With the push for equal rights for women in politics and the election of more female public officials, the image of women in politics has garnered greater attention and changed drastically. The media has often been scrutinized for its portrayal of women in politics as the result of numerous studies showing bias in the coverage and framing of female candidates. *Framing* is described by Robert M. Entman of George Washington University as —select[ing] some aspects of a perceived reality and mak[ing] them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation. This research looks at the portrayal and framing of two women politicians—Sarah Palin and Hillary Clinton—their public relations portrayal, and the media framing. The questions that this research attempts to answer are: What was the intended image portrayal put into practice by the public relations team for each female candidate? Was the intended public relations portrayal of the female candidate easily visible in print journalism? And finally, if the intended public relations portrayal was different from the frame presented in the media, how did it change? To understand how these women were framed, articles from three major newspapers—the *Washington Post*, the *New York Times*, and *USA Today*— were analyzed, along with the press releases issued by their campaigns. These articles and releases were analyzed to show patterns in phraseology, article placement, valance, article subject, and positive and negative descriptors. The press releases and the articles were compared to determine if the positioning of the candidate via her public relations team was conveyed in the media, and to see if overall themes were consistent throughout coverage. This research determined that while there were some similarities between the press releases and the newspaper articles, overall media coverage did not reflect press releases messages or portrayals. This was due to factors such as the newspapers’ attempt to create —fair and balanced‖ coverage of candidates by presenting differing perspectives, the previous framing of the candidate in the media, or external events taking place in the candidates’ life.