

MPC MAJOR RESEARCH PAPER

THE EFFECT OF FACE-TO-FACE COMMUNICATION ON EDITORIAL STANCE:
A CASE STUDY OF THE 2010 LIBERAL EXPRESS TOUR

Michelle Anne MacLeod

Submitted to: Professor Gregory Levey

The Major Research Paper is submitted
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Professional Communication

Ryerson University
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

August 29, 2011

Author's Declaration Page

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this Major Research Paper.

I authorize Ryerson University to lend this MRP to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

Signature _____

I further authorize Ryerson University to reproduce this MRP by photocopying or by other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

Signature _____

Abstract:

This Major Research Paper explores the value of face-to-face communication in a digital age by examining the effect of face-to-face communication on media coverage. The author outlines the theoretical components of agenda-setting theory, presentation theory, and invitational rhetoric to illustrate the process by which individuals or groups compete to gain attention and power, and the role that face-to-face communication can play to persuade. This theory is examined with a political case study of the Liberal Party of Canada's cross-Canada bus tour in July and August of 2010. The author provides a discourse analysis of newspaper editorials published in Ontario, Canada before and after then-Party Leader Michael Ignatieff visited. The author observes that the tone of media coverage is more favourable after face-to-face communication with citizens and journalists took place, suggesting that face-to-face communication is an effective tool for politicians in a digital age.

Acknowledgements

This major research paper would not have been possible without the academic guidance of many key members of faculty at Ryerson University. I am very thankful to my supervisor, Gregory Levey, for his guidance and support throughout this project, and to my second reader, Dr. Catherine Schryer for her teachings on discourse analysis and research methods.

I would also like to thank my parents, Diane and John MacLeod, for their unending support throughout all of my academic pursuits.

Table of Contents

Author's Declaration Page	2
Abstract	4
Acknowledgements	5
List of Tables	6
Introduction	7
Theoretical Framework	9
Review of Literature	16
Discourse Frame	24
Methodology	29
Findings and Analysis	33
Afterward	47
Conclusion	49
Bibliography	51
Appendix	59

List of Tables

Table 1 – Before the summer - Positive Adjectives

Table 2 – Before the summer – Negative Adjectives

Table 3 – Before the summer – Balanced Adjectives

Table 4 - Before the summer – Metaphors

Table 5 – During the summer – Positive Adjectives

Table 6 – During the summer – Negative Adjectives

Table 7- During the summer – Balanced Adjectives

Table 8 – During the summer – Metaphors

Table 9 – Afterword – Positive Adjectives

Table 10 – Afterword – Negative Adjectives

Table 11 – Afterword – Balanced Adjectives

Table 12 – Afterword – Metaphors

Introduction

In 2010, while many politicians were using Facebook and Twitter to connect with constituents and control their digital image, then-Liberal leader Michael Ignatieff said he preferred to take the traditional route: aiming to earn the nation's approval "handshake by handshake, baby by baby, gathering by gathering, and neighbour by neighbour" (Ibbitson, 2010). This communications strategy not only allowed Mr. Ignatieff to meet with constituents face-to-face, but also provided an opportunity to meet with local journalists. Agenda-setting, or the influence over the attention given to policy issues by other institutions such as the media, is arguably one of the most important sources of political power (Eshbaugh-Soha and Peake, 2008, p. 625). Political party leaders are in a unique position to strongly influence the public agenda as a result of their respected status in Canadian society, and the growth of news media in the past decade in Canada means there are more opportunities than ever before for being "in the news. Few Canadians have the opportunity to communicate with politicians directly, which means opinions are largely formed through what they hear and read in the media. For the Liberal Party of Canada, each stop on the 2010 Liberal Express tour represented a new opportunity to reach out and earn the public's approval.

This research paper investigates the strength of face-to-face communication in a digital age by analyzing the effects of the Liberal Express tour on the tone of editorial coverage during the summer of 2010. Through a discourse analysis of adjectives and metaphors collected from newspaper editorials published in Ontario, Canada, this paper will answer the following questions: What effect does political face-to-face

communication have on the editorial agenda? How did the Liberal Express tour affect the tone or “stance” of editorial coverage in Ontario?

These research questions are explored through the lens of agenda-setting theory, presentation theory, and invitational rhetoric. The next section of this paper provides an overview of these theories, illustrating the process by which individuals or groups compete to gain attention and power. Related studies on face-to-face communication and its effect on media coverage or public opinion are then explored in a review of literature before editorials from the Liberal Express Tour are examined. Based on a critical discourse analysis, this paper shows that editorial tone improved after the Liberal Express visited Ontario. Therefore, this case study suggests that face-to-face communication may have a positive impact on the tone of editorial coverage.

Theoretical framework

This aim of this paper is to determine whether face-to-face communication affects the type of media coverage a person or group receives. The growth of social media and the Internet means that many are choosing to communicate online instead of in person; however, face-to-face communication may be a more effective strategy. To provide a more narrow focus to this research topic, the first section of this paper explores the theoretical components of agenda-setting theory, presentation theory, and invitational rhetoric to illustrate the process by which individuals or groups compete to gain attention and power, and the role of face-to-face communication in persuasion. These theories are later applied to a political case study of the Liberal Party of Canada's cross-Canada bus tour in July and August of 2010.

In the summer of 2010, then-leader of the Liberal Party of Canada Michael Ignatieff began a cross-country political tour with the aim of building trust with Canadians. The ultimate goal of the Liberal Party of Canada's communication strategy was to raise awareness about the Party's viewpoints, illustrate the strength and competency of the leader and candidates, and ultimately improve party support for the purpose of winning future votes in an election. In 2010, Mr. Ignatieff had been heavily criticized in the press for being unable to connect with Canadians and for spending a number of years living outside of Canada. If there was any hope of improving the Liberal's standing in the 2011 electoral polls, Mr. Ignatieff needed a way to resonate with voters. According to media richness theory, which refers to the value of a particular medium for communicating, face-to-face communication is most effective because of its allowance for immediate feedback, non-verbal cues, and message tailoring (Zaremba,

2010, p. 37). The public wants to see political leaders in action and in an unvarnished setting, and community events provide an opportunity for political leaders to communicate informally, shake hands with their constituents, and connect with the media. A bus tour did not only allow Mr. Ignatieff to meet Canadian with citizens face-to-face, but also attracted local media outlets, who the Liberals hoped were writing more positive pieces about the Liberal Party.

Agenda-setting theorists point out that a political leader, candidate, or party could most effectively alter the public's viewpoints through media relations. Agenda setting refers to the ongoing competition among individuals and groups in society to control the messages and get noticed by those with power, including media professionals, the public and policy elites (Horvit, et. al., 2008, p. 10). A higher-level component of agenda-setting theory is "agenda building," which relates to a give-and-take process with "gatekeepers," whereby politicians compete to get their stories published. "Gatekeepers," which are the people who control or shape public opinion, may include journalists, sources of media, elected leaders, political campaigns, organizations, public interest groups, public information officers, and public relations professionals (Druckman, et. al., 2004, p. 1182). News releases from political parties are one of the major sources of information for Canadian political reporters, so proactive media pitches can reach and influence the public agenda. Schneider (2007) argues that organizations should see power as a practical achievement, which must be earned over and over again in each social interaction: "We can see every communicative interaction as an occasion to reproduce, undermine, or change apparently fixed power relations" (p. 196). Understanding power in this way helps one understand why someone can have power

and why it can slip away. For the Liberal Party of Canada, understanding power as a practical achievement helps illustrate the numerous opportunities that exist for empowerment. Maximizing media coverage during the summer months – at time when competing parties were nowhere to be seen – was, therefore, a very useful strategy for increasing the strength of the national Liberal Party.

Additionally, agenda-setting theory suggests that the persuasiveness of a media report is dependent on which parts of a story a media chooses to focus on. Media frames are defined as “a central organizing idea or story line that provides meaning to an unfolding strip of vents... the frame suggests what the controversy is about, the essence of the issue” (Gamson and Modigliani, 1987, p. 143). McCombs, Shaw and Weaver (1997) separated frame-setting theory from agenda-setting theory. While agenda-setting theory is concerned with the saliency of issues, frame setting is concerned with the salience of issue attributes (p. 6). Balmas and Sheafer (2010) referred to the focus on priming in agenda-setting literature as “a shift from a focus on the media’s role in telling us ‘what to think about’ to their function of telling us ‘how to think’ about subjects.” Not only can the media affect how the public thinks about issues, but they may also impact how the public assesses a public officials’ personality. In this way, political parties will not only leverage the media to “frame” the topic in a particular way, but they will also “prime” the public to evaluate that issue based on their quoted criteria. For the Liberal Party of Canada, a key advantage of being in the media spotlight during the summer months was being accessible to the media and available to comment on policy issues, such as the spending on fighter jets and the long-form census. During the summer, the Harper Government announced it would be spending

\$16 billion on F-35 fighter jets without asking for bids from other defence contractors and replacing the mandatory long-form Census with a new voluntary questionnaire despite being told by Statistics Canada that important data would be lost. Both decisions were highly criticized by opposition parties, reportedly diminishing the Harper Government's standing in opinion polls (Ibbitson, 2010). The power of media is also strengthened when power-holders are able to maintain ongoing influence (Fairclough, 2001, p. 43). A single text on its own is quite insignificant because the effects of media power are cumulative (p. 45). Therefore, while one or two articles on Mr. Ignatieff's criticisms may have had a limited effect, the series of articles published at different times throughout the summer, would likely have a stronger impact on Canadian voters.

According to critical discourse theorist Norman Fairclough (2001), the power of the press to control controversy is "hidden" (p. 41). Writers and editors exercise power over consumers by determining what is and what isn't newsworthy, by the way they cover each story, and the placement of each story in the day's hierarchy of coverage (p.42). Fairclough argued that the media utilizes its "hidden" power by the choice of angle, or "frame" it uses to report on a story. In the media, events are generally represented as categorical truths through the use of bias-free language. However, this claim disguises the complex process of information gathering and interpretation which go into production (p. 106). Even in media reports that openly admit bias, such as newspaper editorials, the use of inclusive pronouns such as "we" suggest that the writer and the reader share the same point of view (p. 106). Scheufele (2000) proposed that subtle nuances in the wording of a description of a situation might affect how the audience interpreted the situation: "... framing influences how audiences think about

issues, not by making aspects of the issue more salient, but by invoking interpretive schemas that influence the interpretation of incoming information” (p.298). Nelson and Garst (1997) argued that because frames stress specific values and facts they endow them with greater relevancy to the issue than they might appear to have under an alternative frame (p.569). Because new frames are interchangeable, politicians can affect their portrayal in the press by answering media questions in a way that focuses on their preferred angle to an issue.

While agenda-setting theorists argued that face-to-face communication helps frame issues in a favourable way, according to presentation theory, individuals may also control their image by adopting a public personality. In the *Presentation of Self*, Erving Goffman (1959) defined the “self” as a social product that comes into being through face-to-face communication or a “performance.” Performance is defined as “all the activity of a given participant on a given occasion that serves to influence in any way any of the other participants” (p. 26). In this view, the self is composed of two entities, character and performer, as well as the combined entity of the self as a performed character. The organization and management of these identities is the performer’s chief concern. By thinking of media events as a political performance, politicians can use language to define, persuade, appease, entertain, or victimize (Burke, 1950, p. xiv). Burke contends that an actor can improve his persuasive capability through “identification,” which is tailoring one’s message for a micro-level audience. Burke argues that “Identification ranges from the politician, who addressing an audience of farmers says, ‘I was a farm boy myself,’ through the mysteries of social status, to the mystic devout identification with the source of all being” (p. xiv). In Canadian politics,

this would be especially important in distinct ridings, such as those in rural Ontario, which have different needs than those in larger cities. While agenda-setting theory helps explain how face-to-face communication allowed Mr. Ignatieff to receive media attention, presentation theory suggests that he maximized the time spent in each location by speaking directly to the audience's desires. Based on presentation theory, therefore, the Liberal Express tour was advantageous because it provided the opportunity to meet with smaller groups of Canadians, and one-on-one with journalists, which would allow for more tailored and persuasive rhetoric.

Lastly, invitational rhetoric suggests that even if Mr. Ignatieff failed to identify with audiences, the fact that he extended an invitation to hear their needs would help improve his likeability. Foss and Griffin (quoted in Craig and Muller, 2007) have since noted that the opportunity to persuade is more simply the presentation of an invitation. Building on second-wave feminist communication theories, they argued that face-to-face communication is effective even if the key messages or beliefs are not transferred to or accepted by the audience.

Invitational rhetoric constitutes an invitation to the audience to enter the rhetor's world and to see it as the rhetor does. ...Ideally, audience members accept the invitation offered by the rhetor by listening to and trying to understand the rhetor's perspective and then presenting their own. When this happens, rhetor and audience alike contribute to the thinking about an issue so that everyone involved gains a greater understanding of the issue in its subtlety, richness, and complexity (Craig and Muller, 2007, p. 146).

In this view, the focus shifts from the speaker to the audience, and to the generation of new ideas. While the model was originally conceived with marginalized groups in mind, in politics, it provides an opportunity for opposition parties to present an alternative view. Foss and Griffin recognized that there are situations in which rhetoric through

persuasion is necessary, such as during an election; however, the desire to create change is so pervasive that domination and control of the audience must not always be the aim. This view of rhetoric not only provides support for the benefits of proactive media relations and politicians' agenda-setting role, but also leads to a distinct model for evaluating the effectiveness of media tours and the press they receive. For example, the invitation to hear Mr. Ignatieff speak in person would likely have an effect – regardless of what was said during the media event. According to invitational rhetoric, the existence of the Liberal Express Tour may naturally provide more positive media cover regardless of what is said or presented during each stop.

In summary, this paper has thus far outlined three communication theories: agenda-setting theory, presentation theory, and invitational rhetoric, which indicate that face-to-face communication is a powerful communications tool that can be used by individuals or groups to attain media coverage and improve likability. Based on this theoretical framework, face-to-face communication was likely to improve the editorial tone of newspaper coverage about the Liberal Party in Ontario, Canada. Before this case study is presented, however, the next section provides an overview of the current body of academic literature on the role of face-to-face communication in politics.

Review of literature

The major aim of this research paper is to determine whether an individual or group can leverage face-to-face communication to alter the tone of media coverage they receive. This paper has already established that face-to-face communication may have a positive impact on the press in theory. Agenda-setting theory suggests that power is a practical achievement that can be reproduced or undermined based on one's ability to influence the media. Presentation theorists maintain that individuals can act in a specific way to persuade the audience to like them. And, invitational rhetoric suggests that extending an invitation to citizens and journalists is a form of persuasion on its own because it shows care and concern for their needs. Not only did these theories influence research design and analysis; they also helped contextualize this paper in the body of academic communications literature. While this paper uses the Liberal Party of Canada as a political case study, there have been many other political case studies done that provide support to these three theories.

Since few Canadians have the opportunity to meet politicians face-to-face, the media is a very influential source of political information. Based on his study of political news coverage, Fairclough (2001) argues that political news is overwhelmingly in favour of the existing power holders or current government rather than opposition leaders or parties. Fairclough's finding is not surprising given that the role of an editorial section of a newspaper is to express the viewpoints of the community. The newspaper is assumed to speak on behalf of itself, its readers, and all citizens. When covering political news, the elected government generally receives the majority of coverage. As a result, it can

be difficult for opposition parties, such as the 2010 Liberal Party of Canada, who lack constituent support, to attain positive editorial news coverage.

In his study of the influential power of the press, Cohen (1963) argued mass media “may not be successful much of the time in telling people what to think, but is stunningly successful in telling its readers what to think about” (p. 13). Building on Fairclough’s argument that the power of the press is “hidden,” theories of “framing” suggest that journalists have the power to influence the public by culling together a few elements of perceived reality and assembling a narrative that highlights connections among them to promote a particular interpretation (Entman, 2007, p. 164). McCombs and Shaw confirmed this hypothesis in 1972, finding that media had a considerable impact on what voters believed were the most important issues during the 1968 presidential campaign (p. 180). Further, Iyengar and Kinder (1987) studied the news frames used by broadcast journalists to determine how viewers judged the saliency of political topics. Their results indicated that viewers rely quite heavily on news frames.

According to research on opposition politics, making it into the daily paper can be considered a win itself. In their analysis of the 1966 U.S. midterm congressional elections, Miller and Stokes concluded that “recognition carries a positive valence; to be perceived at all is to be perceived favourably” (p. 205). They found people who had positive things to say about challengers in the 1978 American presidential election were likely to vote for them; however, so were people with critical or unfavourable impressions (p. 90). During elections, especially, political parties are the greatest resource for political news. As a result, positive relations with media can put political leaders in an advantageous position to influence public opinion (Semetko et al., 1991

and Dalton et al., 1995). Unlike incumbents, challengers are relatively unknown; and what the public knows is more likely to be negative. As a result, press attention of any kind is advantageous. In contrast, for incumbents, negative press is more directly correlated with a decline in votes (Miller and Stokes, 1966).

The bulk of studies on the frame-setting power of politicians show that citizens judge the legitimacy of a political party through the cues provided by editors. Walter Lippmann (1922) described news coverage by newspapers and magazines in the 1920s as “the beam of a searchlight that moves restlessly about, bringing one episode and then another out of darkness into vision” (Lippman, 1922, p. 229). Polsby (1980) pointed out that “the principal mechanisms through which candidates and their enthusiasts exercise their power are the mass media of news dissemination”. In their study of American National Election Study data, Kahn and Kenney (2002) found that newspaper coverage had a significant impact on candidate evaluations, particularly among everyday readers. According to Son and Weaver’s (2005) study of the 2000 presidential election, cumulative salience and favourable presentation of a candidate in the news did significantly predict increased levels of aggregate public support as measured by Gallup poll (p. 190). Editorials provide a platform for the text to position itself politically and to send signals to its readers about alignments it wishes to seek and leanings it wishes to disregard. Unlike news articles, editorials are more likely to express conviction by using presuppositions that requests affirmation and excludes specific convictions from polite dispute (Porter, 1986, p. 38). For example, the words *of course* may be used to politely acknowledge those who already know the information while incidentally educating those who are unaware. Therefore, producers of mass communication have an effective

method for manipulating audiences through attributing to their experience things which they want the audience to accept.

The way journalists choose to frame stories has had a proven effect on audiences, according to recent studies. Theorists now conceptualize media frames as the independent variable and the audience frame as the dependent variable. Increased coverage of a particular topic in the media is related to the significance people accord to that issue (Iyengar and Kinder, 1987). For instance, Huang (1996) analyzed the extent to which audiences notice media frames, examining how two competing newspapers framed a local controversy and studying audience viewpoints about those frames. Following a series of open-ended interviews with readers, she found media frames affected the way the audience viewed those involved. In a different study, Price, Tewksbury and Powers (1997) asked undergraduate students to read news articles about possible cuts to state funding. Students received different versions of the news article featuring various frames. After the survey, students were asked to write down their thoughts and feelings. Coding showed that various media frames strongly influenced the respondents' answers. Further, the news pieces varied in their ability to persuade the audience. For example, news commentators and experts, such as newspaper columnists, were deemed to have a greater persuasive effect on audiences than traditional news articles or letters to the editor. As a result, this research suggests that public opinion may be influenced by the choice of news frame.

Political communication has been described as undergoing a process of personalization in which media coverage focuses heavily on individual politicians rather than on parties, even in parliamentary systems (Balmas and Sheafer, 2010, p. 204).

Balmas and Sheaffer (2010) point to numerous studies that illustrate voters are more interested in candidate characteristics than specific issues. For example, in Popkin's (1994) study of the 1992 U.S. presidential campaign coverage, he found mass media was heavily fixated on Mr. Clinton's marital troubles and avoidance of military service, leading many to question his personal character. However, the Clinton campaign team was able to alter the media agenda by pitching stories about economic and welfare reform to alternative media sources, slowly strengthening his reputation as a policy expert. When the media focuses on leadership personalities, rather than issues, the public also begins to define politics in similar terms.

While news framing is a necessary journalistic technique for packaging information, Trimble and Sampert (2004) argued that linguistic devices, such as the metaphorical references to politics as a game, may actually trivialize the political sphere and lead to greater disengagement. For example, the game frame appears to be a natural metaphor for an electoral contest and one that is often signalled by references to sport or battle. Game frames allow writers to focus on elements such as leader performance, gaffes, personality quirks, personal information, party strategies, party standings, accusations and personal attacks (Trimble and Sampert, 2004, p. 54). However, the game frame also tends to influence the tone of news coverage and inspire negative evaluations of parties and party leaders (p. 55). While positive references to political actors outnumbered negative in 1962 and 1974, by 1979 there was more negative than positive coverage noted for 1980, 1984, 1993 and 2000 elections (p. 55). The metaphorical representation of social problems as diseases is also extremely common in politics (Fairclough, 2001, p. 99). The ideological significance of disease

metaphors is that they tend to take dominant interests to be the interests of society as a whole, and construe expressions of non-dominant interests, such as strikes, demonstrations, 'riots' as undermining the health of society. Different metaphors imply different ways of dealing with things; one does not arrive at a negotiated settlement with cancer, though one might with an opponent in an argument. Cancer has to be eliminated or cut out (p. 100). Therefore, while an editorial may not use excessively positive or negative adverbs or adjectives, metaphors are frequently used to convey a particular stance.

In addition to metaphors, scholarship shows that the tone of a message plays an important role in opinion formation (Kiousis, Bantimaroudis, and Ban, 1999). Affective attributes refer to those facets of news coverage that elicit emotional reaction from audience members. One of the major goals of Balmas and Sheaffer's (2010) study of the 2006 election in Israel was to address the possible association between individual candidate attributes and candidate evaluations. Specifically, the focus was on the association between the tone (positive or negative) of the most accessible candidate attributes in individual memory and the general judgment regarding the candidate's suitability for the position of Prime Minister. The evidence indicated that for two of three candidates (Olmert and Peretz), when the public perceived the candidate's most salient attribute in a negative manner, the voting intention declined, and vice versa. The tone of a story is a vital thread in the overall composition of news, and is crucial for helping process new information (p. 417). Druckman and Parkin (2005) investigate how editorial slant – defined as the quantity and tone of a newspaper's candidate coverage as influenced by editorial position – shapes candidate evaluations and vote choice. By

combining comprehensive content analyses of the papers with an Election Day exit poll, they found compelling evidence that editorial slant influences voters' decisions. Further, they question the media's place in the electoral democratic process.

While mass media is influential, many theorists suggest that public deliberation is a more democratic and effective way to educate the public. A large body of work has recently been published about the effect of public deliberation on public attitudes (e.g., Delli Carpini, Cook, and Jacobs, 2004; Gastil and Levine, 2005). Findings, however, are mixed. Following the 1996 U.S. National Issues Convention, which brought a large sample of Americans together to discuss national and international issues, Merkle (1996) found relatively little change in aggregate opinion. On the other hand, Fishkin and Luskin (1999) found many changes in opinion. In their study of verbal communication, Nelson and Garst (2005) found attendees at political events pay attention to messages that appeal to their own values, regardless of political standing. Contrary to the hypothesis that party designation would affect the persuasive capability of verbal communication, messages from rival party members were not rejected. Even non-partisan participants seemed to scrutinize the message more thoroughly when the speaker used values common to his or her party and similar to the participants' own. The power of political messages, they note, "derives not only from the values evoked and the party membership claimed by the speaker, but also to some extent on whether these two aspects fit the audience's expectations" (p. 510). These messages produced longer-lasting effects, were more likely to lead to stronger attitude-behaviour associations, and were more resistant to future counter messages. Gastil and Dillard (1999) found that "moderates," or those in the centre of the political spectrum, are more

resilient and are less likely to change their political beliefs (p. 4). However, they are more likely to move to the left when a higher proportion of group members were liberal (and vice versa). Liberals and conservatives were both found to adjust their viewpoints only slightly. However, when in the presence of more liberals, conservatives are more likely to move to the right – a finding they call the “repulsion effect” (p. 38), which does not hold true for liberals. Therefore, both Liberal and Conservative audiences would be receptive to newspaper editorials about the Liberal Express tour. Based on these studies, there is a possibility that the Liberal Party could persuade both journalists and Canadian citizens, suggesting that editorial coverage may become more positive.

Discourse frame

The aim of this research paper is to determine the impact of face-to-face communication on media coverage. Based on agenda-setting theory, presentation theory, and invitational rhetoric, face-to-face communication, this paper has thus far argued that high-profile groups, such as political parties, are in a unique position to strongly influence public opinion through the media. The previous section helped contextualize this debate by providing a scope of research already published on this topic. While there has been much published on the media's effect on electoral results, there has been little published about the impact of face-to-face communication on the media's agenda. The next half of this paper provides a political case study of the Liberal Express Tour, a cross-Canada bus tour taken by then-Leader Michael Ignatieff in the summer of 2010. To determine, the tour's impact on local media and public opinion, newspaper editorials published in Ontario, Canada were collected. Critical discourse analysis was used to determine whether the tone or "stance" of editorial coverage was positive or negative. This section will provide an overview of the type of critical discourse analysis selected for this study.

According to Douglas Biber and Edward Finegan (1988), stance is the "the overt expression of an author's or speaker's attitudes, feelings, judgments, or commitment concerning the message" (p. 1). In texts, stance acts as tool to express certainty, generalization and actuality: "All of these express some aspect of speakers' (or writers') attitudes toward their messages, as a frame of reference for the messages, an attitude toward or judgment of their contents, or an indication of the degree of commitment toward their truthfulness" (p. 2). While there has been increasing academic interest in

identifying the way writers communicate their feelings in text, Biber and Finegan argued that most of this research is related to writers' sources of information, called "evidentials" rather than the way they indicate stance (p. 2). For example, Chafe (1985) categorized four types of "evidentials" that are used to describe the key information in a text. These included: 1) words that denote reliability, such as *maybe* or *certainly*; 2) words that distinguish inductive or deductive learning, such as *must* or *should*; 3) quality of the evidence, such as *it sounds like* or *it seems*, and 4) the way knowledge is referred to in a text, such as *think* or *believe*. Brown and Levinson (1978) argued that writers encode judgments in their writing through "hedges," or "negative politeness." They argued that writers either use "quality" hedges, such as *think* or *believe*, to assume responsibility for the information, or "quantity" hedges, such as *roughly* or *approximately* to raise doubt about the accuracy of the information. Interestingly, Chafe (1985) found that when compared to speakers who wish to sound credible; writers are more likely to raise doubt about the quality of information being discussed through the use of evidential statements or negative politeness.

Biber and Finegan's (1998) findings suggest that when isolated, the literal meanings of many adverbs fail to correspond with the assumed function associated with the stance style (p. 30). Their recommendations for further study on stance included taking greater detailed consideration of individual texts within each genre, and expanding study beyond non-adverbial markers of stance (p. 31). Further, Hunston (2007) argued that identifying whether words have a positive or negative connotation can be challenging because there is no simple correspondence between individual words, on one hand, and position function, on the other hand. As a result,

straightforward analysis of one linguistic device, such as “stance adverbials,” was avoided in this paper’s political case study. Instead, this study builds on this advice, using two linguistic tools for examining stance: adjectives (Hodge and Kress) and metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson).

According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980), metaphors are a way of understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another (p. 10). A metaphor contains two fundamental elements, a topic and a vehicle. The metaphor topic is the object or phenomenon being described, whereas the vehicle is the other object or phenomenon that conveys meaning. Metaphors are conceptual in nature and are one of the primary vehicles for enhancing understanding. For example, the conceptual metaphor “argument is war” is reflected in everyday language by a variety of expressions (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). Though there is no physical battle, there is a verbal battle, and the structure of an argument – attack, defence, counter-attack, etc. – reflects this. Metaphors are widely used in politics because they take complex events and make them accessible to the general public. They convey meaning, embody values, emotions and ideology, and trigger action. As a result, they are frequently used in editorials because they simplify complex ideas for a variety of readers.

Metaphors rarely come singly, and cluster in “themes,” which are powerful linguistic devices used to shape reality (Bolinger, 1980, p. 156). For example, in the 1950s tobacco advertisers used themes of fashion, freedom and fun to appeal to universal desires and allegiances, shielding tobacco from misgivings that are attached to drugs in general (p. 158). Metaphors also play a central role in the construction of social and political reality by highlighting certain realities and hiding others. Bowers and

Osborn (1966) found that metaphor has a greater persuasive effect than ordinary language. Metaphorical conclusions brought about more change in the direction advocated than did the literal conclusions. Sinclair (1991) highlighted the fact that evaluative meanings can be difficult to determine in specific words. Reading across whole phrases or units of meaning, however, is effective. Critical discourse analysts Norman Fairclough (1992) and Michael Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan (1985), found that when studying the infinite variety and subtle linguistic variations within a genre, the social context must also be considered.

The objective of critical discourse analysis is to portray a discourse as part of a social process, showing how it is determined by social structures, and what reproductive effects discourses can have on structures, sustaining them or changing them (Fairclough, 2001, p.135). In examining the relationship between text and the social world, it is important to note that this process is an indirect, mediated one. "One cannot directly extrapolate from the formal features of a text to these structural effects upon the constitution of a society!" (p. 117). Interpretations of textual discourse are dependent on background assumptions and the social context of the discourse. It is fair to assume that any discourse will have determinants and effects on societal, institutional and situational levels (p. 136).

Hodge and Kress (1993) have produced a simple model that looks at the relationship between language use and power that will act as a model for this paper's analysis (p. 7). With the aim of identifying the common sense beliefs of a social system, they propose that "the grammar of language is its theory of reality," which represent the interests of one group over another (p. 7-8). Holland et al. (1998), call these versions of

reality “figured worlds,” which are socially and culturally constructed entities whereby significance is given to certain acts and particular outcomes are valued over others (p. 52). In Hodge and Kress’ (1993) “Syntagmatic Model,” sentences are broken down to determine how agents are represented in the social world (p. 9). These representations can be drawn out by identifying “actionals” and “relationals.” Actionals represent “the relationships perceived in the physical world” (p. 9) and relationals “display the activity of the mind, making judgments, commenting, and so on” (p. 9). Relationals can be broken down into two sub-categories: “equatives,” which establish relationships between two nouns (e.g. Michael is a politician); and “attributives,” which connect nouns and qualities, usually adjectives (e.g. Michael is charismatic). Through classification, a writer “imposes order on what is classified. So classification is an instrument of control in two directions: control over the flux of experience of physical and social reality... and society’s conception of that reality” (p. 63).

Attributives can also be modulated by “upscaling” (intensifying the writer’s commitment) or “downscaling” (softening the writer’s commitment with adverbs and comparative constructions) (Schryer et al., 2009, p. 225). For the purpose of studying newspaper editorials, relationals were the more important element in this model as they associate agents with values, and help classify Mr. Ignatieff and the Liberal Express tour in a particularly positive or negative way. Thus, like metaphors, attributives (or adjectives) represent a form of physical and social reality, and have the potential to shape the reader’s view of reality. Together, the two create a uniform standpoint that illustrates the overall “stance” of an editorial.

Methodology

Building on the existing literature on face-to-face communication described above, this research paper uses theories of agenda-setting and political rhetoric to examine the effectiveness of the Liberal Party of Canada's 2010 cross-country bus tour. In his attempt to improve likability during a non-election year, increase Liberal Party support, and practice staging a cross-country tour, then-Liberal Party Leader Michael Ignatieff travelled across the country July 10, 2010 to September 5, 2010. He visited 112 communities and 105 ridings in all 13 provinces and territories, attended 166 events and conducted 125 one-on-one media interviews. On July 16, 2010, John Ibbitson wrote in the *Globe and Mail* that Mr. Ignatieff "implored the party faithful and the merely curious to help him enfold Canadians into his 'big, red tent at the centre of Canadian life.'" The informal face-to-face conversation occurring throughout the Liberal Express tour would, therefore, provide greater opportunities for goal-negotiation and relationship-building (Biber and Finegan, 1988, p. 17). Many Canadian politicians have organized public gatherings to increase electoral support. For example, Former Prime Minister Jean Chretien effectively used bus tours before winning a majority in 1993, and the Harper government successfully used live, verbal speeches to win support in the 2006 election. Biber and Finegan (1988) wrote that public speeches are directed toward broad audiences, permit little interaction, and assume a relatively small amount of shared knowledge (p. 7). Bus tours differ from conventional political speeches as visits are organized in such a way to facilitate more one-on-one discussion between members of the local community, including journalists, and the Liberal Party of Canada. Not only

were reporters invited to attend a more formal speech component, but they were also encouraged to attend town halls, barbecues, and meet and greets.

To narrow the scope of this research project, this paper focuses on editorial coverage published in five major daily newspapers in Ontario. Ontario has been selected because Mr. Ignatieff spent one-third of his summer (15 days) in Ontario. In contrast, Mr. Ignatieff spent just one day in Albert and made brief trips to the provinces of Quebec and Nova Scotia. During this time period, the Liberal Express stopped in Ottawa, St.-Albert, Hawkesbury, Cornwall, Brockville, Kingston, Napanee, Peterborough, Cobourg, Pickering, Markham, Toronto, Orillia, Muskoka, Thunder Beach, Barrie, Borden, and Brampton from July 13-17; Guelph, Cambridge, Kitchener, and Waterloo from July 26 to July 28; Toronto Thornhill, the Halton Area, Hamilton, St. Catharines, Niagara Falls, Oakville, and Mississauga from July 29 to 31; and lastly, St. Jacob's, London, Chatham, Essex County, and Windsor August 7 to 9. Visits to Ontario ridings were both "strategic" in the sense of needing to win support, and "safe," meaning there is already much existing Liberal support (Funke, 2011). For example, during the first week of the tour, Ignatieff spent the majority of his week in ridings that the Liberals had lost in one of the two previous elections to the Conservatives. The eight ridings, all former Liberal strongholds, include: Trinity-Spadina, Thornhill, Halton, Hamilton East – Stoney Creek, St. Catharines, Niagara Falls, Oakville and Mississauga. Within the first week of his itinerary, he also paid visits to three ridings that he was at risk of losing, including Brampton, where Conservative support is growing; Ajax, where the former Ambassador to Afghanistan was running against two-time Liberal MP Mark Holland, and

in Kingston and the Islands, a riding the Party feared they may lose due to the retirement of MP and Speaker of the House of Commons, Peter Milliken (Funke, 2011).

The editorial pieces included in this study have been selected through a search of Editorial and Opinion and Letters to the Editor on LexisNexis. To ensure the Liberal Express and Mr. Ignatieff were the focus of the editorials; articles included the search terms “Michael Ignatieff.” The terms “Liberal Express” was not included to allow for inclusion of pieces by writers who may have been somewhat affected by perceived strengths or weaknesses of the face-to-effort without explicit mention. Data was collected for two main periods: 15 editorials from before the tour (June 10 to July 10, 2010) and 58 editorials during the tour (July 10 to September 6, 2010). A total of 73 texts published in five major daily newspapers (Hamilton Spectator, Toronto Star, Guelph Mercury, Toronto Sun, and the Waterloo Region Record) were collected for this study. The articles were each studied based on adjectives (“attributives”) and metaphor. Adjectives were drawn from each editorial, classified as being positive, negative, or neutral, and organized in a chart based on political party. For example, “warmer” or “pioneering” was classified as positive while “controversial” or “erratic” were deemed negative. Words such as “little” or “environmental” were deemed neutral as they do not convey a positive or negative tone when isolated from the sentence. The adjectives selected either refer to a party leader or the political party more broadly. Since most of the pieces about the Liberal Express provided background context on policy issues, many adjectives were attributed to Prime Minister Harper, and to a lesser extent, then-NDP Leader Jack Layton and then-Bloc Quebecois leader Gilles Duceppe. In some cases, the three opposition parties were lumped together and referred to as a potential

“socialist” “coalition.” In these cases, adjectives were assigned to each party leader separately. Once a chart was created for each political party for before and after the summer, adjectives were classified by tone, and the number of positive, negative and balanced adjectives were counted and divided by the total number of adjectives collected to create a percentage. For example, before the summer, there were 176 adjectives collected that describe Mr. Ignatieff. Eighty-two of those adjectives were deemed negative, which means 46.5% of adjectives used to describe the then-Liberal leader before the summer were negative. To determine whether there was a change in editorial tone, percentages from before and during/after his visits were compared.

Metaphors were also collected and organized in a chart beside each leader’s adjectives. Metaphors are less overt in tone, which is why each metaphor was studied and analyzed based on its theme. There were many common themes used to describe both political parties and when combined with findings from the adjective analysis, provide a clear understanding of the attitudes the writers and the public had about each party.

Findings and Analysis

Before the summer

To determine whether editorial coverage of the Liberal Party of Canada improved as a result of the Liberal Express Tour, it is important to separate coverage from before, during and after the tour. Before the summer, a great deal of negative coverage was published about Mr. Ignatieff and the national Liberals. At this time, Mr. Ignatieff was second in the polls behind the Tories, and polls were indicating that Mr. Ignatieff was by far the most unpopular national leader. Even typically left-leaning newspapers, such as *The Hamilton Spectator* and the *Toronto Star*, published opinion pieces expressing frustration and confusion about Mr. Ignatieff's silence on policies that they believed mattered most to Canadians ("Ignatieff must," 2010 and "Last hope," 2010). An analysis of the pre-tour coverage helps set the stage for the summer tour and provides a clear indication of the need for the Liberal Party to earn some positive publicity during Parliament's summer recess.

Almost half (47.5%) of the language used to describe Mr. Ignatieff and the national Liberals in the 15 editorials published about the Party in this period was negative, and just 18% was overtly positive (Table 1). "Weak" (as well as "weaken" and "weakened") was the most common adjective used to describe the Liberal Party. "Embarrassing," "disarray," and "serious" were also frequently used (Table 2).

In the 15 editorial pieces published before the Liberal Express took off, just one contained adjectives that were predominantly positive: On June 10, *The Toronto Star*

referred to Mr. Ignatieff's outlook on foreign affairs as "credible," "bolder," "progressive," "energetic," "outward-looking," "more generous," and "broader" in comparison to the current government. Writers often use euphemisms, a substitution for a conventional word, as a strategy for attributing a particularly positive or negative connotation. According to Fairclough (2001), synonyms allow the writer to focus on a particular aspect of reality (p. 96-97). When a particular stance is expressed in editorial, the tone remains largely consistent throughout each piece. For example, in 'Abandon (leader)ship: Iggy sinking Grits,' published June 11, 2010 by *The Toronto Sun*, the stance is made very clear through synonyms, such as "failing," "incoherent," "invisible," "unravelling" and "embarrassing."

Even in editorials that defended Mr. Ignatieff's character, such as a column published in *The Hamilton Spectator* on June 9, 2010 about Dan McLean revoking his interest in running federally in the Ancaster-Dundas-Flamborough-Westdale riding, Mr. Ignatieff is still described as "embattled." And, even though the author notes that Mr. McLean's decision is not related to Mr. Ignatieff, the headline reads that he is stepping away from "Ignatieff's Liberals," suggesting Mr. McLean would have made another decision under a different Party leader. Further, the article uses a "game" metaphor to indicate that Mr. Ignatieff is becoming a more viable competitor against the Harper government. However, by stating that Mr. Ignatieff is *now* ready for a healthy debate, the game metaphor also suggests that he has thus far been an ineffective political leader and reinforces his image as a "rookie" who has only *just* become a viable competitor in the political game.

Throughout June, the Prime Minister's governing style was characterized as "controversial," "erratic," and "far-from-perfect" (Table 2). When isolated, it would appear that the Harper Government fared worse than the Liberal Party with 51% of its attributives being negative. However, when juxtaposed with the description of Mr. Ignatieff, the nature of attributives associated with the Harper government appears more favourable. For example, Mr. Ignatieff is referred to as "weak" and "tottering" (Table 2) while Mr. Harper is "wild," "authoritarian" and "controversial" (Table 2). When compared to the author's use of metaphorical language, the two leaders' contrasting governance styles suggest that a more Machiavellian approach to politics is more appealing and more effective.

A simple scan through the headlines reveals a characterization of the Liberals as being distracted, superficial, self-absorbed, two-faced, and passive. These negative attributives are made more apparent through a multitude of rich metaphors. One prevailing theme is the Party's misplaced emphasis on strong leadership. In early June 2010, *The Waterloo Region-Record* uses a public appearance by former Prime Minister Jean Chretien as an opportunity to comment on the Party's inability to focus on the current political sphere and obsession with finding a perfect leader. Mr. Chretien, who served as prime minister for 10 years, is characterized as a Christ-like character – a "messiah" that may or may not be the saving grace the Liberals need to retreat from the "wasteland" or "return from the grave" and defeat the Harper Government. Mr. Chretien is an ironic representation of the Liberal's quest to find a perfect leader. While Mr. Chretien had a long and successful career as prime minister, promoting Canadian unity, official bilingualism and multiculturalism, his legacy was also scarred by a sponsorship

scandal involving the awarding of \$2-million worth of contract work through an improper bidding process. The scandal became a significant factor in the 2006 federal election, which led to the defeat of the Liberals after 12 years in power. Hopeful images and positive adjectives, such as “golden,” are later juxtaposed with representations of hopelessness. The Party is further described as an “empty vessel” – or a body without soul – that will be “*tossed* with uncertainty” until it exercises the self-discipline needed to learn from their mistakes. In predicting the demise of the Liberal Party of Canada, *The Toronto Sun* writes that the Liberals must give up and “hoist their (white) flag of bygone greatness.”

While there has been a clear need to redefine and unite the Party since the defeat of Paul Martin’s Liberal government in 2006 and Stephane Dion’s inability to regain power in 2008, editorial coverage is largely focused on the lack of internal consensus, exemplified through war-like imagery. On June 9, the *Toronto Sun* blames the “thick intellectual” barrier around “Fort Liberal” as the reason for internal divisions. Political metaphors typically refer to two opposing factions; however, in the June 2010 editorial coverage, the Liberal Party’s poor performance in the polls is blamed on the Party itself rather than the strengths/weaknesses of the Conservative Party. For example, on June 10, 2010, *The Guelph Mercury* referred to the “apparently endless Liberal leadership struggle” as a “Civil War” that would “stack casualties to the rafters.” In a parliamentary political system, poor performance by the federal Liberal Party not only leads to the demise of the Party leader, but usually extends to the MP level as well – a trend that was notably seen in the 2011 when the Party experienced 43 “casualties”. While much political metaphor is often subtle in tone, the war-like images selected by

writers in June was quite blunt and overwhelming negative. For example, *The Hamilton Spectator* wrote that the party wasted little time in “unsheathing” their “long knives” against Mr. Dion, comparing the internal Liberal Party betrayal to the evening that all Premiers, except Quebec, came to the decision to exclude an opt-out clause from the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in an Ottawa hotel kitchen. While this metaphor refers to yet another blow against Quebecois politicians, this reference has deeper, violent roots – referring to mass political executions of the paramilitary branch of the Nazi Party in 1934, ordered by Adolf Hitler.

The Liberal Party’s in-fighting was also criticized as being superficial and irrelevant. *The Guelph Mercury* refers to the Liberal leadership struggle as “look-at-me budgie vanity” which is distracting the party from attaining stability (June 10, 2010). While budgies are beautiful birds, they are pet birds - primarily caged and put on display. By comparing the Party’s vanity to that of the budgie, the author is highlighting the limitations of narcissistic behaviour. While the Liberal image does require finessing, there are also more important duties that the Party needs to be carrying out, such as its role as the Official Opposition. *The Hamilton Spectator* argued that the prime minister is essentially doing what he wants and ignoring environmental safeguards. The Conservative Party’s disregard for the environment was especially contentious at this time because of the British Petroleum oil spill occurring in the Gulf of Mexico. The Liberals failed to hold the Conservatives accountable to the Afghan detainee dispute in late 2009 or compromise their standing in the polls after proroguing parliament in 2010. *The Hamilton Spectator* argued Mr. Ignatieff was essentially “rolling over,” juxtaposing another cute pet metaphor with dark imagery about its effects: “What began with a

padlocked Parliament is ending six months later with democracy wrapped in heavier chains” (June 16, 2010). Accordingly, because of the Liberal’s passive stance on a number of crucial issues, the authors argue the Liberal Party has missed a number of key opportunities to defend Canadian democracy. *The Mercury* goes on to say that the Liberals are “squabbling among themselves over control of the party’s top perch as Stephen Harper wings away with the juiciest worm” (*Guelph Mercury*, June 10, 2010).

Overall, the adjectives used to describe Mr. Ignatieff and the Liberal Party in the weeks leading up to the Liberal Express Tour were not overtly harsh (e.g., feeble, foolish, embarrassing). However, when the Liberals are described as a “sinking ship” (*Toronto Sun*), a “rusting trap” (*Hamilton Spectator*), and a “self-made labyrinth” (*Waterloo Region-Record*), the reader is left with a feeling of disillusionment. Rebuilding the Party was described as a long, arduous process that will be difficult to attain. In this context, there was very little excitement about the coming Liberal Express tour.

Many newspapers criticized the Liberals over issues like unity, a problem that can only be strengthened from a cross-country tour. This sets the Party up well for more positive commentary throughout the summer. According to agenda-setting theory, controlled media tactics provide an excellent opportunity to positively influence media messaging by showcasing a particular image of the Party. While much of the Party’s criticisms have occurred in what sociologist Goffman calls the “back stage,” or the realm of politics that is out of the public eye; Mr. Ignatieff had the opportunity to improve his reputation on the “front stage.” According to Goffman, actors present themselves in different ways depending on time, place and audience. The definition of one’s self emerges from the dramatic effect created in these moments. As a result, the Liberals

had the power to improve editorial coverage by addressing prior criticisms and appearing as a tight-knit, cohesive group during the tour.

During the summer

When the Liberal Express Tour began in July 2010, one in three Canadian voters said they were willing to forgive PM Harper for his weaknesses, having confidence in his ability to run the country. In contrast, slightly more than one in four Canadians said they would support then-Liberal leader Mr. Ignatieff and favour his strengths. The rest of Canadians did not have faith in Mr. Ignatieff's ability to lead the country. With polls like this top-of-mind, Mr. Ignatieff opted to embark on the Liberal Express Tour, an opportunity to showcase political savvy and earn the respect of Canadians, especially journalists. In July 2010, Mr. Ignatieff told the *Globe and Mail*: "I do think politics is a very traditional activity at root, and it shouldn't change much beyond what John A. and Wilfrid Laurier tried to do...They understood that politics is about trust. It's about looking someone in the eye and deciding that he or she is worthy of trust." According to Goffman's (1959) performance theory, the success of a political leader is the result of his or her performance in the public sphere. Goffman noted that all face-to-face conversations, performed on the "front stage," are an opportunity to persuade: "All the world is not of course, a stage, but the crucial ways in which it isn't are not easy to specify" (Goffman, 1959, p.72). When political speeches are conceptualized in this way, it allows for the creation of micro-level communication strategies that appeal to each audience, providing more opportunities for Mr. Ignatieff to connect with the crowds. According to Goffman (1959), "the characteristic issue, the crucial concern, is whether it will be credited or discredited" (p.253).

For the Liberal Express Tour, the size of the audience extended beyond those in close proximity to the stage. While only in Ontario for three weeks of the summer, editorial coverage of The Liberal Party was consistent throughout the eight-week tour. Overall, the tone of editorials published between July 10, 2010 and Sept. 6, 2010 was more positive than the pre-tour editorials; and this tone improved in correlation with Mr. Ignatieff's visits. Based on a discourse analysis of attributives used in the 58 editorials collected from Ontario newspapers, more than three-quarters of coverage was either positive or neutral (Table 5, 7). More specifically, 32% of adjectives were classified as positive; up 14% from 18% in June 2010. The most common positive attributive was "warmly" used to describe Mr. Ignatieff's character (Table 5). This is a new compliment for Mr. Ignatieff, who before the tour was mostly credited with being "intellectual" or "academic," but never "warm." Further, the attributive "warm" is even more beneficial when comparing Mr. Ignatieff to his main rival, Prime Minister Harper, who was frequently criticized for his inability to form an emotional connection with constituents (*Globe and Mail*).

In the first week of the Liberal Express tour, Mr. Ignatieff was criticized for many of the same reasons as in June, such as his elite background and history of working at Harvard. Overall, negative descriptions of Mr. Ignatieff or the Liberal Party dropped from 47% in June to just 20% in the summer, with many criticisms being less harsh in nature and focusing on his "weird" or "nerdy" personality, "elitist" background, and his continued "second-place" standing in the polls. *The Toronto Sun* argued that Mr. Ignatieff would have better luck selling snake oil than trying to convince voters he has the "common touch" (July 13, 2010); and the editorial continued to cluster around the

royal theme by calling Mr. Ignatieff a “Philosopher King” and an “aristocratic Tsarist” whose “shift won’t stink.” Further, metaphors related to the kingdom of God are used to express scepticism about the power of Mr. Ignatieff’s preaching. *The Guelph Mercury* wrote that “it’s reasonable to expect the coming election will be over a year from now and possible Liberals will be looking for another messiah” (July 15, 2010), and *The Toronto Sun* wrote on July 16, 2010 that the Liberal Express Tour was “invariably preaching to the choir,” meaning those in attendance, and those following the tour, are likely already Liberal supporters.

Social psychologists Nelson and Garst (2005), however, argue that most citizens are likely to pay attention to messages that appeal to their own values regardless of party affiliation. Contrary to the hypothesis that individuals with right-wing political views might affect the Liberal Party’s ability to persuade, their study shows messages from rival party members are not rejected: “The power of political messages derives not only from the values evoked and the party membership claimed by the speaker, but also to some extent on whether these two aspects fit the audience’s expectations” (p. 510). While those in attendance at Liberal Express stops were largely Liberal Party supporters, its widespread coverage in Ontario newspapers, including right-wing papers like *The Toronto Sun*, allowed the Party to extend its reach beyond its inner circle. Criticisms of the Conservative government published during the same time also helped this cause, as exemplified by comments made by *The Guelph Mercury*: “Stephen Harper’s will pass its best-before-date this fall,” and “The government is too ideological and too far removed to be offered a long-term lease on 24 Sussex drive” (July 15, 2010).

A discourse analysis of attributives revealed that many of the negative adjectives used to describe Mr. Ignatieff in June no longer appear in August, suggesting that the way the audience views Mr. Ignatieff also changed. In contrast to being “weak,” Mr. Ignatieff is described as “strong,” “bold,” “committed” and “progressive.” Mr. Ignatieff also made progress in key rural ridings where Liberal support waned in past years. In 2010, the Liberals held seats in 23 of 25 ridings in Toronto; however, in the rest of the province, there were 29 ridings where the winning party defeated the second party by a margin of less than 10% in the 2008 election. The Liberals came first in just 13 of these ridings. As a result, improved coverage in swing ridings - Kitchener Centre, Kitchener Waterloo, London Centre, Oakridge Markham, Oshawa, and Oshawa Orleans – was especially beneficial. *The Guelph Mercury* referred to a crowd in London Centre as being “large” and “appreciative,” and commented that the Liberal leader is dispelling the “Just Visiting” nametag that many believed he was holding earlier in the year (Aug. 9, 2010). After a visit to small-town Pembroke, Ontario, *The Hamilton Spectator* commented that Mr. Ignatieff’s “energized” performance was “mood altering,” further predicting that “summer progress is replacing spring pessimism with fall optimism.” Throughout this editorial, *The Spectator* used a number of rural-themed metaphors to ensure the audience understood the value of this trip. For instance, Ignatieff’s clothes were described as “down-home duds” his character was described as “down-home” and the Liberal Express was compared to a “revival of Hee Haw” (Aug. 13, 2011). Not only was the tour significant with rural Ontarians, but also with Quebecois. Columnist Chantel Hebert compared the Liberal Express to a pre-campaign bus tour through Southern Quebec that then-opposition leader Jean Chretien took with a small group of

journalists in 1993. The trip reportedly sent a signal to voters that it was time to consider his bid for Prime Minister more seriously: “in tone, if not in substance, there was a shift in coverage ... Looking at the coverage of Ignatieff’s summer tour to date, a shift along the same lines seems to be in the works” (*Hamilton Spectator*, August 11, 2010). She used attributives such as “promising,” “fortunate,” and “enjoy” to describe Mr. Ignatieff’s summer visibility and its impact on opinion polls, suggesting that the parliamentary press was developing a more positive impression of Mr. Ignatieff.

It is also important to note that based on an analysis of attributives alone, many of the Liberal Express editorials lacked an overtly positive or negative stance. Approximately half of all adjectives used in the summer editorials, whether describing the Liberals or Conservatives, were neutral. While positive coverage is superior, neutral coverage can also be viewed as beneficial for the Liberal Party. The abundance of neutral political coverage, at a time of year when little political action takes place, ensures the Liberal Party’s proactive participation in community events is fresh in the public’s mind ahead of an election. It’s much more difficult for an opposition party to receive media attention. As previously mentioned, according to invitational rhetoric, an invitation to hear Mr. Ignatieff speak is in itself persuasive, and could be seen as long-term strategy for building Party support. For example, *The Guelph Mercury* recognized and commended the Liberal Party for their tour, noting that Ignatieff was “wise” to build up his credibility through face-to-face communication:

He doesn’t have to dazzle the citizenry. He doesn’t have to make them roll in the aisles with his humour. He doesn’t have to wow them with the intellectual content of his policies. He doesn’t have to make the folks love him. But he does have to make them feel comfortable with him, comfortable enough to give him their vote when the moment comes to get rid of Harper (July 26, 2010).

The invitation to board the Liberal Express tour bus was seen as especially beneficial in the context of 2010 when the Harper government was facing scrutiny for being too “dictatorial” and “running roughshod over democracy” (*Toronto Sun*, Sept. 4, 2010). Throughout the summer, *The Guelph Mercury* noted that the Conservatives grossly abused the budget process, tip-toeing past a dozing electorate, with an omnibus bill bulging with unrelated plans to sell the public stake in the atomic energy sector and relax environmental regulations (Aug. 14, 2010). The lack of public discourse regarding Canada’s military priorities or public safeguards in the sole-sourced contract committing Canada to spend \$16 billion replacing CF-18 fighter jets was also criticized. *The Guelph Mercury* and *The Hamilton Spectator* use military-themed metaphors, such as “The Tories march on,” “The result is a country being forced marched to an unknown destination,” and “Conservatives go too far when they trample widely-shared Canadian values by twisting truth to fit narrow ideology” (Aug. 14, 2010), to criticize the lack of open dialogue regarding these important decisions. According to a discourse analysis of attributives, 25% of coverage relating to the Prime Minister was negative in the summer – with coverage being slightly more negative in tone than the Liberals.

Despite being on vacation through the summer months, however, the Conservative Party did experience an increase in positive coverage from June to August. When compared to pre-summer coverage, the tone of editorials became less negative, dropping from 51% negative in June to 25% in July and August (Table 6). Columnist Geoffrey Stevens with *The Guelph Mercury* argues that it’s very “Canadian” for the Prime Minister to disappear all summer and for no one to notice much or care (August 3, 2010). While proactive media was deemed to be the most advantageous way

for Mr. Ignatieff to improve his image, Stevens argues “public disinterest works to Harper’s advantage.” As a result, the tone of editorial coverage was somewhat similar for the Liberals and Conservatives throughout the summer tour. Thus, while the Conservatives didn’t experience the same increase in positive coverage over the summer, they still benefited from less critical coverage.

While the tone of editorial coverage became increasingly positive after the Liberal Express tour visited Ontario communities, not all stops received positive reviews. After the Guelph visit, *The Mercury* published a negative editorial with adjectives, such as “painfully,” “desperate” and “staged” (July 28, 2010). Despite Mr. Ignatieff’s best efforts to appeal to ordinary citizens, the paper called his performance a “show,” arguing he is not “Joe Canadian” – even if he wearing a golf shirt and standing in a Tim Hortons. Further, the tone shifted halfway through the summer tour. In late July, Ekos and Ipsos-Reid noted that support for the federal Tories was sliding, bringing them neck and neck with the Liberals. But by Aug. 14, a Harris-Decima poll noted a Tory rebound (*Hamilton Spectator*). Even though the prime minister was having a “summer of implosions,” opening up the census “can of worms,” fussing over “Big brother” and diminishing his own credibility with an “idiot stick,” the Liberals also began to receive criticism for being “on a bus trip to nowhere” and for failing to hold the government accountable (*Toronto Sun*, Aug. 1, 2010). The *Guelph Mercury* echoed this claim with columnist James Travers titling his Aug. 14 editorial “Liberals are just looking on as Conservatives vandalize Canada,” and a Letter to the Editor compared the Liberal Party to a “train wreck” (Aug. 31, 2010). Reverting back to the metaphorical theme of war, guest columnist Steve Paikin, anchor of *The Agenda* on TVO, asked where the Liberal ad war

has been: “the Liberal ad war that was so successful in killing the chances of Dion in 2008, McGuinty in 1999 and that is certainly making life miserable for Ignatieff post-2008” (*The Hamilton Spectator*, Sept. 1, 2010). While the Liberal Express was a valuable tool for creating increased support for the party, this metaphor suggests that a more aggressive strategy is needed to defeat the Harper government. The Liberal Party was on the defensive for the last few years – but they must also be offensive and attack the Conservative Party’s reputation when they have the chance. Further, *The Toronto Sun* called the boost from the Liberal Express tour a “mirage,” arguing that even though Mr. Ignatieff now seems comfortable in his own skin, it’s now clear that he lacks the “backbone” to be leader (Sept. 3, 2010). In this editorial, writer Michael Den Tandt substituted the war metaphor with a sporting metaphor to illustrate Mr. Ignatieff’s lack of aggression; “They so badly want a contest. It’s what we all want, right? A horse race.” He argued that Mr. Ignatieff had a “golden” chance to boost his fortunes. However, by playing “nice” throughout the summer tour, he showed constituents that he lacks the competitive spirit needed to participate in the political game. Thus, while the Liberal Express proved to be a successful opportunity to frame the Liberal Party in a more favourable light; their inability to capitalize on the missteps of the Harper government affected the end-of-summer coverage.

Afterward

During the two-month Liberal Express Tour, the coverage of the Liberal Party of Canada became slightly more positive as a result of the Liberal Express Tour. This paper illustrated that through focusing on face-to-face communication, the Liberals not only improved the amount of coverage they received, but also softened the types of adjectives and metaphor journalists were using to describe them. Before the summer, the Conservatives were 11 per cent ahead of the Liberals, according to Ekos Research (*Guelph Mercury*, Sept. 7, 2010). By early September, however, the Conservatives had lost this lead and were just 0.3 per cent ahead of the Liberal Party (Sept. 7, 2010). Even *the Toronto Sun*, which was highly critical of the tour throughout the summer, recognized the Liberals were “relatively successful” (Sept. 16, 2010), and suggested “Ignatieff’s leadership may not be quite as dead as it was assumed to be” (Sept. 10, 2010). In *The Guelph Mercury*, Chantal Hebert wrote that “the Liberal leader looked less like an academic awkwardly auditioning for a political role and more like a politician auditioning for the job of prime minister” (Sept. 17, 2010). She noted that Mr. Ignatieff would be a “parliamentarian worth watching,” but also questioned the longevity of Mr. Ignatieff’s success by referring to the Liberal’s visible improvement as a “summer tan” (Sept. 17, 2010).

While Ms. Hebert argued the tour improved the Liberal Party’s standing in the polls and bolstered caucus morale, the “summer tan” metaphor suggests that these improvements are temporary and will inevitably fade away. On Sept. 29, 2010, Ms. Hebert later wrote that the Liberals have been “on the defensive or on the run from coast to coast” in the last 10 years (*Guelph Mercury*). While Mr. Ignatieff was busy

promoting language rights and federalism in Montreal this summer, New Brunswick Premier Shawn Graham –a leading member of the post-Trudeau Liberal generation – was “being consigned to the dustbin of history after just one mandate in power,” she wrote. Predicting further losses for the Liberal Party in coming months, Ms. Hebert was suggesting that Mr. Graham’s defeat is “a harbinger of more provincial defeats to come for the Liberals.” In noting the Liberal Party’s history of becoming “less Liberal” and by questioning the Liberal Party’s ability (or desire) to defend issues like universal health care, bilingualism, and multiculturalism, Ms. Hebert was arguably foreshadowing the decline of Liberal Party in them 2011 federal election, and growth of the NDP in Quebec.

Despite inroads made by Mr. Ignatieff on the Liberal Express Tour, the Liberals saw their worst election results in the party history, falling from 77 to 34 seats, and losing official opposition party status to the New Democrats (Tamis McMahon, National Post, May 3, 2011). Mr. Ignatieff also lost the seat he’s held since 2006 in Etobicoke-Lakeshore to a rookie Conservative, stepping down as Party Leader the following day. In his resignation speech he told Canadians, “I had a very large square put around my neck for a number of years,” referring to a series of attack ads produced by the Conservative Party before the election (Jane Taber, Globe and Mail, May 3, 2011). In his speech, he also added that “Canadians were always surprised to meet me in the flesh,” noting the clear and slight benefit he gained during face-to-face communication on the Liberal Express Tour. Therefore, even though the Liberal Party gained in the opinion polls throughout the summer, once the tour came to a halt, they failed to secure ongoing positive coverage.

Conclusion

In the summer of 2010, Michael Ignatieff, leader of the Liberal Party of Canada, travelled 40,000 kilometres on the Liberal Express tour bus, making 140 stops across the country. Before he embarked on the cross-country tour, Mr. Ignatieff's image in the press was quite negative. Just 17% of editorial coverage was positive and almost half was negative. Rumours about internal turmoil within the Liberal Party, Conservative attack ads that criticized Mr. Ignatieff's career spent outside of the country and Mr. Ignatieff's inability to connect with the average Canadians were hampering the Liberal's ability to win support despite a number of controversial missteps by the Conservative Party such as proroguing Parliament in early 2010. By meeting with constituents and journalists face-to-face, it was hoped that Mr. Ignatieff could showcase his likeable qualities and earn their respect. According to agenda-setting theory, politicians are in an optimal position to influence the press. Many Canadians reportedly receive much of their political education from the media, especially opinion pieces, thus the Liberal leader's portrayal in the press would likely impact his standing in the polls.

Throughout the summer tour, coverage of the Liberal Express was positive. The percentage of negative adjectives used to describe the Liberal Party decreased by 50 per cent, and positive coverage increased 15 percentage points. By September, positive coverage from the Liberal Express tour was also mirrored in opinion polls. According to Ekos, the Conservatives and Liberals were neck and neck before the House resumed in September. In the month that followed the Liberal Express, the adjectives used to describe the Liberals remained largely positive or neutral. Based on discourse analysis

of the Liberal Express Tour alone, it seems that a face-to-face Liberal Express tour was effective at improving the Party's portrayal in the press.

It is important to note that the tour was successful in promoting the Liberal brand throughout the summer. It is rare for the media to be so fixated on an opposition party, yet the Liberal Party was the focus of 58 editorials across five newspapers in one province alone. It is also interesting to note that in the 15 editorials studied from September 6 to October 6, 2010 for the afterward to this paper, when proactive media pitching halted, the focus of editorials shifted from the Liberal Party to the Conservative Party.

This research paper used one method to determine the effectiveness of the Liberal Express Tour – the tone of adjectives and metaphors in newspaper editorials. It is entirely possible that the growth of positive coverage is unrelated to the Liberal Express Tour. For example, the government was being heavily criticized during the summer months. Positive coverage of the Liberals may therefore have more to do with discontent over the governing party rather than growing approval of the Liberals. To be sure, more research needs to be done on the impact of the tour on the media and on the public, but based on a case study of the Liberal Express, it seems that face-to-face communication can have a positive impact on the amount of editorial coverage published as well as the overall tone of editorial coverage.

Bibliography

Balmas, M. and Sheafer, T. (2010). Candidate image in election campaigns: attribute agenda setting, affective priming, and voting intentions. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*. 22(2), 204-229.

Biber and Finegan (1988). Adverbial Stance Types in English. *Discourse Analysis* (11), pp. 1-34.

Bolinger, D. (1980). *Language – the loaded weapon: the use and abuse of language today*. New York: Longman.

Bowers, John W. and Osborn, Michael M. (1966) Attitudinal Effects of Selected Types of Concluding Metaphors in Persuasive Speeches. *Speech Monographs*. 33:147-55.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language use: Politeness phenomena. In N. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction* (pp. 56-289). New York: Cambridge University.

Burke, K. (1950). *A Rhetoric of Motives*. California: University of California Press.

Chafe, W. (1985). Linguistic differences produced by differences between speaking and writing. In D.R. Olson, N. Torrance and A. Hildyard (Eds.), *Literature, language*

and learning. The nature and consequences of reading and writing. (pp. 105-123). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Delli Carpini, M.X., Cook, F.L., and Jacobs, L.R. (2004). Public deliberation, discursive participation, and citizen engagement. *Annual Review of Political Science*. 7(1), 315-344.

Cohen, B. C. (1963). *The Press and Foreign Policy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Craig, R. And Muller, H. *Theorizing Communication*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Dalton R.J., Beck P.A., Huckfeldt, R., Koetzle W. (1995). *Agenda-Setting in the 1992 Campaign: the Flow of Campaign Information*. Presented at Annu. Meet. Midwest Polit. Sci. Assoc., Chicago.

Druckman, Jacobs and Ostermeir (2004). Candidate strategies to prime issues and image. *The Journal of Politics*. 66(4), 1180-1202.

Druckman and Parkin (2005). The impact of media bias: how editorial slant affects voters. *The Journal of Politics*. 67(4), 1030-1049.

Entman (2007). Framing bias. *Journal of Communications*. 57(1), 163-173.

Eshbaugh-Soah, M. and Peake, J. (2008). The presidency and local media: Local

newspaper coverage of President George W. Bush. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*. 38(4), 609- 630.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power*. Toronto: Longman.

Fishkin, J.S. and Luskin, R.C. (1999). Bringing deliberation to the democratic dialogue.

In M. McCombs and A. Reynolds (Eds.), *The Poll with a Human Face: The National Issues Convention Experiment in Political Communication* (pp. 3-38).

Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Funke, A. (2011). *Is the Liberal Party Playing Offence or Defence?* Pundits' guide to

Canadian federal elections. Retrieved March 15, 2011
<<http://www.punditsguide.ca/2010/07/is-the-liberal-express-playing-offence-or-defence/>>

Gamson, W. A., and Modigliani, A. (1987). The changing culture of affirmative action.

Research in Political Sociology. 3, 137-177.

Gastil, J. and Dillard, J.P. (1999). The aims, methods, and effects of deliberative civic

education through the National Issues Forums. *Communication Education*, 48, 179-182.

Gastil, J. and Levine, P. (2005). *The deliberative democracy handbook: strategies for*

- effective civic engagement in the twenty-first century*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, context, and text: aspects of language in a social semiotic perspective*. Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Hawkins, Cullison and Karjala (2004). Presidential agenda setting: Richard Nixon, Bill Clinton, and welfare reform. *Conference Papers – Midwestern Political Science Association*. 1-51.
- Hayes, D. (2007) Does the messenger matter? Candidate-media agenda convergence and its effects on voter salience. *Political Research Quarterly*. 61(1), 134-146.
- Hodge, Robert and Kress, Gunther (1993). *Language as Ideology*. London: Routledge.
- Horvit, Schiffer, and Wright (2008). The limits of presidential agenda setting: predicting newspaper coverage of the weekly radio address. *International Journal Press/Politics*. 13(1), 8-28.
- Huang, K.S. (1996) *A comparison between media frames and audience frames: The case of the Hill-Thomas controversy*. Paper presented at the annual conference

of the International Community Association, Chicago, IL.

Hunston, S. (2007). Semantic prosody revisited. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*. 12(2), 249-268.

Ibbitson, John. (2010, July 16). All aboard the Liberal Express. *The Globe and Mail*.

Retrieved from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/all-aboard-the-liberal-express/article1643059/>.

Iyengar, S. and Kinder, D.R.(1987). *News That Matters: Television and American Opinion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kahn, K. and Kenney P. (2002). The Slant of the News. *American Political Science Review*. 96(2), pp. 381-94.

Kiousis, S., Bantimaroudis, P.and Ban, H. (1999). Candidate image attributes: experiments on the substantive dimension of second level agenda setting. *Communication Research*. 26, 414-428.

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

Lindlof, T.R. and Taylor, B. C. (2002). *Qualitative Communication Research Methods*. California: Sage Publications.

Lippman W. (1992). *Public Opinion*. New York: Free Press.

Merkle, D.M. (1996). The Polls – Review: The National Issues Convention Deliberative Poll. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. (60)4, 588-619.

McCombs and Estrada (1997). The news media and the pictures in our heads. In Shanto Iyengar and Richard Reeves (Eds.) *Do the Media Govern? Politicians, Voters, and Reporters in America* (237-247). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McCombs and Shaw (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 36(2), 176-187.

McCombs, Shaw and Weaver (1997). *Communication and Democracy: Exploring the Theoretical Frontiers in Agenda-Setting Theory*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Miller, Warren E. And Stokes, Donald E. (1966). Constituency influence in Congress. In Angus Campbell, Phillip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller and Donald E. Stokes (Eds.) *Elections and the Political Order*. New York: Wiley.

Nelson, T. E. and Garst, J. (2005). Values-based political messages and persuasion: relationships among speaker, recipient and evoked values. *Political Psychology*. 26(4), 489-514.

Peake and Eshbaugh-Soha (2008). The agenda-setting impact of major presidential TV addresses. *Political Communication*. 25(2), 113-137.

Polsby, N. (1980) *Community Power and Political Theory* (2 ed.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Popkin, S. L. (1994). *The reasoning voter, communication and persuasion in presidential campaigns* (2nd ed.). Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Porter (1986). Intertextuality and the Discourse Community. *Rhetoric Review*. 5(1), 34-47.

Price, V. Tewksbury, D. And Powers, E. (1995). *Switching trains of thought: The impact of news frames on readers' cognitive responses*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Midwest Association for Public Opinion Research, Chicago, IL.

Semetko. Holli A., Blumler Jay G., Gurevitch, Michael, and Weaver, David H. (1991) *The Formation of Campaign Agendas: A Comparative Analysis of Party and Media Roles in Recent American and British Elections*. New Jersey: L.E. Arnold.

Scheufele, DA. (2000). Agenda-setting, priming, and framing revisited: Another look at cognitive effects of political communication. *Mass Communication and Society*. 3(2), 297-316.

Schneider, Barbara (2007). Power as interactional accomplishment: an ethnomethodological perspective on the regulation of communicative practice. In Mark Zachry and Charlotte Thralls (Eds.) *Communicative Practices* (181-202).

New York: Baywood Publishing Company Inc.

Schryer, Catherine F. (2000) Walking a Fine Line: Writing Negative Letters in an Insurance Company. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*. 14:445.

Schryer, C., Afros, E., Mian, M., Spafford M., and Lingard, L. (2009). The Trial of the Expert Witness. *Written Communication*. 26(3), p. 215-243.

Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Small, Taras, and Danchuk (2008). Party web sites and online campaigning during the 2004 and 2006 Canadian federal elections. In Richard Davis et al. (Eds.) *Making a Difference: A Comparative View of the Role of the Internet in Election Politics*. South Carolina: Lexington Press.

Son, Y.J. and Weaver, D. H. (2006). Another look at what moves public opinion: media agenda setting and polls in the 2000 U.S. election. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*. 18, 174-197.

Trimble, Linda and Sampert, Shannon (2004). Who's in the game? The framing of the Canadian election 2000 by the Globe and Mail and the National Post. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*. 37(1), 51-71.

Zaremba, Alan Jay (2010). *Crisis Communication: Theory and Practice*. New York: M.E. Sharpe Inc.

Appendix

Table 1 - Before the Summer - Positive Adjectives

The Liberal Party (Michael Ignatieff)	The Conservative Party (Stephen Harper)
Golden	Powerful
Best	Iconic
Best	Pioneering
Legitimate	Warmer
Persuasive	Effective
Energetic	Successfully
Generous	Appealing
Vocal	Juiciest
Bolder	Best
Credible	
Progressive	
Healthy	
Intelligent	
Intelligent	
Beautiful	
Appropriate	
Appealing	
Complimentary	
Brightest	
Star	
Bravely	
Collegially	
Intellectual	
Glory	
Fresh	
Glory	
Iconic	
Intuitive	
Expedient	
Intellectual	
Dynamic	

Table 2 – before the summer – Negative adjectives

The Liberal Party (Michael Ignatieff)	The Conservative Party (Stephen Harper)
Frustrated	Strident
Silent	Roughshod

Strange
Questionable
Wrong
Missing
Unclear
Unfortunate
Disenchanted
Stuck
Unpopular
Vague
Contradictory
Frightened
Afraid
Unwanted
Feeble
Foolish
Damning
Disappointing
Inescapable
Lukewarm
Struggling
Disposable
Weaken
Tottering
Factitious
Weak
Embarrassing
Disarray
Factionalized
Incoherent
Invisible
Unraveled
Sucks
Embarrassing
Worse
Ridiculous
Distracted
Squabbling
Ill-Defined
Tough
Bitter
Bruised
Petty
Smoldering
Panicked
Weakened

Bad
Controversial
Mad as hell
Wild
Authoritarian
Ruling
Uninspired
Scant
Nuanced
Erratic
Iron
Control freak
Far-from-perfect
Relentless
You-gotta-be-kidding
Vulnerable
Estranged
Nagging
Wild

Rogue
 Squandered
 Worst
 Nagging
 Dangerously
 Gilded
 Rusting
 Embattled
 Desperately
 Bygone
 Burbling
 Weak
 Weak
 Indecisive
 Tired
 Barbed
 Panicking
 Decline
 Disarray
 Exhausted
 Mischievous
 Risky
 Wounded
 Empty
 Loose-lipped
 Critical
 Flat
 Slow
 Hard
 Serious
 Less-than-stellar

Table 3 – before the summer – Balanced Adjectives

The Liberal Party (Michael Ignatieff)	The Conservative Party (Stephen Harper)
Biggest	Private
Public	National
Daylong	Streamline
Medicare	Environmental
Universal	Laissez-faire
Clear	Streamlining
New	Snap
Health-care	Circumscribed
Occasional	Little
National	Governing
Close	

Last
First
Global
Outward-looking
Global
Broader
Economic
Cultural
Proactively
Balanced
Second
Inaugural
Ironic
Former
Natural
Fast
Constant
Semi-serious
Collective
Incredible
Socialist
Endless
Long
Partisan
Plug-and-play
Unbridled
Reversed
Look-at-me
Habitual
Socialist
Overlapping
Rumored
Unheld
Serious
Status-quo
Resurrected
Some
Political
Quick
Personal
Astonishingly
Vigorous
Nostalgic
Current
Necessary
Steep

Internal Old-guard Listless Current Private Public

Table 4 – before the summer – Metaphors

The Liberal Party (Michael Ignatieff)	The Conservative Party (Stephen Harper)
What began with a padlocked Parliament is ending six months later with democracy wrapped in heavier chains - <i>Hamilton Spectator</i> , June 16, 2010.	He's running roughshod over process and principle by making nonsense of Miliken's order while advancing a budget bill that's a legislative Trojan horse - <i>Hamilton Spectator</i> , June 16, 2010
Conservatives would be forced to serve Canadians better if Liberals could stop bickering long enough to rediscover their backbone - <i>Hamilton Spectator</i> , June 16, 2010 rolling over is now the party's best trick - <i>Hamilton Spectator</i> , June 16, 2010.	...an iron first - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , June 13, 2011
That sets the stage for a healthy political debate. <i>Toronto Star</i> , June 16, 2011 Ignatieff must raise his game - <i>Toronto Star</i> , June 15, 2010	
Liberals haven't learned to look in the mirror before throwing the leader under the bus - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , June 13, 2010 ripping him to shreds - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , June 13, 2010	
Giving Dion just one shot at the brass ring - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , June 13, 2010 discarding leaders like disposable diapers - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , June 13, 2010	
Ongoing civil war between Chretien and Martin loyalists continues to weaken the Liberals - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , June 13, 2010 the Liberals want every new leader to be a fast ticket back to power - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , June 13, 2010	
Liberal Party seems intent on devouring itself - <i>Hamilton Spectator</i> , June 12, 2010 ...wasted little time before unsheathing the	

<p>long knives - <i>Hamilton Spectator</i>, June 12, 2010</p>
<p>Abandon (leader)ship: Iggy sinking Grits- <i>Toronto Sun</i>, June 11, 2010 the Liberals have already handed Stephen Harper an incredible gift - the socialist coalition - <i>Toronto Sun</i>, June 11, 2010</p>
<p>He is going to drive a stake through their heart with this line, especially in Ontario. <i>Toronto Sun</i>, June, 11, 2010 Politicians have much in common with budgies. When not pecking at foes, they preen in the mirror - <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, June 10, 2010</p>
<p>Liberals are again squabbling among themselves over control of the party's top perch as Stephen Harper wings away with the juiciest worm - <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, June 10, 2010 Civil wars that long and bitter stack casualties to the rafters - <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, June 10, 2011</p>
<p>Fueling all of this are reversed priorities that put look-at-me budgie vanity ahead of party stability - <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, June 10, 2010 Liberals are gift-wrapping a socialist coalition stick for Harper to use beating opponents silly in the coming campaign - <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, June 10, 2010</p>
<p>as long as Liberals prefer to take turns pecking at each other and then preening in the mirror instead of finding a way out of a once gilded cage that's now a rusting trap - <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, June 10, 2010 Maybe Liberals yearn only to hoist their flag of bygone greatness and bravely salute as the Good Ship Grit goes burbling to the bottom - <i>Toronto Sun</i>, June 9, 2010</p>
<p>apparently that message has not penetrated the thick intellectual ramparts surrounding Fort Liberal - <i>Toronto Sun</i>, June 9, 2010 Liberals aren't laughing about a resurrected Chretien - <i>Waterloo Region Record</i>, June 5, 2010</p>

<p>Chretien's return from the political grave - <i>Waterloo Region Record</i>, June 5, 2010 Liberals in and out of Parliament are again searching for a messiah, or even an NDP coalition to lead them from the wasteland back to power - <i>Waterloo Region Record</i>, June 5, 2010</p>
<p>A nostalgic Chretien honeymoon would soon be cut short by nagging Conservative reminders of the QC sponsorship fling - <i>Waterloo Region Record</i>, June 5, 2010 Shooting inward becomes wounded prey for outside predators -<i>Waterloo Region Record</i>, June 5, 2010</p>
<p>Liberals...now see only a surprisingly empty vessel tossed by uncertainty <i>Waterloo Region Record</i>, June 5, 2010 self-made labyrinth - <i>Waterloo Region Record</i>, June 5,2010</p>
<p>Liberals need to climb off the coalition fence to clearly define who they are - <i>Waterloo Region Record</i>, June 5, 2010 lost too many sails to make it on the open sea - <i>Toronto Star</i>, June 4, 2010</p>

Table 5 – during the summer – Positive Adjectives

The Liberal Party (Michael Ignatieff)	The Conservative Party (Stephen Harper)
Greatest	Star
Hip	Star
Shining	Decisive
Grand	Enduring
Ardent	Compelling
Good	Masterfully
Positive	Simple
Lucky	Talented
Higher	Bigger
Easily	Good
University-educated	Invigorating
Positive	Bigger
Lucky	Admired
Higher	Remarkably
Morale-Booster	Diverse
Boost	Tried-and-true
Greatest	Practical
Warm	Priceless

Affable	Tough-on-crime
Gregarious	Moral
Nice	Boldly
Warmly	Brimming
Warmly	Official
Warmly	Interesting
Twinkly	Free
Happy	Comfortable
Good	Worthwhile
Warmly	Imaginative
Warmly	Beautiful
Adoring	Righteous
Warmly	Proper
Warm	Reasonable
Warmer	Unopposed
Remarkable	Better
Miraculous	Strong
Nice	Strongly
Comfortable	Stronger
Golden	Unwavering
Safer	Unflinchingly
Nice	Democratic
Good	Social
Uniquely	Harmonized
Compelling	Bright
Strong	Decent
Positive	Confident
Political Star	Responsible
Distinctive	Efficient
Splendidly	In tune
Clever	Insightful
Experienced	Brave
Curious	Smarter
Intriguing	Strong
Sensible	Happy
Quebec-savvy	Reliable
Safer	Viable
United	Fair
Consistently	Reasonable
Flexible	Transparent
Principled	Accountable
Greatest	Credible
Promising	Intelligence
Good	Dependability
Strong	Resolve
Down-home	Novel

Well	Brilliant
Cerebral	Classy
Down-home	Extraordinary
Dressed-down	Bias-free
Earnest	
Hot	
Encouraging	
Gently	
Bucolic	
Rustic	
High-speed	
Good	
Knowing	
Energized	
Mood-altering	
Low-risk	
Smoothly	
Effectively	
Principled	
Credible	
Rewarding	
Warmer	
Safe	
Effectively	
Firm	
Smart	
Fair	
Fiercest	
Promising	
Internal	
Fortunate	
Auspicious	
Significant	
Academic	
Star	
Realistic	
Sustain	
Appreciative	
Intelligent	
Thrilling	
Passionate	
Greatest	
Recognizable	
Significant	
Considerable	
High-speed	

Acceptable
Determined
Confident
Pervasive
Persistent
Intellectual
Powerful
Populist
Real
Charming
Intelligent
Wise
Credible
Intellectual
Easy
Natural
Traditional
Best
Dedicated
Prestigious
Intriguing
Popular
Readily
Bigger
High-ranking
Successful
Electable
Clearly
Easily
Shining
Rich
Progressive
Reforming
Bold
Practical
Bold
Detailed
Compelling
Pressing
Consistently
Committed
Established
Comfortable
Wonderful
Bigger
Prestigious

Strong
Soft
Intense
Top
Suitable
Convenient
Reasonable
Plausible
Impressive
Intellectual
Iconic
Scholarly
Undoubtedly
Famous
Nuanced
Nice
Aristocratic
Intellectual
True
Acclaimed
Best

Table 6 – during the summer – negative adjectives

The Liberal Party (Michael Ignatieff)	The Conservative Party (Stephen Harper)
Lefty	Dictatorial
Hardly	Roughshod
Diesel-spewing	Arbitrarily
Carbon	Quixotic
Cold	Quixotic
Last	Dullest
Deadlocked	Doggedly
Disaster	Dreary
Second-place	Unfortunately
Disaster	Bad
Second-place	Ideological
Glowering	Incompetent
Overcast	Mishandled
Lesser	Anxious
Elitist	Inconvenient
Snoot-nosed	Muzzled
Unpromising	Sidelined
Disengaged	Mundane
Already-shrinking	Controversial
Indecisive	Corrosive

Economy-literate	Dubious
Indecisive	Dozing
Odd	Grossly
Uncommunicative	Bulging
Effete	Reeling
Out-of-touch	Fissured
Miserable	Unknown
Sticky	Government-as-cash-dispenser
Wimpy	Nebulous
Unlikely	Heedless
Odd	Closed-door
Ever-shrinking	Bewildering
Stiff	Not realistic
Quarrelsome	Hurried
Unabashed	Knuckle-rapping
Spotty	Noisome
Angry	Sleepy
Empty	Gross
Disarray	Foolish
Shame	Fake
Quixotic	Bad
Tattered	Squabbling
Empty	Predictable
Fool	Silencing
Relentless	Radical
Shrieking	Indignation
Puckering	Predictable
Unlikely	Heinous
Wary	Onerous
Tough	Radical
Hyperbolic	Senseless
Greedy	Idiot
Noncommittal	Confused
Meandering	Weak
Threatening	Befuddling
Rubber-stamping	Aloof
Slow	Limited
Difficult	Irrational
Torturous	Poor
Dog day	Condescending
Loser	Opportunistic
Tired	Hypocritical
Cynical	Dork
Unflattering	Ridiculous
Impotent	Arrogant
Damper	Secretive

Slow
Same old
Wimpy
Dwindling
Poor
Nonsensical
Indignant
Dark
Awkwardly
Inept
Unlovable
Condescending
Opportunistic
Hypocritical
Hardest
Painfully
Ordinary
Desperate
Staged
Tired
Arrogant
Miserable
Awful
Bleak
Dog's breakfast
Pinocchio
Harsh
Anger
Dupe
Strange
Quiet
Poor
Disaster
Short
Crazy
Vague
Timid
Glaring
Terrible
Outraged
Uncomfortable
Vague
Timid
Grueling
Poor
Suicidal

Stubborn
Contemptuous
Incapable
Bully-boy
Late
Senseless
Rigorous
Snake
Weaker
Dishonestly
Ignoble
Bland
Shattered
Turgid

Corrosive
 Relentlessly
 Dilettante
 Worse
 Fiendish
 Nerdy
 Broken
 Last-ditch
 Elitist
 Vile
 Low
 Strangest
 Weirdly
 naughty

Table 7 – during the summer – Neutral Adjectives

The Liberal Party (Michael Ignatieff)	The Conservative Party (Stephen Harper)
Political	Only
Cross-Canada	Only
Only	Massive
Almost	Governing
Political	Governing
Almost	Tough
Undoubtedly	Dual
Relative	Cool
Actual	Harper
Voter	Thin
Competitive	Fuzzy
National	Blue
Relative	Top-of-mind
Voting	Collective
Census	Fiscal
Voter	Economic
Competitive	Conservative
Third	Consecutive
Second	Majority
Liberal	Young
Little	Neo-con
Tough	Five-point
Dual	Lengthen
Checkered	Abolish
Tolstoy	National

Unlimbered	Required
Battle-hardened	Normal
Symbolically	Large
Rural	Daily
Professor	Public
Genetic	Less
BA, MA, PhD, BFD	Every
Basic	Public
Recent	Few
Common	Relatively
Recent	Big
Thickened	Recent
Convicted	Big
Pan-Canadian	Big
Daily	Ruling
Rookie	Unrelated
Parliamentary	Public
Record	Relax
Electoral-driven	Environmental
Academic	Military
Rhetorical	Public
Economic	Sole-sourced
Corporate	Non-partisan
Front-line	Core
Economic	Umbrella
Federal	Federal
Municipal	Widely-shared
Business	Narrow
Academic	Massive
Game-changing	Ongoing
New	Long-form
Surprising	Governing
Provincial	Political
New	Long-form
Rookie	Type-A
Big	Serious
Starker	Leather
Rural	Problem
Clear	Cut
Left-wing	Run
Simultaneous	Afghan
Former	Non-military
Accidental	Internal
Aging	Off-grid
Captive	Daily
Unnoticed	Coasts

Flat-lined	Summertime
Quebec	Abortion
Federalist	Conservative
Opposition	Chief
Repeating	Thinking
Serial	Right-wing
Notable	Common
Carbon	Minority
National	Canadian
Willingly	Big
Natural	Additional
Equally	Centralized
Ruling	Canadian
Latest	Intense
Cross-Canada	Canadian
Latest	Elected
Massive	Unelected
Ongoing	Individual
Red	Long-form
Checked	Municipal
Blue	Provincial
Brown	Small
Cowboy	Ideological
Summer	Delicate
Cool	Collectively
Harvard	Long-form
Canadian	Different
Blue	Random
Denim	Private
Long	Voluntary
Winding	Big
Fragrant	Cruise
Rural	Massive
Grasping	Little
Lowing	Actual
Rural	Spending
City-slicker	Knockout
Homestead	Hidden
Unplugged	Control
Urban	Religious
Metropolitan	Personal
Local	Public
Open	Religious
Equal	Public
Second	Massive
Rural	Foreseeable

First	New
Suddenly	New
Hardly	New
High	Long-form
Four-plus	Long-form
Coalition	Future
21 st -century	Social
Red	Social
Considerable	Faith-based
Patrician	Determined
Brown	Clearly
Black	Widely
Right	Ideological
Federal	Far
Long	Long-term
Political	Partisan
Afghan	Federal
Training	Mandatory
Tight	Long-form
Summer	Forever
Pre-campaign	Philosophical
Quebec	Long-form
Midway	Long-form
Ongoing	Extended
Attending	Short-form
Daily	Mandatory
Business	Eight-question
Public	47-question
Next	Long-form
Federal	Five-fold
Publicly	Intimate
Four-way	Private
Different	Personal
New	Federal
Working	Long-form
Large	Voluntary
Tory	Standard
Political	Short-form
Predictable	Basic
New	Necessary
Pancake	Substantive
Corn	Voluntary
Community	Four
Folk	Right-wing
Federal	Personal
Food	Deliberately

National
Cross-Canada
National
Dense
Downtown
Municipal
Slim
Local
Massive
Equivalent
National
Major
Long-form
Collective
National
Only
fellow
Lower
Every
Right
Average
Political
Widely
Typical
Canadian
Many
Seeming
Average
Local
Policy
Political
Social
Old
Opposition
Post-Trudeau
Journalism
CBC-Ekos
Former
63-year-old
Average
63-year-old
Adult
Successor
Possible
Ontario
Quickly

White
Old
Standing
Federal
Usual
Affirmative-action
Minority
Constitutional
clearly

Virtually
Federal
Recently
Ontario
Long-running
Federal
Former
Early
Successive
News
Former
Old
Personally
Hitherto
Publicly
Federal
Own
Provincial
Federal
Old
Census
1984
Federal
Old-time
Politically
Aboriginal
Root
Bootstrap
Opposition
Dewy
Independent
Blue
White
Small
Small
Off-farm
Last
Scheduled
Final
Eventual
International
Post-election
Cross-country
Political
Academic
Brief

Subsequent
 Early
 Highly
 Content
 Total
 Steep
 Real-world
 International
 Long
 Rare
 Canadian
 Common
 Only
 Common
 Short
 Actual
 Philosopher
 Conductor
 Everyday
 Two
 Future
 Billion-dollar
 New
 Canadian
 Common
 Liberal
 Cross-Canada
 Every
 Common
 Every
 Every
 Every
 Venezuelan
 black

Table 8 - during the summer – Metaphors

The Liberal Party (Michael Ignatieff)	The Conservative Party (Stephen Harper)
making hay when the sun was shining - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , Sept. 4, 2010	the dual crosses of the Jean Charest name and the Liberal brand - <i>Guelph Mercury</i> , Sept.3,2010 - double crosses means betrayal
there was never any need to stop the presses - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , Sept.4,2010	Put Harper in a sauna and he'll still be cool enough to chill a salad - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , Sept.3, 2010
the dual crosses of the Jean Charest	Watching Harper doggedly run the country

name and the Liberal brand - <i>Guelph Mercury</i> , Sept.3, 2010	year after dreary year, like a butcher grinding out sausages, is just not that interesting - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , Sept. 3, 2010
a bit of a breeze at their backs - <i>Hamilton Spectator</i> , Sept. 3, 2010	How can you get excited about a leader who shoots his own kneecaps every time he gets within spitting distance of the bull's eye? - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , Sept. 3, 2010
Ignatieff's bus tour all a mirage- <i>The Toronto Sun</i> , Sept. 3, 2010	Hudak lucky to duck 'frame job' - <i>Hamilton Spectator</i> , Sept. 1, 2010
battle-hardened Grit Warriors - <i>The Toronto Sun</i> , Sept.3, 2010	Prime Ministers have, at best, a few election cycles before they are tossed into the trash heap of history - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , Aug.15, 2010
They'd even sheath their blades and stop dreaming about back-knifing him and dumping him in a vat of hot oil - <i>The Toronto Sun</i> , Sept.3, 2010	Governments can crash and burn just as often from small problems as they do from taking on big issues - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , Aug. 15, 2010
Ignatieff's miraculous return from the wilderness A horse race. - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , Sept.3, 2010	It's better to burn out than it is to rust. Harper needs bigger problems - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , Aug. 15, 2010
Maybe Ignatieff Can grind his way out of the hole he dug in 2009 - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , Sept.3, 2010	dozing electorate; while the nation slept - <i>Guelph Mercury</i> , Aug. 14, 2010
He had a golden chance - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , Sept.3,2010	The result is a country being forced marched to an unknown destination - <i>Guelph Mercury</i> , Aug,14,2010
But the elitist Ignatieff seal has been stamped - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , Sept. 2, 2010	The Tories don't need anyone to shoot at them, they're capable of aiming and firing into both feet all by themselves – <i>Hamilton Spectator</i> , Aug.14,2010
He thinks we're all dumb as posts - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , Sept. 2, 2010	The Tories march on - <i>Hamilton Spectator</i> , Aug. 14, 2010
He channels Chicken Little's ghost - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , Sept. 2, 2010	stroll in the park - <i>Guelph Mercury</i> , Aug.9
...if the Liberals want to send a strong message, that they do have their ducks lined up on the economy - <i>Guelph Mercury</i> , Sept.1, 2010	He's having a summer of implosions... cruise control ... can of worms - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , Aug. 1, 2010
...they should look outside their current ranks for a heavy hitter - <i>Guelph Mercury</i> , Sept.1, 2010	This is a PM who couldn't deliver a knockout blow to the Liberals against perhaps their weakest leader in party history in Stephane Dion - <i>Toronto Sun</i> , Aug. 1,2010
If the above combination does not lead to a game-changing Liberal deployment on the economic front, it may not be long after	Even though you didn't want Michael Ignatieff dropping in at your barbecue, Harper was your guest from hell— <i>Guelph</i>

<p>Ignatieff has disembarked from his bus before he is spinning his wheels in Parliament again. - <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, Sept. 1, 2010</p>	<p><i>Mercury</i>, July 31, 2010</p>
<p>Dion never recovered from the portrait painted by his opponents - <i>Hamilton Spectator</i>, Sept.1, 2010</p>	<p>But running against Ignatieff, his chances look good. Not a slam dunk. But good. - <i>The Toronto Sun</i>, July 31,2010</p>
<p>Where has the Liberal ad war been, designed to frame Hudak,an ad war that so successfully killed the chances of Dion (in 2008), McGuinty (in 1999), and has certainly made life miserable for Ignatieff (post-2008)? - <i>Hamilton Spectator</i>,Sept.1, 2010</p>	<p>The government is too ideological and too far removed to be offered a long-term lease on 24 Sussex Drive - <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, July 26, 2010</p>
<p>Like watching a train wreck This is the position the Liberal Party is in right now. – <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, Aug.31,2010</p>	<p>cuts Big Brother off at the knees - <i>The Toronto Sun</i>, July 20, 2010</p>
<p>ongoing war of words - <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, Aug. 25, 2010 Ignatieff's connection with Quebec was soon lost to the policy white noise that followed his installation as leader - <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, Aug.25, 2010</p>	<p>Big Brother is so...well, so 1984 -<i>The Toronto Sun</i>, July 20, 2010 Statistics Canada, which compiles census data, supposedly guards private information like a pitbull guarding a meth lab - <i>The Toronto Sun</i>, July 20, 2010</p>
<p>Opposition leaders get tossed in the trash can, too -<i>Toronto Sun</i>, Aug. 15, 2011 the Liberal leader has threatened elections and fumed at Conservatives while drawing flexible lines in the capital's blowing sand - <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, Aug. 14, 2010</p>	<p>Canadians have been living with a snake oil salesman for four years - <i>The Hamilton Spectator</i>, July 19, 2010 Federal minority governments normally last a couple of years and Stephen Harper's will pass its best-before-date this fall. <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, July 15,2010</p>
<p>No party or leader willingly commits political suicide. Instead, they lurk in the shadows, weighing odds, and waiting for a promising moment to strike - <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, Aug.14, 2010 Ignatieff knows the Liberals have taken too long to discard the tattered cloak of Canada's natural governing party - <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, Aug.14, 2010</p>	<p>perhaps another pizza parliament in the offing (although a recent poll has Liberal leader Michael Ignatieff dying on the vine) - <i>The Toronto Sun</i>, July 10, 2010</p>
<p>The Liberals are proving equally slow in grasping that an opposition afraid to oppose is an empty vessel voters will fill with blame when the ruling party goes too far - <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, Aug.14, 2010 Sooner or later all roads lead back to the capital. No matter how smoothly Ignatieff</p>	

<p>travels them, he and his party will again lurch to a halt here if they can't more effectively block Stephen Harper's path. - <i>Hamilton Spectator</i>, Aug. 13, 2010</p>
<p>Spreading the Big Red Tent, as the Liberal leader puts it, is slow, yet rewarding summer work – <i>Hamilton Spectator</i>, Aug. 13, 2010 Cake walk - tour not as easy as Ignatieff thought - <i>Hamilton Spectator</i>, Aug. 13, 2010</p>
<p>Sounds like a return to the dark ages - <i>Toronto Sun</i>, Aug. 1, 2010 Michael Ignatieff is on a bus trip to nowhere - <i>Toronto Sun</i>, Aug. 1, 2010</p>
<p>Michael Ignatieff isn't the shortstop on your beer league softball team - <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, July 28, 2010 He doesn't have to make them roll in the aisles with his humour - <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, July 26, 2010</p>
<p>dog's breakfast assignment - <i>The Toronto Sun</i>, July 26, 2010 As two weeks drift towards six and the loop tape of Ignatieff's whistle-stop speech turns into an ear worm - <i>The Toronto Sun</i>, July 26, 2010</p>
<p>Ignatieff's mid-summer dream - <i>The Toronto Sun</i>, July 26, 2010 Quick, someone pass us their Gravol – <i>The Toronto Sun</i>, July 26, 2010</p>
<p>This six-week dupe show is all about Ignatieff's image being in the tank - <i>The Toronto Sun</i>, June 26, 2010 It was rich comparing Liberal Leader Michael Ignatieff's tour with old-time hucksters - <i>Hamilton Spectator</i>, July 19, 2010</p>
<p>Both gifted with an instinct for the jugular - <i>Toronto Sun</i>, July 16, 2010 He's invariably preaching to the choir - <i>The Toronto Sun</i>, July 16, 2010</p>
<p>University of Toronto could be Ignatieff's last stop - <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, July 15, 2010 It's reasonable to expect the coming election will be over a year from now and</p>

possible Liberals will be looking for yet another messiah - *Guelph Mercury*, July 15, 2010

it makes sense for Ignatieff to begin packing a parachute - *Guelph Mercury*, July 15, 2010
 And one who thinks his shift won't stink. - *The Toronto Sun*, July 13, 2010

Table 9 – afterward – Positive Adjectives

The Liberal Party (Michael Ignatieff)	The Conservative Party (Stephen Harper)
All-powerful	Unfettered
Peace-loving	Known
Brave	Recognizable
Acceptable	Educated
Hard-earned	Efficient
Real	Promising
Chief	Relevant
Reversed	Confident
Bolstered	Attractive
High-profile	Consistently
Progressive	Master
Leading	Bilingual
Unscripted	Ambitious
Natural	Gracious
Successful	Gracefully
Grassroots	Good
United	Faithful
Consistently	Majority
Elite	Majority
Tender	Stable
Special	Clever
Legitimate	Clever
Legitimate	Clear-eyed
Perfect	Clever
Wishful	Greater
Stronger	Devout
	Great
	Leading
	Unscripted
	Relaxed
	Genuine
	Easy
	Smart
	Muscular

	Credible Smart Open Adroitly Smart Comfortable Sure-handed Stable
--	--

Table 10 – afterward – Negative Adjectives

The Liberal Party (Michael Ignatieff)	The Conservative Party (Stephen Harper)
Cowardly	Shrinking
Cowardly	Padlocking
Illegal	Polarized
Torture-lite	Shaky
So-called	Whispering
Out-of-touch	Reckless
Commie	Relentless
Reckless	Divided
Reckless	Manipulator
Unholy	Bitterly
Awkwardly	Burning
Phony	Angry
Territorial	Stark
Horrible	Unacceptable
Elitist	Machiavellian
Slanderous	Dysfunctional
Chump	Negative
Weak	Horrible
Pigeon-headed	Cold
Pencil-necked	Emotional
Dictatorship	Frisky
Nanny	Fake
Compulsive	Angry
	Stupid
	Doggedly
	Bloody-minded
	Grotesque
	Narrow
	Red-blooded
	Losing
	Recession
	Restive
	Sputtering
	Downward

Dead Evil Cold-war-style

Table 11 – afterward – Balanced Adjectives

The Liberal Party (Michael Ignatieff)	The Conservative Party (Stephen Harper)
Binding	Old
Liberal	Coming
Political	Federal
Policy	Few
Former	Another
Federal	Mathematically
Third	Ruling
Sovereignist	New
Commemorative	Ruling
Federalist	Conventional
Multicultural	Roughly
Post-Trudeau	Longtime
Provincial	Underlying
Only	Unusually
Little	Current
Rural	Widespread
Big	Ruling
Electoral	Casual
Summer	National
Leadership	Public
Short	Linguistic
Symbolically	Genetically
First	Financially
40-year-old	Firearms
Transpolar	Little
Regular	Taxpayers'
Summer-long	Partisan
New	National
Cross-country	Urbanized
Fall	Smaller
Political	Editorial
Plain	Publicly-funded
Former	Next-generation
Common	Regular
Civil	Minority
Widespread	Polar bear
Iggy	Different
Socialists	Blue
Centralizers	Political

Independents	Karate
Socialists	Right-of-centre
Centralizers	Long-form
Independents	Tim Hortons
	Senior
	Repatriation
	Right-wing
	Massive
	Personal
	New election

Table 12 – afterward – Metaphors

The Liberal Party (Michael Ignatieff)	The Conservative Party (Stephen Harper)
In less than five years he (Harper) has reduced once all-powerful Liberals to a rump - <i>Guelph Mercury</i> , Oct.6, 2010	Once a blood sport played by known rules, the game has changed so much it's hardly recognizable to many on the field let alone the shrinking crowd watching from the bleachers. <i>Guelph Mercury</i> , Oct.6, 2010
the Montreal federalist fortress - <i>Guelph Mercury</i> , Sept. 29, 2010	Never take your foot off an opponent's throat. - A lesson Harper learned from Chretien - <i>Guelph Mercury</i> , Oct.6,2010
dustbin of history - <i>Guelph Mercury</i> , Sept. 29,2010	Genetically predisposed to be suspicious of the impact of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, <i>Guelph Mercury</i> , Oct. 6, 2010
winds of change are battering Premier Dalton McGuinty's government - <i>Guelph Mercury</i> , Sept. 29, 2010	Multiculturalism ...increasingly viewed as a fracture-inducing stress point. <i>Guelph Mercury</i> , Oct. 6, 2010
In British Columbia, the tide turned against Premier Gordon Campbell some time ago - <i>Guelph Mercury</i> , Sept. 29, 2010	Harper's Tories play the politics of fear – <i>Guelph Mercury</i> , Sept. 27, 2010
derail the momentum the Liberals have coming off their leader's summer bus tour - <i>Guelph Mercury</i> , Sept. 29, 2010	If he were a hockey coach who had lost a big game, he wouldn't shake the winning coach's hand. He'd probably charge across the rink and punch him in the nose. <i>Guelph Mercury</i> , Sept. 27, 2010.
Duty calls on Liberals, NDP - <i>The Toronto Star</i> , Sept. 21, 2010	Harper sent his faithful spear-carrier, Jim Flaherty, forth to ravage the opposition from the podium of (improbably) the non-partisan Canadian Club. <i>Guelph Mercury</i> , Sept.27, 2010
they should stand shoulder to shoulder behind the gun registry tomorrow - <i>The Toronto Star</i> , Sept. 21, 2010	Flaherty, too, plays the fear card - <i>Guelph Mercury</i> , Sept. 27, 2010
Gerard Kennedy and Justin Trudeau ... each will be getting more ice time - <i>Guelph</i>	Irresponsible tax-and-spend Liberals and socialist wastrels, who, being in bed with

<p><i>Mercury</i>, Sept. 17, 2010</p>	<p>the radical separatists, will lead us all down the rat's hole of national ruination. <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, Sept. 27, 2010</p>
<p>Gerard Kennedy and Justin Trudeau ... needs to be in the window - <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, Sept. 17, 2010 We've seen this movie before. He's running the same playbook, but it's a different play with a lot more stake - <i>Toronto Sun</i>, Sept. 17, 2010</p>	<p>Tories eye a steal - <i>The Toronto Sun</i>, Sept. 23, 2010 - would put wind in their sails - <i>Toronto Sun</i>, Sept. 23, 2010</p>
<p>It's a slam dunk - <i>Toronto Sun</i>, Sept. 17, 2010 nanny state - <i>Waterloo Region Record</i>, Sept. 8, 2010</p>	<p>A lot of Tory heavy hitters It's game on. - <i>Toronto Sun</i>, Sept. 23, 2010 John Baird - will deliver a dysfunctional Parliament in short order - <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, Sept. 17, 2010</p>
<p>Conservatives and Liberals in a standoff. <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, Sept. 7, 2010</p>	<p>Bernier scored points - <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, Sept. 17, 2010 He's a cold fish. - <i>The Toronto Sun</i>, Sept. 16, 2010</p>
	<p>All the worst moments belonged to the blue team - <i>Toronto Sun</i>, Sept. 16, 2010 When the Tories decided to attack Statistics Canada over the census, they were helping the other teams pull the trigger - <i>Toronto Sun</i>, Sept. 16, 2010</p>
	<p>They're going to be wearing the scars of a summer's worth of self-inflicted wounds - <i>The Toronto Sun</i>, Sept. 16, 2010 Conservatives have dined out on a weak opposition - <i>Toronto Sun</i>, Sept. 10, 2010</p>
	<p>They're taking on water - <i>Toronto Sun</i>, Sept. 10, 2010 In the early years, Harper was much quicker to shift gears when it became clear he'd backed a losing horse (in reference to census) - <i>Toronto Sun</i>, Sept. 10, 2010</p>
	<p>It looks like a Cold War-style standoff - <i>Guelph Mercury</i>, Sept. 7, 2010</p>