SEMIOTIC ANALYSIS OF HILLARY CLINTON’S PHOTOGRAPHIC IMAGE IN NEWSWEEK MAGAZINE

By

HAN CHANG

A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN MASS COMMUNICATION

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2008
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my parents, my brother, my sister, and my grandmother for supporting me to come to UF for my master’s degree. I thank Dr. Goodman for inspiring me on doing a semiotics analysis for my thesis and for advising me on my thesis patiently. I thank Dr. Armstrong for being my co-chair and advising me on my thesis. I thank Chan Wong Wong for his company in my first year at UF. I thank Patrick Chiu for his love and support during the year when I was writing up my thesis.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 LITERATURE REVIEW</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of Women in Media</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrayal of Women in the Political Realm</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Communication and Gender Stereotypes</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary Rodham Clinton as a Polarizing First Lady</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 METHOD</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiotics and Semiotic Analysis</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps in Semiotic Analysis</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pros and Cons of Semiotic Analysis</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Subject</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of <em>Newsweek</em> Magazine</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sample and Sampling Method</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Use of Codes</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 RESULTS</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Lady Hillary Clinton, 1992</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Rally: Aug. 3, 1992, p. 27</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary and I Have Talked This Through: Nov./Dec., 1992, p. 27</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast a Spell: Nov. 16, 1992, p. 35</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary was Better in Strategy-making: Nov./Dec., 1992, p. 38</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Soul of an Activist, Nov. 16, 1992, p. 42</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Lady Incumbent, 1996</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Hopes: Sep. 9, 1996, p. 30</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Themes, Cold Cash: Sep. 2, 1996, p. 24</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charm Offensive: Oct. 7, 1996, p. 38</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wounded and Wary: Nov. 11, 1996, p. 21</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Scent of Scandal: Nov. 18, 1996, p. 70</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Senate Candidate, 2000 ..........................................................................................................68
Syracuse N.Y.: Nov. 20, 2000, p.81 .................................................................................. 69
Fascinated by all Things American: Nov. 27, 2000, p. 51 ............................................... 70
The President Will Help Boost Hillary’s War Chest: Sep. 11, 2000, p.6 ....................... 71
Finger Pointing: Nov. 26, 2000, p. 96 ............................................................................. 72
Presidential Candidate of the Democratic Party, 2007 ...........................................................73
Hillary Defends the Gift: Aug. 20, 2007, p.12 ................................................................. 74
Beset on All Sides: Sep. 17, 2007, p.30, 31 .....................................................................75
What has She Done: Aug. 13, 2007, p.36 ..................................................................... 76
Lobbying Effort: Sep. 17, 2007, p.36 ............................................................................. 77
Bringing It: Nov. 12, 2007, p. 40 .................................................................................... 78
Together Through It All: Oct. 22, 2007, p.43 ................................................................... 79
Member of the Club: Sep. 17, 2007, p.32, 33 ................................................................. 80
What Kind of Decider Would She be: Sep. 17, 2007, cover page ................................. 81
Under Cover: Oct. 29, 2007, p.37 ................................................................................... 82
The Once and Future Queen, Nov. 5, 2007, p.41 ............................................................ 83

5 DISCUSSION .........................................................................................................................84

Limitations ...........................................................................................................................94
Suggestions for Future Research ..........................................................................................95

APPENDIX

A CODING SHEET ...................................................................................................................96
B PHOTOS ...............................................................................................................................98
LIST OF REFERENCES .........................................................................................................123
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH .................................................................................................128
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>St. Louis rally: Aug. 3, 1992, p. 27</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Hillary and I have talked this through: Nov./Dec., 1992, p. 27</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3</td>
<td>Cast a spell: Nov. 16, 1992, p. 35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4</td>
<td>Hillary was better in strategy-making: Nov./Dec., 1992, p. 38</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-5</td>
<td>The soul of an activist, Nov. 16, 1992, p. 42</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-6</td>
<td>Chicago hopes: Sep. 9, 1996, p. 30</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-7</td>
<td>Big themes, cold cash: Sep. 2, 1996, p. 24</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-9</td>
<td>Wounded and wary: Nov. 11, 1996, p. 21</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-10</td>
<td>The scent of scandal: Nov. 18, 1996, p. 70</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-12</td>
<td>Syracuse N.Y.: Nov. 20, 2000, p. 81</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-13</td>
<td>Fascinated by all things American: Nov. 27, 2000, p. 51</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-14</td>
<td>The president will help boost Hillary’s war chest: Sep. 11, 2000, p. 6</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-15</td>
<td>Finger pointing: Nov. 26, 2000, p. 96</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-16</td>
<td>Hillary defends the gift: Aug. 20, 2007, p. 12</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-17</td>
<td>Beset on all sides: Sep. 17, 2007, p. 30, 31</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-18</td>
<td>What has she done: Aug. 13, 2007, p. 36</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-19</td>
<td>Lobbying effort: Sep. 17, 2007, p. 36</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-20</td>
<td>Bringing it: Nov. 12, 2007, p. 40</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-21</td>
<td>Together through it all: Oct. 22, 2007, p. 43</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-22</td>
<td>Member of the club: Sep. 17, 2007, p. 32, 33</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-23</td>
<td>What Kind of Decider Would She be: Sep. 17, 2007, cover page</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hillary Clinton has been a controversial political figure since she was a First Lady. While extensive literature discusses Clinton’s media coverage during her years as First Lady, there is not much literature about Clinton’s image after she progressed to a Senator or a presidential candidate of the Democratic Party. This study looks at Hillary Clinton’s photographic image during her three political career stages—as a First Lady, a Senate candidate and a Presidential candidate in *Newsweek* magazine. Conducting a semiotic analysis, the researcher found that Hillary Clinton’s photographic images had changed as she progressed from a spouse of the President to a Presidential Candidate in the Democratic presidential nomination.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Hillary Clinton is a polarizing figure when it comes to politics and the media. As a first lady, she was controversial because people had a hard time accepting a powerful First Lady (Scharrer, 2002). Extensive literature on Hillary Clinton as a First Lady shows that she was portrayed more negatively than positively by the media (Winfield, 1997; Parry-Giles, 2000). While plenty of literature discusses Clinton’s media coverage during her years as First Lady, there is not much literature about Clinton’s image after she progressed to a Senator or a presidential candidate of the Democratic Party. There is an obvious need to expand the research beyond Hillary Clinton’s image merely as a First Lady to a broader and more holistic view, in order to compare how her image has changed during her three political career stages. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to understand the photographic media portrayal of Hillary Clinton in her three different political career stages: when she served as a spouse to a presidential candidate in 1992 and 1996; when she was a Senate candidate in 2000 and when she became a presidential candidate of the Democratic Party for the 2008 presidential race. While the First Lady’s function is mainly serving as a supporter and a confidant of the president, Senator and presidential candidates are positions that have traditionally been male-dominated. Therefore, it is assumed that her image will be different during her three career stages.

To explore Clinton’s media portrayal during her three career stages, I looked at Clinton’s photos in a newsmagazine. I chose news photos for the focus of the study instead of text because people tend to believe that photos reflect truth better than words (Thorson and Mendelson, 2001). Photos are often considered a reliable, objective witness of events and people. Media is stuffed with stories and photographs of politics; politics have become more and more image-based (Tirohl, 2000). Therefore, looking at news photos helps researchers understand how voters learn
about politicians, especially since most people never meet politicians in person and their knowledge of politicians are based on mediated images of politicians (Thorson and Mendelson, 2001).

In this study, I aimed to find out the connotations created in the images of Hillary Clinton in newsmagazines, particularly within gender representations. To achieve the goal, I used semiotics, which is the study of signs, as my research method. By conducting semiotic analysis, I looked at the symbols in the news photos in order to read the ideologies and the latent messages of the photos. By examining the background, settings, appearances, lightings, angles, colors and tones in the news photos of Hillary Clinton, the portrayals of Hillary Clinton by the media were closely examined.

There is a need for this study because it provides a detailed analysis about Hillary Clinton’s visual image in the media and it explores the idea that media portrayals of female politicians may be sexist and/or biased. There are a limited number of semiotics studies about Hillary Clinton or any other politician’s photos in the existent literature; therefore, this study can be an exemplary work for researchers interested in media portrayal of politicians or female politicians like Hillary Clinton. In addition, learning more about how Clinton has been portrayed during her tenure in the public eye allows researchers to determine how women are covered as they traverse a political career. As one of the most recognizable female political figures, the study of her images can add to the research about the media’s portrayal of female public figures, gender representation by media, and gender politics. Whether Clinton manages to become the presidential candidate or not, her emergence as leading candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination points out that the media coverage of female politicians deserves to be carefully studied.
Literature shows that women with power were met by negative coverage of media (Shames, 2002; Kahn and Goldenberg, 1991; Jamieson, 1995). However, feminists argued that equality can be achieved by education and rational argument (Steeves, 1987; Beasley, 1999). Therefore, this study examines whether the codes in Clinton’s photos match up with her roles after she progressed to a Senator and a presidential candidate, or if her photographic image is just another case of how media portray women with gender stereotypes.

To summarize, this study explores the following research question: How did the media present Hillary Clinton with news photos during her three different political career stages—as a First Lady, a Senator, and a Presidential candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination?
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Framework

The study is based on feminist theory. According to Steeves (1987), feminist theory assumes women are devalued in society. Feminists aim to understand the reasons for the devaluation and focus on changing the devaluation and disparity between women and men in terms of biological, individualistic, social psychological and economic aspects (Steeves, 1987). Based on these aspects of devaluation, there are four main streams of feminism theory that address the devaluation of women: radical feminism, liberal feminism, Marxist feminism and socialist feminism (Steeves, 1987). All four will be outlined below.

According to Beasley (1999), liberal feminism is the most widely known category of feminist theories; it is the mainstream of feminist theories and is often considered identical to feminism. Compared to radical feminists who emphasize the psychological origins of gender discrepancies, liberal feminists believe that the inequality is merely due to irrational prejudice and can be changed through rational arguments and rational mental development (Steeves, 1987; Hughes, 2002). Therefore, liberal feminists promote that both government and society should guarantee equal opportunities between the two sexes; they emphasize on establishing and changing laws on issues such as education, women’s suffrage, employment, and equal payment so to enable women’s intellectual growth, professional success, and to improve representation of women in politics, history, and media (Steeves, 1987; Beasley, 1999; Walters, 2005). They especially focus on issues of the political and economic inequalities that women face (Beasley, 1999).

The liberal feminist movement prospered in the eighteenth-century, the Age of Enlightenment (Beasley, 1999). Male liberal thinkers in that age believed that God gave every
individual a rational mind and the ability to reason things. They asserted that therefore every person has some inherited natural rights, so they should be treated equally in law (Donovan, 1992). However, at the time of the Age of Enlightenment, the “individual,” generally referred only to men. Women were considered as “others,” those who were non-rational and emotional. Therefore, based on the ideas of the male liberal thinkers, women were not entitled natural rights (Donovan, 1992).

Liberal feminists, therefore, endeavored to change this assumption. They argued that women were also citizens and persons who should be permitted the same natural rights as men. During this time of revolutionary zeal when the American Declaration of Independence and French Declaration of the Rights of Men were created, feminist theorists contended that women’s rights should be considered in the new constitutions (Donovan, 1992, Beasley, 1999; LeGates, 2001).

In general, liberal feminists share several points of view (Donovan, 1992). First, they value rationality and believe that the individual’s reason and conscience are more reliable than any kind of tradition or institution. Furthermore, they believe that women and men have the same rational abilities and they are similar in mind and body (Donovan, 1992, Beasley, 1999). Although in society, women are viewed as physically and mentally weaker than men, Hillary Clinton has long been recognized as a capable and strong woman who exceeded the achievements most men have ever gained. Therefore, Hillary Clinton’s achievement in her education and career life sustains this idea of liberal feminists. Second, they value individualism and self-reliance; they see the need for education and training of critical thinking and view them as tools for social changes (Steeves, 1987; Donovan, 1992). Finally, they see natural rights and political rights, especially voting rights, as essential to women (Donovan, 1992). From the case
of Hillary Clinton becoming a presidential candidate, it seems like women have achieved political equalities such as voting rights and rights for running for political office. Therefore, I looked at how the mass media perceive this achievement and this role model as a practitioner of women’s rights: do they support women gaining as much political power as men or do they disagree with it?

Conversely, radical feminists argue that women are oppressed because there are biologically inherent differences between man and women. In other words, they believe that oppression exists because women are viewed as the other sex. Furthermore, they consider the oppression to be a result of patriarchy (Steeves, 1987; Beasley, 1999). Patriarchy means “the rule of the farther” in Greek (LeGates, 2001, p. 11). It was used in *The Old Testament* to describe fathers’ full power over family members, and feminists use it to describe the male domination over women in the society (LeGates, 2001). In the patriarchic society, men belonged to the public sphere and women private; men got better opportunity in terms of education; women were paid less than men for the same amount of work; men had more control over women’s bodies than women to men (LeGates, 2001). Therefore, radical feminists believe that as long as women stay in a patriarchal society, they will never be free from oppression.

In contrast to liberal feminism, which emphasizes changing the political system or law, radical feminism deals with ideas, attitudes and cultural values rather than economics or political rights of the male-dominated society. For instance, because radical feminists recognize sexual oppression, they promote that women should have control over their bodies (Beasley, 1999). This kind of oppression can be found in the media representation of women. In visual presentation such as advertisements and movies, female bodies are the landscape and men are the
ideal spectators. When watching movies or looking at advertisement, a female audience is used to looking at themselves being looked at (Berger, 1972; Mulvey, 1999).

While liberal feminists believe women and men are similar in mind and body, radical feminists believe that any woman shares more similarities with any other woman than with any man, in spite of the two women’s possible differences in their race, class, age or nationality (Beasley, 1999, p.54). They argue that the oppression of women is too deep to be changed by individual or social movements (Steeves, 1987), thus they emphasize the sisterhood of women (Beasley, 1999). They seek to solve the problem by forming political or other bonds between women in the world. They promote the separation between men and women such as encouraging women to live as far as possible from men, to become lesbians or to treat men with hormones so they can bear children (Steeves, 1987; Beasley, 1999).

Both Marxist and socialist feminist theories were prominent in the 1960s and 1970s. However, the Marxist feminist tradition has declined since the end of the 1980s (Beasley, 1999). Like liberal feminism, Marxist feminism is concerned with the public sphere of women and pays attention to the relation of women and the wage of labor (Beasley, 1999). However, compared to liberal feminism, Marxist feminists argue that women’s oppression has resulted in class oppression under capitalism (Steeves, 1987). Marxist theorists consider labor as a source of economic activities; while men used their labor to earn money, women were treated as property of men because they were not the labor source (Beasley, 1999). In other words, Marxist feminists state that women’s oppression in the modern nuclear family structure was the result of the capitalistic society in which male wage earners have control over the family (Steeves, 1987). Therefore, they propose that bringing down capitalism is the necessary step to end male privilege (Steeves, 1987; Beasley, 1999).
Socialist feminism maintains some of the ideas of Marxism but it asserts that women’s oppression was not caused by class oppression and capitalism but has existed before the class-based society (Beasley, 1999). While Marxists see class oppression as the primary factor for women’s oppression, socialist feminists considers the oppression as a result of patriarchy. Besides that, many socialist feminists consider factors like race, sexual preferences and cultural background as important to the oppression (Steeves, 1987).

This study focuses on liberal feminist theory. The rationales of the choice of the theory are stated as follows. First, Hillary Clinton fits into the category of a liberal feminist. She has an advanced degree and have been practicing attorney before she had become a First Lady (Beasley, 2005). Instead of a mere decoration, she influenced the President’s stance on political issues (Beasley, 2005). She held an official position during the National Health Care Reform. She served as a global promoter for women’s rights, giving a speech on human rights in 1995 at the United Nations Conference on Women in Beijing (Beasley, 2005). She moved from the wife of a powerful man to a Senator to a presidential candidate, who endeavors to achieve equal political power as her husband.

Second, the study looks at the change of Hillary Clinton’s image during the stages in which she gained more political power, which corresponds to the idea of liberal feminism that the equality between women and men can be acquired by rational arguments, education or legislation. Liberal feminist theory states that equality between both sexes can be achieved by political and legal reforms. Hillary Clinton, who had become a female presidential candidate in Democratic Party nomination 87 years after women’s suffrage, can be viewed as the fulfillment of the ideals of liberal feminists. The study, therefore, aims at finding out if the photographic
media portrayals of Hillary Clinton reflected the equality she achieved in the political realm or if Hillary Clinton was still treated unequally with gender stereotypes by the media.

**Presentation of Women in Media**

In general, the inequality of women pointed out by feminist theories is reflected in the media (Tuchman, 1979; Lauzen and Dozier, 1999; Glascock and Preston-Schreck, 2004; Len-Rios, Rodgers, Thorson, and Yoon, 2005). This study focuses on the photographic portrayals of Hillary Clinton in a newsmagazine, thus it is important to look at how females are represented by media.

Research shows that women are often underrepresented in terms of quantity by the media. For example, Armstrong (2004) examined 18 U.S. daily newspapers and found that men were mentioned three times as often as women in the front page, lifestyle page, and sports pages.

Furthermore, when women were represented by the media, they were often presented in stereotypes (Glascock and Preston-Schreck, 2004; Len-Rios, Rodgers, Thorson, & Yoon, 2005). Stereotype, according the Merriam-Webster online dictionary, means “something conforming to a fixed or general pattern, especially a standardized mental picture that is held in common by members of a group and that represents an oversimplified opinion, prejudiced attitude, or uncritical judgment” (Merriam-Webster, 2008, http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary). In other words, stereotypes generalize people based on their membership in certain categories. Instead of direct contact and understanding of the group, stereotypes are often the result of indirect information one receives through mass media. Although stereotypes help people to reach rapid conclusions and allow us to make sense of the world we live in, they are sometimes inaccurate and can have a negative influence on the specific groups (Karen & Khoo, 2007).

Gender stereotypes, like any other stereotypes, give us the oversimplified conception and image of women (Karen & Khoo, 2007). Media stereotyped women by presenting them as
spouses (Tuchman, 1979; Luebke, 1989; Jamieson, 1995), mothers, and homemakers (Tuchman, 1979).

Compared to men, women on television were depicted less often as employed outside the home, their marital and parental status were more obvious, and there was more emphasis placed on their physical appearance, especially regarding their age and dress (Glascock and Preston-Schreck, 2004). In addition, women were perceived as more helpful and affectionate than men (Glascock and Preston-Schreck, 2004). While women were depicted as more communal, such as being caring, sensitive, and giving on television, men were viewed as more instrumental--assertive, aggressive and dominant (Len-Rios, Rodgers, Thorson, and Yoon, 2005).

In terms of print advertising, women were depicted younger, more in decorative roles, and working less than men (Glascock and Preston-Schreck, 2004). Research on newspaper content as well supports the lower status of women in society (Luebke. 1989; Daily and Dalton, 2000; Glascock and Preston-Schreck, 2004; Len-Rios, Rodgers, Thorson, & Yoon, 2005). Luebke (1989) looked at 8960 photos found in 184 issues of newspaper to examine the roles portrayed by men and women in newspaper photographs. She found that photos of men outnumbered those of women. Besides, while men were often portrayed in roles as professionals and athletes, women were often portrayed as spouses.

Using feminist theory, Len-Rios, Rodgers, Thorson, & Yoon (2005) examined two newspapers’ content, newsreader perceptions, and news staff to explore the representation of women in newspapers. The results showed that women were underrepresented in terms of amount of coverage and photos. Besides, women appeared less than men in stereotypically male sections such as business or sports and appeared more than men in stereotypically female
sections such as entertainment. Len-Rois et al. (2005) concluded that the newspapers studied mirrored the patriarchal ideology that prevailed in the U.S. society.

Glascock and Preston-Schreck (2004) examined the representation of gender and race in 50 daily newspaper comics. From the sample of comics in one metropolitan daily newspaper and three mid-size daily newspapers in an upper Midwest state, Glascock and Preston-Schreck (2004) found that women were presented in gender stereotypes. They were portrayed more often as married, having children and less often having a job compared to men. When women were portrayed as having a job, they were paid less than men were. Furthermore, the media focused more on the woman’s appearance than on men’s (Glascock and Preston-Schreck, 2004).

Regarding powerful female leaders in the society, media oppressed them by emphasizing their female traits and portraying them as traditional, feminine women (Jamieson, 1995). The following example shows how female executives were portrayed in stereotypes. In Daily and Dalton’s (2000) article about news coverage of women at the top, they argued that women with power such as female executives were constantly covered negatively in gender stereotypes. They pointed out that despite the accomplishment of Carleton “Carly” Fiorian, the chief executive of Hewlett-Packard, *U.S News & World Report* referred to her as a “former receptionist” and the “consummate corporate cheerleader” (as cited in Daily and Dalton, 2000, p. 58). The partner of Hummer Winblad, Ann Winblad, was covered by *Money* magazine not only as “one of Silicon Valley’s preeminent venture capitalists” but also as Bill Gates’ ex-girlfriend who “Gates spends one weekend a year with her” (as cited in Daily and Dalton, 2000, p. 58). They also pointed out that after Darla Moore donated $25 million to the University of South Carolina’s School of Business, a *Business Week* headline wrote “The Lady is a B School,” and *Fortune* called her “the toughest babe in business” (as cited in Daily and Dalton, 2000, p. 58). Daily and Dalton (2000)
concluded that reporters often focused on female executives’ style and look while male executives were given more emphasis on their success in the business realm (Daily and Dalton, 2000).

Tuchman (1979) argued that the underrepresentations and stereotyping of women by the media could be an indicator of the real position of woman in American society—their lack of power. Because the mainstream media serves the interests of male audience rather than those of female audience, women have long struggled for recognition in the male-dominated profession of photography (Sultze, 2003). Doane (1982) and Stacey (1999) stated that when women look at female images, they have to identify themselves as male spectators to appreciate the images. As Doane (1982) has mentioned:

…the result is a tendency to view the female spectator as the site of an oscillation between a feminine position and a masculine position, invoking the metaphor of the transvestite. Given the structure of cinematic narrative, the woman who identifies with a female character must adopt a passive or masochistic position…The transvestite wears clothes which signify a different sexuality, a sexuality which, for the woman, allows a mastery over the image and the very possibility of attaching the gaze to desire. (p. 137, 138)

From the literature presented above, it appears that women were devalued by the media (Tuchman, 1979; Daily and Dalton, 2000). This disparity agrees with the perspective of feminist theory that women are treated unequally in the society. However, liberal feminists believe that equality between two sexes is feasible (Steeves, 1987). From the political standpoint, Clinton’s transcending from First Lady to a presidential candidate can be seen as a sign of the equality. Therefore, this study analyzes the photographic portrayals of Hillary Clinton to see if her media portrayals match up with her power and position at the time, and thus characterize her as a nontraditional woman.

Since Hillary Clinton had become a Senator and a candidate for the Democratic nomination in the presidential election, besides looking at studies on how media represent
women in general, it is necessary to find out how past literature talks about the portrayal of women in the political realm.

Portrayal of Women in the Political Realm

In this male-dominated society, media are owned by the patriarchy, thus the media are used as a means to promote the ideology of the patriarchal society such as male supremacy and maleness (Hall, 1982; Frazer & Lacy, 1993). If women challenge the ideology, the media, as a patriarchal institution, will try to constrain their power. As a result, when a woman departs from a traditional role such as holding political power, the media will try to soften and feminize her by presenting her with gender stereotypes to lessen her threat to the traditional norms of masculinity (Goodman, 1997).

Past studies show that female candidates have been underrepresented and stereotyped as less viable by the media (Kahn and Goldenberg, 1991; Kahn, 1992). Although recent studies have found that female candidates are gradually receiving about the same amount of coverage with their male competitors, the findings have suggested that female and male candidates are still portrayed differently by the media (Aday and Devitt, 2001; Devitt, 2002; Banwart, Bystrom & Robertson, 2003).

In earlier studies on the portrayal of female politicians in the media, Kahn and Goldenberg (1991) examined the news coverage of 26 U.S. Senate campaign from 1982 to 1986 in order to find out how the media covered male and female candidates differently. Kahn and Goldenberg (1991) conducted the content analysis by selecting the newspapers with the largest circulation within each state as the samples and coded them from September 1 to the day after the election. The results show that female candidates received less coverage than male candidates. Furthermore, the media put more focus on the viability of the female candidates and less on their issue position; besides, the media presented female candidates as less viable than
male candidates. Kahn (1992) further conducted an experiment to examine whether the difference in media coverage between male and female candidates affected people’s assessments of candidates of the two sexes. The results show that the candidates who were portrayed as masculine were perceived as more viable, stronger leaders who can handle military issues better (Kahn, 1992). On the other hand, candidates who were portrayed as more feminine were considered as more honest and more compassionate (Kahn, 1992).

Recent studies show an increasing amount of female candidates’ coverage but the unchanged stereotyping of female candidates. For instance, Aday and Devitt (2001) looked at three months of coverage in five newspapers to compare newspaper coverage of Elizabeth Dole's presidential campaign with that of George W. Bush, John McCain and Steve Forbes. They found that Dole received more coverage focusing on her personal traits and less coverage outlining her opinions on the issues, although in quantity, Dole received more coverage than McCain and Forbes. In another study about female and candidates news coverage, Devitt (2002) also found that although female and male candidates received about the same amount of news coverage, female candidates received less issue coverage and more personal coverage than male candidates (Devitt, 2002).

Banwart, Bystrom and Robertson’s (2003) study produced similar results. Examining 1,285 newspaper articles focusing on the media coverage of female and male candidates running for either their Senate or gubernatorial office during the 2000 primary and general election series, Banwart et al. (2003) found that female candidates were more likely to be the main focus in the primary coverage, and both female and male candidates were equally likely to be the main focus in the coverage of the general election. Comparing the quantity, the viability, the issue coverage of female and male candidates, Banwart et al. (2003) argued the results implying that
although gender stereotypes were still mirrored in the presentations, female candidates were treated more equally in media coverage than in the previous election coverage. According to Banwart et al. (2003), female candidates were more likely to have their gender, children, and marital status talked about in both primary and general election articles. However, male candidates received less coverage about their gender, children and marital status during the primary stage than female candidates and almost no coverage about their gender, children and marital status in the general election stage (Banwart et al., 2003).

In addition, men were perceived as more skillful, more able to handle issues like economics and military, while women were considered as better at handling issues with poverty or health care and worse at issues with the military (Leeper, 1991; Huddy & Terkildsen, 1993). Surveying 297 undergraduates attended the State University of New York at Stony Brook in 1990, Huddy and Terkildsen (1993) found that typical male qualities, such as tough, assertive, tough and active, were viewed as important for higher office. Huddy and Terkildsen (1993) suggested that typical female traits were considered less appropriate for higher or executive levels of office (Huddy and Terkildsen, 1993).

From the studies shown above, it appears that stereotyping female candidates may put them at a disadvantage in elections. Kahn (1992) proposed that sex stereotypes could sometimes be an advantage for female candidates, but in the long run, stereotypes put female candidates in disadvantages. Female candidates were portrayed as more compassionate and honest than their male counterparts. This image could help female candidates when they run for government office. However, although benefitting the female candidates in the short-term, stressing traditional female strengths like compassion reinforces the female stereotypes and might eventually hurt female candidates. Being stereotyped as compassionate and honest, female
candidates might not be viewed by the voters as able in dealing with defense and economic issues (Kahn, 1992). Kahn concluded that, overall, the differences in news coverage could negatively affect female candidates.

Female candidates in the U.S. have faced difficulties integrating their gender with their desired political roles because people and the media usually perceive them as women first and candidates second (Shames, 2002). Because of the preference for masculine personality traits of voters for higher office, female candidates often present themselves as women who break the gender stereotypes in the campaigns (Carlson, 2001).

However, even if they break the gender stereotypes and present their masculine traits such as being competent, strong, aggressive, they might still have to face the femininity/competent double bind addressed by Jamieson (1995). Based on the double bind, if women show their female personality traits, they risk being condemned as not competent enough. If they show themselves as too powerful or too capable, they will be accused of being a lesbian or trying to be a man (Jamieson, 1995).

According to Jamieson (1995), the femininity/competence double bind is based on the idea that women cannot be both feminine and competent. Those who showed their intelligence and strength were viewed as tough, active, decisive, competent and masculine; those who utilized their uteruses and held their responsibilities at home were considered as nurturing, passive, warm, and feminine. Women who work in public sphere are usually viewed as either too tough (and thus make male colleagues hard to relate to) or too soft (and thus not tough or smart enough) (Jamieson, 1995). As the linguist Robin Lakoff put it:

So a girl is damned if she does, damned if she doesn’t… If she refuses to talk like a lady, she is ridiculed and subjected to criticism as unfeminine; if she does learn, she is ridiculed as unable to think clearly, unable to take part in a serious discussion: in some sense, at less...
than fully human. These two choices which a woman has—to be less than a woman or less than a person—are highly painful (as cited in Jamieson, 1995, p.121)

The studies presented above focus on examining the text content of newspaper; however, visual images often have a bigger influence or impact on audience’s perception of political elite (Tirohl, 2000; Thorson and Mendelson, 2001).

**Visual Communication**

People believe in images. We trust what we see more than what we read (Tirohl, 2000). Because texts are totally made by writers and the image-making process is subtle and almost invisible, people tend to believe that images can reflect truth better than words, and photos are often considered as a reliable, objective witness of events and people (Thorson and Mendelson, 2001).

Although photos are considered as reliable, in most cases, photos are not necessarily more accurate than words. According to Gamson, Croteau, Hoynes and Sasson (1992):

> We walk around with media-generated images of the world, using them to construct meaning about political and social issues. The lens through which we receive these images is not neutral but evinces the power and point of view of the political and economic elites who operate and focus it. And the special genius of this system is to make the whole process seem so normal and natural that the very art of social construction is invisible. (p. 374)

Gamson et al. (1992) pointed out that while images are reproductions, they could also be “mental pictures” of something not real or not present (Gamson et al., 1992, p. 374). While the image makers might not do it intentionally, images often tell the readers how to interpret the world and are a lot of time teachers of values, ideologies and beliefs (Gamson et al. 1992). In other words, images can affect readers’ points of view on events or people.

Parry-Giles (2000) also claimed that news media have a significant control over the visuals that are presented. He argued that visual presentations can be more skewed than verbal expressions (Parry-Giles, 2000). For example, when selecting video footage and photographs in
the news organizations’ archives, journalists might tend to use the images and footage that support the news story even though they were taken in a different context (Parry-Giles, 2000). Therefore, when visual images were presented, they were often pulled out from the context and were recontextualized within a new story (Parry-Giles, 2000). Visual recontextualization is difficult to find out without close examination of large amounts of news coverage. One of the examples Parry-Giles (2000) presented is how NBC news covered Hillary Clinton’s handling of the Lewinsky affair. During a September 28, 1998, special broadcast by NBC news called “The President and the People,” NBC aired a close-up shot of Hillary Clinton. In the shot, she seems to be crying or has just cried. While they showed the shot, the reporter says:

Hillary Rodham Clinton knows her husband of 23 years better than anyone. Yet this revelation was news to her too we’re told. For most wives the painful details of an affair would be discussed behind closed doors. (As cited in Parry-Giles, 2000, p.214)

This news, along with the shot, implies to the audience that Hillary Clinton was crying because of the affair. However, the footage was actually taken from the memorial service for those Americans who died in the Tanzania and Kenya Embassy bombings (Parry-Giles, 2000). Throughout the service, most of the people who gave speeches had cried (Parry-Giles, 2000).

Another example occurred when CNN covered a news story about Whitewater. The correspondent says, “there were other seeds of trouble in Arkansas—trouble with her husband over other women” (as cited in Parry-Giles, 2000, p. 213). During the narration, CNN first inserted a black-and-white photo that shows Hillary Clinton looking down and looking to the left as she is lost in thought or sad but at the same time looking for something to her left. Then they presented a videotape shot of Bill Clinton dancing with women (mariachi dancers). As he dances with one woman, he gazes closely at her body (Parry-Giles, 2000).

Parry-Giles (2000) argued that the photo of Hillary Clinton implied that she was thinking about her husband’s activities with other women. He further suggested that the combination of
the way Hillary looked at the left and the sudden introduction of the dancing video clip generated
the discourse of Hillary Clinton was on the outside of the event looking in (Parry-Giles, 2000).

Parry-Giles (2000) further mentioned that camera techniques related to distancing such as
zooming in, zooming out of a subject or panning across an image could also create certain
discourses for the audience. Compared to image size, the distance between the camera and the
person has a bigger influence on how the audience sees the person. Close-up shots construct a
sense of intimacy for the audience to the person being portrayed. One of the examples Parry-
Giles (2000) talked about is of the CNN’s coverage of Hillary Clinton. When a CNN
correspondent talks about Clinton as “the least popular First Lady in modern history” (as cited in
Parry-Giles, 2000, p. 215), the aired photo is an extreme close-up shot of Clinton, which shows
her face with only a little of her hair shown because of the proximity of the camera’s gaze.
Hillary Clinton was portrayed as a sad First Lady in this black-and-white photo. The
correspondent then talks about the problem she faces in terms of her public relation in Arkansas:

A lot of southern women will do their best most of the time to look as good as they can.
And a lot of people sort of looked at Hillary with the coke bottle glasses, the unfortunate
hairstyle and a lot of women just said “what’s wrong with that girl.” (as cited in Parry-Giles,
2000, p.215)

During this narration, CNN inserted the photo of Hillary Clinton with large glasses and the
“unfortunate hairstyle” (Parry-Giles, 2000). The extreme close-up picture, according to Parry-Giles
(2000), is so close that it violates Clinton’s privacy. Because of the extreme close-up, it “lures us
into believing that we know the people—and hence the women—we invite regularly into our
homes” (Jamieson, 1995, p.145). When such close-up images are used in the negative narrations
of the person being portrayed, the sense of intimacy created by the closeness of the camera gaze
will persuade the audience to buy into the negative narration about the person (Parry-Giles,
2000).
An example of this kind of the media-mediated images is also found in CNN’s coverage of Hillary Clinton. When the correspondent states, “Critics say Hillary Clinton has stonewalled, that she gives lawyerly answers rather than candid ones” (as cited in Parry-Giles, 2000, p.216), the camera zooms in on Hillary Clinton talking. As Parry-Giles suggests, the camera in this case can help the audience to accomplish what they can’t do: to go into Clinton’s private space and therefore see through her image-making strategies (Parry-Giles, 2000).

These examples of the visual manipulation of media demonstrate that while the audience may see visual texts as evidence of news stories, visual representations can actually be misleading or even deceiving. Therefore, I believe that the media portrayals of Hillary Clinton during the campaigns deserve close scrutiny because while not necessary being genuine, news photos are often considered as reliable sources and used as reliable references of candidates’ personalities (Thorson and Mendelson, 2001).

**Visual Communication and Gender Stereotypes**

In terms of how gender is presented, several studies show that women and men were depicted differently in terms of visual representations. Men were usually assumed to be the active spectators while women were passively portrayed in the photos as objects to be looked at (Berger, 1972; Goffman, 1979; Mulvey, 1999). Mulvey (1999) argued that frequently men were the ideal spectators and women were the landscapes:

> The determining male gaze projects its fantasy onto the female figure, which is styled accordingly. In their traditional exhibitionist role women are simultaneously looked at and displayed, with their appearance coded for strong visual and erotic impact so that they can be said to connote to-be-looked-at-ness. (Mulvey, 1999, p.383)

Berger (1972) points out in his book *Ways of Seeing* that in visual representations, “men act and women appear” (p.47). In other words, women are the images and men are the “bearer of look” (Mulvey, 1999, p. 383). Therefore, men and women are presented differently in photos or
paintings. While men are identified by their power or potential of actions, women are often defined by how they can be treated or acted upon--as passive objects to be looked at. In other words, “men look at women and women watch themselves being looked at” (Berger, 1972, p. 47). While women are being looked at, the spectators are believed to be male and the women are trying to lure the male spectator (Berger, 1972).

Therefore, in visual presentations, women are often photographed as feminine and sexual, for the sake of pleasing the male spectators. In other words, the media objectify women and display them in submissive positions (Berger, 1972 and Mulvey, 1999). They show women’s full bodies (Archer, Iritani, Kimes, & Barrios, 1983), show them in off-balanced positions, show them with their head tilted (Goffman, 1979; McCraken, 1993), and show them with connotation of a male presence through the women’s body pose and facial expression (McCracken, 1993).

Goffman (1979) studied 508 photos in advertisement to examine the gender stereotypes in print advertisement (Goffman, 1979). Examining the pictures, he proposed five categories that show how female stereotypes are presented in advertisements: relative size, the feminine touch, function ranking, the ritualization of subordination, and the licensed withdrawal (Goffman, 1979).

Relative size implies one’s social status. A person shown taller or higher in a photo is often associated with higher social status than those photographed shorter or lower. Although biologically women are generally shorter than men, women were rarely shown in advertisements higher or taller than men. Therefore, in most cases, men were portrayed as having higher social status and more powerful than women. Exceptions could only be found in the ads that portray the male model with lower social status such as restaurant waiters, chefs or salesmen (Goffman, 1979).
Regarding the female touch, Goffman (1979) found that women were more often shown as using their fingers to trace the outline of an object, to caress the surface of an object or to touch themselves. While women were often shown with their hands cradling or caressing, men’s touches were more functional such as fixing cars or performing a surgery (Goffman, 1979).

Regarding function ranking, men more often performed executive roles than women. For example, while men were portrayed as professionals, women were shown as their assistants. When in face-to-face interactions, men were more often shown teaching, talking or demonstrating and women listening, following the instructions or replying to men (Goffman, 1979). This implies men are in general more competent and superior to women.

As for ritualization of subordination, by lowering one’s body physically, one shows respect to others. Therefore, it implies lower social status or subordination. Goffman (1979) found women were more often photographed lying down, in canting positions, or bending their knees, which showed the subordination, submissiveness and appeasement of a person. On the other hand, men were usually presented as standing straight and tall (Goffman, 1979).

Licensed withdrawal is defined as a person being psychologically disengaged from a social situation. Women were more often pictured than men as removing themselves psychologically from the social situation, leaving them disoriented in the environment. Thus, they were assumed to be dependent or in need of protection by men (Goffman, 1979). For example, Goffman (1979) found women were often shown standing off-balanced, eyes averted, or hiding in the chest of men.

In addition to Goffman (1979), Henley (1977) further elaborated the symbols one can find in human body movements, gestures and poses. For example, placing the feet on the table when sitting, leaving the jacket opened, putting the hands in the pockets or sitting with the chair tilted
backward or legs spread out connote superiority and relaxation; sitting in reserved position, jacket buttoned or face grim connote subordination; folding one’s arms and having the jacket buttoned connote defensiveness and refusal to be open-minded; uncrossing legs might connote agreement to other people; crossing legs, especially ankle-to-knee crossing connote competitiveness (Henley, 1977).

In terms of gender nonverbal communication patterns, Henley (1977) pointed out that while women were often shown putting their legs together, standing with their feet parallel to each other, or placing their arms close to the body, men were often shown standing with their feet more open and placing their arms 5 to 20 degrees away from their body (Henley, 1977).

Besides the positions and body movements as mentioned, space is a sign to look at in terms of gender stereotypes in photos (Henley, 1977). Henley (1977) provided a scale of space that allows researchers to judge that social status by looking at the social distance between people. There are four levels of social distance in the scale of space. The intimate distance is from 0 to 18 inches, personal distance is from 1.5 to 4 feet, social distance is from 4 to 12 feet and public distance is from 12 to 25 feet.

Personal space is associated with social status (Henley, 1977). People with higher social status have more personal space than people with lower status and people with lower social status are often shown giving away spaces to those of higher social status (Henley, 1977). According to Henley (1977), women in general have less control over space than men do. In addition, women’s space is more often violated than men’s. Therefore, in photos, women are often shown with less personal space and keeping a shorter distance with other people than men do.
Extensive literature has shown that men and women were presented differently in photos. Women were often portrayed as submissive and less powerful via their poses, gestures, body movement, facial expression or their control over territories (Henley, 1977; Goffman, 1979); Henley pointed out the difference was due to women having less power and being subordinate to men generally in society. However, as a First Lady, junior Senator and a presidential candidate for the Democratic Party, Hillary Clinton is a powerful woman in America. She has attained some of the power traditionally given to men, so examining how her photographic image has changed during her three career stages provides a glimpse into how women with power are possibly viewed by the mass media and the mass population. This study, therefore, examines the nonverbal cues of Hillary Clinton in newsmagazine photos in order to find out if she is portrayed in traditional gender stereotypes or if she is free from the stereotypes since she gained the power that normally only men possess.

**Hillary Rodham Clinton as a Polarizing First Lady**

Hillary Rodham was born in 1947 in Illinois. Born to a businessman and a homemaker, she grew up in Park Ridge, Illinois, a middle class Chicago suburb (Beasley, 2005). After graduating from Wellesley College and Yale Law School, Hillary Rodham worked as a staff attorney for the congressional committee assigned for impeachment against President Nixon (Jamieson, 1995; Beasley, 2005). After Rodham had met Bill Clinton, “a classmate from Arkansas with political aspiration” (Beasley, 2005, p. 210), in the Yale Law Library and had dated him for a while, she moved to Arkansas in 1974 with Bill and taught at the University of Arkansas Law School (Beasley, 2005). After getting married in 1975, she kept her maiden name and worked at the Rose Law Firm in Little Rock (Beasley, 2005).

After Bill Clinton failed to win his second term as the Arkansas governor, Hillary Rodham learned that part of the reason was because the voters were unhappy with her insistence of using
her maiden name and her bookish appearance (Beasley, 2005); she soon took his name and changed her image and dress to be more feminine. Then, Bill Clinton went on to win five more elections (Beasley, 2005).

Not just being criticized when in Arkansas, throughout her tenure as First Lady, Hillary Clinton was questioned about her image, which critics claimed she changed frequently for political reasons. Her hairstyle and clothing was thrust into the national spotlight and seen as a reflection of her ideas on femininity (Beasley, 2005). After being ridiculed for wearing headbands during the 1992 campaign, she stopped wearing them and tried different hairstyles during her tenure as First Lady. “With her wardrobe varying from business and professional attire to ladylike outfits and glamorous evening gowns, some speculated that she downplayed her feminism as elections approached” (Beasley, 2005, p. 203).

In addition to her appearance, Hillary Clinton faced criticism about the things she said that offended the American homemakers. When Bill Clinton became a candidate of Democratic nomination in the 1992 presidential election, the Republican Party had George H.W. Bush for re-election (Jamieson, 1995). The conservatives attacked Bill Clinton on his extramarital relation with Gennifer Flowers, a nightclub singer, and Hillary Clinton on her liberal ideas related to her legal interests. In her CBS 60 Minutes’ interview on Jan. 26, 1992, the host said that the Clintons must have come to a marital arrangement and Hillary Clinton suddenly spoke up:

I am not sitting here—some little woman standing by my man like Tammy Wynette. I am sitting here because I love him, and I honor what we’ve been through together. And, you know, if that’s not enough for people, then heck, don’t vote for him. (as cited in Bealey, 2005, p.212)

Although Hillary Clinton’s faithfulness helped Bill Clinton in the race, she was criticized by what she said and forced to apologize to Wynette, the country singer of the song “Stand by Your Man” and to her fans (Jamieson, 1995; Beasley, 2005).
A few weeks later, Hillary Clinton came up with an even more infamous quote. Defending herself against the accusation that her law firm had inappropriately profited from Bill Clinton as a governor, she told the reporter:

I supposed I could have stayed home and baked cookies and had teas, but what I decided to do was fulfill my profession, which I entered before my husband was in public life. And I’ve worked very, very hard to be as careful as possible, and that’s all I can tell you. (as cited by Jamieson, 1995, p. 27)

According to her aides, after the “cookies and tea” remark was uttered, it felt like “the air went out of the room” (Jamieson, 1995, p.27). Although Clinton soon made the clarification by stating: “You know, the work that I’ve done as a professional, as a public advocate, has been aimed in part to assure that woman can make the choices that they should make—depending upon what stage of life they are at—and I think that is still difficult for people to understand right now, that it is a generational changes” (as cited by Jamieson, 1995, p. 27), the media kept reducing her remark to “I could have stayed home and baked cookies and had teas”. Burden and Mughan (1999) point out that because of the infamous “cookies and tea” quote, Hillary Clinton has been a polarizing figure since 1992 when her husband was running for president because she offended female homemakers by indicating disapproval of the lifestyles other than the professional career lifestyle she chose for herself (Burden and Mughan, 1999).

From the examples above, one can tell that Hillary Clinton was very divergent from the traditional First Lady image. She was a successful lawyer who was upfront and talked aggressively. However, not everyone can accept this non-traditional image of First Lady. First Ladies had been routinely depicted as a symbol of heart, not the head of a government (Beasley, 2005). Hillary Clinton became a polarizing figure to the media and public because she did not fit into the traditional models of first lady reporting which first ladies normally appear in the lifestyle and feature section of the newspapers (Jamieson, 1995; Beasley, 2005). Normally the
media cover First Ladies merely as “the presidents’ wives” (Beasley, 2005). As Beasley (2005) has mentioned, the media coverage of First Ladies hasn’t changed much since Franklin D. Roosevelt’s administration; the media doesn’t cover First Ladies carefully or seriously enough and doesn’t look at their characteristics that don’t fall into the traditional wife categories. Beasley (2005) suggested that this reflects the media’s attitude toward women in general:

I wondered if that was not the way the news media in general tended to treat women—as being somewhat apart from the world of power and influence and as individuals centered on emotion, not reason, and more in tune with victimization than self-actualization. (Beasley, 2005, p.XVII)

Greer (1995) pointed out that in general, the First Lady’s primary function is to express the strengths and active heterosexuality of the President. Americans expect the First Lady to give press conferences, to make public appearances for charitable causes and to stand beside her husband and show her respect and admiration for him. Besides, she should play the role of a “virtuoso housekeeper;” she should know how to dress well and spend money wisely (Greer, 1995). Although she should be smart, she should never try to influence the president’s decision; instead, she should be a silent and submissive supporter. Most important of all, her function is to reinforce to America of the heterosexuality of the president; therefore, she should have children with the president and her greatest ambition should be playing the good role as a wife and a mother. Greer points out that “any consideration of the First Lady’s role shows that the less power she claims, the more she wields” (p.27).

In terms of the visual presentations, Greer described the public expectation of First Lady and President:

(H)e must not show himself to be too aware of her presence. He may place a hand on her waist and shoulder, but, though her eyes must be turned to him, his eyes must be turned to his public. The gesture he should make should be one not of attachment but the ownership and control. She may turn to the public but only after she has followed the line of his eyes; she cannot seek public acclaim for herself. (p.22)
Because Hillary Clinton has broken the stereotypical images of First Lady, media had difficulty to categorize her. As the result, the image of her in the media was inconsistent (Brown, 1997). Hillary Clinton thus was depicted by the media as “a saint, a sinner, a career woman, a wife, a mother, a presidential adviser, a political strategist, a feminist, a ruthless power behind the throne, a high-powered lawyer, a global advocate for women and children, a public policy expert, a health care reformer, a hostess, a religious believer, a sex symbol” (Beasley, 2005, p. 207).

While Hillary Clinton’s image was controversial, studies found that in general, the media were more comfortable when she did “fit into” the traditional stereotypes of women and wife (Scharrer, 2002). Scharrer (2002) analyzed newspaper coverage of Hillary Clinton from October 1, 1999 to February 6, 2000 during the time she transitioned from spouse to Senate candidate. Analyzing 342 news stories of Hillary Clinton and 96 news stories about Rudy Giuliani as comparison, Scharrer (2002) concluded that when Hillary Clinton was presented in a traditional, supportive and soft news oriented role, she got more positive coverage; when seeking political office, she received more negative press coverage. Scharrer (2002) suggested the findings could be an indicator of Clinton falling into narrow gender roles definitions.

Anderson (2002) analyzed print and broadcasting news stories of Hillary Clinton and Elizabeth Dole during the campaign season from July 1998 to November 2000 and Hillary Clinton and Elizabeth Dole’s own rhetoric strategies during the campaign. She found that gender was a significant but not necessarily negative variable in U.S. politics. The results show that although gender issue was a focus when Clinton was First Lady, once she made the transition from First Lady to Senate candidate, the media critiques switched their focus from her being a woman (gender) to her not being a New Yorker (Anderson, 2002). Gender stereotyping became a
tacit subtext and Clinton’s opponents, Rudolph W. Giuliani and Rick Lazio, actually suffered more from gender stereotypes than Clinton in the campaign. Giuliani was criticized as too mean and masculine to be New York Senator and Lazio was perceived as not masculine and too boyish (Anderson, 2002). As to Hillary Clinton’s own campaign strategies, Anderson (2002) found that it was accordant with the media’s portrayal of her during the campaign. On the other hand, because Dole’s gender was emphasized when she ran for president, it was harder for the voters to imagine her as U.S. president. The study suggested that the U.S. presidency were still male-dominated 100 years after women suffrage was attained (Anderson, 2002).

Colbert (1995) examined all 663 photos of Hillary Clinton in The New York Times, The Washington Post, Time, Newsweek and U.S. News & World Report for the first two years of the Clinton administration. The analysis of photos was broken down into four elements: logistics (the origins of the photo and who controlled the photo), visual components (the person in the photo, the kinds of communication, how Hillary Clinton is placed, her gaze, hands, and mouth), compositional devices (light and size of the photo), and stories and roles. The results show that she was portrayed with family members in about 50 percent of the photos. But she was rarely shown with only Chelsea (in 11 photos) or with only Bill Clinton (in 38 photos). Besides, she was often shown as passive or responding to others. She was shown not interacting with others in 28 percent of the photos, listening to others in 12 percent of the photos, and reacting non-verbally in 28 percent of the photos, but she was shown speaking in only 11 percent of the photos. Based on the findings, Colbert (1995) argued that most of the photos of Hillary Clinton were conventional. Gardetto (1997) examined all the New York Times news coverage of Hillary Clinton in the 1992 presidential campaign in order to find the tone of her media coverage. She found three narrative themes the New York Times created in the news coverage of Hillary
Clinton: “her strength—his weakness,” “comparing women/wifefiles,” and “a new kind of partnership” (Gardetto, 1997).

In the first category, the *Times* generates a question suggesting that if a wife is too powerful and strong, she may reduce the husband power in public’s eyes. In the second theme, the coverage often compares Hillary Clinton with other politicians’ wives and indicates that she is different type of wife. In this theme, Gardetto (1997) suggests the paper indirectly asks the reader to judge which type is more preferable. In third theme, the newspaper asks if the interests between Hillary and Bill Clinton will conflict since they both have their own career to pursue (Gardetto, 1997). Gardetto (1997) concludes that the *New York Times* generates the debates about Hillary Clinton’s images and indirectly tells the readers what and how to think about Hillary Clinton (Gardetto, 1997). She further claims that the pre-election coverage of the *New York Times* suggests that Hillary Clinton was controversial as a wife. She was portrayed as a new woman who was an example of conflict between the traditional family values and modern women’s lives today. As a career woman who was neither a subordinate wife nor a traditional housewife, Hillary Clinton became a threat to the traditional family values and the gender disparity they create (Gardetto, 1997).

Winfield (1997) examined all news content about Hillary Clinton in the *New York Times* from 1993 to 1994 and found the coverage of Hillary Clinton was mostly negative in tone. She concluded that the media had a hard time covering a multifaceted first lady. The media could not define her easily except that she violates the standard behavior for a first lady (Winfield, 1997). Although being portrayed negatively overall, Hillary Clinton’s images have changed and become sometimes antithetical during her terms as First Lady (Parry-Giles, 2000). She had been
represented as a career woman, feared feminist, politically powerful First Lady, a traditional mother and wife, and a victim of extramarital affair.

Brown (1997) conducted a focus group study to find out the middle-class attitudes toward the image of Hillary Clinton in television news. Brown (1997) recruited 35 participants (24 women and 11 men), put them into 10 focus groups, and showed them a 9 minutes 22 seconds tape of news coverage of Hillary Clinton by ABC, CBS and NBC and asked them to talk about the tape. Brown (1997) found the conversations in focus groups show that the participants considered that Hillary Clinton’s image was created and shaped by the media; however, participants had polarizing opinions about her images in the news. As concluded by Brown (1997), Hillary Clinton’s image was inconsistent because she crossed the male/dominant vs. female/subordinate binary. Being both an elite in the society and a woman, and both a capable politician and a ceremonial first lady had made Hillary Clinton become a controversial First Lady in the public’s eyes (Brown, 1997).

Burden and Mughan (1999) reviewed the popularity of Hillary Clinton during the first five years of the Clinton administration and concluded that Hillary Clinton was the only First Lady that received continuous attention by polling companies and the media. Her popularity was independent of her husband’s. Hillary Clinton’s popularity fluctuated based on her own conduct rather than national economic situations. In other words, her popularity was dependent on what she said and what she did. When Hillary Clinton changed her image from a strong, aggressive feminist to a good mother and wife/victim, her popularity improved (Jamieson, 1995). This shows that although Hillary Clinton was controversial, the general population preferred to see her with more traditional feminine traits. As claimed by Greer (1995), while feminists
appreciated Hillary Clinton’s perseverance on her capability and self-reliance, for non-feminist, Clinton’s image of feminism could be one more reason for the public to loathe her (Greer, 1995).

Jamieson (1995) argued that the reason the public could not accept Hillary Clinton’s image was because she was neither a capable woman who exercised power nor a wife and mother, but she was both.

Hillary Clinton became a surrogate on whom we projected our attitudes about attributes once thought incompatible, that women either exercised their minds or had children but not both, that women who were smart were unwomanly and sexually unfulfilled, that articulate women were dangerous. (Jamieson, 1995, p. 23)

Jamieson (1995) proposed the idea of the womb/brain double bind and argued that because Hillary Clinton didn’t fit into the criteria of the double bind, she was seen as controversial. According to Jamieson (1995), the womb/brain double bind rests on the idea that because the womb and the brain both cost energy, a woman who exercised her brain betrayed her uterus with the means to maintain her reproductive ability. This violation of the natural law required toll. Her uterus shrunk and was not able to function, even if she bore child, she risked bearing monsters (Jamieson, 1995).

During the nineteenth century, theologians and scientist argued that only when women followed the natural order, which defines woman’s role as childbearing and maintaining houses, would they obtain happiness. Because Eve abused the power of speech and was punished, women were condemned for speaking or teaching. A good woman, therefore, should be a silent, childbearing wife. If an intelligent woman who was pregnant and still involved in public activities, she would jeopardize the child’s health. Because of this assumption, brilliant women who wanted to pursue a career had to sacrifice their sexuality and their reproductive function (Jamieson, 1995).
The double bind first existed in the notion that being educated makes women less attractive to men. Later on the assumption became a woman can have either career or marriage and family, but not both. Even if one woman would have both career and family, she wouldn’t have both at the same time. Therefore, women now face the assumption that if they want to have both at the same time, they will have to pay the price of cheating one or the other (Jamieson, 1995).

Generating this double bind for women, the television news texts merge a gendered discourse on first lady with rhetoric of fear for powerful women (Parry-Giles, 2000).

**Research Question**

The literature above shows that Hillary Clinton received negative and stereotypically feminine coverage when she was First Lady. Much literature has discussed the media coverage and public perspectives of Hillary Clinton when she was First Lady but not much after she became a U.S. Senator and a presidential candidate. It is necessary to expand the research beyond looking at Hillary Clinton when she was a First Lady to her three different political career stages. This study therefore provides a more holistic analysis of Hillary Clinton’s portrayal by the media. This study looks at the changes of how Clinton was portrayed in news photos as she progressed from a spouse, a senate candidate, to a presidential candidate. The following question was asked.

**RQ:** How did the media present Hillary Clinton with news photos during her three different political career stages—as a First Lady, a Senator, and a Presidential candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination?
CHAPTER 3
METHOD

Semiotic analysis, which studies the signs in images, was used in this study in order to answer the research question (Chandler, 2001). As Rose (2001) explained, semiotics “offers a very full box of analytical tools for taking an image apart and tracing how it works in relation to broader systems of meaning” (p. 69). The major strength of semiotics is that it is a sophisticated analytical tool for explaining how signs make sense (Rose, 2001). Furthermore, semiotics has become a commonly used method in feminist media studies because it helps researchers to deconstruct meanings beyond the simple presence of women in cultural forms (van Zoonen, 1994, p. 74).

Semiotics and Semiotic Analysis

Within semiotics, there are two major models of how a sign is structured—the Saussurian model and the Peircean model (van Zoonen, 1994; Chandler, 2001). According to the Saussurian model, a sign consists of the signifier and the signified, and signification is the relationship between the two (Chandler, 2001). In Saussure’s model, both the signifier and the signified are abstract rather than material. The signifier in Saussure’s model is “the form which the sign takes” and a signified is “the concept it represents” (Chandler, 2001, Signs, para. 3). A signified is not to be recognized as a referent; rather, it is a concept in the mind (Chandler, 2001, Signs, para.10). In other words, rather than an actual object, it is the notion of an object (Chandler, 2001, Signs, para.10).

However, people who have adopted Saussure’s model now take the signifier as the material form of the sign, which can be seen, heard, touched, smelled or tasted. The signified, on the other hand, is still treated as a mental concept, but it is pointed out that it might as well refer to material things in the world (Chandler, 2001). Pierce’s model consists of the representamen,
the interpretant, and the object. The representamen is the mode which a sign adopts, which is similar to Sausurre’s signifier. The interpretant is how one makes sense of the sign, which is like Saussure’s signified but it is itself a sign in the mind of the interpreter. The object is the thing that the sign stands for within objective reality (Chandler, 2001). According to Pierce, there were three kinds of signs: the icon, the index and the symbol (Rose, 2001). When the signs are at the iconic stage, the photographic images look just like the thing or person that are being represented, and the signifier and the signified at this stage are similar to each other. An example of an iconic sign is a portrait of a person representing the person portrayed (Dyer, 1982).

Other signs go further than the simple portrayal of a person or a thing. The signs at the indexical stage are used to denote an extra meaning to the one that is obviously represented. The connection is made between the sign and what it is signifying through causation or analogy; thus, the relationship between the signifier and signified are not arbitrary. A postcard of the Eiffel tower that makes people think about Paris is an illustration of indexical signs (Dyer, 1982; Rose, 2001).

Signs at the symbolic stage have a conventionalized and clearly arbitrary relation between signifier and signified. In this stage, the signifier is not a cause or resemblance of the signified; people think of the signified when they see the signifier because they have learned that connection. A rose symbolizing love or passion is an example of a symbolic sign (Dyer, 1982; Rose, 2001).

Although Saussure and Pierce are considered the fathers of semiotics, Roland Barthes’ writing led to the widespread use of semiotics in the cultural studies area (van Zoonen, 1994). From Barthes’ perspective, signs could be denotive or connotive (Rose, 2001). Signs at the denotive level are easy to interpret (Barthes, 1977), but signs at the connotive level are subtle and
more difficult to decode because they have a higher-level meaning (Rose, 2001). More specifically, denotation refers to the literal, obvious, superficial meaning of a sign (Chandler, 2001, Denotation, Connotation and Myth, para.2). Connotation, on the other hand, refers to the ideological and individual affiliation of the sign (Chandler, 2001, Denotation, Connotation and Myth, para.3). These associations are in relation with the interpreter's background such as class, age and gender (Chandler, 2001, Denotation, Connotation and Myth, para.2). Therefore, signs in their connotations allow more room for interpretation than they can in their denotations.

In relation to the denotation and connotation is the notion of myth. Myth is a form of ideology. It converts things that happened into natural phenomenon; it makes natural the way things are. In other words, myths are the dominant ideologies that people don’t question (Chandler, 2001). Barthes (1967) declared that:

(S)emiology therefore aims to take in any system of signs, whatever their substance and limits; images, gestures, musical sounds, objects, and the complex associations of all of these, which form the content of ritual, convention or public entertainment: these constitute, if not languages, at least systems of signification. (p. 9)

The approach of semiotics analysis entails a critical change from “the simple interpretation of objects and forms of communication to investigations of the organization and structure artifacts and, in particular, to enquiry into how they produce meaning” (Dyer, 1982, p. 115). In other words, semiotic analysis focuses on interpreting an image by looking at the signs within it. It allows researchers to make overt of what is usually hidden (Chandler, 2001). Conducting a semiotics approach helps a researcher to decode the signs and read the latent messages in an image.

Semiotics, like case studies, deal with a comparatively small amount of images. The result of the analysis only represents the data rather than a wider range of material. Its results are not generalizable; thus, the results “stand or fall on its analytical integrity” (Rose, 2001, p. 73).
Because this study deals with a small amount of images and looks in-depth into the signs of the images, semiotics is the most suitable method for this study.

**Steps in Semiotic Analysis**

Rose (2001) proposed steps for analyzing the signs in an image. First, identify the signs in the image. Then determine what these signs are in themselves. Find out how the signs relate to each other and then find out the relations to broader meaning systems. Finally, go back to the signs through their codes to discover the specific enunciation of ideology and mythology (p.91).

In conducting my semiotic analysis, I interpreted the news photos by looking at the colors, angles, background settings, hair, eye contacts, gestures, and poses in the photos. A coding sheet (Appendix A) was used in the study to list the elements being analyzed. The coding sheet helped me to make notes about the magazines and organize the finding.

Besides the photos, I looked at the captions accompanying the photos to read the dominant, preferred ideology of the photos as Barthes (1977) suggested. Because images can be polysemic and therefore open to interpretations, considering captions along with the photos can help a researcher to find out which signs to read, and which signs are privileged. As Barthes (1977) had argued, captions are like anchors; they help the readers to choose the correct level of perception (Barthes, 1977, p.39). Therefore, I looked at the captions to determine the dominant, preferred meaning of the photo.

**The Pros and Cons of Semiotic Analysis**

Like any other research method, semiotic analysis has its strengths and weakness. Compared to other research methods, semiotics “offers the promise of a systematic, comprehensive and coherent study of communications phenomena as a whole, not just an instance of it” (Hodge & Kress, 1988, p.1). Semiotics analysis is an efficient tool for analyzing the visual meaning in photos (Rose, 2001); it is a method to deduce emotions and associations.
from signs in images. It takes into account the effects of the images through its construction and its social conditions (Rose, 2001, p.97).

On the other hand, semiotics analysis has some drawbacks. First, its results are not generalizable (Rose, 2001). Second, it contains elaborate terminology that can be confusing. While some terms are useful and are clearly defined, some are unnecessary and can create confusion (Rose, 2001). Last, while images are polysemic and open for different interpretation, semiotics analysis often provides a single interpretation for one image (Rose, 2001).

Background of the Researcher

As mentioned above, images can be polysemic. A person can interpret a sign in an image in one way while another person can have a totally different interpretation for the same sign. A sign might mean something to one person but something totally opposite to the other. People with different social, cultural, racial, class or gender background see things differently. The analysis of the photos was based on the literature I reviewed; however, my cultural and racial background influenced my findings. As the instrument of this semiotic study, my background is provided as below.

I was born and raised in Taiwan, a country with an elected female Vice President from 2000 to 2008. I was raised in an upper-middle class family, and my parents both received bachelor’s degrees. I attended Soochow University in Taiwan and received my bachelor’s degree in English Language and Literature. I came to America in the fall of 2006 to pursue a master’s degree in journalism at the University of Florida.

Research Subject

The visual representation of Hillary Clinton was analyzed by examining the photographs in Newsweek magazine. The rationales for choosing a newsmagazine over other media genre are listed as follows.
First, while newspapers contain different sections such as national news, entertainment, sports, travel, business, etc., newsmagazines give more attention to national news, which is the section that covers Presidential and Senate elections (Goodman, 1997). Furthermore, newspapers carry fewer photos than newsmagazines, especially fewer color photos. Second, compared to other magazine genres, such as fashion, lifestyle, business magazines, newsmagazines contain more First Lady, Senator, and Presidential candidate stories (Goodman, 1997). Third, from my observation, due to fewer publications and timeliness concerns as compared to newspapers and television news, it is assumed that newsmagazines can provide more accurate coverage and more sophisticated photos. Fourth, newsmagazines have higher circulation than newspapers. While the largest national newspaper, *USA Today*, has a circulation rate 2,259,329 in 2006 (USA Today, 2008), *Newsweek* has 3,130,600 (Magazine Publishers of America, 2008). Fifth, television is difficult to use when looking at photos because it shows images with movements rather than an individual still shots. Based on the reasons presented above, I concluded that newsmagazines are the ideal subject for this study.

**Choice of Newsweek Magazine**

The visual representation of Hillary Clinton *Newsweek* magazine was chosen for the study for the reasons presented below. *Newsweek* is the second largest circulating newsmagazine in the country with 3,124,059 in 2006 (Magazine Publishers of America, 2008). *Newsweek* was founded by Thomas J. C., a former editor of *Time* magazine in 1933 and was bought by The Washington Post Company in 1961 (Newsweek website, 2007). It “offers comprehensive coverage of world events with a global network of correspondents, reporters and editors covering national and international affairs, business, science and technology, society and the arts and entertainment” (Newsweek website, 2007, History of Newsweek, para. 3). *Newsweek* has earned
the most national magazine awards given by American Society of Magazine Editors among all the weekly newsmagazines (Newsweek website, 2007).

Although it might be argued that Time magazine would be a better choice since it has the largest circulation rate in the country (3,374,505 in 2006) and it was established earlier than Newsweek, its circulation has actually been declining rapidly (Magazine Publishers of America, 2008). While the circulation rate of Time was 4,082,740 in 2006, it dropped to 3,374,505 in 2007. Although Newsweek circulation dropped from 3,130,600 to 3,124,059, that was only 0.2% compared to Time magazine’s 17.3 percent drop.

Newsweek magazine’s photos have won second and third place in the National Press Photographers Association award for magazine news story in 2008 and first place in the National Press Photographers Association award for magazine natural disaster cover in 2006 (National Press Photographers Association, 2008). Being the second largest newsmagazine in the country with the readership of more than three million and having won awards for its news story photos, I believe the photos of Newsweek magazine deserve a close scrutiny.

The Sample and Sampling Method

The photos being analyzed were chosen from the back issues of Newsweek magazine from August to November 1992, August to November 1996, August to November 2001, and August to November 2007, which are the times of the campaigns for the four elections: the campaign of the presidential election in 1992 and in 1996, the campaign for the senate election in 2000 and the campaign for the presidential primaries in 2008.

I chose the photos from the August to November issues because this time period marks the end of the Democratic and Republican Party’s Nominating Conventions in which the official candidates are named. As for the Senate coverage, I wanted a similar time frame in order to compare to the presidential and First Lady time periods.
Because the main goal of the analysis is to understand Hillary Clinton’s image in the media in her three different political career stages, I looked at all the photos of Hillary Clinton in the sampling interval. In order to provide the whole picture of Hillary Clinton’s photographic portrayals during her three political career stages, I used the purposeful sampling strategy in the study. Purposeful sampling strategy helps researchers to “inform an understanding of the research problem” (Creswell, 1997, p.125). Using this sampling method, the researcher presents the widest range of samples, including the unusual ones, to “represent diverse cases and to fully describe multiple perspectives about the cases” (Creswell, 1997, p.129). Using this sampling method, I made sure to present the examples that demonstrated the widest range of her photographic depictions.

**The Use of Codes**

After choosing an extensive range of depictions, I analyzed the photos using the codes established according to Goodman’s (1997) thesis coding sheet that looked at the images of three First Ladies (Barbara Bush, Hillary Clinton, and Nancy Reagan) in *Time* magazine. The coding sheet is mainly based on Goffman’s model of woman stereotypes, Pingree et al’s (1976) scale of sexism, and Henley’s (1977) chart of human body language. The coding sheet helped facilitate the analysis of the photos by systematically making notes of the signs in the images.

When representing the result of the analysis, Goffman’s (1979) woman stereotype model, Dyer’s (1982) guideline for analyzing images, Archer et al.’s (1983) face-ism index and Pingree’s scale of sexism are applied as the guidelines in the study. In addition, I also looked at the captions of the photo because it can help the researcher to read the preferred images in the photos. Using Goffman’s (1979) model, the study looks at the photos and see if Hillary Clinton is portrayed in traditional female roles in the pictures by focusing on the relative size, the feminine touch, function ranking, the ritualization of subordination and the licensed withdrawal
in the pictures (Goffman, 1979). For relative size, I looked at if Hillary Clinton was portrayed in sitting or lying down position while the men in the photos are in standing position so they appear to be towering over Clinton (Goffman, 1979). In regards to feminine touch, I looked at if Hillary Clinton was portrayed touching an object, caressing an object, or tracing the outline of it. As to ritualization of subordination, I looked at if Hillary Clinton was portrayed as standing straight and holding her head high, which are symbols of superiority, disdain and not being ashamed, or if she was portrayed in “canting position” that conveys “acceptance of subordination, expression of ingratiation, submissiveness and appeasement” (Goffman, 1979, p.46). I also looked at if she was portrayed with a smile that shows her as submissive and inferior to others (Goffman, 1979). In addition, to examine if Hillary Clinton was depicted in licensed withdrawal stereotypes, I looked at if Hillary Clinton was shown with her putting her hand or fingers near her mouth, eyes looking off, or with laughter that shows her as anxious and submissive (Goffman, 1979).

Dyer (1982) provided a guideline of looking at “the principle non-verbal means by which people communicate” (p. 97). She divided the means into appearance, manner and activity. According to Dyer (1982), when looking at appearance, one looks at the age, gender (portrayed in conventional gender roles?), race, hair (female hair is often used to imply seductive beauty or narcissism. It is used as a sign of love or self-admiration), body (whole body or part of the body shown?), size (relative size suggests social status), and looks (innocent, focused…).

Regarding manner, one looks at the expression (emotion and mood), eye contact (submissive, coy, confrontational), pose (standing straight, tilted...), and clothes. In terms of activities, one judges by looking at the touch, body movement (active or passive), and positional communication (e.g. special arrangement of the figure) (Dyer,1982). Besides these three means
that one can look for when analyzing photographic images, props (is the object a symbol of a concept) and settings (normal, unusual…) were used (Dyer, 1982).

Dyer (1982) further suggested looking at camera strategies to analyze the image. Looking at the focus and depth of vision in a photo can help researchers find out what is emphasized what is deemphasized in the image. Close-up is a technique to show the person in his or her appealing details and give them a larger-than-life appearance. At the same time, close-up is used to suggest intimacy (Parry-Giles, 2000); it sometimes persuades us that we know the person (Jamieson, 1995). Finally, people are unaware of the camera angle if the person is shot from an eye line angle. But when a person is not shot from an eye-line angle, the picture can be dramatic and provide different connotations (Dyer, 1982).

As pointed out in Goodman’s (1997) study, looking at the proportion of face and body in the photos is another way to look at the presentation of women by the media. In terms of gender difference in media, researchers look at the facial prominence in a photo (Archer et al., 1983). The head and the face are the cores of a person’s mental life. They are associated with brain, intellectuality and identity (Archer et al., 1983). The face represents the person’s whole being, and it tells about the person’s essential humanity (Kuhn, 1985). Therefore, looking at the proportion of face and body in a photo helps researchers to decide if the person’s intellectuality, identity, character in the photo was being deemphasized or emphasized. The media depict women and men differently in terms of their facial prominence (Archer et al., 1983). Studies show that facial prominence is constantly found higher in pictures of men than those of women (Archer et al. 1983). Archer et al. (1983) conducted an experiment by recruiting 80 university undergraduates, 40 women and 40 men, and asking them to draw a woman and then a man. The results show that both male and female participants made the drawings in which the man’s face
was prominent and the woman’s was not (p.730). Archer et al. (1983) concluded that men’s face/intellect is more emphasized than women’s.

In addition, space is a sign to look at in terms of visual presentation (Henley, 1977). Personal space is affected by dominance, in the amount of space accorded another person. People with higher social status have more personal space than people with lower status. As stated by Henley (1977), women in general have control over less territory than men do. In addition, women’s space is more often violated than men’s. Therefore, it refers to the fact that women are usually viewed as more subordinate and submissive than men are. People with lower social status yield space to the dominant.

Besides space, I also look at the colors to look for symbols in the photos. According to Sharpe (1974), different colors are associated with different emotions, ideas, and objects. Red symbolizes love, passion or anger; White indicates purity, innocent, holiness, and cleanliness; Blue is associated with dignity, poise, and reserve; Green represents nature, calm and security; Black suggests mystery and evil (p.55, 91-92).

Finally, I studied the photos using the scale of sexism (Pingree et al., 1976). According to the scale, women presentation in the media from limited to stereotypes to free from stereotypes can be divided into five levels (Pingree et al., 1976). In level one, women are portrayed as two-dimensional, merely for decoration. In this level women are described as the dumb blond or the sex object. Level two women are depicted as involved in traditional female activities. In this level, women are shown as wives, mothers, secretaries, teachers and nurses. They are shown as mainly stay at home or in womanly occupation. Level three represents women having “two places” – in the office and at home. Although in this level women can have a career, their first priority is housework and mothering. In level four, it is acknowledged that women and men
should be equal. In this level, women can be professionals without being asked to put housework as their higher priority. In level five, women are totally free from stereotyping in the media depiction. The assertion “women and men should be equal” is not necessary in level five because in this level, individuals are not judged by their sex (Pingree et al., 1975). This scale is used to determine if her photos are portraying her in a traditional (i.e., stereotypically female), nontraditional, or mixed manner and assumes that nontraditional portrayals are more “neutral” or less gender-biased.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

This section presents the semiotic analysis of the photos of Hillary Clinton in *Newsweek* magazine in her three political career stages based on the codes stated in the method chapter. This chapter is divided into four sections that discuss respectively her photos in 1992 and in 1996 when she was a First Lady, in 2000 as a Senate candidate and in 2007 as a presidential candidate in the Democratic Party primaries.

**First Lady Hillary Clinton, 1992**

In the issues of *Newsweek* magazine from Aug. 3, 1992 to Nov. 30, 1992, there were 16 photographs of Hillary Clinton, the wife of then presidential candidate Bill Clinton.

After analyzing the photographs, I found all of the photographs characterized her in traditionally feminine roles. Furthermore, she was shown with her husband in eight photos, in headshots in four photos, shown with Chelsea in one photo and with Barbara Bush in one photo. The following are selected photographs that exemplify the full range of traditional representations of Hillary Clinton.

**St. Louis Rally: Aug. 3, 1992, p. 27**

One example of the traditional portrayal of Hillary Clinton as a wife was in the Aug. 3, 1992, issue (Figure B-1). The one-third-page picture shows Bill and Hillary Clinton standing on an outdoor stage with supporters behind them. The title and the caption of the photo read: “State-of-the-Art Symbols: The Clintons end their tour in St. Louis.”

In the half-length body shot, Bill Clinton was waving at people in front of him with his other hand holding Hillary Clinton’s hand. Hillary Clinton, on the other hand, was smiling with her one hand holding Bill Clinton and the other touching the edge of her sunglasses.
Hillary Clinton’s body language in the photo connotes submission and subordination. The picture shows Hillary Clinton behind Bill Clinton with both of them moving toward a pointed direction. Given that Bill Clinton is holding Hillary Clinton and Hillary Clinton was behind him, Hillary Clinton was being led and guided. In other words, she is depicted as passive and dependent in the picture.

The outfit of Clinton reinforces the stereotypes of women in visual presentation. The headband she wears is normally associated with young girls. It can be read as a symbol of being childish and dependent. The one-piece dress is white, which connotes purity, innocence, and is associated with a wedding dress, again reinforcing her role as a wife in the picture. Furthermore, the fact that white clothing gets dirty easily and dresses and accessories constrain a person from walking fast or moving in big motions add to Hillary Clinton’s portrayal as decorative rather than functional. In addition, the belt on the dress shows her thin waist and the curve of her body, which highlights her sexuality and physical attractiveness.

Regarding her sunglasses, apart from the fact that they are used to cover one’s eyes from the sun, sunglasses are also used as a means to hide one’s true identity (Barthes, 1957). In this context, it is read as she is hiding her true nature to the public by wearing the sunglasses. As Beasley (2005) has pointed out, while Clinton first maintained her maiden name and wore pants like a professional woman, voters criticized her for using the maiden name and her bookish appearance. Therefore, she adopted her husband’s name and changed her outfit to be more feminine to please the voters. Therefore, it is assumed that Clinton wears the feminine outfit and acts like a submissive wife to please the voters, but she is actually disguising her true nature from the public. From the literature that discusses her, one assumes that her true nature is that of a capable and strong professional woman (Jamieson, 1995; Beasley, 2005).
In addition, Hillary Clinton was shown touching her sunglasses. Because women are often pictured using their finger to trace the outline of an object or just to touch while men are shown with functional touches (Goffman, 1979), this touch also emphasizes her as traditional. While Bill Clinton is waving to his supporters, Hillary Clinton is not interacting with others but touching her sunglasses; therefore, this feminine touch reinforces her role as a decoration in the photo.

*Hillary and I Have Talked This Through: Nov./Dec., 1992, p. 27*

This photo found in the Nov./Dec., 1992, special election issues again shows Hillary Clinton as a traditional submissive wife (Figure B-2). The half-length body photo shows Bill and Hillary Clinton in a natural setting with Bill Clinton leaning against a tree and the Clintons smiling and holding each other. Only part of Hillary Clinton’s profile is seen but most of Bill Clinton’s face and all his facial features are visible. The caption of the photos read “Hillary and I have talked this through.” Because the photo was taken in a natural setting: the tree and the outdoor background along with the color of their clothes show the couple as youthful and genuine, their juxtaposition with the tree and nature may imply that their intimate relationship and power dynamic is natural. However, the signs found in the photos seem to tell a totally different story.

Although both Bill and Hillary Clinton are holding each other, Hillary Clinton is depicted as more affectionate than Bill Clinton from the signs in the photo. Bill Clinton is holding Hillary Clinton with one arm around her shoulders (a power position) and his other arm is casually placed in his pocket like a *GQ* model, while only one arm of Hillary Clinton is seen in the photo, it is assumed that she is using both hands to embrace Bill Clinton. Furthermore, Bill Clinton is leaning against the tree and appears to be relaxed. Hillary Clinton is leaning against Bill Clinton and burying her face in his chest. The body language of Bill Clinton holding Hillary Clinton
close to him and Hillary Clinton hiding in his chest shows her as being protected and helpless. It is typical of a parent-child photo in which one seeks refuge and comfort in the arms of one’s protector. The visual representation of Bill Clinton leaning against the tree and Hillary Clinton slanting against Bill Clinton supports the image of Hillary Clinton as more affectionate and needy in the relationship than Bill Clinton.

In addition to the body language, Hillary Clinton’s facial expression also connotes submissiveness. While Bill Clinton is smiling and looking down in the picture, which might be argued as being submissive, Hillary Clinton is smiling more expansively with her eyes totally closed. The comparatively more expansive smile can be read as Hillary Clinton taking more pleasure in an intimate relation with Bill Clinton than Bill Clinton does with her, and the closed eyes, which shows her as unaware of the things happening around her, can be read as she is mentally removed from the environment. These as well support the assertion above that Hillary Clinton is portrayed as more loving, affectionate and emotionally dependent. Because of Hillary Clinton’s body language and facial expression in this picture, this picture is depicting her as submissive, subordinate and dependent.

The relative size of the Clintons in the photo reinforces the stereotyped portrayal of Hillary Clinton too (Goffman, 1979). It is known that Bill Clinton is a lot taller and bigger than Hillary Clinton. However, in the photo, Hillary Clinton’s smallness is being emphasized by the camera angle. Hillary Clinton’s body is shown at the side and Bill Clinton’s body is almost facing the camera. In other words, Bill Clinton is photographed with almost whole body facing us while Hillary Clinton is shown with only half her body to the camera. Therefore, Bill Clinton looks a lot bigger and Hillary smaller in the photos than they actually are. This relative size difference
suggests that Bill Clinton has a higher social status and holds more power than Hillary Clinton. It also implies Bill Clinton is strong while Hillary Clinton is weak and small.

While the caption reads “Hillary and I have talked this through,” which might imply that they make decisions together, the picture portrayed Hillary Clinton as a submissive wife. Furthermore, the caption implies Bill Clinton makes decisions with his wife in combination with the photo that depicts Hillary Clinton as submissive and obedient send contradictory messages, a pattern found in other photos in the magazine.

**Cast a Spell: Nov. 16, 1992, p. 35**

Another example of Hillary Clinton portrayed in a traditional feminine role is from the Nov. 16, 1992, issue (Figure B-3). In this one-eighth page, close-up picture, Bill Clinton is kissing Hillary Clinton on her cheek with his eyes closed and Hillary Clinton was smiling and looking away to the right lower corner. In this photo, Bill Clinton’s profile is partly shown, but Hillary Clinton’s face and all of her facial features are seen. The caption of the picture reads “Casting a spell: With Hillary last week.”

From the facial expressions and the body language of Hillary Clinton, she connotes submission, subordination and obedience. In the photo, Bill Clinton grabs Hillary Clinton on her shoulder and kisses her with his head tilted toward Hillary Clinton while Hillary Clinton’s head is tilted away from him as she feels uncomfortable to be kissed in front of the camera. The claim of Hillary Clinton being submissive and obedient in the photo therefore is built on the assumption that although Hillary Clinton feels surprised and embarrassed when Bill Clinton charms her with a kiss in public, she nevertheless smiles in order to support Bill Clinton as a loving wife.

Furthermore, Hillary Clinton is looking away from Bill Clinton and the camera with a stiff smile. Her averted eyes are signs of being submissive and shy, and the open mouth is read as
being surprised or embarrassed in this particular photo (Goffman, 1979). Although the smile can be argued as a sign of being pleased or amused, with her wide-open and averted eyes in this photo, she looks more surprised and embarrassed than happy or amused.

The caption “Casting a spell” again contrasts with the connotation of the photo. First of all, the term casting a spell means doing magic and charming somebody, but in the photo Hillary Clinton neither appears to be fascinated, mesmerized, or charmed by Bill Clinton’s spell. Instead, her wide-open and averted eyes show her as thinking about something else. Second, while Hillary Clinton’s face is completely shown in the photo compared to the partial profile of Bill Clinton, the caption that reads “With Hillary last week” implies Bill Clinton is the main actor portrayed in the photo. Therefore, in the photo, Bill Clinton is shown as dominant while Hillary Clinton is shown to be passive.

Another possible reading of the photo is that she is casting the spell over Bill Clinton rather than the other way around. Women historically are cast as witches (Jamieson, 1995). The black robe makes her look like a witch or sorcerer. However, she looks oddly frozen and transfixed by the kiss. Thus it can be read as although she might be a powerful witch, Bill Clinton’s kiss still overpowers her sorcery.

**Hillary was Better in Strategy-making: Nov./Dec., 1992, p. 38**

One of the photos that show Hillary Clinton campaigning alone for her husband was found in the Nov./Dec., 1992, special election issue (Figure B-4). In this about one-eighth page photo, Hillary Clinton is shown from above knees. She is shown bending over shaking hands with supporters. Besides Clinton and the crowd, there is a security guard standing by Clinton in the photo. The caption of the photo reads “Hillary was better on strategy-making than glad-handing.”
Because of Hillary Clinton’s facial-expressions and body language, she connotes submissiveness and subordination in the photo. Clinton is smiling with her mouth wide open; smile is a sign of submissiveness (Goffman, 1979). Besides, she is bending down toward the crowd. Bending one’s body is a sign of being submissive and showing subordination; while men are often shot standing straight, women are more frequently shown in canting or bending knees positions (Goffman, 1979). The presence of the security guard accentuates her femininity. Clinton is standing in an off-balanced position, thus is more susceptible to falling. The security guard is standing next to Clinton to protect her. Therefore, Clinton is portrayed as dependent and in need of a protector.

Although the supporters are also smiling in the photo, Clinton’s smile is obviously more exaggerative and fake. The multiple colors on the scarf she wears are associated with a peacock or a clown, which characterize her as funny or showy. Besides her outfit, the makeup and the lighting of the photo both reinforce her clown-like image. The bright red lipstick makes her mouth look bigger than usual. The strong spotlight that hits right on her makes her face look very white and thus builds a strong contrast between the white face and the red lips. Therefore, the combination of her big red mouth, awfully white face and multi-colored scarf makes her look showy, funny, entertaining, and ridiculous.

The caption suggests that Clinton is good at planning the campaign but not good at interacting with the constituents. While strategy-making is considered an executive role that is male-dominated, glad-handing is thought to be a skill that women can do better than men. The caption thus implies that although Hillary Clinton is smart and capable at strategy-making like a man, she is not personable, warm and approachable like a woman. This implication sustains the
idea of Jamieson’s (1995) femininity/competence double binds, which points out that when a woman is too competent, she risks to be called as a lesbian or a man.

**The Soul of an Activist, Nov. 16, 1992, p.42**

The only photo that shows both Hillary Clinton and Chelsea Clinton is found in the Nov. 16, 1992, issue (Figure B-5). In this one-eighth page color photo, Hillary Clinton is cutting cake for the children in a day-care center and Chelsea is standing next to Hillary helping her. The title and the caption of the photo read “The soul of an activist: Celebrating her birthday at a day-care center in North Carolina.”

Because of the nonverbal cues, Hillary Clinton is shown as traditional in the photo. In the photo, Hillary Clinton is shown bending over putting a cake on a plate. Besides, she is shown with her mouth open and her head slightly tilted. Bending one’s body down, tilting one’s head and keeping mouth open are all signs of submissiveness (Goffman, 1979). Besides, the combination of Hillary Clinton being with her daughter and taking care of the children further reinforces her mother image in the photo.

The caption that reads “the soul of an activist” seems to imply that Hillary Clinton is an advocate; however, she is shown cutting cake and taking care of children, which are things that traditional homemakers do. Therefore, the caption is contradictory to Hillary Clinton’s image in the photo.

**First Lady Incumbent, 1996**

In the issues of Newsweek magazine from Aug. 12, 1996, to Nov. 18, 1996, there were 21 photographs of then First Lady Hillary Clinton. She was shown as traditional in 15 photos, in-between in five photos, and nontraditional in one photo. On the other hands, she was shown with Bill Clinton in four photos, with Chelsea in three photos, and with both Bill and Chelsea Clinton in four photos. In other words, Hillary Clinton was shown as either a mother or a wife in 11
photos. The following are selected photographs that exemplify the characteristic of Hillary Clinton’s semiotic representation when she was a First Lady incumbent in 1996.

**Chicago Hopes: Sep. 9, 1996, p. 30**

One example photo that still presents her as a traditional feminine housewife is in the Sep. 9, 1996, issue (Figure B-6). The title and the caption of the photo read “Chicago hopes: In the hall, the convention was a packaged family affair. Hillary and Tipper were the boomer moms, raising kids like Chelsea; Christopher Reeve argued for compassion. Meanwhile, liberals like Jackson kept the faith amid the stampede to the center.”

The half-body length photo shows Hillary Clinton standing on the stage between Tipper Gore and another woman applauding and Bill and Chelsea Clinton are behind her facing another direction. Besides the main actors, Al Gore is at the edge of the photo with half of his face shown and other people are shown in the background applauding.

Because of the visual cues of Hillary Clinton, she connotes submission, subordination, passiveness and obedience by her overly expansive smile, slightly tilted head, open mouth, and her half-closed eyes (Goffman, 1979). Although the three women seem to be the main actors in the photo and both Bill Clinton and Al Gore’s profiles are not shown completely, the three women, especially Hillary Clinton, are still portrayed as supporters for their husbands. Hillary Clinton is portrayed as a wife and a supporter of Bill Clinton in the photo. She is applauding and boosting her husband. Besides the facial expressions and the body language, the pink dress is read as a sign of femininity and childish because soft pink is associated with baby girls. Therefore, the pastel colors the women are wearing further emphasize the women’s softness. In the photo, the colors red and blue of the paper confetti, the flag, and the sign convey patriotism. The juxtaposition of the two makes it seem that being super feminine and traditional is being patriotic.
The photo reminds me of the movie “The Stepford Wives,” which is a story about perfect wives that are completely traditional, subservient wives. Because of the stiff smile, the light pink dress, the unnatural position of arms and the tilted head of Hillary Clinton, she somehow looks like a robot than a real person. Her unfocused eyes imply that her brain is empty and dysfunctional; in other words, she is depicted as not thinking, totally conformed to the perfect wife idea, and merely a decoration and a booster as in the movie.

The caption that calls her a boomer mom emphasizes her role as a mother. Besides, it mentions the traditional family image of the Clintons. One can assume that in the campaign, the Clintons try to convey the idea that they support the traditional family values. The caption that mentions “hope” suggests that the traditional family image that the Clintons present is positive and helpful to their campaign. The paper confetti in the background of the photo sets a festive and celebratory mood, which corresponds to the caption that implies the Clintons, who maintain traditional family values, are the hope of America.

**Big Themes, Cold Cash: Sep. 2, 1996, p.24**

Another photo that portrays Hillary Clinton as traditional is found in the Sep. 2, 1996, issue (Figure B-7). In this black-and-white photo, Hillary Clinton is shown with Chelsea Clinton from above chest. Chelsea appears to be talking to somebody in front of her, and Hillary Clinton is standing next to Chelsea smiling. The title and the caption of the photo reads “Big themes, cold cash: Still deeply protective of Chelsea, Mrs. Clinton is finding a home on the fund-raising circuit.”

In the photo, Hillary is standing slightly behind Chelsea. While Chelsea seems to be interacting with the woman in front of her, Hillary seems to be looking at both Chelsea and the woman. Compared to Chelsea who talks and interacts with the other person in the photo, Hillary is characterized as more passive and subordinate in the photo.
Because Hillary’s eyes are shown as looking to her right, it looks at she is watching out for her daughter. Therefore, Hillary is shown in traditional mother role in the photo. From Hillary’s slanted eyes, one can assume that she is worried or concerned of something. Furthermore, the caption mentions that she is protective of Chelsea, thus it is argued that the photo portrays her as a mother who worries about her daughter’s safety.

**Charm Offensive: Oct. 7, 1996, p.38**

One picture that depicted Hillary Clinton as in between is found in the Oct. 7, 1996, issue (Figure B-8). In this black-and-white picture, the Clintons are sitting in a tour bus and Hillary Clinton is looking down holding a paper cup while Bill Clinton seems to be talking to the press with his hands waving or gesturing. Hillary Clinton looks tired and bored, but Bill Clinton is talking energetically. There is a sizable distance between Hillary and Bill Clinton in the photo.

From the nonverbal cues of Hillary Clinton, one can tell that she connotes submission, passiveness, and obedience by her lowered eyes, tilted head, and her hands on her face (Goffman, 1979). However, from her facial expressions, it can be argued that she is portrayed as less submissive and obedient than in other photos. First, Hillary Clinton is looking down instead of looking at Bill Clinton when he is talking. Woman portrayed in stereotypes are portrayed as supportive and affectionate to their husband, but Hillary Clinton doesn’t set her eyes or put her focus on her husband in the photo. Second, her mouth is closed tight and she is not smiling. Even though the caption reads “Charm offensive: Bill Clinton,” from the grim face of Hillary Clinton, it is arguable that she is not charmed by her husband. Third, Hillary Clinton is resting her face on her hand. This particular body language implies the actor of the motion is tired and impatient.

The caption indicates that the Clintons are trying to win through their charm. Compared to their competitors at that time, the Clintons were the younger and more charming couples.
However, it appears in the photo that only Bill Clinton is charming, and Hillary Clinton just looks tired.

**Wounded and Wary: Nov. 11, 1996, p. 21**

This photo that presents Hillary Clinton in a mixture of traditional and nontraditional role is found in the Nov. 18, 1996, issue (Figure B-9). In this one-eighth page, close-up, side view photo, Hillary Clinton is portrayed alone smiling with her eyes half-closed. The title and the caption read “Wounded and Wary: To change her image, she’ll have to let the public see her ‘human’ side.”

Some of the visual cues of the photo connote her superiority and masculinity. In the photo, Hillary Clinton’s chin is around 45 degrees tilted up, which is a sign of superiority, disdain and not being ashamed (Goffman, 1979). Besides, she looks snobbish and arrogant with her eyes looking down. In addition to the facial expression, the high index of face-ism also supports her non-feminine characterization (Archer et al., 1983). The 0.8 face-ism scale is relatively high compare to other photos of Hillary Clinton. High face-ism index emphasizes her wit and ambitions (Archer et al., 1983), which are traits normally used to depict men than women. Besides, the arrogant facial expression of Hillary Clinton corresponds to the caption that points out her not showing her “human side.”

On the other hand, other signs found in the photos show Hillary Clinton in a feminine light. First, she is smiling in the photo. Because a smile is a sign of appeasement, submission and subordination, it softens her arrogant image in the photo. In addition, the soft green suit with the flower decoration and the pearl necklace, which can be interpreted as attempts to soften her image, all highlight her femininity in the photo.
Because of the close-up camera technique, Hillary Clinton’s feminine features such as the sensual lips, long eyelashes and long neck are emphasized in the photo. These imply her physical attractiveness and sexuality, therefore characterizing her as feminine (Goodman, 1997).

The caption of the photo that indicates that she didn’t show her “human” side to the public suggests that she is mean and merciless. The close-up camera technique is sometimes used to suggest the intimacy between the reader and the person being portrayed (Parry-Giles, 200), and thus persuades the readers that they know the person in the photo. In this case, the close-up technique is used to persuade the readers to believe that Hillary Clinton is a person who is mean and not personable.

The Scent of Scandal: Nov. 18, 1996, p.70

One photo that portrays Hillary Clinton with Bill Clinton is found in the Nov. 18, 1996, issue (Figure B-10). In this full page, black-and-white photo, Bill Clinton is kissing Hillary’s hair with his right arm surrounding Hillary’s neck. Hillary Clinton is shown smiling. The title and the caption of the photo read “The scent of scandal: How the White House shored up its defenses against a sea of troubles and managed to blunt the GOP candidate’s re-emergence as Citizen Dole.”

Hillary Clinton is characterized as in-between in the photo. Compared to other photos that portray her in a bending over or canting position, she is standing nearly straight with her chin slightly tilted up in the photo. Her outfit is more casual than those in the other photos. She wears pants and wears less pieces of jewelry than normal. However, other signs found in the photo still characterize her as feminine. First, she is shown as passive in the photo. Because Bill Clinton is kissing her, he is dominant in the photo. Besides, Hillary Clinton’s smile is a sign of submissive and appeasement, which are traditional female traits (Goffman, 1979).
While Hillary Clinton was often photographed with Bill Clinton in the photos found in 1992, there were fewer photos that showed them together in 1996. This photo creates a happy couple image by showing their interaction and body language; however, the title and the caption that mention “scandal” and “trouble” seemed to suggest that the happiness and the intimacy between the two are not genuine.

**Lessons Learned: Oct. 7, 1996, p. 43**

The only one photo that can be argued as describing Hillary Clinton as a professional/career woman, in other words a nontraditional woman, is found in the Oct. 7, 1996, issue (Figure B-11). In this small, nearly headshot photo, Hillary Clinton, in a black suit, is looking off in the distance and seems to be thinking about something with her two fingers on her chin (near her lower lips) and her mouth frowning. The title and the caption read “Lessons learned: Despite health care, the First Lady understands the virtues of small programs.”

It can be argued that she is portrayed as nontraditional in some aspects of the photo. Instead of smiling as she does in most photos, her lips are closed and she looks to be seriously thinking. The golden buttons and the gold crest on her black suit are associated with the military, which is associated with power and control. The flag behind her, which indicates patriotism, freedom and independence (Barthes, 1957; Sharpe, 1974), makes the readers relate the actor in the photo with government office. She looks very official and American. In addition, the 0.5 face-ism index is relatively high compared to other photos of Clinton. Higher facial indexes connote intelligence, wit and ambition, which are masculine traits in the media (Archer et al., 1983). This high index of face-ism supports her nontraditional characterization.

However, although she is portrayed as less traditional in this photo, one feminine trait is found in this photo. Hillary Clinton puts her fingers under her lower lips on her chin. Putting fingers on the mouth is an attenuation of sucking or biting the finger (Goffman, 1979). It
indicates anxiety and meditation, which are characteristics of feminine stereotypes (Goffman, 1979).

Although Hillary Clinton is portrayed more powerful and nontraditional in this photo, she nevertheless is being portrayed negatively. In the picture, Hillary Clinton looks troubled and confused with her contemplative and serious facial expression. It goes with the title, “lesson learned,” And the caption implying that Clinton didn’t understand the virtues of small programs. It is implied that Hillary Clinton is like a child who does things wrong and puts herself into trouble, which certainly isn’t a powerful message. Therefore, although it seems like Hillary Clinton is portrayed less as weak and incapable, she actually is being blamed as not being able to run bigger programs such as health care reform and to play an executive role.

The caption moreover does not call Hillary Clinton by her name; instead, it calls her “the First Lady,” which conflicts with the image of Hillary Clinton in the photo as an executive. The “First Lady” title in the caption generates a discourse of the awkwardness and the ridiculousness of Hillary Clinton, a “First Lady”, a woman, trying to do something (in here, in charge of health care program) that “only man can excel.”

The black color suit further supports this idea. Black is related to evil and death (Sharpe, 1974). In applying this signification to Clinton, she could be viewed as evil because she doesn’t conform to the image of a traditional First Lady.

**Senate Candidate, 2000**

In the photos of *Newsweek* magazine, there were eight photos of then Senate candidate Hillary Clinton. In this stage of her political life, she is portrayed less in stereotypes and less traditional compared to when she was a First Lady. Hillary Clinton is shown as traditional in two photos and in-between in six photos. However, there are still more pictures showing her with her husband or child. She is with Bill Clinton in three photos, with Chelsea Clinton in one photo,
with both Bill and Chelsea in one photo, with her opponent in two photos, and alone in one
photo. The following are the selected photos that exemplify the characteristics of Hillary
Clinton’s semiotics representation when she was a Senate candidate back in 2000.

*Syracuse N.Y.: Nov. 20, 2000, p.81*

One of the photos that depict Hillary Clinton in a traditional role is found in the Nov. 20,
2000 issue (Figure B-12). This black-and-white picture shows Hillary and Bill Clinton sitting on
the counter of an outdoor vendor with a large, rough-looking, male biker with tattoos standing
next to them, and a crowd of working-class people behind them. In the picture, Bill Clinton is
holding some food and talking to the women behind him; Hillary Clinton is laughing and looking
away with her hand on Bill Clinton’s upper thigh. Both of the Clintons have biker-style scarves
on their necks. The title and the caption read “Her turn: Bill Clinton joins Hillary Clinton in
Syracuse, N.Y. The president plunged in with notes and phone calls. ‘This is a relationship that
thrives on distance,’ said the aide.”

Because of her facial expression and body language, she is depicted as traditional. Her
eyes are averted, which implies submissiveness. Her open mouth reflects submissiveness or
amusement (Goffman, 1979). Putting her hand on Bill Clinton’s leg can be explained as a sign of
affection, dependency, which reflects her traditional wife role.

Compared to Bill Clinton, who is holding food and slanting his body backwards talking
to the women, Hillary Clinton’s body language indicates her insecurity or nervousness. In the
photo, Hillary Clinton is holding a cup on the counter and placing the other hand on Bill
Clinton’s leg with her body slanting slightly forward. It seems like Hillary Clinton is
uncomfortable with where she sits. Additionally, Hillary Clinton is leaning into Bill Clinton and
away from the bikers, which reinforce her timidity and femininity. Bill Clinton seems to be
looking back and talking to the people at the back, and the women behind the counter appear to
be paying more attention to Bill than to Hillary Clinton. Moreover, Hillary Clinton is not interacting with anyone except Bill Clinton, which indicates that she is not comfortable with the situation. Her body language here can be read as a sign of her not being capable to fit into different circumstances and not as competent as Bill Clinton. Her lack of interaction with others furthermore, makes her looks disdainful and unfriendly. In this photo, then, Hillary Clinton is not just shown as traditional but also negative and less likable than Bill Clinton.

Moreover, Hillary Clinton wears a white or very light colored suit. White is associated with purity and innocence, traits traditionally seen as feminine. Her clothing color along with her higher elevation makes her look like a goddess on a pedestal and superior to the people.

Finally, the caption that says “her turn” suggests that Hillary Clinton is in the lead role in the relationship and Bill Clinton is the supporter. However, it is inconsistent with the signs in the photo. The remainder of the caption that reads “the relationship thrives on distance” is indicating that the relationship between the couple is rocky, possibly due to “her turn” in the lead role.

**Fascinated by all Things American: Nov. 27, 2000, p. 51**

In this photo from the Nov. 27, 2000, issue, she is portrayed as feminine and decorative (Figure B-13). The color photo shows Hillary and Chelsea from above bust. Both of them are wearing Vietnamese traditional hats smiling with their mouth slightly open. The title and the caption reads “Fascinated by all things American: A Vietnamese honor guard greets the president in Hanoi. In a village, Senator-elect Hillary and daughter Chelsea try on traditional hats.”

At that time, while Hillary Clinton was already elected as a Senator, from the facial expressions one can tell she is still shown in traditional feminine traits. Her smile is friendly and submissive, and her open mouth can be explained as submissive. The jewelry and pink suit also reinforce the traditional feminine role of Hillary Clinton.
The background of the photo shows the roof of an Asian traditional building. The setting is rural and peaceful. If one only look at the picture without knowing about Hillary Clinton, one would not assume Clinton is to be a politician or even a career woman.

The title that reads “Fascinated by all things American” is problematic. It denotes the power, wealth, attractiveness of Americans, but the picture shows Hillary and Chelsea Clinton looking happy in the traditional hats trying to please the Vietnamese.

The President Will Help Boost Hillary’s War Chest: Sep. 11, 2000, p.6

This example shows Hillary Clinton in an in-between role was found in the Sept. 11, 2000 issue (Figure B-14). In this one-eighth-page photo, Hillary Clinton is photographed from above chest and from the side. Bill Clinton is standing behind Hillary Clinton and talking to her with his hands on her shoulder. The caption of the photo reads “The president will help boost Hillary’s war chest”.

In this photo, Hillary Clinton is looking straight ahead and slightly smiling with her mouth closed. Her short hair, slightly upturned chin, and closed mouth are signs of masculinity (Goffman, 1979). Having one’s head straight up is a symbol of superiority, disdain, and not being ashamed (Goffman, 1979).

On the other hand, from the interaction of Bill and Hillary Clinton, one can tell that Bill Clinton is shown as dominant and Hillary Clinton as passive in the picture. Bill Clinton puts his hands on Hillary Clinton’s shoulder and back and talks to her, and Hillary Clinton looks off with her mouth closed. Bill Clinton thus is acting, and Hillary Clinton is passively listening to him. According to Berger (1972), in visual presentation “men act, women appear” (p. 47); it is a gender stereotype that man is the one shown as active and woman as negative. Furthermore, women are often shown as being protected by men putting their arms or hands on the women’s shoulders (Goffman, 1979); therefore, it’s a symbol for submissiveness. Besides, Bill Clinton’s
arm posture and the way he talks to Hillary Clinton make it look like Bill Clinton is persuading Hillary Clinton into doing something. Therefore, he seems to be the one who has more influence than the other way around. Furthermore, although Hillary Clinton is closer to the camera and occupies two-thirds of the photo while Bill Clinton occupies only one-third of the photo, Bill Clinton is shown with almost his whole face while Hillary Clinton is shown with only half face (for she is show at the side), which reinforces his dominant role.

The caption “The president will help boost Hillary’s war chest” is further reinforcing her femininity. It is talking about how Bill Clinton will help her raise money, thereby suggesting Bill Clinton’s authority, strength and influence and Hillary Clinton’s dependence on her husband to be successful. Besides, the subject of the caption is Bill Clinton rather than Hillary Clinton further reinforcing her second-class status.

**Finger Pointing: Nov. 26, 2000, p. 96**

This photo that portrays Hillary Clinton as in-between is found in the Nov. 26, 2000, issue (Figure B-15). This around one-sixth-page, black-and-white photo shows Hillary Clinton and Rick Lazio in a TV senatorial debate. In the photo, Lazio steps away from the podium to finger point at Hillary Clinton, who turns to face him and stands in a defensive position. The title and the caption of the photo read “Finger Pointing: Lazio overplayed his hands, but Bill Clinton thought Hillary had missed some chances—and told her so when he telephoned.”

Some signs in the photo characterize her as nontraditional. In the photo, Clinton is not smiling, but responding to Lazio seriously. Her eyes were confrontational. Besides, her outfit and her hairstyle make her look like a professional woman.

However, from other signs found in the photo, one can tell that she is still portrayed in female stereotypes. First, Lazio is the one who takes action in the photo and Clinton merely responses to his action. Therefore, she is portrayed as passive while Lazio is shown as dominant.
Second, Hillary Clinton is standing with her knee in a bending position. Standing with one’s knee bent is a traditional female trait (Goffman, 1979). The way she stands with her knee bending and leaning forward helps her keep her balance; therefore is read as a defensive position. Furthermore, Lazio is talking toward Clinton with his finger pointing at her, thus he is in attacking position. On one hand, it looks like Clinton is calm and confident in the photo; on the other hand, she also looks like she is protecting herself from being pushed to the floor by Lazio. In addition, Lazio is walking toward where Clinton stands, which is an action of invading one’s personal space. According to Henley (1977), women in general have control over less territory than men do, and women’s space is more often violated than men’s is. Besides, people with lower social status tend to yield space to people with higher social status (Henley, 1977). Therefore, Clinton is presented as having less control over her personal space and thus having lower social status than Lazio in the photo.

The caption talks about Lazio’s action and how Bill Clinton thought about the debate, but it doesn’t talk about Hillary Clinton’s action or response to the situation. Besides, it points out that Bill Clinton advised Hillary Clinton and commented on her performance in the debate. Therefore, the caption further accentuates Hillary Clinton’s subordination and lack of power.

**Presidential Candidate of the Democratic Party, 2007**

In the issues of Newsweek magazine from Aug. 6, 2007 to Nov. 27, 2007, there were 31 photos of Clinton as presidential candidate for the Democratic Party. In this stage of her political life, she is portrayed as less feminine and more powerful compared to when she was a First Lady or a Senator. Eleven photos portray Hillary Clinton in nontraditional role, 16 photos portray her as in between, and only four portray her as totally feminine. Among the four photos that portray her as feminine, three photos were taken during her terms as First Lady and only one photo was taken when she is a presidential primary candidate. She is portrayed less with her husband or her
child as well. She is shown alone in 11 photos, with Bill Clinton in three photos, with Barack Obama in three photos, and with John McCain in one photo. The following are the selected photos that exemplify the characteristics of Hillary Clinton’s semiotics representation when she becomes a presidential candidate.

**Hillary Defends the Gift: Aug. 20, 2007, p.12**

This traditional portrayal of Hillary Clinton is found in the Aug. 20, 2007, issue (Figure B-16). The caption of the photo reads, “Hillary defends the gift.” In this half-body length photo, Hillary Clinton is shown alone from above hips. She is smiling, walking in a parking lot with sunglasses and sun visor on. She is wearing a white dress shirt with beige pants and beige sun visor and holding a yellow bag or purse. Although her outfit looks casual, she is wearing big showy diamond earrings.

Because of the nonverbal cues of the photo, Hillary Clinton connotes femininity. Her open mouth and smile connotes her as submissive and feminine (Goffman, 1979). The 0.2 face-ism index signifies the de-emphasis of the intelligence and the mental mind and the objectification of the actor (Archer et al., 1983).

The outfit also signifies femininity. Although the white dress shirt and the khaki pants seem casual and masculine, her big diamond earrings emphasize her femininity and wealth at the same time. Besides, the shirt and the pants are fitted, stressing Clinton’s curves and highlighting her femininity. From the casual outfit with accessories in same color tone, the big black sunglasses, and more importantly, her big diamond earrings, this photo looks more like a glamour shot than a photo in a newsmagazine.

Because the sunglasses cover her eyes and the eyes are the symbols of one’s mind and thoughts, moreover, her wearing sunglasses can be seen as hiding her true personality. In this context, because of the caption “Hillary defends the gifts,” the photo could imply she is not
telling the truth about the issue. The long stride of her walk, which is associated with her avoiding reporters’ questions about the gift, as well supports the assertion.

Overall, the combination of the outfit, the sunglasses, the parking lot background, her walking motion and the emphasis on her lower body, the layout of the photo is more like the ones of a fashion or living style magazine than the ones of the news magazine. Therefore, this photo creates an image of a celebrity rather than a presidential candidate. In other words, she is subjected to the traditional female roles—a mother, a wife and a woman who knows how to dress up.

**Beset on All Sides: Sep. 17, 2007, p.30, 31**

This photo that portrays Hillary Clinton as traditional is found in the Sep. 17, 2007, issue (Figure B-17). In this black-and-white, around half page photo, Hillary and Bill Clinton were holding hands walking toward front with another couple walking with them. The title and the caption of the photo read “Beset on all sides: Incidents from the Arkansas days were used against her”. From the caption, one can assume that the photo was taken when Bill Clinton was a governor of Arkansas.

Because of the nonverbal cues of the photo, Hillary Clinton connotes submissiveness and subordination. In the photo, Bill Clinton is holding Hillary’s hand and walking. Bill Clinton is walking with his steps a little forward of Hillary Clinton’s. In this case, it appears like Bill Clinton is leading Hillary Clinton. Therefore, Hillary Clinton was shown as passive and following the lead of Bill Clinton in the photo. In addition to her passive body language, her outfit reminds me of traditional mandarin gown, cheongsam (qipao). The dress she wears covers her whole body including her neck, and it is fitted especially around the waist to show women’s body curve. This kind of dress is similar to the traditional Chinese cheongsams, which are the fitted one-piece dresses worn by traditional Chinese woman. Her perfect hairstyle, her
cheongsam-like dress, and her passive body language thus create a submissive wife image of her in the photo.

This traditional wife image of Hillary Clinton contradicts to the caption. The caption implies the Whitewater scandal has influenced her career life as a presidential candidate, but in the photo, Hillary Clinton looks happy because she is smiling. Because of the disagreement of the caption and the photo, Hillary Clinton was portrayed as dishonest in the photo.

**What has She Done: Aug. 13, 2007, p.36**

One of the photos that portrays Hillary Clinton as in-between is found in the Aug. 13, 2007, issue (Figure B-18). In this about one-fourth-page photo, Hillary Clinton is shown surrounded with gay supporters in photo-taking position. The title and the caption of the photo read “But what has she done: Clinton at the New York City gay-pride parade in 2006.”

Clinton is wearing a black suit like a professional woman. Besides, she is surrounding by a group of young or handsome male supporters, which accentuate her superiority and thus characterize her as powerful. However, other signs in the photo characterize her in traditional female stereotypes. First, she is smiling expansively and bending her body over in the photo. Smile is a sign of femininity (Goffman, 1979). Although all the other people in the photo are smiling, Clinton appears to be the happiest. On the other hand, smile can also be a sign of being nervous or embarrassed (Goffman, 1979). In this photo, Clinton’s smile doesn’t look as genuine as the other people, so it is assumed that she feels uncomfortable and shy. Besides, bending one’s body is also a sign of submissiveness (Goffman, 1979). Furthermore, while some other people are posing, taking pictures with their own cameras, or looking away, Clinton seems to be the one who is most aware of the camera. Therefore, she is shown passively responding to the camera.

This photo looks like a party photo, thus Hillary Clinton’s power of a New York Senator seems to be taken away. In other words, Clinton is portrayed as a decoration instead of a Senator.
who works for people in the photo. Besides, the caption that asks what she has done questions her ability as a Senator. Thus the caption agrees with the decorative, feminine and incapable image in the photo.

**Lobbying Effort: Sep. 17, 2007, p.36**

One of the photos that portray Hillary Clinton as in-between is found in the Sept. 17, 2007 issue (Figure B-19). In this one-sixth-page, nearly whole body length photo, Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama are sitting next to each other. The picture shows Obama talking and Clinton looking at him listening. The title and the caption read “Lobbying effort: The battle between the top Dem contenders goes beyond voters.”

Because of the nonverbal cues of the photo, Hillary Clinton is shown as in-between. Her closed mouth, black suit, and the absence of her jewelry build a nontraditional, feminist image of her. Because of the serious facial expressions and the clothing, she is portrayed as a professional woman.

Furthermore, the caption adds to her nontraditional image using phrases such as “battle” and calling her a “top contender.” Both phrases are associated with strength, power, struggle, and belligerence, which are traditionally associated with the masculine.

However, Hillary Clinton also appears to be performing a passive role from her body language. In contrast to Obama’s talking and gesturing to the audience, Clinton is passively listening and giving full attention to him by placing her eyes on him. This interaction shows the domination of Obama and the passiveness of Clinton. Compared to Obama, who is sitting still with his legs open, Clinton’s legs are closed. Putting legs together is a sign of femininity and submissiveness (Henley, 1977). It also presents her as yielding personal space to Obama (Henley, 1977). Her folded hands, tilted head and the tilted shoulders as well imply submission and subordination (Goffman, 1979). Although it is known that Obama is taller and bigger than
Hillary Clinton, because of the positions of the two of them (Obama gesturing with his arm opened and Clinton sitting in canting position, which shows a nearly side view of her), Clinton appears to be even smaller. The smallness of Clinton reinforces the impression of her having less power, less authority and lower rank than Obama. Overall, these signs of the photo portray her as a less viable candidate.

Moreover, canting one’s body signifies submission and subordination, which is a traditional feminine motion (Goffman, 1979). But gesturing with one’s arms open implies talking over space, which indicates masculinity and power (Henley, 1977). Therefore, Clinton is characterized in a traditional feminine role in the photo, and Obama is shown as dominant and powerful.

**Bringing It: Nov. 12, 2007, p. 40**

Another photo that shows Hillary Clinton with Barack Obama is found in the Nov. 12, 2007, issue (Figure B-20). In this photo, Clinton is shown from the side. She turns her back to Obama and looks straight ahead. Obama’s body is positioned in the other direction with his head turning toward her. Obama is shown talking and slightly smiling. The title and the caption of the photo read “Bringing it: Obama has decided it’s time to go on the attack.”

This photo portrays Hillary Clinton as in-between. She is shown with her chin upturned, which is a sign of superiority and not being ashamed (Goffman, 1979). Besides, her short hair and black suit make her look like a professional woman.

However, in the photo, Obama is shown as looking at Clinton and talking. Therefore, he is the main actor in the photo and Clinton is the passive responder. Furthermore, the caption suggests that Obama is attacking Clinton, thus implying to the readers that Obama is saying something to attack or challenge Clinton in the photo while Clinton pretends to not hear what he
says. The caption provides a version of the story in the photo that Clinton is weak and not able to
talk back on Obama’s attack.

On the other hand, Obama also appears to be checking out Clinton in the photo. Obama
is smiling with his mouth open in a way that makes him look like he is talking or blowing a
whistle. Because of their body language and facial expressions, it looks like Obama is checking
Clinton out while she passes by and purposely ignores him. From the interaction between the
two, it is implied that Obama is objectifying Clinton like she is a sexual object. Therefore,
Clinton is shown less powerful than Obama.

**Together Through It All: Oct. 22, 2007, p.43**

Another photo that presents Hillary Clinton as in-between is found in the Oct. 22, 2007,
issue (Figure B-21). In this one-sixth-page, half-body-length color photo, Hillary Clinton is
laughing and clapping her hands, and Bill Clinton is standing behind her with his hand in his
pocket. The title and the caption of the photo reads “Together through it all: The Clintons at a
New Hampshire campaign rally last month.”

Hillary Clinton is the main actor portrayed in the photo. She is portrayed in the photo with
Bill Clinton standing behind her. It is not clear if Hillary Clinton is clapping or just gesturing, but
from the wide opened arms, she connotes dominance and power (Henley, 1977). Also, compared
to Bill Clinton, she appears to be interacting more with the audience or the cameramen; Bill
Clinton seems to be the supporter of her.

However, besides the two points mentioned above, other nonverbal cues connote
submission and subordination of her. First, her open mouth and laughing are both signs of
femininity and submission (Goffman, 1979). Second, compared to Bill Clinton, who looks calm
and relaxed, Hillary Clinton is portrayed as more emotionally involved with whatever is
happening in the photo. Because women are more often portrayed as emotional and men more often rational, this photo reinforces gender stereotypes.

Although the caption implies the close relationship with Bill and Hillary Clinton, in the photo, they are not interacting with each. Although both of them look delighted, Hillary Clinton appears to be laughing while Bill Clinton is only smiling. In addition, they are not looking at exactly the same direction. These two signs indicate their difference and that they think differently or they are different in their personalities. Therefore, the caption contradicts the message of the photo.

**Member of the Club: Sep. 17, 2007, p.32, 33**

This photo that portrays Hillary Clinton in between traditional and non-traditional is found in the Sep. 17, 2007, issue (Figure B-22). In this half-page photo, Hillary Clinton is shot from above waist. Clinton is sitting on the chair and smiling with her eyes looking forward. John McCain is shown standing from the side. He appears to be passing the chair which Clinton sits on. He is putting his right hand on Hillary Clinton’s shoulder. The title and the caption of the photo reads “Member of the Club: In congress, the Senator has reached across the aisle.”

From the nonverbal cues of the photo, Hillary Clinton is shown as in-between in the photo. Hillary Clinton is sitting on the chair with her chin upturned, which is a sign of superiority and not being ashamed (Goffman, 1979). Compared to McCain who keeps his head slightly down, Hillary Clinton looks more powerful and dominant. In addition, although Clinton appears to be a lot shorter than McCain because she is sitting on the chair, she actually looks bigger than McCain because of the camera angle. The size difference makes Clinton look heavier and connotes higher social status than McCain (Goffman, 1979).

On the other hand, while McCain looks more serious with his mouth closed, Clinton is smiling with her mouth open and her teeth shown (Appendix V). Smiling is a sign of submission
and subordination; therefore, the smile lessens her powerful image. Furthermore, because McCain is putting his hand on Clinton’s shoulder, Clinton is passive in the photo while McCain is active and dominant. From this interaction between the two, it shows McCain has more power over Clinton. However, given the caption “member of the club,” one might read McCain’s gesture similarly to a king knighting a man. In other words, he is bestowing his “blessing” on her and welcoming her into the “boy’s club” thereby reinforcing her new powerful role.

**What Kind of Decider Would She be: Sep. 17, 2007, cover page**

One of the photos that describe her as nontraditional and powerful is in the Sep. 17, 2007, issue (Figure B-23). In this full-page, half-body length color photo, Hillary Clinton is in an outdoor setting. She is standing talking with her one hand raised up. The background of the photo is the blue sky with a white cloud. The title of the photo reads “What kind of decider would she be?”

Because of the visual cues in the photo, Hillary Clinton is portrayed as a professional person or an advocator. The colors of the blue sky, white cloud and her red suit are also the colors in the United State’s flag, the presidential seal and other symbols of the country. Therefore, her juxtaposition with these colors symbolizes patriotism, power, and her being an integral part of the country. The color of her suit, red, is also a symbol of power (Barthes, 1957).

The angle of the camera shot from the bottom makes Hillary Clinton look like she is looking down on others. In other words, she exudes superiority and not being ashamed (Goffman, 1979).

In terms of her body language, in this photo Clinton is talking and reaching her arm out. According to Henley (1977), women are more often shown passive and having their arms close to the body and men are shown talking and reaching out their arms. Therefore, this photo characterizes her as more active and dominant.
The caption seems to imply the opposite message. The caption asks what kind of decider Clinton would be. Although it seems to be a question, the answer is found in the signs of the photo. Clinton’s head is shown against the sky in the clouds. The sky and the clouds are associated with daydreaming or high expectations. Therefore, it is assumed that she would be a decider with unrealistic ideals and expectations.

**Under Cover: Oct. 29, 2007, p.37**

Another photo that portrays Hillary Clinton as nontraditional is found in the Oct. 29, 2007, issue (Figure B-24). In this one-third page, half-body length color photo, Hillary Clinton, who is in a dark suit, is placing her hand on her forehead as to block the sunlight while the background is totally black. The title and the caption of the photo read “Under cover: It’s not likely that Clinton’s paper will be public before the election.” The title of the article reads “Papers? I Don’t See Any Papers.”

This photo is different than other photos that portray Hillary Clinton as nontraditional. In this photo, Hillary Clinton is portrayed as nontraditional because she is standing up straight and not smiling (Goffman, 1979). However, she is shown as cold and evil too. In the photo, Hillary Clinton’s eyes are invisible because of the shadow of the hand on her forehead, but from her mouth, one can tell she looks serious. Not showing the eyes indicates not showing one’s true nature, which corresponds to the caption that points out she is hiding her record in the White House. Because light is a symbol of truth and righteousness, blocking the light indicates Clinton is not able to do what is right. Besides, the black background as well indicates that she is hiding in the dark. Additionally, the color black symbolizes evil and death, which fortifies the negative portrayal of Hillary Clinton.
The Once and Future Queen, Nov. 5, 2007, p.41

This photo that depicts Hillary Clinton in a nontraditional role is found in the Nov. 5, 2007, issue (Figure B-25). In this around one-tenth page photo, Hillary Clinton is shown from above waist and from the side. The photo is placed on the left end of the page. On the right end of the page is a photo of Cate Blanchett in the movie Elizabeth. Between the two photos is the title and the subtitle of the article that reads “The Once and Future Queen: Elizabeth’s imperiled England is a lot like the American Clinton could well wind up leading.”

Because of the nonverbal cues, Hillary Clinton is portrayed as nontraditional in the photo. First, Clinton is shown with her mouth closed and slightly tilted down. Men are more often photographed with their mouth closed than women; therefore, mouth closed is opposite to the traditional female sign (Goffman, 1979). Second, Clinton is looking up with her chin slightly turned up in the photo. Tilting one’s head or chin up is a action of being not ashamed and superior, therefore is a sign of being powerful (Goffman, 1979).

Besides her facial expressions and body language, the background also supports her nontraditional and powerful image. First, next to Clinton is a United States flag, which symbolizes patriotism, government office, and power. In addition, she is wearing a jacket with the color red, which is associated with power.

While Clinton is characterized as less traditional in this photo, she is portrayed in a negative light. In the photo, Clinton is looking to her upper right direction with her eyebrows furrowed and her lips tilted down. Because of the slanted eyes and grim facial expression, she looks displeased. The words “queen” and “imperiled” in the title in this context both are negative words that convey the image of a strict and controlling woman; therefore, the title and the subtitle of the article suggest that Clinton might end up being as controlling as Queen Elizabeth and put the country in danger as what Queen Elizabeth did to England.
In this study, I investigated the following research question: How did the media present Hillary Clinton with news photos during her three different political career stages—as a First Lady, a Senator, and a Presidential candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination?

In exploring the question, I looked at liberal feminist theory and the double binds for possible explanations of the result of my analysis. Liberal feminist theory asserts that the disparity between men and women is the result of irrational prejudices, and the equality between both sexes can be achieved through education (Steeves, 1987). Double binds talk about how women are limited in their options because of the premise that women can’t be as competent and capable as men (Jamieson, 1995). According to Jamieson’s (1995) double binds, there are five typical binds that block women on their way to power or hinder the power that women already gained. Among the five binds, I focused on the femininity/competency bind. In this double bind, women are trapped by the idea that they can be either competent or feminine, but not both (Jamieson, 1995).

Besides the theories, I also looked at past literature that looks at Hillary Clinton’s media image during Bill Clinton’s administration. Past studies show that Hillary Clinton has been a controversial First Lady because she didn’t meet the criteria of a traditional wife (Burden and Mughan, 1999; Scharrer, 2002). Other studies suggest that the media depicted Hillary Clinton in more negative ways than positive ways (Gardetto, 1997), especially when she didn’t act like a traditional supportive wife (Scharrer, 2002). Past literature also shows that media indirectly suggested that Hillary Clinton is a controversial wife whose interests conflict with her husband’s (Gardetto, 1997).
In addition to Hillary Clinton’s media portrayal, I reviewed the literature on female political candidates. It appears that female candidates are often underrepresented and stereotyped as less viable by the media (Kahn and Goldenberg, 1991; Kahn, 1992). In terms of media portrayal of women in general, past literature points out that women were underrepresented in quality and were portrayed in traditional roles by the media (Thompson, 1993; Armstrong, 2004; Glascock and Preston-Schreck, 2004; Len-Rios, Rodgers, Thorson, & Yoon, 2005). In photos, women were often stereotyped as sexual objects that try to lure the male spectators (Berger, 1972 and Mulvey, 1999).

Based on the evidence of the past literature, this study aimed to find out whether media coverage on Hillary Clinton during her three political career stages had sustained the traditional ideologies of female portrayal in the media by conducting a semiotic analysis of Hillary Clinton’s photos and captions in *Newsweek* magazine. I reviewed all the photos found in *Newsweek* magazine within my sampling interval of August to November 1992, 1996, 2000, and 2007.

I analyzed the photos and captions using the codes created by Goodman (1997) based on past studies of media portrayal of women such as Goffman’s (1979) model of women stereotypes, Archer et al.’s (1983) face-ism index, Pingree et al.’s (1976) scale of sexism, Henley’s (1977) chart of human body language. Using these codes, the photographs were divided into three categories: traditional, nontraditional and in-between. In the traditional photos, Hillary Clinton was presented as a wife, a mother, or a homemaker who stays at home. In the in-between photos, she was depicted as having a career but primarily stays at home. In the nontraditional photos, Clinton is portrayed as a professional who is equal to men.
I talked about the general patterns of Clinton’s media coverage during her three career stages found for each of the three categories. In the photos of 1992, Hillary Clinton was shown as traditional in 100 percent of the photos; in 1996, she was shown as traditional in 71 percent, as in-between in 24 percent, and as nontraditional in five percent of the photos. When she had become a senate candidate in 2000, 25 percent of the photos showed her as traditional and 25 percent showed her as in-between. In 2007, she was shown as traditional in 13 percent of the photos, as in-between in 52 percent, and as nontraditional in 35 percent of the photos. Then, I presented example photos with in-depth analysis of each category in each career stage. Sorting out the result of my analysis, I proposed five main findings in the photos. All five points are presented below.

First, while Hillary Clinton was portrayed as traditional in the 1992 photos, she was portrayed less traditionally in the photos found in the 1996 issues. As presented in Chapter Four, all photos found in the August to November 1992 issues depict Hillary Clinton as traditional. She was portrayed mainly as wife or mother in the photos. This result is in line with Colbert’s (1995) study of the first two years of Bill Clinton’s administration that found most of Hillary Clinton’s photos are conventional.

Although Hillary Clinton was a successful attorney who had taught at a college, she was not represented as a career woman but rather as a wife and a mother. As argued in Chapter Two, the male elite establish our society’s framework. In this patriarchal society, men belong to the public sphere while women belong to private (LeGates, 2001). As Frazer & Lacy (1993) had pointed out, the “presence of women pollutes the purity of the masculine public world” (p. 24).

When a powerful woman such as Clinton enters the public sphere, she is considered a threat to traditional norms of masculinity. Therefore, the patriarchal society lessens the threat by
emphasizing the “proper” relations between the sexes. They promote the idea that women are primarily sexual and domestic beings (Frazer & Lacy, 1993). In other words, they put women “in their places.”

One way to “put women in their place” is through the media. Because the patriarchy controls the media, they are able to use media to promote and reassert the ideology of the male elite dominated society (Hall, 1982). Thus, media images oppress women by constraining their ability to reinforce the traditional gender roles. The high percentage of traditional portrayals of Hillary Clinton reflects the strategy of how a patriarchal society responds to Hillary Clinton’s departure from a traditional First Lady role.

However, in the photos found in the 1996 sampling interval, 24 percent of them are in-between and five percent characterized her as nontraditional. Besides the increased number of the nontraditional and in-between photos, the captions also showed the trend of her nontraditional image as a First Lady. For example, for the photos found in the Nov. 18, 1996, issue, the captions read “To change her image, she’ll have to let the public see her ‘human’ side.”

Regarding the differences of her photos between her first and second term as a First Lady, one possible explanation is that the patriarchal dominated society reacted to her prominence in the “public sphere” in 1992. As mentioned in Chapter Two, Hillary Clinton was especially outspoken and aggressive and had become controversial during the campaign in 1992 for her infamous quotes “I am not sitting here—some little woman standing by my man like Tammy Wynette,” and “I supposed I could have stayed home and baked cookies and had teas” (Jamieson, 1995). Therefore, the media, a tool of the male-dominated society, accentuated on her feminine traits and depicted her as a traditional woman in order to reinforce the idea of the “proper” relation between men and women (Frazer & Lacy, 1993). However, she has softened
her appearance, behavior and speech in 1996. She focused her work more on children and children’s organizations (Walsh, 1996). Therefore, the media found it less necessary to portray Clinton in a traditional wife, mother, and homemaker role.

Another explanation for her different photographic portrayals between 1992 and 1996 is that it was the campaign strategy of Bill Clinton’s public relation teams. As mentioned above, Hillary Clinton was especially controversial because of her outspokenness and aggressiveness. The campaign team may have recognized that her controversy was harmful to her husband in pursuing the presidential office, particularly in light of the Republicans’ emphasis on traditional family values. Hence, it is assumed that her image-makers might have set up photo opportunities that presented her as traditional.

Second finding in the analysis of the photos is that Hillary Clinton was still portrayed mainly as traditional and in-between when she first transcended from a First Lady to a Senate candidate. None of the photos portrayed her as nontraditional. In the 2000, Hillary Clinton had her hair cut short and was wearing less jewelry and accessories compared to those in 1992 or 1996. She was wearing pantsuits and less makeup. Overall, her hairstyle, makeup and clothes were all less feminine than those in 1996. This sustains the assertion of Carlson (2001), which points out that because voters preferred candidates with masculine personality traits in higher office, female candidates often presented themselves as women who break the gender stereotypes in the campaigns.

As for the photos in 2000, although Hillary Clinton had become a Senate candidate, the photos found in the magazine from August to November 2000 still portray her mostly as traditional and in-between. This finding is consistent with the ones of the past literature regarding the news coverage of female political candidates, which shows that in terms of media
coverage, female candidates were covered in gender stereotypes (Kahn, 1992; Banwart et al., 2003). A possible explanation of her traditional image when she first progressed from a First Lady to a Senate candidate is that the media were more comfortable with women in traditional wife and mother roles than in a more masculine role such as politicians or political candidates. This explanation is supported by Scharrer’s (2002) study in which she examined the newspaper coverage of Clinton from October 1999 to February 2000 and found that the media seemed to be more comfortable representing her as a traditional wife.

Third, Hillary Clinton’s image has become less traditional after she became a presidential candidate in the Democratic primaries. Among the 31 photos of 2007, only four characterize her as traditional. In the four traditional photos, only one was taken after she had become the presidential candidate. This finding sustains the idea of liberal feminists that the equality between both sexes is attainable through education and legislation (Steeves, 1987; Beasley, 1999).

Fourth, in comparing Hillary Clinton’s portrayals based on this in-depth analysis, I found her photo image had changed as she progressed to higher career levels. During her terms as a First Lady, there are 37 photos of Hillary Clinton. Among the photos, 84 percent portray her as traditional. As she became a Senate candidate in 2000, in the eight photos, only 25 percent depict her as traditional. Furthermore, when she became a candidate for President in 2007, in all 35 photos, only 13 percent of the photos show her as traditional. This result shows that as Hillary Clinton gained more political power, usually entitled to men, she received more nontraditional coverage and her media portrayals became more masculine as well. This result is accordant with the premise of the liberal feminist theories, which asserts that women can achieve equality between both sexes (Steeves, 1987).
One explanation of her nontraditional portrayal is that since the public view masculine traits such as aggressiveness, activeness, viability, and toughness as critical for candidates to run for higher political office (Huddy and Terkildsen, 1993), Clinton’s campaign team might have set up photo opportunities that presented her as nontraditional or with masculine traits. Another explanation is that since Hillary Clinton had become Senator and had resigned from a First Lady for seven years at that time, the public and the media are used to her professional image instead of a traditional wife and mother image. Therefore, the 2007 photos no longer depict her as feminine compared to when she was a First Lady (in 1992 and 1996) and when she first transitioned from a First Lady to a Senator candidate (in 2000).

Fifth, while Clinton was portrayed as less traditional in the photos found during the Democratic Presidential Primaries in 2007, some of the nontraditional and in-between photos characterized her as negative and were accompanied with negative coverage or captions. Although it seemed like Hillary Clinton was less stereotyped after she sought government office, she was at the same time covered with a more negative tone. One pattern found in some of the nontraditional and in-between photos was that they were shown with negative news stories or captions. While some of the negative captions or coverage merely pointed to her misconducts or scandals, others seemed to suggest her nontraditional image was negative. For instance, the only photo that characterized Hillary Clinton as nontraditional during her terms as a First Lady was shown with the title and the caption that read “Lessons learned: Despite health care, the First Lady understands the virtues of small programs.” In the photo, both Hillary Clinton’s facial expressions and her outfit are masculine. She appears to be seriously thinking with her mouth tightly closed. She is wearing a black suit with a gold crest which looks like a badge for the military. However, while she is characterized as a career woman, some signs found in the photo
show her as negative. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Clinton looks troubled or confused by her furrowed eyebrows and slightly lowered lips. Besides, the caption implies she is not capable to handle programs such as health care reform. This kind of nontraditional and in-between accompanied by negative captions and signs were found the most in the photos of the 2007 sampling interval. Out of the 11 nontraditional photos, Clinton was portrayed as negative in four photos (36 percent); in the 16 in-between photos, 25 percent of the photos show her in a negative light. One obvious example is found in the Nov. 5, 2007, issue, as presented in Chapter Four. Clinton’s photo is compared with Queen Elizabeth in the article, and the subtitle reads “Elizabeth imperiled England is a lot like the American Clinton could well wind up leading”. In the photo, she looks powerful because of the red suit and her upturned chin, but at the same time she appears to be scheming and merciless. One can tell that the media creates a rhetorical question that asks what kind of leader would Clinton be, and further implies that she would be too powerful that she will imperil the country as Queen Elizabeth had done to England.

These negative portrayals sustain the double binds theory, which points out that if a woman is too powerful or too capable, she is accused of trying to be a man or a lesbian (Jamieson, 1995). In this case, while Hillary Clinton was somehow portrayed as less traditional and more masculine and competent, she, at the same time, suffered from negative coverage that characterizes her as cold, ruthless, controlling, and not showing her “human” side. This result also supports Scharrer’s (2002) finding of her analysis on newspaper coverage of Hillary Clinton from Oct. 1 to Feb. 6, 2000, which shows that in general, the media covered Hillary Clinton more positively when she was presented as a traditional, supportive and soft news oriented role, and more negatively when she was the opposite (Scharrer; 2002).
The explanation of her negative coverage and portrayals is that in the patriarchal society, women are not supposed to pursue a male-dominated career such as a president of a country. The fact that Clinton became a presidential candidate has threatened the norms of the male-dominate society. Thus the media, the promoter for patriarchal ideology, had to buck the trend of women elevating to higher political status.

Sixth, when Clinton is portrayed alone, she is portrayed as more masculine and more powerful. However, when Clinton was shown with Obama in the photo, she was depicted as less powerful than Obama and submissive to him. Clinton was shown with Obama in three photos, and Obama was portrayed as more powerful than Clinton in two of the photos while the other photo is a headshot of them.

As presented in Chapter Five, Clinton was shown with some feminine traits in both of the photos. She was shown passive in both of the photos while Obama was dominant. Clinton was also shown as submissive, in canting position, and with her head-tilted in one of the photo. In contrast, Obama was shown talking with confidence with his arm stretched out taking over space. While Clinton’s popularity was higher than Obama’s during that point in time, Obama was portrayed as more viable, more active, and more like a leading candidate than Clinton in both photos.

This finding supports the findings of the past studies on female political candidates, which pointed out the male candidates were portrayed as more viable, more skillful, more active and tougher than the female candidates (Kahn and Goldenberg, 1991; Huddy and Terkildsen, 1993). A possible explanation of the differences between Clinton and Obama’s images is that the media is not comfortable with powerful women and thus would not portray Clinton as more powerful than her male competitor (Scharrer, 2002). This explanation is in line with the explanations of
why Hillary Clinton was portrayed as overly traditional in the photos of 1992 as opposed to those of 1996. Because literature suggests that typical female traits were considered less appropriate for higher or executive levels of office (Huddy and Terkildsen, 1993), this kind of feminine portrayal of Hillary Clinton when she was presented with her competitor was possibly harmful for her running for the presidential office.

Feminist theorists have pointed out in the eighteenth century that women were treated with inequality in society; from the negative portrayals of Hillary Clinton’s nontraditional and in-between photos, this assertion seems to be still valid after two centuries.

Although Hillary Clinton’s media image has become less traditional as she progressed from the President’s spouse to a Presidential candidate for Democratic Party, still more than half (52 percent) of the photos found in 2007 portray her as in-between. In other words, more than half of the photos still depict her with some traditional feminine stereotypes. Therefore, I conclude that although Hillary Clinton has received less traditional coverage, she is still not freed from gender stereotype at the point of her career stage as a presidential candidate in the Democratic primaries. Past literature shows that the public views feminine personality traits as less appropriate for higher governmental positions (Huddy and Terkildsen, 1993); therefore, I suggest that the traditional feminine portrayal of Hillary Clinton found in newsmagazines might dissuade voters in believing Hillary Clinton to be a competent presidential candidate and thus become an obstacle for her in the presidential nomination race.

As mentioned in Chapter Three, the results of semiotics analysis are not generalizable. The findings and the conclusions of this study don’t point to any other news media, newsmagazines or Newsweek in other sampling intervals. Besides, the purpose of this study is not to provide a general conclusion about media. It aims to provide, instead, a critical look at the messages in
images of Hillary Clinton in her three political career stages in order to see if Hillary Clinton was still stereotyped by the media as most women.

**Limitations**

While valuable, there are some deficiencies concerning this analysis. First, I studied a limited period of time in Hillary Clinton’s three career stages. I chose the sampling intervals around the election season because there is higher exposure for candidates during the campaign season. However, for the photos in the 1992 and the 1996 campaign, it is assumed that Hillary Clinton will get more traditional coverage because the presidential candidates normally try to present themselves and their wives as supporting the traditional family values. The traditional wife and mother is part of traditional values; therefore, my results might not represent the overall media image of Hillary Clinton in her terms of First Lady. In terms of the photos during the 2000 campaign, Hillary Clinton was still in her term as a First Lady when she was running for the New York Senator; therefore, the results don’t point to her overall media portrayal of her Senatorial career period. Second, there are always differences among readers of images as to how they read the images’ connotations. A person can interpret a sign in an image in one way while another person can have a totally different interpretation for the same sign. A sign might mean something to one person but something totally opposite to the other. People with different social, cultural, racial, class or gender background interpret things differently. Although I tend to analyze the photos based on the literature, my cultural and racial background influenced my findings. I am female, and was born and raised in a middle-class family in Taiwan. I received a bachelor’s degree in English Literature in Soochow University in Taiwan and came to the U.S. in 2006 to pursue my master’s degree in Mass Communication at the University of Florida. Therefore, my reading of the photos might be different with people from different cultural, racial, gender, national, educational, and class background.
Suggestions for Future Research

Despite these limitations, the study has its merits. It provides detailed analysis of Hillary Clinton’s photos during her three political career stages. Because I only looked at the signs and tried to find the dominant readings in the photo, I suggest future studies to explore deeper into the ideology of the media when they portray female politicians or other powerful and influential career women with photos. Future studies can try to find out how a newsmagazine manipulates the photo images of a female public figure and ask if they attempt to depict those women in a way that they sustain the ideology of patriarchy. In answering what are the ideologies of the newsmagazines that are conveyed in the photographic images, further research needs to cover the aspects of the photograph’s production. In-depth interviews with magazine publishers, photographers, and photo editors, or other image sources can help in answering the question of how and why the images are created or used.
APPENDIX A
CODING SHEET

Caption:

Description:

Is this a head-shot? yes no

What’s she portrayed as? (professional, public figure, wife, mother, hostess,
homemaker/housekeeper, philanthropist, other, or indeterminate)

Is she alone or with other people? alone with others

Describe and name:

Relative size:
Was there sizable distance between her and others pictured? sizable close
If men were in picture, was she shorter/lower than them? shorter taller/same

Look:
Portrayed in an alluring manner? yes no
As decorative? yes no
Appear disheveled? yes no
Mouth open? yes no
Are her eyes and/or mouth emphasized? yes no

Expression:
Appear grim/serious? yes no
Appears to be laughing or surprised? yes no
Appear tired? yes no
Smiling? yes no

Eye contact:
Eyes lowered/averted? yes no
If face-to-face interaction, is she performing an exec. role? yes no can't tell

Pose:
Standing erect/tall? yes no
Bending her knee? yes no
Canting position? yes no
Chin down? yes no
Head tilted? yes no
Arms close to body? close pointing/reaching out

Body movement (active or passive):
Is she yielding/moving away? yes no N/A indeterminate
Is she moving in a pointed direction? yes no N/A
Passive or dominant? speaking responding to others(listening/react non-verbal)

**Positional communication:**
Is finger to her mouth as if sucking or biting? yes no
Are her fingers touching each other (hands folded)? yes no

**Props: (object as a symbol?)**

**Settings:**

**Camera strategy:** (Close-up/angle/focus/filter)

**Feminine touch:**
Touching/holding an object? yes no
If with an object, tracing its outline, cradling, or caressing it? yes no

**Face-ism:** (face length/ total body length)

**Scale of Sexism:**
Portrayed as? 1. Two dimensional, only decorative. 2. Stay at home or doing womanly occupation. 3. Having two places: in the office and at home (priority is mothering). 4. Acknowledged that women and men should be equal. 6. Totally free from sexism.

**Communication Distance:**
What is her communication distance? intimate (touching) personal (close but not touching) social (at least 1 ft and less than 2 ft.) professional (+2 ft.)

Overall, how do you characterize this photo?

------------------------------------------

traditional nontraditional
Why?
Figure B-2. Hillary and I have talked this through: Nov./Dec., 1992, p. 27
Casting a spell: With Hillary last week

Clinton’s desire to be liked is legend. He is not known for his willingness to disappoint friends, or for his ruthlessness (defined

Figure B-3. Cast a spell: Nov. 16, 1992, p. 35
Figure B-4. Hillary was better in strategy-making: Nov./Dec., 1992, p. 38
Figure B-5. The soul of an activist, Nov. 16, 1992, p.42
Figure B-6. Chicago hopes: Sep. 9, 1996, p. 30
Figure B-7. Big themes, cold cash: Sep. 2, 1996, p.24
Figure B-8. Charm offensive: Oct. 7, 1996, p.38
Democrats and getting rapturous welcomes from carefully chosen crowds. She wants affection from the American public, or, failing that, at least a sympathetic understanding that she’s not the monster who sprang full born from Rush Limbaugh’s forehead.

It turns out that Hillary isn’t quite so tough after all. As Shakespeare said of a different stereotype, if you cut her, she bleeds. According to her closest aides, she wants to nurture the wounds and take her place on the national pedestal beside Eleanor Roosevelt and Barbara Bush. But two formidable problems stand between her and beatification: first, she is reluctant to play the panderer game with the public and the press unless she can control the outcome. And second, she has a special prosecutor armed with subpoena power laying siege to the East Wing.

There’s not much she can do about Ken Starr and his minions. The convention wisdom in Washington week holds that Starr will call her before another jury to testify about her e-mails with White House aide Craig Livingstone if it is still under investigation. But Starr has yet to uncover any smoking gun, and may not have the nerve to indict her if he can’t make a case close enough. None of that will end the virulent anti-Hillary chorus on the op-ed pages — columnists don’t have to meet the burdens of proof.

But Hillary has to do more to help herself. “She’s seen through a very narrow chalice,” says one of her aides, deputy chief of staff Melanie Verveer. “What she needs is to change people’s perception of her.”
Figure B-10. The scent of scandal: Nov. 18, 1996, p.70
THE ROLE OF LIFETIME

Hillary Clinton is many things, but she’s not—and welfare could be her ticket back

DAVID KLEIN

President Clinton never really told Barbara Walters that he hoped the First Lady would “take over” welfare reform, but he came close. The question was actually posed to Mrs. Clinton: what did she think she would be doing in a second term? As has been evident won, the First Lady predicted she would keep on. Then the president, as is his overconfident wont, jumped in: “I have a slightly different opinion.” It was an amusing small as he went on. He started out by saying about Hillary and welfare, that the words “health care” materialized part of his brain, and he retreated from “the real advocates of children, the First Lady, ... [should] weigh in here.” It was a golden television moment. Barbara Walters called the First Lady seemed taken first she heard of it, she said.

It was not a formal role, the president called over his shoulder for cover, and Republicans dancing in the streets. Bob Dole, hilarious chart of all the different off-care plans. Dole also started shouting “liberal” his now patented triple clap, fact.

This is something the world poverty programs are idiosyncratic figures, often religious sounding as OASIS.

Lessons learned: Despite health care, the First Lady understands the virtues of small programs
KERRY AND GORE WERE A LITTLE TOO INDEPENDENT-minded for Gore, too likely to pursue their own presidential ambitions. Lieberman appealed in part, as Tony Caffo saw it, because he would be Gore’s Gore. Complotted loyal and general for the chance to serve. (Indeed, when Lieberman was chosen, he exclaimed, “It’s a miracle!”) Edwards, young and en-

Figure B-12. Syracuse N.Y.: Nov. 20, 2000, p.81
Figure B-13. Fascinated by all things American: Nov. 27, 2000, p. 51
RECENT POLLS call the New York Senate race between Hillary Clinton and Republican Rep. Rick Lazio a dead heat, but the First Lady is lagging in the race for dollars. Clinton netted $3.3 million in the last seven weeks, including her star-studded buck-taking in Los Angeles last month. But Lazio is faring much better, adding $10.7 million to his war chest over the same period. The total is so impressive, even the Clinton camp admits that the First Lady is motivating conservative donors to reach for their checkbooks.

But now Clinton is striking back, enlisting one of the Democratic Party’s top fund-raisers to help hand her a win.

cently wrote a personal appeal to potential donors and, in September, he’ll average one fund-raiser a week on Hillary’s behalf.

This could also be good news for Al Gore, who’s been trying to keep his distance from the boss. Between drumming up bucks for Hillary, battling over the budget with the GOP Congress and continuing to push policies like the patients’ bill of rights and a prescription-drug plan, the president may be out of the way until October. “Whether you’ll ever see Al Gore and Bill Clinton on the stage together—no one’s figured that out yet.”

Figure B-14. The president will help boost Hillary’s war chest: Sep. 11, 2000, p.6
Figure B-15. Finger pointing: Nov. 26, 2000, p. 96
Hillary defends the gifts

‘You know, a lot of those lobbyists, like it or not, represent real Americans.'
Figure B-17. Beset on all sides: Sep. 17, 2007, p.30, 31
Figure B-18. What has she done: Aug. 13, 2007, p.36
The Talent Primary

Obama’s campaign is peeling off former advisers to Bill Clinton, and Hillary’s folks are none too happy.

BY MICHAEL HIRSH

They were devoting Richard Holbrooke, Albright and former security adviser Sandy Berger. To a sense, consciously or subconsciously we don’t want to just go back to the team: Holbrooke, Sandy, Madeleine same people having the same arg about who’s going to be in the room. The middlelevel Obama adviser. The campaign has played on those telling recruits they can rise faster Illinois senator, “The Obama you’ll never be in the inner circle Hillary,” says Gene Sperling, Senate’s top economic advisor. Many former senior officials, administration say they are feeling anyone, Hill.
Figure B-20. Bringing it: Nov. 12, 2007, p. 40
Figure B-21. Together through it all: Oct. 22, 2007, p.43
Figure B-22. Member of the club: Sep. 17, 2007, p.32, 33
Figure B-23. What Kind of Decider Would She be: Sep. 17, 2007, cover page
Papers? I Don’t See Any Papers.

He says he’s ‘pro-disclosure,’ but Bill has kept Hillary’s White House files under wraps.

By MICHAEL ISIKOFF

Bill and Hillary Clinton, the White House Years, "hits the bookstores this week.

The response: Smith got it wrong. Three years after the Clinton Library opened—and more than 21 months after its trove of records became subject to the Freedom of Information Act—Clinton spokesman Danny Rubin says it is "still not likely that Clinton\'s papers will be public before the election."

Figure B-24. Under cover: Oct. 29, 2007, p.37
The Once and Future Queen

Elizabeth's imperiled England is a lot like the America Clinton could well wind up leading.
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