

with fresh intelligence there was good intelligence: *The CIA believed they had good*

intelligence that they knew where Saddam Hussein was.

Relying on intelligence is not new to media reports of war, but combine that with

the large number of unnamed official sources in this study, it was as though the public

simply had to trust anonymous sources who were delivering anonymous information.

Thus, in many instances within these data, no one could actually be held accountable for

much of the information being transmitted.

Language Showing No Significant Difference In Gender Use

Though the remaining metaphors showed no significant difference in gender

specific use, some of the language used deserves mention. Quite interestingly, as

mentioned earlier in this paper, the sports metaphor was used much less frequently than

Lakoff's (2003) study suggested.

Many of the remaining categories also used a great deal of male language that

reinforced the notion of the male warrior. Examples of the language used by the *Go It*

Alone users is a case in point: *We are prepared to invade with or without UN backing*,

and when *we need to act we will act and we really don't need anybody's permission*, and

I don't care about the rest of you. We are America, we know best.   These examples were

all quotes from the President of the United States who, as an unnamed military official

stated, felt compelled *to use the muscular language of the enforcer.* And there was other

muscular language employed.

Those who used the *9/11* metaphor employed a retaliatory tone and were almost

exclusively male government officials and unnamed sources.   However, the person using

it most often in these data was President Bush. Examples from the president include*:*

September 11 should say to the American people that we're now a battlefield, and *we are*

at war for the second time since the September11, 2001, terrorist attacks. In one speech,

a reporter noted that he (Bush) referred to 911 8 times, accusing Iraq of financing both al-

Qaeda and al-Qaeda like organizations. And another male reporter noted that Bush

reminded the nation that September 11 invested his presidency with a mission to fight

terrorism and brought his administration to the brink of war with Iraq. Another male

reporter noted that an unnamed resolution stated that *Iraq is in material breach of United*

Nations resolutions, and another piece of it links the current action against Saddam

Hussein to the post-9/11 war against terrorism.

Thus, no one other than the president directly linked Iraq with the September 11,

2001, attacks with one exception from an unnamed male senator who was willing to say:

Thank goodness we have a president with the courage to protect our country. And when

people ask what has Saddam done to us, I ask what had the 9/11 hijackers done to us

before 9/11?

The *Strange Use of Peace* metaphor was very interesting, albeit a bit

confounding. War, killing and invading were, somehow, going to lead to peace. The

language was distinctly different from the language used by the *Just War* metaphor users

in that the *Strange Use of Peace* users felt that peace was the goal, but it was achieved

through war. Some examples: a reporter suggesting that U.S. soldiers invading Iraq were

frustrated that they had been unable to orchestrate a peaceful entry into the city, and that

the outcome of the war was *a stable, democratic Iraq at peace*.   Others called it

disarmament by peace and *fighting war and winning peace*. One unnamed official

offered: *I hope that through this conflict we can teach them peace*. During a speech the

day before the war started the president said to a large group containing many war

protesters: *I pray for guidance and wisdom and strength. I pray for peace*.   And at the

start of the war he said: *For the peace of the world and benefit and freedom of the Iraqi*

people, I hereby give the order to execute Operation Iraqi Freedom. This is another

single sentence laden with multiple metaphors.

The *Emotional Side of War* metaphor was not one we could ever define the

language for, but mention herein because, though we were never able to define its

metaphorical use, the emotional side of war was left, almost exclusively, to women.

Women wept, worried and feared war; even the few women soldiers who made it into the

news expressed their fear. This is not to say that men did not express fear because they

did, but not nearly as frequently or as emotionally. And, there is not one instance of a

reporter stating that a man was afraid or appeared afraid or that a man cried. Male

sources would speak for themselves and say things like: *sure we are afraid* and *we'd be*

crazy not to be scared. But the women were *scared to death*, and *scared to heck*. And

women were described in reports as *weeping* and one of the few women soldiers

referenced in the data was described by a male reporter thusly: *As a soldier, as a woman,*

the prospect of combat frightened her and she was afraid. Another woman, the wife of a

soldier was described*: she was very very scared and she began to cry 'I don't get it' she*

said, angrily.   Very different language was prescribed for men than for women.

Conclusion

Journalism may well be a tradition bound craft, but with women making up 52% of the population and their presence in the military and the media in increasing numbers, the absence of women's voices in war reports goes beyond tradition; it suggests that the media are caught up in outdated notions of the past, particularly notions of the male warrior and the female helpmate as well as the frame of the female being the dichotomous opposite of the male in general. It further suggests that the pervasiveness of war in history has influenced gender profoundly (Goldstein, 2001), and that the media continues to play a large role in impacting what Lippman (1922) calls the pictures in our head when it comes to matters of war.

Such pictures are based on very old scripts that we learn in early childhood where military service is portrayed strictly as the domain of men (Goldstein, 2001). We envision young men marching off to war and women (wives, mothers, sisters and beaus) awaiting their safe return. These scripts are so engrained and seem so natural that we fail to question them because it is just the way things are and the way things have always been. Women's role in war finds them metaphorically located in the home front; a place that is both safe and where it is they belong. Though this picture no longer offers an accurate reflection of reality, the male warrior is such a dominant frame in our culture (if not in most cultures) that it appears to be a classic example of what Schank (1998) describes as finding a story you already know and making it work with a new story: even though the facts do not fit the frame, it is the facts that are rejected, not the frame, because the frame is familiar.

And, the frame of women warriors is not. Furthermore, the notion is so dissimilar to the pictures in our head that it is jarring if not downright scary. It is a very cyclical process and provides quite an example of the power of language and the power of metaphor. Gender is sustained through these frames and patterns of talk, so women are seen not only as outside of war matters, they are then not at liberty to partake in the discourse. They are not only passive and peaceful, but also require saving. And changing this particular script seems too difficult a concept for our culture to accept just yet. The language attributed to the warrior seems so naturally male that it is uncomfortable, perhaps even unthinkable, to associate it with female.

The use of metaphor is purposeful and portraying women as the opposite and lesser of men is clearly an example of the power structure of patriarchy. It reminds us that social dominance can and does bias the way metaphors are constructed (Tinker, 1986) and, thereby, this metaphorical reality remains male dominated. Given that language is so instrumental in shaping our lives, and that men seem to be the ones with the power to make the symbols and language of war, it is essential that we examine this language, particularly in times of war, which seem to be the most difficult of times to so do. War is powerful, dangerous and male. Or is it?

The fact that women are now part of the war machine puts the media in a particularly difficult position in at least two ways. The media's charge is to report accurate information that reflects reality, yet they, like many Americans, simply do not know what to do with the female warrior. They have no frames and they have no metaphors with which to work to tell this particular story. When a journalist interviews a woman soldier, the first task is to frame the story in a manageable way. Allen (1996)

explains this by suggesting that when women act in untraditional ways, they become unmanageable for the media. Therefore, the journalist will try to frame the woman in a familiar, acceptable niche.

Additionally, because the male warrior is such a dominant frame, to use another poses a risk to the communicator's credibility (Gamson, 1992). It is a slippery slope for the journalist to either use the dominant frame or to reject it. Perhaps that is why it is easier to merely avoid the frame all together.   The data in this study found that journalists herein primarily chose to avoid it, while a few used it.   Thus, of the three women soldiers reported on in this data, two were in very familiar settings. One was in the mess hall, which is where she worked on the ship she was on, and the other spoke of being in the salon as she longed to have her hair and nails done. The third one cried. None were pictured to be even remotely menacing or warrior like, or even soldierly.

And, it is not just women represented as warriors that are at issue, it is that women's voices are still, surprisingly, missing from the rhetoric. Femininity is still deemed as incompatible with the authoritative language of war. Women's voices are absent because a gender ideology exists that still views military authority as the domain of men. Again, this seems to be the case merely because it has always been the case. And even though there were a fair number of women reporters present in this data, they, too, used few women sources.

The fact that journalists, male and female, give salience to the mostly white, mostly male, officials who are mostly pro war, along with the use of experts who are often made up of the same homogenous mix of people (Soley, 1992) it is easy to see why women's voices are omitted. They are, for the most part, not in the pool.

If tradition and culture insist that media reports of war do nothing but largely parrot official sources, then it is clear that the media are missing many vital aspects of war. Due to the enormity of the consequences of any war, it is of paramount importance that the language of the officials is scrutinized and, equally as important, that the language of those who disagree or have a different perspective or solutions be included. The media are in a better position to provide salience to these other voices than just about any other institution.

However, the media are also in just about the worst position to scrutinize the official line, especially in times of war, because they rely so heavily on these officials to give them accurate, concise, understandable language, that it would not behoove the media to develop adverse relationships with the sources they rely so heavily upon. Thus, it is a dichotomy, and one that might not be easily resolved.

But, this dilemma is not a new one. The exigencies of war reporting have long been a challenge to journalists. Reporters have often been criticized for their accommodation of military language, and they know well the tension between objectivity, patriotism and humanitarianism (Robinson, 2004). Another common trap is found when reporters use logic from previous wars and recycle it into new wars until they have had a chance to see how the war at hand is different from previous wars and have a chance to alter their reports accordingly.

And, the war on terror we are currently engaged in certainly fits in that description; it is unlike any war we have been involved with in the past, with many questioning whether it should even be termed as a war. Therefore, there could well be a case for exploring a range of alternative metaphors that would allow us to better

81

understand this new type of war because, it is suggested, the old metaphors of war do not seem to correspond to the reality of modern warfare (Steinert, 2003). War, it seems, needs a new metaphoric foundation and journalists are in about the best position to initiate that change. And women might just be in a better position than men to put forth such a foundation.

Acquisition of new ways of thinking requires a departure from the old worldview to a new set of ideas, values and beliefs that will be reflected in the newly adopted language. Metaphors can refocus the familiar and show it in a new light (Wilson, 1992). They provide a vivid image which makes future actions more tangible. The use of different metaphors may lead to different behaviors. Metaphorical language may not only influence perception but subsequent action as suggested by Sapienza (1985). They can initiate the process of change by triggering a perceptual shift, the choice of metaphor influencing the direction, interpretation or/and feelings about the shift (Sackman, 1989).

This researcher thought that women would bring different metaphors to the media reports on war because experiences shape metaphors and women's experience in war has traditionally been different from men's. With more women present in war matters than ever before, it was thought that female journalists, who would likely be aware of male dominance, would choose not to be trapped in the language game of the male metaphors of war. It was further thought that women reporters would seek out alternate voices to add to their reports. Unfortunately, there was not enough evidence to either prove or reject this. The greatest limitation of this study is the limited number of women's voices found herein. Those sparse numbers made it difficult, if not impossible, to conclude whether or not women bring new metaphors to war.

82

However, if the social world is a kaleidoscope of potential realities, any of which can be evoked by altering the way in which observations are framed (Edelman, 1993), women are not going to get a chance to impact the realities of war if they are not provided the opportunities to do the framing. It seems providing themselves this opportunity might be their best bet because maintaining a culture is easier than changing one and opportunities to do so will unlikely be provided by those already entrenched within the system.

It will be interesting to see how, over time, women's voices may change the way we talk and think about war. Their voices being included in numbers that reflect their percentage of the population must surely be just a matter of time due to the nature of journalism's quest for and the citizenry's thirst for the truth.

There is a chance that more women's voices in the media reports on war might not change the way we think and talk about war; media ownership might have more of an impact than just the presence of women's voices, but that is the topic of another study.

Total number of text strings: 2,916

Number of text strings by male reporters: 2,139 (73.3%)

Male sources	845	39.5%
Female sources	99	4.6%
Unnamed sources	312	14.6%
Self sources	883	41.3%

Number of text strings by female reporters: 615 (21.1%)

Male sources	259	42.1%
Female sources	48	7.8%
Unnamed sources	51	8.3%
Self sources	257	41.8%

Number of text strings by reporters who shared a byline: 162 (5.6%)

Male sources	62	38.3%
Female sources	7	4.3%
Unnamed Sources	44	27.2%
Self-sources	49	30.2%

Summary

Number of text strings in women's voices:	411 (14.1%)
Number of text strings in men's voices:	2,049 (70.3%)
Number of text strings represented by unnamed sources:	407 (13.9%)
Number of text strings by reporters who shared a byline:	49 (1.7%)
Number of women sources	154 (5.3%)
Number of men sources	1166 (40%)

REFERENCES

Adams, A. (1997). The military academy: Metaphors of family for pedagogy and public life. In L. Weinstein & C.C. White (Eds.), *Wives and warriors: Women and the military in the United States and Canada (pp.* 63-77). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Allan, S. (1998). (En)gendering the truth: Politics of news discourse. In C. Carter, G. Branson & S. Allan (Eds.), *News, gender and power* (pp. 121-146). London: Routledge.

Allen, B. (1996). *Rape warfare: The hidden genocide in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Armstrong, C. (2004). The influence of reporter gender on source selection in newspaper stories. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly,* 81(1), 139-154.

Beasley, M., & Gibbons, S. (1993). *Taking their place: A documentary history of women and journalism.* Washington, D.C.: American University Press.

Benford, R., & Snow, D. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment, *Annual Review of Sociology,* 26, 11-39.

Benhabib, S. (1992). *Situating the self: Gender, community and postmodernism in contemporary ethics.* New York: Routledge.

Black, M. (1962). *Models and metaphor.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

_____. (1979). More about metaphor. In A. Ortony, (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (pp. 19-43).

Bleier, R. (1987). A polemic on sex differences in research. In C. Farnham (Ed.), *The impact of feminist research in the academy* (pp. 111-130).   Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Boggs, C. (1976). *Gramsci's Marxism*. London: Pluto Press.

Boose, L. (1993). Techno-muscularity and the "Boy Eternal": From the quagmire to the gulf. In M. Cooke and A. Woolacott (Eds.), *Gendering War Talk* (pp. 67-106). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Brooten, L. (2004). *Gender and the independent media center: How alternative is this alternative?* Paper presented at the meeting of the International Association of Media and Communication Researchers, Porto Alegre, Brazil. Retrieved February 12, 2005 from http://nmc.siu.edu/~brooten/GenderandtheIMC(IAMCR).pdf

Bucholtz, M. (2003). Theories of discourse as theories of gender: Discourse analysis in language and gender studies. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *The handbook of language and gender* (pp. 43-68*).* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Burke, B. (1999) Antonio Gramsci and informal education. In *The Encyclopedia of Informal Education*, Retrieved February 12, 2005 from http://www.infed.org/thinkers/et-gram.htm.

Bybee, J. (1990). Constructing women as authorities: Local journalism and the microphysics of power [Electronic version]. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication,* 7(29), 199-228.

Cameron, D. (1985). *Feminism and linguistic theory*. New York: St. Martin's.

Cameron, L. (1999). Operationalising metaphor for applied linguistic research. In L. Cameron & G. Low (Eds.) *Researching and applying metaphor (pp. 3-28)*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cappella, J., & Jamieson, K. (1997). *Spiral of cynicism: The press and the public good*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Carragee, K., & Roefs, W. (2004). The neglect of power in recent framing research. *Journal of Communication,* 54(2), 214 -233.

Carter, C., Branston, G., & Allan, S. (1998). Setting new(s) agendas: An   introduction. In C. Carter, G. Branson & S. Allan (Eds.), *News, gender and power* (pp. 1-9). London: Routledge.

Chambers, D., Steiner, L., & Fleming, C. (2004)*. Women and journalism*. New York: Routledge.

Cinco, C. (1999). Surviving war: A review of *Common Grounds: Violence against women in war and armed conflict situations*. Retrieved on March 11, 2005 from http://www.isiswomen.org/wia/wia399/vaw00007.html.

Cirksena, K., Cuklanz, L. (1992). Male is to female as _____ is to _____: A guided tour of five feminist frameworks for communication studies. In L. Rakow (Ed.), *Women making meaning: New feminist directions in communication.* New York & London: Routledge.

Cohn, C. (1993). Wars, wimps, and women: Talking gender and thinking war. In M. Cooke & A. Woolacott (Eds.), *Gendering war talk* (pp. 227-248). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Cooke, M. (1993). [WO]-man, retelling the war myth. In M. Cooke & A. Woolacott (Eds.), *Gendering war talk* (pp. 177-204). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Deignan, A. (2003). Collins cobuild English guides. Metaphor. London: Harper-Collins.

Del Zotto, A. (2002). Weeping women, wringing hands: How the mainstream media stereotyped women's experiences in Kosovo [Electronic version]. *Journal of Gender Studies,* 11(2), 141-150.

Dickerson, D. (2001). Framing "political correctness": The New York Times' tale of two professors. In S. Reese, O. Gandy, Jr., & A.E. Grant (Eds.), *Framing public life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world* (pp. 163-174). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Donsbach, W. (1981). Legitimacy through competence rather than value judgments: The concept of professionalization re-considered. *Gazette,* 27, 47–67.

Douglas, S. (1994). *Where the girls are: Growing up female with the mass media.* New York: Times Books.

Dowler, L. (2002). Women on the frontlines: Rethinking war narratives post 9/11 *GeoJournal, 58, 159-65*.

Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An introduction.* London: New York: Verso.

Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2003). *Language and gender.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edelman, M. (1977) *Political language: Words that succeed and policies that fail.* New York: Academic Press.

Eldridge, J. (1995). *News, content, language and visuals*. London: Routledge.

Elshtain, J. (1987). *Women and war.* New York: Basic Books.

Entman, R. (1993). Framing: Towards clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58.

Fauconnier, G. & Turner. M. (1998). Conceptual integration networks. *Cognitive Science* 22(2), 133-187.

Fishman, M. (1980). *Manufacturing the news*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Forceville, C. (2004). *A course in pictorial and multimodal metaphor*. Retrieved October 31, 2005 from: http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/epc/srb/cyber/cyber.html

Fountaine, S., & McGregor, J. (2003). *Reconstructing gender for the 21st Century: News media framing of political women in New Zealand*. Retrieved October 23, 2004, from http://www.bond.edu.au/hss/communication/ANZCA/journpapers.htm.

Freedman, J. (2001). *Feminism*. Buckingham, PA: Open University Press.

Fuller, D. & Waugh, P. (1999). Introduction. In D. Fuller & P. Waugh (Eds.), *The arts and sciences of criticism* (pp. 1- 31). Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Gallagher, M. (2001). *Gender setting: New agendas for media monitoring and advocacy*. New York: St. Martin's.

Gamson, W. (1992). *Talking politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gamson, W., Croteau, D., Hoynes, D. & Sasson, T. Media images and the social construction of reality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 95, 1-37.

Gamson, W., & Modigliani, A. (1989). Media discourse as a symbolic contest: A constructionist approach. *American Journal of Sociology,* 95, 1-37.

Gans, H. (1979). *Deciding what's news*. New York: Pantheon Books.

_____. (2003). *Democracy and the news*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gardner, H. (1982). *Art, mind and brain: A cognitive approach to creativity*. New York: Basic Books.

Gibbs, R. (1999). Taking metaphor out of our heads and putting it into the cultural world. In R. Gibbs & G. Steen (Eds.), *Metaphor in cognitive linguistics* (pp. 146-166). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making of the new left.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Global Media Monitoring Project. (1995). *Women's participation in the news*. Retrieved February 17, 2005 from http://www.globalmediamonitoring.org/gmmp/history/gmmp_1995

_____(2000). *Who makes the news?* Retrieved February 17, 2005 from http://www.globalmediamonitoring.org/gmmp/history/gmmp_2000.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis*. New York: Free Press.

Goldstein, J. (2001). *War and gender: How gender shapes the war system and vice versa.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grady, J. Oakley, T. & Coulson, S. (1999). Blending and metaphor. In G. Steen & R. Gibbs, P. (Eds.). *Metaphor in cognitive linguistics.* (pp. 37- 54). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Gramsci, A. (1971). Selections from the prison notebooks. Q. Hoare & G.N, Smith (Eds. and Trans.). New York: International Publishers Online Version: *Antonio Gramsci Internet Archive (marxists.org) 2000.* Retrieved January 17, 2005 from http://www.marxists.org/archive/gramsci/editions/spn/contents.htm.

Gurevitch, M., & Levy,M. (1985) Introduction. In M. Gurevitch & M. Levy (Eds.), *Mass Communication Yearbook*, (Vol. 5, pp.11-22). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Hall, S. (1982). The rediscovery of 'ideology': Return of the repressed in media studies. In M. Gurevitch, T. Bennett, J. Curran & J. Woolacott (Eds.), *Culture, society and the media (pp .56-90)*. London: Methuen.

Hall, S. (1986). Media power and class power. In J. Curran, J. Eccleston, G. Oakley & A. Richardson (Eds.). *Bending reality: The state of the media* (pp. 127-142). London: Pluto Press.

Hanson, C. (2002). Women warriors. *Columbia Journalism Review*, 41(1), 46-50.

Hartley, J. (1998). Juvenation: News, girls and power. In C. Carter, G. Branston, & S. Allan (Eds.). *News, gender and power (*pp. 47-70). London & New York: Routledge.

Haslanger, S. (2003). Gender, patriotism and the events of 9/11. *Peace Review*, 15(4), 457-461.

Herbert, M. (1991). Amazons or butterflies: The recruitment of women into the military during World War II. *Minerva: Quarterly Report on Women and the Military,* 9(2), 50-68.

89

Hernandez, D. (1994). Good and the bad about women's news in newspapers. *Editor and Publisher,* 127(21), 17-41.

Hertzog, J., & McLeod, D. (2001). A multiperspectival approach to framing analysis: A field guide. In S. Reese, O. Gandy, Jr., & A.E. Grant (Eds.), *Framing public life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world* (pp. 139-162). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Holland, P. (1987). Politics of the smile: 'Soft news' and the sexualisation of the popular press. In C. Carter, G. Branston, & S. Allan (Eds.), *News, gender and power (*pp.17-32). London & New York: Routledge,

Howard, I. (2002). Power sources: On party, gender, race and class: TV news looks to the most powerful group. *Fairness and accuracy in reporting.* Retrieved January 5, 2005 from
http://www.fair.org/index.php?page=1109.

Iyengar, S. (1991) *Is anyone responsible? : How television frames political issues*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jorgensen, K. (1992). Constructing masculinities in U.S. presidential campaigns. In A. Sreberny & L. van Zoonen (Eds.), *Gender, politics and communication* (pp.53-78). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Kahn, A. & Yoder, J. (1989). The psychology of women and conservatism: Rediscovering social change*. Psychology of Women Quarterly,* 13(1), 417-432.

Kennedy, V. (2000). Intended tropes and unintended metatropes in reporting on the war in Kosovo**.** *Metaphor & Symbol*, 15 (4), 252-265.

Kirby, J. (1997). Aristotle on metaphor. [Electronic version] *American Journal of Philology* 118(4), 517-554.

Kovecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor In Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Krippendorff, K. (1993) Major metaphors of communication and some constructivist reflections on their use. *Cybernetics & Human Knowing,* 2(1), 3-25.

Kummel, G. (2002). When boy meets girl: The 'feminization' of the military: An introduction also to be read as a postscript. *Current Sociology*, 50(5), 615–639.

Lakoff, G. (1991). *Metaphor in politics*. Retrieved December 27, 2004 from
http://philosophy.uoregon.edu/meatphor/lakoff-1.htm.

_____. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A.Ortony (Ed.),
    Metaphor and thought (pp. 202- 251). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (2001). Metaphors of terror. Retrieved December 25, 2004 from
    http://www.press.uchicago.edu/News/911lakoff.html.

_____. (2003). *Metaphor and war, again.* Retrieved December 27, 2004 from
    http://www.alternet.org/story/15414.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by.* Chicago: University of
    Chicago Press.

Lakofff, G. & Turner, M. (1989). *More than cool reason: A field guide to poetic
    metapho*r. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Lapham, L. (1992). Trained seals and sitting ducks.   In H. Smith (Ed*.) The media
    and the Gulf War: The Press and Democracy in Wartime (pp.* 256-63).
    Washington, DC: Seven Locks Press.

Lemert, J. (1998). *Criticizing the media.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Lenz, E., & Myerhoff, B. (1985). *The feminization of America: How women's values are
    changing our public and private lives*. Los Angeles: Tarcher.

Lippman, W. (1921). *Public Opinion.* New Your: Free Press.

Litowitz, D. 2000. Gramsci, hegemony, and the law [Electronic version]. *Brigham
    Young University Law Review*, 2, 515 -552.

London, S. (1993). *How the media frames political issues*. Retrieved April 4, 2005 from
    http://www.scottlondon.com/reports/frames.html

Low, G. (1999) Validating metaphor research projects. In L. Cameron & G. Low (Eds.)
    Researching and applying metaphor (pp. 48-67). New York: Cambridge
    University Press.

Lule, J. (2003). *War and its metaphors: News language and the prelude to war in
    Iraq*.Retrieved March 4, 2005 from
    http://list.msu.edu/cgi-bin/wa?A2=.

Mac Cormac, E. (1985). *A cognitive theory of metaphor*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Macionis, J. (1992). *Society. The basics*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Mahon, J. (1999). Getting your sources right: What Aristotle didn't say. In L. Cameron & G. Low (Eds.), *Researching and applying metaphor (pp. 69- 80).* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Manning, P. (1979). Metaphors of the field: Varieties of organizational discourse. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 660-671..

McBride, J. (1995). *War, battering and other sports: The gulf between American men and women.* Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.

McChesney, R (1999). *Rich media, poor democracy: Communication politics in dubious times*. New York: The New Press.

McCombs, M. & Bell, T. (1996). The agenda setting role of mass communication. In M. Salwen & D. Stacks (Eds.), *An integrated approach to communication theory and research* (pp.93-110). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

McCombs, M., & Estrada, G. (1997). The news media and the pictures in our heads. In S. Iyengar & R. Reeves (Eds.), *Do the media govern? Politicians, voters, and reporters in America* (pp. 237-247). Thousand Oak, CA: Sage.

McMillan, J., & Cheney, G. (1996). The student as consumer: The implications and limitations of a metaphor. *Communication Education*, 45, 1-15.

McQuail, D. (1994). *Mass communication theory: An introduction.* London: Sage.

Meyer, David S. (1999). Tending the vineyard: Cultivating political process research. *Sociological Forum,* 14, 79-92.

Miller, M., & Riechert, B. (2001). The spiral of opportunity and frame resonance: Mapping the issue cycle in news and public discourse. In S. Reese, O. Gandy, Jr., & A.E. Grant (Eds.), *Framing public life: Perspectives on   media and our understanding of the social world* (pp. 107-122). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mills, K. (1988*). A place in the news.* NY: Dodd Mead and Company.

Mithen, S. (1998). A creative explosion? Theory of mind, language, and the disembodied mind of the Upper Paleolithic. In S. Mithen (Ed.)*, Creativity in human evolution and prehistory* (pp. 165-191). London: New York: Routledge.

Morgan, D. (1994). Theater of war: Combat, the military, and masculinities. In H, Brod & M, Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing masculinities* (pp.165–82). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Moser, C. & Peake, L. (1987). *Women, human settlements, and housing*.   London: Tavistock.

Noelle-Neumann, E. (1984). *The spiral of silence: Public opinion -- our social skin.* Chicago: University of Chicago.

Norris, P. (1997). Introduction: Women, media and politics. In P. Norris (Ed.)*, Women, media and politics* (pp. 1- 18). New York: Oxford University   Press.

Northwestern University Media Management Center. (2000). *Newspaper Industry Content Analysis Report: Data Tables & Definitions* http://www.readership.org/resources/reports.htm#Content.

National Public Radio. (2002). *NPR programs attract record-breaking audiences: Public radio listenership at all-time high*. Retrieved December 13, 2004 from http://www.npr.org/about/press/020319.recordbreak.html.

O'Barr, W., & Conley, J. (1992). Fortune and folly: The wealth and power of institutional investing. In P. Eckert & S. McConnell-Ginet (Eds.), Language *and gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ortony, A. (1979). Metaphor: A multidisciplinary problem. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Palertz, D., & Entman, R. (1981). *Media, power, politics.* New York: Free Press.

Pan, Z., & Kosicki, G. (2001). Framing as a strategic action in public deliberation. In S. Reese, O. Gandy, Jr., & A.E. Grant (Eds.), *Framing public life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social   world* (pp. 35-66). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Peach, L. (1997). Behind the front lines: Feminist battles over women in combat. In L. Weinstein & C.C. White (Eds.), *Wives and warriors: Women and the military in the United States and Canada (pp.* 99-136). Westport,   CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Rakow, L. (1986). Rethinking gender research in communication*. Journal of Communication* 36(4), 11-26.

Reese, S. (2001). Framing public life: Prologue. In S. Reese, O. Gandy Jr., & A. Grant (Eds.), *Framing public life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world* (pp. 7-31). Mahwah, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Richards, I. (1936) *The philosophy of metaphor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ritchie, D. (2003). Argument is war: Or is it a game of chess? Multiple meanings in the analysis of implicit metaphors. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 18(2), 125-146.

Robinson, P. (2004). Reporting war : Journalism in wartime. In S. Allan & B. Zelizer *Researching US media-state relations and twenty-first century wars (pp* 96-112). London ; New York : Routledge.

Ruddick, S. (1993). Notes toward a feminist peace politics. In M. Cooke & A. Woolacott (Eds.), *Gendering war talk* (pp. 109-127). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Sackman, S. (1989). The role of metaphors in organizational transformation. *Human Relations*, 42(6), 463-485.

Sadler, G. (1997). Women in combat: The U.S. Military and the impact of the Persian Gulf War. In L. Weinstein & C.C. White (Eds.). *Wives and warriors: Women and the military in the United States and Canada (pp.* 79-98). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Sapienza, A. Believing is seeing: How culture influences the decisions top managers make. In R. Kilmann, M. Saxton, & R. Sherpa (Eds.), *Gaining control of the corporate culture.* San Francisco, London: Jossey-Bass Publishers,

Sarbin, T. (2003). The metaphor to myth transformation with special reference to the "war on terrorism." *Journal of Peace Psychology*, 9(2), 149-157.

Schank, R. (1990). *Tell me a story: Narrative and intelligence*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Scheufele, D. (1999). Framing as a theory of media effects. *Journal of Communication,* 49, 103-122.

Schudson, M. (2003). *Sociology of news*. New York: Norton.

Shoemaker, P., & Reese, S. (1996). *Mediating the message: Theories of influence on mass media content. (2nd Ed.).* New York: Longman.

Sigal, L. (1986). Sources make the news. In R. Manoff & M. Schudson (Eds.) *Reading the News*, pp 9-37. New York: Pantheon Books.

Smith, S. (1997*). Developing new reflexes in framing stories. Retrieved March 15, 2005* from *http://www.pewcenter.org/doingcj/civiccat/displayCivcat.php?id=9.*

Smith, D. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Soley, L. (1992). *The news shapers.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Sontag, S. (1990). *Illness as metaphor and AIDS and its metaphors*. New York: Doubleday.

St. Clair, D. (2003). *The road to war: Breaking the code.*. Retrieved December 28, 2004 from http://list.msu.edu/cgi-bin/wa Item #2558.

Steeves, L. (1987). Gender and mass communication in a global context. In P. Creedon (Ed.), *Women in mass communication* (pp. 32- 60). Newbury   Park, CA: Sage.

Steinert, H. (2003). *The indispensable metaphor of war: On populist politics and the contradictions of the state's monopoly of force*. London, Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Strickland, R., & Duvvury, N. (2003). *Gender equity and peace building. From rhetoric to reality: Finding the way*. Retrieved December 30, 2004 from www.idrc.ca/en/ev-7456-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html - 18k.

Tankard, J. (2001). The empirical approach to the study of media framing. In S. Reese, O. Gandy, Jr., & A. Grant (Eds.), *Framing public life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world* (pp. 95-106). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates,

Taylor, A., & Bernstein Miller, J. (1994). *Conflict and gender*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Tickner, J. (1996). *Gender in international relations*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Tickner, J. (2002). Feminist perspectives on 9/11. *International Studies Perspective*, 3, 333-350.

Tinker, T. (1986). Metaphor or reification: Are radical humanists really libertarian anarchists? *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 23 No.4, pp.363-84.

Trotta, L. (1991). *Fighting for air: In the trenches with television news*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making News: A study in the construction of reality*. New   York: Free Press.

U. S. Census Bureau (2003). *About women in the military.* Retrieved February 25, 2005 from
     http://usmilitary.about.com/od/womeninthemilitary/.

Vargus, M. (2002). *Postfeminist news: Political women in media culture*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2000). Constructed masculinities in U.S. presidential campaigns: the case of 1992. . In A. Sreberny & L. van Zoonen (Eds.), *Gender, politics and communication* (pp. 53- 78). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Weinstein, L., & White, C. (1997). Warriors. In L. Weinstein & C.C. White (Eds.), *Wives and warriors: Women and the military in the United States and Canada (pp.* 55- 61). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Williams, R. (1960). *Culture and society, 1780-1950.* New York: Columbia University Press, c1983.

Wilson, F. (1992). Language, technology, gender and power. *Human Relations*, 45, 883- 905.

Woolf, V. (1938). Three Guineas. Retrieved July 31, 2005 from.
     http://etext.library.adelaide.edu.au/w/woolf/virginia/w91tg/chapter1.html

Zaller, J. (1992). The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Zoch, L. & Turk, J. (1998) Women making news: Gender as a variable in source selection and use. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly,* 75(4), 762- 775.

Zoonen, L. (1994). *Feminist media studies*. London: Sage.