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WOMEN, POLITICS, AND POWER:
THE MEDIA'S CONSTRUCTION OF A FIRST LADY

Abstract

The "First Lady" position and its accompanying roles and responsibilities evoke fascination, and sometimes contempt, in the American public. First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton has drawn considerable attention since campaigning for her husband's successful bid for the Presidency.

From the beginning, their open political partnership was hotly discussed and debated in the media. Media attention and concern centered on Rodham Clinton's political power and influence. With her appointment to head the National Health Care Reform Task Force, the Clintons solidified her position in his administration and verified her political power and influence.

This dissertation investigates the print and broadcast media's coverage of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton during her tenure as head of the National Health Care Reform Task Force, highlighting the manner in which the media constructed this politically active and
powerful First Lady. A content analysis of The Los Angeles Times, The Washington Post, USA Today and ABC, CBS, and NBC’s coverage of Rodham Clinton from January 1993 through September 1994 revealed that the media kept the focus on politics as opposed to the traditional social focus First Ladies receive from the media. While primarily politically focused, the media still highlighted the anomaly of having an openly politically active First Lady; thus, the media discussed and critiqued her political influence and power. This type of coverage kept the focus on Rodham Clinton’s expansion of the First Lady role and diminished the policy changes she helped craft. While not overt, First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton was constructed by a media still adapting to the changes in women’s roles.
You know the rules are basically as follows:
If you don’t get married you are abnormal.
If you get married but don’t have children, you’re a selfish yuppie.
If you get married and have children but then go outside the home to work you’re a bad mother.
If you get married and have children but stay at home, you’ve wasted your education.
And if you don’t get married but have children and work outside the home as a fictional newscaster you get in trouble with the vice-president. (Daly, as cited in Goodall, 1994)
In the preceding excerpt, Hillary Rodham Clinton expressed to the graduating class at Wellesley College the often conflicting role expectations all women face, including the First Lady.

Beginning in the early 1980s the wife of the president, the First Lady, has drawn serious attention from historians, journalists, and popular writers. These women, by marrying a man that will later be president, have become national symbols of marriage, motherhood, and womanhood (e.g., Gould, 1996; Pollitt, 1993). Their "role" has no specific Constitutional assignments, but these women still have become prominent parts of the presidency. Specifically, Campbell (1996) states:

The role of the First Lady is vital to the presidency because it epitomizes what sociologist Hanna Papanek calls the 'two person career,' that is, a profession that by reason of the combination of 'formal and informal institutional demands placed upon a married couple' precludes a traditional public-private spousal division of labor. (p. 180)

Hence, First Ladies are placed into an awkward position with no clearly defined duties, and yet they are still expected to conform to the "First Lady" role. This role
mandates that these women function as a representative of the nation when greeting heads of state, presiding at state dinners, making public appearances, attending local, national, and international ceremonies, and being a patron of selected projects and charities (Campbell, 1996).

Gould (1996) argues that the First Lady role is a mixture of social and political expectations that severely restricts the women in this position:

Being First Lady . . . requires a woman to act, if she would succeed, as a mixture of queen, club woman, and starlet. Subject to unrelenting attention, expected to behave impeccably in every situation, and criticized from some quarters for substantive assertion, the wife of the president has all the perquisites of stardom and the rewards of fame. What she is denied is the genuine importance as an individual. Celebrity is a trivializing process, and for First Ladies that is the central point of their position. They live on display. While their cage is gilded, their freedom remains severely limited. (p. 535)
Thus, these ambiguous and conflicting role expectations put First Ladies into paradoxical situations.

The study of First Ladies is important on a number of levels. First, it reveals the gendered ways of the American presidency and executive power. In 1992, Bill Clinton clearly stated his respect for his wife’s intellectual and political expertise during his presidential campaign when he included her in his campaign as an advisor and as a political equal (e.g., Daughton, 1995; van Assendelft & Nye, 1998). Societal interest, concern, and outrage regarding Hillary Rodham Clinton’s “power” over her husband exemplifies a U.S. cultural masculine presidential norm. By publicly acknowledging his respect and admiration for his wife, Clinton was labeled a wimp dominated by his wife (Campbell, 1996). Clinton’s wimp characterization illustrates the masculine, or male, nature of the presidency and executive power.

Second, as noted by Campbell (1996), an examination of candidates’ wives highlights the issue of the relationship between women, sexuality, and power. Specifically, she states:
Women candidates ask voters to revise the relationship between women and public power directly. By contrast, presidential wives raise the more problematic issue of the relationship between women, sexuality, and power. That is, spouses exert power by virtue of their sexual and marital relationship to the president; their influence is indirect and intimate, a subtle intrusion of the private into the public, political sphere.

(Campbell, 1996, p. 181)

Accordingly, as women’s cultural roles have changed, the role of presidential wives has also changed, and the press and public are left to reevaluate the extent and nature of the influence First Ladies have on their husband’s presidency.

Campbell (1996) posits that the anxiety about the relationship between a president and his wife are rooted in U.S. history. The presidency came into existence during a time when female roles were dominated by the “cult of ‘true womanhood’ which defined [women] as pious, pure, submissive, and domestic and relegates them entirely to the private sphere of home and to the functions of wife, mother, and housekeeper” (Campbell,
Women who tried to break with these constraints and enter the public arena lost their claim to purity and femininity. Hence, the "ambivalence about the First Ladyship is a product of the ambiguous combination of its public-private functions, which transcend woman's traditional sphere, and of beliefs about women that reach back to the very beginnings of Western civilization" (Campbell, 1996, p. 182). As the stories of Pandora and Eve highlight, Greco-Roman and Judeo-Christian traditions suggest that the way to contain women's potential for evil is for her to remain in the home in traditional roles; whereas when women move into the public-political arena her potential for evil can be realized.

A third reason the study of First Ladies is important is that to the degree they stand as symbols of American womanhood, the study of First Ladies illuminates the constraints upon and possibilities for women's political action in the United States. Although the First Lady is not an elected political official, she is still considered one of the most powerful people in Washington; and some argue that she is the second most powerful person in the world (Watson, 1997).
While the media heralded the 1992 election year as "The Year of the Woman" in American politics, there is still a vast disparity between the number of male and female elected officials (e.g., Daughton, 1995; Marshall, 1996; van Assendeft & Nye, 1998). The 1992 election year symbolized the nation's slow progress toward gender equality and actually resulted in little change in political representations for women (Daughton, 1995; Delli Carpini & Fuchs, 1993; Faludi, 1992). Specifically, in the 101st Congress, serving between 1989-1991, there was a total of 31 women elected; and in the next Congress, serving 1991-1993, the number rose to 32. Thus, an increase of the less than 1% was touted by the media as "The Year of the Woman" (Center for the American Woman and Politics, 1999).

Shanley and Pateman (1991) suggest why women and politics seem to clash:

Manhood and politics go hand in hand. . . .
Everything that stands in contrast to and opposed to political life and the political virtues has been represented by women, their capacitates and the tasks seen as natural to their sex. (p. 3)
The controversy regarding Hillary Rodham Clinton’s power provides a striking counterpoint to the “Year of the Woman.” Political pundits and public opinion polls indicated concerns about Bill Clinton’s “two for the price of one” and “co-presidency” campaign discourse (Campbell, 1996). Thus, during the “Year of the Women” people were bothered and angered by Hillary and Bill Clinton’s overt acknowledgement of the public, political role of the First Lady (e.g., Campbell, 1996; Marshall, 1996). For example, Pollitt (1993) documents that the concern over Hillary Rodham Clinton’s political power resulted in two complete hours of Nightline to discuss the topic “Does she have too much power, or what?” (p. 657). The study of First Ladies, then, goes beyond a "great woman" study, by revealing insight into questions of women’s agency in contemporary American culture.

The expanding interest in the private life of politicians influences what the public expects to learn about the First Lady. Historically, the women who fulfilled the role of First Lady have interacted with the American public in various ways. Early presidential wives had no blueprint to follow for defining their roles. Given the vague nature of the First Lady institution,
women such as Martha Dandrisge Custis Washington and Abigail Smith Adams shaped the role of First Lady into a public ceremonial office that was responsible for all social functions of the presidential life. As women's societal roles have changed, First Ladies have also changed the manner in which they interacted with the public (Watson, 1997). “The first ladies of the early twentieth century forges new roles of the institution. The foundation for the modern first lady as an active presidential partner was set during this time” (Watson, 1997, p. 812). For instance, Helen Taft was highly ambitious and was active in her husband’s campaign by writing speeches and advising. Eleanor Roosevelt expanded the role even further by giving public speeches and excelling at a writing career.

The advent of a more immediate mass media culture with the wider use of television made the First Lady a more public institution and a greater part of her husband’s presidency. During Jacqueline Lee Bouvier Kennedy’s tenure as First Lady the press had unprecedented access to her and her family. For instance, the media were invited into the family quarters of the
White House for a tour given by First Lady Kennedy (Carol, 1995; Gould, 1996).

Modern First Ladies have further broadened their public sphere duties by becoming openly active political partners with their husbands, by attending cabinet meetings and by being politically active in social causes (Watson, 1997). Hence, as the role of the First Lady has changed, the women in the role have also changed how they fulfill their public and private obligations.

The American public has very little or no opportunity to interact directly with national political figures (e.g., Bennett, 1996; Cohen, 1963; Gitlin, 1980; Graber, 1987, 1997; Iyengar, 1991; Lippmann, 1922; McCombs & Shaw, 1972, 1993; Patterson, 1980, 1982, 1994; Schudson, 1995). The news coverage of political figures, including the First Lady, needs examination because it is this information that the American public uses to form political beliefs and make political decisions (e.g., Kahn, 1996; Keshishian, 1997). Specifically, Patterson (1994) maintains that the media have become the “chief intermediary” between contemporary voters and candidates. The purpose of this dissertation is to analyze the media coverage of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton in a public
and political role during her tenure as head of the National Health Care Reform Task Force. Specifically, this dissertation will conduct a content analysis of the reporting of selected print media, *The Los Angeles Times*, *The Washington Post*, and *USA Today* and of the reporting by the national broadcast news media from ABC, CBS, and NBC. Thus, the aim of this dissertation is to investigate the media construction of a First Lady who headed what *The New York Times* labeled the “Biggest National Effort Since Social Security” (September 23, 1993, p. 1).

As a foundation for this case study of analyzing the news coverage of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton during her tenure as the head of the National Health Care Reform Task Force, the following chapter first overviews relevant literature that investigates the interaction of news and politics. Next, it presents research that investigates the relationship between news coverage of female politicians and gender role expectations. Following this theoretical grounding, this dissertation turns to literature regarding the roles First Ladies have played throughout history and the relationship between First Ladies and the news media. Emerging from this research review, I pose research questions and Chapter
Three outlines the content analytic procedures that will be used to answer these questions. Finally, Chapter Four presents the results of the content analysis and Chapter Five highlights implications of the results while noting limitations of the study and offering future research avenues.
Chapter II

Theoretical Foundation and The First Lady:

Review of Significant Literature

Every newspaper when it reaches the reader is the result of a whole series of selections as to what items shall be printed, in what positions they shall be printed, how much space each shall occupy, what emphasis each shall have. There are no objective standards here. There are no conventions. (Lippmann, 1922, p. 223)

The preceding assertion by Walter Lippmann indicates that people experience most of the world’s proceedings through the perceptions of journalists and the organizational constraints that confine them. The very act of media gatekeepers choosing what to communicate and how to communicate the information affects viewers’ perceptions of the world. Consequently, news organizations shape what people know (e.g., Bennett, 1996; Cohen, 1963; Gitlin, 1980; Graber, 1987, 1997; Iyengar, 1991; Lippmann, 1922; McCombs & Shaw, 1972, 1993; Patterson, 1980, 1982, 1994; Schudson, 1995).
Numerous media scholars, primarily during the last three decades, have studied the effects of news presentation on audiences (e.g., Bennett, 1996; Cohen, 1963; Gitlin, 1980; Graber, 1987, 1997; Iyengar, 1991; Lippmann, 1922; McCombs & Shaw, 1972, 1993; Patterson, 1980, 1982, 1994; Schudson, 1995). Although this dissertation is approached with the understanding that the information contained in the news affects audiences (e.g. Cohen, 1963; Gitlin, 1980; Lippmann, 1922; McCombs & Shaw, 1972, 1993), it does not address the effects of the information itself. Instead, this study focuses on the information presented by media organizations because people socially construct their realities and are influenced by the information presented by the media. Edleman (1988) argues that "news accounts, therefore reconstruct social worlds . . . they construct the social reality to which people respond and help construct the subjectivity of actors and spectators as well" (p. 29). Hence, it is important to understand the information portrayed by the media regardless of specific audience effects.

The following section presents a review of the literature directly related to this study. First, this
review offers an overview of how scholars approach the study of news and politics. Second, it presents research regarding the media's construction and reification of gender role expectations.

News and Politics

"News is an integral part of the political process. . . . linking politicians and people in the struggle for government power" (Bennett, 1996, p. 3). Although early media effects studies suggest that the media largely reinforce people's predispositions (e.g., Klapper, 1960) recent work argues for more substantial media effects. Ansolabehere, Behr, and Iyengar (1991) present media effects in electoral campaigns in four broad areas: a) information acquisition, b) persuasion, c) agenda-setting, d) priming. The following section reviews the four above-mentioned effects and media frames.

Information acquisition.

The news media influence the type and amount of information that the public receives during elections. When the media focus on campaign issues such as the horse race and gaffs, rather than policy issues, this presentation style influences the public's view of political campaigns. Patterson (1993) posits that
journalists see politics through a game schema that keeps the focus on which candidate has an advantage. For example, Patterson (1993) states that:

The reporter’s instinct is to look for the game. In October 1991, CNN provided live coverage of Bill Clinton’s announcement speech from the steps of the Old Senate House in Little Rock, Arkansas. The camera stayed on him as he spoke of the programs he would pursue as president, however, CNN broke away to its Washington studio so that the commentators David Broder and William Schneider could discuss Clinton’s chances of winning the Democratic nomination. (p. 58)

Thus, instead of informing the public about Clinton’s proposals, CNN focused on his political viability.

In addition to the type of coverage, the amount of coverage also impacts audiences. Patterson (1980) argues that there is a strong relationship between news coverage of the 1976 presidential campaign and public awareness of Jimmy Carter. Hence, he concludes that the media influences voters’ perceptions of candidate viability and influences the electoral process.
**Persuasion.**

Besides relaying information to potential voters, the information presented in the media can also change people's attitudes about political participants and events. Thus, the media play an important role in political socialization, "the learning about structures and environmental factors and internalizing of customs and rules governing political life," (Graber, 1997, p. 191).

As Vice President Quayle's denouncement of the sitcom character Murphy Brown's decision to have a child while unmarried indicates, there is a strongly held belief that factual and fictional media information shape the thinking and behavior of the audience (e.g., Dow, 1999; Graber, 1997). While early research suggests weak-to-nonexistent effects on the audience's attitudes (e.g., Klapper, 1960) there are important methodological limitations to this line of research. Specifically, cross-sectional surveys are not good indicators of short-term changes in attitude (Hovland, 1959). Experimental and quasi-experimental studies (e.g., Robinson, 1976; Steeper, 1978) and time-series analysis (e.g., Page &
Shapiro, 1987) suggest that the information presented by the media can produce changes in public opinion.

Agenda setting.

Lippmann (1922) was the first researcher who formalized the idea of the mass media “putting pictures in our heads” (p. 3). However, Cohen (1963) receives credit for expressing the metaphor that inspired agenda-setting research. Cohen states:

The press is significantly more than a purveyor of information and opinion. It may not be successful much of the time in telling people what to think, but it is stunningly successful in telling its readers what to think about.... The world will look different to different people, depending on the map that is drawn for them by writers, editors, and publishers of the papers they read. (p. 13)

From this initial start, communication scholars have investigated Cohen’s (1963) premise that the media do not tell us what to think but do tell us what to think about. Thus, agenda setting metaphorically describes the mass media’s role in the formation of public opinion (e.g., Ansolabehere, Behr, & Iyengar, 1991; Erbring, Goldenberg,

**Priming.**

Priming, an offshoot of agenda setting research, posits that the media’s emphasis of certain issues alters the criteria people use to evaluate political actors, events, and issues (e.g., Ansolabehere, Behr, & Iyengar, 1991; Miller, Krosnick, 1997; Iyengar & Kinder, 1987; Iyengar, Peters, & Kinder, 1982). Ansolabehere, Behr, and Iyengar (1991) state:

While agenda setting reflects the impact of news coverage on the perceived importance of national issues, priming refers to the impact of news coverage on the weight assigned to specific issues in making political judgments. Specifically, researchers have found that the more prominent an issue is in the national information stream, the greater is its weight in political judgments. (p. 127)

For example, if the news media focus on foreign affairs, then the public will think that foreign affairs are important (agenda setting). Therefore, voters’ perceptions of a senator’s foreign affairs performance
will strongly influence their overall evaluations of the senator. Kahn (1996) argues that priming is a “potentially powerful phenomena” (p. 13) because it suggests that the news media can influence people’s political views by influencing what people think about when evaluating political participants.

**Framing.**

While research regarding news frames emerged from agenda setting in the field of communication, psychologists define framing as “changes in judgment engendered by alterations to the definition of judgment or choice problems” (Iyengar & Simon, 1993). Sociologists, building on the work of Bateson (1972) and Goffman (1974), define framing in terms of ideological or value perspectives (Iyengar & Simon, 1993). Only recently have scholars begun to examine the power of news frames to affect the public’s view of the political realm (Gamson, 1992; Iyengar, 1991; Neuman, Just, & Crigler, 1992; Rhee, 1997).

Neuman, Just, and Crigler (1992) assert that social relevance and personal experiences mediate news reception and thus, news frames. Further, Rhee (1997) affirms that “framing concerns the individual process of news
interpretation characterized by the complex interaction, or negotiation, between news texts and the individual’s social knowledge” (p. 27).

News “framing” refers to the media’s selection and presentation of specific aspects of an issue to make these aspects more important, and salient, than other aspects of the same issue (Dearing & Rogers, 1996; Iyengar, 1991). For instance, Gitlin (1980) investigates framing with his study of how CBS trivialized a major student movement in the 1960s. The author argues that when covering an event, journalists have many options on how to frame or conceptualize the event. For example, the journalists could choose to focus on how the government is responding, the social implications of the movement, the activists as students, the activists as radicals or critique the way the problem is being handled. The way journalists frame events influences the public’s perceptions of those events.

Dearing and Rogers (1996) maintain that frames are how the media give meaning to issues. Thus, media organizational processes result in a specific focus in the news coverage of the issue (Entman, 1993). For example, Iyengar and Simon (1993) posit that when the
nightly network newscasts portrayed the Persian Gulf crisis in military rather than diplomatic terms, public support for a military response increased. Similarly, Gamson (1992) found that media presentations of affirmative action as a "special interest" program for minorities led to increased expectations of individualistic responsibility. Consequently, reporters, in conjunction with other media influences, define and construct meaning by their manner of presentation.

In addition, Schoenbach and Semetko (1992) assert that tone and frequency of political coverage are important factors that affect public opinion. They conclude that media framing of an issue as positive or negative influences public perceptions of issue salience. Additionally, Cappella and Jamieson (1996) posit that "subtle changes in the way news stories are framed can affect consumers' responses, activating, if not creating, cynicism about campaigns, policy, and governance" (p. 71). Hence, mass mediated information influences how individuals evaluate issues (Iyengar, 1991; Salwen & Matera, 1992). McCombs and Shaw (1993) state that:

Whatever the attributes of an issue—or other topic—presented on the news agenda, the consequences for
audience behavior are considerable. How a communicator frames an issue sets an agenda of attributes and can influence how we think about it. Agenda setting is a process that can effect both what to think about and how to think about it. (p. 63)

Consequently, by covering certain topics while ignoring others, the media influence what people consider important.

Media, Politics, and Gender Role Representation

The media are responsible for informing the public about the world, and this information ideally should include women and the societal changes that have been made. Nevertheless, Byerly (1995) argues that:

News, in all of its forms, has historically underrepresented and misrepresented women. Through the late 1970s, world news routinely ignored women’s problems and accomplishments as subjects for serious coverage . . . Even as women’s rights movements in the 1960s and 1970s helped to expand women’s roles in the public spheres of paid workforces and politics, news coverage ignored or trivialized their gains. (p. 108)
Therefore, as women have gained increasing access into the public sphere the media have either ignored or trivialized their accomplishments.

The media have an effect on how the public views women, women political candidates, and the First Lady (e.g., Kahn, 1992, 1994; Winfield, 1997a, 1997b; Witt, Paget, & Matthews, 1994). All of these positions have gender and gendered expectations in common. Questions arise regarding what specifically about media coverage continues to constrain women. This section presents literature that addresses the public's response to female political figures. Next, there is a summary of empirical evidence that illuminates the differential responses of the public to female and male political figures. Finally, this section reviews research regarding the role of the mass media in influencing public perceptions of gender roles in the political arena.

The public's response to women political participants is predicated upon societal stereotypes. Feminist and cultural studies specify two themes of stereotyping. First, the cognitive effects of the public's exposure to mass media messages about female political figures occur in the context of a media
environment where political messages concern male political participants (Perkins, 1979). Therefore, when the media present female political participants, they compare them to the idealized male political figure, and place the public in the position of evaluating women by these masculine criteria (e.g., Gillespie & Spohn, 1987, 1990; Kahn, 1996). Second, these two areas of study critique the legitimization of social power by the use of stereotypes. Both sender and receiver of the messages may perpetuate stereotypes in their construction of meanings, either consciously or unconsciously. This continuation of stereotypical images maintains the status quo in power relations among the different groups in society (Mouffe, 1992; Seiter, 1986; VanZooner, 1994).

Researching the multiple ways in which people internalize and act on their stereotypical assumptions is problematic (Kahn, 1996). The public’s stereotypical understanding of what it means to be a woman, and a woman political participant, may manifest itself in a total rejection of women in politics or in a restriction regarding appropriate “women issues” (Seiter, 1986). To illustrate, it is evident in the societal conception of the First Lady that some people believe that she should
stay out of the political arena. Others believe that she should simply focus on domestic and social issues. Hence, it may not be that the public considers women inferior; instead, it may be that the public has stereotypical ideals that restrict women to “appropriate” political issues and tasks.

Further, Edelman (1988) argues that there is a societal ideal of a “chauvinistic leadership” style that political leaders need to adhere to in order to be successful. Based on prevailing sexist norms—sexist stereotypes—leaders must act chauvinistically or they will be defined as “weak and ineffective.” Specifically, Edelman (1988) posts that:

In their actions and in their talk, political leaders are prone to stress the values of authority, hierarchy, toughness, and dominance over compassion, equality, or the welfare of the powerless, and there is evidence that the public has been socialized to display the same priorities when choosing among aspirants for high office. (p. 61)

By relying on the “chauvinistic leadership” style, the public judges all potential leaders, including women, by this measure.
Cognitions in mediated political realities partly manifest in interaction and transaction with the media. The political world is complex, and people need belief systems and schemata to make sense out of the confusion. Neisser (1976) defines schema as a mental representation of a category. Other scholars have expanded on this parsimonious definition to explain how people represent these mental categorizations in their heads. Fiske (1984) states that a schema is “a cognitive structure that contains a concept’s attributes and links among other attributes” (p. 41). Bem (1983) notes that a schema is “a network of associations that organizes and guides an individual’s perception” (p. 603). Further, Lau (1984) maintains that it is “a cognitive structure, based on experience, that organizes people’s conceptions of the world” (p. 1017). Thus, there is a relationship between stored knowledge and the effects of processing, such as recall, cognitive responses, and attitudes (e.g., Graber, 1997).

In considering the public’s evaluation of the First Lady, it is important to recognize that people use schemas to categorize and understand political knowledge (Graber, 1997; Patterson, 1994). These political schemas
include stored knowledge about what it means to be First Lady. Similarly, Kinder, Peters, Abelson, and Fiske (1980) posit that people define their prototypical representation of an ideal president by the conspicuous actions of the incumbent president, by social and political values, and by mass communication. Through a combination of personal experiences, media exposure, and real world experiences the public form schema about political actors that represent acceptable political roles. Therefore, people use preexisting knowledge structures or schema, representing generalized conceptions of political candidates and the First Lady to make judgments. If the person being judged does not conform to these preexisting expectations then there are problems, such as when First Ladies move into the public and/or political sphere.

Martin and Halverson (1981) posit that people's understanding of the traits, activities, and behaviors traditionally associated with men or women form a conceptual cognitive structure that they refer to as a gender schema. Accordingly, gender schema influences the encoding and processing of incoming information. Consequently, there is a tendency to classify people by
gender, and political participants do not escape this classification system. Specifically, people evaluate the First Lady based on their socialized stereotypical understandings of women's roles and activities.

The media's presentation of women political participants shapes and reinforces people's gender schemata. For instance, Kahn and Goldenberg (1991) conducted a content analysis of media coverage of 26 U.S. Senate races in 1984 and 1986 and found the following: 1) that the media covered women candidates with an emphasis on the "horse race"; 2) presented women as less viable candidates; 3) completely disregard their issue concerns; 4) focused on "feminine" issues and traits; and 5) accorded less coverage to female candidates. In addition, journalists trivialize women candidates and political figures by using "gender-specific terms (Braden, 1996). Witt, Paget, and Matthews (1994) critique The Chicago Tribune's coverage of Carole Mosely-Braun's 1992 Senate campaign against Rich Williams. In their coverage the journalists described the candidates in this manner: "she is commanding and ebullient, a den mother with a cheerleader's smile; he, by comparison, is all business, like a corporate lawyer he is" (p. 181). Thus, the media
presented to the American people a construction of female candidates that kept the focus on their gender and not on their politics.

Journalists, like the public at large, have gender schemata that impact their coverage of politicians (Graber, 1997; Kahn, 1993, 1996). Specifically, Kahn (1993) argues that these gender schema and stereotypes may lead reporters to "emphasize certain traits (e.g., compassion, honesty) when covering female candidates and other traits (competence, leadership) when covering male candidates regardless of the candidates' own emphasis" (p. 494). This gendered coverage may lead reporters to consider and present male candidates as more viable and legitimate.

A recent study conducted by Smith (1997) regarding newspaper coverage of female and male Senate and gubernatorial candidates in 1994 suggests that reporters are beginning to treat female and male candidates equally. This study indicates that female and male candidates received approximately the same quantity and quality of news coverage. While Smith argues that women predominately received roughly equal coverage, the author
notes that when there were disparities, female candidates were the ones slighted by media coverage.

It is inconceivable to presume that people develop their female political participant schema based on direct contact with these women; instead, the public relies on the media for information. If reporters and anchors frame stories in a gender-conscious way, it is likely that, after repeated exposure, the audience will develop schema for female political participants that aligns with the reporters' bias. Thus, female political participants face considerable obstacles when they decide to enter the public political arena. The media, both print and broadcast, greatly affect the public's perceptions of these women. Witt, Paget, and Matthews (1994) argue that "press coverage of women in politics is an artifact of this country's age-old but still unresolved debate over women citizens' proper role versus proper women's place" (p. 182).

When studying the First Lady it is important to address the gendered nature of the role and the expectations these women confront and attempt to fulfill. The very title "First Lady" expresses certain expectations, and throughout history numerous women have
explored and expanded what it means to be a First Lady. Historically, "lady" denoted a woman of superior position and when combined with "first" the wife of the president became "first lady of the land"—the most superior wife in American society (Kramarae & Treichler, 1989; Stannard, 1977).

During the last three decades, American women have actively sought to change the ideals and expectations of what it means to be a woman. Women political candidates face controversy because they step out of a woman's "traditional" role and enter a sphere that society deems only appropriate for men. As women's roles have changed, the conceptualization of "First Lady" and the women who were First Ladies have also evolved (e.g., Gould, 1996; Jamieson, 1995; Kiely & Fullerton, 1996; Watson, 1997).

The mass media are the principal conduits between the outside world and the images people hole of the world (e.g., Bennett, 1996; Cohen, 1963; Gitlin, 1980; Graber, 1987, 1997; Iyengar, 1991; Lippmann, 1922; McCombs & Shaw, 1972, 1993; Patterson, 1980, 1982, 1994; Schudson, 1995). In fact, the media provides important information about political issues, candidates, and events and this information becomes the basis for individual decision
making. Thus, given people’s reliance on the media, the media’s potential impact on people’s perceptions of politics, and the differences in media coverage of male and female politicians; an investigation into the media’s coverage of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton during her tenure as the head of the National Health Care Reform Task Force is warranted.

The First Lady:

Review of Significant Literature

The following section addresses research regarding the First Lady. First, it presents studies that focus on the life and work of First Ladies. Second, this section overviews the relationship between the media and the First Lady. Finally, this review of literature presents the limited studies that examine the news coverage of the First Lady.

American First Ladies and Societal Roles

Studying First Ladies is important for what it illuminates about American culture. Gould (1986) highlights this point when he describes the significance of increased research on First Ladies:

By ignoring First Ladies we have truncated the humanity of presidents and diminished them as men.
Our view of the presidency is poorer for that action. But we also have, and this is more important, downgraded a group of women who have fulfilled a unique responsibility. It is too simple to say that their role has been symbolic. It has been wisely said that we live by symbols. How we view the First Lady is how we expect women to act, marriages to work, families to grow and people to live. In the most profound sense, the study of the First Ladies holds up a mirror to ourselves. (p. 529)

Hence, by marriage and/or design these women come to represent society and societal concerns.

First Ladies are not elected, nor do they have a formalized role; instead these women face a job that is ambiguous, and yet they are a national symbol (Benze, 1990; Caroli, 1995). Benze (1990) states that:

Historically, the First Lady has been expected to fulfill a variety of functions, ranging from national hostess to advocate for the disabled. However, she is not elected to her position . . . this creates many expectations for the First Lady,
but provides her little means of fulfilling them.

(p. 778)

These expectations, combined with the national symbol function of the role, present First Ladies with numerous problems. For instance, with the changing role of American women and the electorate’s polarized ideal regarding what it means to be a woman, contemporary First Ladies are in an impossible situation. First, American society expects these women to fulfill the traditional role of political wives:

As for the fixed image of women married to politicians in the States, . . . they are almost Victorian: a perfectly turned out groomed lady who admires all her husband’s speeches and normally walks half a pace behind him, everywhere, all the time. He is always seen to be gallant helping her down from the aircraft steps, assisting her through doors, standing up when she enters a room, and so on. (Holtzman & Williams, 1987, p. 28)

Second, society also expects First Ladies to have an interest apart from the family and to advocate for women’s issues. Thus, First Ladies represent and
epitomize the multiple roles encompassed in homemaker and working women that American women face.

Numerous First Ladies have excelled at fulfilling their traditional roles. Martha Dandrisge Curtis Washington (1789-1797) began what would become the role of “First Lady” with domestic and social activities. Dolley Payne Todd Madison (1809-1817) is one of the most famous First Ladies of the nineteenth century. She went beyond simply decorating the White House and acting as hostess by re-defining the private space of the First Lady to included political matters. Shulman (1996) maintains that:

Dolly Madison, however, was not merely an appendage to her powerful husband. She created, instead, a kind of third world between public and private. In society—on those occasions when government is run through the social forms of dinners, parties, and other ceremonial forms of entertainment—she was more important than her husband. The drawing rooms of the White House were her rooms and not his. She presided over that world as no First Lady had done before, and created a precedent that her successors could follow. (p. 52)
Therefore, previous First Ladies, while conforming to traditional female role expectations, were able to expand what it meant to be the First Lady and impact the political arena.

In addition to the traditional role of the First Lady, numerous women who have held the position have been active political. Besides the present First Lady, Hillary Rodham Clinton (1992- present) and the recognized political activities of Eleanor Roosevelt (1933-1945), a number of First Ladies have also been keen politicians. Because of their political knowledge, these First Ladies have assisted their husbands in wielding the power entrusted to the president, either out of the public's eye or at times in plain view (e.g., Caroli, 1995; Gould, 1996; Truman, 1995). O'Connor, Nye, and van Assendelft (1996) conducted a study which indicated that of the nation's 38 First Ladies "at least 31 first ladies discussed politics with their husbands; twenty-six could be considered confidantes or advisers. That role often included not only discussing politics, but also screening correspondence, highlighting news articles, and editing speeches" (p. 846). Further, the authors report that 14 First Ladies played crucial roles in the president's
appointments and nominations. Thus, history indicates that First Ladies have always wielded political power.

Edith Bolling Galt Wilson (1915-1921) was First Lady from the time she married sitting President Woodrow Wilson in 1915 until the end of his second term in 1921. In the beginning of her tenure as First Lady, Wilson did not pursue any personal causes; instead, she focused on her husband's health and welfare. In contrast, during the last two years of his second term, she virtually ran the presidency. After President Wilson's stroke in 1919, while many people close to him were against his leaving office, Mrs. Wilson felt he should resign. She was persuaded that, given sufficient incentive (his presidency) and a peaceful environment, he would be more prone to recover. First Lady Wilson took it upon herself to provide as tranquil a setting as can be had in the White House, effectively shielding him from unnecessary situations and decisions. While she insisted that she never made a decision for the president, she did wield a heavy influence over him during this time, including what did or did not come to his attention. Thus, Edith Bolling Galt Wilson exercised real power and has become one of
the most controversial First Ladies (Benze, 1990; Caroli, 1995; Gould, 1996; Truman, 1995).

While Edith Bolling Galt Wilson openly wielded power, Abigail Smith Adams (1797-1801) was the initial First Lady to actually be called "Mrs. President" by her foes. Her letters to her husband reveal an outspoken and politically minded woman often urging her husband about women’s rights (Benze, 1990; Caroli, 1995; Levin, 1996; Truman, 1995). On March 31, 1776 Abigail Smith Adams began her campaign for women’s rights with a letter that she would refer to as her “List of Female Grievances”:

Remember the ladies and be more generous to them than your ancestors! Do not put such unlimited power into the hands of the husbands. Remember that all men would be tyrants if they could. If particular care and attention is not paid to the Ladies we are determined to foment a Rebellion, and will not hold ourselves bound by any Laws in which we have no voice, or Representation. (Levin, 1996, p. 25)

Moreover, during Adams’ presidency, the First Lady influenced her husband to hire and fire cabinet members and openly and vocally supported various pieces of legislation, including the Alien and Sedition Acts of
1798. She also leaked stories to the press, an act that later First Ladies duplicated.

Anna Eleanor Roosevelt (1933-1945) made the most significant enlargement of the First Ladyship in modern times during her 12-year tenure. As First Lady she traveled all over the nation for the president, gave lectures, hosted her own radio show, wrote for newspapers, and expressed her opinions on controversial issues such as civil rights. Although First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt was obviously active in the political arena she attempted to frame her activities as a helpmate to her husband (Benze, 1990; Campbell, 1996; Caroli, 1995; Levin, 1996; Truman, 1995). Specifically, Campbell states that because of “anxieties about her public role, she felt constrained to minimize her influence and to describe her activities in terms consistent with traditional notions of womanhood” (p. 184).

Another more contemporary outspoken First Lady, Elizabeth (Betty) Ann Bloomer Ford (1974-1977) also used her position to be politically active. President Ford publicly acknowledged that he valued her opinions and that he sought her advice. A firm supporter of women’s rights and the ERA, First Lady Ford spent hours on the
telephone, attempting to win enough votes to push the constitutional amendment through congress. While the amendment did not pass, she still used her position to influence her husband to appoint women to several cabinet and ambassadorial posts. Mrs. Ford openly supported the Supreme Court’s decision on abortion, despite the negative stand that the Republican Party took. Further, she straightforwardly discussed her psychotherapy and breast cancer—two subjects that she helped bring to the public’s attention—and thus, removed some of the negative stigma associated with these issues (Benze, 1990; Caroli, 1995; Pope, 1996; Truman, 1995). Pope (1996) further highlights her activeness: “In recognition of her work, Time magazine named Mrs. Ford one of its Women of the Year for 1975—an accolade no other First Lady had received” (p. 547).

Of all the contemporary First Ladies before 1992, Eleanor (Rosalynn) Smith Carter (1977-1981) was possibly the most publicly politically active. Considering their relationship, which they described as a partnership, Mrs. Carter was involved in all aspects of the Carter presidency, “from the campaign trail (where many considered her to one of candidate Carter’s best assets)
to the White House (where she often sat in on cabinet meetings)” (Benze, 1990, p. 785). When she became First Lady, she reorganized the office of the First Lady. This reorganization divided the office into four divisions: 1) projects and community liaison; 2) press and research; 3) scheduling; and 4) social and personal objectives and commitments. Under First Lady Carter’s direction the staff increased from 18 full time employees to 21 plus numerous volunteers. While these actions were controversial, the most controversial was the hiring of Edith J. Dobelle for the newly created position of chief-of-staff for the First Lady (Benze, 1990; Caroli, 1995; Smith, 1996; Truman, 1995). Smith (1996) posits “as First Lady, Rosalynn Carter’s main functions were social leader, adviser, representative, campaigner, and policy or project advocate” (p. 567). While she excelled at all these roles, she expanded what it meant to be the First Lady when President Carter openly acknowledged that he not only valued her advice, but he respected and used it (Smith, 1996).

While Rosalynn and Jimmy Carter were very open in their partnership, the Reagan’s presented their marriage as more traditional; thus, presenting Mrs. Reagan (1980-
1988) as having no political interests. As their presidential reign progressed, it became evident that Nancy Anne Francis Robbins Davis Reagan did indeed have political aspirations and power. Throughout the 1980 campaign Mrs. Reagan maintained a traditional political wife role: she answered questions, she traveled with her husband, and she attended his speeches. During this time, she became more powerful behind the scenes (Benze, 1990, 1996; Caroli, 1995; Truman, 1995). Although her impact on the position of First Lady was not primarily historically significant, Benze (1996) states that:

What was most interesting and important about Mrs. Reagan’s years as First Lady was the prolonged national debate that took place over the proper role of a First Lady, with Mrs. Reagan’s performance being either praised or condemned. . . Some Americans clearly desired an activist First Lady . . . Other Americans desired a First Lady who supported her husband but stayed out of politics. (p. 594)

During her eight years as First Lady, Mrs. Reagan did not adequately fill either of these roles. She was more elitist than some people desired and more politically involved than others wanted or imagined. Even though she
wielded power in her husband’s administration, they attempted to present her as a traditional First Lady who spent her time redecorating the White House and entertaining Heads of State (Benze, 1990, 1996; Caroli, 1995; Truman, 1995).

Although numerous First Ladies have had political aspirations, First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton has had one of the most openly influential political positions. Albeit not the first political couple to declare themselves a partnership, the Clintons solidified this position with numerous actions. “On January 20, 1993 Hillary Rodham Clinton moved into the White House amid predictions that she would completely rewrite the job of First Lady. Headlines described a president’s ‘First Partner’ who is ‘breaking new ground’” (Garoli, 1995, p. 288). Soon after taking office, President Clinton appointed Rodham Clinton to oversee the revamping of the nation’s health care system, which was central in his campaign for the presidency.

A First Lady leading such a major reform broke all precedents. Any proposals her commission reached promised far wider changes than the reforms in mental health care championed by Rosalynn Carter or
the beautification program of Lady Bird Johnson.

Hillary Clinton’s mandate bore no resemblance at all to Barbara Bush’s literacy program or Nancy Reagan’s “Just Say No to Drugs.” (Garoli, 1995, p. 304)

A federal court upheld this expansion of the role of First Lady when it described the First Lady as a “virtual extension of her husband” and “the functional equivalent of an assistant to the president” (Truman, 1995, p. 328). This empowerment gave Mrs. Clinton political power because it was now apparent when she said “we” she meant her partnership with the President.

Besides this political appointment, Rodham Clinton has been politically active since college and has campaigned for family and children’s rights most of her adult life. While at Yale she became involved in the Children’s Defense Fund, a nonprofit organization set up to help children and families. Further, she spent an extra year at Yale to specialize in law about children. This interest and activism continued into her political life. While the First Lady of Arkansas, Rodham Clinton chaired the Arkansas Education Standards Committee. In this position she traveled throughout the state and talked to parents and teachers to help reform the
educational system. The state of Arkansas adopted the reforms she proposed (Caroli, 1995; Gould, 1995; Radcliff, 1993).

The women mentioned in the above overview of the ever-changing role of First Lady merely represent some of the accomplishments made by American First Ladies. The review serves to demonstrate the evolution of the role and the unique qualities of some of the women who found themselves in the often precarious position of an American First Lady.

The Media and the First Lady

Throughout the last 100 years, the influence and scope of media coverage has grown considerably. Currently, American society has access to information about the world 24 hours a day. They can gain information through newspapers, radio, television, and through online avenues such as the Internet. The vast flow of information has changed the world and has influenced how people view politicians. Specifically, mediated information allows more people to be privy to information regarding almost all nuances of political life. America’s First Ladies have not escaped this focused lens. While the coverage of the First Lady allows the public to
follow her every move, the relationship between First Ladies and the media continuously evolves.

Media attention and public interest in First Ladies began from the onset of American government with Martha Washington. Coverage of Mrs. Washington primarily focused on her activities and did not openly critique her. Conversely, the media openly attacked Abigail Adams for her political stances. Most of Mrs. Adams immediate successors confined their activities to being the White House hostesses and refused to become openly involved in politics. Therefore, they were not a focus of the press. During the first decades of American government, newspapers did not cover social events. Thus, if the First Lady was not involved in politics she was not perceived as newsworthy. Further, during this time, magazines did not cover the First Lady because they did not cover politics (Caroli, 1995; Gould, 1996).

During the nineteenth century, and in particular during the Civil War, national attention focused on women, and thus the press focused more on First Ladies. Newspapers moved from an information source primarily for the wealthy to an information source for the nation.
Caroli (1995) documents other advances that influenced news:

With the telegraph supplying information and a national rail system providing delivery, newspapers became much broader in scope. These developments, with advances in printing techniques, combined to make newspapers bigger, fuller, and cheaper than they had ever been before. (p. 314)

Further, women were obtaining an education and becoming as literate as men. With these societal changes, people who decided what was news recognized that the nation wanted to know about other people. Specifically, the public wanted information on people that were powerful, rich, and beautiful. Hence, now the First Lady was worthy of news.

Mary Todd Lincoln (1861-1865) endured the harsh focus of the media when she became First Lady. Her spending habits became a topic of conversation as the press reported how much she spent, and on what. No detail was too insignificant for print; for example, when First Lady Grant occupied the White House, the press labeled her "fair, fat, and frumpy" (Caroli, 1995, p. 316).
With newspapers documenting the First Ladies' every move, magazines soon followed this lead. In 1873, the magazine *Godey's Lady's Book* began a regular monthly column on the people living in the White House. In addition to words, the public wanted a visual representation of the political players. In the 1800s, print sources primarily used sketches, but toward the end of that century, pictures replaced the sketches. Thus, Americans now could follow the First Ladies' every move through pictures (Caroli, 1995).

As early as 1886, with the White House marriage of Grover Cleveland, people began to question the ethical nature of news reporters that tried to bribe their way into the White House, and those who stalked the President and his bride on their honeymoon. When these reporters wrote about First Ladies, they created a role for these women that revolved around being a hostess and style setter, as opposed to a role that emphasized their many accomplishments. For instance, First Lady Caroline Harrison (1889-1892) helped make Johns Hopkins Medical School coeducational, but her obituary only praised her domestic achievements (Caroli, 1995).
The turn of the century was another factor that contributed to the change in how First Ladies handled the flow of information. First Lady Edith Roosevelt engineered new ways of disseminating information as follows: by hiring a social secretary, by altering details of White House socializing, and by distributing posed, formal pictures of her children so that reporters would not stalk the family. The information presented in the news did not go beyond the society pages, although First Ladies Taft and Harding both played significant roles in their husbands' presidencies (Caroli, 1995; Gould, 1996; Truman, 1995).

It was not until 1933 that reports on the First Lady focused on her individual personality. When Eleanor Roosevelt became First Lady, she began to use the press to make herself a role model by combining traditional aspects of a woman's role with the requirements of changing times. She was the first president's wife to openly use her position to seek access to the media and turn this access to her and her husband's advantage. She held 348 press conferences, wrote a syndicated newspaper column, sold articles to magazines and newspapers, earned money as a lecturer, and was a radio commentator. Eleanor
Roosevelt was the only First Lady to have a money-making media career while she was in office. Because she recognized the power of information, she conducted a relationship with the media that was on her terms and this relationship ultimately fulfilled her goals (Beasley, 1987; Caroli, 1995; Gould, 1996; Truman, 1995; Watson, 1997).

As information about the First Lady and the First Family continued to flow, the public’s interest in these people flourished. The use of a press secretary for First Ladies kept the press farther away from these women and their families. The relentless coverage of First Lady Jackie Kennedy (1961-1963) epitomizes the American public’s desire for information, and the media’s deteriorating respect for the people they followed. For instance, reporters followed Mrs. Kennedy and took pictures of her walking on the beach when she was pregnant and on vacation. Further, reporters began to go to any length to get information; they would badger and/or bribe her hairdresser, her caterer, and her pianist. Television literally brought this First Lady into the public’s living room, and this familiarity fed
the public's expanding appetite for more information (Caroli, 1995; Gould, 1996; Truman, 1995).

America did not have another First Lady who was publicly outspoken until First Lady Betty Ford. She used the press, similar to Eleanor Roosevelt's style, to get her message out to the public. Mrs. Ford was honest and forthright about her life, her opinions, and her political stances. She actively campaigned and advocated for the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment. Further, when she underwent a mastectomy, she allowed the press access to details in the hope that she might save the lives of other women. Thus, the coverage of the First Lady moved beyond simply her style and began to focus on her as a person with thoughts and opinions (Caroli, 1995).

The coverage of First Lady Rosalynn Carter's press conference to announce President Carter's Commission on Mental Health highlights the media's conflict regarding what is newsworthy concerning the First Lady. The Washington Post focused on the First Lady's decision to serve only wine at the White House instead of focusing on informing the public about the Commission on Mental Health (Caroli, 1995; Gould, 1996; Truman, 1995).
“Rosalynn Carter learned that as much as she wished to emphasize her work on substantive issues, the press would not ignore the more frivolous elements of her life” (Caroli, 1995, p. 333).

As the role of the First Lady evolved, the media coverage also changed. Gutin (1986) states that the transition of the First Lady from an emerging spokesperson to a political surrogate/independent advocate was completed during the Reagan administration. During Reagan’s second run for the presidency, campaigns began to use wives as substitute candidates and to help the candidates reach women on “women issues”, such as daycare and pay equality.

During her eight years as First Lady, Nancy Reagan had two primary problems with press coverage. First, she presented herself to the public as a traditional wife who merely supported her husband and was essentially only concerned with style. This emphasis on style resulted in press coverage that accentuated glamour and the elite nature of her tenure as First Lady. Second, as her time as First Lady progressed, the press emphasized Mrs. Reagan’s influence in her husband’s presidency. Hence, the coverage of Nancy Reagan highlights the tension
between the two often conflicting roles that First Ladies fulfill (Benze, 1990; Caroli, 1995; Gould, 1996; Truman, 1995).

In 1992, then Governor Bill Clinton won the presidency and brought with him to the White House his politically active and savvy wife, Hillary Rodham Clinton. During their political life in Arkansas, and during Clinton's campaign for president, these two people presented themselves as a team that worked well together and that respected one another's opinions and advice. Hence, the American public knowingly voted a political partnership into the White House (e.g., Radcliff, 1993; Winfeild, 1997a).

The American press raised concerns regarding this partnership by focusing on her possible political power and whether she would be "co-president" (Winfeild, 1997a). Winfeild (1997a) states that:

"Hillary-bashing" was one of the greatest subthemes of the campaign, the subtext was about the role of women at the end of the twentieth century. She was breaking the acceptable boundaries of a presidential candidate's wife. Hillary Clinton was an equal partner . . . and the 1992 press coverage
represented the competing choices for women at the end of the century: Successful careers and self-fulfillment and the gender-based roles of mothers and wives. (p. 176)

Thus, before Rodham Clinton became First Lady she seemed to infuriate the American press core by presenting herself as a competent, confident, and capable career woman, wife, mother, and possible First Lady. The American press spotlighted a further illustration of this tension:

One incident in mid-March underlined the sensitivity of Hillary Clinton’s visible role in her husband’s presidential campaign. Speaking in Chicago on March 16, 1992, she told a reporter, according to Rex Nelson, “I’ve done the best I can to lead my life. I suppose I could have stayed home and baked cookies and had teas.” The press pounced on the statement and talk shows reverberated with angry denunciations of Hillary Clinton as having demeaned traditional women and their homemaking priorities. (Gould, 1996, p.639)

Besides the tension between traditional and contemporary role expectations, the Clinton partnership drew the
media’s attention because of the implied, and overt, political implications of this powerful couple.

Goodall (1994) argues that the political and social reaction to the “Tea and Cookies” sound bite gave rise to more negative coverage of Hillary Rodham Clinton. After the religious right’s charge that Rodham Clinton was a radical feminist, the media portrayed her as a “selfish yuppie” and as a “political problem.” As the ’92 campaign continued the media’s attention continued to denigrate this aspiring First Lady. Specifically, Goodall (1994) presents excerpt from an article in Vanity Fair by Gail Sheely that illustrated the negative and intrusive news coverage Hilary Rodham Clinton suffered:

> When the cameras dolly in, however, one can detect the calculation in the f-stop click of Hillary’s eyes. Lips pulled back over her slightly jutting teeth, the public smile is practiced; the small form establishes an air of superiority; her hair looks lifelessly doll like.

Hence, even with the ample amount of ammunition the Clinton’s gave the media about her political aspirations the media still focused on more traditional female coverage by attacking her physical appearance.
The controversy caused by the “non-traditional” candidate’s wife continued into Hillary Rodham Clinton’s realm as America’s First Lady. “Hillary Clinton is without a doubt the most newsy first lady this country has ever seen” (Kiely & Fulleton, 1996). The media coverage of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton ranged from the social to the political and from positive to extremely derogatory. Bystrom, McKinnon and Chaney (1999) state “Rodham Clinton's overt policy role and potential political power, which violated traditional norms, was sometimes praised but often condemned by the media” (p. 82). For instance, the press core’s concern regarding Rodham Clinton’s political power is especially evident when President Clinton appointed First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton to head the National Health Care Reform Task Force. Following the defeat of the Clinton National Health Care Reform proposal, many critics argued that the political defeat of health care reform signified the cultural rejection of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton’s activist role in the Clinton administration, and, more broadly, an indictment of women’s overt political power (Carney, 1994). Hillary Rodham Clinton brought to the public sphere the tension among the various roles that
When trying to represent American women (a difficult, if not impossible task), Hillary Rodham Clinton faces a nation and a media system that is not quite sure how to handle this "modern" woman.

**Media coverage of First Ladies**

Studies investigating the media's coverage of American First Ladies are sparse. Gardetto (1997) analyzes *The New York Times'* pre-election coverage of Hillary Rodham Clinton. She argues that the *Times'* presents Rodham Clinton as a "new women" who illuminates the tensions between the symbolic separation of public and private realms of social life, and how this tension relates to gender roles and expectations. The coverage clearly represents the conflict about this tension but the concerns over Rodham Clinton are better understood in the broader social context of the role of a married woman in public life, rather than simply as the matter of a First Lady overstepping her bounds. Thus, the process of news coverage does not operate outside American values.

In another study, Winfield (1997b) examines the media constructed image of Rodham Clinton during her first 18 months as First Lady. Traditionally, media
coverage of First Ladies has framed her in the customary female spousal support role by focusing on her fashion sense, social and cultural events, and her charitable works. When focusing energy on policymaking and political power or influence, First Ladies venture out of this societal constraint and news coverage often becomes critical. Winfield’s study indicates that the press and Rodham Clinton’s office were confused about her role, and thus, the initial coverage of the First Lady was confusing and disjointed.

Marshal (1996) investigates the news coverage of Hillary Rodham Clinton and Marilyn Quayle during the ‘92 presidential campaign. The contrast between First Lady Barbara Bush and Hillary Rodham Clinton was obvious; there were significant generational differences that made comparisons between the two women difficult. The Republican Party used Marilyn Qualye as a “traditional” counterpoint to Rodham Clinton's “non-traditional” stances. Specifically, Qualye emphasized differences between herself and Rodham Clinton on the basis of their lifestyle choices. She differentiated herself from Mrs. Clinton by highlighting her choice to leave her law career to support her husband’s political campaign
(Marshall, 1996). Marshall argues that the media generally accepted Mrs. Qualye's autobiographical account of herself, and thus, ignoring her past challenges to the traditional ideals she espoused. Specifically, Marshall (1996) states that:

Despite differences in religious and political beliefs, Marilyn Qualye and Hillary Clinton are two accomplished women whose histories reveal more lifestyle similarities than differences. Friends describe Marilyn Qualye, the daughter of two physicians, as determined, ambitious and a high achiever. Due to deliver her first child on the day of her bar exam, she reportedly had labor induced early so she could take the test. (p. 61)

In her political life Qualye acted as her husband's senior advisor, had an office across from the Vice President's, and received daily briefings on his activities and upcoming policy decisions. These openly non-traditional activities of Marilyn Qualye were largely ignored by the media during the '92 election (Marshall, 1996).

In another political comparison, Bystrom, McKinnon, and Chaney (1999) investigate the media coverage of
Hillary Rodham Clinton and Elizabeth Dole during the 1996 presidential election. In this election, the public faced presidential candidates that both offered "non-traditional" wives who were successful career women apart from their lives with their husbands. Using a content analysis, the authors compared the print news' coverage of these two candidates' wives. Results indicate that:

Both Rodham Clinton and Hanford Dole, when they were the primary or background focus of an article or spot, were equally more likely to be discussed in terms of their image (i.e., personality, appearance, qualities, etc.) than in terms of political issues by a ratio of 8 to 1. (p. 91)

Besides primarily focusing on image, the news coverage was also not neutral. Specifically, of the 42 stories coded when the candidates' wives were the primary focus, only approximately one fourth were neutral. Bystrom, McKinnon, and Chaney (1999) state that "Rodham Clinton was significantly more likely that Hanford Dole to receive negative coverage and Hanford Dole was significantly more likely to receive positive coverage" (p. 93). In contrast to Rodham Clinton's image, Hanford
Dole constructed herself, with the media’s help, as a “traditional” wife simply there to support her husband.

Jamieson (1995) argues that the media’s treatment of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton is a Rorschach test of the “evolution of women in our society” (p. 22). At the center of the public and private debate regarding Rodham Clinton are issues of women and power, marriage, children, and career choices.

The experiences of Hillary Rodham Clinton as spouse of a democratic contender as a First Partner are an ongoing demonstration of the power of cultural binds that enjoin women in general, and of the ways in which women continue to surmount or maneuver around.

(Jamieson, 1995, p. 52)

Thus, analysis of news stories of Rodham Clinton is an avenue for researchers to investigate the roles and expectations of women in our society.

The media coverage of First Ladies contributes to the public’s perception of these women. In the beginning of this political role, the press infrequently covered the First Lady and primarily focused on her social and domestic activities. As the role of the First Lady evolved and the media’s ability to convey information to
the public expanded, the coverage of women in this position became more extensive and detailed. With the advent of the numerous forms of media and the expanded political role of the First Lady, the media exposes the American public to more information regarding the First Lady and other political figures.

American First Ladies face an impossible task of representing all women, all wives, and all mothers (e.g., Campbell, 1996; Watson, 1997). By accepting the role of the “The American Woman,” these women inevitably fail to fulfill these high expectations. As women and society continue to change the “ideal” of what it means to be a woman, the multiple roles the First Lady must attempt to fulfill will also change. History illuminates the numerous transformations that American society has faced and the ways in which it responded to the often ambiguous definitions and expectations of our First Ladies.

Research Questions

As the role of the First Lady has evolved it has become more political. van Assendelft and Nye (1998) argue that the First Lady position has become so politicized that Republican presidential candidate Robert Dole suggested a debate between the two First Lady
"candidates". This open politicization of the First Lady role was an admission by Dole that the First Lady is really the person a heartbeat away from the President.

With the increased politicization of the First Lady the media coverage has become more pervasive; this coverage contributes to the public's conceptualization of her, and ultimately of all women (e.g., Campbell, 1996; Daugnton, 1995; Goodall, 1994; Marshall, 1996). Scholars need to investigate and critique how media "gatekeepers" present women, women political candidates, and the First Lady. Understanding the ways that the media constructs gender identities will help scholars recognize gender stereotypes, and begin to question and possibly expand these often-rigid gender roles.

An examination of both print and broadcast media is important to the study of the news coverage of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton because each medium is unique in its presentation of information. There is significant evidence that newspapers present more in-depth coverage of political issues and that people learn more factual information from this medium (e.g., Graber, 1997; Kahn, 1993, 1996). In contrast, television, by its ability to reach millions of people simultaneously with the same
images and by its use of visuals, which are excellent ways of transmitting realism and emotional appeal, also has an important political impact (Graber, 1997). Further, Trent and Friedenberg (1995) state “since 1963 American’s have named television as their primary and most believable news medium” (p. 94). Thus, investigation of both print and broadcast news stories allows for a more accurate understanding of the media’s depiction of the First Lady.

Because of the paucity of research regarding the news coverage of the First Lady, this study poses the following three research questions:

RQ1: How did the print media present First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton during her tenure as head of the National Health Care Reform Task Force?

RQ2: How did the national broadcast media present First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton during her tenure as head of the National Health Care Reform Task Force?
RQ3 Were there differences between the print and broadcast media’s presentation of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton during her tenure as head of the National Health Care Reform Task Force?
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Method

To determine how the news media constructed First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton during her appointment as head of the National Health Care Reform Task Force, I will compare and contrast the print and broadcast news stories focusing on her and health care reform. In addition to the language used by these media reports, this study will also investigate the broadcast news stories' use of visuals to construct the First Lady; televised messages consist of both verbal and visual elements and both contribute meaning to the overall story (e.g., Hahn, 1998; Nesbit, 1988). Thus, this study, by analyzing the language and visual representations of Rodham Clinton, will illuminate how the American press constructed a First Lady while she served in an important and influential political position.

By using newspaper articles from geographically diverse locations, The Los Angeles Times, The Washington Post, and USA Today, and stories from the three network news programs, ABC World News Tonight, CBS Evening News and NBC Nightly News, focusing on the First Lady and health care reform, this study is designed to give an
overall assessment of the construction of Hillary Rodham Clinton. Stories/articles were chosen using a keyword search of both print and broadcast archives for the selected time period of January 1993 through September 1994, which encompasses the time in which President Clinton initiated health care reform and Congress finally rejected the reform proposal.

Content Analysis

To examine, explicate, and appraise the news presentation of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton during her tenure as head of the National Health Care Reform Task Force both broadcast and print stories were content analyzed according to procedures set forth by Kaid and Wadsworth (1989). As one of the most frequently used methodologies in political, mass, and public communication (Frey, Botan, Friedman, & Kreps, 1989; Kaid & Wadsworth, 1989), content analysis is recognized as a powerful and valuable research tool for making objective, systematic, and usually quantitative (Kaid & Wadsworth, 1989) descriptions of communication context, and for making replicable and valid inferences from the data within the context that communication occurs (Krippendorff, 1980). Therefore, content analysis is a
useful methodology to examine, describe, and assess how the media constructed First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton during her tenure as head of the National Health Care Reform Task Force.

Similar to other methodological approaches, Kaid and Wadsworth (1989) state that content analysis begins with the formulation of research questions or hypothesis. The authors further outline content analytic procedures to include: (a) selecting the sample to be analyzed; (b) defining the categories to be applied; (c) outlining the coding process and training the coders who will implement the process; (d) implementing the coding process; (e) determining reliability and validity; and (f) analyzing the results of the coding process.

**Sample.**

One important step in content analysis is the selection of the sample to be analyzed. Because this study investigated two forms of media, there were different data collection strategies employed.

To collect the print media articles I conducted a keyword search using Hillary Rodham Clinton and health care reform of the online archives of The Los Angeles Times, The Washington Post, and USA Today. These
newspapers were chosen to represent the print media because their circulation size and regional location allowed for a broad representation of the print articles about Hillary Rodham Clinton and health care reform. To gather the broadcast network stories on ABC, CBS, and NBC I conducted the same keyword search of the Vanderbilt Television News Index and Abstracts.

These searches yielded the universe of stories that focused on the First Lady from the time she was appointed head of the National Health Care Reform Task Force until the Congress rejected the reform—January 1993 through September 1994. From this universe, I further narrowed the stories by collecting only news articles from the print media as opposed to more socially focused articles found in other sections of the paper. Thus, only including articles in the front (A) section of each paper kept the focus on the news of health care reform and the First Lady. In addition, I narrowed the volume of broadcast stories by collecting only stories that began in the first five minutes of the newscast; again, I narrowed the universe to include only news stories, as indicated by their early placement in the nightly newscast. Keeping the focus on news stories, as opposed
to including op-ed or lifestyle pieces, allowed for the exploration of how the media presented Hillary Rodham Clinton and the health care policy proposal she headed.

The sample size from these searches totaled 321 news stores/articles with 245 print articles and 76 broadcast stories for analysis. More specifically, there were 103 articles from The Washington Post, 93 from USA Today, and 49 from The Los Angeles Times with 20 broadcast stories presented by ABC, 33 by CBS, and 23 by NBC.

Categories.

Because the purpose of this research is to examine the print and broadcast media’s construction of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton during her tenure as head of the National Health Care Reform Task Force (January 1993 - September 1994), each article/story is the appropriate unit of analysis to code for content categories. Quantification was accomplished through frequencies with which the content attributes of each of the categories were selected by the coders. Hence, the 244 content attributes of each of the 44 categories were the units of enumeration.

Typically, in content analysis after the sample is collected, categories need to be defined to investigate
the unit of analysis, the news story/article. Due to the lack of research on the First Lady there are no existing sets of content analytic categories to utilize. In content analytic research there is often a need to create categories. Specifically, Krippendorff (1980) posits that because of the lack of agreed upon standardized categories, the researcher often has to develop her or his own categories to answer the questions posed in the research. The categories created must be exhaustive and mutually exclusive (Kaid & Wadsworth, 1989).

Because of the paucity of research on the First Lady, this study used Kahn’s (1993, 1996) and Kaid and Johnston’s (1991) categories to begin the development of a codebook and code sheet (see Appendixes A and B). Kahn developed categories for the investigation of news coverage of female political candidates; thus, these categories informed the categories used in this study by focusing on the gendered nature of news coverage of female political candidates. For example, this study narrowed Kahn’s list of 48 character traits the media focus on when constructing female politicians to include categories about the First Lady’s physical attributes.
The use of Kaid and Johnston’s (1991) categories investigating image characteristics and strategies deemed “masculine” and “feminine” in political communication and political science literature will illuminate the characteristics and strategies the media focused on when constructing Rodham Clinton. For instance, honesty/integrity (Kahn, 1993), and warmth/compassion (Kahn, 1993; Trent & Sabourin, 1993) are traditionally seen as feminine traits. In contrast, toughness/strength (Trent & Sabourin, 1993), competency (Mueller, 1986), aggressiveness (Pearson et. al., 1985; Trent & Sabourin, 1993), activity (Williams, 1994) have all been associated with “masculine” traits. This study investigates whether the media praise, criticize, and/or focus on these gendered traits when constructing First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Several other categories were added to the coding instrument for this study based on review of the literature. For example, categories were added to measure whom the media gave voice in the article/story. Thus, these categories measured whom the media quoted or paraphrased. As Derrida (1978) argues, language creates meaning, and the inclusion or exclusion of voices from
the health care reform debate contributes to the construction of this important issue. By giving voice to some while ignoring others the media legitimize some views while marginalizing and/or ignoring others (Roof & Wiegman, 1995). Hence, the voices present in the stories/articles illuminate whom the media privileged and whom they silenced.

Besides analyzing the voice given, categories were added to note how the print articles referred to the First Lady, and who used the titles, to add insight into the often treacherous territory of how to address women. Jamieson (1995) details this territory with an analysis of the changing expectations of how to address women. For example, the 1977 UPI Stylebook instructed reporters to refer to married women using their maiden name as Miss as opposed to Ms. The marital status of women has continued to be of interest and concern to journalists. As a further illustration, early in her career journalists insisted on calling Geraldine Ferraro (her maiden name) Geraldine Ferraro-Zaccaro in press to note her marital status even though she never used her husband’s name professionally. Further, the concern and fascination over First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton’s name led the Wall
Street Journal and NBC to sponsor a poll in January 1993 asking the public whether she should be called Hillary Clinton or Hillary Rodham Clinton (Jamieson, 1995). “By zeroing in on the names a women and not a man chooses to use, they [the media] refocus on difference. Simultaneously, they also implicitly deny a woman the power to self-identify” (Jamieson, 1995, p. 166).

Categories to investigate ABC, CBS, and NBC’s use of videos and graphics were added because of the importance and impact of television’s use of visuals (e.g., Hellweg, Pfau, & Brydon, 1992; Kern, 1989). Jamieson (1988) concludes, “visual images are more quickly comprehended and more readily retained than verbal ones” (p. 114). Further, Blair (1996) argues that visuals are very “influential in affecting attitudes and beliefs. A single visual image can probably be more powerful than a single verbal assertion . . . television programs . . . are enormously powerful influences on attitude and beliefs” (p. 23).

Coders noted if the broadcast stories used videos and/or graphics. Further, because of the impact of visuals coders also identified the people in the videos and whether the video related to the story. Finally,
Coders determined if the image presented in the video or graphic was positive, negative, or neutral by using definitions presented by Waldman and Devitt (1998). Waldman and Devitt maintain that visual representation may greatly influence the audience’s opinions and attitudes towards politicians. These authors argue that positive visuals are ones that depict a political person as: (a) smiling, (b) looking determined, (c) speaking at a podium, (d) speaking to political figures, (e) shaking hands, (f) with a cheering crowd, (g) smiling or attentive colleagues, (h) around the American flag (or other national objects) and (i) at eye level (camera is at the level of the person). In contrast, negative visuals show a political person as: (a) frowning, (b) looking sad or confused, (c) sitting reading, (d) alone or with inattentive others, (e) with no identifiable background, (f) looking up (the camera angle allows for a shot from above). Finally, Waldman and Devitt (1998) define neutral visuals as having no discernable positive or negative bias.

Further expanding and modifying the established categories, an issue category was used to measure how the media framed health care reform. Using issue categories
presented by Stemple (1991), this category will indicate what issues the media presented to the public as the most significant when considering health care reform. For example, framing health care with the economy, taxes, welfare, and/or education can impact the audience’s understanding of health care reform (e.g., Dearing & Rogers, 1986; Entman; Iyenger, 1991).

Thus, the codebook and code sheet developed for this study consists of established and emergent categories that measure the media’s construction of Hillary Rodham Clinton in an overtly political position as head of the National Health Care Reform Task Force. By focusing on such issues as what was said, who said it, how it was said, this coding instrument will help illuminate what the audience was told about Rodham Clinton and the health care reform she headed and helped develop.

Coding procedures.

Three coders, two female and one male, were recruited and trained to code the 321 news articles/stories using the written codebook and code sheet informed by categories defined by Kahn (1993) and Kaid and Johnston (1991), and using emergent categories for this study. Coders included two graduate students,
one in Political Communication, one in English, and one Letters' graduating senior.

Because of scheduling conflicts there were two, two-hour training sessions which were conducted in the same manner. At the first session, the male graduate student and the female graduating senior coders were trained, whereas the female graduate student coder was trained eight days later. During these sessions, the researcher discussed the general purpose of the study, had each coder read the codebook and code sheet, and then explained the categories and coding procedures while asking for questions. Next, the coders jointly coded a print article to help further clarify and identify areas of disagreement. In the session with the single coder the researcher and the coder jointly coded the same article and then compared those results with the ones from the previous training session.

When the coders appeared to understand the definition and application of the coding instrument, they next independently coded two more print articles. These results were not changed and were compared to additionally elucidate and distinguish areas of disagreements. Because the results of these three
articles indicated that the coders understood the coding instrument and the coding procedures, they independently coded a representative sample of the stories/articles to be analyzed in the study. Specifically, a random number table was used prior to the training session to select 17 stories/articles (5% of the total sample to be analyzed) to be coded individually by the coders. Coders completed the coding of the remaining 14 articles/stories individually within 10 days following the training sessions.

Using Holsti’s formula, intercoder reliability was calculated for each of the 45 categories, including the 244 individual variables defined in the coding instrument. Calculations of intercoder reliability on the 244 individual variables produced coefficients ranging from .68 (Characteristics mentioned about the First Lady) to 1.0 (e.g., medium; newspaper/network; date; length of the article/story; sex of the author; is the First Lady’s marital status mentioned; dominant combination story). Because of the problems with four overall categories, I re-trained one coder. Specifically, the following clarifications were made: (a) what constituted a biased analysis and an unnamed source in the category assessing
the voice in the media presentation and the category assessing who criticized the First Lady; (b) the difference between the First Lady's political power and her influence on the president; and finally, (c) the category inquiring about what the media mentioned about the First Lady investigates neutral coverage of her characteristics and traits as opposed to what the media criticize or praise about the First Lady. With this re-training session the coder re-coded the articles/stories and the lowest intercoder reliability coefficient rose to .81. Overall intercoder reliability for the coding instrument was .92.

Because intercoder coefficients of .80 or above are considered reliable (Kassarjian, as cited in Kaid & Wadsworth, 1989), the coders were asked to proceed to the actual coding stage. During conversations with the coders the researcher further verbally clarified a few categories and coding procedures based on observations during calculating intercoder reliability and the slightly revised codebook that reflected the clarifications discussed in the training sessions.

Each coder was randomly assigned 82 articles (one coded 81 articles) and a tape containing 26 broadcast
stories (one tape contained 25 stories). Thus, each coder received every third article/story from the sample organized chronologically. Coding was complete within five weeks of the initial training session.

Assessing validity.

As the stories/articles were not randomly drawn, the results of this study cannot be generalized to the larger population. Thus, the results will be used to describe this particular sample. Validity in content analytic studies revolves around "face validity"; hence, does the instrument actually measure what it purports to measure? The use of tested instruments is a way to assure validity (Kaid & Johnston, 1991). Because this study is exploratory and the coding instrument is largely untested to check face validity I re-examined parts of the sample to check qualitatively the quantitative results derived from the instrument. Qualitative examinations should be used to support the quantitative results (Krippendorff, 1980).

Data analysis.

Using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer software, frequency counts, and chi square tests were calculated to examine the print and
broadcast news construction of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton during her tenure as head of the National Health Care Reform Task Force.

To answer RQ1, which asks:

RQ1 How did the print media present First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton during her tenure as head of the National Health Care Reform Task Force?

RQ2, which asks:

RQ2 How did the broadcast media present First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton during her tenure as head of the National Health Care Reform Task Force?

and RQ3, which asks:

RQ3 Were there differences between the print and broadcast media’s presentation of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton during her tenure as the head of the National Health Care Reform Task Force?

the following statistical calculations were conducted:

First, frequencies and percentages were calculated on the individual categories. Further, select chi-square goodness of fit tests were administered on specific categories to further highlight how the media constructed Rodham Clinton and health care reform.
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Results

Analysis of the results of the content analysis of the print and broadcast sample reveals significant differences as well as similarities in the media’s construction of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton during her tenure as head of the National Health Care Reform Task Force.

Newspaper Coverage of Hillary Rodham Clinton and Health Care Reform

Results of the coding analysis of the 245 newspaper articles presented in The Los Angeles Times, The Washington Post, and USA Today indicate interesting findings about how the print media constructed a First Lady engaged in formulating public policy.

An examination of the print media reveals that there were different amounts of coverage among The Washington Post, The Los Angeles Times, and USA Today. Specifically, The Washington Post presented the most coverage of the First Lady and health care reform with 103 (42%) articles and USA Today’s coverage was similar with 93 (38%) articles. In contrast, The Los Angeles Times only presented 49 (20%) articles to inform their readers.
Because the articles were collected from online archives the traditional manner of counting column inches for article length was not employed. Instead coders noted page length of the downloaded articles to explore the depth of coverage readers of the newspapers received. Thus, by coding the articles in .25 intervals the results reveal that 51.4% of the articles were between 1.50 - 2.25 pages. Additionally, only 8.4% of the articles were over 4 pages in length.

Results reveal differences in the distribution of author gender as well. Specifically, 53.1% (130) of the articles about Rodham Clinton and health care were written by women. In contrast, men authored these articles only 31% (76) of the time. The remaining articles were either jointly written by men and women (8.6%, 21) or were not attributed to a specific author (7.3%, 18).

Coders noted the headlines, headline language, the overall slant of the article, and the use of the First Lady in the first sentence. The First Lady was mentioned in 41.2% (101) of the headlines and the language used in the headlines was predominately neutral (see Table 1).

--- Insert Table 1 here ---
The results in Table 1 also suggest similarities in the amount of language that was positive (16.3%, 40), negative (13.9%, 34), or a combination of both positive and negative (12.7%, 31). In contrast to those similarities, there were differences in the slant of the articles. Neutral was the most common slant used in these articles (47.8%, 117) (see Table 1). As the results in Table 1 demonstrate, 29.4% (72) of the articles used a combination of positive and negative slant, with 6.9% (17) being solely negative and 15.9% (39) being solely positive. Finally, the print media referred to the First Lady in 131 (53.5%) first sentences.

Results indicate that a variety of voices were represented in these articles. The First Lady was the person given voice the most often (47.8%, 117). Other political figures were similarly quoted or paraphrased: (a) a Democrat (43.2%, 106), (b) a Presidential Advisor, (42.8%, 105), (c) a Republican (35.1%, 86), and (d) President Clinton (24.8%, 61). In contrast, experts (20.8%, 51), and the public (13.8%, 34) were not included as often. (The percentages total to more than 100% because coders noted all voices included in the print article.)
Besides who was given voice, the coders determined who was the dominant voice in the article. As Table 2 illustrates, First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton (20.0%, 48) was the dominant voice when the coders could clearly delineate a dominant voice.

The articles were classified into four basic categories and coders determined that "political" was the predominant focus of the article. Specifically, 94.3% (231) of the newspaper articles were political in nature, only .04% (1) focused on social aspects, and 4.5% (11) represented a combination of the political and the social. Coders found no stories to include in the "other" category provided. When the article focused on political, the author presented different specifics about the political nature of the information. Health care reform was the focus of most of the articles (88.2%, 216) with Rodham Clinton's political power a distant second (40.4%, 99). Other focuses included other political issues (31.0%, 76), the First Lady's influence on President Clinton (13.5%, 33), and Clinton Administration Scandals (5.3%, 13). In addition, coders noted the dominant political focus of these print articles. Results indicate the dominant political focus was health care reform.
(70.6% 173) with Rodham Clinton's political influence the second most dominant focus (9%, 22) (see Table 2).

The only article, presented by The Los Angeles Times on January 15, 1994, that focused on the social, as opposed to the political, mentioned numerous elements associated with the social domain. Specifically, this newspaper article focused on the First Lady's appearance, charity work, marriage, social functions, professional qualifications, and her violation of the First Lady role.

In the 11 articles that focused on a combination between the political and the social, coders noted a variety of elements mentioned about the First Lady. The most common elements were Rodham Clinton's political power (3.7%, 9), her influence on the President (3.3%, 8), health care reform, (3.7%, 9), her marriage (2.9%, 7), the social functions of the First Lady (3.7%, 9), and her past history (2.9%, 7). There were also different elements that the newspapers chose to dominantly focus on these articles (see Table 2). The most frequent dominant combination focuses were the First Lady's political power (15.4%, 2), and motherhood/Chelsea (15.4%, 2).

The newspapers criticized the First Lady in 19.6% (48) of the articles. This criticism came from
Reporter/anchor/media person(s) most often (9.4%, 23), with Republicans criticizing 4.9% (12) of the time. The least likely sources of criticism were Democrats (1.6%, 4), experts (1.6%, 4), the public (1.2%, 3), and, the President (.4%, 1). Table 2 reveals that reporters/anchors/media persons were the most dominant source of criticism in the print media article (40.8%, 20). Biased analysis (12.2%, 6), Republicans (10.2%, 5), and “other” sources (10.2%, 5) were the next most likely dominant sources of criticism. In contrast, the least likely sources of criticism were Democrats (6.1%, 3), the public (4.1%, 2), and experts (2.0%, 1).

As with the different people who criticized the First Lady, there were also different things she was criticized for. Political issues (8.2%, 20), her performance/success (6.1%, 15) and her political influence (6.1%, 15) were the three items most often criticized. The First Lady’s qualifications (.4%, 1), marriage/mothering/family (.4%, 1), values/morals (.4%, 1), and appearance (.4%, 1) did not draw much criticism.

Similar to the type of criticism, the coders noted a variety of items emerging as a dominant criticism in these newspaper articles. Table 2 suggests the variety
while highlighting the most dominant criticism. Rodham Clinton’s performance/success (17.6%, 9), her stance on political issues other than health care (17.6%, 9), and her political influence (17.6%, 9) were the focus of the dominant criticism in the newspapers. Her honesty (11.8%, 6) and political ideology (11.8%, 6) were also targets for criticism. In contrast, the articles did not focus the criticism on her toughness/strength (2.0%, 1), aggressiveness (2.0%, 1), or qualifications (2.0%, 1).

Besides being criticized, the results of the data indicate the First Lady was also praised in these articles. Specifically, she was praised 25.7% (63) of the time. The people that praised her most were (a) Democrats (7.8%, 19), (b) the public (6.5%, 16), (c) reporters/anchors/media persons (6.1%, 15), and (d) Republicans (4.9%, 12). Whereas Rodham Clinton received less praise from presidential advisors (3.7%, 9), experts (3.3%, 8), or the President (2.9%, 7). Similarly, the dominant source of criticism emerged from those most likely to praise the First Lady (see Table 2).

--- Insert Table 2 here ---

As with the criticism leveled against First Lady Rodham Clinton, she was also praised on a variety of
items. Results indicate she was praised most for her competency (15.5%, 38), performance/success (13.5%, 33), and activeness (10.2%, 25). The articles were less likely to praise the First Lady about her: (a) honesty/integrity (4.1%, 10), (b) warmth/compassion (3.3%, 8), (c) aggressiveness (3.36%, 8), (d) qualifications (2.4%, 6), (e) political ideology (.8%, 2), (f) First Lady role (4.1%, 10), (g) marriage/mothering/family (.4%, 1), (h) values/morals (3.7%, 9), and/or (i) appearance (1.2%, 3).

The dominant focus of the praise was also wide in scope. Table 2 suggests that over 50% of the dominant praise centered on either the First Lady’s competency (33.8%, 22) or her performance/success (23.1%, 15). Further, less than 8% of the dominant praise was for her First Lady role (4.6%, 3) or her honesty/integrity (3.1%, 2).

In addition to praise and criticism, this study investigated what was mentioned about the First Lady. First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton’s political influence was mentioned in 42.9% (105) of the articles. Her activeness (41.2%, 101), political issues (33.1%, 81), competency (25.3%, 62), and performance/success (23.3%, 57) also drew the print media’s attention.
As with the previous categories, coders determined the dominant focus of the items mentioned about the First Lady. Results in Table 2 demonstrate the different dominant foci of the articles. The table shows the First Lady’s political influence was mentioned dominantly in 27.8% (65) of the articles. Her activeness (17.9%, 42) and political issues (16.7%, 39) were also a dominant focus.

Results indicate a variety of issues besides public health (96.7%, 237) presented in the print media’s construction of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton and health care reform. Political and governmental acts (40.8%, 100), the economy (37.6%, 92), and ethics, (21.9%, 56) were the most common issues presented besides public health. Taxes (19.2%, 47) and general human interest (14.7%, 36) were also issues the print media focused upon when informing the public. Table 2 indicates that the dominant issue in these articles was public health (70.6%, 173) with general human interest (6.9%, 17) a very distant second.

The titles or manners of address the print media used for First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton also varied in these dailies. Results suggest the most frequently used
mode of address was Hillary Clinton (74.7%, 183). Hillary Rodham Clinton (63.3%, 155) and First Lady (49.0%, 120) were the second and third most often used titles. First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton was used as a mode of address 32.2% (79) of the time, with Clinton (17.6%, 43), Hillary (16.7%, 41), Mrs. Clinton (13.5%, 33), and Clinton’s (12.2%, 30) all being used to address the First Lady as well. These manners of address are similar to the dominant manners of address (see Table 2). Specifically, when the coders could distinguish a dominant mode of address Hillary Clinton was used in 24.2% (59) of the articles. First Lady was also a popular dominant title for Rodham Clinton as it was used in 11.9% (29) of the newspapers.

In addition to mode of address, this study collected data on whether the First Lady’s martial status was mentioned besides the use of Mrs. or First Lady to denote her relationship to the President. Thirty point two percent (74) of the articles did mention her marital status. Results demonstrate that while many people mentioned her marital status no one source category dominated this form of address.
Finally, the coders noted if First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton’s daughter, Chelsea, was mentioned in the articles. Chelsea Clinton was only mentioned in 4.9% (12) of the 245 print articles.

Broadcast Coverage of Hillary Rodham Clinton and Health Care Reform

Results of the coding of the 76 broadcast news stories from the national nightly newscasts of ABC, CBS, and NBC offer interesting information about the construction of Rodham Clinton as she headed the National Health Care Reform Task Force.

An examination of the broadcast media reveals that there were different amounts of coverage among ABC, CBS, and NBC. Specifically, CBS aired the most coverage of the First Lady and health care reform with 33 (43%) stories; whereas, ABC (20, 26.3%), and NBC’s (23, 30.3%) coverage was less and more similar in amount.

Coders were asked to note the length of the story to illustrate the depth of the broadcast stories when informing the public about Rodham Clinton and health care reform. Twenty-nine percent of the stories were 2-2.10 minutes in length and 61.8% of the stories were shorter
than three minutes. Thus, the broadcast media kept the reporting to shorter segments.

Results reveal little differences in the distribution of reporter gender. Specifically, 27.6% (21) of the stories about Rodham Clinton and health care were reported by women, 38.2%, (29) by men, and 32.9%, (25) were reporter/presented jointly by men and women, and only 1.3% (1) were unattributed.

Coders noted the lead-in, lead, lead-in language, and the overall slant of the story. The First Lady was mentioned in 36.8% (28) of the lead-ins, and in 42.1% (32) of the leads. Further, Table 3 suggests that the language used in the lead-ins was predominately neutral (39.5%, 30) or a combination of positive and negative (34.2%, 26). Further, Table 3 demonstrates that the networks used story slants that were either neutral, 40.8% (31) or a combination of positive and negative 30.3% (23). In addition, there was not a large difference between the use of a positive (14.5%, 11) or negative (11.8%, 9) slants in these network news stories.

Results highlight a variety of voices represented in these stories; the First Lady was the person given voice most often (86.8%, 66). With other political figures
similarly quoted or paraphrased: (a) President Clinton (44.7%, 34), (b) Republicans (39.5%, 30), (c) Democrats (34.2%, 26), and (d) Presidential Advisors (30.2%, 23). In contrast, the public (22.4%, 17), and experts (19.7%, 15) were not included as often. (The percentages total to more than 100% because coders noted all voices in the story.)

Besides who was given voice, the coders also determined who was the dominant voice in the stories. As Table 4 illustrates, reporters/media people (27.6%, 21) was the dominant category of voice when the coders could clearly delineate a dominant voice. The First Lady was the second most dominant voice in the stories (13.2%, 10).

The stories were categorized into four themes, political, social, combination of political and social, and an "other" category to capture stories that do not fit in the preceding categorization scheme. Political was the predominant focus of the broadcast news stories. Specifically, 98.7% (75) broadcast stories were political in nature, 1.3% (1) representing a combination of the political and the social, and there were no social or other stories during this time. When the stories focused
on political, the reporter presented different specifics about the political nature of the information. Health care reform was the focus of most of the stories (96.1%, 73), political issues (55.3%, 42) the second most focused upon element of the political stories, and Rodham Clinton's political power the third (42.1%, 32). Other foci included the First Lady's influence on President Clinton (10.5%, 8), and Clinton Administration Scandals (5.3%, 4). The dominant political focus was health care reform (64.5%, 49) with political issues (11.8%, 9) and Rodham Clinton's political influence (10.5%, 8) the second and third most dominant focus respectively, (see Table 4).

The combination story, aired by CBS on February 4, 1993, primarily focused on politics as well. As with the political stories, there were also a variety of elements mentioned about the First Lady. This story mentioned the First Lady's political power, her influence on the President, health care reform, motherhood/Chelsea, the social functions of the First Lady, and her violation of the First Lady role. Her political power was the dominant focus of this singular combination story.
The networks criticized the First Lady in 19.7% (15) of the articles. Republicans criticized her the most (14.5%, 11) with reporter/anchor/media criticizing 9.2% (7) of the time. The least likely sources of criticism were Democrats (2.6%, 2), experts (1.3%, 1), and the public (0%, 0). Table 4 explicates that Republicans were the dominant source of criticism in the stories (9.2%) and reporters/anchors/media persons were the second most dominant source of criticism (6.6%, 5).

As with the different people who criticized the First Lady, there were also different things she was criticized about. Political issues (14.5%, 11) and her political ideology (5.3%, 4) were the two items most often criticized. In contrast, there was no criticism leveled about her performance/success, aggressiveness, past qualifications, political influence, marriage/mothering/family life, values/morals, or appearance.

Similar to the criticism, the stories also had a variety of items for the dominant criticism. Table 4 indicates Rodham Clinton’s political ideology (5.3%, 4) and political issues (5.3%, 4) were the focus of the dominant criticism in the networks. Her activeness (3.9%,
3) and political scandals (3.9%, 3) were also targets for criticism.

Besides being criticized, the results of the data indicate the First Lady was also praised in these news stories. Specifically, she was praised 13.2% (10) of the time. The people that praised her the most were (a) reporters/anchors/media persons (5.3%, 4), (b) the President (2.6%, 2), and (c) Republicans (2.6%, 2). Whereas Rodham Clinton received less praise from the public (1.3%, 1) or Democrats (1.3%, 1), and no praise from experts or presidential advisors. Similarly, the dominant source of criticism emerged from those most likely to praise the First Lady (see Table 4).

As with the criticism leveled against First Lady Rodham Clinton, she was also praised on a variety of items. Specifically, she was praised most for her competency (5%, 6.6): whereas the stories were less likely to praise the First Lady about her: (a) honesty/integrity (2.6%, 2), (b) toughness/strength (2.6%, 2), (c) warmth/compassion (2.6%, 2), (d) performance/success (2.6%, 2), (e) political ideology (2.6%, 2), (f) qualifications (1.3%, 1), and (g) political issues (1.3%, 1).
The dominant focus of the praise illustrates interesting results. Table 4 indicates that 50% of the dominant praise was for the First Lady's competency (50.0%, 5) and 20% (2) was for her activeness. Further, 10% (1) of the praise the First Lady received dominantly focused on her performance/success or her appearance, respectively.

In addition to praise and criticism, this study also investigated what the broadcast stories mentioned about the First Lady. Specifically, political issues were mentioned in 61.8% (47) of the stories, and her political influence was mentioned in 56.6% (43) of the stories. Her activeness (46.1%, 35) and competency (34.2%, 26) also drew the broadcast media's attention.

Similar to the previous categories, coders determined the dominant focus of the items mentioned about the First Lady. Table 4 demonstrates the different dominant foci of the stories. As the table shows, political issues (26.3%, 20) was the dominant focus with the First Lady's political influence (25.0%, 19) and activeness (19.7%, 125) also dominantly focused upon by the networks.
The issues mentioned by the broadcast media were investigated. Results indicate a variety of issues besides public health (98.7%, 75) presented in the construction of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton and health care reform. For instance, political and governmental acts (85.5%, 65), the economy (51.3%, 39), and taxes (51.3%, 39) were the most common issues presented besides public health. Social Security and elderly issues (28.9%, 22), ethics (18.4%, 14), and general human interest (17.1%, 13) were also issues the networks focused upon when informing the public. Table 4 suggests that the dominant issue in these stories was public health (63.2%, 48) with political and governmental acts (17.1%, 13) a distant second.

The titles or manner of address used by the broadcast news networks to denote First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton also varied in these news stories. Results indicate the most frequently used mode of address was Hillary Clinton (63.2%, 48). Mrs. Clinton (52.6%, 40) and First Lady (35.5%, 27) were the second and third most often used titles. Hillary Rodham Clinton was used as a mode of address 14.5% (11) of the time with First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton (5.3%, 4), Clinton (1.3%, 1),
Hillary (2.6%, 2), and Clinton’s (11.8%, 9) all being used to address the First Lady as well. These manners of address are similar to the dominant manners of address (see Table).

--- Insert Table 4 here ---

When coders could distinguish a dominant mode of address Mrs. Clinton was used in 25.0% (19) of the broadcast stories and Hillary Clinton (22.4%, 17) was a popular dominant title for Rodham Clinton (see Table 4).

In addition to mode of address, this study collected data on whether the First Lady’s marital status was mentioned besides the use of Mrs. or First Lady to denote her relationship to the President. Forty three point four percent (33) of the broadcast stories did mention her marital status, and results in Table 4 illustrate that the story reporter or network anchor (40.8%, 31) were the predominate source to mention her marital status.

Coders further noted if First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton’s daughter, Chelsea, was mentioned in the broadcasts. Chelsea Clinton was only mentioned in 1.3% (1) of the 76 network stories about the First Lady and health care reform.
Because television is a visual media, this study collected data about the use of video and graphics in these stories. Eighty five point five percent (65) of the network stories presented video in the reporting. First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton was featured in the videos the most (82.9%, 63). Besides the First Lady, the video also starred unidentified people (40.8%, 31), the President (32.9%, 63), the public (28.9%, 22), and elected Democratic officials (17.1%, 13). In addition to who was in the video, results reveal the video related to the story 71.1% (54) of the time, and 53.9% (41) of the time presented a positive image, as opposed to a negative (9.2%, 7) or neutral (22.4%, 17) image. Finally, only 15.8% (12) of the newscasts presented a graphic of the First Lady with the image of her. The graphics presented split evenly between positive (6.6%, 5) and negative (6.6%, 5).

Differences in the Print and Broadcast Media’s Construction of Hillary Rodham Clinton and Health Care Reform

Analysis of the results of the coding of the 245 newspaper articles and the 76 network nightly news broadcast stories indicate differences in the coverage
offered to the audiences of the print and broadcast mediums.

Results from the print and broadcast media reveal that there were different amounts of coverage between the two types of media outlets. Specifically, the print media presented 244 articles whereas the broadcast media only presented 76 stories during the same period. Thus, of the total 321 news articles/stories used in this sample, print articles accounted for 76.3% of the coverage with broadcast stories accounting for merely 23.4%.

There are differences in the distribution of the gender of the authors and the reporters. Specifically, results reveal women wrote 53.1% (130) of the print articles about Rodham Clinton and health care whereas women only reported 27.6% (21) of the broadcast stories. In contrast, men authored the articles 31% (76) of the time and they reported the stories 38.2% (29) of the time. Thus, the print media relied more heavily on women and the broadcast media utilized men more frequently in their reporting. The remaining articles were either jointly written by men and women (8.6%, 21) or were not attributed to a specific author (7.3%, 18), and the
remaining stories were predominately jointly reported (32.9%, 25) with only one story unattributed (1.3%).

Coders also noted the headlines/lead-ins, language used, first sentences/leads, and the overall slant of the articles and stories. The First Lady was mentioned in 41.2% (101) of the headlines and in 36.8% (28) of the lead-ins. In addition, the language used in the headlines and the lead-in was predominately neutral. Further, results reveal little differences in the amount of language that was positive (print=16.3%, 40; broadcast=14.5%, 11), and negative (print=13.9%, 34; broadcast 11.8%, 9). In contrast, there were more dramatic differences between the newspapers' use of a combination of both positive and negative language (12.7%, 31) and the networks' use of combination language (34.2%, 26). Finally, the newspapers and networks differed in their use of the First Lady in the first sentence/lead (print=53.5%, 131; broadcast=42.1%, 32).

Additionally, there were similarities between the slant of the article and story. Neutral was the most common slant used in the print articles (47.8%, 117) as well as in the broadcast stories (40.8%, 31). Twenty nine point four percent (72) of the articles used a
combination of positive and negative slant, with 6.9% (17) being solely negative, and 15.9% (39) being solely positive. Likewise, the broadcast stories followed a similar pattern with 30.3% (23) of the stories using a combination story slant, 11.8% (9) being solely negative, and 17.1% (13) solely positive.

Results also indicate a similarity in the variety of voices represented in these print articles and broadcast stories. The First Lady was the person given voice the most often (print=47.8%, 117; broadcast=86.8%, 66). Other political figures were similarly quoted or paraphrased: (a) President Clinton (print=24.9%, 61; broadcast=44.7%, 34), (b) Democrats (print=43.3%, 106; broadcast=34.2%, 26), (c) Republicans (print=35.1%, 86; broadcast=39.5%, 30), and (d) Presidential Advisor(s) (print=42.9%, 105; broadcast=30.3%, 23). In contrast, experts (print=20.8%, 51; broadcast=19.7%, 15), and the public (print=13.9%, 34; broadcast=22.4%, 17) were not included as often. (The percentages total to more than 100% because coders noted all voices present.)

In addition to who was given voice, the coders also determined who was the dominant voice in the print articles and in the broadcast stories. First Lady Hillary
Rodham Clinton was the dominant voice (19.6%, 48) when the coders could clearly delineate a dominant voice in the articles while the reporter/media person (27.6%, 21) was dominant in the broadcast stories.

"Political" was the predominant focus of the newspaper articles and the network stories. Specifically, 94.3% (231) of the newspaper articles were political in nature and 98.7% (75) of the network stories were also politically focused. In contrast to this similarity, the print media provided more variety in their presentation by utilizing focuses on social (.4%, 1) and a combination of the political and the social (4.5%, 11); whereas the broadcast media only presented one other type of story—combination (1.3%, 1).

When the articles/stories focused on political, the author/reporter presented different specifics about the political nature of the information. Health care reform was the focus of most of the print articles (88.2%, 216) and most of the broadcast stories (96.1%, 73). Rodham Clinton's political power was the second most focused on element of the political information (40.4%, 99) in the print media; in contrast, the networks focused more on other political issues (55.3%, 42). The dominant
political focus for both mediums was health care reform (print=70.6%, 173, broadcast=64.5%, 49), with Rodham Clinton’s political influence the second most dominant focus (9%, 22) in the print media and other political issues being slightly more dominant (11.8%, 9) than her political influence (10.5, 8%) in the broadcast media.

The newspapers and networks criticized the First Lady similarly (print 19.6%, 48, broadcast=19.7%, 15). Differences emerged when investigating the source of the criticism. Specifically, reporter/anchor/media person(s) most often criticized her (9.4%, 23) in the newspapers with Republicans criticizing her most in the network stories (14.5%, 11). The least likely sources of criticism were the President (print=.4%, 1; broadcast=0), Democrats (print=1.6%, 4; broadcast=2.6%, 2), experts (print=1.6%, 4; broadcast=1.3%, 1), and the public (print=1.2%, 3; broadcast=0). Finally, reporters/anchors/media persons were the most dominant source of criticism in the articles (40.8%, 20) with Republicans being the dominant source of criticism in the stories (46.7%, 7).

As with the different people who criticized the First Lady, there were also different things she was
criticized about. Political issues was the most often criticized category in both the print (8.2%, 20) and the broadcast (14.5%, 11) mediums. In contrast, her performance/success was of concern in the articles (6.1%, 15) but drew no criticism from the network stories.

The print articles and broadcast stories also had a variety of items for the dominant criticism. Rodham Clinton's performance/success (17.6%, 9), her stance on political issues other than health care (17.6%, 9), and her political influence (17.6%, 9) were the focus of the dominant criticism in the newspapers. In the broadcast stories her political ideology (25.0%, 4) and other political issues (25.0%, 4) drew the most dominant criticism. Thus, the broadcast media did not focus on her performance/success (0%) or her political influence (0%) as the print media did.

Besides being criticized, the results of the data indicate the First Lady was also praised in these newspaper articles and television stories. Interestingly, the print media praised her in 25.7% (63) of the articles while the broadcast media praised her less (13.2%, 10). Further differences between the mediums are illustrated in the people that praised Rodham Clinton. The newspapers
relied on Democrats (7.8%, 19), the public (6.5%, 16), and Republicans (4.9%, 12) for the primary sources of praise. In contrast, the networks presented praise from reporters/anchors/media people (5.3%, 4) the most with the President (2.6%, 2) and Republicans (2.6%, 2) the second most likely sources of praise. Similarly, there were different dominant sources of criticism emerging from those most likely to criticize the First Lady. Specifically, the print media relied on reporters/media personal to criticize the First Lady most often (40.8%) whereas the broadcast media left the dominant criticism to the Republicans (14.5%).

As with the criticism leveled against First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton, she was also praised on a variety of items. The results indicate she was praised most for her competency (print=15.5%, 38; broadcast=6.6%, 5). The second most common source of praise from the newspaper articles was her performance/success (13.5%, 33), with the second most praised item in the broadcast stories being her activeness (3.9%, 3).

The dominant focus of the praise was also wide in scope for the print media while being narrower for the broadcast media. Specifically, over 50% of the articles'
dominant praise was about either the First Lady's competency (33.8%, 22) or her performance/success (23.1%, 15). Similarly, 60% of the praise from the network stories came from her competency (50%, 5) and her performance/success (10%, 1).

In addition to praise and criticism, this study investigated what was mentioned about the First Lady. The 245 articles and 76 stories analyzed mentioned a variety of items about Rodham Clinton. First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton's political influence was mentioned the most in 42.9% (105) of the articles; it was the second (56.6%, 43) highest mentioned item in the broadcast stories with political issues being first (61.8%, 47). Her activeness (print=41.2%, 101; broadcast=46.1%, 35), competency (print=25.3%, 62; broadcast=34.2%, 26), and performance/success (print=23.3%, 57; broadcast=13.2%, 10) also drew the media's attention.

As with the previous categories, coders determined the dominant focus of the items mentioned about the First Lady. The newspaper articles and network stories differed in the focus of the dominant praise offered about Rodham Clinton. In the print articles, the First Lady's political influence was dominantly mentioned in 27.8%
(65) of the time. Her activeness (17.9%, 42) and political issues (16.7%, 39) were also dominantly focused upon. In contrast, the broadcast stories presented political issues (26.3%, 20) as the most dominant source of praise with Rodham Clinton’s political influence a close second (25.0%, 19).

The issues mentioned by the print and broadcast media were investigated to help indicate the media’s construction of the First Lady and health care reform. Results indicate a variety of issues besides public health (print=96.7%, 237; broadcast=98.7%, 75) being used by the mediums. Specifically, the economy was the most frequent issue in both print (37.6%, 92) and broadcast (51.3%, 39) presentations and in the broadcast media taxes was presented as equally important (51.3%, 39). In contrast, the second most often presented issue in the network stories was Social Security and elderly issues (28.9%, 22) as opposed to newspapers’ focus on political and governmental acts (40.8%, 100). The different mediums similarly presented ethics (print=22.9%, 56, broadcast=18.4%, 14) and general human interest (print=14.7%, 36, broadcast=17.1%, 13) as issues corresponding to the First Lady and health care reform.
Finally, the dominant issue in these articles and stories was public health (70.6%, 173, 63.2%, 48) with general human interest (6.9%, 17) a distant second in the print articles and political and governmental acts (17.1%, 13) a distant second in the broadcast stories.

The titles or manners of address used to denote First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton also varied in these print articles and broadcast stories. The results indicate the most frequently used mode of address was Hillary Clinton (print=74.7%, 183; broadcast=63.2%, 48). Hillary Rodham Clinton (63.3%, 155) and First Lady (49.0%, 120) were the second and third most often used titles in the print media. The broadcast media also relied on First Lady (35.5%, 27) and Hillary Rodham Clinton (14.5%, 11) as forms of address but the second most often used form of address was Mrs. Clinton (52.6%, 40). When the coders could distinguish a dominant mode of address Hillary Clinton was used in 24.2% (59) of the articles and Mrs. Clinton was used in 25% (19) of the news stories. Hillary Clinton (22.4%, 17) was the second most common dominant form of address in the broadcast stories with First Lady being the second most popular
dominant title for Rodham Clinton in the newspapers as it was used in 11.9% (29) of the articles.

In addition to the mode of address, this study collected data on whether the First Lady’s marital status was mentioned besides the use of Mrs. or First Lady to denote her relationship to the President. Thirty-two point two percent (74) of the print articles did mention her marital status and 43.4% (33) of the broadcast stories did as well. Although many people mentioned her marital status, no one person(s) dominated this form of address in the print media. In contrast, reporters/anchors (40.8%, 31) were clearly the dominant source to focus on the First Lady’s marital status in the broadcast stories.
Chapter V
Discussion

The goal of this study is to contribute to the paucity of scholarship on First Ladies and on women in politics. Through a content analysis of 245 newspaper articles and 76 broadcast stories focusing on First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton and health care reform from January 1993 through September 1994, this study was designed to investigate the news coverage of a First Lady in an overtly political position—Hillary Rodham Clinton as head of President Clinton’s National Health Care Reform Task Force. Thus, this study helps illuminate the manner in which the media construct a politically active and politically powerful First Lady, adding insight into the media treatment of other politically active and politically powerful women.

This chapter will address the implications of the results from the print media, broadcast media, and the implications of the differences found between the mediums’ coverage of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton and health care reform. In addition, this chapter will delineate the study’s limitations, and offer suggestion for future research.
Print Media Implications

The most obvious implication of these data is that the newspapers presented differing amounts of articles for their readers. As previously stated, The Washington Post (43%, 103) and USA Today (38%, 93) were similar in the amount of coverage with The Los Angeles Times (20%, 49) presenting approximately 50% less articles. A chi-square, goodness of fit test, indicates a significant difference in the amount of coverage by the dailies $X^2_{(2)} = 20.212$, $p < .0001$. Graber (1997) argues that print media excel at conveying factual details and are "viewed by most people as sources of information" (p. 190). Schudson (1995) states that "when the media offer the public an item of news, they confer upon it public legitimacy. . . . [The coverage] also provides a certification of importance" (p. 19). Thus, when The Los Angeles Times limited their coverage of the First Lady and health care reform their readers may have seen the issue as less important.

Another interesting and easily identified characteristic of these stories is the gender of the authors. Specifically, more women authored these articles (130) than male (76), joint (21), and can not determine
A chi-square goodness of fit test revealed a significant difference from the expected distribution of author gender and the actual distribution in these articles. Weaver (1997) denotes that women reporters are more common in print than in the broadcast media. Specifically, Weaver states that in 1992 women made-up 44.1% of the daily newspaper workforce and only 24.8% of the broadcast workforce.

Additionally, Shoemaker and Reese (1991) maintain that author/reporter individual characteristics can and do impact the stories s/he writes. Specifically, his/her background, attitudes, values, and beliefs all factor into the process of defining, constructing, and reporting the news. Thus, as Postman (1992) argues "every news story is a reflection of the reporter who tells the story" (p. 15). Thus, women journalists bring different experiences to the job because of their different life experiences (Mills, 1997).

Scholars have investigated and critiqued the objectivity of the content presented in the media and objectivity has been an ideal for journalists (e.g., Bennett, 1996; Davis, 1990; Entman, 1993; Gitlin, 1980; & Lippmann, 1922) for the better part of the 20th century.
Results from this study indicate that neutrality, if not objectivity, does seem to be the most predominant mode of communicating information. Specifically, as Table 1 illustrates, the newspapers primarily used neutral language in their headlines. For example, The Washington Post's March 19, 1993 headline, Health Care Plan Modeled on HMOs: 1973 Act Used as Guideline, has no language that indicates either approval or disapproval for the modeling of health care reform after the HMO example. In contrast, the language used in the headline by the same paper on October 30, 1993, First Lady, GOP Leaders Enjoy Amiable Health Care Debate, which positively conveys the actions of Rodham Clinton and unnamed Republicans. While the papers did not use a lot of negative headlines the ones chosen were often bluntly stated. For instance, USA Today's headline February 2, 1993, Hillary is a Poor Choice, was an overt criticism of the First Lady heading the National Health Care Reform Task Force. Finally, there were also those headlines that both praised and criticized perhaps in an attempt to balance the coverage. USA Today's January 26, 1993 headline, Search for Healthcare Solutions gets top priority High-power role puts First Lady in Hot Seat, both praises the concern over
health care while insinuating problems for Hillary Clinton.

With the language of the headlines setting the tone it is not surprising that neutrality in the overall print article was the most common slant as well. Although the primary slant of the articles was neutral (see Table 1) when the story was slanted negatively the First Lady was often hit hard. As the USA Today February 2, 1993 article demonstrates, the initial negative headline lead into an equally negative story. The author started his story with his criticism of President Clinton for “[naming] his wife ‘czarina’ of health-care reform” (p. 10A) and ended with him questioning her credibility and her qualifications “During the campaign, Bill Clinton made health care a top issue. It is too important to be entrusted to amateurs” (P. 10A).

Whether the dailies presented the information neutrally or slanted it in a positive or negative manner, the print media used the First Lady to draw readers by mentioning her in the headline and the first sentence. She was mentioned in 41.2% of the headlines, and in 53.5% of the first sentences. Thus, the newspapers obviously relied on her name to garner readership.
In addition to using the First Lady in the headline and/or the first sentence, the newspapers also privileged Rodham Clinton’s voice. They used her words in 117 (47.8%) articles (see Table 2). Using her words in these articles was to be expected, but the lack of public voice is disturbing. The public was only given voice in 34 (13.9%) articles. While some articles used quotes and paraphrases to give the public a voice in this momentous proposed change to their health care system, polls were the predominate manner through which the public was allowed to speak. Bennett (1996) posits that feedback from the public is needed to keep a democracy vital and that polling is an ineffective and imperfect mode of obtaining such feedback. Polls are conducted to help design communication campaigns and to help shape public opinion. Thus, the results from these measures are suspect since polls are not there to record reactions to events, they are there to shape the events. Hence, when constructing health care reform the print media’s reliance on official political sources (see Table 2) and their virtual silencing of the reactions and thoughts of the public limited the audience’s knowledge of the
public’s thoughts and views of Hillary Rodham Clinton and health care reform.

Coverage of First Ladies has primarily focused on the social aspects of the role. As mentioned previously, even when a First Lady was involved in more politically focused projects the media still constructed her and her activities based on the social expectations of a wife (e.g., Benze, 1990, Garoli, 1995, Gould, 1996). This study investigated whether the focus of these print and broadcast articles/stories about Rodham Clinton and health care focused on the political, the social, or combined the political and the social when constructing the First Lady and health care reform. Contrary to what happened to First Lady Rosalynn Carter in a press conference to announce President Carter’s Commission on Mental Health (Caroli, 1995), this time the print media kept the focus on politics as opposed to the social. Specifically, 94.3% of the articles kept the focus on politics with 4.5% focusing on a combination of political and social elements and only 4% (1) print article being solely socially focused.

Albeit the dominant focus of these articles was on politics, Rodham Clinton’s political power was analyzed
in 40.4% of these stories. The Washington Post’s April 30, 1993 article addressed her political influence when noting her recently won respect of Congress members after them being “suspicious and restful of the powerful First Lady” (P. A01). USA Today also mentioned the concern about her power in a June 23, 1993 article. For example, the reporters noted the concern by stating “there were questions about the first lady’s appropriate policy role and acceptable clout quotient” (p. 6A) and when quoting Phyllis Schalafy expressing trepidation over her power and authority, “the reason she was there was because [of] the White House . . . I think people resent that too”. The Los Angeles Times also addressed Rodham Clinton’s political power when noting in the January 26, 1993 article that her appointment to head the task force indicated that the President saw health care reform as a top priority. The stories that focused on the political and the social, the combination stories, also concentrated more on her political power than any other element.

The concern and emphasis about her political power was evident in the headlines as well as in the articles. For example, on March 8, 1994 a USA Today headline, Furor
over the first lady Issue shows dilemma of changing role. This paper, earlier in the year on January 14, also headlined with a focus on her political power, 'Whole new world’ Spotlight revisits role of first lady. Hence, because of her overtly political and highly influential role as head of the National Health Care Reform Task Force, Hillary Clinton drew a lot of attention not only for her politics but also for her power and influence.

While the preceding analysis highlighted both criticism and praise, only 19.6% of the articles overtly criticized the First Lady. As Table 2 illustrates media personal (9.4%) were the dominant source of criticism and the criticism focused primarily on political issues other than health care reform, her performance/success, and her political influence.

An example of reporter/media personal criticism is found in a February 2, 1993 article in USA Today. The author spends the entire article criticizing the President’s choice of appointing the First Lady to head health care reform. The author questions her power and the legalities of the President giving her the power “[her appointment] brings the strong odor of politics into an arena that ought to be as free as possible from
that virus. And even though it is a non-paying job, her appointment may violate the ‘anti-nepotism act’” (p. 10A). The author sharpens his criticism when he directly attacks the First Lady.

Hillary Rodham Clinton also brings more than two decades of political activism to her new role. People have the right to ask whether, as a non-professional health-care person, she will be able to subordinate her ideology to the facts if those facts run counter to her political beliefs. (p. 10A)

The print media were so willing to criticize the First Lady that USA Toady, in a January 14, 1994 article, quoted a criticism issued from William Safire a New York Times columnist who accused Hillary Clinton “of wanting to hide Whitewater documents ‘because they may show her to be not merely an inept wheeler-dealer, but an occasionally less than competent attorney’” (p. 4A).

Thus, the print media did not leave it to the Republicans or other opposition to criticize the First Lady, the newspapers joined in the fray by criticizing her political influence, her qualifications, and her stance on other political issues.
While reporters were the most common source of criticism, Republicans were also given a chance to take up the sword (see Table 2). The Washington Post's September 30, 1993 article reported a sharp exchange between the First Lady and Representative Richard K. Armey (R. Tex). Armey is quoted saying to Rodham Clinton, "I have been told about your charm and wit, . . . the reports of your charm are overstated" (p. A06). A less overt criticism emerged from Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole (R. Kan) who addressed her as Mrs. President in a USA Today article on April 30, 1993 (Hall, 1993). Thus, he criticized the First Lady by referring to her in a manner that highlighted her political power and influence and diminished her personal agency by re-naming her position in the government—making a joke of her political power and of her.

Because typical news coverage of First Ladies has centered on the social aspects of the role, media attention has often focused on the appearance of these women. While Rodham Clinton has not escaped this focal point, as is evidenced by the concern shown about her hairstyles—the web pages devoted to this topic are numerous—the criticism leveled at the First Lady did not
focus on such trivial matters. Specifically, only .4% of
the criticism focused on her appearance, perhaps
indicating that although her expansion and redefinition
of the role of the First Lady confused, concerned, and
excited people, there was some understanding and
acceptance of the importance of the political role she
undertook.

While the newspapers did criticize First Lady
Hillary Rodham Clinton, the articles also presented
praise for her and the health care reform effort she
headed. Specifically, she was praised 25.7% of the time
primarily from Democrats (7.8%), the public (6.5%), media
personal (6.1%), and Republicans (4.9%) (see Table 2).
Thus, while media personal were the dominant source of
criticism they were less likely to praise. Attacking or
criticizing politicians, political figures, the political
process, and the government in general emerged as a media
norm after Vietnam and Watergate. These two historical
events led to a more critical and distrustful press corps
and public; which in turn led to more critical and
judgmental reporting of the "facts" (e.g., Entman, 1989,
the journalists' indiscriminate skepticism has
metamorphosed into "attack journalism and abidingly cynical coverage of political leaders and governmental institutions" (p. 436).

The praise the First Lady garnered focused on her competency (15.5%), performance/success (13.5%), and activeness (10.2%) all traditionally male traits (Mueller, 1986; Pearson et. al., 1985; Trent & Sabourin, 1993; Williams, 1994). For example, The Washington Post's April 30, 1993 article praised her for her activeness by stating:

If some Americans remain unaware of the health care task force and the pending revisions, it is not for lack of trying on Hillary Clinton's part. Except for the two weeks she spent in Little Rock, Ark., before her father died, she has devoted much of her time to the president's goal of having a comprehensive health care proposal by late May. (P. A01)

The article also praised her for her performance/success, "her personalized knack for 'speaking to politicians as politicians' . . . has been apparent to a number of lawmakers" (p. A01). Thus, by talking the talk she has been able to communicate to Congress about health care reform.
USA Today also praised Rodham Clinton for her activeness and her performance/success. A June 23, 1993 article quotes Representative Jim Cooper (D. Ten) as saying the First Lady is "'extraordinary able, almost visionary, a fantastic negotiator, sharp as a tack" (p. 6A). The reporters of the piece go on to praise her activeness by reciting a list of activities she has been involved in. Specifically, they state she has:

- Consulted often with Congress, including Republicans. . . . Fulfilled the public's demand for villains in the health cost mess by hammering doctors and drug manufacturers. Managed to praise those same groups in a bid to win their support. Won public support with her own star power in dozens of appearances. (p. 6A)

All of this activity was accomplished while the President "struggl[ed] to find his equilibrium" (p. 6A).

While not common sources of praise, USA Today on April 30, 1993 also praises the First Lady about her political influence, First Lady role, values and morals, and her mothering. Hall states that the first 100 days of her tenure as First Lady has been remarkable. Specifically:
In three months, she has presided over her family's move to Washington, gotten her teen-age daughter started in school, and spent three weeks in Little Rock watching her father slip toward death. . . . [Further] she has taken responsibility for a comprehensive health-care reform plan . . . [while] carving out an unprecedented role that could forever change the nation's image of its first lady, Hillary Clinton is engaged in an extraordinary balancing act. (P. 7A)

On January 26, 1993 right after her appointment to head the National Health Care Reform Task Force, The Los Angeles Times praised the First Lady's political influence by noting her appointment indicated that President Clinton viewed health care reform as his "No. 1 domestic priority" (p. A-1).

The use of criticism and praise in these articles is important to note because as Schoenbach and Semetko (1992) assert tone and frequency of political coverage are important factors that affect public opinion. They conclude that media framing of an issue as positive or negative influences public perceptions of issue salience. Thus, these data reveal that overall the print media
praised more than criticized the First Lady while she headed the National Health Care Reform Task Force. An interesting finding is that the criticism, while less frequent, was often more clearly stated and more harsh than the praise was complementary, and the criticism primarily emerged from the media representatives further highlighting problems with "attack" journalism (Alger, 1996; Entman, 1989, Paterson, 1994; Schudson, 1995). Additionally, Cappella and Jamieson (1996) argue that "subtle changes in the way news stories are framed can affect consumers’ responses, activating, if not creating, cynicism about campaigns, policy, and governance" (p. 71). Thus, the language and tone of the criticism in these 245 articles may impact the public’s perception of the First Lady and health care reform.

Besides investigating what the First Lady was criticized and praised about this study also investigated what was simply mentioned about her to further highlight how the media constructed Rodham Clinton during this highly political and powerful position. As with the criticism, the print media primarily focused their attention on her political influence (see Table 2). This focus is not surprising since Rodham Clinton was/is in
the process of changing the role and expectations of a First Lady. By mentioning her political influence in 42.9% of the stories the print media kept the focus on the uniqueness of having a First Lady in such a powerful position and possibly took some focus away from the actual proposed reform.

By criticizing the First Lady and focusing on her political influence, the media kept the focus on the "game" of health care reform, the drama and not the substance of the issue (Patterson, 1994). Specifically, by highlighting the conflict and concern about Hillary Clinton's political power and political influence the media focused on her individually as opposed to the larger issue of health care reform. Thus, this focus directed the audience's attention to the concern about a First Lady wielding political power and away from policy issues associated with reforming health care.

Because evidence suggests that media frames impact the audience's understanding and attitudes about events this study noted the issues presented in these articles (e.g., Gamson, 1992; Iyengar, 1991; Neuman, Just, & Crigler, 1992; Rhee, 1997). Specifically, frames are a means through which a particular meaning is given to an
issue (Dearing & Rogers, 1996, p. 64). Thus, this organizational process results in a specific story line being emphasized in the news coverage of the issue (Entman, 1993). For example, Iyengar and Simon (1993) illustrate that when the nightly network newscasts portrayed the Persian Gulf crisis in military rather than diplomatic terms, public support for a military response increased. Consequently, reporters define and construct meaning by their manner of presentation and this definition and construction influences how individual’s evaluate issues (Iyengar, 1991; Salwen & Matera, 1992).

The most dominant issue in these 245 print articles was public health (96.7%) with governmental acts (40.8%), the economy (37.6%), ethics (21.9%), and taxes (19.2%) all being important issues in these articles as well. Framing health care reform as an economic issue began with the appointment of Hillary Clinton to head the reform process. The Los Angeles Times on January 26, 1993 announced her appointment and then constructed the problem of health care in economic terms by over-viewing the projected costs of “comprehensive long-term care programs—depending on benefits and eligibility—could cost $10 billion to 30 billion a year in additional costs” (p.
A-1). Thus, the paper highlighted the costs to the American people but did not explain how the costs may be paid or the benefits of an improved health care system. Still using an economic frame, The Los Angeles Times went on to quote President Clinton stating “It’s time to bring costs under control . . . [Americans] spend 30% more of our income on health care than any other nation in the world, and get less for it” (A-1). Putting a more personalized face on the economic realities of health care, The Washington Post’s October 30, 1993 article gave voice to the concerns of Dorothy Huber, a 70 year old woman facing recent medical bills reaching $170,000, who wanted to know more about the proposed reform.

While the costs of reform and the costs of failing to reform the health care system are important to understand, the media also used an ethical frame to construct the First Lady and health care reform. USA Today on September 17, 1993, used horrific health care stories of people to not only personalize the issue but also to highlight the ethical reasons to pass some sort of health care reform. In this article, the reporter included stories from the public to highlight the ethical reasons to reform health care:
Brigitte Burdine of Van Nuys, Calif., talked about her sister’s battle with AIDS. Jean Kazmarck of Glen Ellyn, Ill., wrote that she is having trouble getting health insurance because of problems with her first pregnancy. She wants a second child but is worried about her lack of coverage. “Now we find ourselves stuck,” she wrote. (p. 7A)

Another common way that ethics was used as a frame encompassed the ethical nature of the First Lady heading the task force. There were questions of nepotism and the need for secrecy when deliberating about the reform. For example, USA Today, on August 22, 1994, ran an article using the headline Hillary’s health deception. From this beginning the article goes on to state:

The Clinton administration agreed last week to make public the full records of Hillary Rodham Clinton’s Health Care Task Force—files it has tried to conceal for 15 months. . . But team Clinton had little choice. If it had not come clean voluntarily, it would have been forced to do so in a federal court proceeding. (p. 11A)

The criticism about ethics, the truthfulness, the openness of the task force, continued throughout the
article. Specifically, the reporter raises questions about the cost and the composition of the task force. The author states that the task force "was a special-interest love-fest loaded up with people who had a direct personal or financial interest in ClintonCare" (P. 11A). Finally, the reporter ends with an ethical concern by questioning the public's lack of input in planning the reform. As data presented in this study indicate, the public was not given many opportunities to be heard in the media's reporting of health care reform or to contribute to this massive reform proposal.

Finally, while the primary focus of these articles, whether when criticizing or praising the First Lady, was on politics, there were limited but interesting instances of a social focus. The one article focusing on the social and the 11 combination articles highlighted specific social aspects of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton's position. It is in these articles that the print media drew attention to her appearance, charity work, marriage, motherhood, social functions, professional qualifications, and her violation of the First Lady role. For example, USA Today's September 29, 1994 article starts with the headline HILLARY WILL BE BACK: Clinton
still seeks ways to stretch role. The reporter goes on to focus on the problems Rodham Clinton faced as she expanded the role of the First Lady and argues that some think she will retreat into a more traditional role because of the defeat of the health care reform proposal.

Another indication of a social focus in all of the articles is found in the references to her marriage. Specifically, the newspapers mentioned her marital status in 30.2% (74) of the articles. Thus, when the papers noted her marital status in other ways than using Mrs. or First Lady it reminded the public of her private life and her relationship to the President during an article primarily focused on health care reform. Interestingly, the reporters were the primary source to focus on her marriage (see Table 2). Once again, but not as obviously nor as often as previous research indicates of media coverage, the print media brought the private social life of a First Lady into the public political arena where she was there to work on policy issues.

Broadcast Media Implications

These data reveal that the networks presented differing amounts of coverage to their audiences. Thus, because CBS presented 33 (43%) stories there was a
difference among the networks but not a significant difference according to a chi-square goodness of fit test from ABC’s 20 (26.3%) and NBC’s 23 (30.3%) stories. Hence, audiences tuning into the individual three major networks received roughly the same amount of coverage about First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton and health care reform during her tenure as Head of the National Health Care Reform Task Force.

While the amount of stories did not differ significantly there were interesting differences in the length of the stories each network produced. Specifically, 29% of the stories were between 2-2.10 minutes and 61.8% of the stories were shorter than three minutes. When examining story length by network the data reveals that although CBS presented a higher volume of stories they kept the stories short with 24 (72.7%) of them being under three minutes. In contrast, NBC presented 12 (52.1%) stories that were four minutes or longer with 2 (.09%) stories over six minutes. Thus, NBC may have contributed to a more detailed understanding of the issue by producing longer stories.

As noted in the previous section the objectivity of media content has drawn scholarly attention and has been
a journalist ideal for some time (e.g., Bennett, 1996; Davis, 1990; Entman, 1993; Gitlin, 1980; & Lippmannn, 1922). The results of this analysis reveal that the broadcast media relied on a neutral mode of communication. Specifically, Table 4 illustrates the networks primarily used neutral language in their lead-ins and leads. While neutrality was used more than praise or criticism, a combination between both positive and negative language was used in 34.2% (26) of the network stories.

Although neutrality was the predominate mode of communication there were instances of praise in the lead-ins. For instance, CBS’ September 28, 1993 lead-in:

First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton was lead off witness on Capital Hill for the Clinton version of health care reform. Mrs. Clinton was a key player in shaping her husband’s plan from start to finish and today she . . . kicked off a blitz of testimony and lobbying in both the House and the Senate.

Further, some overt criticism was also found in the lead-ins. For example, CBS on April 30, 1993 anchor’s lead-in presented this criticism of the First Lady and health care reform:
Chances for National Health Care Reform nose dived today. Even before [it] can be officially unveiled President Clinton's ideas for overhauling the national health care system could be in deep trouble. Today Hillary Clinton tried to preview and sell some of the key elements under consideration to members of the U.S. Senate but many senators were unimpressed.

With the language of the leads and lead-ins primarily being neutral, it is not surprising that neutrality was the most common slant as well. Although the primary slant of the stories was neutral (see Table 4) when the story was slanted negatively it was often very overt and obvious. For example, on October 26, 1993 NBC started a story about health care with the lead-in "President faces longer odds" and continued to construct the health care issue in a negative way by using phrases such as "costs too much", "spending monster" "original plan was leaked", "bureaucratic nightmare", and "Congressional supporters don't think the White House numbers add up".

No matter how the networks presented the information they used the First Lady to draw viewers by mentioning
her in the lead-in and the leads. She was mentioned in 36.8% of the lead-ins, which similar to newspaper headlines draw audiences, and in 42.1% of the leads, which perform a similar function as the print media’s first sentences.

The broadcast media further used First Lady Rodham Clinton to garner an audience when using her voice in 66 stories. Thus, while not primarily relying on her name in the lead-in and the leads the media did rely on her to draw viewers by using her voice in 86.8% of the stories, indicating she was an important part of this issue. These stories also privileged other political voices (see Table 4) while only allowing the public’s voice to be heard in 22% of the stories. As is a Clinton tradition, there were opportunities for the public to communicate with the administration about health care reform, but when the broadcast media presented these opportunities the public’s voices were often muted and instead the audience heard media representative interpreting what the public and the Clinton team said. Further, as with the print media there was a reliance on polls to represent the public and their opinions.
The broadcast media did not focus, as has been tradition, on the more social aspects of the First Lady role (e.g., Benze, 1990, Garoli, 1995, Gould, 1996). This study investigated whether the focus of these news stories about Rodham Clinton and health care focused on the political, the social, or combined the political and the social when constructing this political issue. Ninety eight point seven percent of the stories kept the focus entirely on politics with 1.3% of the stories focusing on a combination of political and social elements. There were no stories with a dominant focus on the social aspects of the First Lady.

While politics was the dominant focus Rodham Clinton’s political power was a major theme in 42.1% of these stories including her influence on the President (see Table 4). Focusing on her political power in the Clinton administration began with the campaign and continued on the first day of the new Clinton administration. For instance, NBC’s January 21, 1993 story about Hillary Rodham Clinton and health care reform highlighted her political power:

Hillary Clinton will supervise development of health care reform. [This is an] unprecedented policy role
for a First Lady. She'll also have an office among the senior staff not on the other side of the White House where First Ladies traditionally work.

Her political power drew attention in the lead-ins as well, as NBS' February 16, 1994 lead-in illustrates "[The] two hit the road together. For the two of them its all on the line-his Presidency, her prestige."

Although there were both criticism and praise in the lead-ins and the leads only 19.7% of the broadcast stories overtly criticized the First Lady. Republicans criticized her the most (14.5%) with media personal criticizing her 9.2% of the time. The criticism she drew centered primarily on political issues (14.5%) and her political ideology (5.3%) rather than health care reform, her performance/success, and her political influence (see Table 4). For instance, CBS, on October 22, 1993 presented sharp and pointed criticism emerging from the Republican advertisements that argued any plan from the Republicans would be better than the one proposed from the Democrats. Of interest here is that CBS presented the Republican advertisements without any analysis or interpretation of the claims made. The simple re-production of political advertisements is common and
research has found that only 1.7% of the content of the coverage of ads investigated the accuracy of the claims made (Jamieson, 1992). Thus, the audience only saw the ad reproduced as aired in a privileged medium, on the network nightly news.

Republican Senator Robert Dole (Kan) offered a more pointed and personal political ideological attack on the First Lady. Specifically, ABC on August 10, 1994 showed video of Dole issuing this advice to Rodham Clinton “Mrs. Clinton ought to just cool off . . . she is out there with a lot of partisan sniping.”

In addition to criticism focusing on differences in political ideology, the First Lady and health care reform also drew criticism about other political issues. Specifically, CBS on October 28, 1993 focused on the proposed and probable increase in taxes and the increase in entitlement programs that the Clinton health care reform would cause.

Although Rodham Clinton drew sharp criticism, these attacks did not center on typically social aspects of her role. For instance, there were no criticisms leveled at her regarding her marriage/mothering/family life or her appearance.
Similar to the amount of criticism the First Lady drew from these network stories she also drew praise in 13.2% of the stories. As Table 4 highlights she was praised by the media (5.3%), the President (2.6%), and Republicans (2.6%). Thus, the President may have been careful and sparse with his praise to help diminish the criticism of nepotism with his appointment of the First Lady to head the National Health Care Reform Task Force.

The praise the First Lady garnered focused on her competency (5.0%), performance/success (2.6%), toughness/strength (2.6%), political ideology (2.6%), honesty/integrity (2.6%), and warmth/compassion (2.6%). Thus, she received praise on traditionally male traits (Mueller, 1986; Pearson et. al., 1985; Trent & Sabourin, 1993; Williams, 1994) as well as traditionally female traits (Kahn, 1993; Trent & Sabourin, 1993). For example, CBS, on September 28, 1993 praised her on a number of these traits. The reporter praised her for her competency and her performance/success by stating:

She came, she saw, she wowed. . . . [She spent] all day before one committee then another in the afternoon. Seldom referring to notes, she argued that much of the system is broken and must be fixed.
There seemed no detail she did not know, no criticism she had not considered.
The First Lady also drew praise for her competency from Republican John Chafee (RI) "She knows her stuff . . . she doesn't need a whole lot of notes to find out the answer to that question" Finally, the reporter praised Rodham Clinton for her toughness/strength "She stood her ground . . . [and] offered no apologies."

As previously stated the use of criticism and praise in these articles is important to investigate because the tone and frequency of political coverage affect public opinion. The media's framing of an issue as positive or negative influences public perceptions of issue salience (Schoenbach & Semetko, 1992). These data reveal that networks criticized more than praised the First Lady while she headed the National Health Care Reform Task Force. The criticism, while not significantly high, still represents what scholars have termed "attack" journalism (Alger, 1996; Entman, 1989, Paterson, 1994; Schudson, 1995). Further, the broadcast media's reliance on reporter/anchor/media personal to criticize the First Lady and health care reform is an illustration of the media's shift toward more interpretive reporting where
the “analyst’s role has come to overshadow the rest” (Patterson, 1994, p.81). Thus, media “actors” now plan a starring role in the construction of news.

In addition to collecting data on what the First Lady was criticized and praised about this study also collected data on what was mentioned about her to further highlight how the media constructed Rodham Clinton during this highly political and powerful position. The First Lady’s political influence drew a lot of attention from these broadcast stories (see Table 4). For instance, CBS on September 28, 1993 highlighted her political power when stating “For the first time a First Lady rather than a Cabinet Officer [took] the lead on a major Presidential initiative.”

Intermixed with the coverage about her political power was coverage about her expansion of the First Lady role. For instance, ABC’s January 22, 1993 story stated:

[There were] hints beforehand that Hillary Clinton would play a major role in developing policy. It will be that way. . . . Traditionally, the President’s wife holds the bible, walks behind her husband, and stands demurely aside, . . . .Hillary Rodham Clinton is anything but traditional. She is
the first First Lady with two offices, one in the East wing where parties are planned and one in the West wing where policy is made. . . . This President wants his wife to play a major role in among other things the formulation of health care policy.

Further evidence of this intermixing emerged from CBS on September 28, 1993 when the reporter stated “though [the First Lady] will hold center stage like few First Lady’s have done before her, her friends insist she is focused on results not on her own image.” This statement also highlights that while not overtly criticizing the First Lady there is an implied criticism when questioning her focus.

The broadcast media’s focus on her political influence is expected because of the uniqueness of the role this First Lady was carving out for herself. By mentioning her political influence in 56.6% of the stories the networks kept the focus on the remarkableness of having a First Lady in such a powerful position and possibly took some focus away from the actual proposed reform.

As argued in the previous section, research suggests that the manner in which the media frame events impacts
the audience's understanding and attitudes about events (e.g., Gamson, 1992; Iyengar, 1991; Neuman, Just, & Crigler, 1992; Rhee, 1997). Because of the impact of framing, this study researched the issues the media presented in addition to public health.

To be expected, the dominant issue in these 76 broadcast stories was public health (98.7%) with governmental acts (85.5%), the economy (51.3%), and taxes (51.3%) all being issues dominating these stories (see Table 4). Framing health care reform as a money problem began early in the reform process and was presented in the lead-ins to the stories. CBS, on February 22, 1993, broadcasted a story lead-in that highlights this frame:

The price for getting health care coverage to the millions who don't have it could be billions in new taxes. President Clinton's point woman on health care reform made no mention of the wallet-ectomy today . . . hints are all around that the overhaul won't be . . . cheap.

While there were no stories that focused primarily on the social aspects of the First Lady role there were indications of a social focus in some of the stories. For instance, Mrs. Clinton was the dominant way the First
Lady was addressed and her marital status, besides using Mrs. or First Lady, was mentioned in 43.4% of the stories. Further, the reporter or network anchor was the primary source to focus on Rodham Clinton’s marriage to the President. By centering on her private life and her relationship to the President the broadcast media, again, brought the private sphere into the public sphere when constructing the First Lady.

Television relies on both oral and visual communication techniques to relay information. Research indicates that the visuals in the stories are more easily comprehended and retained (Jamieson, 1988). In addition, visual communication influences the audience’s attitudes and beliefs (Blair, 1996).

This research investigated the use of videos and graphics. Eighty five point five percent of the stories used videos to communicate about First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton and health care reform. As with the voices in the stories the First Lady was also the predominate person in the videos (82.9%). With Rodham Clinton the videos also provided an avenue for the public to be seen if not heard. Thus, there were a number of nameless and
voiceless members of the public represented, but they remained primarily mute.

Besides the use of videos and who was in the video, coders determined that 71.1% of the videos related to the story. Put another way, approximately 30% of the videos used were not related to the story being told. For instance, there was a lot of campaign footage used which did not relate to health care but did show the First Lady in a variety of situations. This finding was surprising since Rodham Clinton made herself very accessible to the media during her tenure as head of the National Health Care Reform Task Force.

The image presented by these videos was overwhelmingly positive (53.9%). For example, she is pictured in a NBC May 26, 1993 story as powerful when shown at a podium giving a speech about health care reform and the audience's applause is heard after some of her main points. Thus, while not overly positive in the oral presentation of the First Lady and health care reform the visual images were very positive.

Finally, graphics are another visual image used by the broadcast media. These results indicate graphics were not a common source of visual imagery appearing in only
15.8% of the stories. While graphics were not used a lot by the networks, the image presented in the graphics was similar—6.6% negative and 6.6% positive. ABC, on January 22, 1993, presented a graphic of the First Lady where she was smiling and looking directly at the audience; thus, presenting a positive image. In contrast, on February 22, 1993 CBS chose to air a negative graphic that showed the First Lady with her eyes slightly closed, looking downward, her mouth unsmiling and slightly open, and the image of the First Lady was slightly out of focus.

**Medium Differences Implications**

The final research question in this study investigated the differences found between the print and broadcast media’s construction of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton and health care reform. A simple examination of the data reveals vast differences in the volume of broadcast stories and print articles presented from January 1993 through September 1994. Specifically, the print media presented 244 articles whereas the broadcast media only presented 76 stories during the same period. Thus, of the total 321 sample, print articles accounted for 76.3% of the coverage with the broadcast stories accounting for merely 23.4%. With television
being the primary medium from which people receive their news (e.g., Alger, 1996; Gitlin, 1980; Hart, 1994; Iyengar, 1991; Postman & Powers, 1992) it is troubling that audiences received so little opportunity from the networks to be exposed to information about health care reform. The complicated and detailed nature of health care reform is a possible reason for the paucity of network coverage. Television newscasts present shorter, more easily dramatized stories and the specifics of health care reform do not easily conform to this style (Bennett, 1996).

Another interesting implication emerging from the data is the differences in the distribution of gender of the authors and the reporters. Specifically, 53.1% (130) of the articles about Rodham Clinton and health care were written by women whereas only 27.6% (21) of the broadcast stories were reported by women. Thus, this gender distribution difference follows employment trends in the respective mediums; there are more women employed by daily newspapers then employed by broadcast networks (Weaver, 1997).

While there were similarities in the voices privileged in the print and broadcast mediums there were
differences found in the dominant voice in the article and the story. As Table 2 illustrates, First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton was the dominant voice (19.6%, 48) when the coders could clearly delineate a dominant voice in the articles while the reporter/media person (27.6%, 21) was dominant in the broadcast stories (see Table 4). Although Patterson (1994) argues "the differences in the styles of television and newspaper reporting is now relatively small" (p. 81), results from this study indicate that television relies on interpretive reporting more than print.

The print media reliance on Democratic voices is another noteworthy implication. Specifically, Table 2 illustrates that 45.7% of the dominant voices privileged in the articles were those associated with the White House. Thus, the print media allowed those aligned with the Clinton Administration more opportunity to speak. In contrast, the broadcast media were not as biased toward Democratic voices relying on those associated with the White House 22.4% of the time (see Table 4).

While the predominant focus of both the print and the broadcast media was on politics there were differences in the manner in which they presented the
political information. For instance, Rodham Clinton’s political power was the second most focused on element of the political information (40.4%, 99) in the print media; in contrast, the networks focused more on other political issues (55.3%, 42). Further, the dominant focus of the mediums also differed, with the print media again centering on Rodham Clinton’s political power and broadcast centering on other political issues (see Tables 2 and 4). With the volume of print stories outweighing the broadcast stories so significantly it is obvious that readers were inundated with information about the First Lady’s political power, which highlights the uniqueness of her political position.

Although the newspapers and networks criticized the First Lady similarly (print 19.6%, 48, broadcast=19.7%, 15) there were interesting differences in who voiced these criticisms. The print media relied on reporter/anchor/media person(s) most often to criticize the First Lady (9.4%, 23) whereas Republicans criticized her most in the broadcast stories (14.5%, 11). Thus, while the reporter or the anchor was the dominant voice heard in the network stories they still constructed a story that had Republicans as the primary source of
criticism. Using the Republicans to criticize the First Lady and health care reform kept the focus on the "game" (Patterson, 1994) and produced melodramatic coverage (Bennett, 1996) which dramatized the news and reduced opportunities for the audience to receive substantial information about health care reform policy. In addition, while media personal were not the dominant voice in the newspaper stories they were the dominant source of criticism (see Table 2).

Similar to the criticism leveled at the First Lady the data reveals differences with the amount of praise she drew. There is over a 10% difference in the amount of praise between the print (25.7%) and the broadcast (13.2%). More differences between the mediums emerge in the people who praised Rodham Clinton. The newspaper articles relied on Democrats (7.8%, 19), the public (6.5%, 16), and Republicans (4.9%, 12) for the primary sources of praise, whereas, the broadcast stories elicited praise from reporters/anchors/media people (5.3%, 4), the President (2.6%, 10), and Republicans (2.6%, 2). Thus, when praising, in contrast to criticizing, the dominant voice in the broadcast—the
reporter/anchor person—chose to use some of that time to be the dominant source of praise about the First Lady.

As is evidenced by the criticism the First Lady received, the print media spent a lot of time on concerns about her political influence. This focus is further exemplified since the print media mentioned her political influence in 42.9% (105) of the articles. While her political influence drew attention from the broadcast media as well, the print media spent more time on this issue (see Tables 2 and 4) possibly because of the increased volume of stories presented in the print media as opposed to the broadcast media.

Another interesting difference found between the media outlets was the issues presented in the articles/stories. Public health was the dominant issue for both the print and the broadcast (See Table 2 and 4); issues pertaining to the economy were also important in both print and broadcast. The print media further focused on the economy with taxes being mentioned in 51.3% of the articles. Thus, the print media framed health care reform as a money issue while the broadcast media also framed health care in terms of Social Security and elderly issues (28.9%, 22). This frame may have allowed networks’
audiences to see a more human dimension to health care reform.

Limitations

As with any research study, there are limitations that must be noted when considering these results. First, although the sample drawn for this study included all the news articles/stories during the specified time period for the media outlets chosen, it is not a universal sample of all the articles/stories available. In addition, the sample was not drawn randomly from all the possible articles/stories produced about the First Lady and health care reform. Thus, the results of this study are not generalizable to all reporting about First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton and health care reform.

Further, limiting the sample to include only news articles/stories allowed for an investigation into the coverage of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton as head of the National Health Care Reform Task Force and this may have narrowed the scope too much. Coverage of a First Lady is often presented in other sections of the newspaper or the newscast so important information may have been missed.
Another important limitation is the coding instrument. First, when using predetermined categories there is always the risk of missing important data. To compensate for this inherent limitation in content analysis this study included "other" categories to allow coders to include information not accounted for by the codebook. Results indicate that the instrument used in this study was representative of the sample because of the coders' limited use of the "other" categories. Further, since this is an initial study using an instrument that is greatly untested, the categories provided by the codebook need more testing. That being the case, intercoder reliability was strong so further testing of the instrument should verify these results while allowing adjustments to refine the tool.

Research should continue to improve the instrument used in this study. By refining the tool, scholars will be able to better understand the construction of First Ladies and other women in the political arena. While this study focused on the First Lady, the patterns of coverage found in the print and broadcast mediums can add insight into the types of coverage other politically powerful women receive.
Future Research

Scholars need to investigate the First Lady and the roles she plays in a Presidential administration. Thus far, there is an extreme paucity of research regarding these women and the variety of roles they assume in their husbands’ Presidential administration. Research that expands the limited knowledge currently available is necessary to understand women who hold powerful public positions. For example, how will the First Lady role and its accompanying expectations change with a First Lady who is employed?

With the increase of women in national politics, scholars have the opportunity to explore the unique qualities they bring to this predominately male domain. Further, as women gain more access and acceptance in national politics there will come a day when we see a “First Husband”. Thus, questions will arise as to the inherent nature of the role. As Hillary Rodham Clinton has found, being too active, too powerful, and too politically savvy has drawn significant concern and criticism; when a man occupies the role of “First Spouse” how will the role and expectations change? What will the public demand from him—will the criticism center on his
lack of action, power, and political involvement and knowledge? Further, who will handle the social “wifely” duties assigned to the “First Spouse”—throwing parties, picking china, and/or planning the menu for state affairs? This reversal of roles may help reveal the cultural constraints placed on women and men in regards to the roles they are “encouraged” to play.

Different methodological approaches to the study of First Ladies and news coverage of First Ladies will contribute to the knowledge of these often-neglected political actors. For instance, using a close textual analysis of the media’s construction of Rodham Clinton would add richness and depth regarding the media’s construction of a politically active and powerful First Lady.

Finally, Hillary Rodham Clinton currently offers scholars another unique opportunity to research women, politics, and power with her apparent intention to run for the U.S. Senate from New York. Yet again, this First Lady is breaking with tradition and breaking new ground as she explores the possibility of seeking an elected national office. Currently, America has a sitting First Lady actively beginning to campaign for future public
office—a First Lady that is now a candidate. Thus, Rodham Clinton, as she prepares to leave her often-controversial tenure as First Lady, begins to legitimize her political savvy and power by assuming the role of political candidate but also she continues to expand the role of First Lady, which is influenced and constrained by years of tradition and expectations.

Conclusion

After November 3, 1992, Hillary Rodham Clinton found herself in a role influenced by years of tradition. As First Lady, like her predecessors, she faced public expectations about the position. For more than two hundred years, the American media have both judged and relayed societal expectations about what is acceptable or not acceptable behavior for a First Lady. (Winfield, 1997b)

As a Presidential candidate’s wife and as a First Lady, Hillary Rodham Clinton openly broke with tradition and very publicly changed the role of a First Lady by heading the National Health Care Reform Task Force. Rodham Clinton’s break with tradition offered researchers a unique opportunity to explore how the media constructed this “new” role for a First Lady.
This study explored the print and broadcast media’s construction of Hillary Rodham Clinton during her tenure as head of health care reform to highlight how the media reacted to a First Lady in a policy position. Results revealed that contrary to past news coverage of her and other First Ladies, while heading the National Health Care Reform Task Force both the print and broadcast media focused on politics and not on the social expectations and obligations of a First Lady. Keeping the focus on politics and health care reform indicates changes in the media’s coverage of First Ladies, but the traditionally social aspects of First Lady coverage seeped in when the media continually explored and critiqued Rodham Clinton’s political power and influence. Hence, First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton received coverage that reflected and reinforced the constraints most women face as they negotiate traditional expectations with modern life.

Inasmuch as the press mirrors societal values, this study suggests some acceptance for the vast changes in women’s roles and the continual confusion and concern over what the changes mean to society. Hillary Clinton noted this confusion when “before the inauguration [she] recognized the ambiguities of the [First Lady] position,
saying 'Right now, I'm confused about what the rules are'" (Winfield, 1997b). Society and the media are in the process of adapting to the evolution of what it means to be a woman and how that impacts the First Lady role.
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Table 1
Print Media's Tone of Headlines and Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Combo</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headline</td>
<td>40 (16.3%)</td>
<td>34 (13.9%)</td>
<td>31 (12.7%)</td>
<td>140 (57.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slant</td>
<td>39 (15.9%)</td>
<td>17 (6.9%)</td>
<td>72 (29.4%)</td>
<td>117 (47.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Print Media's Dominant Foci

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Voice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The First Lady</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Advisor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The President</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biased Analysis</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Public</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Media</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Focus in Political Story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Reform</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Influence</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Issues</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Scandals</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dominant Focus in Combination Story**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Power</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Reform</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Influence</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motherhood/Chelsea</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of F.L. Role</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dominant Source of Criticism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporter/media person</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biased Analysis</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unattributed</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dominant Focus of Criticism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Influence</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance/Success</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty/Integrity</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Ideology</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Scandals</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Lady Role</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toughness/Strength</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressiveness</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dominant Source of Praise**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporter/media person</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Determinable</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The President</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Advisor</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unattributed</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Dominant Focus of Praise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance/Success</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activeness</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toughness/Strength</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Lady Role</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty/Integrity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Ideology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Influence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth/Compassion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage/Motherhood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values/Morals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dominant Focus of What was Mentioned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Influence</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activeness</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Issues</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance/Success</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Lady Role</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Scandals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth/Compassion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty/Integrity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressiveness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toughness/Strength</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage/Motherhood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Ideology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dominant Issue in Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics and Govn. Acts</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Human Interest</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime and Punishment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Activity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security/Elderly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education/Classical Arts 1 .40%
Abortion 1 .40%

Dominant Modes of Addressing the First Lady

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hillary Clinton</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Lady</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Clinton</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary Rodham Clinton</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Clinton</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Lady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary Rodham Clinton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clintons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

Broadcast Media’s Tone of Lead-ins and Stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Combo</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead-in</td>
<td>11 (14.3%)</td>
<td>9 (11.8%)</td>
<td>26 (34.2%)</td>
<td>30 (39.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slant</td>
<td>13 (17.1%)</td>
<td>9 (11.8%)</td>
<td>23 (30.3%)</td>
<td>31 (40.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dominant Voice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporter/anchor/media</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The First Lady</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The President</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Advisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biased Analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Public</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dominant Focus in Political Story</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Reform</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Issues</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Influence</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Influence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Scandals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dominant Source of Criticism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporter/Media</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biased Analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dominant Focus of Criticism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Ideology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Issues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activeness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Scandals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty/Integrity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Dominant Source of Praise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporter/media person</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Public</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dominant Focus of Praise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activeness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance/Success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dominant Focus of What was Mentioned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Issues</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Influence</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activeness</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Lady Role</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Scandals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth/Compassion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Ideology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty/Integrity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toughness/Strength</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dominant Issue in Stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics and Gov'n. Acts</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidents/Disasters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dominant Modes of Addressing the First Lady

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Clinton</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary Clinton</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Lady</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary Rodham Clinton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Lady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary Clinton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Lady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary Rodham Clinton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

First Lady
Codebook

Coder _______________________

Variable Description
1. Medium

___ 1= Print
___ 2= Broadcast

2. Newspaper/Network

___ 1= The Washington Post
___ 2= The Los Angeles Times
___ 3= USA Today
___ 1= ABC
___ 2= CBS
___ 3= NBC

3. Date (Month/Day/Year) ______ ______ ______

4. Article/Story Number ______

5. Length of the Article/Story (number of pages, .25, .50, .75, 1., etc/number of seconds) ______ ______

6. Sex of the Author(s)/Reporter(s)

___ 1= Female(s)
___ 2= Male(s)
___ 3= Joint authorship (male and female)
___ 4= Cannot be determined

Name _________________________
7. First Lady Mentioned in headline/lead-in
   ___ 1= Yes
   ___ 2= No

8. First Lady Mentioned in first sentence/lead
   ___ 1= Yes
   ___ 2= No

9. Headline/lead-in language
   ___ 1= Positive
       Approval of how things are going, doing good work, good things are said about the First Lady and/or her heading the Health Care Reform Task Force, and/or the proposed health care reform.
   ___ 2= Negative
       Disapproval of how things are going, doing poor work, bad things are said about the First Lady and/or her heading the Health Care Reform Task Force, and/or the proposed health care reform.
   ___ 3= Mixture
       Both positive and negative presentation of how things are going, doing poor and good work, good and bad things are said about the First Lady and/or her heading the Health Care Reform Task Force, and/or the proposed health care reform.
   ___ 4= Indifferent/Neutral
       Neither positive or negative presentation of how things are going, what the work is like, or what is said about the First Lady and/or her heading the Health Care Reform Task Force, and/or the proposed health care reform.
10. Slant of Article/Story

What is the slant taken about her performance as head of the Health Care Reform Task Force?

__ 1= Positive
   Approval of how things are going, doing good work, good things are said about the First Lady and/or her heading the Health Care Reform Task Force, and/or the proposed health care reform.

__ 2= Negative
   Disapproval of how things are going, doing poor work, bad things are said about the First Lady and/or her heading the Health Care Reform Task Force, and/or the proposed health care reform.

__ 3= Combination
   Both positive and negative presentation of how things are going, doing poor and good work, good and bad things are said about the First Lady and/or her heading the Health Care Reform Task Force, and/or the proposed health care reform.

__ 4= Indifferent/Neutral
   Neither positive or negative presentation of how things are going, what the work is like, or what is said about the First Lady and/or her heading the Health Care Reform Task Force, and/or the proposed health care reform.

11. What voice(s) was (were) present in the story/article?
   Code for all who were quoted, paraphrased, analyzed etc.

__ 1= the First Lady
__ 2= the President
__ 3= a(n) elected Democratic political figure(s)
__ 4= a(n) elected Republican political figure(s)
__ 5= a(n) expert(s)
    Neutral analysis such as Dr. C. Everett Coop
__ 6= Presidential advisor (s), cabinet member(s) and/or staff.
__ 7= Biased analysis by an interest group representative such as the AMA or Insurance
8= by a(n) unnamed source(s)-unattributed
9= by the public
10= by a reporter or media person
   Code for this when a reporter, anchor, or media person other than the author or original reporter of the story in interviewed or asked for analysis.
11= other ____________________________

12. Code for dominant

1= ______
2= Not determinable/ no dominant voice

13. Focus of the story/article

Code for only one
1= political
   Formal, legislative, policy orientated, political ideology, political scandals etc.
   ** Go to question 15
2= social
   Sexuality, hostess, wife, mother, family, domestic "ambassador"
   ** Go to question 17
3= combination
   The presentation of both political and social aspects in the story
   **Go to question 14
4= other ____________________________

14. Code for dominant of the combination story/article

Code for the dominant political or social slant of the story
1= ______
   ** Go to question 19
15. If political is the focus what is emphasized?

Code for all that are present
   ___ 1= her political power
   ___ 2= her influence on President Clinton
   ___ 3= the Clinton administration's political scandals
   ___ 4= Health Care Reform
       Specifics about health care reform such as the actual content of the reform, the procedures to enact the reform, the process of crafting the reform etc.
   ___ 5= political issues __________________________
       Legislation/policy, policy orientated, political ideology, political scandals
   ___ 6= other

16. Code for dominant
   1= ___
   2= Not determinable
      **Go to question 21

17. If social is the focus what is emphasized?

Code for all that are present
   ___ 1= her appearance
   ___ 2= her charity work
   ___ 3= her marriage
   ___ 4= motherhood/Chelsea
   ___ 5= social functions of the First Lady
   ___ 6= her past history
   ___ 7= her professional qualifications
   ___ 8= her violation of First Lady role
   ___ 9= other __________________________

18. Code for dominant

   ___ 1= ___
   ___ 2= Not determinable
      **Go to question 21
19. If the focus is a combination between political and social what is emphasized?
Code for all that are present
___ 1= her political power
___ 2= her influence on President Clinton
___ 3= the Clinton administration’s political scandals
___ 4= Health Care Reform
___ 5= political issues
    Legislation/policy, policy orientated, political ideology, political scandals
___ 6= her appearance
___ 7= her charity work
___ 8= her marriage
___ 9= motherhood/Chelsea
___ 10= social functions of the First Lady
___ 11= past history
___ 12= her professional qualifications
___ 13= her violation of First Lady role
___ 14= other

20. Code for dominant
___ 1= ___
___ 2= Not determinable

21. Is the First Lady Explicitly Criticized?
The criticism must be overt and obvious. There must be direct evidence of the criticism of the First Lady. For example, “First Lady Hillary Clinton is the wrong person to be in charge of changing the nation’s health care”
___ 1= Yes
___ 2= No
    If no, go to question 26

22. If Yes, By Whom
___ 1= the First Lady
___ 2= the President
___ 3= a(n) elected Democratic political figure(s)
___ 4= a(n) elected Republican political figure(s)
___ 5= a(n) expert(s)
Neutral analysis such as Dr. C. Evert Coop

6= Presidential advisor(s), cabinet member(s) and/or staff.

7= Biased analysis by an interest group representative such as the AMA or Insurance

8= by a(n) unnamed source(s)—unattributed

9= by the public

10= by a reporter or media person
    Code for this when a reporter, anchor, or media person other than the author or original reporter of the story is interviewed or asked for analysis.

11= other __________________________

23. Code for Dominant Source of Criticism

1= __________

2= Not determinable

24. What is she Criticized About?

Code for the presence of all that apply

1= Her Honesty/integrity

2= Her Toughness/strength

3= Her Warmth/compassion
    focus on human relationships; e.g., showing concern for children, the elderly, homeless people

4= Her Competency
    the ability or authority to do what is required

5= Her Performance/success
    her health care reform accomplishments, achievements

6= Her Aggressiveness
    need for aggressive action, need for drastic change to solve problem(s)

7= Her Activeness
    have a plan, willing to work, take action

8= Her Past Qualifications
    record, past political accomplishments

9= Her Political Ideology

10= Political Issues

11= Her political influence

12= Political scandals
25. Code for Dominant

   __ 1=

26. Is the First Lady Praised

   __ 1= Yes
   __ 2= No
   If no, go to question number 31

27. If Yes, by whom is she praised

   __ 1= the First Lady
   __ 2= the President
   __ 3= a(n) elected Democratic political figure(s)
   __ 4= a(n) elected Republican political figure(s)
   __ 5= a(n) expert(s)
       Neutral analysis such as Dr. C. Evert Coop
   __ 6= Presidential advisor(s), cabinet member(s)
       and/or staff.
   __ 7= Biased analysis by an interest group
       representative such as the AMA or Insurance
   __ 8= by a(n) unnamed source(s) - unattributed
   __ 9= by the public
   __ 10= by a reporter or media person
       Code for this when a reporter, anchor, or
       media person other than the author or
       original reporter of the story is
       interviewed or asked for analysis.
   __ 11= other ____________________________

28. Code for Dominant

   __ 1=
   __ 2= Not determinable
29. What is She Praised About

Code for the presence of all that apply

___ 1= Her Honesty/integrity
___ 2= Her Toughness/strength
___ 3= Her Warmth/compassion

  focus on human relationships; e.g.,
  showing concern for children, the elderly,
  homeless people
___ 4= Her Competency

  the ability or authority to do what is
  required
___ 5= Her Performance/success

  her health care reform accomplishments,
  achievements
___ 6= Her Aggressiveness

  need for aggressive action, need for
  drastic change to solve problem(s)
___ 7= Her Activeness

  have a plan, willing to work, take action
___ 8= Her Past Qualifications

  record, past political accomplishments
___ 9= Her Political Ideology
___ 10= Political Issues
___ 11= Her political influence
___ 12= Political scandals
___ 13= First Lady Role
___ 14= Her Marriage, mothering, family life
___ 15= Her values/morals
___ 16= Her appearance
___ 17= Other _______________________

30. Code for Dominant

___ 1= ___

31. What is mentioned about the First Lady?

Code for the presence of all categories where there is no overt, explicit criticism and/or praise. Thus, code for neutral presentation of these.

___ 1= Her Honesty/integrity
___ 2= Her Toughness/strength
___ 3= Her Warmth/compassion

  focus on human relationships; e.g.,
  showing concern for children, the elderly,
  homeless people
32. Code for Dominant

33. What Issues are mentioned?
   Code for presence of all that apply
   1= Abortion
   2= Accidents and Disasters
      Human-caused and natural disasters
   3= Agriculture
      Farm issues and economics related to farm issues
   4= Crime and Judicial
      Court proceedings, gun control, drug control, and the death penalty
   5= Diplomacy and Foreign Relation
      Combines foreign affairs but not issues related to war, the military, or defense
   6= Economic Activity
      Includes government budget, issues of government, personal business, finance, labor, and wages
   7= Education and Classical Arts
Public financing of education and the arts, higher education issues relating to financial aid

8 = Ethics
   Personal background and ethics in government

9 = General Human Interest
   Human interest, weather, obituaries, children's interests, and family values

10 = Politics and Governmental Acts
    Legislation, partisan nature of government or campaign activities

11 = Public Health
    Health care, insurance, Medicare and Medicaid programs

12 = Science, Innovation, and the Environment

13 = Social Security and Elderly Issues

14 = Taxes
    Separate from economic issues.

15 = Transportation and Travel
    The economic aspects of transportation industries as well as issues relating to mass transit, road, and travel industries' services

16 = War and Defense
    Military issues and issues relating to conflict or war, foreign and domestic.

17 = Welfare
    All mention of public assistance programs, except those relating to public health care.

34. Code for Dominant
    1 = ___
    2 = Not determinable

35. What Title(s) is(are) Assigned to the First Lady?
    Code for presence of all titles
    1 = Mrs. Clinton
    2 = Ms. Clinton
    3 = Hillary
    4 = Hillary Clinton
    5 = Hillary Rodham Clinton
    6 = Clinton
    7 = First Lady
    8 = First Lady Clinton
9 = First Lady Hillary Clinton
10 = First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton
11 = Clintons
12 = Other

36. Code for Dominant
   1 =
   2 = Not determinable

37. Is Her Marital Status Mentioned?
   Code for references to marriage other than the use of titles to imply her marital status. For example, code yes if the President is called her husband but code no if she is called Mrs. or First Lady.
   1 = Yes
   2 = No
   ** Go to question 39

38. Who refers to the First Lady’s martial status?
   Code for all that refer to her marital status
   1 = the First Lady
   2 = the President
   3 = a(n) elected Democratic political figure(s)
   4 = a(n) elected Republican political figure(s)
   5 = a(n) expert(s)
      Neutral analysis such as Dr. C. Evert Coop
   6 = Presidential advisor(s), cabinet member(s) and/or staff.
   7 = Biased analysis by an interest group representative such as the AMA or Insurance
   8 = by a(n) unnamed source(s)—unattributed
   9 = by the public
   10 = by a reporter or media person
      Code for this when a reporter, anchor, or media person other than the author or original reporter of the story is interviewed or asked for analysis.
   11 = by the reporter/anchor/author
   12 = other

39. Is Her Child Mentioned?
   1 = Yes
   2 = No
40. Is there a picture/video clip of the First Lady?

   ___ 1= Yes
   ___ 2= No

   You are done with this story/article 😊

41. Who is in the picture/video clip?

   ___ 1= the First Lady
   ___ 2= the President
   ___ 3= a(n) elected Democratic political figure(s)
   ___ 4= a(n) elected Republican political figure(s)
   ___ 5= a(n) expert(s)
        Neutral analysis such as Dr. C. Evert Coop
   ___ 6= Presidential advisor(s), cabinet member(s)
        and/or staff.
   ___ 7= Chelsea
   ___ 8= unidentified people (person)
   ___ 9= the public
   ___ 10= a reporter or media person
   ___ 11= other _______________________

42. Does the picture/video clip relate to the story?

   ___ 1= Yes
   ___ 2= No
   ___ 3= Can not determine

43. What image of the First Lady does the picture/video clip present?

   ___ 1= Positive

   For example, showing the First Lady:
   smiling, looking determined, speaking at a
   podium, speaking to political figures,
   shaking hands, with a cheering crowd,
   smiling or attentive colleagues, around
   the American flag (other national
   objects), at eye level (camera is at her
   level)
2= Negative
For example, showing the First Lady:
frowning, looking sad or confused,
sitting, reading, alone or with
inattentive others, with no identifiable
background, or with her looking up (the
camera angle allows for a shot from above)

3= Neutral
No discernable positive or negative bias

4= Can not determine

44. Is there a graphic of the First Lady

1= Yes
2= No

45. What image of the First Lady does the graphic
    present?

1= Positive
For example, showing the First Lady:
smiling, looking determined, speaking at a
podium, speaking to political figures,
shaking hands, with a cheering crowd,
smiling or attentive colleagues, around
the American flag (other national
objects), at eye level (camera is at her
level)

2= Negative
For example, showing the First Lady:
frowning, looking sad or confused,
sitting, reading, alone or with
inattentive others, with no identifiable
background, or with her looking up (the
camera angle allows for a shot from above)

3= Neutral
No discernable positive or negative bias

4= Can not determine
Appendix B
First Lady
Code Sheet

Coder __________________

Variable Description

1. Medium
   ___ 1= Print
   ___ 2= Broadcast

2. Newspaper/Network
   ___ 1= The Washington Post
   ___ 2= The Los Angeles Times
   ___ 3= USA Today
   ___ 1= ABC
   ___ 2= CBS
   ___ 3= NBC

3. Date (Month/Day/Year) ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

4. Article/Story Number ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

5. Length of the Article/Story (number of pages, .25, .50, .75, 1. etc/number of seconds)
   ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

6. Sex of the Author(s)/Reporter(s)
   ___ 1= Female(s)
   ___ 2= Male(s)
   ___ 3= Joint authorship (male and female)
   ___ 4= Cannot be determined
   Name _______________________

7. First Lady Mentioned in headline/lead-in
   ___ 1= Yes
   ___ 2= No

8. First Lady Mentioned in first sentence/lead
   ___ 1= Yes
   ___ 2= No

9. Headline/lead-in language
   ___ 1= Positive
   ___ 2= Negative
   ___ 3= Mixture
   ___ 4= Indifferent/Neutral

10. Slant of Article/Story
    What is the slant taken about her performance as head of the Health Care Reform Task Force?
    ___ 1= Positive
    ___ 2= Negative
3. Combination
4. Indifferent/Neutral

11. What voice(s) was/were present in the story/article?
Code for all who were quoted, paraphrased, analyzed etc.

1 = the First Lady
2 = the President
3 = a(n) elected Democratic political figure(s)
4 = a(n) elected Republican political figure(s)
5 = a(n) expert(s)
6 = Presidential advisor(s), cabinet member(s) and/or staff.
7 = Biased analysis by an interest group representative such as the AMA or Insurance
8 = by a(n) unnamed source(s)—unattributed
9 = by the public
10 = by a reporter or media person
11 = other _________________________________

12. Code for dominant

1 = _______
2 = Not determinable/no dominant voice

13. Focus of the story/article
Code for only one

1 = political
   ** Go to question 15
2 = social
   ** Go to question 17
3 = combination
   ** Go to question 14
4 = other _________________________________

14. Code for dominant of the combination story/article

Code for the dominant political or social slant of the story

1 = _______
   ** Go to question 19

15. If political is the focus what is emphasized?
Code for all that are present

1 = her political power
2 = her influence on President Clinton
3 = the Clinton administration’s political scandals
4 = Health Care Reform
5 = political issues _________________________________
16. Code for dominant
   1= ___
   2= Not determinable
   **Go to question 21

17. If social is the focus what is emphasized?
   Code for all that are present
   ___ 1= her appearance
   ___ 2= her charity work
   ___ 3= her marriage
   ___ 4= motherhood/Chelsea
   ___ 5= social functions of the First Lady
   ___ 6= her past history
   ___ 7= her professional qualifications
   ___ 8= her violation of First Lady role
   ___ 9= other _____________________

18. Code for dominant
   ___ 1= ___
   ___ 2= Not determinable
   **Go to question 21

19. If the focus is a combination between political and social what is emphasized?
   Code for all that are present
   ___ 1= her political power
   ___ 2= her influence on President Clinton
   ___ 3= the Clinton administration’s political scandals
   ___ 4= Health Care Reform
   ___ 5= political issues _________________________
   ___ 6= her appearance
   ___ 7= her charity work
   ___ 8= her marriage
   ___ 9= motherhood/Chelsea
   ___ 10= social functions of the First Lady
   ___ 11= past history
   ___ 12= her professional qualifications
   ___ 13= her violation of First Lady role
   ___ 14= other _________________________

20. Code for dominant
   ___ 1= ___
   ___ 2= Not determinable
21. Is the First Lady Explicitly Criticized?
   __ 1= Yes
   __ 2= No
       If no, go to question 26

22. If Yes, By Whom
   __ 1= the First Lady
   __ 2= the President
   __ 3= a(n) elected Democratic political figure(s)
   __ 4= a(n) elected Republican political figure(s)
   __ 5= a(n) expert(s)
   __ 6= Presidential advisor(s), cabinet member(s)
        and/or staff.
   __ 7= Biased analysis by an interest group
        representative such as the AMA or Insurance
   __ 8= by a(n) unnamed source(s)—unattributed
   __ 9= by the public
   __ 10= by a reporter or media person
   __ 11= other ____________________________

23. Code for Dominant Source of Criticism

   1= __
   2= Not determinable

24. What is she Criticized About?
   Code for the presence of all that apply
   __ 1= Her Honesty/integrity
   __ 2= Her Toughness/strength
   __ 3= Her Warmth/compassion
   __ 4= Her Competency
   __ 5= Her Performance/success
   __ 6= Her Aggressiveness
   __ 7= Her Activeness
   __ 8= Her Past Qualifications
   __ 9= Her Political Ideology
   __ 10= Political Issues
   __ 11= Her political influence
   __ 12= Political scandals
   __ 13= First Lady Role
   __ 14= Her Marriage, mothering, family life
   __ 15= Her values/morals
   __ 16= Her appearance
   __ 17= Other ____________________________

25. Code for Dominant

   __ 1= __

26. Is the First Lady Praised
   __ 1= Yes
2= No
If no, go to question number 31

27. If Yes, By whom is she praised
1= the First Lady
2= the President
3= a(n) elected Democratic political figure(s)
4= a(n) elected Republican political figure(s)
5= a(n) expert(s)
6= Presidential advisor(s), cabinet member(s)
and/or staff.
7= Biased analysis by an interest group
representative such as the AMA or Insurance
8= by a(n) unnamed source(s)—unattributed
9= by the public
10= by a reporter or media person
11= other ________________________________

28. Code for Dominant
1= ___
2= Not determinable

29. What is She Praised About
Code for the presence of all that apply
1= Her Honesty/integrity
2= Her Toughness/strength
3= Her Warmth/compassion
4= Her Competency
5= Her Performance/success
6= Her Aggressiveness
7= Her Activeness
8= Her Past Qualifications
9= Her Political Ideology
10= Political Issues
11= Her political influence
12= Political scandals
13= First Lady Role
14= Her Marriage, mothering, family life
15= Her values/morals
16= Her appearance
17= Other ________________________________

30. Code for Dominant
1= ___

31. What is mentioned about the First Lady?
1= Her Honesty/integrity
2= Her Toughness/strength
3= Her Warmth/compassion
4= Her Competency
5= Her Performance/success
6= Her Aggressiveness
7= Her Activeness
8= Her Past Qualifications
9= Her Political Ideology
10= Political Issues
11= Her political influence
12= Political scandals
13= First Lady Role
14= Her Marriage, mothering, family life
15= Her values/morals
16= Her appearance
17= Other

32. **Code for Dominant**
   1= _____

33. **What Issues are mentioned?**
   Code for presence of all that apply
   1= Abortion
   2= Accidents and Disasters
   3= Agriculture
   4= Crime and Judicial
   5= Diplomacy and Foreign Relation
   6= Economic Activity
   7= Education and Classical Arts
   8= Ethics
   9= General Human Interest
   10= Politics and Governmental Acts
   11= Public Health
   12= Science, Innovation, and the Environment
   13= Social Security and Elderly Issues
   14= Taxes
   15= Transportation and Travel
   16= War and Defense
   17= Welfare

34. **Code for Dominant**
   1= _____
   2= Not determinable

35. **What Title(s) is(are) Assigned to the First Lady?**
   Code for presence of all titles
   1= Mrs. Clinton
   2= Ms. Clinton
   3= Hillary
   4= Hillary Clinton
   5= Hillary Rodham Clinton
   6= Clinton
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>First Lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>First Lady Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>First Lady Hillary Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Clintons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. **Code for Dominant**

- 1 = ___
- 2 = Not determinable

37. **Is Her Marital Status Mentioned?**

- 1 = Yes
- 2 = No

**Go to question 39**

38. **Who refers to the First Lady's marital status?**

Code for all that refer to her marital status

- 1 = the First Lady
- 2 = the President
- 3 = a(n) elected Democratic political figure(s)
- 4 = a(n) elected Republican political figure(s)
- 5 = a(n) expert(s)
- 6 = Presidential advisor(s), cabinet member(s) and/or staff.
- 7 = Biased analysis by an interest group representative such as the AMA or Insurance
- 8 = by a(n) unnamed source(s)-unattributed
- 9 = by the public
- 10 = by a reporter or media person
  - Code for this when a reporter, anchor, or media person other than the author or original reporter of the story is interviewed or asked for analysis.
- 11 = by the reporter/anchor/author
- 12 = other

39. **Is Her Child Mentioned?**

- 1 = Yes
- 2 = No

40. **Is there a picture/video clip of the First Lady?**

- 1 = Yes
- 2 = No

You are done with this story/article 😊
41. Who is in the picture/video clip?
   ___ 1= the First Lady
   ___ 2= the President
   ___ 3= a(n) elected Democratic political figure(s)
   ___ 4= a(n) elected Republican political figure(s)
   ___ 5= a(n) expert(s)
       Neutral analysis such as Dr. C. Evert Coop
   ___ 6= Presidential advisor(s), cabinet member(s)
       and/or staff.
   ___ 7= Chelsea
   ___ 8= unidentified people (person)
   ___ 9= the public
   ___ 10= a reporter or media person
   ___ 11= other ____________________________

42. Does the picture/video clip relate to the story?
   ___ 1= Yes
   ___ 2= No
   ___ 3= Can not determine

43. What image of the First Lady does the picture/video clip present?
   ___ 1= Positive
   ___ 2= Negative
   ___ 3= Neutral
   ___ 4= Can not determine

** Print is done **

44. Is there a graphic of the First Lady
   ___ 1= Yes
   ___ 2= No

45. What image of the First Lady does the graphic present?
   ___ 1= Positive
   ___ 2= Negative
   ___ 3= Neutral
   ___ 4= Can not determine