Chapter 1 : Czars in the White House

CHAPTER 3 The Substantive Content of Presidential Agendas In chapter 2 we looked at the process of problem identification, an important aspect of agenda building.

Early examples are from the universities of Oxford and Cambridge from and the founding President of the Royal Society William Brouncker in This usage survives today in the title of such offices as " President of the Board of Trade " and " Lord President of the Council " in the United Kingdom , as well as "President of the Senate" in the United States one of the roles constitutionally assigned to the vice president. The officiating priest at certain Anglican religious services, too, is sometimes called the "president" in this sense. However, the most common modern usage is as the title of a head of state in a republic. In pre-revolutionary France , the president of a Parlement evolved into a powerful magistrate , a member of the so-called noblesse de robe " nobility of the gown" , with considerable judicial as well as administrative authority. The name referred to his primary role of presiding over trials and other hearings. In the 17th and 18th centuries, seats in the Parlements, including presidencies, became effectively hereditary, since the holder of the office could ensure that it would pass to an heir by paying the crown a special tax known as the paulette. The Parlements were abolished by the French Revolution. The first usage of the word president to denote the highest official in a government was during the Commonwealth of England. After the abolition of the monarchy the English Council of State , whose members were elected by the House of Commons, became the executive government of the Commonwealth. The Council of State was the successor of the Privy Council , which had previously been headed by the Lord President ; its successor the Council of State was also headed by a Lord President, the first of which was John Bradshaw. However, the Lord President alone was not head of state, because that office was vested in the council as a whole. The modern usage of the term president to designate a single person who is the head of state of a republic can be traced directly to the United States Constitution of , which created the office of President of the United States. Previous American governments had included "presidents" such as the president of the Continental Congress or the president of the Massachusetts Provincial Congress , but these were presiding officers in the older sense, with no executive authority. It has been suggested that the executive use of the term was borrowed from early American colleges and universities, which were usually headed by a president. British universities were headed by an official called the " Chancellor " typically a ceremonial position while the chief administrator held the title of " Vice-Chancellor ". A number of colleges at Cambridge University featured an official called the "president". The head, for instance, of Magdalene College, Cambridge was called the master and his second the president. The first president of Harvard, Henry Dunster , had been educated at Magdalene. Some have speculated that he borrowed the term out of a sense of humility, considering himself only a temporary place-holder. The presiding official of Yale College, originally a "rector" after the usage of continental European universities , became "president" in The fictional name Tourvel refers not to the parlement in which the magistrate sits, but rather, in imitation of an aristocratic title, to his private estate. Once the United States adopted the title of "president" for its republican head of state, many other nations followed suit. Haiti became the first presidential republic in Latin America when Henri Christophe assumed the title in Almost all of the American nations that became independent from Spain in the early s and s chose a US-style president as their chief executive. The first European president was the president of the Italian Republic of , a client state of revolutionary France, in the person of Napoleon Bonaparte. The first African president was the President of Liberia , while the first Asian president was the President of the Republic of China The spectrum of power has included presidents-for-life and hereditary presidencies to ceremonial heads of state. Presidents in the countries with a democratic or representative form of government are usually elected for a specified period of time and in some cases may be re-elected by the same process by which they are appointed, i. The powers vested in such presidents vary considerably. Some presidencies, such as that of Ireland , are largely ceremonial, whereas other systems vest the president with

substantive powers such as the appointment and dismissal of prime ministers or cabinets , the power to declare war , and powers of veto on legislation. Presidential systems Main article: In almost all states with a presidential system of government, the president exercises the functions of head of state and head of government , i. Presidents in this system are either directly elected by popular vote or indirectly elected by an electoral college or some other democratically elected body. In the United States , the President is indirectly elected by the Electoral College made up of electors chosen by voters in the presidential election. In most states of the United States, each elector is committed to voting for a specified candidate determined by the popular vote in each state, so that the people, in voting for each elector, are in effect voting for the candidate. However, for various reasons the numbers of electors in favour of each candidate are unlikely to be proportional to the popular vote. Thus, in five close United States elections , , , , and , the candidate with the most popular votes still lost the election. In Mexico , the president is directly elected for a six-year term by popular vote. The candidate who wins the most votes is elected president even without an absolute majority. The president may never get another term. The Mexican elections had a fierce competition, the electoral results showed a minimal difference between the two most voted candidates and such difference was just about the 0. The Federal Electoral Tribunal declared an elected president after a controversial post-electoral process. In Brazil , the president is directly elected for a four-year term by popular vote. If no candidates achieve a majority of the votes, there is a runoff election between the two candidates with most votes. Again, a candidate needs a majority of the vote to be elected. In Brazil, a president cannot be elected to more than two consecutive terms, but there is no limit on the number of terms a president can serve. A second system is the semi-presidential system , also known as the French model. In this system, as in the parliamentary system, there are both a president and a prime minister; but unlike the parliamentary system, the president may have significant day-to-day power. For example, in France, when their party controls the majority of seats in the National Assembly , the president can operate closely with the parliament and prime minister , and work towards a common agenda. When the National Assembly is controlled by their opponents, however, the president can find themselves marginalized with the opposition party prime minister exercising most of the power. Thus, sometimes the president and prime minister can be allies, sometimes rivals; the latter situation is known in France as cohabitation. Variants of the French semi-presidential system, developed at the beginning of the Fifth Republic by Charles de Gaulle , are used in France , Portugal , Romania , Taiwan [1] , Sri Lanka and several post-colonial countries which have emulated the French model. In Finland, although the constitution moved towards a ceremonial presidency, the system is still formally semi-presidential, with the President of Finland retaining e. Parliamentary systems See also: Parliamentary system and Parliamentary republic The parliamentary republic , is a parliamentary system in which the presidency is largely ceremonial with either de facto or no significant executive authority such as the President of Austria or de jure no significant executive power such as the President of Ireland , and the executive powers rests with the Prime Minister who automatically assumes the post as head of a majority party or coalition, but takes oath of office administered by the president. However, the president is head of the civil service, commander in chief of the armed forces and in some cases can dissolve parliament. A variation of the parliamentary republic is a system with an executive president in which the president is the head of state and the government but unlike a presidential system , is elected by and accountable to a parliament, and referred to as president. Countries using this system include Botswana , South Africa and Suriname. Collective presidency The seven-member Swiss Federal Council serves as collective head of government and state of Switzerland. Only a tiny minority of modern republics do not have a single head of state. Some examples of this are:

Chapter 2 : Harvard Study Finds Biased, Non-Substantive Media Coverage of Election - MediaFile

Yet little is known about the content of agendas that news professionals set in presidential debates. Through a quantitative content analysis, this study examines 20 years of general election debate questions to determine whether the commercial news values common in today's campaign coverage also influence debate agendas.

They discovered that certain individual and group characteristics are likely to act as contingent conditions of media impact and proposed a model of "audience effects". Thus, media effects are contingent on issue-specific audience characteristics. Erbring, Goldenberg and Miller have also demonstrated that people who do not talk about political issues are more subject to agenda-setting influence because they depend more heavily on media content than those who receive information from other sources, including their colleagues and friends. Because of their link to personal concerns, these issues almost compel attention from political elites as well as the news media. Moreover, with this type of issues the problem would be of general concern even without attention from the news media. Research performed by Zucker suggests that an issue is obtrusive if most members of the public have had direct contact with it, and less obtrusive if audience members have not had direct experience. The latter may push the story past the threshold of inattention, but it is also important to look at the kind of coverage to explain how a certain incident becomes an issue. To explain differences in the correlation, McCombs and colleagues created the concept of "need for orientation", which "describes individual differences in the desire for orienting cues and background information". Relevance suggests that an individual will not seek news media information if an issue is not personally relevant. Hence, if relevance is low, people will feel the need for less orientation. There are many issues in our country that are just not relevant to people, because they do not affect us. Many news organizations attempt to frame issues in a way that attempts to make them relevant to its audiences. Frequently, individuals already have all the information that they desire about a topic. Their degree of uncertainty is low. Research done by Weaver in suggested that individuals vary on their need for orientation. The higher levels of interest and uncertainty produce higher levels of need for orientation. So the individual would be considerably likely to be influenced by the media stories psychological aspect of theory. As agenda-setting theory was being developed, scholars pointed out many attributes that describe the object. Each of the objects on an agenda has a lot of attributes containing cognitive components such as information that describes characteristics of the object, and an affective component including tones positive, negative, neutral of the characteristics on agenda. The agenda setting theory and the second level of agenda setting, framing, are both relevant and similar in demonstrating how society is influenced by media, but they describe a different process of influence. One tells us what information to process and the other tells us how to process that information. It is said that there are two main attributes of the second-level of agenda setting. Those include substantive and affective. The substantive factor has to do mainly with things such as personality and ideology. The affective factor is focused on the positive, negative, and neutral side of things. Furthermore, Ghanem [36] demonstrated that the certain attributes agendas in the news with low psychological distance, drove compelling arguments for the salience of public agenda. An example of framing is when a company releases a statement that sounds a lot better than what it actually is. They "frame" it to sound better and more appealing to the public. This can also take place in crisis management, when companies release a statement to save the companies reputation after a crisis occurred. This was very prominent in the BP oil spill several years ago. It also suggests that framing is a form of gatekeeping, similar to the agenda setting theory. McCombs, Shaw, Weaver and colleagues generally argue that framing is a part of agenda-setting that operates as a "second-level" or secondary effect. Dietram Schefuele has argued the opposite. Scheufele argues that framing and agenda-setting possess distinct theoretical boundaries, operate via distinct cognitive processes accessibility vs. Priming is considered to be the step past agenda setting, and is also referred to as the last step of the process. Priming is primarily used in political settings. It discusses how the media will choose to leave some issues about the candidates out of

coverage, while presenting other issues in the fore front. This process creates different standards by which the public evaluates candidates. As well, by reporting the issues that have the most salience on the public; they are not objectively presenting both candidates equally. According to Weaver, [39] framing and second-level agenda setting have the following characteristics: Both are more concerned with how issues or other objects are depicted in the media than with which issues or objects are more or less prominently reported. Both focus on most salient or prominent aspects of themes or descriptions of the objects of interest. Both are concerned with ways of thinking rather than objects of thinking Differences: Framing does seem to include a broader range of cognitive processes â€" moral evaluations, causal reasoning, appeals to principle, and recommendations for treatment of problems â€" than does second-level agenda-setting the salience of attributes of an object. Scheufele and Tewksbury argue that "framing differs significantly from these accessibility-based models [i. It is based on the assumption that how an issue is characterized in news reports can have an influence on how it is understood by audiences;" [40] the difference between whether we think about an issue and how we think about it. Framing and agenda setting differ in their functions in the process of news production, information processing and media effects. Although "both frame building and agenda building refer to macroscopic mechanisms that deal with message construction rather than media effects", frame building is more concerned with the news production process than agenda building. In other words, "how forces and groups in society try to shape public discourse about an issue by establishing predominant labels is of far greater interest from a framing perspective than from a traditional agenda-setting one. For framing and agenda-setting, different conditions seem to be needed in processing messages to produce respective effects. Framing effect is more concerned with audience attention to news messages, while agenda setting is more concerned with repeated exposure to messages. Agenda-setting effects are determined by the ease with which people can retrieve from their memory issues recently covered by mass media, while framing is the extent to which media messages fit ideas or knowledge people have in their knowledge store. Based on these shared characteristics, McCombs and colleagues [41] recently argued that framing effects should be seen as the extension of agenda setting. In other words, according to them, the premise that framing is about selecting "a restricted number of thematically related attributes" [42] for media representation can be understood as the process of transferring the salience of issue attributes i. Accessibility-based explanation of agenda-setting is also applied to second-level agenda-setting. That is, transferring the salience of issue attributes i. For framing effects, empirical evidence shows that the impact of frames on public perceptions is mainly determined by perceived importance of specific frames rather than by the quickness of retrieving frames. On a related note, Scheufele and Tewksbury [40] argues that, because accessibility and applicability vary in their functions of media effects, "the distinction between accessibility and applicability effects has obvious benefits for understanding and predicting the effects of dynamic information environments". Taken together, it can be concluded that the integration of framing into agenda-setting is either impossible because they are based on different theoretical premises or imprudent because merging the two concepts would result in the loss of our capabilities to explain various media effects. Price and Tewksbury argued that agenda-setting effects are based on the accessibility model of information processing. Accessibility can be defined as "how much" or "how recently" a person has been exposed to certain issues Kim et al. Specifically, individuals try to make less cognitive effort in forming social judgments, they are more likely to rely on the information that is easily accessible Higgins, The concept of accessibility is the foundation of a memory-based model Scheufele, When individuals receive and process information, they develop memory traces that can be easily recalled to make decisions on a certain issue. This may sound similar to attribute agenda-setting. Both seem to examine which attributes or aspects of an issue are emphasized in the media Kim et al. Some scholars even argue that framing should be considered as an extension of agenda-setting McCombs, However, framing is based on the applicability model, which is conceptually different from the accessibility model used in agenda-setting. According to Goffman , individuals actively classify and interpret their life experiences to make sense of the world around them. Kim and his colleagues provide distinction between the applicability and accessibility

models is important in terms of issue salience. Framing assumes that each individual will have its own interpretation of an issue, regardless of the salience of an issue. Specifically, it focuses on the "terminological or semantic differences" of how an issue is described. Taken together, the accessibility of issue salience makes the two models of information processing different Scheufele, An emotion dimension[edit] According to the theory of affective intelligence, "emotions enhance citizen rationality". It argues that emotions, particularly negative ones, are crucial in having people pay attention to politics and help shape their political views. They find that apart from the cognitive assessment - which is commonly studied before, emotion is another critical dimension of the Second-level affects in Agenda-setting. Three conclusions are presented: Agenda setting between media and other sources[edit] Recent research on agenda-setting digs into the question of "who sets the media agenda". McCombs and Bell [49] observe that journalists live in "an ambiguous social world" so that they will "rely on one another for confirmation and as a source of ideas". Lim [50] finds that the major news websites in South Korea influence the agendas of online newspapers and also influence each other to some extent. According to McCombs and Funk , [51] intermedia agenda setting is a new path of the future agenda setting research. These publications have a direct effect on local newspapers and television networks that are viewed on a less elite scale. Website networks favor other websites that tend to have a higher viewing and SEO. This type of relationship is known as Power Law which allows the media to have a stronger effect on agenda setting. Based on that, Guo, Vu and McCombs [53] bring up a new theoretical model called Network Agenda Setting Model, which they refer to as the third-level agenda-setting. Twitter application[edit] Over the last few years, the increase in social media has had a direct effect on political campaigns particularly Twitter. Its unique platform allows users to showcase their political opinion without functioning two directions. It is currently being viewed as a platform for political advancement. Before the use of Twitter, political candidates were using blogs and websites to portray their message and to gain more attention and popularity among their followers. Some of the most followed users on Twitter are past and current Presidents of the United States and other political figures. Twitter is being used as a resource to gather information, reach a larger audience and engagement, stay up to date with current social and political issues, and to achieve the agenda building role. Twitter helps express public opinion which in turn allows a relationship to form between the media and the public. Some may argue that Twitter is still being used as a place for people to follow celebrity news and the culture of Hollywood more than it is being used for important issues and world news. Some may also argue that Twitter does not have the ability to set an agenda as much as conventional news outlets. A study found a positive correlation between issue ranks in news coverage and issue ranks in Twitter feeds, suggesting that Twitter and conventional news outlets by and large reflected each other. Non-political application[edit] McCombs and Shaw originally established agenda-setting within the context of a presidential election. Many subsequent studies have looked at agenda setting in the context of an election or in otherwise political contexts. However, more recently scholars have been studying agenda setting in the context of brand community. A brand is defined as what resides in the minds of individuals about a product or service.

Chapter 3 : Substantive Impoverishment of Presidential Rhetoric - Oxford Scholarship

Specifically, a content analysis of news releases, political speeches, and issue platform statements was conducted to assess the salience of issues and attributes in the presidential election from the Bush, Kerry, and Nader campaigns.

Chapter 4 : President - Wikipedia

The President's Management Agenda lays the foundation needed to address the critical challenges where Government as a whole still operates in the past. This is one of many steps to building a.

Chapter 5 : Agenda-setting theory - Wikipedia

President's Management Agenda 1 Most Americans may not think about the Federal Government every day—but when they need Government services, they expect them to work.

Chapter 6 : Paul Ryan dreams of a kinder, more substantive GOP - POLITICO

Keywords: presidential rhetoric, substantive impoverishment, linguistic simplification, substantive anti-intellectualism, presidents Oxford Scholarship Online requires a subscription or purchase to access the full text of books within the service.

Chapter 7 : Substantive | Definition of Substantive by Merriam-Webster

unique data collected on presidential policy tools and substantive policy change in the federal bureaucracy, we investigate whether presidential signals, sent using certain policy tools, are able to provoke bureaucratic policy activity.