

APPROVAL PAGE

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of Humanities and Social Sciences, have examined the thesis entitled

Behind Closed Doors: Self-Presentation strategies amidst political affairs

Presented by Lindsey Torres

A candidate for the degree of Master of Art in Professional Communication, and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.



Dr. Kevin Stein, Committee Chair



Dr. Brian Heuett,



Dr. Arthur Challis

Running Head: Political Affairs

Behind Closed Doors: Self-Presentation strategies amidst political affairs

A thesis presented to the faculty of the Communication Department at Southern Utah University

Lindsey Torres

Southern Utah University

Faculty Supervisor: Dr. Kevin Stein

April 2010

APPROVAL PAGE

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of Humanities and Social Sciences, have examined the thesis entitled

Behind Closed Doors: Self-Presentation strategies amidst political affairs

Presented by Lindsey Torres

A candidate for the degree of Master of Art in Professional Communication, and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Dr. Kevin Stein, Committee Chair

Dr. Brian Heuett,

Dr. Arthur Challis

Behind Closed Doors: Self-Presentation strategies amidst political affairs

Lindsey Torres

Dr. Kevin Stein; Faculty Supervisor

Abstract

What happens behind closed doors stays behind closed doors; is not always the case concerning politicians who engage in extra-marital affairs. Once an affair becomes public knowledge many politicians seeks to repair a tarnished image. Through the use and understanding of Goffman's self-presentation strategies politicians have been able to once again find favor with the public. Bill Clinton and Mark Sanford were both accused to engaging in extra-marital affairs during their political career; and later admitted guilt to transgressions. Through the analysis of print and television and by assessing audience reaction; self-presentation strategies have been demonstrated by both politicians.

Table of Contents

	Page
1. Introduction.....	5
2. Literature Review.....	12
<i>Theoretical Foundation of Self-Presentation.....</i>	<i>13</i>
Application for Theoretical use of Self-Presentation.....	13
3. Methods.....	26
4. Results.....	31
<i>Television.....</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>Print.....</i>	<i>34</i>
5. Discussion.....	48
<i>Limitations.....</i>	<i>61</i>
<i>Conclusion.....</i>	<i>62</i>
6. References.....	63

Chapter One

Introduction

The history of American politicians who have admitted to an extra-marital affair date back as far as Thomas Jefferson in the early 19th century and as circumstances arise have been handled behind closed doors by political advisors (Cornog, 2004). Historically when politicians were caught amidst an extra-marital affair it proved to be political suicide, therefore, politicians traditionally have kept their mistresses out of the public's view. Recent politicians who have admitted guilt for past transgressions, however, have been able to maintain political office and popularity with voters.

At any given time a politician is looking ahead to their next political campaign and striving to maintain their image and popularity with voters. When a politician loses popularity with their voters, they could eventually lose their political office and ultimately their job. Therefore in order to maintain popularity, a politician must cater to the wants and needs of their voters. Most often politicians will participate in activities that are appealing to the general public and will tailor their image to match the majority of the population. When information becomes public knowledge, which is contrary to what the politician would have the public believe, the politician will strive to repair their tarnished image back to the tailored and manipulated image that they wish the public to receive.

Voters have traditionally supported candidates whose values and ideals most closely match their own (Cornog, 2004). Voters tend to admire candidates who not only demonstrate knowledge for a wide range of subjects but also those whose private lives are appealing as well. During the 1980 presidential race between Ronald Reagan and Jimmy Carter, Reagan's private life came under intense scrutiny because he had been divorced. At the time, the majority of the population valued a traditional family structure and voting Reagan into office would have gone contrary to the ideals that people valued (Cornog, 2004). Similarly, a 2009 Gallup poll was conducted and asked Americans what values they considered morally wrong and which principles they supported. The results indicated that while past

trends of unwed pregnancies and drug use was once considered morally unacceptable; were now considered morally acceptable. Other results indicated that the majority of the population still considered abortion, polygamy and married men and women having an affair morally unacceptable.

While it is interesting to note that the majority of the population still considers married men and women having an affair morally unacceptable, 37% of men have admitted to having an extra-marital affair, while 22% of women have admitted to straying during marriage (Menstuff, 1999). These statistics reflect that while many voters consider extra-marital affairs morally wrong, many voters still engage in morally wrong behaviors-contrary to what their ideals and values are. According to Williams (2009), "Marital fidelity is now rated as more quaint than virtuous. Marital infidelity is as routine as rising and setting of the sun" (p.13). A 2009 Newsweek polled asked Americans whether they would vote for a presidential candidate who had committed an extra-marital affair. The results indicated that 43% of voters would not vote for a candidate who had had an affair (Seib, 2009). Just 2 years prior in 2007 The Pew Research Center asked voters whether or not they would vote for a candidate who had admitted to an extra-marital affair and found that 62% of Republicans and 25% of Democrats would be less likely to vote for a candidate who had had an affair in their past (Leavenworth, 2007). Sieb (2009) further explains that while voters may believe that an extra-marital affair is wrong, many voters are willing to look past the affair because such behavior could be viewed as glamorous and shows a passionate streak for the politician. Andersen (1998) explains, "There are acceptable lies and unacceptable lies, and lying about someone's sex life is one of those tolerated lies" (p.9).

John F. Kennedy was a popular politician and president for many reasons, but it seemed his most well known presidential feature was his ability keep extra-marital affairs secret and out of the press (Cornog, 2004). Many in Kennedy's inner circle knew of the president's philandering ways-but most considered it a harmless hobby. One member of Kennedy's inner circle even remarked, "It took less time than tennis, and partners were easier to find" (Seib, 2009, p. 1). At a time when adultery was

still considered morally unacceptable-many members of the president's inner circle went to great lengths to ensure the public was not aware of the president's private life. Throughout the course of history many of Kennedy's affairs have become better known and have had little effect on his overall presidential rating. However, recent politicians who have admitted to an affair have seen their political career become dismal as allegations became more public. In 1987, presidential candidate Gary Hart was caught with another woman and immediately the press made the public aware of Hart's behavior. Within one week after the first allegations arose, Hart was forced to withdraw his presidential bid and subsequently he was forgotten about (Seib, 2009). Current politicians have been able to benefit from past politicians inability to remain faithful during marriage. According to Leavenworth (2007), current politicians do not need to worry about airing their dirty laundry to the public because past presidential scandals have lowered the bar.

During the 1992 presidential race between William Jefferson Clinton and George H.W. Bush allegations arose indicating that Clinton had not always been faithful to wife, Hillary Rodham Clinton. Allegations indicated that during Clinton's time as Governor of Arkansas he had been involved with numerous women, with the most recent being Gennifer Flowers. As the presidential race between Clinton and Bush began to get heated, more allegations came forth. In order to repair damage done to his image, Clinton appeared with his wife on national television and admitted fault. Clinton was then viewed as apologetic and Rodham viewed as a faithful and endearing wife. Clinton eventually won the 1992 presidential race, even amidst claims of extra-marital affairs. However, after entering office many rumors continued to swirl regarding Clinton and numerous affairs throughout his past as well as allegations during his time as president. In 1997 the first allegations linking Clinton with White House intern, Monica Lewinsky arose. The president's inner circle tried to extinguish the story but many American voters were still aware of the scandal. Over the course of the next year Clinton denied an inappropriate relationship with Lewinsky but eventually had to once again admit fault. Clinton admitted

to, "A critical lapse in judgment and a personal failure" (Seib, 2009, p. 1). Americans seemed to accept Clinton's apology as a physical disorder and many Americans viewed adultery as a growing societal problem. Although Clinton was impeached as president for obstruction of justice and later acquitted by the U.S. Senate, Clinton left office in 2000 with an overwhelming approval rating of 57%; second only to Dwight Eisenhower in 1960 (Beyle, 2001).

Hillary Rodham continued to stand by her husband throughout allegations of affairs and appeared next to his side during any public apology and admission of guilt. While campaigning for office Hillary portrayed a valiant wife who was able to forgive her husband for any past transgression. "You know, I'm not sitting here like some little woman standing by my man, like Tammy Wynette," Hillary Clinton remarked in 1992. She further explained, "I'm sitting here because I love him, and I respect him, and I honor what he's been through and what we've been through together. And you know; if that's not enough for people, then heck, don't vote for him" (Garofoli, 2008, p.2). When Clinton admitted to fault with Lewinsky, Hillary continued to believe and stand by husband Bill. Hillary, like the rest of the American population, had believed Bill's plea that he had not committed any wrong doings with Lewinsky. In early 1998, Hillary even defended Bill once again stating that adultery by a president "Would be a very serious offense" (Garofoli, 2008, p.2). In regards to questions about her husband Hillary further explained, "That is not going to be proven true. I think we're going to find some things. And I think that when all this is put into context and we really look at the people involved here, look at their motivations, look at their backgrounds, look at their past behavior, some folks are going to have a lot to answer for" (McMantus, 1998, p.1). After Bill admitted guilt for transgressions on national television, Hillary was shown as a committed and enduring spouse. Hillary seemed to set the standard for the way political wives should handle an extra-marital affair and many voters have come to expect political wives to stand by their husband whenever an admission of guilt is rendered.

Mark Sanford's first gubernatorial campaign began in 2002 in the basement of his beach house while his wife, Jenny Sanford, worked tirelessly along with their boys to help ensure Sanford's win as Governor of South Carolina. Prior to his governorship of South Carolina, Sanford held three terms in the U.S. House of Representatives and was known as a conservative Republican and considered a contender for the 2012 presidential bid (Davenport, 2009). Davenport further explains that although married for nearly 20 years, Sanford's private life was brought forth to national attention when he went missing in June of 2009. After failed attempts at contacting Sanford, Sanford later admitted that he had been visiting his mistress in Argentina. Further investigation into Sanford's life, letters and e-mail correspondence indicated that Sanford had been having an affair for more than a year and also admitted to straying in the past. Sanford made public apologies and pleas and reassured voters that any government funds spent while visiting his mistress would be repaid in full. Many voters in South Carolina called for the governor's resignation; however, Sanford declined and has strove to rebuild a tarnished image. In early 2010 Jenny Sanford filed for divorce and Mark Sanford has remained in office even amidst a dismal approval rating and has seemingly lost all chances at a 2012 presidential bid.

Contrary to past political standards, when Governor Mark Sanford admitted guilt in visiting his mistress in Argentina, Jenny Sanford was nowhere to be found. Jenny Sanford refused to stand behind her husband as he made a public apology regarding his extra-marital affair. When Jenny was questioned about the future of Mark's political career, Jenny remarked, "He's going to have to worry about that. I'm worried about my family and the character of my children" (Campbell, 2009, p. B7). After the affair became public knowledge, Jenny assured the public that she would try and work on her marriage, yet when questioned regarding Mark's floundering political career-she made no apologies or explanations. Jenny told Barbara Walters, "I have forgiven him, but would not forget," (Washington Post, 2009, p. 1). A few weeks after Jenny told Walters her side of the story, Jenny filed for divorce from Mark after more

than 20 years together. Jenny acted contrary to what past political wives have been expected and as such as gained credit for ushering in the next generation of political wives.

The difference between how political sex scandals are handled today in the press and how scandals were managed twenty years ago has drastically changed. Historically when political advisors found out about a politician who had entered into an extra-marital affair, the political advisors would strive to handle the news as privately as possible. With the increased availability of instantaneously news, handling sensitive information that could possibly hurt a political campaign can be detrimental to any political race. Therefore politicians have had to understand that the line between their private lives and public lives is blurred (Sulek, 2007). Sulek explains, "Some of this has to do with the new reality of politics. Whatever happens, it is now best for a candidate to tell it all, tell it early and tell it himself" (p.1). In 1999 voters were asked about whether the media should investigate a candidate's private life, only 29% favored such invasive probes (Leavenworth, 2007). Therefore it may be assumed that although the public may seem apprehensive about finding out about a politician's private life the press still considers their private life newsworthy. As any politician attempts to take public office they must understand that all areas of their life, both public and private will be examined and critiqued by voters. Sulek (2007) states, "We just no longer value privacy. It's just not considered sacred as it once was and it further underscores what has been a trend in American politics for 40 years," (p.1). Leavenworth (2007) explains this need for more open politicians, "Clearly, the morality of the candidate should be a factor. You could have a very moral candidate who would be an awful president" (p. 1). Although many politicians have had to confess to past drug use, alcoholism, family estrangement, depression and divorce the most hurtful and what seems to be the hardest for voters to consider morally acceptable is adultery.

Over the past 20 years since Gary Hart first admitted guilt in his presidential bid, many Americans have grown a bit numb to a politician's sexual indiscretions (Seib, 2009). According to Seib, it

now takes a couple of extra steps before people start to take notice of a politician's private life. Politicians are now forced to wear their religion on their sleeves and also acknowledge any moral shortcomings that they may have. Because the presidential office is the most special public office a politician may hold, people expect their candidates to become an open book. Sulek (2007) states, "Character is vital and people need to see that transparency" (p.1). Their private lives are considered fair game for aggressive journalists and voters are now made aware of what they will and won't tolerate. According to Scott (2007), voters find politicians more appealing when they are able to admit to past mistakes and ask for forgiveness. Sulek (2007) explains one reason why voters seem to accept open and honest admissions of guilt, "I think voters are now lowering the bar but are realizing their expectations should not be much greater than their own selves and sometimes a president is no longer a god-or goddess-like figure. Rather, someone like me, someone with personal foibles, weaknesses and personal strengths" (p.1). Scott (2007) further explains that entertainment and news networks have become more blurred-thus making it easier for politicians to tell their side of the story directly to the American voters.

At one point all it took was to have an incriminating photo of oneself leaked to the press to get yourself in trouble; but as Johnson (2009) explains the public now wants to know more and more details of the personal and sexual affairs of politicians. With the emergence of e-mails and text messaging it becomes virtually impossible to hide any trace of an extra-marital affair. When e-mail correspondence was leaked between Sanford and his mistress, public interest rose, as did the intimate details regarding their relationship. However, according to Johnson, often times it is the cover-up of past transgressions that ends up being the worse crime. In the end, however, a voter will take into consideration all aspects of a candidate. "All behavior is subject to differing interpretations. Opponents can spin information one-way, supporters may spin it another. Ultimately, it is the American public who decides whether the

information constitutes a character flaw or hypocrisy and whether either of those are disqualifications for holding office” (Leavenworth, 2007, p. 1).

American history seems to dictate, to some extent, how future events, scandals and issues will be handled. As the competition for public office becomes more strenuous and rigorous there seems to be certain character attributes that voters seem to tolerate more than others. While some politicians have faded into the background after allegations of adultery others have succeeded and triumphed into greater political success. “Gary Hart was driven from the race 20 years ago by accusation of cheating, while Bill Clinton was elected twice despite identical accusations,” (Leavenworth, 2007, p.1). What makes the difference in how politicians handle sexual indiscretions? Through an analysis of self-presentation strategies used by Clinton and Sanford in acknowledging sexual misconduct through their admission of guilt in television and through print and by analyzing audience reaction, I hope to better understand why voters accept some while rejecting others for similar sexual carelessness. First by understanding the literature of self-presentation, I hope to better illustrate the ways individuals engage in self-presentation. Second I will analyze use of self-presentation strategies exemplified by Clinton and Sanford through staged performances following confession of an extra-marital affair. Finally I will draw conclusions based upon previous literature and illustration of key self-presentation strategies used by Clinton and Sanford and finally assess audience reaction following performances where self-presentation occurred.

Chapter Two

Literature Review

Self-presentation can be viewed first from its theoretical foundation then by application and illustration of self-presentation strategies used throughout daily interactions. A basic review of Goffman’s principles will be explained, application for use of self-presentation in social settings, the

difference between how genders use self-presentation and finally a review of how individuals use self-presentation in television, radio, and on the internet.

Theoretical Foundation of Self-Presentation

The theoretical foundation for self-presentation is derived from Erving Goffman's (1959) book entitled, *"The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life."* Goffman proposed "Sometimes individuals will act in a thoroughly calculating manner, expressing himself in a given way solely in order to give the kind of impression to others that is likely to evoke a specific response he is concerned to obtain" (p.6). At times individuals will be unaware of the manipulative behavior in which they act, however, Goffman suggests "Sometimes he will intentionally and consciously express himself in a particular way" (p.6). Depending upon the social rules and standards that exist in the group and social status the individual may or may not engage in conscious controlled behaviors. Goffman further explains that individuals will respond to situations that are most likely to present him or herself in a favorable light to the group. As individuals give off impressions to the group, the group may witness the impressions in two parts. One part easily controlled and manipulated through the use of calculating verbal statements and the other part the individual has little control over-the nonverbal impression he gives off.

Application for theoretical use of self-presentation

Goffman (1959) compares individuals to actors on a stage-he characterize the individuals as putting on performances. "When an individual plays a part he implicitly requests his observers to take seriously the impression that is fostered before them. They are asked to believe that the character they see actually possesses the attributes he appears to possess," (p. 17). Because individuals engage in these manipulated controlled impressions, the performer can be convinced that the impression being portrayed is reality. Goffman explains that within any performance various terms are used to describe the actions that the individuals will take during a performance.

Understanding the use of the self-presentation terms developed by Goffman helps in understanding how individuals use and present themselves in public. The front refers to “That part of the individual’s performance which regularly functions for those general and fixed fashion to define the situation for those who observe the performance” (p. 22). In other words the front most commonly deals with scenic aspects of the performance. Dramatic realization refers to an individual’s ability to noticeably highlight facts and elements of a performance that might otherwise have remained unnoticed. Dramatic realization allows for performers to hide flaws while still showcasing strong points. Idealization constitutes the way a performer is molded to fit into the understanding and expectations of the society or culture in which the performance is presented. Most times idealization can be illustrated through the standards and regulations that people place on performers to act and maintain specific impressions in given situations. Maintenance of expressive control suggests that “The performer can rely upon his audience to accept minor cues as a sign of something important about his performance” (p. 51). As suggested earlier, an audience will try to orient themselves with a situation by accepting the performer’s cues. Misrepresentation is when the audience accepts cues or signs that the performer could have skewed-thus misrepresentation is when the audience accepts cues that could have been distorted by the performer. Mystification suggests that during a performance an individual or actor will emphasize certain matters and hide others. Similar to dramatic realization, mystification will emphasize certain matters while dramatic realization will noticeably highlight facts while leaving others unnoticed. Finally, reality and contrivance is defined as two separate terms; reality “We tend to see real performances as something not purposely put together but being the unintentional product of the individuals unself-conscious response to the facts in his situation” (p. 70). Contrived performances, we see the performances as manipulated situations where the performer places false items together in order to construct a new reality.

Goffman states that individuals will put on performances for various social settings. Performers will engage in different behaviors depending upon the expected social standards. Individuals will participate in various stages and social settings throughout their life, and for certain individuals they will be judged more harshly depending upon the actions they engage in while on stage. Goffman also explains that while individuals may act alone while engaged in self-presentation they may also act in teams or pairs to compliment the performance.

The complexity of self-presentation is derived from the intricacy of the self. According to Samp, Wittenberg and Gilett (2003) the self can contain information about the roles, abilities, relationships, and values that define a person. The various elements that define the self allow a performer to make strategic decisions about which elements they are going to portray to their audience. Samp et. al., state that the “public self” (p. 2) can change depending upon which social setting the performer is currently engaged in.

Human behavior has indicated that “The pervasive tendency of individuals is to claim credit for their successes while denying responsibility for their failures” (Rosenfeld, 1989, p. 495). While striving to claim credit for success, people will strive to enhance, maintain or defend their own self-esteem. Goffman (1959) suggests that individuals will enhance the self by talking about oneself in a positive way. Thus it can be assumed that individuals wishing to portray a positive self will avoid talking about past mistakes and failures and will concentrate on current success. Gee and Heyman (2007) believe that there are many reasons why people would reveal untrue statements about themselves. Some may reveal untrue statements because of “Lack of self-knowledge, a desire to present themselves in a favorable manner and purposeful deceit” (p. 800). According to Atkinson, Kaufer and Ishizaki (2008) a presenter may use presence as a way of focusing on success while hiding any hidden flaws. Presence is the ability to focus on given elements within an argument and give desired amplitude to less important elements of the argument. When a performer demonstrates presence within an argument they are able

to manipulate which elements an audience should accept as reality. However, Uysal and Oner-Ozkan (2007) believe that presenters also engage in protective self-presentation in that a performer will refuse to transmit bad news and instead focus on transmitting good news. Individuals feel that if they can transmit good news then the audience will view them as having a positive image, whereas the transmitting of bad news will reflect poorly on the presenter.

The basic contention within self-presentation is how individuals try and “Affect the attributions that significant others make with respect to their identity and are best understood within a social power context because they are often the key to other forms of influence” (Mor, 2007, p. 662). Mor suggests that self-presentation occurs in social settings, among social actors and within the social settings and actors will project manipulated identities for power-augmentation purposes. Mor also states that self-presentation strategies are dominant in social settings and are used as a source of social influence. Through the use of self-presentation strategies in social settings a performer will be able to influence the social circle and manipulate their reality. As society changes, self-presenters will feel the need to have a specific desired outcome and according to Uysal and Oner-Ozkan (2007) presenters will be more motivated to manage the impressions that are received for various settings.

When people present themselves in various social settings, people will put together information that will be desirable for their audience (Pontari & Schlenker 2006). Actors engaged in a performance will tailor messages that fit with an audience’s characteristics and ideals. Pontari and Schelenker also assert that not only will people facilitate impressions, but friends of those engaged in self-presentation will also help present desirable impressions to the audience. Just as the performer will use manipulated impressions to match an audience’s ideal, friends will help convey that same impression to the audience. “Just as with self-presentation, the strategic presentation of a friend involves a mix of truth, exaggeration and perhaps even lies” (Pontari & Schelenker, 2006, p. 177). Thus, people who are

indirectly involved in a performance also play a key role in helping the actor maintain and control a positive impression to the audience.

The way male and females engage in self-presentation performances varies within social settings and depends heavily upon the self-identities that men and women exhibit (Shaw & Edwards, 1997). One way that men and women engage in self-presentation differently is the way they express themselves through narration. Shaw and Edwards argue, "In a most profound way, our stories tell us who we are and who we can-or cannot-be, at both surface and deep-level meaning. The personal narrative is the act of self-presentation" (p. 56). The way actors engage in narrative allows the actor to portray specific representations and mask the way images are presented to the audience. The narration of an actor is "part of the teller's repertoire, a repeatable item" (p. 57) and becomes part of an evaluation for that performance. Men and women tell narration differently; men focus more on their own character and ability while women focus more on the social world in which they take part.

As self-presentation evolves the audience has become more aware of activities the actors engage in on and off the stage; certain individuals have had greater pressure placed upon them to behave in a specific way. Entertainers, teachers, musicians, sports figures are all judged on their behaviors they demonstrate while entering and exiting the various social settings that they belong to. However, one group of individuals seems to be judged more harshly than others because of the expected behaviors that the public places upon them. Politicians have had to learn that through the use of calculating acts, they are able to gain and win voters approval. However, politicians also have learned that inappropriate acts and behavior can prevent them from winning a political campaign and hindering the advancement of their career.

When considering a career in politics, the presidential candidate decides what character role to portray. Through narration the presidential candidate can create an image of himself contrary to past published reports. One way that presidential candidates can move past published reports is to deal with

transgressions that may exist in their past (Cornog, 2004). According to Cornog, in presidential history it was considered taboo to ask presidential candidates about any past drug use or sexual escapades, however, in recent years the private lives of candidates are now considered public knowledge (p. 105). Many times presidential candidates deal with past transgressions in an open manner.

Prior to televised presidential debates candidates were judged on their onstage lectures and rallies, however, today it is expected that candidates must be able to “Play the role of the candidate as well” (p.111). Televised debates, immediate press conferences and the internet require candidates to not only envision his role as the president but also must play his role onstage and to a vast and critical worldwide audience (Cornog, 2004). Trained as an actor prior to his political career, Ronald Reagan would often turn to his acting ability to engage audiences and to narrate stories. When questioned about his inability to answer a difficult question Reagan was able to play off the incident as an endearing trait that made him more like a father figure and less like a forgetful grandfather.

During the 1992 presidential race between George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton published reports indicated that Clinton had had an extra-marital affair with Gennifer Flowers. Although Clinton did not forthright admit to the affair, it was indicated through his language that he had indeed “caused pain” (p. 106) in his marriage. Although this affair had occurred prior to his run as president-it was imminent on the minds of voters across America. Even though this was seemingly an image problem with Clinton, he was able to act in his role as a man on the path to forgiveness. Clinton appeared with his wife, Hillary Rodman, as part of a carefully crafted impression management technique of demonstrating even amidst the pain caused in their marriage, Hillary was able to forgive and move forward.

As illustrated by the Clinton campaign, political campaigns are largely fought through the use of television. Schutz (1995) suggests that as political campaigns develop the television is mainly used for self-presentation rather than for discussing current events. Politicians use television “By presenting their personality and motivations, leaders may deflect the electorate from judging them by their political

record” (p. 212). According to Boyer, Brunner, Charles and Coleman (2006) performers who engage in televised impressions have a unique opportunity to use mass communication as a vehicle for influence.

“Those who work in the field of radio broadcasting and, especially, in television keenly appreciate that momentary impression they give will have an effect on the view a massive audience takes of them, and it is in this part of the communication industry that great care is taken to give the right impression and great anxiety is felt that the impression given might not be right” (p. 141).

Thus, in any political campaign great care should be taken to generate a specific image that would be considered believable by their audience.

The difference in how politicians, entertainers and popular figures present themselves varies because each individual will possess a different goal. Schutz (1995) believes that actors and entertainers will likely try to showcase their personality while experts will likely try and display their knowledge. However, politicians present an interesting conflict in that the audience may wish to see both their personality and their knowledge. When an audience is assessing a presenter’s ability, the most common traits that one should exhibit are: likeability, status, competency and trustworthiness. Managing to maintain these traits will help gain the approval of the audience for the presenter. As politicians take the stage and are cast as an actor vying for the role of the next elected official, the ability to meet the audience’s demands become more prevalent. According to Schutz when politicians were able to point out their personal moral values well and their worthiness for the job, the audience perceived their impression as sincere and thus created likeability and trustworthiness for the candidate.

Schutz attempted to understand how different groups of people use self-presentation as a means of controlling and manipulating the audience’s impression. A list of eight categories was created that detailed how a politician would present himself to the public. Schutz’s list of self-presentation categories were: reference to personal values, self-disclosure such as talking about personal experiences

or personal hopes and fears, reference to status or position, reference to past successes or awards, presentation of new ideas or plans, statement of facts that help establish credibility, modest self-presentation such as admitting to being an ordinary person and admitting failures and finally general favorable self-description or self-enhancement. Schutz found that politicians did indeed engage in more self-disclosure than experts but less than entertainers, and did strive to exert more knowledge than entertainers but less than experts. A politician's ability to present himself effectively using self-presentation is the difference between a win and loss.

The use of presidential self-presentation is most often used by politicians who are trying to wield power. According to Lee Sigelman (2001) human behavior assumes "That people constantly attempt to portray particular self-images to others in order to manage the impressions of an omnipresent audience" (p. 1). Sigelman attempts to understand the human behavior that exists between onstage or front behavior and backstage behavior. Typically in self-presentation a presenter will try and portray controlled impressions while engaged in the onstage performance; therefore, a backstage performance is generally considered more honest and real. However, an audience member should never consider a backstage performance as entirely reality. Sigelman explains, "Elements of self-presentation are never entirely absent from any performance, even when one is alone, the incentive to make the right impression varies as function of publicness of the performance and the perceived importance of the role" (p.2). Particularly politicians are self-aware of their role as they engage in a highly salient role that tends to be very publically aware. Since presidents and presidential candidates are all vying for a very public role-each action they portray is analyzed and critiqued. As such, they can at times convey different images when speaking in public and when speaking in private and it must be assumed that through their use of rhetoric is can and does reveal their "inner man" (p. 3). Sigelman's final analysis of presidential self-presentation studied the different ways that President Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon presented themselves onstage and backstage. Sigelman found that although Nixon

and Johnson did use different self-presentation strategies to engage the public onstage, the backstage conversations were not suitable to the general public. While engaged in onstage presentation both presidents tended to present a presidential profile and displayed qualities conducive to American's expectations of how presidents should appear and act.

James Stanyer (2008) suggests that with the emergence of "Personality-focused electorate means that effective through the media is increasingly essential for building a bond with voters, and ensuring electoral success" (p. 415). With the increased competition within political parties, a politician's success depends heavily upon how they are able to strategically manage their self-presentation strategies. Verser and Wicks (2006) state that politicians understand that images have the ability to produce an emotional response. If the politician is able to create a positive image of themselves in the mind of the voters than their positive feelings will produce positive results. Stanyer (2008) advises that US presidential candidates have begun to use certain media channels to emphasize personal qualities while campaigning. Throughout political campaigns and through the use of certain media's to guide impressions, politicians most often control their performance on television by "Pointing out their belief in moral values as well as their worthiness, which was paired with self-disclosure" (p. 415). Politicians tried to present their knowledge and showcase past successes and innovative ideas all in order to give the impression of competence. They, the politicians, wanted to appear as "Likeable, trustworthy, and competent person, who is sincere in promising changes for the better, as well as capable of bringing about these changes" (p. 415). Through the use of calculated television appearances, politicians are able to maintain and manage impressions that voters and the worldwide public view of them.

Throughout a political campaign, it is the goal of any campaign manager to create a presidential image of their candidate for the public. A campaign manager would create a presidential image through the use of photographs the public views. According to Verser and Wicks (2006), "Photographs enable voters to form impressions, opinions, and beliefs about political candidates-even when a candidate's

behavior is completely scripted and rehearsed” (p. 129). Traditionally, candidates have used photographs, as a way to portray a specific image of themselves to their audience and candidates would lend themselves to opportunities that seemed presidential. A campaign manager would also create a desired image of the presidential candidate through calculated and strategic photographs. Each picture used to enhance the presidential candidate should build and reinforce the previous image. According to Verser and Wicks, through the use of strategic photographs, President John F. Kennedy was able to create the image of himself as a family man-even amidst rumors of extra-marital affairs. Kennedy would pose for pictures with his family and then use the pictures throughout press engagements. Many Americans would view the pictures as reality rather than news stories that would detail information about his personal life.

Understanding how self-presentation strategies are used and implemented in everyday interactions has had limited study. The most common strategy that has been studied is the deliberate use of language that “Involves explicitly evoking or talking about attributes of the self” (Bangerter, 2000, p. 437); also defined as self-disclosure or the voluntarily sharing of personal information with others. However, not all self-disclosure can be characterized as self-presentation. What is the difference between self-disclosure and the strategy of self-presentation that involves talk about oneself? Bangerter suggests “Direct disclosures are explicit, and speakers are accountable for them. Indirect disclosures are performed ‘off the record’ and must be inferred by the hearer” (p.438). In conversation with others, the topic will not always focus on the speaker and the speaker must transition the topic in order to engage in explicit disclosure. When an actor’s motivation is to talk about oneself and try to create impressions within the audience the actor will shift the conversation to allow for opportunities to exhibit self-presentation. The actor will strive to use narration and make their disclosure appear as if part of the existing body of conversation. The audience will engage the actor by asking questions and making comments which will allow the actor to “test” whether or not their explicit disclosure of self is working.

Indirect disclosure allows the audience to make assumptions based upon information told from the presenter. According to Bangerter, when involved in a conversation a presenter may not try and shift the conversational flow, but rather they will make comments that will lead the audience to assume personal qualities and traits about the presenter.

Most recently with the emergence of the internet as a medium for conveying information, politicians have also engaged in online self-presentation. Stanyer (2008) suggests that websites now contain a biography-which will demonstrate a politician's accomplishments and professional successes. Most often on the politicians Internet homepage personal traits, qualifications and family relations appear as a way to highlight a bond with voters and appear more like an ordinary man. To illustrate from Goffman (1959) the website is simply another front where performers can demonstrate and control impressions that others receive of them.

Online self-presentation allows for what Gibbs, Ellison and Heino (2006) term "Selective self-presentation" (p.153). Gibbs et. al., relate self-presentation with self-disclosure behaviors and how these two strategies relate and differ. However, self-presentation and self-disclosure online is seen as less honest because of the increased chances for self-presentation manipulation and encourage others to engage in misrepresentation that differs from "real life identities" (p. 156). Gibbs et. al. term positive self-disclosure as self-presentation success which refers to how users "Feel they are able to make good impressions on others and achieve favorable self-presentation" (p. 159). However Ellison, Heino, and Gibbs (2006) assert that highlighting one's positive characteristics through self-presentation presents problems when also trying to present one's true self-which is key in relationship building. Ellison et. al. attest that self-presentation is important in relational development and self presentation is a way "To convey an impression to others which is in his interests to convey" (p. 417). Relational development is a way for politicians to connect to voters and appear more realistic and approachable to their voters. The

use of online media to demonstrate self-presentation allows for political candidates to have one more medium to manipulate voter's impressions.

Although online self-presentation has emerged as a way to manage impressions, it is also problematic. According to Jimmy Sanderson (2008) self-presentation strategies online can create problems because people may purposely present themselves deceitfully, which may result in others feeling uncertain about others true identity. As the performer executes self-presentation in online media, the performer wishes to project a credible image and wishes to "Construct an identity that seeks to be consistent with audience expectations" (p. 914). Sanderson further explains that not only is it a goal for the presenter to please the audience, but the self-presentation is also dependent upon the presenter's own personal goals. If the audience is not pleased or if the presenter's personal goals are not reached then self-presentation is considered ineffective. When studying which self-presentation strategy is most effective, Sanderson stated that ingratiation or "seeking to be liked and attributing positive characteristics to others" (p.914) is the most common strategy used. However competence, seeking to be perceived as skilled, and supplication, asking for help or engaging in self-deprecation, also appeared as common strategies within online media networks.

As people engage in various mass media outlets to project impressions on their audience, the actors involved in the performance are highly aware of the "Prestige conferred by virtue of a good performance" (Sullivan, 2005, p. 720). Likewise actors are also aware that a poor performance while engaged with an audience can have consequences to the self. Some performances that an actor may take part in allow for audience participation or audience question and answers. Sullivan (2005) analyzed callers on a radio talk show and found that callers, or the audience, also engaged in self-presentation to the larger audience. The callers were highly aware of the larger listening audience at hand and sought to reveal aspects of their own personality while still remaining on subject with the discussion. Talk shows present an interesting format, in that the host or hostess of the show will also strive to have the

audience engaged and participating with the actors who are performing. The host will control the actors as to ensure the audience is always entertained. Sullivan states, "Their priority is to keep the audience listening" (p. 723). The actors performing will understand and tailor the impressions made as to ensure that their performance is conducive to what that audience enjoys and expects. Individuals, when engaged in a public performance, try and relate a believed definition of themselves to their audience and they do this by what they say, do and the final impression that they portray. Sullivan suggests that as individuals present their perceived image of themselves they will usually have a motive or objective impression and as they present their impression they will illustrate this through a defensive or protective technique. Depending upon the performance the individual is engaged in, they will have a different motive behind their impression, which will dictate which technique, either defensive or protective.

Through the study of self-presentation researchers have been able to understand how people perform while engaged with an audience. Self-presentation has been studied in various forms of mass communication and through the study of self-presentation techniques we are able to understand which forms of mass communication allow for greater demonstration of self-presentation. It has also been shown that politicians engage in self-presentation in order to maintain and win voters approval. However, I feel that the area of self-presentation for politicians does deserve review in how potential presidential candidates deal with an image that has been potentially harmed because of an extra-marital affair. I will now use some of the self-presentation strategies mentioned above and examine how ex-president Bill Clinton and presidential hopeful Mark Sanford executed self-presentation strategies when dealing with their audience in television and through print communication. Using audience reaction following implementation of self-presentation strategies, I hope to better understand which politician appears to demonstrate the most effective use of self-presentation.

Methods

Through the use of Erving Goffman's theory of self-presentation and by analyzing the use of self-presentation strategies used by political candidates, I hope to better understand how the public perceives those who hold public office. This research is based upon Erving Goffman's understanding and theoretical foundation of self-presentation. According to Goffman (1959) self-presentation is a calculating manner and a way of expressing an impression in order to gain a specific response from an audience. Most often those who engage in self-presentation will strive to project themselves in a favorable light and by practicing self-presentation the performer will begin to believe that their actions are indeed reality.

Through the use of self-presentation strategies and according to Goffman, the performer will "intentionally and consciously express himself in a particular way, but chiefly because the traditions of his group or social status require this kind of expression" (p. 6). The successful staging and presentation of the self requires the use of real technique-the same techniques that individuals engage in on a daily basis. Politicians are instructed how to act while in the public eye; however, some politicians have been unable to maintain the same behavior when behind closed doors. When the public politician and the private politician's behavior contradict one another the politician must appeal to the public and engage in a new form of self-presentation. In the analysis of Clinton and Sanford, both politicians have had to engage in successful staging techniques in order to repair a tainted public image.

Self-presentation can be characterized through a variety of ways and through a variety of medians. The analysis of Clinton and Sanford, I will be examining the use of self-presentation strategies in television and through print communication. When individuals present themselves in any median they will engage and demonstrate various self-presentation strategies. The front refers to the situation or scenic aspects of a performance. When presidential candidate John Edwards admitted to engaging in an extra-marital affair during his presidential race on national television it seemed like a perfect median

to finally break his silence. In August 2008 ABC News reporters were the first to break the eighteen month long silence after allegations first arose regarding Edward's fidelity in 2006-2007. According to the Schwartz et. al. (2008), the *National Enquirer* was the first media outlet to report the affair in October 2007; however, Edwards adamantly denied the allegations as tabloid rumors. After more than a year of silence, Edwards finally chose prime time television ABC News to clear the air. The front refers to Edwards "Nightline" interview with Bob Woodruff as his situation or scenic performance in which Edwards engaged in. Edwards made it explicitly clear that his interview should air on "Nightline" and the interview was conducted at the Edwards mansion in Chapel Hill, North Carolina. Having the interviewer come to the personal residence of the Edwards family also refers to the front and the scenic atmosphere of Edwards's self-presentation strategy.

The second strategy individuals will engage in is dramatic realization or the ability of the performer to highlight facts and elements about their performance that might have remained unnoticed. This can be demonstrated through the 2007 admission of an extra-marital affair of 2008 Republican presidential candidate Newt Gingrich. According to the Associated Press (2007), Gingrich previously had denied any extra-marital affairs throughout his past, although many speculated unfaithfulness because of two previous divorces. Dramatic realization refers to Gingrich's ability to highlight his current marriage while striving to keep past allegations regarding his unfaithfulness to his previous wife private and unnoticed. Gingrich frequently campaigned on family values and even made public statements regarding Clinton's inability to remain faithful; thus highlighting some facts while leaving others unnoticed.

Idealization is the ability of the performer to maintain specific impressions in a given situation. This may be demonstrated through standards, rules and regulations that people might place on a performer. When popular politicians have devoted their life to fighting crime and striving to maintain a high approval rating, many politicians will follow some of the same rules and regulations others have set

before them. New York Governor Eliot Spitzer was federally investigated after being involved in a high profile prostitution ring. One of the rules that Spitzer followed was acknowledging his fault followed by apologizes to his family. According to Hakim and Rashbaum (2008), Spitzer was quoted as saying, "I have acted in a way that violated my obligation to my family and violates my or any sense or wrong. I apologize first and most importantly to my family. I apologize to the public to whom I promised better" (p.1). Spitzer is an example of how through idealization he was able to maintain an apologetic image by following rules and regulations placed upon him by those who have also admitted to an extra-marital affair.

When a performer relies upon his audience to accept cues as an important part of his performance, a performer is engaging in maintenance. The audience will try and familiarize themselves with a performer and in so doing will accept signs given by a performer as a way of orientating themselves with a performance. Well known for his ability to clean up New York City crime and praised for his leadership skills in handling the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center, it is easy to see how Rudy Giuliani gained favor with his voters. However, according to Joel Roberts (2009) Giuliani led a very different private life. Divorced from his first wife in the mid 1980's Giuliani went on to marry his then Mistress Donna Hanover. After 15 years of marriage, amidst rumors of an extra-marital affair with Judith Nathan, Giuliani announced that he was separating from then wife Donna Hanover. Giuliani then married for third time to his mistress Judith Nathan. When allegations arose that Giuliani was engaging in an affair with Nathan, instead of striving to dispel rumors and allegations, Giuliani accepted the audience's cues that his popularity amongst voters would remain consistent because of his past accomplishments. Giuliani frequently made public statements regarding Nathan as a "very very fine woman" (p.1) even while married to Hanover.

However, the audience might also accept cues and signs that the performer may have manipulated their performance. Goffman (1959) defines this self-presentation strategy as

misrepresentation. When allegations first arose regarding John Edwards and Rielle Hunter in October 2007, Edwards adamantly denied the rumors as tabloid scandals. Edwards continued to deny any involvement with Hunter throughout his presidential campaign in 2007 and 2008, however, in August 2008 Edwards admitted to engaging in an affair with Hunter in 2006. Throughout the ABC News interview Edwards denied that he fathered Hunter's 6-month-old girl and insisted that their affair had ended in 2006. According to Ferran et. al. (2010), Edwards later admitted that he had fathered Hunter's now 2 year old child and that it was "wrong" (p. 1) for him to ever deny paternity. Hunter's baby was born in February 2008 also proving that Edwards had also lied about the timeline of his affair with Hunter. Although denied paternity in his 2008 ABC News interview, the audience accepted the performer's cues and signs that what he was saying was truth and that his affair with Hunter had indeed ended in 2006. However, after Edwards admitted to paternity of Hunter's child misrepresentation of previous statements is demonstrated by Edwards.

Since the performer demonstrates the structure of a performance an actor may choose to emphasize certain matters and hide others. The ability of a performer to hide flaws in a performance refers to mystification. The difference between dramatic realization and mystification allows an actor to emphasize certain elements of a performance; while dramatic realization will simply leave elements of a performance unnoticed. When John Edwards admitted to engaging in an extra-marital affair with Hunter on national television, Edwards made it clear to Bob Woodruff that he was allowed to ask any questions he may wish to know, however, Edwards was still able to decide whether or not he would answer the questions. When Edwards was questioned regarding the timeline of his affair, Edwards responded, "I think my family is entitled to every detail. They've been told every detail...I think beyond the basics...I think that's where it stops in terms of the public because I think everything else is within my family and those privacy boundaries should to be respected" (Schwartz, et al., 2008, p. 1). Through mystification it

allows Edwards to emphasize that while he did engage in an affair he will still be able to hide the timeline of the affair from public knowledge.

Finally, the last self-presentation strategies are reality and contrivance. Although paired together as one self-presentation strategy—both terms can be separately defined and understood. When a performer engages in reality the audience believes that the performance is an unintentional byproduct of an unconscious response to the given situation. This can be demonstrated through Giuliani's public acknowledgment of an ongoing relationship with Nathan. According to O'Neill (2000) two days after announcing his split from Hanover, Giuliani was seen dining and walking home with his mistress, Nathan, after a pleasant evening of fish and cake. Giuliani ended the evening by giving Nathan a chaste kiss on the cheek before returning home. Although Giuliani had admitted to a relationship with Nathan and had acknowledged his separation from Hanover, Giuliani felt reasonably entitled to wine and dine his new partner. Giuliani was engaging in reality because although he was still legally married to Hanover, he felt the reality of his current situation no longer needed to be hidden. Contrived performance, however, is viewed when the audience believes the situation is manipulated and that they are given told to construct a new reality. During John Edwards' ABC News interview, Edwards made a public appeal to the American voters to forgive him for his past transgressions and faults with Hunter. Woodruff questioned Edwards regarding the paternity of Hunter's child. The public was made to believe that the child was not Edwards but an Edwards' staffer Andrew Young. The audience, or American voters, were then asked to construct a new reality when Young denied paternity and Edwards admitted to fathering Hunter's 2 year old child (Ferran et. al. 2010).

By examining the use of self-presentation strategies in television and print and through audience analysis, we hope to gain a better understanding of how politicians, particularly how Clinton and Sanford, "acted in a thoroughly calculating manner, expressing himself in a given way solely in order

to give the kind of impression to others that is likely to evoke from them a specific response he is concerned to obtain” (Goffman, 1959, p. 6).

I will be assessing Clinton’s press conferences, testimony and speeches beginning on January 26, 1998 and ending with the final speech given on December 11, 1998. The first statement analyzed will be Clinton’s statement regarding his relationship with Lewinsky, which occurred on January 26, 1998, at a White House news conference; which will be analyzed through television. The second statement made by Clinton will be his grand jury testimony on August 17, 1998; which will be analyzed through television and print. Clinton’s speech given on August 17, 1998, entitled “I have misled people”; following his grand jury testimony will be assessed through print. Finally through print, I will be assessing Clinton’s “I have sinned” speech given on September 11, 1998 and “I am profoundly sorry” speech given on December 11, 1998. Each speech given by Clinton follows the timeline from whence allegations first arose regarding his relationship with Lewinsky in early 1998 and ending with his admission of guilt and subsequent impeachment in December 1998. Sanford’s press conference, given at the South Carolina Statehouse upon his arrival from Argentina on June 24, 2009 will be assessed through both television and print. Each speech and statement given by Clinton and Sanford will be examined in determining when and if self-presentation strategies occurred, followed by a critique of how successful demonstration of self-presentation strategies affected audience reaction.

Chapter Four

Results

The results will detail use of television and print in demonstrating use of self-presentation strategies exemplified by Clinton and Sanford.

Television

Television is an excellent medium that is used to relay information to the public in a speedy and usually controlled atmosphere. Televised interviews and press conferences are now becoming the trend

for politicians who are wishing to clear their name to the American people. Television serves as an excellent “front” or setting to admit to transgressions. According to Goffman (1959) the front or the scenic aspect of a performance is the first self-presentation strategy that is exemplified by actors engaged in a performance. As indicated previously politicians use television as a way of creating a specific impression to the masses. According to Schutz (1995) “By presenting their personality and motivations, leaders may deflect the electorate from judging them by their political record” (p. 212). According to Boyer, Brunner, Charles and Coleman (2006) television creates a momentary impression to the audience and great care should be taken in using television as a way of communicating a message and an impression to the audience. When President Bill Clinton admitted to having an inappropriate relationship with Monica Lewinsky, Clinton chose to tell the American public through a live televised broadcast on August 17, 1998. The broadcast occurred only after Clinton had been questioned and testified about his relationship with Lewinsky. Clinton was shown sitting down in well-furnished office with dimly lit lights. Clinton remained calm and rehearsed as he delivered a well-prepared speech. Clinton, while portrayed live on camera, was never shown making direct eye contact with the audience.

Previously on January 26, 1998 when questioned about his relationship with Lewinsky, Clinton chose a press conference to deny any allegations with Lewinsky. Clinton was shown standing at a podium, under bright camera lights and fluorescent room lights. Clinton was shown shaking his hand directly toward the audience and reiterating past statements. Clinton was shown making direct eye contact with the camera and thus making eye contact with the audience.

When Clinton was subpoenaed to appear before a grand jury to testify regarding his relationship with Lewinsky the front was seen as less formal, as Clinton was repeatedly asked detailed questions regarding his relationship with Lewinsky. Clinton was shown sitting down, with his hands clasped and moving in his seat as each question was asked. Again, Clinton was shown facing the audience-although not shown making direct eye contact with the camera. Throughout the interrogation Clinton was shown

slumped over and appeared to be uncomfortable as he was questioned. During his testimony Clinton was also shown drinking soda as he was questioned regarding other intimate details regarding his relationship.

When Mark Sanford went missing in June 2009, Sanford staffers indicated that he had gone hiking in the nearby Appalachian Mountains. When Sanford's aids were not able to contact him after more than a week-Sanford reappeared unharmed. Further questioning regarding what the South Carolina Governor had been doing during his weeklong trip followed. On June 24, 2009 Sanford held a press conference at the state house in Columbia South Carolina to report his whereabouts for the last week. Sanford, while surrounded by staffers and reporters, addressed the public by asking the audience if they were ready. Sanford looked nervous and stuttered as he began his press conference. Sanford was shown behind a podium and the sound of cameras clicking is evident as begins his speech. Sanford admits to needing a "break" from his time as governor and that during his absence he had indeed taken a break from his duties as governor. After admitting that while he did share parts of the truth with staffers, he had not disclosed the entire truth regarding his whereabouts. Sanford appears emotionless as he begins to reveal aspects of the truth to the public, but as Sanford begins to talk about his wife, Jenny, he appears to have more emotions rise to the surface. Sanford shifts weight frequently as the press conference continues and admits that the press conference is a result of the public needing to know his whereabouts for the last week. Before any acknowledgement of an extra-marital affair, Sanford apologizes to those close to him. Also, Jenny Sanford is not present at the press conference-thus leaving Sanford to apologize and recognize his transgressions alone. Sanford does not admit to an extra-marital affair until more than 8 minutes into the press conference. Many members of the audience can be seen in the background as Sanford continues to apologize for his behavior.

Unlike the front exhibited by Clinton, Sanford takes questions from the public and reporters regarding the affair to which he has just admitted guilt. Sanford appeared unrehearsed and at times lost

as to what he should say next as part of his press conference. When questions start to arise regarding his relationship with his wife, Sanford appears confused as to the correct statement that should be made and searches around the room as he answers their questions. During the questioning Sanford appears more emotional than he had previously when he admitted to the affair. Repeated attempts were made to question Sanford while he was answering other questions-thus confusing and frustrating Sanford unto the point he must clarify that he can only answer one question at a time. Sanford used the medium of television to disclose in-depth details regarding his extra-marital affair and allowed for reporters and the general public to continue to pry into his personal life.

Print

When Bill Clinton first admitted guilt for his inappropriate relationship with Lewinsky, it was on August 17, 1998 during a grand jury testimony. It was during this testimony that other elements of self-presentation are exhibited. Bill Clinton begins his opening statement by stating:

“When I was alone with Ms. Lewinsky on certain occasions in early 1996 and once in early 1997, I engaged in conduct that was wrong. These encounters did not consist of sexual intercourse. They did not constitute sexual relations, as I understood that term to be defined at my January 17th, 1998 deposition. But they did involve inappropriate intimate contact. These inappropriate encounters ended, at my insistence, in early 1997. I also had occasional telephone conversations with Ms. Lewinsky that included inappropriate sexual banter. I regret that what began as a friendship came to include this conduct, and I take full responsibility for my actions. While I will provide the grand jury whatever other information I can, because of privacy considerations affecting my family, myself, and others, and in an effort to preserve the dignity of the office I hold, this is all I will say about the specifics of these particular matters. I will try to answer, to the best of my ability, other questions including questions about my relationship with Ms. Lewinsky; questions about my understanding of the term "sexual relations", as I understood it to

be defined at my January 17th, 1998 deposition; and questions concerning alleged subornation of perjury, obstruction of justice, and intimidation of witnesses” (Clinton, 1998, p. 1).

As illustrated from Clinton’s opening statement, Clinton engaged in the second self-presentation strategy of dramatic realization; which according to Goffman (1959) is when a character highlights facts and elements about their performance that might have remained unnoticed. Although Clinton does acknowledge inappropriate intimate contact, he chooses to highlight that although the encounters did happen he ended the relationship in 1997. Clinton highlighted the information regarding their relationship, Clinton and Lewinsky, when it could have gone unnoticed to the audience.

Further into questioning, Clinton is asked regarding the definition of sexual content and sexual harassment and refers to a previous statement made in January of 1998. During his questioning in August of 1998 regarding his statement in January; Clinton chooses to highlight the fact he had reread his statement, but the current grand jury did not have copies of the text. Clinton highlighted the fact that the definition in the January text was taken out of context when the current grand jury did not have access to the textual pages.

Highlighting factual elements that would have remained unnoticed is illustrated again when Clinton continues to highlight his definition of what a sexual relationship consists of.

“Well, that – I think – let me answer what I said before. I think most people when they use that term include sexual relationships and whatever other sexual contact is involved in a particular relationship. But they think it includes intercourse as well. And I would have thought so. Before I got into this case and heard all I've heard, and seen all I've seen, I would have thought that that's what nearly everybody thought it meant” (Clinton, 1998, p. 2).

By highlighting the fact that he believes everyone’s definition of sexual relationship would indeed include sexual intercourse he is thus highlighting something that would have remained unnoticed to the audience.

Throughout Clinton's testimony before the grand jury he also made it a point to highlight the fact that his memory is not clear and although Clinton repeatedly admits to seeing Lewinsky; he is never able to give an exact measurement of time and the encounters he had with Lewinsky. Again, this is another illustration of dramatic realization; Clinton is highlighting the fact that his memory is not clear.

When Clinton is questioned regarding letters, notes and cards that he had received from Lewinsky during and after their relationship; Clinton made it a point to highlight the fact that he was indeed apprehensive about their relationship. Clinton remarked,

Sir, the truth is that most of the time, even when she was expressing her feelings for me in affectionate terms, I believed that she had accepted, understood my decision to stop this inappropriate contact. She knew from the very beginning of our relationship that I was apprehensive about it. And I think that in a way she felt a little freer to be affectionate, because she knew that nothing else was going happen. I can't explain entirely what was in her mind (Clinton, 1998, p. 4).

Highlighting the fact that he was apprehensive about their relationship and also highlighting that he cannot explain what was going on in her mind is another example of dramatic realization. Clinton engages in his own speculation about their relationship and is quick to highlight what he said and felt that could possibly present him in a more favorable light.

Well, my recollection is that she – that maybe because of changed circumstances in her own life in 1997, after there was no more inappropriate contact, that she sent me more things in the mail, and that there was sort of a disconnect sometimes between what she was saying and the plain facts of our relationship. And I don't know what caused that. But it may have been dissatisfaction with the rest of her life... It may be that when I did the right thing and made it stick, that in a way she felt a need to cling more closely, or try to get closer to me, even though

she knew nothing improper was happening or was going to happen. I don't know the answer to that (Clinton, 1998, p.4).

When Clinton first publically admitted to guilt with Lewinsky on August 17, 1998; Clinton highlights the fact that not only has he misled people, but he also misled his wife.

The next example of a self-presentation strategy is idealization or the ability of the presenter or actor to maintain a specific impression in a given situation. This is usually demonstrated by the rules and regulations that are placed upon the performer. During Clinton's grand jury testimony there are specific rules and regulations that he must follow in order to obey the law. When Clinton does not engage in following those rules, he is questioned regarding his behavior.

In the face of that, I knew that in the face of their illegal activity, I still had to behave lawfully. But I wanted to be legal without being particularly helpful. I thought that was, that was what I was trying to do. And this is the first – you are the first persons who ever suggested to me that, that I should have been doing their lawyers' work for them, when they were perfectly free to ask follow-up questions. On one or two occasions, Mr. Bennett invited them to ask follow-up questions (Clinton, 1998, p. 6).

Through this example you can see that although he does acknowledge following the rules, he also wants to maintain a specific impression that does not fall within the governed rules. Clinton restates that although he tried to follow the rules he did not want to be helpful in his testimony either.

Now, so I will admit this, sir. My goal in this deposition was to be truthful, but not particularly helpful. I did not wish to do the work of the Jones lawyers. I deplored what they were doing. I deplored the innocent people they were tormenting and traumatizing. I deplored their illegal leaking. I deplored the fact that they knew, once they knew our evidence, that this was a bogus lawsuit, and that because of the funding they had from my political enemies, they were putting ahead. I deplored it (Clinton, 1998, p.6).

Clinton was further questioned regarding specifics regarding his relationship with Lewinsky and what constitutes sexual relations. Clinton refuses to give specifics regarding what is inappropriate contact and therefore obliges the rules and regulations he believes he has regarding his private life. According to Clinton (1998), "I mean just what I said. But I would like to ask the grand jury, because I think I have been quite specific and I think I've been willing to answer some specific questions that I haven't been asked yet, but I do not want to discuss something that is intensely painful to me. This has been tough enough already on me and on my family, although I take responsibility for it. I have no one to blame but myself" (p.7). Clinton tries to follow rules and regulations regarding his private life through exemplifying idealization. According to Clinton (1998), "Since that was not covered by the definition, I want to fall back on my statement. Look, I'm not trying to be evasive here. I'm trying to protect my privacy, my family's privacy, and I'm trying to stick to what the deposition was about. If the deposition wasn't about this and didn't cover it, then I don't believe that I should be required to go beyond my statement" (p.7).

During the annual White House prayer breakfast, Clinton attempts an apology and yet another admission of guilt for his transgressions with Lewinsky. It is during this apology that Clinton is engaged in idealization, in that the audience expected certain rules and regulations of him. The audience for the White House prayer was more than 100 ministers, priests and representatives from various religions. Given on September 11, 1998, this statement was given also in response to criticism for his August 17th speech in which many people felt he was not contrite. According to Clinton (1998),

It is important to me that everybody who has been hurt know that the sorrow I feel is genuine: first and most important, my family; also my friends, my staff, my Cabinet, Monica Lewinsky and her family, and the American people. I have asked all for their forgiveness. But I believe that to be forgiven, more than sorrow is required - at least two more things. First, genuine repentance - a determination to change and to repair breaches of my own making. I have repented. Second,

what my bible calls a "broken spirit"; an understanding that I must have God's help to be the person that I want to be; a willingness to give the very forgiveness I seek; a renunciation of the pride and the anger which cloud judgment, lead people to excuse and compare and to blame and complain (p.1).

During the August 17th, 1998 grand jury testimony Clinton was not required to have a public audience; however Clinton was able to engage in the next self-presentation strategy of maintenance. Maintenance refers to when the performer accepts audience cues in an attempt to familiarize him or herself with a performance. As questioning regarding Clinton's account of his relationship with Lewinsky becomes somewhat more heated, the audience or in this case Mr. Wisenberg accepts cues from Clinton about his performance. On page 7 of the grand jury testimony Clinton declines to answer a question regarding oral sex and whether oral sex constituted sexual relations. It is during this questioning that Clinton and Wisenberg argue and Mr. Kendall, who is Clinton's legal counsel, must interfere in an attempt to clarify the situation. Mr. Kendall, who is also part of the audience, is attempting to engage in maintenance with Clinton who is the performer.

During Clinton's September 11th, 1998 apology Clinton attempts to familiarize and acknowledge those who have supported him during his journey to repentance. Clinton had a large support system, or an audience that demonstrated maintenance by accepting signs of his guilt. According to Clinton (1998),

I am very grateful for the many, many people - clergy and ordinary citizens alike - who have written me with wise counsel. I am profoundly grateful for the support of so many Americans who somehow through it all seem to still know that I care about them a great deal, that I care about their problems and their dreams. .. Nevertheless, in this case, it may be a blessing, because I still sinned. And if my repentance is genuine and sustained, and if I can maintain both a broken spirit and a strong heart, then good can come of this for our country as well as for me and my family (p.1).

When the audience accepts cues and signs that are manipulated then the performer is engaged in misrepresentation. During Clinton's grand jury testimony, Clinton admits to having misled the audience by giving false cues and signs. According to Clinton (1998),

And so I said to them things that were true about this relationship. That I used – in the language I used, I said, there's nothing going on between us. That was true. I said, I have not had sex with her as I defined it. That was true... But I also didn't want to do anything to complicate this matter further. So, I said things that were true. They may have been misleading, and if they were I have to take responsibility for it, and I'm sorry (p.8).

Clinton is again questioned regarding misleading statements and again mentions why he engaged in misrepresentation. According to Clinton (1998),

Since we have seen this four-year, \$40-million-investigation come down to parsing the definition of sex, I think it might have been. I don't think at the time that I thought that's what this was going to be about. ..So, what I was trying to do was to give them something they could – that would be true, even if misleading in the context of this deposition, and keep them out of trouble, and let's deal – and deal with what I thought was the almost ludicrous suggestion that I had urged someone to lie or tried to suborn perjury, in other words (p.8).

On August 17th, 1998, Clinton admits to publically misleading people throughout the entire investigation. According to Clinton (1998), "I know that my public comments and my silence about this matter gave a false impression. I misled people, including even my wife. I deeply regret that" (p.1).

An interesting comparison to Clinton's admission of misleading people, on December 11th 1998; just minutes before the grand jury would vote on the first article of impeachment Clinton (1998) remarks, "I never should have misled the country, the Congress, my friends or my family. Quite simply, I gave in to my shame. I have been condemned by my accusers with harsh words. And while it's hard to

hear yourself called deceitful and manipulative, I remember Ben Franklin's admonition that our critics are our friends, for they do show us our faults" (p.1).

A performer may also engage in mystification, in which they will emphasize certain matters while trying to hide others. During Clinton's 1998 grand jury testimony, Clinton is repeatedly asked questions regarding his conversations with staff members after they were subpoena for the Paula Jones trial. During Clinton's statements he would emphasize that he told them not to lie.

Well, again, I don't recall, and I don't recall whether I might have done something like that, for example, if somebody says, what if the reporters ask me this, that or the other thing. I can tell you this: In the context of whether she could be a witness, I have a recollection that she asked me, well, what I do if I get called as a witness, and I said you have to get a lawyer. And that's all I said. And I never asked her to lie (p.8).

Although in this example Clinton emphasizes that he told them not to lie, he also admits that he does not recall exact statements with staff members. During this time, Mr. Wisenberg questioned Clinton's motivations regarding his helpful nature toward Lewinsky after her subpoena in the Paula Jones case. According to Clinton (1998),

After I terminated the improper contact with her, she wanted to come in more than she did. She got angry when she didn't get in sometimes. I knew that that might make her more likely to speak, and I still did it because I had to limit the contact. ..once I got into this unfortunate and wrong conduct, that when I stopped it, which I knew I'd have to do and which I should have done a long time before I did, that she would talk about it...But I knew that the minute there was no longer any contact, she would talk about this. She would have to. She couldn't help it. It was, it was a part of her psyche. So, I had put myself at risk, sir. I was not trying to buy her silence or get Vernon Jordan to buy her silence... She had not been involved with me for a long

time in any improper way, months, and I wanted to help her get on with her life. It's just as simple as that (p.9).

Clinton chooses to emphasize that he was only trying to help her out, portraying that he engaged in a good deed, however; he hides the fact that in exchange for helping Lewinsky, she might possibly give a more favorable statement of him in the Paula Jones case.

When a performer engages the audience in reality, the audience believes the reality is an unintentional byproduct of the given situation. On January 26, 1998 Clinton was questioned at a press conference about his relationship with Lewinsky. Clinton, feeling slightly pressured by the events surrounding the recent Paula Jones case responds by stating:

I want you to listen to me. I'm going to say this again. I did not have sexual relations with that woman, Miss Lewinsky. I never told anybody to lie, not a single time – never. These allegations are false...And I need to go back to work for the American people (p.1).

Clinton had made numerous statements to the American public in early 1998 in which he repeatedly told the public that he did not have sexual relations with Lewinsky. On a televised interview with Jim Lehrer on January 12, 1998, Clinton again asked the audience to construct a reality. During the next example Mr. Lehrer questions Clinton regarding his behavior, while Clinton attempts to answer.

Mr. Lehrer: The news of this day is that Kenneth Starr, independent counsel, is investigating allegations that you suborn perjury by encouraging a 24-year-old woman, former White House intern, to lie under oath in a civil deposition about her having had an affair with you. Mr.

President, is that true?

Mr. Clinton: That is not true. That is not true. I did not ask anyone to tell anything other than the truth. There is no improper relationship. And I intend to cooperate with this inquiry. But that is not true.

Mr. Lehrer: "No improper relationship" – define what you mean by that.

Mr. Clinton: Well, I think you know what it means. It means that there is not a sexual relationship, an improper sexual relationship, or any other kind of improper relationship.

Mr. Lehrer: You had no sexual relationship with this young woman?

Mr. Clinton: There is not a sexual relationship – that is accurate (p.7).

However, after the performer constructs a reality, the audience may believe that the reality was manipulated and they are then asked to construct a reality; when this self-presentation strategy occurs this is referred to as contrived performance. After months of asking the American people to believe a constructed reality that he did not have sexual relations with Lewinsky, Clinton admitted to misleading people on August 17, 1998. During this televised news conference, Clinton is asking the audience to construct a new reality, contrary to what he had previously stated. According to Clinton (1998), “Indeed, I did have a relationship with Ms. Lewinsky that was not appropriate. In fact, it was wrong. It constituted a critical lapse in judgment and a personal failure on my part for which I am solely and completely responsible” (p.1).

When news first broke that South Carolina’s governor was missing, the public believed that something was amiss. When Governor Sanford appeared days later, he held a press conference to acknowledge his whereabouts. It was during his June 24th, 2009 press conference at the South Carolina Statehouse that he admitted to having travelled to Argentina to visit his mistress. During this press conference Sanford also engaged in various self-presentation strategies as he strove to repair a tainted image.

Sanford begins by highlighting some of his adventures as a young man, and how he had loved to visit and hike the Appalachian Trail. Sanford demonstrates dramatic realization when he acknowledges and highlights the fact that he does enjoy hiking the mountains near his home. After Sanford acknowledges that while hiking the mountains is part of his passion, it is not the whole truth behind where he has been over the last 10 days. According to Sanford (2009), “So all those things we talked

about this morning were true, but they're not the whole story. And that's obviously why everybody's gathered here right now. And so, let me lay out that larger story that has attracted so many of you all here. I'm a bottom-line kind of -- kind of guy" (p.1). Sanford continues to highlight various aspects about his private life, that while contribute to the story as a whole would have remained unnoticed if he had not engaged in dramatic realization. As the press conference continues Sanford states that he had talked with his wife, and that he had also had many intimate conversations with his father-in-law. Portraying these elements of Sanford's private life allows for the audience to notice his closeness to his family and the journey of forgiveness that he has already begun.

Sanford also follows rules and regulations that are set forth for the given situation. Before Sanford admits to guilt he professes countless apologizes to those who he has hurt. He acknowledges his four children, his wife, his staff, and a dear friend and finally to the people of South Carolina and to the larger American population and most importantly to God and God's laws. According to Sanford (2009),

But I'm here because if you were to look at God's laws, they're in every instance designed to protect people from themselves. I think that that is the bottom line of God's law, that it's not a moral, rigid list of do's and don'ts just for the heck of do's and don'ts. It is indeed to protect us from ourselves. ..And in this regard, let me throw one more apology out there, and that is to people of faith across South Carolina, or for that matter, across the nation, because I think that one of the big disappointments when -- believe it or not, I've been a person of faith all my life. If somebody falls within the fellowship of believers or the walk of faith, I think it makes it that much harder for believers to say, "Well, where was that person coming from?" or folks that weren't believers to say, "Where indeed was that person coming from?" So one more apology in there (p.1).

Sanford continues to acknowledge that when someone breaks God's law there is a consequence and that consequence, for Sanford, would be the current press conference.

Cues play an important part in self-presentation and Sanford acknowledges the cues from the audience as he engaged in maintenance. It was noticed by Sanford that many people are curious as to the events surrounding his disappearance and as such have placed cameras on his wife and family. Sanford acknowledges the curiosity, but also states that he hopes the press conference will allow for his family to have privacy. According to Sanford (2009),

I guess I'm not deserving of indulgence, but indulgence not for me, but for Jenny and the boys. You know, there are a team of cameras and crews and all those sorts of things camped out down at Sullivan's Island. And I would just ask for a zone of privacy, if not for me, for her and the boys. As we go through this process of working through this, there are going to be some hard decisions to be made, to be dealt with, and those are probably not best dealt with through the prism of television cameras and media headlines (p.2).

By acknowledging the audiences cues of curiosity, Sanford is engaged in maintenance.

When a performer demonstrates a manipulated image, the performer is engaged in misrepresentation. When Sanford was first reported missing it was assumed that the statement he had made to his staff regarding his hiking trip on the Appalachian Trail was indeed where he had spent the last ten days. When Sanford first began his press conference he acknowledges that he had not been entirely truthful regarding his whereabouts. According to Sanford (2009),

I would also apologize to my staff, because as much as I did talk about going to the Appalachian Trail, that was one of the original scenarios that I'd thrown out to Mary Neil (sp), that isn't what -- where I ended up. And so I let them down by creating a fiction with regard to where I was going, which means that I had then, in turn, given as much as they relied on that information, let down people that I represent across this state. And so I want to apologize to my staff and I want to apologize to anybody who lives in South Carolina for the way that I let them down on that front (p.1).

Sanford also acknowledges that his family and wife have known about the affair for more than five months prior to the June 24th news conference. For the months previously, Sanford had been demonstrating misrepresentation, in that his staff and the larger population were manipulated to believe his relationship with his wife was still intact. According to Sanford (2009),

We've been working through this thing for about the last five months. ..It was a, believe it or not, a Christian Bible study; some folks that asked of members of Congress hard questions that I think we're very, very important. And I've been working with them" (p.3).

After Sanford admitted to being unfaithful to his wife, he begins to explain some of the details regarding his relationship with his mistress. Sanford engages in mystification when he tells the audience that while his relationship began innocently through e-mail correspondence, he does not mention the exact timeframe for when his relationship started. According to Sanford (2009), "And so the bottom line is this: I have been unfaithful to my wife. I developed a relationship with a -- what started out as a dear, dear friend from Argentina. It began very innocently, as I suspect many of these things do, in just a casual e-mail back and forth, in advice on one's life there and advice here" (p.2). While Sanford is choosing to emphasize that he had indeed been unfaithful, he is leaving unnoticed the timeline of his relationship and whether or not the relationship had ended. When questioned regarding whether or not he and his wife were separated, Sanford avoids specifically answering the question. According to Sanford (2009), "I -- I don't know how you want to define that. I mean, I'm here and she's there. I guess in a formal sense we're not. But you know, what we're -- what we're trying to do is work through something that, you know, we've been working through for a number of months now" (p.3).

The audience is made to believe that, through the demonstrations of reality, that Sanford's relationship with his mistress was just a byproduct of time. According to Sanford (2009), his relationship with his mistress began quite casually.

The -- and there's a certain irony to this, but this person at the time was separated. And we ended up in this incredibly serious conversation about why she ought to get back with her husband for the sake of her two boys; that not only was it part of God's law, but ultimately those two boys would be better off for it. And we had this incredibly earnest conversation and at the end of it said, "Well, could I get your e-mail?" We swapped e-mails, whatever. And it began just on a very casual basis -- "Hey, I've got this issue that's come up with my life," or vice versa. "What do you think?" ...And so there was this zone of protectiveness, in that she lives thousands of miles away and I was up here, and you could throw an idea out or vice versa. And we developed a remarkable friendship over those eight years. And then, as I said, about a year ago, it sparked into something more than that. I have seen her three times since then, during that whole sparking thing. And it was discovered (p. 3-4).

The performance of the entire press conference given on June 24th is also an illustration of reality. While Sanford was in Argentina with his mistress, he had not attempted to contact his staff to let them know of his location--instead he allowed them to believe he was on a hiking trip. After his staff became worried, and after Sanford arrived back in South Carolina he was immediately asked to give a press conference regarding his whereabouts; which leads me into the next demonstration of self-presentation, contrived performance.

Contrived performance is when the audience is asked to construct a new reality because the previous performance was manipulated. Acknowledged previously Sanford had made not only his staff, but also the South Carolina and American population believe that he had been hiking--and that he had needed a respite from politics. When Sanford returned from his trip he was then asked to give a press conference, in which he acknowledges that he was not on a hiking trip and that he was indeed with his mistress. The audience was asked for now to believe that his relationship with Jenny Sanford was not as idealistic as previously implied, and also that he had lied about his whereabouts. The audience now

needed to construct a new reality that Sanford was not a happily married man, who enjoyed a good hiking trip; but rather a man who had an extra-marital affair and had left the country.

Discussion

While both politicians have been able to successfully demonstrate use of self-presentation strategies, Clinton and Sanford engaged in self-presentation differently. Through our understanding of the front, dramatic realization, idealization, maintenance, misrepresentation, mystification, reality and contrived performance we have been able to reveal specifics about how each politicians' self-presentation strategies are demonstrated through their behavior. I will now discuss and analyze how self-presentation can be demonstrated to an audience by illustrating examples used by Clinton and Sanford in maintaining and engaging the audience in order to successfully or unsuccessfully maintain popularity with voters and their public.

The front refers to the situation or scenic aspect of a performance, and Clinton and Sanford choose to demonstrate use of the front through televised appearances. Clinton was able to demonstrate more control over the televised front, whereas Sanford appeared to be uncomfortable and unsure of the staging of a live press conference. During Clinton's first televised appearance on January 26, 1998, when questioned regarding his relationship with Lewinsky; Clinton possessed little or no control over the scenic aspect of the performance. During Clinton's reiteration that he did not have sexual relations with Lewinsky, Clinton was shown nervous and at times frustrated with the constant questions from the public. Similarly when Clinton was shown during his grand jury testimony, Clinton shifted weight and seemed uncomfortable with questions from the audience. It was not until Clinton's staged televised appeal on August 17, 1998 that successful use of self-presentation was used. During Clinton's apology to the American people, he appeared poised and comfortable as he rehearsed a well-written speech. Clinton successfully demonstrated that through correctly staged performances he was able to showcase a well-rehearsed and comfortable politician. In a sense, Clinton was able to control the front; which

included all the scenic aspects of his performance. Clinton controlled the camera angles, the lighting and even the language that was used; unlike the press conferences and grand jury testimony when he appeared uncomfortable and frustrated with the direction of each interview.

When Sanford appeared on live television to discuss his whereabouts and consequently his extra-marital affair, he chose to demonstrate self-presentation strategies at a press conference in the South Carolina Statehouse. Sanford confessed prior to beginning his June 24, 2009 press conference that he had only been back in the state for a short time, thus leaving little time to prepare and rehearse a possible speech. Sanford was unable to control the questions from the press, as well as the possible audience and their reaction regarding his statement about his mistress. Throughout the press conference Sanford appeared confused and at times lost as to the next direction he should take as he proceeded forth with his statement. Many audience members were shown in the background and throughout Sanford's speech, one could analysis the audiences' reaction to Sanford's statement. Unable to control the front and the scenic aspect of the performance Sanford demonstrated that when a performer engages in self-presentation, particularly when representing the front, the performer should strive to have control over the scenic aspect of the performance. By controlling the scenic aspect of the performance the actor is able to demonstrate a controlled impression that would correctly relay the manipulated impression the actor is wishing to present. Particularly useful with politicians who are striving to maintain a specific impression with the public, the actor should attempt to control and organize each aspect of the front. The ability to create a specific impression to a massive audience through illustration of an appealing front allows for the audience to interpret behaviors and consequently their language.

Although both Clinton and Sanford chose to admit to guilt through live televised appearances, both illustrated use of self-presentation strategies differently through their language. As Clinton and Sanford engaged in dramatic realization, both were able to highlight facts and elements about their

relationship that might otherwise have gone unnoticed. Clinton demonstrated this through highlighting and constantly referring back to previous statements in which he stated that he had not had sexual relations with Lewinsky but indeed had inappropriate contact. Clinton chose to highlight several times throughout his grand jury testimony that he had told the truth regarding what he believed to constitute sexual relations. Clinton also chose to illustrate that while he did engage in inappropriate behavior, he wanted the larger audience to know and understand that it was he who chose to end their relationship. By highlighting the fact that it was he, Clinton, who chose to end the relationship he was offering closure to the audience by indicating that their relationship had ended in 1997. Clinton made it clear to the audience, as well, that he did not fully remember or account for each time he engaged in inappropriate contact with Lewinsky-thus highlighting that some facts regarding their relationship he might not fully remember.

Sanford similarly engaged in dramatic realization, by highlighting certain elements regarding his relationship. From the beginning of his June 24, 2009 press conference Sanford chose to highlight that he had not entirely lied about hiking in the Appalachian Mountains, and that had he indeed engage in such hikes as a young man. Sanford hopes to illustrate that although his whereabouts were not known, he had not lied about enjoying hiking. Sanford continues on, but stating that he is a “bottom line kind of guy,” (Sanford, 2009, p.1) and wishes to keep the current press conference short. Sanford continues to highlight certain elements regarding his private life, including recent conversations he has had with his father-in-law, friends, colleagues and his staff. Sanford is highlighting these elements in an attempt to help put the audience at ease with his confession and ultimately with his whereabouts.

The ability of both politicians to highlight certain aspects of their relationships as well as their behavior during the course of their relationship allows for the audience to feel as if they truly are revealing detailed aspects regarding their affair. Each politician is choosing to highlight certain elements of their behavior, with hopes of striving to shift the focus from one behavioral flaw to a more favorable

behavior. While Clinton chose to highlight elements of previous statements, definitions as defined by those in power and details regarding Lewinsky's situation; Sanford chose to highlight times when he did tell the truth, the support he is receiving from his family and friends and elements of his personal life. Thus, Clinton and Sanford are able to create a manipulated impression to the audience and although expressed differently are able to successfully demonstrate self-presentation.

As a public figure and as any politician, certain rules and regulations are set forth to help govern and dictate their behavior. While both Clinton and Sanford follow certain rules regarding expectations of politicians, how they follow and adapt to those rules differs. As previously shown, many politicians when confronted with an extra-marital affair will allow for their campaign managers to help govern rules regarding what to tell the public and what to leave behind closed doors. President John F. Kennedy's political advisors made many attempts to hide any transgressions and consequently were able to keep Kennedy's mistresses out of the public's view (Cornog, 2004). However, rules and regulations regarding inappropriate behavior have changed and adapted with time. Clinton demonstrates this by stating throughout his grand jury testimony that during questioning regarding his relationship with Lewinsky, he had not been entirely truthful, but he still wanted to be helpful in the investigation. Clinton also allows specific rules to guide his behavior during the White House prayer, in which he acknowledges that God is changing him and that he has repented. Similarly, Sanford also strives to acknowledge God's laws as changing and dictating his behavior as he has changed.

Also demonstrated from past politicians who have been caught in an extra-marital affair, idealization occurs when the politicians attempts to seek public forgiveness from his wife and family. Demonstrated successfully by Eliot Spitzer, a politician who appears to express sincere remorse to his family, will generally fair better overall with public opinion (Hakim & Rashbaum 2008). While both Clinton and Sanford expressed remorse to their families in a public appeal; neither Clinton nor Sanford appeared with their wives near their side as previously regulated by past politicians. In all the text and

through each television press conference Hillary Rodham Clinton and Jenny Sanford were nonexistent as their husbands sought the forgiveness of the American public and their personal forgiveness. Each politician appeared alone while on stage and each had to engage in idealization without the support of their spouse. Consequently, Hillary stayed with Clinton, even after acknowledgment of an affair, whereas Jenny filed for divorce after learning about Sanford transgressions.

Successful demonstration of idealization, where a politician allows for rules and regulations to guide his or her behavior is helpful to maintain popularity and appeal with voters. Clinton has been able to move past his transgressions and continue his marriage with Hillary; thus helping him to maintain popularity and appeal with Americans. Comparatively Sanford has seen any hope of a 2012 presidential bid fade, as news coverage continues to circulate regarding his impending divorce with Jenny, thus harming his appeal with voters. The ability of the performer to follow rules and regulations, especially the previous rule of having your wife appear supportive of your remorse and admission of guilt, will allow for each politician to continue to develop and build a bond with voters. Although Clinton and Sanford did not appear with their wives at each press conference; the ability of Clinton to maintain his marriage after his admission of guilt does demonstrate idealization. Sanford has been unable to maintain his relationship with his wife and consequently his 2012 presidential bid.

When an actor engages in the self-presentation strategy of maintenance they are able to accept the cues from the audience in an attempt to familiarize him or herself with the performance. Most of the press conferences that Clinton engaged in were not in front of a live audience; however, Clinton was able to demonstrate maintenance by understanding and listening to the wants of the public. It was during the White House breakfast that Clinton was able to demonstrate, to a live audience, maintenance. Clinton acknowledges those in the audience that have helped him on his journey to repentance. The audience at the White House breakfast consisted of many religious clergymen, and thus when Clinton acknowledges their continued support and guidance during his repentance he is able to

demonstrate accepting cues from the audience. Sanford, likewise, acknowledges those in the audience who had supported him as he has also dealt with consequences from his actions. Sanford also addressed the audience's interest in his family and his children, and accepts their cues for more information by stating that this was his choice and that his family should be left alone.

By assessing the audience's cues, Clinton and Sanford are able to make ties with the audience—thus helping the audience feel more comfortable with the message that they are trying to relay. By acknowledging the audiences' cues Clinton and Sanford are able to appear deceitful. Although audience cues are implicitly implied, the actor engaged in the performance with the audience will explicitly demonstrate self-presentation through direct language or nonverbal cues. According to Goffman (1959), "As students of social life we have been less ready to appreciate that even sympathetic audiences can be momentarily disturbed, shocked and weakened in their faith..." (p.51). If a politician is able to accept the cues of the audience, and successfully demonstrate maintenance then the audience will be more willing to accept their apology as sincere and sympathetic. While both Clinton and Sanford were able to use each of the cues of the audience, Sanford was able to use a live press conference with reporters as a way of appearing more open about his relationship and his current behavior. Compared to Clinton who choose to give a recorded statement in an atmosphere where the press was not able to confront him with questions and probe more extensively into his private life.

Occurring most frequently during self-presentation is when an actor or a performer engages in misrepresentation; or allowing the audience to accept manipulated signs and cues. When allegations first arose against Clinton regarding his relationship with Lewinsky, immediately Clinton denied any unlawful and inappropriate contact. When questioned directly regarding his relationship in January 1998, Clinton gave clear and direct cues that he had not had a relationship with Lewinsky; thus the audience was expected to accept his cues as truth. However; in August 1998 Clinton later admitted to having an inappropriate relationship with Lewinsky; therefore, the audience realizes that previous

statements were indeed manipulated. While most American's were unaware of Sanford prior to his admission of guilt, audience members were still fed a manipulated impression prior to his televised press conference. According to Sanford staffers, Sanford had led his audience to believe that he had traveled to the Appalachian Mountains to enjoy a hiking trip. When South Carolinians began to question where Sanford had been for the last week, many members of the Sanford political campaign led audience members to believe that Sanford had indeed gone hiking. Sanford failed to answer any attempts at contacting him, and therefore audience members began to understand that their previously developed impression had been manipulated.

Both Clinton and Sanford acknowledge to misleading and manipulating the audience. Clinton and Sanford also sought forgiveness from their audience, family members and staffers for having misled their previous impression. Another form of misrepresentation that Clinton and Sanford engaged was leading the audience to believe that they had a stable marriage. As indicated previously (Cornog, 2004), Clinton had admitted to marital transgressions prior to his presidential win in 1992. Clinton appeared on television to ensure voters that he had changed his ways; Hillary appeared with her husband to lend her support and approval that in fact her husband was a changed man. However, Clinton was unable to maintain the impression with his audience that he was a faithful husband; therefore, Clinton once again misled and manipulated his audience into believing that he could remain faithful in his marriage.

Sanford, prior to his 2009 press conference, had always believed in fidelity throughout marriage and during Sanford's service in the House of Representatives for the duration of the Clinton administration had been a critic of Clinton's philandering ways (Stein, 2009). According to Stein, Sanford had called for Clinton to resign and had called the Clinton-Lewinsky affair "very damaging" (p.1). Many audience members who knew and came to respect Sanford as a conservative Republican and a politician, who so highly regarded marital vows, were misled into thinking that Sanford was unable to engage in an extra-marital affair. Thus, when Sanford did admit to having a mistress in Argentina the audience soon

realized that he had engaged in misrepresentation. Sanford also had to indicate to the public that his wife and family had known about the affair 5 months previous to his disappearance in June; thus many audience members were misled into thinking that Sanford and his wife Jenny had a stable and faithful marriage.

Although it is clear that Clinton and Sanford both engaged in misrepresentation to their audience, each audience chooses to deal with and understand their manipulated impression differently. It appears that while Clinton's audience had been previously misled from prior allegations, the general audience more readily accepted Clinton's apology after his 1998 admission of guilt (Holland, 1998). However, since Sanford has previously been a spokesman for conservative values and traditional marital standards seemed to take harsher criticism from his past supporters (SurveyUSA, 2009). Sanford had previously led his audience to believe he held similar values and standards in his own life; Sanford was forced to acknowledge that he in fact misled his audience.

Attempting to understand how an actor will emphasize certain elements of their performance while striving to hide others refers to mystification. During Clinton's grand jury testimony, Clinton repeatedly strove to emphasize that he could not recall specifics regarding his relationship with Lewinsky; however, when questioned about specifics he was able to answer the question without hesitation. Thus, indicating to audience members that he was hiding certain elements regarding his relationship with Lewinsky. Also, during Clinton's grand jury testimony he had made little attempt to clarify any details regarding his relationship with Lewinsky; however, Clinton chooses to emphasize that he had been the one to end his relationship with Lewinsky. Similarly, Sanford also chooses to not illustrate specifics regarding his relationship with his mistress; however, he does choose to emphasize that the relationship did begin innocently. Sanford appears to have hid fewer details from the press regarding his relationship with his mistress, whereas, Clinton strove to keep more specifics regarding his relationship out of the public's eye. Sanford acknowledges how he met his mistress, a timeline for when

things started to become more intimate and even topics of conversations that they had had. Clinton would only detail information regarding time spent with Lewinsky only after the moderators, during the grand jury testimony, specifically asked.

Successfully demonstrating mystification to the audience allows for an actor or politician to hide elements regarding their impressions that they would rather keep behind closed doors. Although Sanford ultimately divulged intimate details regarding his relationship with his mistress through e-mails that were leaked to the press (Associated Press, 2009); forthright admitting to the press the timeline of his relationship allows for unanswered questions to become public knowledge. Clinton did not admit to specifics regarding his relationship with Lewinsky; however, Lewinsky did divulge details regarding her relationship with Clinton (Stroud, 1998). Consequently, if a politician chooses to emphasize certain matters and hide others, ultimately any hidden matters regarding their relationship will eventually become public knowledge. Successful self-presentation of mystification will allow, for a time, a politician to hide elements of their performance; however, as indicated any element that they choose to leave hidden could become public knowledge and may hurt their overall public impression and previous display of self-presentation.

Often times the performer engaged in demonstrating reality will not use any persuasive language to demonstrate what they believe to be a byproduct of a given situation as indicated by Rudy Giuliani's public appearance with his then mistress Nathan (O'Neill, 200). However, both Clinton and Sanford used language to help create a reality for their audience. Prior to his August 17, 1998 admission of guilt, Clinton had been telling the American people that he had not had a relationship with Lewinsky. Repeated attempts were made to establish reality with the audience; however, Clinton chooses to demonstrate reality by stating that the allegations against him were false. Any allegations against Clinton regarding his relationship with Lewinsky were a right-wing conspiracy to simply diminish his name and popularity as a president (Cornog, 2004). Clinton is subsequently asking the audience to

construct a reality out of Clinton's definition and analysis of his relationship; thus a byproduct of the situation he has created. Similarly Sanford expressed to the public that his affair with his mistress simply began casually, but as the friendship developed the relationship was ultimately the next step. Sanford strives to construct the reality that while his relationship with his mistress began innocently enough; the current situation escalated to an extra-marital affair was a mere byproduct of time.

The ability to construct a given reality to the audience allows for the actor to manipulate and control the impressions the audience is receiving based upon the new reality the performer wishes the audience to receive. While Clinton and Sanford construct realities for their audience members, both construct a new reality based on one that will best fit their needs. Constructing the reality may become harmful if the reality is determined to be manipulated. When the audience is made aware of a manipulated reality through a previous performance the actor is now engaged in contrived performance. After Clinton constructed a reality for the audience, in which he led them to believe he had not had a relationship with Lewinsky; he was subsequently forced to construct a new reality when he admitted guilt in August 1998. For 9 months previously the audience was asked to believe the reality that an inappropriate relationship did not happen; however, after Clinton's August 1998 confession the audience realizes that the previously constructed reality was manipulated. Although not the first time audience members have been asked to construct a new reality after a politician's admission of guilt, Clinton still suffered the consequences of his actions by his December 1998 impeachment. Sanford's audience members had previously been led to believe that Sanford was an avid hiker who had gone for a simple hiking trip; however, upon his return the audience members were then asked to construct the reality that he had been engaged in an extra-marital affair in Argentina.

When an audience is fed a constructed reality then subsequently fed an alternative reality through contrived performance the audience could be apprehensive about any new details regarding truth and manipulation. Continually asking your audience to develop and construct new realities based

upon the needs of the politician could be harmful to the overall opinion and impression the audience is receiving; and if the audience believes the politician can no longer be trusted could lose overall popularity with their voters.

The consequences for Clinton and Sanford live televised press conferences concerning their extra-marital affairs and their demonstration of self-presentation strategies through their language differs drastically when analyzing the audiences' reaction. In 1996, prior to acknowledgement of any extramarital affair, Clinton's approval rating was 62% (Allpolitics, 1997), which was Clinton's highest approval rate to date. At the end of 1997, before any extramarital allegations became public knowledge, and before Clinton admitted to guilt, Clinton was voted America's most admired man (Allpolitics, 1997). One year later, on December 20, 1998 and in the wake of impeachment Clinton's approval rating jumped 10 points to an astounding 73% (Holland, 1998). In 1998 American's were asked regarding Clinton's job performance and their opinions toward the Republican and Democratic Party. According to Holland (1998), 31% of Americans had a favorable view towards Republicans, while 57% of American's held a favorable opinion towards Democrats. When questioned whether Clinton should resign from office, 69% of Americans indicated no, and when asked whether American's approved of the decision to impeach Clinton-only 35% of American's agreed with the decision to impeach Clinton.

According to Brody (1998), news coverage of the affair did not harm the public's evaluation of Clinton-however judgments of Clinton's character and personal qualities did seem to suffer. During 1998, American's were less likely to characterize Clinton as honest and trustworthy. Not only were American's less likely to believe Clinton as honest and trustworthy, American's also rejected the statement that Clinton possessed high personal and ethical standards; and according to Brody the public formed these opinion only after being informed of the Lewinsky affair. However, the public's perception of Clinton as a president seemed unaffected in the wake of impeachment. During 1998, Brody indicated

increases in the perception of Clinton as “cares about” or “understands” the needs or problems of “people like me.”

Just over a year after Clinton admitted guilt for transgressions with Lewinsky, American’s were asked in a Fox News poll regarding the Lewinsky-Clinton affair. According to Fox News (1999), 37% of American’s had forgiven but not forgotten the Lewinsky-Clinton affair and 35% of American’s had neither forgiven nor forgotten. However, 52% of American’s believed that the country had fully recovered from the Lewinsky-Clinton affair in 1999.

Just after leaving office in 2001, Fox News questioned American’s regarding the false testimony given during Clinton’s impeachment. According to Fox News, 67% of American’s believed Clinton had indeed lied under oath; however, when asked whether Clinton should be charged with a crime regarding lying under oath only 46% of American’s believed he should. According to Fox News (2001), 64% of American’s believed that impeachment was punishment enough for Clinton and that the matter should now be dropped.

Comparatively in 2002, after years of representing South Carolina in the House of Representatives, Sanford was elected to this first term of governor. In 2006, Sanford easily won his second term of governor, 65% to 35% and in 2008, according to SurveyUSA, had an approval rating of 61%. In 2009, Survey USA (2006), indicated that Sanford had declined in approval and only 41% of South Carolinian’s approved of his job in office. According to the Associated Press (2009), many past political supporters were asking for the governor’s resignation after admitting to an extramarital affair. However, Sanford had also indicated in his June 24, 2009 press conference that he had no plans to resign his post of governor. Past campaign supporters that had donated money to Sanford’s race for governor in 2006, indicated asking for their money back.

Once considered to be a contender for the 2012 presidential race, US News polled American's and asked them whether Sanford should now be considered a contender. According to US News (2010), 58% of American's believed that he was no longer a contender for the 2012 presidential race.

After Clinton's August 17th, 1998 televised confession, his popularity and classification as American's most admired man remained constant; however, when Sanford appeared at his press conference immediate rebuke was felt from South Carolina voters calling for his resignation and subsequently his popularity with voters suffered. Clinton took more than 9 months to admit to guilt with Lewinsky after the first allegations arose; while Sanford admitted to guilt without any prior allegations regarding his marital faithfulness. This goes directly against what was mentioned previously by Sulek (2007) which stated, "Whatever happens, it is now best for a candidate to tell it all, tell it early and tell it himself" (p.1). While Sanford did "tell it all and tell it early," Sanford's popularity with voters suffered; comparatively, Clinton was not forthright with information, but he was able to still maintain popularity with voters and the American people.

Another factor indicating why American's seemed to favor Clinton's behavior to that of Sanford regards their political affiliation. According to Newport (2009), when Americans were asked regarding whether they believed married men and women having an affair was morally wrong, 2% of Republicans believed it was morally acceptable; versus 10% of Democrats believing married men and women having an affair was morally acceptable. Thus illustrating that while the majority of Americans still believe an extra-marital affair is a morally unacceptable behavior; Democrats are more likely than Republicans to support those candidates who have engaged in morally wrong behavior.

Many things can be attributed to Clinton's overall success and popularity with voters after his admission of an extra-marital affair. However, Clinton's successful demonstration of self-presentation through his ability to construct a front, idealization, maintenance, misrepresentation, mystification, reality and contrived performance allows for voters to view a successfully and controlled impression.

Whereas, Sanford demonstrated at times successful staging of self-presentation the overall effectiveness of his message lacked success for his political career and future with American voters.

Limitations

When assessing a politician's success through the use of self-presentation, some limitations may apply. While both Clinton and Sanford can be characterized as demonstrating self-presentation strategies throughout their use of the front, idealization, maintenance, misrepresentation, mystification, reality and contrived performance other factors may have altered overall public opinion and popularity.

One factor that could be attributed to Clinton's success with Americans was the Clinton's economic climate versus Sanford's economic climate during his admission of guilt. While many Americans may have been able to overlook Clinton's flawed performance, they also felt that the country was still unaffected by Clinton's philandering ways. Comparatively, Sanford's admission of guilt came at a time when South Carolinians were dealing with budget deficits and unemployment. Thus, while American's may have been able to overlook behavioral flaws in Clinton; they may not have been able to overlook Sanford's flaws.

Another possible factor that could affect the overall effectiveness of self-presentation is the amount of press and attention each news story garnered. While Sanford's press conference did draw national news coverage and immediate reaction from Americans; Sanford's news story slowly diminished with time and became less popular. However, Clinton's affair with Lewinsky still garners media attention after more than 12 years of coverage. This can be attributed to the overall presidential status of Clinton versus Sanford's position as governor and not that President of the United States.

Lastly, the timeline for admission of guilt could have possibility factored into the overall popularity with voters. Clinton took more than 9 months to admit to guilt with Lewinsky; thus allowing Americans time to adjust to past allegations against Clinton. Whereas, Sanford acknowledged his affair immediately after suspicion arose. Giving Americans time to adjust and analyze the allegations prior to

admission of guilt could have possibly contributed to the overall effectiveness of the use of self-presentation strategies.

Conclusion

By understanding how public figures and particularly politicians engage in self-presentation an audience may be able to better understand how actors engaged in a performance will strive and create a manipulated impression to the audience. Assessing our understanding and evaluation of political candidates and their use of self-presentation will allow for individuals to better judge what is truth and what is manipulated through public discourse. Although, extensive understanding of how public figures engage in self-presentation through television, print and by evaluating the audience reaction does deserve further research and understanding; the above critic of Clinton and Sanford does serve as a base for future research.

Demonstration of self-presentation strategies can prove to be very successful to those who accurately create a desired impression to the audience; however, as indicated does not always contribute to the overall popularity and success a politician may have. According to Goffman (1959), "A character staged in a theater is not in some ways real, nor does it have the same kind of real consequences as does the thoroughly contrived character performed by a confident man; but the successful staging of either of these types of false figures involved real technique-the same technique by which everyday person sustain their real social situations" (p.254). Although, politicians may not engage in complete successful staging of a manipulated impression at all times; the real success of controlled impression management lies in the everyday social situations in which we all engage in.

References

- AllPolitics. (1998, December 20). Poll: Clinton's approval rating up in wake of impeachment. Retrieved on March 22, 2010, from <http://www.cnn.com/ALLPOLITICS/stories/1998/12/20/impeachment.poll/>
- Andersen, H. (1998, August, 2). Most people would object to Clinton adultery. *Omaha World-Herald*, B, 9.
- Associated Press. (2007, March, 08). Former house speaker Newt Gingrich acknowledges having affair during Clinton impeachment. Retrieved on January 21, 2010, from <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,258001,00.html>
- Associated Press. (2009, June 25). Politicians call for disgraced governor to resign. Retrieved on March 22, 2010 from <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/31522908/>
- Associated Press. (2009, June 25). Sanford's romantic e-mails with mistress leaked to the press. *The Washington Examiner*, retrieved on March 31, 2010 from <http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/politics/Sanfords-romantic-e-mails-with-mistress-leaked-to-the-press-49086691.html>
- Atkinson, N. S., Kaufer D., & Ishizaki, S. (2008). Presence and global presence in genres of self-presentation; A framework for comparative analysis. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 38, 357-384.
- Bangerter, A. (2000). Self-Representation: Conversation implementation of self-presentational goals in research interviews. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 19, 436-463.
- Beyle, T. (2001, January 15). Running with, or from, the presidents' coattails. Retrieved January 5, 2010, <http://www.pollingreport.com/beyle.htm>.
- Boyer, L., Brunner, B.R., Charles, T., & Coleman, P. (2006). Manageing impressions in a virtual enviroment: Is ethnic diversity a self-presentation strategy for colleges and universities. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 12.

Brody, R. (1998, November 16). The Lewinsky affair and popular support for President Clinton.

Retrieved on March 22, 2010, from <http://www.pollingreport.com/brody.htm>

Campbell, S. (July 2, 2009). Governor's wife won't grin and bear it for the cameras, *The Vancouver Sun*,

p. B.7., Retrieved on February 11, 2010 from Document

URL:<http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1776731141&Fmt=3&clientId=1670&RQT=309&VName=PQD>.

Clinton, B. (1998, August 17). Bill Clinton's grand jury testimony [Video File]. Retrieved from

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QQ79NTqS-8U&feature=related>

Clinton, B. (1998, August 17). Clinton testify [Video Files]. Retrieved from

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ClfpG2-1Bv4>

Clinton, B. (1998, August 17). Full text of President Clinton's August 17 grand jury testimony. *The*

Washington Post. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/special/clinton/stories/docs092198.htm>

Clinton, B. (1998, August 17). I have misled people. Retrieved on March 22, 2010, from

<http://www.historyplace.com/speeches/clinton.htm>

Clinton, B. (1998, August 17). President Bill Clinton-Statement on testifying before jury [Video File].

Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zFKtgTsKDIg&feature=related>

Clinton, B. (1998, January 17). What Clinton said. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/special/clinton/stories/whatclintonsaid.htm>

Cornog, E. (2004). *The Power and the Story: How the Crafted Presidential Narrative has Determined*

Political success from George Washington to George W. Bush. New York: The Penguin Press.

Davenport, J. (2009, June, 24). Jenny Sanford lauded husband's career. Retrieved on January, 6, 2009

from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/06/24/mark-sanfords-career-was- n_220506.html.

- Ellison, N., Heino, R., & Gibbs, J. (2006). Managing impressions online: Self-presentation processes in online dating environment. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 11, 415-441.
- Ferran, L., Ross, B., Shubalat, N., & Francescani, C. (2010, January 21). John Edwards admits he fathered Rielle Hunter's child. ABCnews. Retrieved on January 23, 2010 from <http://abcnews.go.com/GMA/john-edwards-admits-fathered-child-affair/story?id=9620812>.
- FoxNews. (1999, July 28-29). Opinion Dynamics poll. Retrieved on March 22, 2010, from <http://www.pollingreport.com/scandals.htm>
- Garofoli, J. (March 12, 2008). Why do the wives stand by their men? The Spitzer scandal raises doubts about the political tradition, San Francisco Chronicle, p. A. 1. Retrieved on February 11, 2010 from <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1443987991&Fmt=3&clientId=1670&RQT=309&VName=PQD>.
- Gee, CL., & Heyman, G.D . (2007). Children's evaluation of other people's self-descriptions. *Social Development*, 16, 800-818.
- Gibbs, J.L., Ellison, N.B., & Heino, R. (2006). Self-presentation in online personal: The role of anticipated future interaction, self-disclosure, and perceived success in internet dating. *Communication Research*, 33, 152-177.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Anchor.
- Hakim, D. & Rashibaum, W.K. (2008, March 10). Spitzer linked to prostitution ring. New York Times, retrieved on January 23, 2010 from <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/03/10/nyregion/10cnd-spitzer.html>.
- Holland, K. (1997, December 30). President Clinton is America's most admired man. Retrieved on March 22, 2010, from <http://www.cnn.com/ALLPOLITICS/1997/12/30/poll/>

Holland, K. (1998, January 16). Clinton approval rating at all-time high. Retrieved on March 22, 2010,

from <http://www.cnn.com/ALLPOLITICS/1997/01/16/poll.clinton/>

Johnson, J. (2009, July 8-July 14). Cheaters sometimes prosper. *Michigan Chronicle*, 72, 43, C7.

Leavenworth, J. (2007, March, 22). Politics and bedfellows; Do voters care about divorce and adultery when choosing a president?. *Hartford Courant*, D, 1.

McMantus, D. (1998, October 1). Clinton's denial believed by first lady, friends say. *Times Washington Bureau Chief*. Retrieved February 11, 2010, from

<http://articles.latimes.com/1998/oct/01/news/mn-28237>

Menstuff. (1999). *Infidelity Statistics*. Retrieved December 20, 2009, from

<http://www.menstuff.org/issues/byissue/infidelitystats.html>

Mor, B.D. (2007). The rhetoric of public diplomacy and propaganda wars: A view from self-presentation theory. *European Journal of Political Research*, 46, 661-683.

Newport, F. (2009). *Extramarital Affairs, Like Sanford, Morally Taboo*. Retrieved December 20, 2009,

from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/121253/extramarital-affairs-sanford-morally-taboo.aspx>.

O'Neill, A.M. (2000, May 29.) What next?. *People*, 53,21.

Pontari, B.A., & Schlenker, B.R. (2006). Helping friends manage impressions: We like helpful liars but respect nonhelpful truth tellers. *Basic & Applied Social Psychology*, 28, 177-183.

Roberts, J. (2009, May 11). The women in Giuliani's life. CBSnews.com. retrieved on January 23, 2010

from <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2000/05/11/politics/main194350.shtml>.

Rosenfeld, P. (2001). Self-esteem and impression management explanations for self-serving biases. The *Journal of Social Psychology*, 130, 495-500.

Samp, J.A., Wittenberg, E.M., & Gillett, D.L. (2003). Presentating and monitoring a gender-defined self on the internet. *Communication Research Reports*, 20, 1-12.

- Sanderson, J. (2008). The blog is serving its purpose: Self-presentation strategies on 38pitches.com. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication, 13*, 912-936.
- Sanford, M. (2009, June 24). SC governor takes questions from reporters video 2 [Video File]. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SBr4MM4hcdU&NR=1&feature=fvwp>
- Sanford, M. (2009, June 24). South Carolina Governor Mark Sanford confesses to affair [Video File]. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fazff4C4HJ8>
- Sanford, M. (2009, June 24). Mark Sanford's press briefing. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2009/06/24/us/24text-sanford.html?_r=1
- Schwartz, R., Ross, B., & Francescan, C. (2008). Edwards admits sexual affair; Lied as presidential candidate. Retrieved January 21, 2010, from <http://abcnews.go.com/Blotter/story?id=5441195&page=1>
- Scott, M. (2007). Skeletons in the closet candidates find the best defense is to come clean early, smoothly. *Journal-Gazette, 11*.
- Seib, G. (2009). Americans and their cheatin hearts; In the last 50 years, attitudes have hardened toward politicians who cheat and the women who accept them. *Wall Street Journal, 2*.
- Shaw, C.H., & Edwards, R. (1997). Self-concepts and self-presentations of males and females: Similarities and Differences. *Communication Reports, 10*, 55-62.
- Shutz, A. (1995). Entertainers, experts, or public servants, politicians' self-presentation on television talk shows. *Political Communication, 12*, 211-221.
- Sigelman, L. (2001). The presentation of self in presidential life: Onstage and backstage with Johnson and Nixon. *Political Communication, 18*, 1-22.
- Stanyer, J. (2008). Elected representatives, online self-presentation and the personal vote: Party, personality and webstyles in the United States and United Kingdom. *Communication & Society, 11*, 414-432.

- Stein, S. (2009, June 24). Sanford was harsh critic of Clinton affair, called president a rascal. *The Huffington Post*, retrieved on March 31, 2010 from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/06/24/sanford-was-harsh-critic_n_220325.html
- Stroud, M. (1998, November 23). Walters gets Lewinsky interview. *Broadcasting and Cable*. Retrieved on March 31, 2010 from <http://www.allbusiness.com/government/government-bodies-offices-heads/7698232-1.html>
- Sulek, S. (2007, March, 22). Candidates' personal lives become public domain. *McClatchy-Tribune News Service*, 1.
- Sullivan, S. (2005). 'The whole nation is listening to you': The presentation of self on a tabloid talk show. *Media Culture Society*, 27, 720-739.
- SurveyUSA. (2008). SurveyUSA February 2008 governor approval ratings. Retrieved on March 22, 2010 from <http://www.uselectionatlas.org/FORUM/index.php?topic=71496.0>
- SurveyUSA. (2009). Do you approve or disapprove of the job Mark Sanford is doing as governor? Retrieved on March 22, 2010 from <http://www.surveyusa.com/client/PollTrack.aspx?g=79bc576e-2f1d-4cec-a2b4-94aecce55b09>
- The Washington Post. (December 12, 2009). Jenny Sanfrod's handling of cheating husband South Carolina governer Mark Sanford strikes a chord with many women. Retrieved on February 11, 2010 from http://www.cleveland.com/nation/index.ssf/2009/12/jenny_sanfords_handling_of_che.html.
- US News. (2009). Could Mark Sanford still be the republican presidential candidate in 2012? Retrieved on March 22, 2010 from <http://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2009/06/25/could-mark-sanford-still-be-the-republican-presidential-candidate-in-2012.html>
- Uysal, A. ,& Oner-Ozkan, B. (2007). A self- presentational approach to transmission of good and bad news. *Social Behavior & Personality*, 35, 63-78.

Verser R., & Wicks R. H. (2007). Manageing voter impressions: The use of images on presidential candidate web sites during the 2000 campaign. *Journal of Communication, 56*, 178-197.

Williams, A. (2009, July9-July 15). Moral standard of leadership. *New York Amsterdam News, 28*, p. 13.